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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
  - RECENT AND STILL DISPUTED – far from systematically applied.
  - 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

Commitment to all donors

Scientific training + mentorship

This training + policy outreach mentorship
Why are we here?

Purpose of this workshop:

• Make sure your PEP research answers actual policy questions

PEP requires from grantees to:

• Identify and engage/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 policymaking
- **Session 2**: Designing research to address actual policy needs
- **Session 3**: Designing an effective policy engagement strategy
An effective policy must be based on **facts**, but it is also influenced by **cultural values** and **politics**.
Policy processes

Development

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

Example: Access to water in Tunisia

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

- 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
Policy processes

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 basing 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.
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)
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

Policymaking cycle – role of research/evaluation

Agenda setting
- Identify problems
- Measure their magnitude

Policy formation
- Define options
- Legitimation (evidence - debate)
- (ex-ante)

Decision-making
- Choix de l’option
- Based on legitimation

Policy implementation
- (in itinere)

Policy evaluation
- (ex-post)
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

Policymaking cycle – role of research/evaluation

- **Agenda setting**: Identify and assess problems
- **Policy formation**: Evaluate/compare options (ex-ante)
- **Decision-making**: Evaluate existing/current policy (in itinere)
- **Policy implementation**: Evaluate existing/current policy (ex-post)

**EIPM:**
What type of methods/evidence is being used?
Role of research?
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

Policymaking cycle

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.
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

Decision-making
Good policy requires effective use of all

Professional knowledge
Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

Local knowledge
From society/communities’ experiences and practice
When they work together...

**Policy influence is strengthened**

*Scientific knowledge*

- Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates
- From society/communities' experiences and practice

**Nugroho & al., 2018**

*Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking*
Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking

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

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

**Scientific knowledge**
- Held by bureaucrats, intermediaries, and advocates

**Local knowledge**
- From society/communities' experiences and practice

**Professional knowledge**
- To understand policy needs/priorities, must engage and consult with...

Channeling scientific evidence into policymaking
Policy stakeholders

**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
Policy stakeholders

What are the main types of stakeholders?

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

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
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»
**Policy stakeholders**

**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
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?
Q1: **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
Q2: Associate your PEP project with the relevant stage of policymaking cycle

- Agenda setting
  - Identify and assess problems

- Policy formation
  - Evaluate/compare options (ex-ante)

- Decision-making

- Policy implementation
  - Evaluate existing/current policy (in itinere)

- Policy evaluation
  - (ex-post)
Q3:

# 1 - Identify 3 categories of relevant stakeholders for your project
# 2 – Name one example (institution, organization) for each category
# 3 – For each example, explain why you consider them to be priority target
Thank you!
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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
Session 2 - Contents

- Science and policy: a complicated relationship
- Understanding policy needs
- What do policymakers need to know
- Your PEP policy paper
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”...
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

The *relative influence of scientific evidence* VS other factors/inputs in policymaking:
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

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

**Scientific knowledge**

**Decision-making**
Good policy requires effective use of all

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

**Local knowledge**
From society/communities' experiences and practice
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 and constraints.
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.
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

“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
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.. to answer..
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?
  - What type = must compare options

- **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?

- **Must inform..**

- **Right question?**
Science and policy: a complicated relationship

Babu Rahman, 2017 – UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office

*How to make research more useful to government officials*

“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..”**

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**”
### Usual criteria to assess “good policy”

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria

**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?

---

**Usual criteria to assess "good policy"**

#### EFFECTS
- Effectiveness
- Unintended effects
- Equity

#### APPLICATION
- Cost
- Feasibility
- Acceptability
## 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>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Unintended effects</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the policy achieve the desired outcomes?</td>
<td>Are there unintended effects to consider?</td>
<td>What are the effects for different population groups? How do they affect equity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICA-TION</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the costs/budget implications?</td>
<td>Is this policy technically viable/feasible?</td>
<td>How is this policy perceived by (priority) stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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”)
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**

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**

**Decision-makers 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>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>

Option 1

- Effectiveness: ✅
- Unintended effects: ❌
- Equity: ✅
- Cost: ??
- Feasibility: ??
- Acceptability: ??
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></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>![??]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>![Thumb-Down]</td>
<td>![??]</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>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 - PRIORITIES
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></td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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>

Don’t underestimate the importance of COST-EFFECTIVENESS

A basic “cost-benefit analysis” can be a very powerful policy argument.
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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Thumbs Up" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Thumbs Up" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Thumbs Down" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should provide information about the “cost implications” of the recommended policy intervention.
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
(policy context analysis)

**Part 2** – final stage
(findings)
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

CONTEXT MATTERS!
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**?
Assess as many criteria as POSSIBLE...

