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Introduction to workshop

The Concern Worldwide, Bangladesh (CWWB) workshop on the topic Policy Analysis, Engagement and Advocacy took place 7-9 August, 2006 at the BIAM conference centre in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

The workshop originated as part of the Overseas Development Institute’s (ODI) ‘Civil Society Partnerships Programme’ (CSPP). The objective of the CSPP is to help Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) influence national policies and practices to make them pro-poor. Through the CSPP, ODI has organised regional and national workshops in Africa and Asia to provide a forum for CSOs to discuss the opportunities and challenges they face when trying to inform policy and share experiences about what works and what does not, learn about the latest worldwide research and practice in this area, and identify gaps for future work.

This report provides a narrative summary of the Bangladesh three-day workshop.¹

Objectives and expectations of the workshop

The workshop was moderated by Mr Naved Chowdhury of ODI. He welcomed the participants and set out several objectives of this workshop, bearing in mind this was a sharing workshop, and not an instructive one:

- Share experiences about CSO-policy context in Asia
- Learn about the latest worldwide research and practice in this area
- Share experiences about approaches to influence policy and what works
- Start to develop strategies to improve policy impact

This was followed by brief self-introductions by all participants, each of whom also expressed his or her expectations of the workshop. Expectations were mainly to learn more about advocacy strategies and tools, best practice, opportunities for policy change, how to move from challenging to engaging with the policy process, frameworks (e.g. RAPID) and failures and successes of civil society.

As an additional resource, Mr Chowdhury referred to the Make Poverty History document on the ODI website, which discusses how to galvanise Civil Society and policy engagement.²

¹ Due to illness of the facilitator of this workshop, the schedule as outlined in the agenda was altered and somewhat shortened.
² Overseas Development Institute: http://www.odi.org.uk/
Day 1: Basics of policy influence: CSOs, evidence and policy processes

Mr. Chowdhury provided an introduction to ODI, the RAPID programme and the Civil Society Partnerships Programme (CSPP), which helped to set the context for the workshop.

Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
ODI is ‘Britain’s leading independent think-tank on international development and humanitarian issues. Its mission is to inspire and inform policy and practice which lead to the reduction of poverty, the alleviation of suffering and the achievement of sustainable livelihoods in developing countries. This is done by locking together high-quality applied research, practical policy advice, and policy-focused dissemination and debate. ODI work with partners in the public and private sectors, in both developing and developed countries.

ODI holds regular discussion meetings, workshops and seminars on development topics of general interest, addressed by speakers from the UK and overseas. ODI manages three international networks linking researchers, policy-makers and practitioners (the Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AGREN); the Rural Development Forestry Network (RDFN); and the Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN)). In addition, it hosts the Secretariat of the Active Learning Network on Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP).

The Institute regularly provides advice on development issues to a wide range of organisations including governments, international agencies, and non-governmental bodies. ODI also provides research support and advice to Parliamentary Select Committees, MPs and Peers. Since 1984 the Institute has provided research and administrative support to the All Party Parliamentary Group on Overseas Development. As a registered charity, the Institute is supported by grants and donations from research foundations, international organisations, NGOs and business. ODI's work centres on its research and policy groups and programmes, of which Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) is one.

Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) – Bridging research and policy
The Overseas Development Institute, as part of its Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) programme, has been looking at the links between research and policy for several years. It is now beginning a process of identifying, developing, distributing and delivering tools, resources and training support that can help research providers access the policy process.

ODI's Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) programme is working on these issues and aims to improve the use of research and evidence in development policy and practice through research, advice and debate. The programme works on four main themes:

- The role of evidence in policy processes (identification, development and implementation)
- Improving communication and information systems for development agencies, policy and practice
- How better knowledge management can enhance the impact of and learning for development agencies
- Approaches (promotion and capacity building) to institutional development for evidence-based policy.

Better utilization 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. On the other hand, the

3 From the Overseas Development Institute website: http://www.odi.org.uk/about.html (12 September, 2006).
4 Humanitarian Policy; Poverty and Public Policy; Rural Policy and Governance; International Economic Development
5 Research and Policy in Development; Water Policy; Rights in Action; Business and Development Performance; Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure; European Development Cooperation to 2010; Civil Society Partnerships; ESAU Economic and Statistics Analysis Unit; Forest Policy and Environment; Forum on the Future of Aid.
6 From the ODI RAPID website: (12 September, 2006).
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.

