

How Indonesian NGOs can use Advocacy as a Strategy to advance their Missions

Setting the Scene

Chapter 1.

Carrying out Advocacy through Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) - who are we, and what are our possible roles?

NGOs are one kind of civil society organisation distinguished by their interest in and commitment to social development. Civil Society Organisations are all kinds of associations of citizens that are larger than the family and smaller than the state. They embrace both formal and informal organisations, and they embrace many different kinds of organisations with interests ranging from choirs to civic education, from old school alumni associations to trade unions, from traditional cultural associations to modern think tanks.

The Three Sectors of a State

Civil Society is generally thought of as being one part of the three parts of the Nation State - the other two being the Public Sector, and the Business Sector. In different countries, and at different times the size and importance of these three sectors relative to each other will change. In Indonesia, in the Orde Baru, the Public Sector was by far the largest – with a smaller space given to Business and a very much smaller space given to Civil Society. In Indonesia in 1997, the relative spaces occupied by the three sectors have changed with a comparative growth in the Civil Society sector vis-à-vis the Public Sector and the Business Sector. Each of these three sectors have different motivations, different resources and different ways of mobilizing those resources. It is important for organisations which call themselves "Civil Society Organisations" to appreciate who they are in comparison with the other main actors in the state - how they are different, and what roles they can play – particularly in advocacy

OHT 1/1

OHT 1/2

Let us take these one by one:

1. The Public Sector:

This comprises the political leadership of the country (i.e. the current Political Regime together with the Civil Service or the Administration. It also encompasses the Armed Forces.

The Motivation of the Public Sector is to rule and to govern.

The Resources of the Public Sector are state property, laws, and taxes.

The way that the Public Sector mobilizes Resources is by law, by coercion, and command.

2. The Business Sector

This comprises the for-profit private sector of the country.

The Motivation of the Business Sector is to make private profits.

The Resources of the Business Sector are private property.

The way that the Business Sector mobilizes Resources is by trade and exchange.

3. The Civil Society Sector

This comprises the non-profit, non-government sector of citizen's associations.

The Motivation of the Civil Society Sector is in three parts:

- a. to hold the other two sectors (Public and Business) accountable to the citizens
- b. to enable citizens to associate
- c. to improve the lives of the citizens

The Resources of the Civil Society Sector are in two parts:

- a. citizen's own time, energy, and personal resources
- b. time, energy, and personal resources gifted by others (meaning any or all of citizens, business and government)

The way that the Civil Society Sector Mobilizes Resources are in two parts:

- a. by shared values with other citizens
- b. by shared commitment to action with other citizens

Citizens, by themselves, have neither the authority of the State, nor the resources of the Business sector. They rely on having good ideas that others share, and that others are prepared to join with them in promoting.

The borders between these three sectors are not watertight: they are fuzzy and sometimes unclear. For instance, a citizen may be a government official, but at the same time be a member of a civil society organisation. A citizen may be a government official and at the same time own a business. There may be an unclear distinction between running a business and running a government (Indonesia is familiar with this in the Orde Baru with government owned businesses and military owned businesses). Lastly, a civil society organisation may also run a business (e.g. renting out property).

Generally, however, these distinctions hold. The Civil Society Sector has very different motivations, resources and ways of mobilizing resources from the other two sectors. This is important to remember when thinking of advocacy.

Analyzing the Civil Society Sector

There are two kinds of organisations within civil society, each of which has a different approach to advocacy:

OHT 1/3

1. Mutual Benefit Organisations

These are organisations formed by people who are all members of the organisation, who are all people who have a common bond, and who the organisation is designed to benefit. Such organisations could be professional associations (like the Doctors Association), or Trade Unions, or self-help community groups. When they do advocacy, they are advocating on behalf of themselves, and they hope to get the benefits of their advocacy themselves.

2. Public Benefit Organisations

These are organisations of people who have come together voluntarily in order to help some other identified group of people in society (like the disabled, or victims of natural disaster, or victims of social disasters) - or to help everyone in society (like consumers, or voters). Any benefits that such an organisation is able to realize are for other people, not for itself. Advocacy is carried out on behalf of other people - which brings up the question of whether such people

have agreed to such advocacy being carried out on their behalf (see Chapter 9 for more on this).

There is a third kind of civil society organisation which reflects the shadow or illegitimate side of civil society. These are organisations which pretend to be either mutual benefit or public benefit organisations, but which are either fronts for other purposes, or are devices for private individuals to gain benefits for themselves by pretending to be a civil society organisation. This is the realm of GONGOs (Government organised NGOs), PONGOs (Political Party Organised NGOs) etc. It is important to mention them because genuine civil society organisations are often accused of being pretenders, doing advocacy for private or party political gain.

OHT 1/4

It is possible to carry out a Mapping exercise to map a Nation and ascertain what kinds of civil society organisations exist within it. OHT 4 gives a generic way of doing this. It looks at the Three Sectors, then looks at all those Civil Society Institutions which are the interface between the Civil Society Sector and the other two sectors. It then focuses on Civil Society Organisations, and looks at the varieties that exist within the three categories of "Mutual Benefit Organisations", "Public Benefit Organisations" and "Private Benefit Organisations".

Note that Community Based Organisations (CBOs) are listed as one part of "Mutual Benefit Organisations" and note that "NGOs" are listed as one part of Public Benefit Organisations. Civil Society Organisations are much larger and more numerous than just CBOs and NGOs, although many people think only of these two when they discuss Civil Society.

OHT 1/5

OHT 5 provides a version of the generic map of Civil Society specifically dealing with Indonesia

Civil Society Organisations in Indonesia potentially interested in Advocacy

OHT 1/6

Here we look at five different kinds of Civil Society Organisations interested in and practicing advocacy. These are:

1. "Civic Education" NGOs - i.e. public benefit organisations which have identified their role as being concerned with democracy and governance issues.

2. Employment Related Organisations - i.e. mutual benefit organisations which represent people in a particular profession or trade - ranging from Trade Unions to Chambers of Commerce to professional associations.
3. Service Delivery NGOs - i.e. those public benefit organisations which have identified their role as delivering services to identified groups of disadvantaged people or to citizens of Indonesia as a whole.
4. Organisations of the Disadvantaged - i.e. those mutual benefit organisations which are formed by those suffering from a common disadvantage - which may be a disability, or may be simply a group within society, like women who suffer discrimination, or people who have been victims of a particular human rights abuse
5. Community Based Organisations - i.e. those mutual benefit organisations which are very geographically local and concerned with self-help issues in their locality.

OHT 1/7

Characteristics of NGOs and CBOs

Since so many of the organisations that are concerned with advocacy are NGOs and CBOs, it is valuable for them to reflect on what it means to be an NGO or a CBO when entering the field of advocacy.

Characteristics of NGOs

1. Voluntary - NGOs are formed voluntarily, and there is an element of voluntary participation in the organisation (usually at the level of Board members, or at the level of beneficiaries).
2. Independent - NGOs are formally constituted and autonomous, and governed by people to whom responsibility is delegated through a Board.
3. Not for Profit - NGOs do not make profits by definition, but if they have surplus income, this is ploughed back into the work of the NGO: Board members receive no fees for being Board members. Note that this does not mean they cannot run a business; but profits of the business are not privately distributed - they are ploughed back into the NGOs' work.

