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Why are we here?

Evidence-informed policymaking

- The concept implies that “one should prioritise scientific or research-based evidence as input” into policy design and decision processes
- Sounds obvious? Think again...
  - The emphasis on applying scientific standards of proof to policymaking is a recent and still disputed phenomenon.
  - In most countries, governments have yet to develop:
    - Clear requirements and procedures
    - Internal capacities to link scientific evidence with policymaking
Why are we here?

Evidence-informed policymaking – the objective of your PEP project

• PEP research aims to inform policy

  • Providing evidence that is both:
    - Reliable (scientifically-sound)
    - Contextualised:
      • From a local perspective
      • Addressing COUNTRY-SPECIFIC POLICY NEEDS / QUESTIONS
Why are we here?

Purpose of this workshop:

- Make sure your PEP research answers actual policy questions

PEP requirements from grantees:

- Identify and consult with stakeholders
  - PEP requires stakeholder analysis and periodic reports
- Develop a (parallel) policy paper analysis
  - Starting with a policy context analysis, to clarify the key policy questions to address
Why are we here?

Structure of this workshop:

• **Session 1**: Understanding policy processes
• **Session 2**: Designing research to address actual policy needs
• **Session 3**: Designing an effective policy engagement strategy
Policy processes

Definitions - policy

➢ POLICY:
  • A relatively stable, purposive course of action (or inaction) followed by an actor (or set of actors) in dealing with a problem or matter of concern.

➢ PUBLIC POLICY:
  • Policy developed by governmental bodies and officials.
    o Process by which governments translate their political vision into plans and actions to achieve the changes they desire to make in the real world
    o Includes not only the decision to adopt a law or make a rule on some topic, but also the subsequent actions aimed at implementing and enforcing the law or rule
An effective policy must be based on **facts**, but it is also influenced by **cultural values** and **politics**.
Policy processes

Development

Example: Access to water in Tunisia

- Water is a free good given by god
- Water resources are limitless

- 20% of rural people do not have access to drinking water
- 70% of dams experience a significant decrease in their storage capacity
- 50% of the water distribution network requires rehabilitation

- Politicians seek popular consensus, so they prioritize access to water for large urban centers
Policy processes

Governance

Societal demands → Political interaction → Government

Implementation → Policy
Governance – performance is “measured” by:

**Responsiveness:**
Extent to which delivered services are consistent with citizen preferences

**Effectiveness:**
Extent to which adopted actions are achieving desired goals

**Efficiency:**
Ratio between the quality of services provided (i.e. effectiveness) and the cost to provide them
Policy processes

Political economy factors that prevent decision-makers from supporting their decisions on scientific knowledge:

- Culture, ideology - acceptability
- Commitments, budget constraints – feasibility
- Crises – e.g. COVID – diverting attention and resources

Understanding policy needs means ADAPTING RESEARCH or its communication TO SPECIFIC CONTEXTS and priorities
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Though it appears to follow an orderly and closed cycle, the process can begin and be abandoned or altered at any point of the cycle.
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Research-based evidence can (and should) be used at EVERY STAGE of the cycle to:

- **IDENTIFY** problems
- **MEASURE** their magnitude and seriousness
- **REVIEW** alternative policy interventions
- **ASSESS** the likely consequences of particular policy actions (intended and unintended)
- **EVALUATE** what, in fact, results from policy (effectiveness, efficiency, unexpected outcomes)

What about your PEP research?
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Each stage has its own challenges for EIPM:

**Agenda setting**

Government decides to address a specific problem

- **Challenge:** Convincing policy makers of importance and urgency of an issue

**Policy formulation**

Set objectives, identify & compare (+/-) potential measures, define policy instruments to implement

- **Challenge:** Gathering knowledge and expertise to identify and assess best potential measures
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Each stage has its own challenges for EIPM:

**Policy legitimation**
Assess and secure popular and political support for selected measure

- **Challenge:** Understanding how different stakeholders will react to the proposed measures.

**Policy implementation**
Allocate resources, mandate & supervise implementers

- **Challenge:** Resistance from bureaucracy, limited capacity of implementing organization, limited capacity for state oversight
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Each stage has its own challenges for EIPM:

Policy evaluation

- Assess effectiveness, efficiency (cost vs results) and other consequences of implemented measure.
- Evaluate new challenges that came up through the policy process.

➤ Challenge: Getting the data needed to evaluate
Policy processes

Policymaking cycle

Overall challenges for EIPM

1) The formulation and implementation of policies are inherently political:
   - involve conflict and struggle among individuals and groups, officials and state bodies who have conflicting ideas, interests, values, and information.

