



LPI's Policy advocacy framework: Theoretical & practical guidance and actions

**Final version
15 October 2012**

Table of contents

Page

Part I

1. What is policy advocacy and why does LPI work with it?	4
2. How does LPI work with policy advocacy?	5
3. On what, with what and towards whom does LPI undertake policy advocacy?	10
4. Measuring results	11
5. Understanding and managing risk	12
6. Bibliography and additional resources	12

Part II

Policy advocacy project framework	14
-----------------------------------	----

Annexes

- 1) An example of the Policy advocacy project framework completed
- 2) Three approaches to advocacy
- 3) LPI's advocacy cycle
- 4) Making the most of a meeting
- 5) Developing a position
- 6) Advocacy and policy change composite logic model

Foreword

LPI has experience with policy advocacy activities throughout the more than 25 years of its existence although sometimes framed or called differently. Through different networks, events and publications LPI and its partners have fed relevant actors and decision-makers at the local, national, regional and international levels with first-hand and highly reliable information, giving them a more comprehensive understanding of the conflicts and their dynamics thus enabling them to make more informed decisions/strategies.

With the commitment to make policy work and awareness-raising one of the Institute's three strategic priorities¹, the process of developing LPI's policy work with PeaceNexus (<http://peacenexus.org>) and the development of this document, the Institute is moving from a mostly reactive approach, organising ad hoc events and publications, towards a more integrated, coherent, proactive and targeted strategy for policy work. LPI's policy work is building on the numerous contacts and partnerships that LPI already has, to develop these further and to complement them with new contacts and partnerships when needed. The same goes for LPI's already existing communication tools, the website and the periodicals the Horn of Africa Bulletin and New Routes.

The first steps in the development of LPI's policy work, including this framework, have been taken in cooperation with, and with the support of, PeaceNexus. The process was steered by an internal core group including all LPI Resident Representatives, the Programme and Communications Directors and the Programme Advisor on Policy.

This policy advocacy framework is developed for LPI's policy work and although connected to awareness-raising and communications as a whole, a separate policy for communications is available. Furthermore, this framework will serve as the basis for any specific 'local' policy advocacy strategies or plans developed by the field offices.

The policy advocacy framework should be seen as a living document and as such, should be reviewed, and if needed revised, in one year.

¹ LPI Strategic Plan 2010-2016

Part I

1. What is policy advocacy and why does LPI work with it?

1.1 Organisational foundation

Advocacy is an integral part of LPI's conflict transformation work. LPI conducts policy advocacy based on its mandate and identity.

LPI Vision: LPI envisions a world where peace, justice and nonviolent relations prevail through people's active work and commitment.

Mission: LPI supports and promotes nonviolent approaches to conflict transformation through a combination of research and action that entails the strengthening of existing local capacities and enhancing the preconditions for building peace.

Identity: LPI is an international and ecumenical organisation supporting nonviolent conflict transformation. LPI uses research and action in partnership with other organisations to strengthen existing local conflict transformation capacities in Africa.

Policy advocacy: For LPI, policy advocacy is primarily field-driven and rooted in the organisation's experience and values. LPI undertakes advocacy work on its own, through other organisations and networks and in collaboration with partners. It strives to promote civil society conflict transformation processes, as well as raise pertinent policy issues deriving from the work in the field. It aims to actively influence relevant local, national, regional and international processes and actors in order to bring about change in people, policies, structures and systems. Policy advocacy is a time-bound activity with specific target audiences and well-defined outcomes. LPI sets policy advocacy priorities as a function of need, specifying intended and measurable change and in consideration of available resources. Conflict transformation is by its nature delicate work; LPI will undertake policy advocacy taking into consideration the timing of such work and its existing process of risk assessment and management.

Awareness-raising: is an on-going activity to enhance understanding amongst target audiences on priority themes relevant to LPI's work and its partners. This understanding will lead to increased knowledge on priority themes and contribute to desired outcomes including greater influence on policy, facilitation of field operations and bringing about direct change in communities. Secondary effects are the strengthening of LPI image, reinforcing relationships and further mobilisation of resources. The scope of its awareness-raising efforts is conditioned by the availability of resources and its broader communication strategy. Awareness-raising activities at LPI do not require the completion of the policy project framework.