4. Not self-serving - NGOs are constituted to improve the circumstances of identified disadvantaged people or to act on concerns of society as a whole, not to advantage themselves.
5. Value Driven - NGOs are based on shared values and commitment
6. Non-Political - NGOs are not primarily involved in promoting candidates for elected office
7. Non-Religious - NGOs are not primarily involved in the promotion of religious worship or religious education

Characteristics of CBOs

OHT 1/8

1. CBOs formed by the indigenous people themselves
 - 1.1. are formed to help members
 - 1.2. have democratic governance, usually run by volunteers
 - 1.3. have few (if any) paid staff
 - 1.4. mobilize resources usually from the local area
 - 1.5. have a small area of operation
 - 1.6. usually work multi-sectorally
 - 1.7. are usually unregistered in law
 - 1.8. are formed by people with some (usually geographic) connection to improve their own circumstances.
2. CBOs formed following inducement by others
 - 2.1. are formed because of some external influence (Government, NGOs, Donors)
 - 2.2. are often motivated by a particular incentive created by the external influence
 - 2.3. are not always sustained, depending on the how far the CBO is "owned" by local people.

Roles and Functions of NGOs in Advocacy

Given the motivations of the Civil Society Sector (see "The Three Sectors of the State" above), and the roles that they can play, we can now look at the ways NGOs, within organisations of civil society, play these roles. Let us look at these one by one:

OHT 1/9

1. Holding the Public Sector and Business Sector accountable to civil society

This can be done by:

- a. research - finding out how the Public Sector and the Business Sector is operating
- b. making such information public - publicizing the research and its findings
- c. using the existing citizens complaints procedures
- d. advocacy campaigns to change laws or policies, or, more likely, to make sure that laws and policies are implemented.

2. Enabling citizens to associate together

This can be done by:

- a. organising citizens to form associations to test the right of association
- b. advocacy for policies or laws that create an enabling environment for civil society organisations.

3. Improving the lives of the people

This can be done by:

- a. implementing projects to deliver services
- b. empowering people
- c. encouraging self-help
- d. providing public information and education
- e. advocating for changes in laws, policies, practices and behaviour which are blocking improvements in the lives of the people.

Given the characteristics of Civil Society Organisations there are two roles that CSOs should not play

1. forming political parties
2. promoting their point of view by force.

OHT1/10

This overview has helped establish what Civil Society Organisations are, what we can expect from them, what we can expect from other sectors in a Nation, and more particularly what we can expect from NGOs and CBOs. Civil Society Organisations functions can very well be implemented through advocacy, but

CSOs should be clear on whose behalf they are carrying out advocacy, and what mandate they have received from such people.

Chapter 2: Definition of Advocacy

Advocacy as another strategy for CSOs

CSOs in Indonesia use a variety of strategies to carry out their mission: those in common use are:

- Service delivery - to improve people's livelihoods and physical well-being
- Empowerment - so that individually and collectively people are able to instigate their own development
- Encouragement of self-help - by building up people's organisations, and people's initiatives
- Public information and education - so that people individually and collectively are aware of issues that affect their own development.

In some cases CSOs find that their ability to be effective and have impact through these chosen ways of working is constrained by the situation they find themselves in - composed of a mix of existing laws, or policies, or attitudes, or practice. They realize that they have to try and address these constraints before they can hope to achieve much more through their existing strategies. In such cases they want to do two things:

- To show that existing laws, policies, attitudes or practice are hindering rather than helping development
- To lobby for changes in them which will allow the CSOs (and others) to carry out more and better development work.

This process of organised pressure for change in laws, policies, attitudes and practice that are constraining development, we call "advocacy". It is another strategy that NGOs can use to supplement their existing strategies in promoting development in general and in implementing their own purpose and mission in particular.

Policies, Laws, Practices, Behaviour

We have stated that advocacy can operate to bring about change in four different arenas - policies, laws, practices and behaviour. Four examples of these different arenas may provide a clearer understanding of the different ways in which advocacy can be used:

Handout 2/1

Laws:

Let us take the example of child adoption. In Zambia the present policies on child adoption are based on laws that were passed in the colonial era, and which were originally targeted at the small white settler population. These laws refer to a set of circumstances that has long passed, and provide for rules and procedures that are inappropriate for the present where huge numbers of native Zambian children need to be considered for adoption - or some other kind of organised fostering.

NGOs working with children in 1999 in Zambia understand that the AIDS pandemic has produced huge numbers of orphans from parents who have died of AIDS. Society has to deal with the overwhelming problem of orphans. One of the likely means of addressing this problem is by encouraging more Zambian families to foster and adopt AIDS orphans. The existing laws, however, constrain rather than support such efforts because they are cumbersome and ill-suited to present circumstances. The NGOs therefore realize that they need to address the problem of changing outdated and inappropriate laws to allow them to further their work with children in need.

Policies

Let us take the example of the policies of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry of Agriculture in Zambia promotes a policy of small holder or peasant farmer production of food crops (particularly maize) based on heavy application of fertilizers, insecticides, and the use of purchased hybrid seeds. In their opinion such a policy will produce greater production of food crops for consumption, and will be profitable for the small farmer to sell on the market even though the costs of inputs is substantial.

Many NGOs point out that the availability and cost of the inputs (seeds, fertilizers, insecticides) is both so high and so unpredictable that small scale farmers are better advised to have a low input approach to growing food crops - using organic fertilization (manure and nitrogen fixing plants), no insecticides, and open pollinated varieties. They suggest that yields may be slightly less, but that costs will be considerably less. They advocate a change in Ministry of Agriculture policies that will concentrate more on realistic possibilities for poor farmers who cannot afford, or who cannot access expensive inputs. Such a change in policy would bring the large resources of the Ministry of Agriculture behind what is at present the practice of a minority of farmers.

Practice

Let us take the example of the practices within the jails of Zambia. The situation of prisoners in Zambian jails is acknowledged to be terrible. Prisoners are kept in filthy, overcrowded conditions, are provided with minimal amounts of food, bedding, and clothing, and are frequently beaten. Moreover hardened and convicted criminals are kept together with prisoners on remand, and considerable physical and sexual abuse between prisoners is not checked.

This is not the result of policy or law: it is existing practice and is allowed to continue. NGOs concerned with human rights feel that prisoners also have rights, and these rights are being abused. They advocate a change in practice through which prisoners are recognised as having certain rights, and these rights are observed by prison authorities.

Behaviour

Let us take the example of sexual behaviour in Zambia. The spread of HIV/AIDS in Zambia is fuelled by the continuance of certain behavioural practices that increase sexually transmitted diseases. These include polygamy, acceptance and practice of numerous sexual liaisons by men and women (especially men), difficulty of wives refusing sex to their husbands even when they suspect that they are infected with HIV/AIDS, unwillingness of men to use condoms, use of herbs by women to attract men through dry vaginas - and subsequent vaginal lacerations, and men's increasing pursuit of younger girls for sex

In order to slow the rate of AIDS infection in the population, NGOs are concerned to advocate against these kinds of behaviour, and to advocate for a range of other behaviours linked to safe sex, like the right of women to use condoms without risking divorce or being beaten by their husbands.