2) These political, stakeholder and value considerations:
   - are outside the scope of science,
   - must be incorporated by the multiple actors involved in the policy advisory process.

3) Few government institutions have a clear definition of what should be considered as sufficient/reliable evidence.
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

What is evidence for policy?

Different sources and types of evidence used to inform the policy advisory process:

- **Raw data**
  - Do not speak by themselves - must be analyzed and interpreted, i.e. requires a scientific methodology

All relevant, **but...**
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

What is evidence for policy?

Different sources and types of evidence used to inform the policy advisory process:

- **Raw data**
- **Grey literature**

No official « review/validation » process – standards of quality can vary considerably. Potential biases from organization’s objectives.

All relevant, but...
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

What is evidence for policy?

Different sources and types of evidence used to inform the policy advisory process:

- **Raw data**
- **Grey literature**
- **“People” - experience, expertise**

Potential biases (context, subjectivity, interests)

All relevant, but...
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

What is evidence for policy?

Different sources and types of evidence used to inform the policy advisory process:

- **Raw data**
- **Grey literature**
- **“People” - experience, expertise**
- **Scientific literature**

All relevant, but...

- Often based on research led in different context.
- No account of «subjective values/considerations» and practical constraints – difficult to apply.
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

What is evidence for policy?

Different sources and types of evidence used to inform the policy advisory process:

- Raw data
- Grey literature
- “People”
- Scientific literature

Evidence-informed policymaking (EIPM):

- Requires to use scientific (research-based) evidence "among inputs"
- But the purpose is not to reduce the policy process to a scientific problem-solving exercise...

All sources/types are relevant and necessary

- Policymakers often prefer sources they are « familiar with » - Can help to cite known sources when relevant
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

The relative influence of scientific evidence versus other factors/inputs can be illustrated as follows:
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

But a more realistic illustration of the many sources of influences, competing over the policy decision process would rather look like this:

You must find the most strategic ENTRY POINTS
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

Nugroho & al., 2018

Scientific knowledge

Professional knowledge
Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

Good policy requires effective use of all

Decision-making

Local knowledge
From society/communities' experiences and practice
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

When they work together...

Scientific knowledge

Policy influence is strengthened

Professional knowledge
Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

Local knowledge
From society/communities' experiences and practice

Nugroho & al., 2018
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

To understand policy needs/priorities, one must engage and consult with:

- **Scientific knowledge**
- **Professional knowledge**
- **Local knowledge**

**Professional knowledge**
Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

**Scientific knowledge**
From society/communities' experiences and practice
Policy stakeholders

**A
c

**Actors (individuals or organizations) with a vested interest in the concerned policy**

- An *interest* can be based on:
  - A current or future gain, or
  - Damages that the actor may suffer in relation to the policy
What are the **main types** of stakeholders?

- State
- Political Parties
- Think tanks
- Civil society
- IOs & NGOs
- Research Community
- Business Community
- The People
- Media
Policy stakeholders

For your PEP project, we recommend to focus on:

- State
- Political Parties
- Think tanks
- Civil society
- IOs & NGOs
- Research Community
- Business Community
- The People
- Media
Policy stakeholders

STATE

Specialized bodies working in coordination.

• Those **producing policies** are legislators, executives, administrators, judges.
• Supposed to be the impartial arbitrator between major interests.

BUT:

• State bodies often **compete** with each other, and **do not coordinate** their actions, particularly when their **respective responsibilities** are not clearly defined.
• Also, degree of expertise, or "**technical knowledge**, can vary.

Communication tip: Focus on mandate/responsibilities
Help aggregate interests - converting the particular demands of interest groups into general policy alternatives.

**BUT:**

Mostly interested in “controlling power” through government

Policies are often instrumental to gaining power, rather than the other way around

**Communication tip:** Focus on their « political capital »
CIVIL SOCIETY

Public space where people associate freely for the pursuit of common goals.

- Incl. mechanisms through which *individuals/groups demand* transparency, accountability, responsiveness, and efficiency (from policy).

**BUT:**

Not a unitary actor - NOT cohesive/coherent, equal, organized, or coordinated

*Communication tip:* Focus on their « advocacy agenda/objectives »
BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Largely independent actors who pursue wealth and power through the delivery of goods and services.

BUT:

- Objectives pursued are always “self-serving”, profit-oriented
- Serving the interests of a few to the expense of most

Communication tip: Focus on economic benefits
Policy stakeholders

MEDIA

Help determine what people think about, and shape their attitudes.