1.2 Why engage in policy work?

LPI's primary objective for its policy work is to make the work of the organisation, as a whole, more effective and advocacy is therefore meant to complement LPI's other work.

Related to this, LPI undertakes policy advocacy for a number of reasons:

- Conflict transformation is about dealing with the root causes to conflict and advocacy addresses them by asking what policies, practices or other factors are leading to conflict and injustice and challenging these.
- There is a need to focus attention on particular forgotten conflicts which are low on the policy agenda, or temporarily eclipsed by more ‘news-worthy’ conflicts or events elsewhere in the world. There are certain conflicts within even high-profile countries like DRC, Sudan, etc. that can also be defined as ‘forgotten’.
- It is important to draw attention to the complexity of conflict, particularly in response to badly informed, or what could be seen as deliberately over-simplified, messages emanating from elsewhere.
- Part of LPI’s conflict transformation approach is helping local communities to see themselves as agents for change. Advocacy work can help achieve this, so that local communities are more in control of their lives and better able to participate in decision-making that affects the future of their community and wider area.
- Conflict transformation is often forgotten in the post-conflict phase, when attention turns to good governance, economic governance, and other forms of state-building without addressing the root causes of the conflict which persist post-conflict.
- Conflict transformation does not get enough attention and may be over-shadowed by power-politics, military responses, and/or short-termism. This can be, but need not be, related to advocating for increased funding for the work of conflict transformation NGOs.
- This type of work can raise the profile of the organisation, its skills and partners.
- Advocacy work can generate or attract resources and actions and can therefore have a significant multiplier effect on conflict transformation work that is already happening.
- LPI is working on growing the field of conflict transformation directly as part of awareness-raising and indirectly as part of policy advocacy.

2. How does LPI work with policy advocacy?

2.1 Policy advocacy approach/strategy

LPI’s three strategic priorities reinforce each other and the organisation’s approach to policy work is strategic, proactive (creating opportunities, changing the agenda for discussions) and oriented towards the medium or long term. Contributing to in-depth understanding of context is a top priority for policy advocacy in LPI. In undertaking policy advocacy activities, LPI does not only communicate its analysis, it draws conclusions and advocates for action in conflict sensitive ways that does not jeopardise our other programme work. The focus of LPI’s advocacy is context-specific. However, thematic approaches that have value in more than one country or at the regional level could be chosen (and fall within our Regional programme) if based on strong evidence emerging from LPI’s and partners’ field work.

Advocacy, as practiced by LPI is collaborative, not confrontational. LPI prioritises constructive advocacy². This entails working with actors to improve their awareness of conflict and supporting them to develop more effective responses using non-violent conflict transformation.

² The notion of constructive advocacy has a profound impact on the message – because *the approach is the message and the message is the approach*.

The type of engagement depends on the context and needs, it might range from quiet and informal diplomacy to large public campaigns. Depending on the specific policy advocacy initiative capacity building needs might arise. LPI's analysis and, consequently, policy advocacy positions can be very specific and thus require a degree of expertise in the context and conflict transformation theories. LPI's advocacy objectives are based on good research and part of an advocacy strategy. They are presented as a clear message directed at those who have the power to bring about change or those who can influence them. These advocacy activities are implemented by LPI, partners or those affected by the situation or a combination thereof and will be communicated through a variety of methods and activities. It all comes together forming an advocacy strategy. LPI strives for coherence between its communications and resource mobilisation policies and its policy advocacy framework. The three policies need to align to achieve the same strategic priority goals and be mutually reinforcing.

2.2 Effective internal processes

LPI's policy advocacy process should, when seen as useful, seek to combine field and head office staff (communications and programme unit staff), be agile and manage risk responsibly.

When working with policy processes, LPI:

- follows the advocacy process set-up (as described below)
- uses the policy advocacy project framework (as included below) to clearly state the problem, results chain, key activities, target audiences, risks, time frame etc
- maximises the use of existing internal and external communication tools and networks
- when engaging on specific policy themes, examines the existing and relevant policies on this matter

2.3 Roles

Field offices (as far as possible together with partners)

- Identify entry points and opportunities with local/national/regional/international decision-makers, such as a visit by national parliamentarians or possible upcoming changes in legislation, opportunities emerging from the Participatory Action Research (PAR) etc.
- Provide the context analysis and policy content (incl. risks) and contacts from their host-country and region.
- Bring out the stakeholders voices³ to illustrate the need, the policy issues and identify success stories.
- Carry out the policy work that has been agreed upon
- Identify and manage risks for LPI and partners in the local context.