The NGO Version of Advocacy

In general the term "advocacy" means "organised efforts to effect systematic or incremental change". This limited definition would therefore cover lobbying activities by pressure groups to improve their own situation vis-à-vis others. An example might be one particular industry in Indonesia lobbying the Ministry of Finance for reductions in tax that support their own position. Such lobbying might well be carried out by professional lobbyists - i.e. lawyers who push for advantages to their clients.

When we are dealing with value-based organisations like NGOs, advocacy is not simply pushing your case in rivalry to others' cases. It contains two specific and particular elements which underline NGOs' specific ways of carrying out development:

OHT2/2

1. the Advocacy effort must involve citizens in the advocacy process in order to develop a politically active civil society
2. the Advocacy effort must benefit specific and identified disadvantaged groups, or must redress situations which disadvantaged citizens of Indonesia as a whole find themselves in.

NGO advocacy, as well as advocating for the particular changes under consideration at any one time, is also concerned with good governance and with bringing civil society into the political arena. It is interested in:

- social justice
- public participation
- a functioning democracy
- administrative accountability
- monitoring and ensuring compliance with laws and policies that have been established.

Defining Advocacy

When we look, therefore at the elements of Law, Policy, Practice and Behaviour; when we look at advocacy as a way to change the factors that cause blockages for development work: when we add the elements of an active civil society - we start to get some clearer ideas for a definition of advocacy.

Others have also thought about this subject, and have some thoughts on how advocacy should be defined for NGOs.

Handout 2/3

We can suggest a definition of "advocacy" for NGOs concerned with development as being:

A systematic, democratic, and organised effort by CSOs to change, influence, or initiate policies, laws, practice, behaviour so that disadvantaged citizens in particular, or all Indonesia citizens in general will be benefited.

OHT 2/4

The "Civic Education" NGOs

We have said that some CSOs in Indonesia use advocacy strategies to supplement their existing development work because they have found specific laws, policies, practice or behaviour are blocking their ability to deliver benefits. Some NGOs are not in that situation.

Some CSOs in Indonesia have already decided that advocacy on behalf of good governance practices is their main activity. Such NGOs operate on topics such as social justice, economic liberalism, political pluralism, administrative accountability, and democratic practices. They have mostly been formed since 1997.

OHT 2/5

In some cases their interest in such matters has come from the services that they offer to clients e.g. legal aid; in some cases their interest has come from the disparity they observe between publicly proclaimed laws, statutory implements, principles and policies concerning democracy and good governance, and what is actually happening. In many cases this is an inheritance from the tumultuous events during the overthrow of Suharto.

Such CSOs are trying to hold the Government accountable to what it has publicly proclaimed - either through political party manifestos, or through duly passed laws. They are trying to ensure that the rhetoric of the transition is actually put into practice, and they are trying to make sure that the injustices of the Orde Baru are recognized, and reform instituted. They are taking up the role of civil society to be a watchdog on the existing structure of governance.

Such organisations do not, by and large, concern themselves with service delivery or community development activities: they have decided that their function is to push for change, and that their tool will be advocacy.

Chapter 3: NGO Advocacy Takes place in a Democracy and within a system of Democratic Governance - what does this mean?

(This chapter adapts the work of Inter-action's "Women's Advocacy Initiative")

The range of words and concepts linked to Democracy and Governance do not always have an agreed meaning in Indonesia, or an agreed translation into local languages⁷. Since Advocacy is very frequently linked to some of these words and concepts, it is important to get clear what people understand by them. We start with "democracy" and "democratic governance". Advocacy is frequently seen as an adjunct of democracy, so it is important to understand how democracy and democratic governance is viewed by CSOs in Zambia: and important to understand what aspects of democracy and democratic governance lay a foundation for advocacy work.

Democracy

Here are some views of democracy:

Democracy is an individual's right to freely participate in decision making on issues that affect individuals

Democracy is a continuous process of creating opportunities through which citizens can participate in decision making

Democracy is people's participation in governance and promotion of the rule of law

Democracy is governance mandated by people which allows shared values such as freedom of expression and association, and promotes transparency

Democracy is a system of governance allowing citizens to elect their leaders and participate in decision making

The key elements are:

- participation in decision making
 - freedom to act
-

- a process mandated by the people

Democratic Governance

The present democratic governance in Indonesia allows :

- *freedom of expression*
- *freedom of the press*
- *freedom of association*
- *freedom of speech*
- *elections*
- *accountability and transparency*
- *the fundamental freedoms guaranteed in the constitution*
- *the law for the registration of foundations and peoples organisations*
- *existing grievance and complaint channels*
- *independent media*
- *multi-partyism and the resultant pluralism of ideas*
- *freedom of movement*
- *citizens participation in national issues*
- *the rule of law*

This contrasts with the situation in the Orde Baru in which many of these rights and opportunities did not exist. There is general agreement that advocacy can take place when these features of democratic governance exist and are working, but will have difficulty in taking place when these features are absent or are not working. The movement to remove Soeharto took place, to a large extent, to make sure that these elements of democratic governance were allowed to be put in place.

OHT 3/1

Chapter 4: Advocacy takes place within the political arena - what does this mean?

(This chapter adapts the work of Inter-Action's "Women's Advocacy Initiative")

For many people the word "politics" has acquired only one meaning - and that is Political Party Politics. In spite of euphoria with the freedom to have party politics, many people are now unhappy with party politics, and the words have many negative connotations - connected with bribery, corruption, repression, control, exploitation, greed etc. Since advocacy takes place within the political arena - meaning within the arena of decision making, and the managing and planning the use of resources - it is important for those planning to be involved in advocacy to clarify their own perceptions of politics, and to be clear that all politics (small "p") does not have to smell the same as Party Politics (big "P").

A useful distinction can be made between "politics" spelt with a small "p" - which means decision making negotiated between different interests and interest groups: and "Politics" with a big "P" - which means the conduct of Political Parties.

Those interested in entering the field of advocacy need to be clear that they will be required to be political (small "p"), but not to be Political (big "P"). Politics in the small "p" sense involves many aspects that are crucial to advocacy, e.g.

OHT 4/1

- The art of reconciling diverse interests
- The art of achieving consensus and resolving conflicts
- Being aware of issues, able to analyze them and strategize to meet objectives
- Being knowledgeable of community needs and concerns
- The art of governing

We can think of politicians (with a small "p") as having the following characteristics:

Activists, organisers, achievers, advocates, analysts, managers, mobilisers, strategists, leaders.

When such is their understanding, those preparing to undertake advocacy accept that they are acting as politicians, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in that.

However, all concerned with advocacy need to be distinguished from the Party Politician who often is thought of as having the following characteristics:

Untrustworthy, exploitative, unprincipled, lying, selling, cheating.

Chapter 5: NGO Advocacy involves dealing with power and power relations - what do we have to offer?

(This chapter adapts the work of Inter-action's "Women's Advocacy Initiative")

A critical ingredient in successful political influence is understanding power and how to use it. Power is embedded within the institutions that define our society and our daily life - from the family, through neighbourhood associations, religious groups, businesses, the legal system, and the government - even the international donor agencies. It is also an essential ingredient to effective advocacy and social change. Some CSOs have the same unease in dealing with power and power relations as they have in dealing with politics - and for the same reasons: "power" has unfortunate connotations. It is not a word that many CSOs feel comfortable with.

If people from CSOs are asked what words they associate with power as it is expressed by the existing power-holders, they think of terms like:

Money
Control
Use of violence
Ability to ignore and marginalize people
Intolerance
Intimidation

These are not terms that CSO people feel comfortable with or try to promote.