Donors spend around US$3 billion on development research annually, but there has been very limited systematic understanding of when, how and why evidence informs policy. A better understanding of how research can contribute to pro-poor policies is urgently needed. In particular we need to know more about:

- How policy-makers can best use research, for evidence-based policy-making;
- How researchers can best use their findings in order to influence policy;
- How to improve the interaction between researchers and policy-makers.

**How we're doing it in RAPID**
Under the RAPID framework, policy research is always done with the advocacy process in mind. The following are some of the key points in advocacy research:

- Clear Aim and Outputs
- Building credibility with research and action
- Employing the right staff and staff development
- Good internal systems (management, communications and knowledge management)
- Programme approach
- Strategic opportunism
- Research / practical advice / stimulating debate
- Engagement with policy makers and practitioners
- Community of practice of network
- Financial opportunism

**SMEPOL Egypt: some of tools used for policy analysis, research and advise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Process Mapping</th>
<th>Force-Field Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAPID Framework</td>
<td>SWOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Analysis</td>
<td>Action Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Adapting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSOs and Pro-poor Policy Influence**
Experience has shown that when CSOs are able to assemble and communicate information effectively, there is a significant and pro-poor impact on policy. Some of the ways through which CSOs influence policy processes and thus enlarges the democratic space are:

- Complementing state in providing services
- Innovators in service delivery
- Advocates with and for the poor
- Identifying problems and solutions
- Extending our understanding
- Providing information
- Training and capacity building
The linear logical policy model...

1. Identify the problem
2. Commission research
3. Analyse the results
4. Choose the best option
5. Establish the policy
6. Implement the policy
7. Evaluate the results

Some definitions
- Research: any systematic effort to increase the stock of knowledge
- Evidence: the result/output of the research process
- Policy: a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors

Figure 1: Generic Policy Processes

The Policy Cycle

1. Problem Definition/Agenda Setting
2. Constructing the Policy Alternatives/Policy Formulation
3. Choice of Solution/Selection of Preferred Policy Option
4. Policy Design
5. Policy Implementation and Monitoring
6. Evaluation

Figure 2: The RAPID Framework – Policy life is complex. What issues matter?

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

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

Political Context: Key Areas
- The macro political context (democracy, governance, media freedom; academic freedom)
- The sector/issue process (Policy uptake = demand – contestation) [NB Demand: political and societal. Power.]
- How policymakers think (narratives and policy streams)
Policy implementation and practice (bureaucracies, incentives, street level, room for manoeuvre, participatory approaches)

Decisive moments in the policy process (policy processes, votes, policy windows and crises)

Context is crucial, but you can maximize your chances

**Civil Society Partnerships Programme (CSPP)**

ODI’s seven-year DFID-funded Civil Society Partnerships Programme (CSPP) aims to strengthen the voice of Civil Society to use research-based evidence to promote pro-poor development policy. It will do this by establishing a worldwide network community of practice for think-tanks, policy research institutes and similar organisations working in international development. The programme builds on the results of 18 months’ work with policy research institutes, think tanks and NGOs worldwide.

In order to ensure that southern voices are heard during the process of formulating and implementing international development policy, funding and programming over the next few years, and that those voices are based on sound evidence, the CSPP is establishing a worldwide network for think-tanks, policy research institutes and similar organisations working in international development. Most members are in developing countries, but the programme also fosters collaboration between countries and across the boundary between North and South. The programme helps members to support each other through training, exchange visits, and sharing of information, and will collaborate on projects to generate and use research-based evidence to improve development policy at national, regional and global level.

Key activities to establish the network will include capacity development activities, small-scale collaborative projects between network members; establishing a network website; other forms of information and knowledge exchange through conferences, workshops, and seminars; printed and web-based publications; and links with other networks; general management and support activities, including the procedures for membership, collaborative projects, recruitment of new members, fundraising and M&E.

Members of the network will work together on gathering and synthesising lessons on how CSOs can use research-based evidence to influence pro-poor policy; producing of practical useful information materials, including: a ‘state-of-the-art’ report on Civil Society, Evidence and Policy Influence; a series of short four-page briefing papers and information materials for the website; and a set of ‘how to do it’ guidelines and training materials for CSOs; developing and establishing a small number of international collaborative projects addressing regional or global development issues (e.g. the international aid architecture; trade – access to markets and subsidies; debt cancellation; environment and climate change; PRSPs and the Millennium Development Goals; HIV/AIDS).