Head Office

- Identify entry points and opportunities with international actors, donors and decision makers.
- Manage risk on the organisational level. Does a specific message have ramifications for other programmes, or the organisation as a whole?

³ While doing this we need to take in consideration the complexity of intersectional identities and their interplay.

- Repackage the message/information into a format that speaks the right language to the target audiences in their spheres.
- Illustrate a more general message (e.g. on anti-corruption or empowering women) by drawing on real-life examples from the field, giving theoretical messages a tangible feel.
- Carry out the policy work that has been agreed upon

Policy and communications advisor (based at the head office or in the field)

- Oversee, support and monitor all LPI policy initiatives
- Ensure coherence in all policy work across the organisation.
- Build and nurture key relationships relating to policy work. Identify entry points and opportunities with decision makers, e.g. in Sweden, EU, UN etc, such as a visit by national parliamentarians or documentary-makers to the field, or upcoming legislation.

2.4 Advocacy process set-up

The following process should be used for all policy initiatives with national, regional or international ramifications⁴. The only exception being local policy work⁵ which the Resident Representative (ResRep)⁶ should discuss with the Policy and Communications advisor (PCA), document and circulate to all other ResReps and the Senior Management Team (SMT). The circulation needs to take place before implementation to make sure that there are no possible negative ramifications for other programmes as well as to allow for synergies and sharing of lessons learned from similar initiatives in other places. The PCA and corresponding PA(s)⁷ should also be kept updated throughout the process

Step 1: Consideration of policy needs

In order to systematise our policy work, identifying policy needs should routinely follow all analyses at LPI. Analyses need not always result in a policy initiative; however analyses provide an important opportunity to consider policy needs. Analyses at LPI are normally conducted with partners.

Step 2: Conception of idea

The initiative/idea can come from analysis conducted at any office. Example: If field office X comes up with an idea for a policy initiative, the ResRep contacts the PCA discusses the matter before implementation and determines how to move forward. Or if the idea originates at the head office the relevant ResRep (s) is/are contacted to discuss the idea. If it is a local initiative, the process described above will be followed. However, if it is a policy initiative with national, regional or international ramification steps 1-8 need to be undertaken.

Who decides to take the proposal forward: the corresponding ResRep

Step 3: Developing the Policy advocacy project framework

The different components of the policy advocacy project framework (that can be found at the end of this document) are discussed, options considered, and choices made which are then used

⁴ As the Regional programme develops it might reveal new needs for additional or new steps in this process and this advocacy process set-up should therefore be reviewed in light of this, 6-12 months into the Regional programme.

⁵ What constitutes a local policy initiative will be determined on a case by case basis.

⁶ Whenever Resident Representative (ResRep) is used in this document it also refers to their delegates such as programme managers, national programme coordinators and programme coordinators.

⁷ Whenever Programme advisor (PA) is used in this document it also refers to technical advisors with a policy portfolio.

to complete the framework. The framework is both a discussion guide and a means for documenting the decisions reached after exploring all the options. The framework contains the necessary information regarding the objective/expected results of the initiative, target groups, resources etc.

Who is involved: This is a collaborative initiative lead by the corresponding ResReps and involving the PCA, partners, the Communications Director, corresponding geographic or thematic policy advisors (PAs), the Programme Director and experts as appropriate.

Step 4: SMT reviewing the Policy advocacy project framework

The SMT reviews the Policy advocacy project framework and can call upon the PCA to provide clarifications etc. Who is involved: SMT, PCA

Sign-off: Executive Director (ED)

Step 5: Circulating the framework

All ResReps should receive all the draft policy project frameworks and comment on the implications of the initiative for their country and their region.

Responsible for circulation and obtaining endorsements: PCA

Who is involved: All ResReps and PCA

Step 6: Improving the framework

This is the stage where the framework is improved if requested by the SMT, and possibly, other recommendations and ideas. Who is involved: PCA, all ResReps, Communications, PA(s) and experts as appropriate.