What is important is to realise is that power is not all of one kind. Just as there are small "p" politicians as well as big "P" Politicians, so there are those who use power "unilaterally" i.e. in a one way, top-down, coercive and authoritarian manner, and those who use power in a "relational" manner i.e. in a reciprocal, collaborative, and coalition building manner.

CSOs should not try and compete with power-holders for the first form of power, but realise that they have other possible sources of power, and that these need to be developed.

OHT 5/1

Such sources of power are:

- A large active membership
- A large outreach to many communities
- Alliances with strong coalitions
- Prominent influential allies
- Credibility
- Legitimacy
- Reliable information
- Compelling issues and arguments
- An authority that is respected and recognized
- Moral authority

CSOs do not necessarily already have all these elements of power - and not all of them necessarily fit their circumstances. CSOs need to analyze their particular circumstances as they develop their own advocacy strategies and identify their own power sources. But they should realise that they are not powerless in comparison with existing power holders. Their power may be of a different kind, but it is still power.

The wise CSO does not try to compete for power with existing power holders using their tools and their weapons; it looks for advantages that it can get from its own and unique set of circumstances, and decides to build up its own power in its own way. Stalin, one time head of the old USSR, once said, dismissively, "How many army divisions does the Pope have?" The Pope had no army divisions, but he had power of a different kind.

Chapter 6: NGO Advocacy depends upon having a vision of a better world than the present - what will this consist of?

(This chapter adapts the work of Inter-Action's "Women's Advocacy Initiative")

Most NGOs and CBOs within the civil society sector who are interested in acquiring advocacy skills start from a background in development projects. They tend to think about meeting basic needs or solving community problems through their activities. Their pre-occupation with present problems often confines them to short-term services to alleviate symptoms. Although most NGOs and CBOs have goals of social change, they are pre-occupied with problems of the present, and do not usually articulate a long term view of social change, of how they would like the world to be, and how they will get there.

In contrast, civil society organisations which are concerned with advocacy have looked at the present and have seen structural problems which need to be changed. They have a view of a better world in which these problems are eradicated, and in which change has taken place. They have a political vision, and a long term view for change.

It is important that all CSOs who want to work with advocacy practice thinking about the world they would like to create through the changes for which they are advocating. It is important that they have a view of the future in respect of the particular topic of their advocacy, rather than just concentrating on the problems.

To use the examples we used in Chapter 2: Defining Advocacy:

- NGOs concerned with AIDS orphans should be able to imagine a future world in which relevant adoption and fostering laws have been put in place and are operating
- NGOs concerned with peasant agriculture must be able to visualise a world in which the Ministry of Agriculture supports organic fertilisation and open pollinated seeds
- NGOs involved in prisoners rights should be able to imagine prisons where the abuses of the present have been replaced with humane treatment of prisoners

- NGOs involved with HIV/AIDS must be able to imagine a world in which considerable changes have taken place in individual sexual behaviour.

If the NGO staff are unable to visualize such a world, then their advocacy efforts are likely to be insubstantial dreams or unrealistic desires. Advocacy deals with realistic and pragmatic plans to achieve change in laws, policies, practice and behaviour, not vague hopes of a better world.

OHT 6/1

An important component, therefore, in preparing for advocacy work, is having a vision of how you want the world to be in respect of the particular field in which you work. A shared vision is often a force that brings people together for collective action. A clearly articulated vision can provide energy, momentum and strength to individuals working in development and can be a continuing focus for their social commitment.

To have a vision of an improved future means that you have expectations of the future which is better than the present. This may seem an obvious point, but too few NGOs systematically think of social change goals - they are usually much too busy thinking of present day problems and activities to solve them. If they want to add advocacy to their strategies, then they must be clear about what changes they want for the future, and how they are going to get there.

It is useful to practice such visioning by initially thinking more widely than just the field of your immediate work. Try to imagine:

- What will political relations look like in ten years? in the family? in the community? in your CSO? in Parliament? in Government?
- What will be the characteristics of ideal leaders?
- What will be the role of ordinary citizens?

Then imagine

- What will the particular field of work in which I am interested look like with the changes I want to bring about?

Such a visioning exercise helps reveal features of political life that may be very pertinent to your planned advocacy campaign.

Tools and Instruments

Chapter 7: NGO-Government Relations

(This chapter adapts the work of CORE's Advocacy Workshop)

Civil Society Organisations in general and NGOs in particular spend a lot of their time complaining about Government, about how Government does not understand what they are trying to do, about how Government does not recognize their legitimacy, about how Government does not support their work.

Rather than getting bogged down in complaining it is important to gain a better understanding of the different types of relationships that CSOs can have with Government, and to establish what CSOs can do to foster constructive relations with Government, while at the same time preserving their autonomy. Advocacy is likely to consist largely of seeking to get Government to change its laws, policies, practices, and behaviour in ways that the CSO promotes. It is therefore very important to create a climate in which constructive discussion and dialogue can take place.

While there is a lot that CSOs can do to improve their relations with Government, it is important to appreciate that this is a two way street. It is also important to think what Governments can do to foster more constructive relations with CSOs. And we must think both of central government and, with regional autonomy, of Local Government

Kinds of Relationships between Governments and NGOs

Here are some examples of the different kinds of relations that Governments can have with NGOs:

- **Control:** here Government only relates to an CSO as instruments for development that they can control, and which will do what Government wants them to do. This is often linked to a contractual relationship in which Government decides what it wants to do, and contracts an CSO to carry out its work

- Collaboration: here Government appreciates the value of the CSO's work, and supports what it is trying to do. It involves the CSO in its thinking and policy making, and together they approach the problems that need to be tackled
- Funding: here Government accepts that it cannot deal with all aspects of social problems and is prepared to fund CSOs to deal with some of them, recognizing their ability to do so. Such funding may be for programs mutually agreed, or it can be via contracts (in which case the Government is using its funding in a more controlling manner - see above)
- Dialogue: here Government is interested in getting the CSO's input into policy making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, recognizing that the CSO may have insights and experience from which the Government may learn
- Competition: here the Government sees the CSO as a rival for the people's loyalty and so attempts to co-opt or neutralize the CSO's work so that the Government's efforts are given greater prominence
- Opposition: here the Government sees the CSO as a political opposition party in disguise whose purpose is to attack and ridicule the Government.

Government Criticisms of Civil Society Organisations

The Government's criticisms of the civil society organisations need to be further broken down between the criticisms of the Political arm of Government, and the criticisms of the Executive arm of Government. Here are a variety of comments from Indonesia

- *CSOs are pawns of foreign governments, and dependent on their funds*
- *CSOs are the conscience of the people*
- *CSOs are not democratic, transparent or accountable*
- *CSOs are the channel for the people's aspirations*
- *CSOs have limited capacity*
- *CSOs have specialist knowledge that is useful to the government*
- *CSOs are only interested in demonstrations*
- *CSOs have an important mediating role for local conflicts*
- *CSOs impose their own ideas on the communities*
- *CSOs listen to the people*

As can be seen there are a variety of comments both positive and negative. Such comments can come from the Executive arm of government, the legislative arm of government, and at a variety of levels, national, provincial, kabupaten, kecamatan, and desa.

What can CSOs do to foster constructive relations with Government and avoid conflict?