The focus of work during the first phase was on learning more about how CSOs use evidence to influence policy processes, identifying northern and southern organisations helping the programme to do this, and improving ODI’s own information and communication activities to be more useful and accessible for CSOs.

The CSPP’s first step was a series of consultations in different geographical regions of the developing world to learn more about the role that CSOs play in using evidence to promote development policy and practice, explore what they need to do it better, and to identify opportunities for small-scale collaborative work. The first three consultations were held in Africa at the beginning of 2005 and consultations in South Asia, South East Asia, Latin America were held mid-2005.
Plenary: Opportunities and challenges to policy influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Civil Society Partnership Programme</th>
<th>Some key questions…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘The CSPP provides the linking of evidence and policy – it is its job to understand politics. It sees policy as responsive, and it recognises that the need for policy influence must come from external sources.’</td>
<td>How do CSOs influence policy in development? Does evidence matter to CSO work? If so, how, when and why? Can evidence improve the legitimacy and effectiveness of CSOs? Does evidence help them influence policy processes? What networks do CSOs engage in? Does this help with influencing policy with evidence? How and Why? What organisations are helping CSOs to do this? What kind of support do they need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the brief introduction by Mr Chowdhury, Kieron Crawley, Country Director of Concern Worldwide Bangladesh, welcomed all participants and thanked ODI and Mr Chowdhury for conducting this workshop on such a relevant and important topic. Mr Crawley emphasised the importance of policy entrepreneurship, and the ability to spot opportunities for real change.

This followed on to the plenary discussion, on the topic of opportunities and challenges to policy influence. The following questions were raised during the discussion.

- What are the main opportunities and challenges?
  - Regarding CSO-policy links? (in general)
  - Affecting the policy impact of your work?

The RAPID Framework: Theory and Practice – Lessons from the Civil Society Partnerships Programme

Following the introduction to the RAPID framework, participants discussed how to develop messages and be more inclusive.

Advocacy messages must be precise, brief and specific: what exactly is it you want them (policymakers) to do?

Some examples of more effective advocacy in policy implementation include the campaigning for khas land to the poor; provision for wholesale microfinance for the extreme poor; development of an integrated Health and Nutrition programme; equal access to services for sex workers; ensured safety net for the poor people; etc.

A few points on advocacy messages:
- What methodology was used in generating evidence? Is it credible to policy makers?
- The message must be clear
- The message must be specific and not too broad

Group work: three (missed) opportunities and challenges

Engaging with Civil Society over a long time is the only way of disseminating research and it is also a more proactive one. ODI, which is founded on, and thrives on this principal, is working with two local organisations: Unnayan Onneshan and the Centre for Policy Dialogue, Bangladesh. Their

---

7 The Unnayan Onneshan is an independent progressive think tank, which aims to contribute to innovation in development through research, advocacy, solidarity and action.
work here is mainly in Knowledge Management – how knowledge is documented and used and how to promote institutional knowledge.

Feedback from group work
Participants organised themselves into groups of four and five and were asked to name, opportunities and challenges for advocacy work in their particular project or area of work. Following discussions within the group, they reported back to the larger group. Some issues raised were the following.

GROUP 1

Opportunities for advocacy work:
• A possible change of government
• The National policies and/or institutions required for change are in place
• Networking: there are many emerging Civil Society organisations
• Access to government

Challenges to advocacy work:
• Domestic and international politics
• The lack of transparency of the government
• The lack of transparency of ourselves?

GROUP 2

Opportunities for advocacy work:
• The credibility and reputation of Concern Bangladesh
• The Innovative approach of Concern Bangladesh

Challenges to advocacy work:
• Lack of skills to influence and implement policies
• Lack of awareness of what is already in place
• The strategic direction is not very clear, both programmatically and organisationally
• Lack of Knowledge Management – lack of learning from failures

(A Knowledge Management system that is robust and flexible can provide an incentive to read the documents produced or collected. This is one type of engagement.)

GROUP 3

Opportunities:
• Concern Bangladesh has a long history of working with the Bangladeshi government.
• Concern’s programmes were developed in line with the PRSP.
• Concern Bangladesh is a member of various networks and alliances – it believes that without networks there can be no change.