Sign-off: ED

Step 7: Implementation and monitoring of the project

Responsible: ResRep

Who is involved: PCA, ResRep, Communications, PA(s) and experts as appropriate.

Step 8: Evaluation

Responsible: ResRep

Who is involved: PCA, ResRep, Communications, PA (s) and experts as appropriate.

Sign-off: ED

2.5 Defining the way to undertake policy advocacy

- Where possible, advocacy work should come out of *existing conflict transformation activities*. However, we should also remain open to other opportunities that could benefit our conflict transformation activities.
- Decide which approach to advocacy the initiative will use. Will LPI advocate *for* those affected by a situation, *with* those affected or *empower those affected by the situation to advocate for themselves*? (see annex 2) It might be appropriate to use a mixture of these three approaches to advocacy at different times throughout the process.
- Carefully assess *what LPI wants to change* (policy target/ advocacy goal) and *at which level, or levels*; local, provincial, national, regional (AU, IGAD, EU?), international (UN?).
- Establish a *realistic advocacy strategy* with objectives/ expected results that are 'achievable' considering time frame and available resources and a strategy that takes into account the accessibility of the targets, the likelihood of change and articulate the

theories of change implied in the results frame matrix.

- Think about where ***the issue currently stands in the policy process***. If it is early on, the goal may be raising awareness of the problem that needs to be addressed. Alternatively the problem may already be known and the goal is developing a solution and getting that solution adopted as policy. Or, policy might already exist and the goal is to make sure that it is being implemented correctly and is having its intended impact.
- Policy processes are complex and rarely linear or logical. Simply presenting information to policy-makers and expecting them to act upon it is very unlikely to work. ***Strategies must be able to adapt to changing contexts and to take advantage of policy windows; delivering information at the right time*** in terms of the policy agenda/cycle so that there is the opportunity as well as the will to turn advocacy into action (please see annex 6 the column furthest to the right). Effective monitoring and learning systems are essential.
- ***Target the right people*** who can make that change (target audience⁸). The temptation is to target ‘friends’ rather than reaching decision-makers within local, national, regional and international institutions. ‘Spoilers’ are also an important target.
- Reflect on ***what it will take to convince or move the right people/target audience***
- ***Be part of and build the right network(s)*** Effective advocacy is built on solid relationships, developed and maintained over time. Working through networks is a good way to achieve policy objectives and LPI will conduct a mapping exercise to see what others are already doing and decide which networks and partnerships are (most) appropriate and how LPI should engage in them proactively. Building networks puts LPI in a stronger position to affect policy change when it has a specific message to push. These include government partners and donors, allies and peers within the sector: practitioners, academics, politicians, and journalists who are already interested in the issue(s). Knowing what others are doing help us being clear on what LPI does directly and what we do indirectly, with our partners, contacts and networks to achieve synergies. When considering networking it might be worth thinking about 1) who shares our values 2) who is already working on the issue 3) who can provide something that we need 4) who would cooperate with us 5) who has the capacity to act
- ***Choose the right vehicle(s)*** for delivery, be it via a network, using the appropriate tool and ‘packaging’ of messages appropriate to target audience, considering also timeframe and resources.
- If there is an opposition or competition think about how they are positioned or ***what counter arguments might be***.
- Consider ***what contextual factors might affect the strategy’s success***. These factors might not be controllable but may impact the strategy’s success and therefore are important to keep in mind.
- Ensure that different people have contact with decision-makers so that all contacts and influence ***are not focused on one person*** (especially if that person later moves on to another organisation).
- Is there a need for a ***contingency plan***, an alternative path to the end goal if the current strategy is not successful? Which indicators will signal if the strategy is not working and will it then be possible to revise the strategy?

⁸ Referred to as primary target groups in our Implementation plans and change agents in our PME&L tool.