➢ Influence the capacity of government officials to convert their ideas into policy

BUT:

• Generally provides minimal coverage of policy issues

• Often owned or controlled by the state and economic interest groups who introduce a bias on which news are conveyed and how.

Communication tip: Focus on the interests of their « audience »
IOs & NGOs/INGOs

NGOs / INGOs: independent of governments - two types:

- Advocacy: aim to influence governments with a specific goal,
- Operational: provide services.

IOs (i.e. intergovernmental – formed by treaties)

- Help set the international agenda, cooperation among states, mediate political bargaining, promote initiatives in favor of collective good

BUT:

- Focused on specific “topics” (development trends)

Communication tip: Focus on their agenda/thematic priorities
Policy stakeholders

Stakeholder analysis

Determine whose interest should be taken into account in relation to a specific policy/program.

Questions to ask:

• Who has **power/influence** in specific policy process (formulation, adoption, implement..?)

• Who can **inform** viz specific needs/constraints related to policy?

• Who can **benefit from/support** the “policy”?

• Who can provide **entry point** into the decision process?
“Communications are adequate if they reach people with the information that they need in a form that they can use.”

“Useful analysis requires effective communication among diverse individuals”
Go to your team’s Google slides and…

Slide 1: **Reproduce this example** (fill the boxes) for your project.

- Water is a free good given by god
- Water resources are limitless

- 20% of rural people do not have access to drinking water
- 70% of dams experience a significant decrease in their storage capacity
- 50% of the water distribution network requires rehabilitation

- Politicians seek popular consensus, so they prioritize access to water for large urban centers

Indicate your PEP project’s topic/title:
HANDS-ON Go to your team’s Google slides and...

Slides 2-3: Associate your PEP project with the relevant..

#1 – Objective/role

- **IDENTIFY** problems
- **MEASURE** their magnitude and seriousness
- **REVIEW** alternative policy interventions
- **ASSESS** the likely consequences of particular policy actions
- **EVALUATE** what, in fact, results from policy (effectiveness, efficiency, unexpected outcomes)

#2 – Stage of the policy cycle

1. Agenda Setting
2. Policy Formulation
3. Policy Legitimation
4. Policy Implementation
5. Policy Evaluation
Slide 4:

# 1 - Identify 3 categories of relevant stakeholders for your project

# 2 – Name one example (institution, organization) for each category

- State
- Political Parties
- Think tanks
- Civil society
- IOs & NGOs
- Research Community
- Business Community
- The People
- Media
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- **Science and policy**: a complicated relationship
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- What do policymakers need to know
- Your PEP policy paper
Why are we here?

Evidence-informed policymaking – the objective of your PEP project

• PEP research aims to inform policy

• Providing evidence that is both:
  ➢ Reliable (scientifically-sound)
  ➢ Contextualised:
    • From a local perspective
    • Addressing COUNTRY-SPECIFIC POLICY NEEDS / QUESTIONS
Why are we here?

Purpose of this workshop:

• Make sure your PEP research answers actual policy questions

PEP requirements from grantees:

• Identify and consult with stakeholders
  - PEP requires stakeholder analysis and periodic reports

• Develop a (parallel) policy paper analysis
  - Starting with a policy context analysis, to clarify the key policy questions to address
Why are we here?

Structure of this workshop:

- **Session 1**: Understanding policy processes
- **Session 2**: Designing research to address actual policy needs
- **Session 3**: Designing an effective policy engagement strategy
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

The tale of “two communities”

Like in any relationship.. it’s mainly a “communication problem”

Science and policy “don’t speak the same language”

- Not just in terms of “technical jargon”, which is ALWAYS a problem with academics
- But also in terms of “PRIORITIES”…
“Whereas academics’ value lies in illuminating complexity, civil servants are assessed on their ability to simplify complex issues down to the key components necessary to make a decision.”

“What (policymakers) want from research is NOT: ‘It’s complicated’ or ‘Here’s the answer’. What they want is comparative work highlighting a range of possible solutions...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission/objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Find solutions and actions to “change the world”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Produce knowledge, spur more ideas/questions to “explain the world”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talking to</strong></td>
<td>Decision-makers, or the general public</td>
<td>Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>• Clear &amp; concise</td>
<td>• Exhaustive, relates to literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linked to “action”/solution</td>
<td>• Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Account for broader context</td>
<td>• Focused on ”one piece of the puzzle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>Short deadline and time-sensitive</td>
<td>Long or no deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success criteria</strong></td>
<td>“Right”, (cost-)effective, actionable and applicable</td>
<td>Novel, exact, generalizable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentives</strong></td>
<td>Successful interventions, political capital</td>
<td>More research, publication, (academic) acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

The **relative influence of scientific evidence** VS other factors/inputs in policymaking:
The relative influence of scientific evidence versus other factors/inputs in policymaking:

Decision-making

Good policy requires effective use of all

Scientific knowledge

Professional knowledge

Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

Local knowledge

From society/communities' experiences and practice
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

The **relative influence of scientific evidence** VS other factors/inputs in policymaking:

Wide range of **political, stakeholder and value considerations** that:

- are outside the scope of science
- must be incorporated by the (multiple) actors involved in the policy advisory process.