Challenges to advocacy work:
• There are no evidence-based documents. There is a need to document successes and failures from individual projects.
• The thinking is still largely project-based as opposed to programme-based. There is a need for a more programmatic approach.

---

8 A Civil Society think tank, CPD strives to bridge the gap between empirical research and policy advocacy through a sustained effort in public policy analysis, and endeavours to create a national environment conducive to open public discussion on important policy issues with a view to ensuring domestic ownership over the policy agenda and also building a broad-based support for such policies.
Often there is no advocacy plan from the outset of the project, and even a lack of designated advocacy, person. This leads to delay and confusion as to ‘who, what, when and how much’. There is a need to move away from the ad hoc policy approach.

Advocacy work is very staff intensive, particularly for the first three years. It is therefore vital to the advocacy campaign that it is strategic from the outset.

GROUP 4

Opportunities:
- Evidence
- Facilitation (through networks, etc)
- Concern Bangladesh already emphasises advocacy issues
- Improve learning
- Improve documentation
- Improve coherence cross-programme
- Involve stakeholders more and better

Challenges:
- Lack of understanding of politics
- Lack of transparency of Concern Bangladesh
- Lack of skills
- Lack of awareness of our strategic direction

The group generally felt that there is a need to clarify Concern’s stand on a variety of issues and answer the question as to what extent individual projects can have a stance on various advocacy issues? This must be clarified to ensure coherence. Currently there is a lack of coordination of advocacy issues, both cross-programmatically as well as cross-organisationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is a Civil Society Organisation (CSO)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A CSO is any entity which is in size and purpose neither household nor govt; nor does it have a personal stake in policy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government’s job is to formulate policy; the NGOs’ job is to influence the policy formulation process to make sure it is pro-poor. Without a national ownership of a policy and where there is no indigenous institution to take the policy forward, the proposed policy – or policy amendment - will fail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This phenomena is explained and explored in the book ‘the tipping point’, by, which explains how, gradual, continuous work can, little by little tip the balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This reiterates the complexity of policy life, and the importance of the ability to recognise and appropriately advocate for a specific issue. What issues matter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of CSOs
- Think tanks and research institutes
- Professional associations
- Human rights advocacy bodies and other promotional groups
- Foundations and other philanthropic bodies
- Trade unions and workers co-operatives
- Media/journalist societies
- Community based organisations
- Faith based organisations
- Cross-national policy dialogue groups

What is a Civil Society Organisation (CSO)?

A CSO is any entity which is in size and purpose neither household nor govt; nor does it have a personal stake in policy development.

The government’s job is to formulate policy; the NGOs’ job is to influence the policy formulation process to make sure it is pro-poor. Without a national ownership of a policy and where there is no indigenous institution to take the policy forward, the proposed policy – or policy amendment - will fail.

This phenomena is explained and explored in the book ‘the tipping point’, by, which explains how, gradual, continuous work can, little by little tip the balance.

This reiterates the complexity of policy life, and the importance of the ability to recognise and appropriately advocate for a specific issue. What issues matter?

Types of CSOs
- Think tanks and research institutes
- Professional associations
- Human rights advocacy bodies and other promotional groups
- Foundations and other philanthropic bodies
- Trade unions and workers co-operatives
- Media/journalist societies
- Community based organisations
- Faith based organisations
- Cross-national policy dialogue groups
The RAPID framework; Theory and Practice, Lessons learned from the Civil Society Partnerships Programme

The message should be very simple – even if the process of getting to the essence of the message is very complex, this should not be reflected in the ‘final product’. The ‘packaging’ of the message is also crucial: it must be comprehensible to the selected target audience, and so should be tailored to each audience if more than one. Cultural influences in policy making must also be recognised. [see 28 key questions figure]

Keynote speaker: Dr Masihur Rahman on ‘The needs and pressures of policy making’ and Discussion

Following the discussion on civil society, Mr Chowdhury introduced the keynote speaker, Dr Masihur Rahman, former Secretary of the Government of Bangladesh and Managing Director, Credit Rating Agency of Bangladesh. Dr Rahman spoke on the topic of the needs and pressures of policymaking, seen from the perspective of a policymaker, particularly in relation to policymaking, trade liberalisation and tax reform.

