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In these workshops sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) John Young, who leads the Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) Programme at the Overseas Development Institute in London, and Louise Shaxson, a consultant to the Evidence Base Team, Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs in London, UK. will provide an opportunity for researchers, policy makers and practitioners to learn how to improve the use of research in development policy and practice.

The series of three modular workshops focus on three different audiences:
- researchers wishing to improve the impact of their work on policy and practice;
- policy makers who want to know how to use research-based evidence more effectively; and
- practitioners who want to learn how to incorporate research into their practical projects.

Each workshop is self contained, and will include presentations, discussions and group work. Presentation handouts, and suggested background reading will be provided.

Module 1: Effective Research for Development Policy
In spite of an annual investment by donors of US$3 billion in development research, little is understood about how, when, and why evidence informs policy. This module will examine ways in which development research can be executed more effectively to maximize its influence on policy. To access further information about this workshop visit: http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/Module1.html

Module 2: Evidence and the Policy Making Process
There is an increasing emphasis on evidence-based policy making in developed and developing countries around the world. Module 2 will examine ways in which policy makers access research and researchers, what constitutes evidence (it's more than just hard facts!), and how research fits into the policy cycle. To access further information about this workshop visit: http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/Module2.html

Module 3: Action Research for Maximum Impact
Better application of research and evidence in development policy making can save lives, reduce poverty, and improve quality of life. The final module in this series will look at ways in which action research can lead to greater impact during project implementation, and will examine "good news" case studies in developing countries. To access further information about this workshop visit: http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/Module1.html

¹ Visit http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress to access these materials on-line.
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Module 1: Effective Research for Development Policy
John Young – j.young@odi.org.uk

In spite of an annual investment by donors of US$3 billion in development research, little is understood about how, when, and why evidence informs policy. This module will examine ways in which development research can be executed more effectively to maximize its influence on policy.

Background
How does research contribute to policy? Traditionally, the link between research findings and policy processes has been viewed as a linear process, whereby a set of research findings is shifted from the 'research sphere' over to the 'policy sphere', and then has some impact on policy-makers' decisions. This traditional view is now being questioned. It is no longer assumed that research influences policy in a one-way process (the linear model), or that there is a clear divide between researchers and policy-makers (the two communities model). Instead, literature on the research-policy link is now moving towards a more dynamic and complex view that emphasises a two-way process between research and policy, shaped by multiple relations and reservoirs of knowledge. This shift reflects the fact that the subject area has generated greater interest in the past few years. However, there is still a limited number of case studies, and it is often difficult to explain why some policies become evidence-based while others seem to remain evidence-averse.

In order to improve understanding and awareness in this area, RAPID has developed both a conceptual framework and collected a number of case studies. The traditional question could be phrased: 'How can research be transported from the research to the policy sphere?' Now, however, the question concerns research uptake pathways: 'Why are some of the ideas that circulate in the research/policy networks picked up and acted on, while others are ignored and disappear?' The answer to this seems to lie in a combination of several determining influences, which can broadly be divided into three areas: (1) Political context, (2) Evidence, and (3) Links. In addition, the ongoing work has shown that a fourth area is crucial, namely: (4) External factors. This conceptual framework has been applied to fifty short case studies from around the world (ODI Working Paper 213), and four in-depth case studies for the edited volume Bridging Research and Policy in Development; Evidence and the Change Process.

The Problem
The dimensions of the problem are well illustrated by the following three quotes:

- **Policy Processes are not linear and logical**: 'The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies' - Edward Clay, 1984

- **Much research is irrelevant**: 'Most policy research on African agriculture is irrelevant to agricultural and overall economic policy in Africa' - Steve Were Omamo, 2003

- **Policymakers are not interested**: policymakers 'seem to regard "research" as the opposite of "action" rather than the opposite of "ignorance".' - Martin Surr, 2002

1 http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/module1.html
2 http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/ODI_WP_213.html
3 http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/BRP_ITDG.html
Lessons
Based on over five years of theoretical and case study research, ODI’s Research and Policy in Development programme has developed a simple analytical framework and practical tools that can help researchers to make better use of research-based evidence in development policy and practice. For this to happen more effectively researchers need to do three things:

- First, they need to develop a detailed understanding of i) the policymaking process - what are the key influencing factors, and how do they relate to each other? ii) the nature of the evidence they have, or hope to get - is it credible, practical and operationally useful? and iii) all the other stakeholders involved in the policy area - who else can help to get the message across?

- Second, they need to develop an overall strategy for their work - identify political supporters and opponents, keep an eye out for, and be able to react to policy windows, ensure the evidence is credible and practically useful, and build coalitions with like-minded groups.

- Third, they need to be entrepreneurial - get to know, and work with the policymakers, build long term programmes of credible research, communicate effectively, use participatory approaches, identify key networkers and salesmen and use shadow networks.

Suggested reading

- Bridging Research and Policy in International Development: An Analytical and Practical Framework. John Young and Julius Court, RAPID Briefing Paper 1, October 2004
- Bridging Research and Policy in Development: Evidence and the Change Process. Edited by Julius Court, Ingie Hovland and John Young, ITDG Publishing
  This edited volume contains four in-depth case studies which are also available individually in Working Paper format:
  - Tools for Policy Impact: A toolkit to help researchers achieve greater impact.
  - Successful Communication: 23 research communication tools, divided into the following categories: ‘Planning’, ‘Packaging’, ‘Targeting’ and ‘Monitoring’.
  - A Toolkit for Progressive Policymakers in Developing Countries: based on approaches from Evidence-based Policymaking (EBP) in the UK
Effective Research for Development Policy

John Young
CFHSS Congress 2006
York University

Definitions

- **Research**: “any systematic effort to increase the stock of knowledge”
- **Policy**: a “purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors”
- **Evidence**: “the available information supporting or otherwise a belief or proposition”
- **Evidence-based Policy**: “public policy informed by rigorously established evidence”.

Overseas Development Institute

- Development Think Tank
- £8m, 60 researchers
- Research / Advice / Public Debate
- Rural / Humanitarian / Poverty & Aid / Economics / Policy Processes
- DFID, Parliament, WB, EC
- Civil Society

For more information see: www.odi.org.uk

RAPID Programme

- Research
  - Literature
  - GDN Case Studies
  - ODI Case Studies
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  - Projects
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- Workshops and Seminars
- Think Tank Programme

for further information see: www.odi.org.uk/rapid

Workshop Overview

- Definitions
- ODI & RAPID
- Some theory & an analytical framework
- A case study
- Group work: Your own experience
- Feedback
- A practical framework
- Tools & further information

The linear logical model…

- Identify the problem
  - Commission research
  - Analyse the results
  - Choose the best option
- Establish the policy
- Implement the policy
- Evaluation
...in reality...

- "The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies" 1
- "Most policy research on African agriculture is irrelevant to agricultural and overall economic policy in Africa" 2
- "Research is more often regarded as the opposite of action rather than a response to ignorance" 3

1 Clay & Schaffer (1984), Room for Manoeuvre; An Exploration of Public Policy in Agricultural and Rural Development, Heineman Educational Books, London
3 Surr (2003), DFID Research Review

Existing theory

- Policy narratives, Roe
- Systems of Innovation Model, (NSI)
- "Room for manoeuvre", Clay & Schaffer
- "Street level bureaucrats", Lipsky
- DisjointedIncrementalism, Lindquist
- Social Epidemics, Gladwell
- The RAPID Framework

An Analytical Framework

External Influences

- Socio-economic and cultural influences, donor policies etc

The political context

- political and economic structures, processes, culture, institutional pressures, incremental vs radical change etc.

The links

- between policy and research communities – networks, relationships, power, competing discourses, trust, knowledge etc.

The evidence

- credibility, the degree it challenges received wisdom, research approaches and methodology, simplicity of the message, how it is packaged etc.

Case Studies

- Sustainable Livelihoods: The Evolution of DFID Policy
- The PRSP Initiative: Research in Multilateral Policy Change
- The adoption of Ethical Principles in Humanitarian Aid post Rwanda
- Animal Health Care in Kenya: Evidence fails to influence Policy
- 50 GDN Case Studies: Examples where evidence has or hasn’t influenced policy

Paravets in Kenya

- Professionalisation of Public Services. Structural Adjustment → collapse of services.
- Paravet projects emerge.
- Privatisation.
- ITDG projects – collaborative research.
- Rapid spread in North.
- Multistakeholder WSs → new policies.
-Still not approved / passed!