Better **understanding** these considerations can help **ALIGN RESEARCH & COMMUNICATE EVIDENCE** in a way that speaks to POLICY NEEDS.
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

Science

- Identify/define problem
- Design research/gather data
- Apply method to produce/analyze data
- Produce new evidence
- Assess validity/robustness
- Communicate results/conclusions

Policy

- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Decision (policy selection)
- Weigh/assess different policy options
- Define/advise policy option(s)
- Synthesize data/information + produce brief
- Gather evidence (information) on given policy issue/problem
- Identify/define problem

Research problem ≠ policy problem
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

Science

- Identify/define problem
- Design research/gather data
- Apply method to produce/analyze data
- Produce new evidence
- Assess validity/robustness
- Communicate results/conclusions

Result = Difficult to translate scientific evidence into useful policy advice

Policy

- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Decision (policy selection)
- Weigh/assess different policy options
- Define/advise policy option(s)
- Synthesize data/information + produce brief
- Gather evidence on given policy issue/problem
- Identify/define problem

Science and policy: a complicated relationship
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

**Science**
- Identify/define problem
- Design research/gather data
- Apply method to produce/analyze data
- Produce new evidence
- Assess validity/robustness
- Communicate results/conclusions

**Policy**
- Decision (policy selection)
- Weigh/assess different policy options
- Define/advise policy option(s)
- Synthesize data/information + produce brief
- Gather evidence (information) on given policy issue/problem
- Implementation
- Evaluation

**Should inform**
- Identify/define problem

Science and policy: a complicated relationship
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

The various roles of science in policy

- **identify** problems
- **measure** their magnitude and seriousness
- **review** alternative policy interventions
- **assess** the likely consequences of policy actions (ex-ante)
- **evaluate** what, in fact, results from policy (ex-post)

Different uses = different “policy questions”

Must understand the type of question to provide the right type of answer
“For policy makers to do science better, scientists need to do policy better.”

Chris Tyler, Director of UK Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology

The complicated relationship between science and policy

“Communications are adequate if they reach people with the information that they need in a form that they can use.”

Baruch Fischhoff, 2011

Applying the science of communication to the communication of science
What can be done from the science/research side?

Adapt research DESIGN & COMMUNICATION to better address policy needs

Step #1: UNDERSTAND POLICY NEEDS
Understanding policy needs

Policy

Evidence gap

Science
Understanding policy needs

Researchers must:

1. Understand the **POLICY PROBLEM** (vs research issue) in order to...

2. Position research/evidence into **existing policy options/strategies** in order to...

3. Produce practical/useful **recommendations** for policymakers
1. Understand the **POLICY PROBLEM** (vs research issue)

- **POLICY QUESTION**
  - Answer provides recommendation FOR ACTION

- **RESEARCH QUESTION**
  - Answer provides an assessment of the situation

Must inform..
Understanding policy needs

1. Understand the POLICY PROBLEM (vs research issue)

What are the effects of non-farm diversification on rural women’s income?

Research or policy?
1. Understand the **POLICY PROBLEM** (vs research issue)

What type of intervention can effectively contribute to improving rural women’s income?

Research or policy?
1. Understand the **POLICY PROBLEM** (vs research issue)

**Policy question**
What type of intervention to improve rural women’s income?

Must inform..

**Research question**
Effects of non-farm diversification on rural women’s income?

Sufficient to inform policy decision?

Non-farm diversification = 1 option

How do policymakers assess/compare policy options? What criteria?

Right question?
### Usual criteria to assess “good policy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Effectiveness**: Does the policy achieve the desired outcomes?
- **Unintended effects**: Are there unintended effects to consider?
- **Equity**: What are the effects for different population groups? How do they affect equity?
- **Cost**: What are the costs/budget implications?
- **Feasibility**: Is this policy technically viable/feasible?
- **Acceptability**: How is this policy perceived by (priority) stakeholders?
What do policymakers need to know? **Criteria**

Research evidence usually informs 1-2 criteria, but NEVER THE FULL PICTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Does the policy achieve the desired outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>Are there unintended effects to consider?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>What are the effects for different population groups? How do they affect equity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>What are the costs/budget implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Is this policy technically viable/feasible?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>How is this policy perceived by (priority) stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And research largely tends to overlook the “practical” constraints of policymaking.