3. On what, with what and towards whom does LPI undertake policy advocacy?

It is important to consider some of the points below when LPI is sharing information:

- **Provide good evidence for your argument**, it should be accurate, reliable and verifiable. LPI must be seen as a reliable source of accurate information, ethical in their operations, and with trustworthy partners who can discuss sensitive issues in confidence. Policy-makers are more likely to trust information coming from organisations/people they know, and who have a good reputation. LPI's strong field presence has added value.
- **Be true to our guiding principles and avoid reinforcing prejudice and stereotypes:** We need to be mindful that the values we communicate follow our guiding principles. Is our policy work sensitive to gender? How do we portray women and men with words or images in our policy work?
- **Link to the bigger picture:** Information from local conflicts should be presented in the framework of the larger national/regional/thematic discussions where relevant.
- **Timely:** Event-specific information has a short life-span.
- **Concise:** Even the most complex reports need to be accompanied by concise conclusions/summaries/recommendations that can be digested at-a-glance.
- **Framed so it speaks the target audience's language:** conclusions/recommendations are most useful when tailored to the recipient and makes sense within their policy framework. It needs to speak the right language, be clear, concise, easily digestible and has information/recommendations **tailored to the recipient's needs**.
- **Connected to policy:** Officials welcome INGOs bringing partners from the field: However, it is important that all actors are well informed on the policy framework they are addressing to avoid the risk of making presentations which have no policy 'handle.'
- **Illustrate Theories of Change:** through examples from the field rather than theory.
- **Provide cross-comparison:** use different context examples to illustrate a wider point, so that our message is not pigeon-holed as only "Somalia", "DRC", etc.
- Understand what others are doing and **try to coordinate with other NGOs when possible and deemed appropriate** (also to avoid duplication).
- **Learn from past successes and mistakes**

3.1 Creating a position

A position is a statement of what an organisation, group or person believes about a particular issue and how they think this should be acted upon. All policy advocacy initiatives do not require *one/a* position but when LPI chooses to develop such, it needs to reflect its principles and values. Positions can be internal, formal, proactive/long term, reactive/emergency, with others or alone and short (2-4 pages briefing paper presenting the main points) or long (policy or research paper giving detailed arguments and recommendations, often accompanied by a letter or an executive summary high-lighting the main points). (see annex 5 for more information on how to develop a position)

3.2 Stakeholders

Policy advocacy issues should come out of an analysis. If a stakeholder mapping has not been part of that analysis it is recommended to do a stakeholder mapping and analysis for each specific issue defining 1) who is directly affected by the situation 2) who is responsible for creating the situation or with formal responsibility for finding a solution such as government,

civil service, local authority etc 3) additional actors concerned with the topic such as NGOs, church groups, business, media and 4) international players such as donors, UN bodies, INGOs etc. When the most relevant stakeholders have been identified, the organisation needs to strengthen or develop relationships with them, understand their positions and their interests and work with those who are able to make a difference. This will help us target our time and resources towards the most useful contacts and help us avoid putting all our efforts into working with those who are in strong agreement but have no influence, or working with those for whom the issue is low priority and hence are unlikely to give it much time.

3.3 Who has the power to bring change?

The **target audience** is determined as a function of the policy advocacy, the objectives and the available resources. There may be situations when you cannot gain direct access to policy makers, but you can influence others⁹ who have direct access to them. Once the target group is decided, identify the changes needed if they are to support the desired policy outcome –in other words, develop a theory of change.

3.4 Tools

A number of different tools/ vehicles/ methods can be used in policy advocacy some of the most commonly used are:

- In-depth reports with policy recommendations
- Face-to face meetings
- working directly with parliamentarians, government officials
- newsletters, journals, articles, op-eds
- advisory groups and patrons
- press releases
- blogs, Twitter and other social media
- websites
- events

Always keep the target audience(s) in mind and use the tools that can reach/influence/change that specific group. Hence be selective when using tools: not all of them will always be effective. Also consider if these tools have worked before, if there are alternatives and if the organisations has the skills and resources to use them well, before deciding on a specific tool/method. More tools/vehicles can be found in annex 6 of this document and in the LPI's communications strategy (which also includes more discussion on subject).

4. Measuring results

The final step is to develop a monitoring and learning system, not only to track progress, make any necessary adjustments and assess the effectiveness of the approach but also to learn lessons for the future. Periodic monitoring of an advocacy initiative is needed to see whether activities are being implemented as planned and working towards the objectives or whether changes need to be made to the advocacy strategy.