1970s
1980s
1990s
2000s

Dr Kajume
KVB letter (January 1998)
The Hubli Study
From your own experience - What was the key factor for success or failure?

Other models
- National Systems of Innovation (Hall) [see http://www.idrc.ca/fr/ev-85054-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html]
- Drivers of Change (DFID) [see http://www.gov-exchange.org/pc themes/innovationsystems_drivers.html]
- Spiral Dynamics (Don Beck) [see http://wie.org/spiral/?ifr=af]

A Practical Framework

What you need to know
- The external environment: Who are the key actors? What is their agenda? How do they influence the political context?
- The political context: Is there political interest in change? Is there room for manoeuvre? How do they perceive the problem?
- The evidence: Is it there? Is it relevant? Is it practically useful? Are the concepts familiar or new? Does it need re-packaging?
- Links: Who are the key individuals? Are there existing networks to use? How best to transfer the information? The media? Campaigns?

What researchers need to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Context:</strong></td>
<td>Get to know the policymakers. Identify friends and foes. Prepare for policy opportunities. Look out for policy windows.</td>
<td>Work with them — seek commissions. Strategic opportunism — prepare for known events + resources for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links</strong></td>
<td>Get to know the others. Work through existing networks. Build coalitions. Build new policy networks. Develop partnerships. Identify key networkers, mavens and salesmen. Use informal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy entrepreneurs

- Storytellers
- Networkers
- Engineers
- Fixers

Practical Tools

- Overarching Tools
  - The RAPID Framework
  - Using the Framework
  - The Entrepreneurship Questionnaire

- Communication Tools
  - Communications Strategy
  - SWOT analysis
  - Message Design
  - Making use of the media

- Policy Influence Tools
  - Influence Mapping & Power Map
  - Lobbying and Advocacy
  - Campaigning: A Simple Guide
  - Competency self-assessment

Groundwater in India

- To maximise impact of DFID forest/ground water research project in India
- Researchers, policy makers and activists
- Used framework to analyse factors in water sector in India
- Developed strategy for final phase:
  - Less research
  - More communication
  - Developing champions in regional and national government
  - Local, Regional & National advocacy campaign

SMEPOL Project Egypt

- An IDRC project to improve small and medium scale enterprise policy in Egypt
- Policy analysts & researchers
- Used a range of tools:
  - Policy Process Mapping
  - RAPID Framework
  - Stakeholder Analysis
  - Force-Field Analysis
  - SWOT
- To develop action plans for more evidence-based policy development

DFID Policy Processes

- To explore how policies formed and promoted in DFID.
- Small, informal workshop:
  - 7 staff
  - Identified 8 recent policy initiatives
  - Pair-wise ranking of success factors.
- Key factors in DFID:
  - Intellectual coherence & “evidence”
  - Congruence with White Papers
  - High-level support
  - Follow-up

RAPID Stuff

- ODI Working Papers
- Bridging Research and Policy Book
- Meeting series Monograph
- RAPID Briefing Paper
- Tools for Policy Impact
- Communication Tools
- Policymaker Tools
- RAPID CDROM
- www.odi.org.uk/rapid
Bridging Research and Policy in International Development
An Analytical and Practical Framework

The RAPID Programme

The RAPID Programme
ODI’s Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) programme aims to improve the use of research and evidence in development policy and practice through research, advice and debate. The programme has four main themes:

- The use of evidence in policy identification, development and implementation;
- Improving communication and information systems for development agencies;
- Better knowledge management to enhance the impact of development agencies;
- Promotion and capacity building for evidence-based policy.

We would like to acknowledge support for this work from: the UK Department for International Development, the Global Development Network, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, and the Merck Foundation.

The Problem

The Policy Process: ‘The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies’ – Edward Clay, 1984

Relevance: ‘Most policy research on African agriculture is irrelevant to agricultural and overall economic policy in Africa’ – Steve Were Omamo, 2003

Policy Uptake: ‘policymakers “seem to regard “research” as the opposite of “action” rather than the opposite of “ignorance”.”’ – Martin Surr, 2002


The Issue in Brief

Better use of research-based evidence in development policy and practice can help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. But for this to happen more effectively researchers need to do three things:

First, they need to develop a detailed understanding of i) the policymaking process – what are the key influencing factors, and how do they relate to each other? ii) the nature of the evidence they have, or hope to get – is it credible, practical and operationally useful? and iii) all the other stakeholders involved in the policy area – who else can help to get the message across?

Second, they need to develop an overall strategy for their work – identify political supporters and opponents, keep an eye out for, and be able to react to policy windows, ensure the evidence is credible and practically useful, and build coalitions with like-minded groups.

Third, they need to be entrepreneurial – get to know, and work with the policymakers, build long term programmes of credible research, communicate effectively, use participatory approaches, identify key networkers and salesmen and use shadow networks.

Based on over five years of theoretical and case study research, ODI’s Research and Policy in Development programme has developed a simple analytical framework and practical tools that can help researchers to do this.

Why Research-Policy Links Matter

Often it seems that researchers, practitioners and policymakers live in parallel universes. Researchers cannot understand why there is resistance to policy change despite clear and convincing evidence. Policymakers bemoan the inability of many researchers to make their findings accessible and digestible in time for policy decisions. Practitioners often just get on with things.

Yet better utilisation of research and evidence in development policy and practice can help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. For example, the results of household disease surveys in rural Tanzania informed a process of health service reforms which contributed to over 40% reductions in infant mortality between 2000 and 2003 in two districts.

Indeed, the impact of research and evidence on development policy is not only beneficial – it is crucial. The HIV/AIDS crisis has deepened in some countries because of the reluctance of governments to implement effective control programmes despite clear evidence of what causes the disease and how to prevent it spreading.

What Influences Research to Policy Uptake? The RAPID Framework

Often, the link between research and policy, or evidence and practice, is viewed as a linear process, whereby a set of research findings or lessons shift from the ‘research sphere’ over to the ‘policy sphere’, and then has some impact on policymakers’ decisions and practical programmes. Reality tends to be much more dynamic...
and complex, with two-way processes between research, policy and practice, shaped by multiple relations and reservoirs of knowledge.

The traditional question ‘How can research be transported from the research to the policy sphere?’ has been replaced by a more complex question: ‘Why are some of the ideas that circulate in the research/policy networks picked up and acted on, while others are ignored and disappear?’.

ODI’s theoretical, case study and practical work has identified a wide range of inter-related factors, which determine whether research-based and other forms of evidence are likely to be adopted by policymakers and practitioners. These factors can broadly be divided into three overlapping areas: the political context; the evidence; and the links between policy and research communities, within a fourth set of factors: the external context. The interplay of these four areas is laid out in Figure 1: The RAPID Framework. The framework should be seen as a generic, perhaps ideal, model. In some cases there will not be much overlap between the different spheres; in others the overlap may vary considerably.

![Figure 1: The RAPID Framework](image)

**External Influences**

- Socio-economic and cultural influences,
- donor policies

**Political Context: Politics and Institutions**

Research-policy links are dramatically shaped by the political context. The policy process and the production of research are in themselves political processes from start to finish. Key influencing factors include:

- The extent of civil and political freedoms in a country;
- Political contestation, institutional pressures and vested interests;
- The attitudes and incentives among officials, their room for manoeuvre, local history, and power relations.

In some cases the political strategies and power relations are obvious, and are tied to specific institutional pressures. Ideas circulating may be discarded by the majority of staff in an organisation if those ideas elicit disapproval from the leadership.

**Evidence: Credibility and Communication**

Our findings and experience suggest that the quality of the research is important for policy uptake. Policy influence is affected by topical relevance and, as importantly, the operational usefulness of an idea; it helps if a new approach has been piloted and the document can clearly demonstrate the value of a new option. A critical issue affecting uptake is whether research has provided a solution to a problem.

The other key set of issues here concern communication. The sources and conveyors of evidence, the way new messages are packaged (especially if they are couched in familiar terms) and targeted can all make a big difference. For example, marketing is based on the insight that people’s reaction to a new product or idea is often determined by the packaging rather than the content in and of itself. The key message is that communication is a very demanding process and it is best to take an interactive approach. Continuous interaction leads to greater chances of successful communication than a simple or linear approach.