What do policymakers need to know? **Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Effectiveness**: Is it applicable/realistic? (Thumbs up)
- **Unintended effects**: (Thumbs down)
- **Equity**: (Thumbs up)

= **cost-effectiveness**
= **efficiency**

Major consideration for Gov, yet rarely part of scientific assessment.

Is it applicable/realistic??
What do policymakers need to know?

Babu Rahman, 2017
How to make research more useful to government officials

“What (policymakers) want from research is (...) comparative work highlighting a range of possible solutions.”

Brick et al., 2018
Winners and losers: Communicating the potential impacts of policies

“Decision-makers need communications that succinctly describe potential harms and benefits of different options.”
Questions that decision-makers always have

Gluckman, 2019

• Why do we have to do something now? Why is it a priority?
  ➢ What is the (political) risk of doing or not doing something?

• Have we got the OPTION that meets our broader needs?
  ➢ Who will it benefit? Does it benefit priority stakeholders?
  ➢ What are the risks and to whom?
  ➢ How does it compare with other options?

• What will it cost? (vs “benefits”)
What do policymakers need to know? Options

When designing research aimed at informing policy, or preparing to communicate findings to policy users, must remember that:

Decision = choice = options = need to compare options!!

A policy decision will be made by weighing the pros & cons, or harms & benefits of the different options.
What do policymakers need to know? Options

4 questions to ask before defining research questions/objectives

#1: What “decision” do you wish to inform?

#2: What are the options likely to be considered in this decision process?

#3: What are the key criteria that would be used to evaluate/compare the options?

#4: What type of evidence is missing to help inform this evaluation?
What do policymakers need to know?

Difference between “COMMUNICATING RESEARCH RESULTS”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Unintended effects</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1
What do policymakers need to know?

And communicating “EVIDENCE-INFORMED POLICY ADVICE”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Question Mark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>![Thumb Down]</td>
<td>![Thumb Question Mark]</td>
<td>![Thumb Up]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not possible to research all, then..

Should also be able/ready to communicate uncertainty..
What do policymakers need to know?

And communicating “EVIDENCE-INFORMED POLICY ADVICE”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Unintended effects</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1: Effectiveness: Thumbs up; Unintended effects: Thumbs up; Equity: Thumbs up; Cost / efficiency: Thumbs up; Feasibility: Thumbs down; Acceptability: Thumbs down

Option 2: Effectiveness: Thumbs up; Unintended effects: Thumbs down; Equity: Thumbs down; Cost / efficiency: Thumbs down; Feasibility: Thumbs down; Acceptability: Thumbs down

Option 3: Effectiveness: Thumbs down; Unintended effects: Thumbs down; Equity: Thumbs down; Cost / efficiency: Thumbs up; Feasibility: Thumbs up; Acceptability: Thumbs up

If not possible to research all, then..

Identify and focus on - PRIORITIES
What do policymakers need to know?

And communicating “EVIDENCE-INFORMED POLICY ADVICE”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🎉</td>
<td>🚫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🚫</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not possible to research all, then...

Identify and focus on - KEY EVIDENCE GAPS
What do policymakers need to know?

And communicating "EVIDENCE-INFORMED POLICY ADVICE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>🌿</td>
<td>🌿</td>
<td>🍒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>🌿</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🍒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>🌿</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🍒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t underestimate the importance of COST-EFFECTIVENESS

A basic "cost-benefit analysis" can be a very powerful policy argument..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td>🌿</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🌿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🌿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🍒</td>
<td>🌿</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do policymakers need to know?

And communicating “EVIDENCE-INFORMED POLICY ADVICE”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Unintended effects</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New in PEP research:
Must provide information about the “cost implications” of the recommended policy intervention.

Option 1: Effectiveness
Option 2: Unintended effects
Option 3: Equity

- $\$\$-$
What can be done from the science/research side?

Adapt research DESIGN & COMMUNICATION to better address policy needs

Step #2: POSITION YOUR RESEARCH
Your PEP policy paper

**STRUCTURE**

- **Problem** - importance
- **Options** available / considered
- **Criteria** to assess options
- **Evaluation** - comparing options based on criteria
- **Recommendation** + roadmap

**Part 1** – interim stage (December)

**Part 2** – final stage (May 2022?)
Why do we have to do something now? Why is it a priority?

- What is the (political) risk of doing or not doing something?