⁹ referred to as secondary target groups in our Implementation plans

Evaluation provides a chance to learn for future advocacy initiatives. LPI has the PME&L tool as a solid starting point which can be tailored to the specificities of policy advocacy. When we advocate for a particular policy, we need to monitor whether or not that policy is adopted (outcome). We also need to measure whether and how that policy is implemented and the consequences it is having on the ground (vision of success). Evaluating policy advocacy initiatives requires close monitoring of short term outcomes and their contribution towards clearly defined longer term outcomes and vision of success. This demands detailed results chains with clearly defined milestones and more regular monitoring including collective discussions on progress, obstacles and opportunities.

5. Understanding and managing risk

Advocacy brings challenges as well as benefits. These challenges need to be addressed carefully and if there is a potential risk, advocates and those affected by the situation should be aware of the risks before any action is taken. LPI will undertake policy advocacy taking into consideration the timing of such work and its existing process of risk assessment and management. One possible tool to use is the risk matrix introduced in the security framework. Risk may include:

- harming community-based field work by e.g. being perceived as bias
- diverting resources, skills, time and energy from other conflict transformation work
- risking the work of other LPI field offices through sharing a message that can be controversial in other contexts
- further disempowering groups by speaking for them, without consultation and agreement
- losing property, job or personal safety
- creating more general recommendations may detract from LPI and its partners' core grass-roots competence and in doing so they may not add value to the broader debate as it is not their particular expertise

Furthermore,

- messages specific to one context may not be transferrable to other contexts, and /or may clash with the key message
- working closely with one state or institution may lead the organisation to be seen as allied with that state/institution. Can reinforce concentration of power
- outputs can be less measurable and it may take a long time to see change

One risk mitigation strategy might be to engage organisations outside the country, like the Church of Sweden (to campaign on local groups behalf) or to undertake advocacy as part of a coalition e.g. European Peacebuilding Liaison Office or PeaceNet in order to keep a low profile for the organisation. It might also be wise to cultivate strong relationships with some influential people, who can act as bridges to others or help the organisation if it gets into difficulty.

Bibliography and additional resources

Coffman, J., Hendricks, A., Kaye, J., Kelly, T., & Masters, B. *The advocacy and policy change composite logic model* (2007) Seattle, WA (annex 6)

Davis, L., *LPI Policy Engagement: Menu of Options for Policy Advocacy Workshop May 2011* (not published but developed as part of LPI-PeaceNexus cooperation)

Gordon, G *Understanding advocacy*, Tearfund 2002
http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/Roots/English/Advocacy%20toolkit/Advocacy%20toolkit_E_FULL%20DOC_Parts%20A%20BB.pdf

Gordon, G *Practical action in advocacy*, Tearfund 2002
http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/Roots/English/Advocacy%20toolkit/Advocacy%20toolkit_E_FULL%20DOC_Part%20C.pdf

Helping researchers become policy entrepreneurs, ODI Briefing paper 53, September 2009
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/1730.pdf>

Hovland, I., *Making a difference: M&E of policy research*, ODI Working paper 281 (July 2007)
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/2426.pdf>

Rana, R., *LPI Policy Engagement: Process mapping report with recommendations* (not published but developed as part of LPI-PeaceNexus cooperation)
LPI's Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (PME&L) Tool (2011) <http://www.life-peace.org/who-we-are/plans-and-reports/>

Additional resources

A guide to measuring advocacy and policy
<http://www.aecf.org/upload/PublicationFiles/DA3622H5000.pdf>

A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/6453.pdf>

Bridging the gap. The role of monitoring and evaluation in Evidence-based policy making
http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf

Carter, I., *Building the capacity of local groups: PILLARS guide* (2001) -available in English and French
http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/PILLARS/English/PILLARS%20Building%20capacity_E.pdf

Chapman, J. and Wameyo, A., *Monitoring and evaluating advocacy* (2001)
http://www.g-rap.org/docs/monitoring_and_evaluation/chapman-wameyo_2001_me_on_advocacy.pdf

Critical webs of power and change: Resource pack for planning, reflection and learning in people-centred advocacy. Action Aid International

Evaluating the Effectiveness of DFID's Influence with Multilaterals
<http://mande.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/A-Review-of-NGO-Approaches-To-Advocacy.pdf>

Footsteps issue 45: *Advocacy* (2000) -available in English and French
<http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/Footsteps/English/FS45.pdf>