**Links: Influence and Legitimacy**

Third, our work emphasises the importance of links; of communities, networks and intermediaries (for example, the media and campaigning groups) in affecting policy change. Some of the current literature focuses explicitly on various types of networks, such as policy communities, epistemic communities, and advocacy coalitions. While systematic understanding remains limited, issues of trust, legitimacy, openness and the formalisation of networks have emerged as important. Existing theory stresses the role of translators and communicators. It seems that there is often an under-appreciation of the extent and ways that intermediary organisations and networks impact on formal policy guidance documents, which in turn influence officials.

**External Influences**

Finally, a synthesis of the RAPID experience emphasises the impact of external forces and donors actions on research-policy interactions. While many questions remain, key issues here include the impact of international politics and processes, as well as the impact of general donor policies and specific research-funding instruments. Broad incentives, such as EU Accession or the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process, can have a substantial impact on the demand for research by policymakers. Trends towards democratisation and liberalisation and donor support for civil society are also having an impact. Much of the research on development issues is undertaken in the North, raising concerns of relevance and beneficiaries’ access to the findings. A substantial amount of research in the poorest countries is funded by international donors, which also raises a range of issues around ownership, whose priorities, use of external consultants and perceived legitimacy. As policy processes become increasingly global, this arena will increase in importance.

However, although evidence clearly matters, there has been very limited systematic understanding of when, how and why evidence informs policy. This Briefing Paper...
provides a synthesis of the main conclusions of recent ODI work in this area and makes recommendations for how research can better contribute to pro-poor policy and practice.

**PRSPs: A Case Study of Research-Policy Linkages**

In September 1999, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) adopted a new approach to aid – Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). How did the idea of the PRSP come to be adopted? What was the role of research in this process – both ‘academic research’ in general and the ‘applied policy research’ within the World Bank and IMF? An ODI case study traces the various factors that contributed to this far-reaching policy shift.

**Political Context:** The most important contextual factor that shaped the PRSP initiative was the convergence of debates and controversies in the field of international development in the late 1990s. This led to a widespread sense of there being ‘a problem’ within the international development field even though policymakers did not agree on the exact nature of the problem. The challenges that needed to be addressed – particularly by the World Bank and the IMF – included:

- The questioning of the mandates of the IMF and World Bank – in the light of the 1997 Asia Crisis and the failure of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) to resolve Africa’s development problems;
- The 1999 Review of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the campaign to make debt relief ‘broader, deeper, faster, better’;
- The need to operationalise the new conceptual framework for aid put forward by World Bank President James Wolfensohn’s Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF).

The PRSP initiative can be viewed as bringing together all these interlinked concerns, and providing answers or at least partial solutions to the issues that needed to be addressed. It therefore received broad-based support from many different parties.

**Evidence:** There were three main types of evidence that influenced the emergence of the PRSP initiative. First, academic research contributed, often indirectly, to the major shifts in international development discourse towards poverty reduction, participation, and aid effectiveness. Second, there were important pieces of applied policy research undertaken in the late 1990s, in particular the research related to the ESAF reviews, the HIPC review, the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) Working Groups, and the NGO research on debt relief. This evidence focused more on providing policy recommendations and operational solutions. This was seen as particularly credible when it was commissioned by the IFIs themselves or other donors, demonstrated analytical rigour, and was communicated in a language that was accessible and relevant to World Bank and IMF staff and other donor agencies. Third, an extremely powerful demonstration effect was provided by the positive experience of Uganda in drafting the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). This did much to convince policymakers of the feasibility and merits of the poverty reduction strategy model.

**Links:** The PRSP story is characterised by a multitude of links between policymakers and researchers in main institutional actors – the World Bank and IMF, Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA), UK and US governments, and the NGO movement. As one interviewee put it, ‘none of the players is more than two handshakes away from any of the others’. The formal and informal networks contributed to the speed with which the PRSP ideas were spread and accepted in international development policy.

**When Does Evidence Influence Policy?**

Emerging results from this and a synthesis of the other ODI studies seems to indicate that research-based and other forms of evidence is more likely to contribute to policy if:

- It fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policymakers, and resonates with their assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge them;
- The evidence is credible and convincing, provides practical solutions to pressing policy problems, and is packaged to attract policymakers’ interest;
- Researchers and policymakers share common networks, trust each other, and communicate effectively.

But these three conditions are rarely met in practice. Although researchers and practitioners can control the credibility of their evidence and ensure they interact with and communicate well with policymakers, they often have limited capacity to influence the political context within which they work. Resources are also limited, and researchers and practitioners need to make choices.
Table 1: How to influence policy and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Context:</th>
<th>What researchers need to know</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who are the policymakers?</td>
<td>• Get to know the policymakers, their agendas and their constraints.</td>
<td>• Work with the policymakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there policymaker demand for new ideas?</td>
<td>• Identify potential supporters and opponents.</td>
<td>• Seek commissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the sources / strengths of resistance?</td>
<td>• Keep an eye on the horizon and prepare for opportunities in regular policy processes.</td>
<td>• Line up research programmes with high-profile policy events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the policymaking process?</td>
<td>• Look out for – and react to – unexpected policy windows.</td>
<td>• Reserve resources to be able to move quickly to respond to policy windows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the opportunities and timing for input into formal processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow sufficient time and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence:</th>
<th>What researchers need to know</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the current theory?</td>
<td>• Establish credibility over the long term.</td>
<td>• Build up programmes of high-quality work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the prevailing narratives?</td>
<td>• Provide practical solutions to problems.</td>
<td>• Action-research and Pilot projects to demonstrate benefits of new approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How divergent is the new evidence?</td>
<td>• Establish legitimacy.</td>
<td>• Use participatory approaches to help with legitimacy and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What sort of evidence will convince policymakers?</td>
<td>• Build a convincing case and present clear policy options.</td>
<td>• Clear strategy for communication from the start.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Package new ideas in familiar theory or narratives.</td>
<td>• Face-to-face communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links:</th>
<th>What researchers need to know</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who are the key stakeholders?</td>
<td>• Get to know the other stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Partnerships between researchers, policymakers and policy end-users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What links and networks exist between them?</td>
<td>• Establish a presence in existing networks.</td>
<td>• Identify key networkers and salesmen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who are the intermediaries, and do they have influence?</td>
<td>• Build coalitions with like-minded stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Use informal contacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whose side are they on?</td>
<td>• Build new policy networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences:</th>
<th>What researchers need to know</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who are main international actors in the policy process?</td>
<td>• Get to know the donors, their priorities and constraints.</td>
<td>• Develop extensive background on donor policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What influence do they have?</td>
<td>• Identify potential supporters, key individuals and networks.</td>
<td>• Orient communications to suit donor priorities and language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are their aid priorities?</td>
<td>• Establish credibility.</td>
<td>• Cooperate with donors and seek commissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are their research priorities and mechanisms?</td>
<td>• Keep an eye on donor policy and look out for policy windows.</td>
<td>• Contact (regularly) key individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the policies of the donors funding the research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

about what they do. By making more informed, strategic choices, researchers can maximise their chances of policy influence.

What Can Researchers Do?
Evidence from ODI’s work so far provides preliminary recommendations in four areas, which are laid out in Table 1.

RAPID has been testing and developing the practical applications of this framework through a series of case studies and international workshops. It is clear that the conditions of the political context, the evidence, the links and the external factors vary greatly according to the particular situation. Further information on the use of the framework in a variety of specific contexts will be presented in subsequent Briefing Papers.

Source Material
This Briefing Paper is based on work conducted in the RAPID Programme at ODI, and particularly draws on the book *Bridging Research and Policy in International Development: Evidence and the Change Process* by Julius Court, Ingie Hovland and John Young (ITDG, 2004).
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Module 2: Evidence and the Policy Making Process

Louise Shaxson Louise@shaxson.com

There is an increasing emphasis on evidence-based policy making in developed and developing countries around the world. Module 2 will examine ways in which policy makers access research and researchers, what constitutes evidence (it's more than just hard facts!), and how research fits into the policy cycle, and will examine ways in which development research can be executed more effectively to maximize its influence on policy.