Interest in issues that are important “NOW”

- Media – public perceptions
- Commitments – electoral cycle
- Especially for constituencies/core supporters
Have we got the option that meets our broader needs?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?
   - Current policy
   - Policy alternative/change under consideration by Gov (CONSULT!)
   - Other alternatives? – based on literature, or other countries..
Have we got the option that meets our broader needs?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?

2) On the basis of which criteria can we evaluate/compare options?
   - Effectiveness, equity, efficiency...
   - Consider: ➢ Government priorities & constraints – budget, commitments..
     ➢ Which can you realistically assess / find information about?
Have we got the option that meets our **broader needs**?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?

2) On the basis of which criteria can we evaluate/compare options?

= Framework of analysis
Have we got the option that meets our broader needs?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?

2) On the basis of which criteria can we evaluate/compare options?

3) Assess criteria and use results to compare options

What will it cost?
**Your PEP policy paper – Part 2 (May 2022)**

Assess as many criteria as POSSIBLE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Dislike" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Dislike" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Dislike" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Dislike" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Like" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Your research
- Consultations
- Literature
- Find info on costs and analyse!

Policy paper = parallel ANALYSIS
## Your PEP policy paper – Part 2 (May 2022)

### Structure – Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unlike" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Like" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best option**
Have we got the option that meets our broader needs?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?
2) On the basis of which criteria can we evaluate/compare options?
3) Assess criteria and use results to compare options
4) Identify best option (What will it cost?)
Have we got the option that meets our **broader needs**?

1) What are the options available to address this problem?
2) On the basis of which criteria can we evaluate/compare options?
3) Assess criteria and use results to compare options
4) **Identify best option**
5) **How do we implement?**

Propose a roadmap for success:
Consultations, data gathering, further analysis
Your PEP policy paper

STRUCTURE

- Problem - importance
- Options available / considered
- Criteria to assess options
- Evaluation - comparing options based on criteria
- Recommendation + roadmap

Part 1 – interim stage (December)

Part 2 – final stage (May 2022)
Assignment – for tomorrow (May 20)

Slide 5 – Identify your project’s POLICY vs RESEARCH questions

Must inform..

POLICY QUESTION? ≠ RESEARCH QUESTION?

How will your research/evidence contribute to informing a specific policy decision/process?

to answer..
How can we mitigate the impact of climate change on food security?

Policy

What are the effects of crop diversification on household food security in a context of rainfall shocks?

Research

How do climate-related shocks affect women’s intra-household bargaining power?

Research

How can the current climate resilience strategy be adapted to mitigate effects of climate shocks on girls’ education?

Policy
Thank you!
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Session 3 - Contents

- Analysing your policy/political context
  - Stakeholder analysis
  - Context-specific influence paths and power relations

- Engaging target audiences:
  - Tools and tips for effective communication with policy

- Reporting your engagement activities throughout the PEP project
Why are we here?

Evidence-informed policymaking – the objective of your PEP project

• PEP research aims to inform policy

• Providing evidence that is both:
  
  ➢ Reliable (scientifically-sound)
  
  ➢ Contextualised:
    
    • From a local perspective
    
    • Addressing COUNTRY-SPECIFIC POLICY NEEDS / QUESTIONS
Why are we here?

Purpose of this workshop:

• Make sure your PEP research answers actual policy questions

PEP requirements from grantees:

• Identify and consult with stakeholders
  ➢ PEP requires stakeholder analysis and periodic reports

• Develop a (parallel) policy paper analysis
  ➢ Starting with a policy context analysis, to clarify the key policy questions to address
Why are we here?

Structure of this workshop:

- **Session 1**: Understanding policy processes
- **Session 2**: Designing research to address actual policy needs
- **Session 3**: Designing an effective policy engagement strategy
Analysing your policy/political context

How can evidence be channeled into policymaking?

You must find the most strategic ENTRY POINTS
Analyzing your policy/political context

The policy process unfolds in a specific **policy context**, a complex environment with **multiple competing interests**

A conceptual framework that includes **influences**, **events**, **practices**, and **consequences** that impact the evolution of policy & its subsequent analysis

(Ball 2006)

Analyzing the policy context is critical to:

1) **Identify the factors & actors that affect policy decisions**

2) Develop appropriate advocacy strategies
Analysing your policy/political context

- **the political climate**
- **actors** that influence the policy process
- **the process** of how policies are made
- **formal and informal institutions & regulations**
Analysing your policy/political context

**FACTORS:** Many factors can influence the context of a policy issue

**Macro-context:** political freedom, corruption, & role of outside forces involved in the policy process

**Relationship between actors:** the power relations or interactions between public institutions, government agencies, & other stakeholders