1. Ensure good governance within their organisations. This covers such topics as making sure that there is a general assembly which elects a Board: that the Board provides oversight to the organisation: that the Board selects and supervises the Chief Executive Officer: and that the Board members are publicly known.
2. Ensure that the CSO's constituency, mandate, and objectives are made public so that their legitimacy cannot be challenged. This involves the CSO thinking about these topics seriously and clarifying them to itself, and - through some form of brochure or pamphlet - to the government and the public
3. Concentrate on developing the CSO's management and project implementation capacity so that its reputation will be beyond reproach. Apart from assessing its own capacity, and seeking to build capacity in places where it is weak, this also involves making sure that the government knows what the NGO has done (and is doing) well.
4. Be transparent about financial accountability. This involves having public statements of accounts, having outside audits, and being willing to show these publicly.
5. Provide the Government with regular summary financial and narrative reports about project activities and impact. Such documents are usually only provided to the donor (often a foreign donor), and not to the government.
6. Where necessary, consult with the Government: this involves bringing government into some of the CSO's thinking about how it intends to work, what are its concerns etc.
7. Agree on a CSO Code of Conduct. Many CSOs are waiting for the Government and Business sectors to publish their own codes of conduct, but do not realize that this is pertinent

to them too.to finalize and publish the NGO Policy which will have guidelines for this.

8. Raise some of their funds from local sources. This would prove that local citizens or institutions support the work of the CSOs.

Often there is in Indonesia a rhetoric that supports the work of CSOs in theory – and such fine words can be heard from government officials and DPR representatives. When CSOs take action that attacks such people or positions on issues of corruption, for instance, then the rhetoric changes.

CSOs have it in their power to go a long way towards removing any suspicions and antagonisms that exist between Government and CSOs. It also requires, however, a climate of opinion in which both sides are mutually appreciative of the work of the other, mutually understanding of the problems that each face, and in which both sides believe that all resources need to be mobilized - from the Government and the CSOs - to address the problems of Indonesia.

The advocacy work of the CSOs over the past few years has been important, as it has helped to bring down the Orde Baru and help with the reform process. Now, however, the fluid situation of 1997-2000 is becoming less volatile and the CSOs have to clarify their long term roles vis-à-vis the Government at National and Local level and with the DPR9D).

Chapter 8: Relations between NGOs and Communities and/or Constituencies

(This chapter adapts work of CORE's Advocacy Workshops and Inter-Action's "Women's Advocacy Initiative")

Communities

While relations between CSOs and Government are important from the point of view of promoting the advocacy issues that CSOs are concerned about, relations between CSOs and Communities and/or Constituencies are important from the point of view of the legitimacy of the advocacy issues - and the mandate that CSOs have been given from a community or constituency to advocate on their behalf.

By and large CSOs work with communities - that is people who are all experiencing the same situation. The word "community", however, is used in a number of different ways. It may mean (and often does mean) a group of people who all live in a geographic area e.g. a village community or an urban slum community. But it can also mean people who, for instance, work together ('the community of plantation workers'), belong to the same association ('the community of Batak people'), or have some other common feature ("the expatriate community", "the transmigrant community", "the refugee community"). People belong to a community passively, being numbered within a group of people who share some feature in common, unless that community is activated for some purpose. If that purpose is advocacy on some issue, the community moves to become a constituency.

Constituencies

OHT 8/1

In advocacy a constituency consists of two kinds of people:

- a. people who have a direct stake in finding a solution to a problem that can be addressed by an advocacy effort
- b. people who may not be directly affected by a problem, but who care deeply about having it solved.

It is no longer a group of people who have some passive common feature, but a group of people who are united by a direct or indirect desire for change.

When a constituency has been formed for an advocacy issue, then there are some added expectations and responsibilities between the pro-active organisation moving the advocacy process forward (usually a CSO) and its constituency. The CSO has to be responsive and accountable to its constituency. It has to be able to answer the questions:

- Has a community become a constituency for a particular advocacy issue?
- How does the CSO know what the communities want?
- How are communities involved in the CSO's process of deciding which advocacy issues are important ?
- Who speaks for whom on the advocacy issue and with what authority?

For many CSOs this new way of looking at a community involves some shifts of attitude. It is not uncommon for CSOs to look at the members of the communities with whom they work as passive beneficiaries of services, and people who have to be educated if they are going to take action.

Advocacy which is intended to expand citizen participation must reflect actual grievances felt by a broad group of people. We are not talking about a few CSO leaders persuading a few policy-makers. We are not talking about cooking up an advocacy campaign in the urban headquarters of the CSO by CSO leaders who assume they know the nature of the problems faced by poor people in rural or urban communities.

We are talking about engaging the people who have a stake in a problem in defining and analysing that problem and determining what changes in law, policy, practice or behaviour will be a solution to that problem.

It is not uncommon for CSOs to claim that they are acting on behalf of a constituency, but when pressed, the constituency proves to be very large and diffuse (like "the women of Indonesia"). The CSO cannot claim that it has, in any real sense, consulted with the constituency, because the constituency has no real focus. Likewise the constituency (because it has no real focus) cannot say that they know the CSO is working on their behalf, that the CSO has consulted them, or that they have given the CSO any kind of mandate to work on their behalf. A constituency, by definition, knows who they are, and who is representing them.

Principles of NGO - Community Relations

OHT 8/2

The complexity of the relations between a CSO and a community (or a constituency in the case of an advocacy effort), therefore, forces us back to look at first principles of how CSOs and communities relate to each other. Some of these basic principles are:

- Participation
- Empowerment
- Accountability
- Transparency
- Organisation
- Collective Action
- Leadership and Initiative
- Equality
- Education and skills transfer
- Information and critical awareness building
- Self-reliance
- Income generation
- Voluntarism promotion

Roles that NGOs can play with Communities and Constituencies

OHT 8/3

CSOs and communities or constituencies should interact as partners. CSOs should only play roles on behalf of their partner communities or constituencies when requested or mandated to do so by them. Here are some suggestions as to legitimate roles that CSOs can play with communities in general development work - and how those roles can be modified for advocacy work

1. NGOs can help communities to raise donor funds for a project, but they should not fund more than is necessary to supplement existing local resources

In advocacy work, NGOs can help constituencies raise donor funds, but should also involve some in-kind involvement by the constituency

2. NGOs can help communities to negotiate with government agencies for information, resources, approvals etc.

In advocacy work, NGOs can work with constituencies to seek information from Government

3. NGOs can help to identify appropriate technical advisers for communities and to provide training services

In advocacy work NGOs can provide technical assistance to constituencies in tactics for advocacy campaigns, but must also clarify possible risks to constituencies (see Chapter 10 later for more on this).

4. NGOs can access information from outside sources that may not be familiar to the community.

This role is also very important in advocacy

5. NGOs can solicit regular feedback from communities as to whether the NGOs' projects are meeting their needs.

This role is doubly important in advocacy work.

Ways for NGOs to have legitimacy in pursuing an advocacy strategy

There are a number of ways for CSOs to prove their legitimacy. Some of these are:

1. By interaction with a specific geographical community who are consulted about issues and who agree to the NGO's involvement and for the NGO to advocate on this issue on their behalf. This would be the example of ????????
2. By identifying an issue through its experience and having this issue agreed as important by a large number of members of the CSO and/or by the members of other CSOs with whom it affiliates. This is the example of ???????
3. By identifying an issue through a smaller group of influential people, and by getting the importance of the issue endorsed through the interest that it generates amongst policy makers. This is the example
4. By identifying a law that has been duly passed and gazetted, but which is not being implemented, and rallying people behind the lack of implementation. This is the example ???
5. By bringing an issue to some form of tribunal at which a duly constituted body will decide on the issue. This is the

example of ?????