Introduction

‘Evidence-based policy making’ is a buzzword these days – there is a great emphasis on it in the UK and elsewhere, and many learned journal articles are devoted to trying to explain what it means in different contexts. One of the contexts that is missing from much analysis, however, is that of the policymakers themselves. Analysing policy-making as part of the business of Government can bring about a quite different view of the nature of evidence that is needed and the processes through which we put it. Evidence suppliers place great emphasis on the need to keep evidence ‘policy neutral’ in order to be able to provide ‘objective’ answers to policy questions – but this is increasingly being questioned by those on the demand side of the equation.

Purpose of the workshop session

This workshop session will explore how to think about reconciling the demand and supply of evidence for policy. Louise has spent the past three years working closely with policy makers in the UK’s Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) to understand how the internal business of a large government department shapes the issues around the use of evidence. This workshop will explore evidence-based policy making from the policy makers’ point of view, paying particular emphasis to situations where policy goals are diffuse, long-term and highly negotiable.

Scope of the workshop session

Following an icebreaker, Louise will give a short presentation on the meaning of evidence & analysis in the policymaking process. She will argue that ‘evidence based policy making’ is not a sacred cow, and will show that there are two keys to improving the use of evidence in policy. First is an appreciation of policymaking as a business; second is the need to move away from spurious notions of objectivity in the evidence base and develop a more nuanced view of what we mean by ‘policy relevant’ evidence.

Suggested reading


1 Access these materials on line at http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/module2
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Workshop Overview
• Exercise: Food in primary schools
• Drivers of change
• Policy development trajectory
• Evidence and analysis
• What policymakers want
• The role of analysts
• EBPM in practice
• Further information

Exercise: Food in Primary Schools

Drivers of change
• Increasing emphasis on the quality of evidence and its use (Modernising Government);
• To underpin & inform strategy, policy, regulatory work, foresight; and to mitigate risk;
• Importance of challenge to evidence (BSE inquiry, Science Advisory Committees)
• Depth and breadth of future evidence needs will increase given complex and overlapping strategic priorities

Policy development trajectory
• Smaller policy core (efficiency drive in the public sector)
• Getting rid of the ‘generalist/specialist’ label
• Improving intelligent customer capability
• Future evidence needs, when set against strategic priorities, are complex & overlapping. How do we deal with ‘sustainability’?

Evidence for policy is…
…any robust information that helps to turn a Department’s strategic priorities into something concrete, manageable and achievable.

The nature of the evidence you need is proportional to the nature of the risk associated with the decision that is being made.
What is evidence and analysis?

**Evidence is:**
Facts (data, known trends), judgements, opinions, analyses, syntheses, arguments, costings, reviews, qualitative & quantitative survey data

**Analysis is:**
Lines of argument (strategy-policy), research, interpretation

Decision makers like numbers…
…but the evidence base is built upon
- Data
- Lines of argument (analysis)
- Stakeholder opinions

Evidence-based policy making is not a sacred cow:

There are policies that:
- Use good information… ...and use it well…
- Use poor information… ...and use it poorly…

Evidence and analysis needed rapidly to answer pressing policy questions

Components of robust evidence & analysis (supply side)
- Is the evidence **credible**?
- Can we make **generalisations** from it?
- Is it **reliable** enough for M&E or impact assessments?
- Is it **objective**? How do we account for bias?
- Is it **rooted** in an understanding of the framing assumptions?

Components of robust evidence & analysis (demand side)
- Is the evidence **policy relevant**?
- Is it **timely**? Has it been delivered fast enough to inform policy decisions?
- Is it **accessible** to all key stakeholders, not just researchers?
- Is the evidence **cost-effective**?
- Is it **interdisciplinary** enough to address cross-cutting issues?
The role of analysts

...is to provide appropriate evidence & analysis throughout the policy making process

- Quality assessment, peer review, advisory councils, G2000
- Procuring, managing and carrying out new research
- Interpreting & applying new or existing evidence; monitoring & evaluating the policy once implemented
- Negotiate how to apply the evidence; consultancy role
- Scoping the issue; asking the question; deciding what sort of evidence is needed
- Negotiate the question, advise on alternative sources of evidence

EBPM in practice

- Defra's Evidence & Innovation Strategy:
- Matching supply-side and demand-side criteria
- Based on the question ‘does it make good policy?’ rather than ‘is it good science?’
- Develop a clear line of sight between policy priorities and evidence provision – for efficient delivery
- Analyse in relation to the policy cycle – evidence needs change from strategy through to delivery
- Need a better understanding of innovation

How can analysts balance...

- the need to answer policy’s immediate questions (with robust & cost-efficient evidence)
- while developing their role (as people who understand policy processes)
- to underpin broader & more strategic approaches to policy (involving other evidence providers, particularly other disciplines)

Selected Bibliography
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Module 3: Action Research for Maximum Impact

John Young – j.young@odi.org.uk

Better application of research and evidence in development policy making can save lives, reduce poverty, and improve quality of life. The final module in this series will look at ways in which action research can lead to greater impact during project implementation, and will examine "good news" case studies in developing countries.

Analysis of over 50 case studies gathered from around the world indicates that research-based and other forms of evidence is more likely to contribute to evidence-based policy if:

i. it fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policy makers, and resonates with their assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge them;

ii. the evidence is credible and convincing, provides practical solutions to current policy problems, and is packaged to attract policy-makers interest;

iii. researchers and policy makers share common networks, trust each other, honestly, represent the interests of all stakeholders and communicate effectively.

Action-research are designed to do just this. This workshop will present some examples of successful action-research projects, some lessons about what matters, and some simple tools to help researchers and practitioners to maximise the impact of their work.

Suggested reading

- The DELIVERI Case Study and Website:
- The Paravets in Kenya Case Study:
- The TEHIP Case Study and website:
- Tools for Policy Impact: This toolkit represents work-in-progress on tools for policy impact, specifically geared towards the needs of researchers. The tools are grouped under the headings Research Tools, Context Assessment Tools, Communication Tools, and Policy Influence Tools.
- A Toolkit for Progressive Policymakers: The aim of this toolkit is to identify lessons and approaches from Evidence-based Policymaking (EBP) in the UK which may be valuable for developing countries and it summaries specific tools used by the UK government.
- Successful Communication: What is needed is far better communication of evidence within the international development field, therefore this toolkit is designed to help development actors communicate better. It presents 23 tools, divided into the following categories: 'Planning', 'Packaging', 'Targeting' and 'Monitoring'.

---

1 http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/events/congress/module3.html
4 http://www.deliveri.org/default.htm
5 www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Tools/Case_studies/Paravets.html
6 www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Tools/Case_studies/TEHIP.html
7 www.idrc.ca/tehip
Action Research for Maximum Impact
John Young
CFHSS Congress 2006
York University

Workshop Overview
- Can research influence policy?
- The RAPID CEL Framework
- Good news stories – what works?
- Some practical tools
- Group work: trying out the tools
- Sources of further information.

Agriculture in Africa
“The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies”

Chronic Poverty in Uganda

Health Policy in Tanzania
“The results of household disease surveys informed processes of health service reform which contributed to a 43 and 46 per cent reduction in infant mortality between 2000 and 2003 in two districts in rural Tanzania.”
TEHIP Project, Tanzania: www.idrc.ca/tehip

An Analytical Framework

External Influences
- Socio-economic and cultural influences,
- donor policies etc

The political context –
- political and economic structures
- and processes, culture, institutional pressures, incremental vs radical change etc.

The links between policy and research communities –
- networks, relationships, power,
- competing discourses, trust, knowledge etc.

The evidence – credibility, the degree it challenges received wisdom, research approaches and methodology, simplicity of the message, how it is packaged etc.
Case Studies

- Sustainable Livelihoods: The Evolution of DFID Policy
- The PRSP Initiative: Research in Multilateral Policy Change
- The adoption of Ethical Principles in Humanitarian Aid post Rwanda
- Animal Health Care in Kenya: Evidence fails to influence Policy
- 50 GDN Case Studies: Examples where evidence has or hasn’t influenced policy

What you need to know

- The external environment: Who are the key actors? What is their agenda? How do they influence the political context?
- The political context: Is there political interest in change? Is there room for manoeuvre? How do they perceive the problem?
- The evidence: Is it there? Is it relevant? Is it practically useful? Are the concepts familiar or new? Does it need re-packaging?
- Links: Who are the key individuals? Are there existing networks to use? How best to transfer the information? The media? Campaigns?