**Processes:** the mechanisms and steps of the decision-making process

**Culture:** habits, behaviors, & assumptions learned of actors

**Resources:** financial budget, infrastructure, technology, & other resources, as well as the degree of state control over these resources
Policy Issue: In Italy, migrant university students tend to have less opportunities in the job market when they graduate

Policy context FACTORS:

- Conservative society that does not prioritize social inclusion of migrants
- Far-right parties resist change
- Minister of Labour does not consult external actors to implement policy on migrant inclusion in the job market
- Low budget to address social inclusion
- Discrimination & clientelism in many job sectors
Analysing your policy/political context

Policy analysis cycle *(policy paper)*

1. Identify problem
2. Consider policy options
3. Propose solutions

- Evaluate policy options in the **specific context**
- Establish precise evaluation criteria to help **compare and rank** policy options effectively
Analysing your policy/political context

Important to **assess the feasibility** of a potential policy in a given context

- **LEGAL FEASIBILITY**
- **ADMINISTRATIVE FEASIBILITY**
- **TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY**
- **SOCIAL & CULTURAL FEASIBILITY**

If knowledge or recommendation is “inapplicable”, then **may affect your credibility**
### Assessing feasibility - example

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issue:</th>
<th>Lack of grazing land for nomads in southern Morocco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGAL FEASIBILITY:</strong></td>
<td>• Legal framework governing land is a complicated mix of customary law, Islamic law, French civil law, and a series of decrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **ADMINISTRATIVE FEASIBILITY:** | • Authority from central government vs. rural, local government  
• Competing government interests: mining, agriculture, dam construction, land rights of other communities |
Example:

Policy Issue: Lack of grazing land for nomads in southern Morocco

TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY:
- What resources could be mobilized in rural areas?

SOCIAL & CULTURAL FEASIBILITY:
- Strained relationships with sedentary communities over land rights
Analysing your policy/political context

To understand your “context factors”, you should:

#1 – IDENTIFY key / target stakeholders
Stakeholder analysis

#2 – CONSULT key / target stakeholders
Stakeholder engagement

“Useful analysis requires effective communication among diverse individuals”

Baruch Fischhoff, 2011
To understand policy needs/priorities, you must engage and consult with:

- **Scientific knowledge**
- **Local knowledge**

**Professional knowledge**
Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates.

From society/communities' experiences and practice.

**Analysing your policy/political context**
Stakeholder analysis

Stakeholders are individuals, organizations, or communities that have a direct interest in a specific policy issue/endeavor.

Each stakeholder pursues its own agenda, and influences other stakeholders and policy-makers.

Power relations and influence paths
4 steps

1. Define the research topic and intended policy change
2. Identify all relevant stakeholders associated with the policy issue
3. Classify the various stakeholders:
   - Power to act
   - Interest
   - Position (support/oppose)
4. Engage stakeholders to contribute to policy development

Stakeholder analysis

ANALYSIS ➔ STRATEGY
A stakeholder analysis is key to understand:

- Key players
- Specific group interests
- Power relations among groups
- Competing interests among groups
- Productive or obstructive positions
- Specific groups most likely to be impacted by policy change
- Conflicts and risks
Stakeholder analysis – identifying stakeholders

For your PEP project, we recommend to focus on:

1. State
2. Political Parties
3. IOs & NGOs
4. Media
5. Business Community
6. Civil Society
7. Think tanks
8. Research Community
9. The People
Different parts of the state are involved at different stages of the policy making cycle:

- **Government**: Decision-making & agenda-setting
- **Parliament**: Decision-making & building legislative frameworks
- **Civil Servants**: Supporting decision-makers in policy formulation
Determine whose interest should be taken into account in relation to a specific policy/program.

Questions to ask:

• Who has **power/influence** in specific policy process (formulation, adoption, implement..?)
• Who can **inform** viz specific needs/constraints related to policy?
• Who can **benefit from/support** the “policy”?
• Who can provide **entry point** into the decision process?
Stakeholder analysis – classifying stakeholders

Classify stakeholders based on their:

1 - Level of interest/engagement:
   • To what degree will the stakeholder be affected by the policy change?
   • What vested interest do they have?

2 - Power to act:
   • What role does the stakeholder have in determining the policy?
   • What resources can they mobilize?
   • What influence does the stakeholder have on policy implementation?

3 - Position/Stance:
   • How strongly do they support or oppose an issue?