Legitimacy is one thing. NGOs may achieve their legitimacy through some of the measures indicated above. Another equally important factor is credibility i.e. whether anyone considers that your CSO is able to take on a particular issue with any chance of success.

A way of assessing your organisation's credibility is to use the Questionnaire shown in Handout 11. If your organisation has a low score on the Questionnaire, you need to reflect whether your organisation has the credibility to carry out an advocacy campaign.

Handout 8/5

Chapter 9: Policies and the Key Stakeholders in developing them

This chapter is taken from Chapter IV - the Public Policy System, in the book "Advocacy Sourcebook" by the Institute of Development Research. Those parts not from this book are shown in italics.

Introduction

Policy making systems help establish the rules that govern states and societies. They are made up of institutions and people with different understandings of their society's problems and different stakes in the policies that address them. Changing and dynamic, these systems vary from country to country. Each operates in a particular political and cultural context with differing characteristics and players.

Stages of the Policy Making Process

In most settings the public policy process involves a combination of stages that include:

OHT 9/1

1. Agenda setting: getting an issue or problem on the policy agenda for consideration
2. Formulation and enactment: developing a policy that responds to the issue and getting it passed into law or statute (or other kind of instruction) by the relevant agency or branch of government
3. Implementation and enforcement: putting the law, statute, policy etc. into action and enforcing it when necessary
4. Monitoring and evaluation: monitoring and assessing the policy's application and impact.

During the agenda setting stage, an issue or problem is placed on the public agenda for government action. Once on the agenda a policy can be formulated that responds to the problem and, if successful, can be approved and enacted into law. After enactment, the law or policy passes through an implementation and enforcement phase where its provisions are supposed to be fulfilled and enforced. In the best of cases its implementation and impact and impact are then monitored and evaluated so that the policy can be reviewed. Depending on the results of the review, the policy may

be re-introduced to the agenda, re-formulated, repealed, or, if the law/policy is not being implemented, enforced more vigorously.

(NGOs may also get involved with another possibility - where an old law or policy has become irrelevant to the present circumstances. In such cases it is very useful to do some historical research to find why the original policy or law was first introduced, what was the context, and who were the original stakeholders. Such information is very pertinent in exposing the present irrelevance of out-dated laws)

In the best of circumstances, advocacy interventions can occur at any stage of the policy process and usually involve stopping something from happening, or getting something done - for example:

- getting an issue on the political agenda:
- getting a policy approved:
- getting a law enforced:
- getting an existing law or policy modified or revoked.

In some political settings, advocacy may be more difficult during certain stages because the process may not be public, easily accessible, or amenable to intervention

Embedded within over-lapping systems of economic, political, and social power, the policy making process produces differing outcomes depending on shifting power relationships within society. The process is never neat. For example, sometimes laws are passed, but opponents work against having the legislation implemented or enforced. Other times, Government money is allocated for programs, but never spent. And sometimes, groups doing the advocacy are marginalized, while more powerful groups reap the benefits.

Stakeholders/Policy Players

The results of each stage of the policy process can be influenced by a variety of stakeholders and policy players - people and institutions that are concerned about a particular policy and the problems that it is designed to address. Each of these stakeholders have their own interests and ideas vis-a-vis the policy. The different positions and stakes they have in a specific policy shape how they will act - some in favour, some opposed: some hold very high stakes regarding its outcome, and some have only nominal interest in the result.

In optimum democratic circumstances, stakeholders have the opportunity to influence every phase of the process. This can be seen in OHT 26. In the centre of the policy making circle are the stakeholders and players - key institutions or individuals from those institutions who are or can be influential in the process. Also included are the stakes that individuals have in the policy outcome as well as their positions on the policy itself, since these affect what they will do.

In more closed regimes and situations of large power differences, CSOs and citizens organisations may not have access to all stages of policy making. Power holders often want to have policies discussed in closed sessions to which CSOs cannot gain access.

Once policies are made public, advocacy interventions are much more problematic, and can entail danger because the CSO is challenging something that has gone through due process.

Depending on the particular circumstances, groups enter the process at different points. Some may be able to influence the entire process from agenda setting through monitoring and evaluation: others may enter at the formulation or enactment stage. Still others may get involved at the implementation and enforcement stage. In a coalition effort some members may be particularly effective in one stage over another, and consequently, may be brought in at that point for maximum impact.

Tools for Analyzing Policies and Stakeholders

Two tools are offered as assistance for NGOs looking at the questions of policy and stakeholders:

1. Policy System Overview Map: this allows you to summarize the main players active in each phase of the process and their positions - the institutions and groups concerned about the issue, the key individuals from those institutions working on the policy, what stake or interest they have in it, and what they think about the policy.
2. The Policy System - Close Up Map: this allows you to chart and fill in information about key actors for each stage of the policy process and includes different levels of players from international agencies to local government officials and community groups.

Some important points to keep in mind as you analyze the policy system:

- There is often a big difference between what is happening according to the formal rules or procedures of the policy making system and what happens in reality. Stakeholders and policy players may say one thing and do another: policymakers, for example, may say they support your position and then vote against you or work against your position behind the scenes. Cultural traditions or religious customs may predominate in a society and not follow or be susceptible to formal rules or secular laws.
- It is important to identify (for all players) points where their interests converge, and where they are in conflict.
- The more specific the issue, the easier the mapping and analysis is.

Handout 9/4

Chapter 10: Risks and Benefits for CSOs involved in Advocacy

(This chapter adapts the work of CORE's Advocacy Workshop)

When an CSO decides to move into advocacy work, it is taking up a different strategy with probably a higher profile, and greater risks - together with greater potential benefits. It is important that NGOs think about the risks and benefits in advance and assess for themselves their comparative effects on the NGO. Each risk or benefit will also have implications for the organisation as whole, since the advocacy work is unlikely to be the only work of the organisation. The following table offers some suggestions for considering risks and benefits:

Risks

OHT 10/1

Risks of Advocacy Work	Organisational Implications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO loses track of its own priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of organisational direction and effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imbalance between NGO's goals and advocacy work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs own agenda may be hijacked, marginalised or changed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time Constraints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overstretching own organisation's staff, diverting them from usual development work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO becomes the target of attack by opposing forces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO loses credibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO depletes existing resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO may not attain its objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO requires more resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO draws on existing resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative perceptions develop regarding the NGO's political affiliation or other biases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO loses credibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alienation of some target groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO needs training in new skills
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO loses donor favour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO faces additional fund-raising burden
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In case of a failed strategy, NGO becomes demoralised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decline in support for NGO's organisational goals and objectives • Decline in access to resources • Decline in staff self-confidence • Problems in implementing development work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neglect of NGO's constituency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to achieve original objectives

Benefits of Advocacy Work	Organisational Implications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Popularity or public recognition of the NGO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased credibility of the NGO within the community
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive impact on policy: achievement of desired policy change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased legitimacy and influence of the NGO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO's ideas put on the policy agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of the broader relevance of the NGO's work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO belongs to a broader group, coalition or network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved policy environment for NGO work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased influence with policy makers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and analysis by the NGO or its allies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United NGO action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplements impact of NGO's other development work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates achievement of NGO's overall objectives and enhances NGO capacity to monitor their own impact • Increases NGO awareness of wider social and economic issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have positive influence with donors or government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds confidence of NGO staff • Increases access to resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunity for re-assessment of the NGO's goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures relevance of the NGO's goals and activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased confidence of other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders are more likely to support the NGO on other issues • support the NGO on other issues

Above all advocacy work should be pragmatic. It is probably better for a CSO to engage only in advocacy work that it has a chance of winning. The CSO has to think not only whether the issue is, in theory, winnable: it also has to consider whether it is the best organisation to win the issue. Perhaps the CSO should only get involved if it is in coalition with others. (see Chapter 14.3 for more on this).