Following Dr Rahman’s presentation, the floor was opened for questions to the keynote speaker. Below is a summary of the key questions and discussion.

QUESTION: What do you see as the contribution of NGOs and CSOs to policy making? How do you rate the evidence of these? Are they credible?

In relation to the Health and Nutrition project, Dr Rahman pointed out that the government brought NGOs on board in order for them to contribute, particularly in regards efficiency and cost effectiveness of the government vis-à-vis NGOs.

Although there is a system of institutions addressing issues; institutional competence is often lost through frequent transfers of staff between a number of departments.

QUESTION: Which are the key factors in influencing and changing policy?

- The knowledge that something is wrong and the belief in changing it
- Ability to be open to suggestions from outside, e.g. a civil servant must recognise his limited knowledge
- Clear understanding of the goal, why is it not reached and how to reach it
- Ability to provide additional info to politicians, bureaucrats

QUESTION: How can NGOs begin the advocacy process?

- The service provider should not equal the Government
- NGOs can work as voice to ask for better quality of service on behalf of those who do not have the capacity to do so
- NGOs can act as source of information and knowledge and supply and respond to demands for better quality of services.
- NGOs should demand more space for discussion

Health Research: the Power of Advocacy, Subir Kumar Saha

Subir Kumar Saha, of Concern WW Bangladesh Health and Nutrition Department of Concern Worldwide Bangladesh, gave a presentation on ‘The Power of Advocacy’, based on his own research.

Mr. Kumar Saha presented a range of statistical data about various health issues in Bangladesh (e.g. comparative numbers of lives saved through different approaches; cost; infant mortality in Bangladesh; urban-rural trend of infant mortality; urban-rural gap in infant mortality, etc) and spoke of how research can be a tool for advocacy; hence analysis is the first step for any effective advocacy.

The donor wants to see how efficiently and effectively their money is used, e.g. in the format of a comparison of how many lives have been saved and the average cost per life saved. Donors often do not want a lot of information; these however are some of the key things they want to know.
Main Advocacy Message:
In relation to infant mortality in Bangladesh, research and statistics show that the poorest of the poor must be targeted. The extreme poor suffer the highest child mortality rate in the country. Analyses of the data describing deliveries at health facilities and hospitals indicate that the current model is successful – as it shows an increase in all regions – and replicable.

Infant mortality rates began to decrease since independence, however they are now stagnant. Mr. Kumar Saha posed the question as to why policies are not based on adequate research, and reaffirmed that the advocate here acts as a middleman: taking the knowledge, repackaging it and ‘selling’ it to the policy maker. Mr. Saha presented a framework for Advocacy:

- Analysis
- Strategy
- Mobilisation
- Action
- Evaluation
- Continuity
- Institutional knowledge

Why is it that policies are not based on adequate research?
- Quality of Research
- Dissemination of research findings
- Organisational culture that does not support research-based decision making
- Research organisations are often not strong lobbying force
- Lack of research-based education and advocacy campaigns

Conclusion
- Research and Advocacy can influence in policy change
- Strengthen link between research and policy by –
  - In-depth research with analysis of policy options
  - Wider dissemination of research findings
  - Research-based advocacy campaigns
  - Institutional linkage
  - Coordinated and well-planned advocacy campaigns are necessary

Q: Which levels of government, in your experience, are more interested in research and used to making changes? Is it, for example, at the ward level, at thana level, district, ministry?
There is a [grade scale] from lower level to higher (this process has been experienced by the MHP project). In Health research and advocacy, very powerful and unequivocal arguments are needed, e.g. the decrease of infant mortality rates. This is not always the case in other types of work, such as in Livelihoods Security, where issues are not always as clear cut, or quantifiable, and thus requires are more holistic representation.

When presenting data, was there disagreement from the government and how did you handle it?
[Answer in Bangla]
There is a gap between research and implementation. One can use external comparable data (i.e. other works research) to make one’s case more convincing.

Subrata Kumar Chakrabarty, Senior Livelihoods Manager Concern Worldwide Bangladesh, gave a presentation on his research in the Livelihoods Security Department.

His presentation covered issues such as needs assessment; baseline; external evaluation; impact assessment; action research based on a pilot study. Because of the nature of the Livelihoods work, more qualitative than quantitative data is used in research, and there are two crucial factors;
accuracy of the data and an adequate sample size. When there is a lack of in-house expertise – use expertise of partners. There should be mapping within project, i.e. who should we go to for what, what data to present them with, etc and confidence in ability to do advocacy – capacity building – but also policy entrepreneurship, i.e. spotting who may the best person/organisation to do the advocating. In development, research should always be done with policy change in mind.