Guide for partners on advocacy work Tearfund
<http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/Topics/Advocacy%20services%20for%20Tearfund%20partners.pdf>

Miller V., Covey, J. *Advocacy sourcebook* (1997), Institute for Development Research

Melot, S. *Getting people thinking* (2000) –available in English and French
http://tilz.tearfund.org/webdocs/Tilz/Roots/GPTENG_full%20doc.pdf

Pathways for change: 6 Theories about How Policy Change Happens
http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publicationsandresources/pathways_for_change_6_theories_about_how_policy_change_happens.pdf

Power analysis: The EU and peacebuilding after Lisbon (July 2012)
http://www.eplo.org/assets/files/2.%20Activities/Working%20Groups/EEAS/EPLO_PeacebuildingafterLisbon_July2012.pdf

Strengthening learning from research and evaluation: going with the grain
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/6327.pdf>

Tracking Progress in Advocacy: Why and How to Monitor and Evaluate Advocacy Projects and Programmes <http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/672/Tracking-Progress-in-Advocacy-Why-and-How-to-Monitor-and-Evaluate-Advocacy-Projects-and-Programmes.pdf>

Using Programme Theory to Evaluate Complicated and Complex Aspects of Interventions
http://www.rismes.it/pdf/rogers_complex.pdf

Part II

Policy Advocacy Project Framework

As described above, the following project framework should be developed as Step 3 in the set up of a policy project. The framework is meant to provide all the necessary information regarding the objective of the initiative, target groups, resources, budget etc and be used both for a 'go-ahead decision' on the project but also throughout the project cycle (planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation).

1. Project summary

Applicant	
Partners	
Target Area	
Duration	
Overall Budget	
Vision of success	
Expected Results	

2. Introduction

Background, relevance, the motivation, niche etc.

3. Problem & situation analysis

What is/are the issues? (Please refer to existing stakeholder and conflict analyses). What are the effects of the problem? What are the root-causes of the problem? (feel free to add a problem tree if appropriate) Define what the advocacy strategy is trying to achieve (what you think needs to be done). When considering the question, think about where the issue currently is in the policy process. Do we want to influence policy development or the implementation of policy? How will this policy advocacy project support the broader work of LPI?

What is the current position of the target audience (who we want to influence, who has the power to make a change) and what is the desired position? What would help them move from one position to the other (underlining needs and interests)?

Who are stakeholders? Potential allies?

4. Results chain and monitoring

Vision of Success					
Target audience (direct or primary target group (s)): Stakeholders (indirect or secondary target group(s))					
Results Chain Outcomes & related outputs	Indicators	How to measure? (means of verification)	When to measure? (frequency)	Who to measure? (collect data)	Decisions that data informs
Higher level outcome A. <i>(Insert description)</i>					
Higher level outcome B					
Lower level outcome A1.					
Lower level outcome A2.					
Lower level outcome B1.					
Lower level outcome B2.					

Lower level outcome B3.					
Outputs; <i>(list)</i>					
Key activities <i>(Could for example be message/material development, issue/policy analysis and research, policy proposal development, briefings/presentations, relationship building with decision makers, coalition and network building, media advocacy and outreach, direct lobbying etc)</i>					

5. Risk analysis

Please provide a sense of the kinds of risks you think you/the office/LPI will face in the project, how/if they are manageable, and how you will use the tool in the implementation phase. If the risk is too high, it is wise to consider using other methods or options for your advocacy (such as using an external spokes person or collaborate with other NGOs) or decide not to undertake the advocacy initiative.

Major risk identified	Mitigation measures (ways of reducing risks)	Responsibility/ owner

6. Evaluation

How will the expected results be evaluated? When? By whom? How will the lessons learned be shared and fed into future planning?

7. Timetable for activities, responsibility and resources needed

Write down in consecutive order the intended activities within the project's timeframe, resources needed and responsibilities. Preferably as a Gantt chart. It should be seen as a guide only and needs to be flexible and responsive to new circumstances.

Annexes

- 1) An example of the Policy advocacy project framework completed
- 2) Three approaches to advocacy
- 3) LPI's advocacy cycle
- 4) Making the most of a meeting
- 5) Developing a position
- 6) Advocacy and policy change composite logic model