Chapter 11: Making sure that the whole NGO is ready

Advocacy is a new kind of activity for many NGOs:

- it is potentially risky
- it is very public
- it will redefine your organisation's image with the public and the government.

it is therefore very important that the whole organisation, and, in particular, the governance of the organisation, is aware of what is being planned, is aware of the implications, and has clearly decided what it is prepared to do, and what it is not prepared to do.

The governance of an CSO is composed of :

- the Membership (operating through a General Assembly)
- the Governing Body (often called a Board)
- Advisers, sponsors, patrons
- Staff

Legally the Governing body are responsible for the organisation, and responsible for the policies of the organisation. If the CSO decides to move into advocacy work, it is the Board who, in the final analysis, have to be convinced that this is the right strategy for the CSO.

Many CSOs are driven by the Chief Executive Officer: the Governing Body or Board is very much a passive body basically there to rubber stamp the decisions of the staff. This is not a good way to proceed. The idea behind a Board is that they are a disinterested group of people who, because they are not employed by the CSO, have no conflict of interest in advising the CSO, and who are wise and mature enough to give it good advice. They are also legally responsible for the organisation.

The Board should be interested in the advocacy option and should discuss it fully - being made aware of the risks and benefits analyzed previously. If an CSO goes ahead with an advocacy campaign while it has dissenting voices on its Board, there are many potential dangers. Opponents of the CSO will soon find this out and make political capital out of the dissent. The CSO's legitimacy and credibility will suffer, and it may lead to the NGO getting split into different camps.

Advocacy in this regard, as in many other ways, forces an CSO to re-examine itself and see whether it has the required capacities, and is well organised for the work it is intending to do. CSOs intending to get into advocacy work need to examine the way that their Board works, to make sure that the Board is well acquainted with the issues, and that the Board can and will hold pertinent discussions with the best interests of the organisation in mind⁷.

The best Boards will be composed of:

- people from a variety of backgrounds
- people who have a strong commitment to the mission of the NGO
- people who are experienced, and wise in the fields in which the NGO works
- people who are prepared to give time to their role as Board members of the NGO
- people who do not have any conflict of interest with the work that the NGO does
- people who can get on with the other members of the Board.

OHT 11/1

Boards may well not know enough about the Organisation that they are governing to give an informed answer as to whether it is ready to undertake advocacy work. It is useful to give Board members some help with this. A valuable tool developed in Indonesia is the Advocacy Capacity Organisational Assessment Tool which helps Board members (and staff) ask questions that will reveal organisational strengths and weaknesses in advocacy.

*Handout
11/2*

Chapter 12: Skills needed for Advocacy work

(This chapter adapts work of CORE's Advocacy Workshops)

The kinds of skills required for advocacy work may not be the same as those required for the other kinds of work of the CSO. It is sensible for a CSO about to embark on advocacy to consider the skills that it will need and compare those with the skills that it has in the organisation. If there are gaps then the CSO has the chance to try and build capacity where it is weak, or the opportunity to ally itself with another organisation which may have some of the skills that it lacks.

The skills that are most needed in advocacy work are:

OHT 12/1

- Research and analysis
- Strategic planning
- Communication and Media Use
- Networking
- Negotiating

Many people would put Negotiating as the most important skill - but it needs to be broken down into its component parts to understand it better. They consist of:

- Patience
- Persuasion
- Ability to compromise
- Ability to read peoples reactions
- Diplomacy
- Good listening
- Ability to keep on track
- Lobbying skills and ability to marshall arguments
- Ability to handle stress and conflict.

Alan Fowler in his book, "Striking a Balance - a guide to enhancing the effectiveness of non-governmental organisations in international development" suggests six skill areas which NGOs need for advocacy work, but which they may not find it easy to provide:

Handout
12/2

Untainted Leadership: This does not mean someone with no allegiances of affiliations, but a leadership which - while perhaps radical - cannot be legitimately accused of personal promotion,

egotism, and pursuit of self-interest on the backs of those in whose name policy change is advocated

Development Legitimacy: This derives from the quality of the work being done, with practical alternatives to existing policies being one of the most powerful features for leverage

Analytical Ability: To be heard by policy makers, CSO staff have to be able to use compelling arguments, which usually calls for a high level of abstraction and analytic powers often spanning more than one discipline: because professionals feel a natural affinity towards those with the same training, they are more likely to listen to and respect NGOs who provide a professional match

Relational Capital: This is drawn up from collaborative experience generating the trust which can be drawn on when mobilising pressure on many fronts. Creating this capital requires previous investment in networks, coalitions, and exchange of assistance. While opportunistic links are obviously useful, they cannot be relied on in the same way.

Professional Competence as Advocates: Policy influencing is also a specialism where professional competence is vital. This includes: intellectual integrity, good interpersonal verbal and written skills, links to a variety of organisations including the media, and ability to conceptualize complex processes, a sound grasp of technical details and evidence, good judgement of timings for actions, and a clear analytic framework. Also critical is respect for those at the periphery who are not in the public eye, but on the edge where the struggle to meet the organisation's mission is less glamorous, conditions are harsher, and personal harassment a real concern.

Documentation Ability: Often CSOs need to prove what leaders and officials have said or committed themselves to, which calls for the ability to document information and retrieve it accurately.

Once a CSO has identified skills that it needs, but does not have, it should ascertain where such skills may be acquired. It is possible, though unlikely, that such skills may be available through formal training courses. Other ways of acquiring such skills are:

- Attachment or secondment to another organisation where such skills are used (and CSOs are well advised to look beyond other CSOs - to Unions or Professional Associations, for instance)

- Hiring a consultant to work with the CSO and build certain skill capacities
- Study tours of different institutions where such skills are practiced.

Chapter 13: Choosing an Issue

This chapter adapts material from CORE's Advocacy Workshop

At this point a CSO should be ready to start developing an advocacy strategy. It is likely that the CSO has a number of issues that concern the particular problems that it has identified as blockages to its ongoing development work. Not all issues are equally applicable to an advocacy approach, however. CSOs are more likely to succeed with some issues than others. It is sensible to consider what criteria make a good issue for advocacy purposes, and then to check whether the issue that you are considering fits these criteria.