Plenary discussion
How can we change what we do to be more useful for policymakers?

In order to maximise your chances, you need to
• Better understand how policy is made and options for policy entrepreneurship
• Use evidence more effectively in influencing policy-making processes
• Build stronger connections with other stakeholders
• Actively participate in policy networks
• Communicate better

Policy entrepreneurship questionnaire: Skills of pro-poor policy entrepreneurs
All participants were given a policy entrepreneurship questionnaire, where a number of questions are given with a number of corresponding response option. According to the outcome of the questionnaire, each participant will find out which type of ‘advocacy personality’ she or he is. The four main categories are:

• Storyteller – this personality knows how to capture the attention of an audience and how to tell a good story
• Networker – this personality knows you can only get your message across if you network
• Engineer – this category relates to being practically involved in testing ideas if they expect policy makers to heed their recommendations.
• Fixer – this style is about understanding the policy and political process, knowing when to make your pitch and to whom.
Day 2: Tools for Policy Impact

Introduction for the day
[As Mr Chowdhury had fallen ill, the participants agreed to alter the workshop schedule and dedicate Day 2 solely to group work]. First however, there was a brief presentation of the previous day’s Policy Entrepreneurs Questionnaire.

Presentation of the Policy Entrepreneurs Questionnaire
The results of the previous session’s questionnaire told that the average Concern Worldwide Bangladesh participant is a pretty good storyteller, but is a less apt networker and is not always adequately politically savvy and au-fait with political dynamics, which may lead to a low uptake on research. This may suggest we have a tendency to prefer storytelling to networking. Several people dislike ‘fixing’ and ‘engineering’ is close by. One person has a strong preference for ‘networking’.

Understanding the context: Using the RAPID Framework – 28 Questions and other methods

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?

Figure 3 RAPID 28 Questions
What CSOs need to do

Figure 4: What CSOs need to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT CSOs NEED TO KNOW</th>
<th>WHAT CSOs 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>Who are the policymakers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there demand for ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the policy process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Establish credibility Provide practical solutions Establish legitimacy. Present clear options Use familiar narratives.</td>
<td>Build a reputation Action-research Pilot projects to generate legitimacy Good communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the current theory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the narratives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How divergent is it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links</strong></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>
<tr>
<td>Who are the stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What networks exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the connectors, mavens and salesmen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Force Field Analysis

Force field analysis was developed by Lewin in 1951, and is widely used to help identify the forces for and against change, and 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.

As a tool, it looks at what is going to be the impact of our actions and helps to clarify a strategy to help us use the forces in our actions.

- This is not an analysis to decide whether to take action or not
- It merely allows us to be aware of how the strategic action will pan out.

Strategically, we have already decided to take action – we now need to know what forces are in place.

It follows that there is a clash between the strength of a force and the importance of a force: e.g. in organisational change, staff may be a strong force against initially, therefore strategies must be put in place to address this, and facilitate the change for all affected staff, e.g. CARE going from project to programme approach. From the outset, the staff was a strong force against this change, however it still happened. A consensus must be reached after weighing in all factors.

Group work: Policy implication of Concern projects

Participants were divided in groups of four or five. Each group chose a Concern project to focus on for the day’s group work, and, using the tools provided along with the ‘What to watch for’ one-pager, participants were asked to decide on a specific policy issue (within the remit of the group’s chosen project) and through discussions, critical analysis and debate put together (i) a strategy brief (detailing the problem, the context, the strategy and communications) and (ii) a presentation of the message.
The Task

A. Decide on a policy issue related to your chosen project
B. Use the RAPID framework to analyse the key factors likely to affect the policy influence of your work (28 questions)

1. How friendly is the policy context?
2. Do you have access to the right evidence?
3. Are there clear and strong links between evidence and policy?
4. How influential are external forces?
   i. What is the issue?
   ii. What factors matter?
   iii. Is evidence credible?