What researchers need to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What researchers need to know</th>
<th>What researchers need to do</th>
<th>How to do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Links</td>
<td>Get to know the others. Work through existing networks. Build coalitions. Build new policy networks.</td>
<td>• Build partnerships. Identify key networkers, mavens and salesmen. Use informal contacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storytellers</th>
<th>Networkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>Fixers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any good stories?
Paravets in Kenya

- Professionalisation of PAs
- Structural Adjustment → collapse of services
- ITDG projects – collaborative research
- Privatisation
- ITDG Paravet network and change of DVS
- Rapid spread in North
- KVB letter (January 1998)
- Multistakeholder WSs → new policies
- Still not approved / passed
- But well established throughout the country!

Livestock Services Indonesia

- 5-year £5m DFID-funded project 1996-2001
- Long DFID involvement, successful pilot & senior government champion
- Field-level pilots, HRD and central policy components
- Very strong emphasis on engagement and communication
- 1998 “Krisis Monitaire”
- Field-tested practical solutions
- Critical mass of trained champions
- Good linkages with other processes & programmes

For more information: www.deliveri.org/default.htm

Health Policy in Tanzania

- GoT strongly committed to improved services but highly centralised and few resources
- TEHIP IDRC / CIDA / Government of Tanzania project since 1997: how can health services be more evidence-based?
- Local disease surveys informing local service planning
- + improved resources (global projects)
- Ongoing surveys now annual process
- ↓ child mortality of 40% by 2002, ↓ death rates 15-60 yrs of 16% (cf no change elsewhere)

Critical factors

- Long involvement
- Understanding of the context
- Local champions & ownership
- Researchers, policy makers and practitioners working together
- Practical (policy) solutions
- Engagement with all stakeholders (ie including bureaucrats and communities)
- Effective communications
- Flexibility
- Personalities
- Luck

Some practical tools

- Overarching Tools
  - The RAPID Framework
  - Using the Framework
  - The Entrepreneurship Questionnaire

- Communication Tools
  - Communications Strategy
  - SWOT analysis
  - Message Design
  - Making use of the media

- Policy Influence Tools
  - Influence Mapping & Power Map
  - Lobbying and Advocacy
  - Campaigning: A Simple Guide
  - Competency self-assessment
Introducing some tools

- RAPID Framework
- Problem Situation Analysis (Tree Analysis)
- Stakeholder Analysis
- Policy Process Mapping
- Force field analysis
- Influence mapping
- SWOT analysis

RAPID CEL Framework

Problem Tree Analysis

1. Discuss and agree the problem or issue to be analysed.
2. Identify the causes of the focal problem (roots) and then the consequences (branches)

NB: The discussion is the most important thing; as issues are debated factors are arranged and re-arranged, often forming sub-dividing roots and branches

Stakeholder Analysis

Why:
- To understand who gains or lose from a policy or project.
- To help Build Consensus.

Steps:
1. Identify Stakeholders
2. Analysis Workshop
3. Develop Strategies

Policy Process Mapping

- General domestic and international context.
- Specific Policy Issues (i.e. the policy cycle)
- Who are the Stakeholders? (Stakeholder analysis)
  – Arena: government, parliament, civil society, judiciary, private sector.
  – Level: local, national, international
- What is their interest and influence?
- Process matrix + political matrix
- Political and administrative feasibility assessment

[Sources: M. Grindle / J. Court]

Actors and processes

[Source: Yael Parag]
**Forcefield Analysis**

- Identify what you want to achieve
- Identify forces for and against change
- Identify which are the most important
- Develop strategies to reinforce those for and overcome those against

---

**SWOT Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts and Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other orgs relevant to the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources: financial, technical, human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and policy space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups or forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SMEPOL Project Egypt**

- An IDRC project to improve small and medium scale enterprise policy in Egypt
- Policy analysts & researchers
- Used a range of tools:
  - Policy Process Mapping
  - RAPID Framework
  - Stakeholder Analysis
  - Force-Field Analysis
  - SWOT
- To develop action plans for more evidence-based policy development

---

**Selected Bibliography**

- www.idrc.org/tehip
- The DELIVERI Case Study and Website: [www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Tools/Case_studies/DELIVERI.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Tools/Case_studies/DELIVERI.html)
- www.deliveri.org/default.htm

---
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Community-based Animal Health Workers in Kenya: The long and complicated process of policy reform

This case study is a summary of research which formed part of ODI's Bridging Research and Policy project which is seeking to learn more about linkages between development research, policy and practice and promote evidence-based international development policy. This research project drew lessons from policy advocacy work in Kenya carried out by the Intermediate Technology Development Group and various development agencies. The project also included a literature review, the development of a framework paper and two other case studies.

Livestock services, were among the first rural services targeted for privatisation under structural adjustment programmes, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. The veterinary profession however was very slow to respond. In Kenya the increasing financial constraints effectively paralysed government services in the late 80s and early 90s. During this period NGOs introduced a new model of community-based livestock services, otherwise called Community-based Animal Healthcare (CAHC). Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG), one of early pioneers in the mid 80s, adopted an action-research approach with a clear objective to use the results, if positive, to influence the policy environment to allow the approaches to be widely replicated. This case study explores the reasons why, despite the outstanding success and proliferation of the new Community-based Animal Healthcare (CAHC) approaches in ASAL areas, it took over 15 years to convince policy makers to develop policies and legislation to allow the approach to be used legally.

Traditionally, the link between research and policy has been viewed as a linear process, whereby a set of research findings is shifted from the ‘research sphere’ over to the ‘policy sphere’, and then has some impact on policy-makers’ decisions. Literature on the research-policy link is now shifting away from this model towards a more dynamic and complex view that emphasises a two-way process between research and policy, shaped by multiple relations and reservoirs of knowledge.

The ODI case studies were designed to test the hypothesis that research is more likely to contribute to evidence-based policy if:

- it fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policy makers, and resonates with their ideological assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge those limits;
- researchers and policy-makers share particular kinds of networks and develop chains of legitimacy for particular policy areas;
- outputs are based on local involvement and credible evidence, and is communicated via the most appropriate communicators, channels, style, format and timing.

To test these hypotheses ODI constructed an historical narrative leading up to the observed policy change in each case study. This involved creating a timeline of key policy decisions and practices, along with important documents and events, and identifying key actors. The next step was to explore why those policy decisions and practices took place and assess the role of research in that process. This was done through interviews with key actors and reviewing the literature, and cross-checking conflicting narratives.

The key events which seem to have contributed to the policy shift in Kenya were:

- The arrival of ITDG in 1986 with an explicit focus on developing and testing new approaches, then seeking to influence the policy environment so they can be implemented more widely. This coincided with the adoption of Sessional Paper No 1 1986 - “Economic Management for Renewed Growth” which set the stage for structural adjustment and privatisation of public services, creating a favourable macro policy context for reform of livestock services.
- The first ITDG vets workshop* in 1988 which brought together CAHC practitioners from several projects around the country marked a significant increase in interactions between researchers/practitioners and policy makers.
- The emphasis on veterinary professionalism and ethics by a new Director of Veterinary Services, seconded from the Department of Clinical Studies of the University of Nairobi in 1990, reversed an emerging interest in policy reform driven by contracting government budgets, and emerging evidence of the value of the alternative decentralised animal health care model.
- The establishment of bilateral CAHC projects in 1992 added weight to the evidence in favour of CAHC approaches, and ITDG’s international CAHC workshop strengthened the emerging network of practitioners and links between policy makers and practitioners.
- ITDG’s 1993 vets workshop attracted the interest of the Eastern Provincial Director of Veterinary Services, who became convinced of the value of the CAHC approach by the enthusiasm of the livestock
might have accelerated the process. These include:

- The appointment of a new Director of Veterinary Services in 1994 with practical field experience in ASAL areas and more open-minded attitudes towards new innovation, together with the promotion of the Eastern Province Director of Veterinary Services to Deputy-Director in Nairobi dramatically improved the policy context for CAHC approaches.
- The gradual increase in number of agencies in training CAHCs from 1994 to 1997 further strengthened the evidence in favour of CAHC approaches, but also raised concerns among members of the Kenya Veterinary Association and Kenya veterinary Board leading to:
- The publication of a letter by the Kenya Veterinary Board in 1998 threatening to de-register veterinarians involved in CAHC programmes in an attempt to stop what they regarded as an illegal approach. The letter however had the opposite effect. Far from stopping CAHC programmes, it brought together all stakeholders into a policy network to try to find a solution to the problem. Supporters in the government used the crisis to launch a multi-stakeholder study (known widely as the Hübl study) which significantly further increased the weight of evidence.
- A multi-stakeholder workshop in Meru in 1999 (based on ITDG’s Vets Workshops) provided a clear signal from policy makers that they were interested in finding a solution, and established a multi-stakeholder working group to develop new policies and guidelines.
- The political climate for policy reform deteriorated with the appointment of a more conservative Director in 2000, before the new policies and guidelines had been formally adopted.
- Increasing opposition to the new policies from the Kenya Veterinary Association in 2001 both undermined the policy coalition reducing the link between researchers/practitioners and policy makers, and complicated and worsened the political climate.