Effectiveness
Unintended effects
Equity
Cost / efficiency
Feasibility
Acceptability

Option 1
Option 2
Option 3

- 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="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost / efficiency</td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_up.png" alt="Thumb Up" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></td>
<td><img src="thumb_down.png" alt="Thumb Down" /></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?

Questions that decision-makers always have...

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

**Part 2** – final stage
Q4 – Identify your project’s POLICY vs RESEARCH questions

POLICY QUESTION? ≠ RESEARCH QUESTION?

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

Must inform...

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**
HANDS ON

Q5 – Understanding the relevant decision-making framework/process related to the policy issue of your project

5.1. Can you think of 3 potential options (courses of action) available for decision-makers to choose from, at this point, to address the issue at the core of your research? (N.B. One of them can be the “status quo”, or a “no-action” scenario)

Example: Vocational training as strategy to promote youth employment
- Option 1: Current vocational training program, post-graduation (status quo)
- Option 2: Complement current (post-graduate) vocational training with employment subsidy scheme
- Option 3: Change strategy for new “work-while-in-school” (pre-graduation apprenticeship) program

Is your research specifically linked to one of them? If so, which one?

5.2. IF YOU CANNOT think of potential options for policy action, explain how your research relates to specific policy making or decision processes
Thank you!
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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
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
Analysing your policy/political context

How can evidence be channeled into policymaking?

You must find the most strategic ENTRY POINTS
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

- **POLICY 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
Analysing your policy/political context

Policy paper/analysis

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

To understand policy needs/priorities,

- **Scientific knowledge**
  - Must ENGAGE and CONSULT WITH...

- **Local knowledge**
  - From society/communities' experiences and practice

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

EXAMPLE:
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

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/influence
   - Inform
   - Benefit
   - Entry point

4. Engage stakeholders to contribute to 1) inform research or 2) use evidence

ANALYSIS  →  STRATEGY
For your PEP project, we recommend to focus on: Stakeholder analysis – identifying stakeholders

1. State
2. Political Parties
3. IOs & NGOs
4. Media
5. Business Community
6. Research Community
7. Think tanks
8. Civil society
9. The People
# 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 **directly concerned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/gov</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Civil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
<td>Namibia Fishery Supply</td>
<td>Green Peace</td>
<td>Local Student Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Ministry of Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Life Namibia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

#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 likely support or oppose your position
Engaging stakeholders – entry points

Entry points are:

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

- **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
## Engaging stakeholders – entry points

**How to take advantage** of an entry point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipate:</th>
<th>Be prepared to discuss your research at seminars, conferences &amp; public debates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate:</td>
<td>Raise awareness by disseminating information on a website or other platform, and create space for debate and discussion on the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make allies:</td>
<td>Work with other researchers focused on projects that have similar stakeholders, impacts, or policy implications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 – PEP monitors & evaluate

PEP REQUIRES periodic reports on stakeholder consultations

- **INITIAL CONSULTATIONS** - On project objectives/questions
  + **STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**
  - Proposal stage – 1\textsuperscript{st} grant

- **CONSULTATIONS ON PROGRESS / UPDATE** (preliminary results)
  - Interim stage – 2\textsuperscript{nd} grant

- **CONSULTATIONS TO DISCUSS RESULTS – (+ policy implications) & DISSEMINATION**
  - Final report stage – 3\textsuperscript{rd} grant
  - Publication stage – 4\textsuperscript{th} grant

- **DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES** – official communications of results
  - National conference grant
#6 – Answer the following questions for each of the priority stakeholders identified in question #3 (page 3 – session 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
<th>Stakeholder 1: e.g. Ministry of Health</th>
<th>Stakeholder 2: e.g. UNICEF</th>
<th>Stakeholder 3: e.g. Women’s rights association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is their core mandate/interest?</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of information do they need?</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of information can they provide?</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
<td>Type here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you expect to face a specific challenge to engage this stakeholder?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#7 – Identify 3 potential “entry points” (people or opportunities) that could give you access to the decision-making processes that you seek to inform

(See definition of “entry points”)

- Entry point #1
- Entry point #2
- Entry point #3

Entry points are:

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

- **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
Thank you!
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