C. Apply Force Field Analysis to your chosen policy issue
D. Use the tools (handouts): What to Watch for; SMART strategy and Preparing your Message
E. Prepare a 15-minute presentation
Day 3: Presentations of Group Work from Day 2

Group 1

Group members: Ashutosh, Imran, Kalpana, Shamim and Mothabbir

Policy Issue: Modification of Existing NNP Model for Urban Area of Bangladesh in order to improve the effectiveness

Process:
Issue Identification
RAPID Framework for Situation analysis
Force Field Analysis on suggested changes
Strategy formulation
Message Development

Summary of RAPID Framework Analysis
Policy actors are WB, MOHFW (minister, secretary), DPs, Implementing NGOs, professional bodies, research institutions, National level Nutrition Advisory Committee, BNNC,NWG

Donors and Development Partners (DPs) are very influential in formulating national nutrition strategy and policy

Project documented evidence base to influence policy makers for replicating in urban areas of Bangladesh. Sometimes, evidence base not consider as credible for nation wide replication

Networks/Alliances are active to support policy formulation, implementation and or change

Figure 5: Group 1 – Force Field Analysis of Policy Issue

Forces For Change

**Donors and DPs**
- Support GoB
- Cost effectiveness
- Sustainable behaviour change
- Community empowerment

**Government of Bangladesh**
- Improved existing strategy
- Cost effectiveness

**Community / CSOs**
- Community empowerment

Forces Against Change

**Government of Bangladesh**
- Financial benefit
- Political interest

**Implementing NGOs**
- Financial interest

Policy Issue
Modification of the existing NNP Model for Urban Areas of Bangladesh in order to improve its effectiveness
Strategies to bring changes in implementation method and practice

- Key policy actors and connectors identification at different level
- Dialogue/discussion meeting with identified key actors for sensitisation
- Evidence base findings dissemination
- Project visit
- Network/Alliance strengthening for lobbying with key actors
- Experts recruitment
- Staff capacity enhancement
- Documentation
- Monitoring and follow up mechanism development

**Audience**

WB, DPs, Minister, Secretary (MOHFW)
CSOs

**Promotion**

- Dialogue/discussions/meetings
- Dissemination
- Project visit
- Lobbying
- Documentation
- Staff capacity enhancement
- Monitoring and follow up

**Message**

Existing NNP model need adaptation for Urban

---

**Group 2**

**Group Members:** Amirul, Bijoy, Subrata, Rupali, Shakil, Rita and Subir

**Policy Issue:** The need to increase safety net support for the extremely poor of Island chars

**Issue:** The need to increase safety net support for the extremely poor of Island chars

**Process:** Analysis of the policy issues using RAPID framework: External Environment

- World Bank, DFID, USAID, UNDP (WFP)
- Act as pressure group for Government and for policy formulation
- Good Governance, PRSP contributing to MDGs
- Poverty, Livelihoods, Governance
- The existing policy is not uniformly applicable for all areas which negatively affect communities with regard to unequal distribution of resources
• Political instability affecting economic growth and vice versa
• According to HDI ranking, donors are favourable to funding Bangladesh/ climate change is one of the major shocks which is leading to frequent flooding/erosions increasing the vulnerability of the extreme poor and therefore their need for more assistance

**Background:**
• In comparison to the mainland chars, the support given by the govt safety net programme *both in quality and quantity is very low/inadequate in the island chars*
• Furthermore the NGOs in the island chars also do not extend *coverage* to the people of the island chars because of the logistic and costly challenge of working in this areas. (Ref: Concern experience, Concern livelihood assessment done in participation of local stakeholders and the CLP baseline)
• The little coverage given by the safety net as carried out by the local government authorities is *biased and politicized* excluding the extreme poor of the island chars.
• The government policy at present allocates safety net benefits equally across all regions in B'desh, and the project feels the government needs to place special focus to *increase allocation* for island chars.

**Political context:**
• Ministries ( LGED, Social Welfare, Women's Affairs , Food & Disaster, Planning & Finance and relevant).
• Closed mind attitude of some policy makers
  o Political biases. Conflicts
  o Resources constraints.
• Main policy making structures:
  o Relevant Ministry ,LGED > Parliament> Parliament advisory committee>
  o sometimes specific ministers have power to approve a policy change which may be delayed if Finance ministry cannot give allocation.
• The project has an agenda on networking and advocacy.
• The issues need to be moved for minimum of 6 months before budget and on an ongoing basis during project lifetime.