The animal health care case study generally supports ODI's hypothesis. The policy process was influenced far more by the political context than by anything else, and personalities and personal relationships, both in the research/practitioner and policy communities were at least as important as any formal relationships and structures.

The crisis caused by the KVB letter in 1998 was clearly pivotal. Beforehand there was a long period where CAHC schemes gradually proliferated, generating powerful evidence of their value, and providing an issue around which different groups of stakeholders, supporters and antagonists, could form formal and informal networks. Afterwards, there was a surprisingly long process where all stakeholders came together to develop a new policy framework.

Formal research seems to have contributed relatively little to the process, and research reports even less so (with the exception of the Hübl study). Evidence generated by working CAHC schemes, communicated directly to visitors by livestock owners and the animal health staff directly involved in them seems to have been much more important. Earlier on, this evidence contributed to the rising popularity of CAHC programmes with donors and field veterinarians. In the mid 90s, alarm among KVB members caused by the proliferating CAHC schemes provoked the publication of their letter in the national press, which brought everybody together and resulted in the new policy framework legitimising the approach – the exact opposite of what the KVB had hoped.

With the benefit of hindsight, distance and the results of this study, it is possible to suggest some changes that might have accelerated the process. These include:

- Greater effort to understand the political context – the legal and policy framework, the key actors, their attitudes and influences, and other reform processes.
- Greater effort, earlier on, to get government staff, especially those opposed to the idea, to visit working CAHC schemes and learn about them at first hand.
- A clearer communication strategy to influence government vets and government policy.
- More effort to get to know the key players – the Director and Deputy Directors of Veterinary Services in Nairobi, the Kenya Veterinary Association and the Kenya Veterinary Board – and figure out how best to influence them.
- More effort to understand the policy process in Kenya – how new ideas become incorporated into policy, and new legislation enacted.
- Lessons learned should be used to replicate the process in other areas on policy influencing.

It is also clear that working with local communities to develop effective and sustainable examples of new approaches is essential to prove their effectiveness, and acquire the legitimacy to advocate for change. That takes time, and the early pioneers of the approach in Kenya deserve recognition for the efforts they have made over the last 17 years.

* Vets Workshops were a series of workshops which were organised by the Intermediate Technology Development Group and other stakeholders which brought together Animal Health Care practitioners and in later stages policy makers to share the experiences in community based animal healthcare.

This is the summary of ODI Working Paper 214: Animal Health Care in Kenya: The Road to Community-Based Animal Health Service Delivery, which can be downloaded from the ODI website: WP214 (Adobe Pdf 336kb).
The Decentralised Livestock Services in Indonesia Project

The 5-year Department for International Development (DFID) funded Decentralised Livestock Services in Eastern Indonesia (DELIVERI) project was an action-research project aiming to make livestock service institutions more responsive to the needs of small-scale farmers. It was much more successful than anyone expected.

The project worked concurrently at several levels: with field-level government staff and farmers to research livestock production systems and identify opportunities for improved services, then provided appropriate training to staff and farmers to establish and evaluate pilot projects; with District and Provincial livestock service managers to research institutional constraints and opportunities for supporting more client-oriented services, using the results of the field-level pilot projects to convince them of their value; and with National livestock service managers to research the policy framework and bureaucratic mechanisms for providing livestock services, using the results of the field-level pilot projects, and increasingly enthusiastic field, district and provincial livestock service staff to encourage them to change policies and practices to support more client-oriented approaches.

When the project started in 1996, towards the end of the Suharto era, government services were highly centralized, bureaucratic and inefficient, although policies promoting decentralization, privatization and participation had been in place for a number of years. All budgets, services, programmes and projects continued to be designed and controlled from Jakarta, and regional and district staff simply followed orders. During the first two years, although farmers and field-level staff were enthusiastic about the results of the projects research and the new approaches, and a few enlightened senior managers recognized their value, the project made little headway with the bureaucracy. Then the economic, social and political crisis in 1997/8 pushed Suharto out of office and the new era of "Reformasi" forced ill prepared government departments to rapidly implement the long-shelved policies of "decentralizasi", "privatizasi" and "partisipasi". By that time the DELIVERI project had a number of successful pilot projects up and running, and some charismatic champions among livestock service staff at all levels, and suddenly found itself in high demand.

By the end of the project livestock services were significantly more available to smallholder farmers in the project areas, more client-oriented, and higher quality. A customer satisfaction survey in 2000 found that 78% of farmers were satisfied or very satisfied with livestock services in general compared with only 16% in 1998, and the improved availability and quality of services has encouraged farmers to invest more in livestock enterprises resulting in a substantial increases in income. By the same time, government policies, practices and budgets were changing to support the development and implementation of more client-oriented services. The Department had a new people-oriented vision "Healthy and productive communities through the development of locally-based livestock resources", new decentralized interdepartmental structures and new mechanisms to co-operate across departmental boundaries, and over 50% of central government livestock service budgets incorporated more "participatory" approaches. The new approaches were also starting to spread to other sectors at district, province and national level2.

The surprising success of the DELIVERI project illustrates several critical factors, which influence whether the results of research can influence policy. Some are about the 'location' of the research within the pre-existing policy environment:

- **Focus** – the project was undertaking research on how to implement the government's well established, but not yet implemented policies of decentralisation privatisation and participation. The research had political legitimacy, but, initially at least, little political influence.
- **Close linkages with policy-makers** – the project built on DFID relationships in the livestock sector at field, district, provincial and national level, that had been established through collaborative work over the preceding 10 years. It had champions who were able to bring the results to the attention of policy makers and senior managers.
- **Timing** – the project was in place, well established and therefore able to capitalise on the new policy opportunities presented by the economic and political collapse in 1998, and rush for "reformasi".

Others are about how the research was done:

- **The DELIVERI project had a clear strategy for policy influence from the start** – it had explicit sequenced activities, first to undertake field research and establish, pilot projects, then research the policies and practices of government livestock service provision, then synthesise convincing evidence to convince people at all levels of the value of the new approaches, and finally to work with senior policy makers, planners and managers to help them to make the necessary changes to policy, organisational structure and practice to promote them on a wider scale. There is a clear and necessary role for research at all
stages of the policy process, if high-level policy change is to be implemented in practice.

- Researchers and other staff worked closely with all stakeholders, including farmers, community leaders, local, district, provincial and central government, and other organisations involved in livestock services. Involving policy-makers and practitioners in identifying the issues, undertaking the research, and implementing the results is likely to be more successful that undertaking the research in isolation then seeking to interest policy makers in the results afterwards. Establishing synergistic networking between different stakeholder groups, so they could share their own interpretation of the results was a particularly effective mechanism for communication.

- DELIVERI was a "process" project. Within the overall project framework, implementation was iterative – activities were based on an assessment of the results of previous activities, and the ever-changing context, and the project was flexible enough to be able to respond to the political opportunity presented by the economic crisis in 1998.

- The project used a quality management approach – all activities were “fit-for-the-purpose” rather than individually perfect. Much of the research was qualitative, or if quantitative, based on small sample sizes, yet was good enough to convince senior planners and policy makers.

- A major effort was made to synthesise and disseminated high-quality tailor-made information to all of the stakeholder groups. The project developed a communications strategy during the first year, which identified the key targets, their information needs and preferences, and the most effective mechanism to deliver it. Personal meetings were the most effective mechanism for senior policy makers, supported with attractive printed materials, and video clips. An illustrated diary, with attractive summaries of key findings and recommendations was very popular with field staff and service managers. Particularly since government budgetary constraints prevented many departments from producing their own.