Update stakeholder analysis after findings - recommendation
Types of power & influence in a policy context

1. VISIBLE POWER
   observable decision-making processes
   - political parties, ministries, law-makers

2. HIDDEN POWER
   actors behind official decisions
   - political advisors, lobbies

3. INTANGIBLE POWER
   shapes meaning in society & influences how people think about an issue
   - social networks, media, advocacy groups?
Stakeholder analysis – classifying stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **High Engagement**
  - Supportive
  - Opposed

- **Low Engagement**
  - Supportive
  - Opposed

- **Keep satisfied**
- **Manage closely**
- **Monitor (minimum effort)**
- **Keep informed**
Stakeholder analysis – classifying stakeholders

Example:

Policy Issue: Orange Roughy (type of fish) in Namibia is endangered due to over fishing
Policy Solution: Prohibit fishing during the reproduction season of Orange Roughy

#1 - Identify players who are interested/engaged

State/gov
- Ministry of Commerce
- Namibia Ministry of Environment

Business
- Namibia Fishery Supply
- Fisherman Organizations
- Foreign Companies

NGOs
- Green Peace
- Earth Life Namibia

Civil
- Local Student Association
Example:
Policy Issue: Orange Roughy (type of fish) in Namibia is endangered due to over fishing
Policy Solution: Prohibit fishing during the reproduction season of Orange Roughy

#2 - Identify players who can affect/influence decision-making
Stakeholder analysis – classifying stakeholders

Example:
Policy Issue: Orange Roughy (type of fish) in Namibia is endangered due to over fishing
Policy Solution: Prohibit fishing during the reproduction season of Orange Roughy

After findings:
#3 - Identify players who can will likey support or oppose your position
Entry points are:

- **Windows of opportunity** to catch the attention of policymakers, stakeholders, or the broader public.
  - **Government processes**: revisions of existing legislation, budgets, or major policies
  - **Changes in administration**: new national, sub-national, or local governments might dismiss or welcome new information (compared to their predecessors)
  - **Political events**: regional meetings, global summits, elections, launch events for new policies or programs
  - **Social events**: events related to an advocacy issue (international days, VIP visits..)
  - **Conferences and workshops**

- **People**:
  - **Existing or accessible contacts** who can provide introductions or create opportunities to connect with target stakeholders
Engaging stakeholders – entry points

How to take advantage of an entry point:

**Anticipate:** Be prepared to discuss your research at seminars, conferences & public debates

**Disseminate:** Raise awareness by disseminating information on a website or other platform, and create space for debate and discussion on the issue

**Make allies:** Work with other researchers focused on projects that have similar stakeholders, impacts, or policy implications

Foster relationships with influential leaders, NGOs, or journalists that can advocate for your work
Engaging stakeholders

Be proactive!
Do NOT expect policy-makers to find/read your research.

➢ Must engage EARLY in the process - while setting the research agenda in order to ensure the research is impactful

Be prepared!
Before you meet, be sure to do your homework:

→ What are their interests?
→ What information do they need? Or can they provide?
→ What is the best strategy to:
  ➢ interact with them?
  ➢ to raise interest for your project?
Engaging stakeholders

*Beware!* Policy-makers often:

- prefer certain institutions or researchers (based on background, experience, or political leanings)
- do not trust towards information and sources external to the public policy system

**Challenges and risks:**

- Capacity to gauge personal vs. public/institutional opinions of people in organizations
- Hidden interests and agendas that are not made public
- Risks associated with asking about power and interest (especially in authoritarian regimes)
Engaging stakeholders – beware

CONTEXT MATTERS!

Interest in issues that are important “NOW”

- Media – public perceptions
- Commitments – electoral cycle
- Especially related to constituencies/core supporters
Engaging stakeholders

Monitoring and measuring successful engagement

- Short Term Outcomes
  - Stakeholder Awareness
- Intermediate Outcomes
  - Stakeholder Policy Acceptance
- Policy Change
  - Legislation Enacted
Engaging stakeholders – PEP monitors & evaluate

PEP REQUIRES periodic reports on stakeholder consultations

- **INITIAL CONSULTATIONS** - On project objectives/questions
  + **STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**
  
  Proposal stage – 1st grant
  
  June-July 2021

- **CONSULTATIONS ON PROGRESS / UPDATE** (preliminary results)

  Interim stage – 2nd grant
  
  Nov-Dec 2021

- **CONSULTATIONS TO DISCUSS RESULTS – (+ policy implications) & DISSEMINATION**

  Final report stage – 3rd grant
  
  Publication stage – 4th grant
  
  May-Aug 2022

- **DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES** – official communications of results

  National conference grant
  
  July-Sept 2022

PEP REQUIRES periodic reports on stakeholder consultations.
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