**Figure 6: Group 2 – Policy Issue: Political Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PRSP, Donor forces positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Biased/conflict</td>
<td>Lack of awareness</td>
<td>Lack of opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evidence**

- Current theory – the allocation and distribution of safety net benefits for the extreme poor in the island chars is biased, unequal and politicised with an unfavourable policy stance
- Existing Evidence credible – Concern Livelihoods assessment, CLP baseline, Shouhardo studies, DFID studies
- But needs more research for strength of evidence.
- Most of the studies shows similar findings
- Not enough to convince policymakers.
- As baseline/assessment report.
- Evidence is relevant, materials and applicable but needs more accuracy.
- Using credible, scientific, qualitative/quantitative participatory methods.
- Evidence produced for project purpose but not trusted by all policymakers.
- Ignored information
  - academic studies – because we don’t know.
- Review of SNP commissioned by Govt and executed by external consultant not used because very recently published.

**Figure 8: Group 2 – Policy Issue: Force Field Analysis**

**Policy Issue**

Increase safety nets for the extremely poor people of island Chars

**Forces for Change**

- Existence of safety net programme and distribution system – 5
- PRSP/MDGs focus the extreme poor – 3
- Donor policy/commitment – 4
- Northern part of the country is emphasised by government, donor, NGOs – 1
- Concern policy/commitment – 3
- Positive attitude of other stakeholders (civil society, media) – 3

**Forces against Change**

- Bureaucratic and politicised (in practical) distribution process – 5
- Lack of government resources – 3
- Credible research for Advocacy – 4
- Advocacy positioning of Concern – 3
Group 3

Group Members: Shamima Tasmin, Umme Salma, Katarina Säll, Idris Ali Khan, Golam Sarowar and Oliver Wakelin

Issue: Strengthening SMC’s involvement to improve quality education for all children in Bangladesh

Audience: Community and elite

Message: Active participation increases SMCs’ strength and ensure quality education
Promotion by orientation on roles and responsibilities, training, cross visits, using NGO field workers and theatre.

Union Parishad
Message: Better linkages with SMCs will improve education in your Union.
Promotion: by encouraging UP’s participation in SMC’s activities such as joint visit, joint planning and by using theatre, newspaper, television, radio etc.

Upazila Education Officer
Message: Stronger SMCs will support your planning and implementation work
Promotion: by encouraging participation with SMCs, facilitating visits, joint planning and monitoring.

DG-Directorate of Primary Education
Message: Strengthening SMCs to improve learning achievement of all primary school children.
Promotion: by evidence presented at workshops, formal and informal meeting, lobbying and exposure visits, put to directorate and others with influence.
Advocacy Opportunity

- Policy life is very complex
- Policy entrepreneurs are required
- Credible evidence is a must
- Appropriate tools are needed
- The audience and the message must match
- The message must be targeted – think of a bow and arrow: the arrow must be sharp enough, targeted enough and powerful enough to hit its target

Going Forward: Suggestions and Recommendations

1. It was agreed that Concern Bangladesh’s organisational stance on various advocacy issues should be clarified.
2. It was suggested that Concern Bangladesh establishes a centralised advocacy committee, as opposed to project-specific advocacy work. There were some objections to this suggestion, as it was believed that this might lead to a neglect of advocacy issues on the project/field level.
3. There was however a consensus that leadership on advocacy is needed. The project level advocacy issues would be fed up to management by the field staff.
4. An advocacy focus group was suggested, as this would also build staffs’ capacity on advocating, while providing technical assistance on various issues relating to advocacy. The Advocacy focus group would also ensure that the senior management are aware of issues.
5. At any given time, the organisation should focus on no more than be 3-4 advocacy issues in order to avoid a ‘dilution’ of messages.
6. On a national level, senior management and the Country Director has a big role to play in terms of raising the profile of various advocacy issues. On a local level however, all staff have a role to play.
7. In some projects Concern works though advocacy project partners (in, for example, Nodi O Jion and HISAL) – does this help bringing the issues forward or does it impede our own advocacy work?
8. Within the organisation there is a lack of advocacy skills and/or a lack of confidence. Perhaps also lack of time? Advocacy work is time consuming and it generally takes a long time before you can see the benefits/achievements of the work.
9. Internal lessons learnt should be improved: we must determine where we are doing good advocacy work and why it is working, and then transfer the good practice to other issues.