- The project’s multidisciplinary team of researchers, practitioners and communicators from a wide range of backgrounds focused on individual people at all levels, using collaborative research, specific training activities, personal follow-up, coaching and mentoring to generate enthusiasm.

This summary is based on information on the DELIVERI project website (www.deliveri.org/default.htm). More detail about impact can be found in the “Progress and Impact” section (www.deliveri.org/frames/deliveri/default.htm)
Research-Policy Case Study - TEHIP

Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project (TEHIP)

Introduction to the case

This case study considers the process that led to the implementation of a series of essential interventions on the Tanzanian Health System that brought about evidence based health planning and practice in two districts, Rufiji and Morogoro. Through TEHIP these interventions have provided a series of management tools that have allowed district health teams to vastly improve their health systems and bring about startling health improvements. In a nutshell, these tools are designed to allow health planners to do more with less (or what they already have).

The idea is directly related to the World Bank's World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health, which focused on health systems, suggested that health could be significantly improved by adopting a minimum package of health interventions to respond directly and cost-effectively to evidence about the burden of disease. In 1993, at a conference hosted by IDRC, representatives from the World Bank, WHO, UNICEF and others agreed to test the WDR hypothesis. IDRC and CIDA provided the funding for what became known as the Essential Health Interventions Project (EHIP). In 1996, Tanzania, that had initiated its own health reform around the same time as the WDR 1993 was launched, was chosen to test the assumptions made by the WDR.

The type and extent of policy change

TEHIP has brought about a change in the way that local health policy and practice is planned and resources are allocated across geographical and technical areas. At the district level health care workers and managers are more in control of resources and processes. This has also contributed towards a more robust decentralisation of the health care provision.

In both districts, the introduction of TEHIP tools significantly improved budget allocation. Before TEHIP, STDs received a negligible share of total health spending (about 3%). However, evidence about the burden of STDs provided by the Demographic surveillance system (DSS) to health planners resulted in the increase of the share to about 9.5%. Large proportional increases were also seen for malaria interventions and Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses. These changes were made possible by new tools and a judicious use of new incremental funding from a Sector Wide decentralized basket fund (on average less than US$1 per capita extra funding). Absolute per capita funds for other essential health interventions which were previously adequately funded such as immunization, remained at their previous level.

Some thoughts on the explanation of the policy change

Political leadership

The country's health reform was receptive to decentralised, evidence-based planning and needed to find ways in which it could be implemented. Hence the opportunity to join TEHIP was welcomed at the policy level. The Tanzanian health situation and health system structure also provided an attractive context for the work of TEHIP. Tanzania's unique background, however, provided an excellent window of opportunity.

After independence, political commitment developed a dynamic and strong health infrastructure and system throughout the country. However, resource limitations (mostly as a consequence of debt burden and the fall of international commodity prices) as well as fatigue of the central planning structure, added to the appearance and spread of HIV/AIDS in the mid-80s, brought about an unfortunate reversal of the health gains made during the 70s and 80s. The initial solution promoted by the World Bank, to inject funds into the system by introducing user fees and other cost-recovery mechanisms, further drove Tanzanians away from the health system.

Evidence and policy-relevant research

In 1996, sentinel Demographic Surveillance Systems were used to provide data for the districts on the burden of disease presented in terms of a health services profile. This then became part of the routine information used by TEHIP to feed into a tool kit for health managers. These tools were then put in the hands of the Tanzanian District Health Management Teams (DHMTs) in the two districts who were then given a free hand in the use of the tools and resources. Additional funding to the DHMTs was marginal, amounting to about US$1 per capita annually. Such funds were used by the district for support to both health services and for capacity building of the health system. The information on the intervention addressable burden of disease, together with a budget mapping tool, allowed the health managers to allocate funds with better alignment with health needs. The management tools provided by TEHIP facilitated their work and processes thus reducing costs of...
production and delivery of services. The tools used to plan health evidence based interventions included:

- District burden of disease profile tool to repackage population health information from the DSS in a way that the district officials can easily understand;
- District health accounts tool to analyse budgets in a standard way to generate easy-to-use graphics that show how plans for spending coalesce as a complete plan;
- District health service mapping tool to allow health administrators to access a quick visual representation of the availability of specific health services or the attendance at health facilities for various interventions across the district;
- Community voice tools to promote community participation and inform health planning, and to promote ownership.

An underlying principle and result of these health system interventions was that there was a need for integrated solutions to the problem focusing on the needs and guidance of community-level health workers and managers. TEHIP, therefore, had to develop a structure that provided a fertile ground for innovations that could be integrated into the routine of the community health case workers and managers; thus making research an intrinsic part of its work.

External influences
Internationally as well as locally, there was a recognition that sudden increases in funding, although necessary, would not bring about significant improvements if not accompanied by reforms in the systems that managed them. Unfortunately, these improvements involved a reform that not many governments were ready or prepared to undertake.

Fortunately, external influences turned in favour of Africa, and Tanzania, in the late 1990's. A renewed focus on Africa has translated into specific initiatives such as the GFATM, and the appearance of other private and multilateral initiatives such as the Roll Back Malaria Partnership which have contributed to make health care a priority in Africa (killer diseases are at the top of the DFID research agenda). These global health initiatives significantly increase available resources for selected interventions. However it remains to be seen whether such increases in funding will be used, in part at least, to effect the necessary strengthening of health systems to deliver these interventions - a key lesson of TEHIP.

The impact and lessons learned
The impact of these interventions can now be observed. Child mortality in the two districts fell by over 40% in the 5 years following the introduction of evidence-based planning; and death rates for men and women between 15 and 60 years old declined by 18%. During the same period, the health indicators for other private and Tanzania, and in fact across Africa, have become stagnant. This suggests that the project provided the Tanzanian health reform with the appropriate tools needed for development of an evidence-based health system and policies.

The key lesson from this experience is that the burden of disease can be significantly lowered through relatively low-cost investments in strengthening health systems by providing incremental, decentralised, sector-wide health basket funding and a tool kit of practical management, planning and priority-setting tools that assist an evidence-based approach. Other lessons regarding research-policy issues are:

- Funding research and development simultaneously, and encouraging researchers and development specialists to be aware of and involved in each other’s specific areas of concern, produces multiple benefits.
- Development plans can benefit from the continuous input from researchers.
- Links to concrete development agendas afford researchers greater credibility.
- Funding and implementation priorities must be increasingly based upon locally owned, evidence-based plans that aim to develop the health system, maximise health, and reduce inequities: this involves having exit strategies in place and health observatories to facilitate the involvement of local actors.
- Demographic surveillance can inform policy and planning, monitor progress, and also provide accountability for government and donor spending priorities and patterns.

Sources of Information
This case study is based on the Description of the TEHIP project on the IDRC website: www.idrc.ca/tehip.

See also:
- Images courtesy of TEHIP project. If you would like to view the images with captions, see the slides shows on: www.idrc.ca/tehip
A stakeholder is a person who has something to gain or lose through the outcomes of a planning process or project. In many circles these are called interest groups and they can have a powerful bearing on the outcomes of political processes. It is often beneficial for research projects to identify and analyse the needs and concerns of different stakeholders particularly when these projects aim to influence policy.

In bridging research and policy, stakeholder analysis can be used to identify all parties engaged in conducting the research, those who make or implement policy, and the intermediaries between them. It can help define a way to engage stakeholders so that the impact of research on policy can be maximised.

It can also be used later in the research, when results are available and the team may want to use the evidence to create policy impact. Then it can be a useful tool to consider who needs to know about the research, what their positions and interests are and how the research should be presented and framed to appeal to them. In this way it becomes an essential tool for assessing different interest groups around a policy issue or debate, and their ability to influence the final outcome.

**Detailed Outline of the Process**

The first step is to clarify the research or policy change objective being discussed (for this Problem Tree Analysis or Objectives Analysis might help). Next, identify all the stakeholders or interest groups associated with this objective, project, problem or issue. A small group of about six to eight people, with a varied perspective on the problem, should be enough to create a good brainstorming session. Stakeholders can be organisations, groups, departments, structures, networks or individuals, but the list needs to be pretty exhaustive to ensure nobody is left out. The table on the right may help organise the brainstorm, or provide a structure for feedback to plenary if you are working in break-out groups.

Then using the grid organise the stakeholders in different matrices according to their interest and power. 'Interest' measures to what degree they are likely to be affected by the research project or policy change, and what degree of interest or concern they have in or about it. 'Power' measures the influence they have over the project or policy, and to what degree they can help achieve, or block, the desired change.

Stakeholders with high power, and interests aligned with the project, are the people or organisations it is important to fully engage and bring on board. If trying to create policy change, these people are the targets of any campaign. At the very top of the 'power' list will be the 'decision-makers', usually members of the government. Beneath these are people whose opinion matters - the 'opinion leaders'. This creates a pyramid sometimes known as an Influence Map.

Stakeholders with high interest but low power need to be kept informed but, if organised, they may form the basis of an interest group or coalition which can lobby for change. Those with high power but low interest should be kept satisfied and ideally brought around as patrons or supporters for the proposed policy change.

If time and resources permit, further analysis can be carried out which explores in more detail i) the nature of the power and its position and ii) the interests that give it that position. This helps the project to better understand why people take certain stands and how they can be bought around. This analysis is developed further in Influence Mapping.

The final step is to develop a strategy for how best to engage different stakeholders in a project, how to 'frame' or present the message or information so it is useful to them, and how to maintain a relationship with them. Identify who will make each contact and how, what message they will communicate and how they will follow-up.

**A Good Example**

A good journal article (which includes some case studies) can be found at: [www.stsc.hill.af.mil/crosstalk/2000/12/smith.html](http://www.stsc.hill.af.mil/crosstalk/2000/12/smith.html)
Further Information

- DFID has produced various guidance notes on how to do stakeholder analysis which can be found at: www.dfid.gov.uk/FOI/tools/chapter_02.htm or http://www.eurofic.org/gb/stake1.htm.
- For a basic step by step guide, see: www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/stake.html
- For a template see: www.scenarioplus.org.uk/stakeholders/stakeholders_template.doc.
- For material specifically adapted for campaigning see resources at www.thepressuregroup.com
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Force Field Analysis was developed by Lewin (1951) and is widely used to inform decision-making, particularly in planning and implementing change management programmes in organisations. It is a powerful method for gaining a comprehensive overview of the different forces acting on a potential policy issue, and for assessing their source and strength.

**Detailed Outline of the Process**

Force Field Analysis is best carried out in small group of about six to eight people using flip chart paper or overhead transparency so that everyone can see what's going on. The first step is to agree the area of change to be discussed. This might be written as a desired policy goal or objective. All the forces in support of the change are then listed in a column to the left (driving the change forward) while all forces working against the change are listed in a column to the right (holding it back). The driving and restraining forces should be sorted around common themes and should then be scored according to their 'magnitude' ranging from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong). The score may well not balance on either side. The resulting table might look like the example on the right (Source: Mind Tool, available at www.psywww.com/mtsite/forcefld.html).

Throughout the process rich discussion, debate and dialogue should emerge. This is an important part of the exercise and key issues should be allowed time. Findings and ideas may well come up to do with concerns, problems, symptoms and solutions. It's useful to record these and review where there is a consensus on an action or a way forward. In policy influencing the aim is to find ways to reduce the restraining forces and to capitalise on the driving forces.

Force Field Analysis is natural follow-on from Problem Tree Analysis which can often help to identify objectives for policy change. A useful next step on from Force Field Analysis is Stakeholder Analysis in which the specific stakeholders for and against a change are identified, together with their power, influence and interests.

**A Good Example**

Force field analysis has been used in diverse fields ranging from participatory rural appraisal and social research to strategic planning and organisational change. As part of a DFID sponsored participatory poverty profiling in Bolangir, a drought prone district in Western Orissa, India, a team of facilitators from PRAXIS used various participatory tools to conduct a study of the poverty profile of the district. Seasonal migration poses a serious problem with the rural poor and a Force Field Analysis was conducted with a group of villagers to study the factors leading to migration. Drought and lack of land emerged as the most important factors contributing to migration. Among the forces inhibiting migration were emotional attachment to the village and excessive work during migration. The information generated from the FFA has been useful in that it has led to designing a livelihood project, to be implemented by the Government of Orissa, supported by DFID, India.

**Further Information**


Another case details the use of force field analysis in a school situation to assess the potential to change from teacher-centered methods of working to greater pupil participation in planning. See: www.crossroad.to/Quotes/brainwashing/force-field.htm


Simple step-by-step guides to carrying out force field analysis are available at:

- www.mindtools.com/forcefld.html for examples of the use of force field analysis in management
- www.psywww.com/mtsite/forcefld.html for examples of the use of force field analysis in psychology

For a brief overview see www.mycoted.com/creativity/techniques/forcefieldanal.php

Examples of the application of force field analysis in different areas are available below:

- Change management: www.accel-team.com/techniques/force_field_analysis.html
- Health (MSH & UNICEF): http://erc.msh.org/quality/example/example5.cfm
For computer software to conduct force field analysis see: www.skymark.com/resources/tools/force_field_diagram.asp
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SWOT Analysis

SWOT analysis is a classic strategic planning tool. Using a framework of internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats, it provides a simple way to assess how a strategy can best be implemented. The tool helps planners be realistic about what they can achieve, and where they should focus.

Detailed Outline of the Process

The SWOT framework - a two-by-two matrix - is best completed in a group with key members of the team or organisation present. First it is important to be clear what the policy change objective is, and what team or organisation the analysis is being carried out on. Once these are clarified and agreed, begin with a brainstorm of ideas, and then hone them down and clarify them afterwards in discussion.

An assessment of **internal capacity** helps identify where the project or organisation is now: the existing resources that can be used immediately and current problems that won’t go away. It can help identify where new resources, skills or allies will be needed. When thinking of strengths it is useful to think of real examples of success to ground and clarify the conversation.

Typical focus questions to help think through these issues might include:

- What type of policy influence does our organisation / project currently do best? Where have we had the most success?
- What types of policy influencing skills and capacities do we have?
- In what areas have our staff used them most effectively?
- Who are our strongest allies in policy influence?
- When have they worked with us to create policy impact?
- What do staff consider to be our main strengths and weaknesses? Why is this? What opinions do others outside the organisation hold?

An assessment of the **external environment** tends to focus on what is going on outside the organisation, or areas which are not yet affecting the strategy but could do - either positively or negatively.

The grid above summarises some of the subject areas that might need considering under both internal and external factors. These can be used as topic headings if working in small break-out groups (a good idea if your group is larger than about eight).

Back in plenary it is often useful to rate or rank the most important strengths and weaknesses (perhaps with symbols: ++, + and 0). In a larger group participants might like to assign their own scores, perhaps by assigning sticky dots. The results can then be discussed and debated.

It is important to keep an eye on possible actions or solutions that emerge and round up with an action-oriented discussion. How can our group build on strengths to further our aim and strategy? What can be included in the strategy to minimise our weakness? And so on.

The SWOT analysis is a versatile tool that can be returned to at many different stages of a project; to structure a review or provide a warm-up discussion before forward planning. It can be applied broadly, or a small sub-component of the strategy can be singled out for detailed analysis. The SWOT often forms a useful complement to a stakeholder analysis. Both are good precursors to Force Field Analysis and Influence Mapping.

A Good Example

The example below shows a possible analysis for a small, start-up NGO considering how to use its new research study to influence government.

**Example of SWOT analysis for small NGO**

**Strengths:**
- We are able to follow-up on this research as the current small amount of work means we have plenty of time
- Our lead researcher has strong reputation within the policy community
- Our organisation's director has good links to the Ministry

**Weaknesses:**
- Our organisation has little reputation in other parts of government
- We have a small staff with a shallow skills base in many areas
- We are vulnerable to vital staff being sick, leaving, etc

**Opportunities:**
Threats:
- Will the report be too politically sensitive and threaten funding from sponsors?
- There is a pool of counter-evidence that could be used to discredit our research and therefore our organisation.

The NGO might therefore decide, amongst other things, to target the report to specific patrons in the one ministry, use their lead researcher to bring credibility to the findings and work on building up a regional coalition on the issue.

Further Information

- The Marketing Teacher provides online tools for those involved in marketing and managing. Their resources include a SWOT analysis. (www.marketingteacher.com/Lessons/lesson_swot.htm)
- Useful introductions to the SWOT can also be found at www.mindtools.com/swot.html and www.tutor2u.net/business/strategy/SWOT_analysis.htm
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