Here is a set of criteria that go back to the original description of NGO advocacy in Chapter 2 - which stated that in NGO advocacy:

1. *the Advocacy effort must involve citizens in the advocacy process in order to develop a politically active civil society*
2. *the Advocacy effort must benefit specific and identified disadvantaged groups, or must redress situations which disadvantage citizens of Zambia as a whole.*

Criteria

OHT 13/1

- Will the issue be widely felt (by many people)?
- Will the issue be deeply felt (are people angry, frustrated etc?)
- Will the issue result in real improvements in people's lives?
- Will the issue provide opportunities for people to learn about and be involved in politics?
- Will the issue give people a sense of their own power?
- Will the issue challenge the relations of power?
- Will the issue be winnable?
- Will the issue raise awareness about politics and power?
- Will the issue help build alliances with other groups and NGOs?
- Will the issue have a clear time frame that advantages the NGO?
- Will the issue link local concerns with broader issues?
- Will the issue build grass-roots leadership?
- Will the issue strengthen NGO links and accountability to the grass roots?
- Will the issue be consistent with the NGO's values and vision?

- Will the issue provide an opportunity to promote people's rights and challenge stereotypes (e.g. of women, the poor etc)?

Not all these criterion are of equal value, and not all fit all circumstances. It is entirely possible that a CSO could bring in new criteria that deal with particular circumstances. But it is valuable to think systematically about what elements of the issue you are interested in that make it a good candidate for an advocacy campaign.

Chapter 14

Identifying the Target Audience to Engage

The Target Audience for your advocacy effort is the person who has the power over the issue or problem that you have identified. You are looking for the key decision maker within the organisation that controls the field in which you are interested. The target audience is a person, not an organisation, because it is people who make organisations move. The key is to find first the organisation which has the power or authority to make the necessary changes that you desire, and secondly to find the individual within that organisation who has the power to move that organisation in the direction you desire.

Primary Target

Once you have identified the organisation and the person that you think is key to making a change in the issue you have identified, consider what their interest is in the issue. Do not assume that he/she is implacably opposed to your position.

CSOs all too frequently assume that all Government officials are hostile and all behave in the same way. A CSO that researches the interest of the target audience may find that their position on the advocacy issue is not necessarily what was expected.

In some cases the target is already convinced of the rightness of the CSO's case, and is looking for an opportunity to make the same changes as the CSO desires. In other cases the target is sympathetic but is also aware of other pressures that the CSO may not be aware of. In still other cases the target is opposed, but is under pressure from some other quarter that is sympathetic to the CSO's position. A good CSO tries to find out the influences on the target, and the target's interests in the issue.

One situation may be that the target is not adequately informed about the issue - and simply does not understand how important it is. The job of the CSO is then to make sure that it can explain clearly and persuasively the nature of the issue, and the importance of the issue. It should use the language and the type of arguments which will impress the target, and not just assume that stating the issue from the NGO's perspective will convince the target.

Secondary Target

It may not be that easy for the CSO to get access to the target in order to make its case, or start negotiating. It may be that the key

person is difficult to reach or initially uninterested in talking to the CSO. In such cases the CSO has to identify a secondary target - which means the person or persons who can influence the target.

Here the CSO has to think who is in a position to persuade or have some influence over the target, and this becomes the target that they initially contact. It might be, for instance, that a religious leader has a good deal of influence over the target: in such a case the CSO targets the religious leader in order to persuade him or her. The plan is then that the secondary target uses his or her influence over the primary target.

If your CSO has little influence over the target, and your ideas by themselves are not enough to convince the target, then you have to think of how your ideas can best be carried to the target's attention with the greatest chance of success. This is where you must think of tactics. Is it possible that someone else (a sympathetic politician, perhaps) can initially carry your ideas to the target? Is it possible that you can get access to some conference, where you can have your ideas presented, perhaps by someone else? Is it possible that you can arrange for the target to visit some place where the issue is clearly demonstrated and build on that?

The smart NGO has to think of all the different tactics that are needed in order to get the issue to the target. Sometimes it is important to find some other person or organisation to carry your CSO's ideas to the target.

Another important point in your relations with the target is to think through the options available to the target if he/she was convinced of the case that the CSO is making. In some cases you may find that the target is sympathetic, but s/he explains that their hands are tied, and that they have no room to move in the direction you would like them to move. The CSO must put itself in the target's shoes, learn as much as possible about their situation, and consider tactics and strategies which would help the target advance the cause the CSO is advocating.

In order to think through these points more practically, let us look at the question of identifying and getting access to primary and secondary targets in the issues suggested in Chapter 2 - Defining Advocacy where we looked at Laws, Policies, Practices and Behaviour. These ideas are not specific suggestions for advocacy strategies since each CSO would have to study each case on its merits, but illustrative examples and possible scenarios.

1. The Law on Child Adoption

In this case the NGO is advocating for a change in the law. It is likely that any changes in the law would have to come from a bill introduced by a Minister to Parliament. The appropriate Minister is probably the Minister of Youth, Sports and Child Development. The Minister, however, would have to use the services of the Ministry of Legal Affairs to draft a new law. The NGO may not find it easy to get access to the Minister, and so it strategises that getting access to the Permanent Secretary (the PS) or the Planning Unit of that Ministry is the way to work. It also considers what other people or organisations would be able to influence the Minister, and identifies them as secondary targets. The NGO may also target the Ministry of Legal Affairs in order to understand more about the legal framework within which a new law might be drafted.

2. The Policy of the Ministry of Agriculture on Low Input Agriculture

In this case the NGO is advocating a change in the policy of the Ministry of Agriculture from supporting the use of fertilizer, insecticide and hybrid seeds, to one of support to low input agriculture. The NGO may decide that the target is the Permanent Secretary but secondary targets are the technical advisers in the Ministry. The NGO may think that it is important to provide such people with clear evidence of the yields possible with low input practices so that they have some ammunition to use. The NGOs may think that organised groups like the Zambia National Farmers Union need to be convinced first, so that they in turn can lobby the PS. The NGO may think of contacting an MP in an area where fertilizer has been delivered too late, or is inaccessible, and getting him/her to put the case for low input agriculture to the PS. It may be that a technical adviser from FAO, for instance, is convinced of the rightness of the NGO's case, and can put the arguments in ways that the NGO cannot. It may be that the NGO finds sympathetic contacts inside the Ministry of Agriculture who tells it that the real problem is the fertiliser companies who exert a lot of influence in the Ministry, and that this needs to be exposed.

3. The Practices within the Prisons of Zambia

In this case the NGO is advocating for a change in practice amongst prison staff. The target is probably seen as the Director of Prisons who has authority over the way prisons are run. It may well be that such a person is sympathetic to the NGOs case but feels he/she can do little about it because attitudes and practices have

become so established, and because the budget of the Department is so inadequate. In such a case the NGO would be best advised to strategize with the Director of Prisons about how secondary targets could help strengthen the case of the Director of Prisons for reform. It might be that a public education campaign about the situation in the prisons could mobilize public opinion for reform. It might be that a foreign donor could be persuaded to assist the Government of Zambia with aid for prison reform. It might be that the NGO can identify people or organisations to train or re-train prison staff in better practices. It may be that high profile people who have spent some time in prison can be persuasive.

4. Sexual Behaviour among Men and Women in Zambia

This is perhaps the most difficult area in which to identify a target since we are dealing with established and cultural patterns of behaviour. It may be that the NGO thinks that the people who have some ability to effect change in this area are religious and cultural leaders - and so it targets chiefs and bishops (or other religious leaders). It may be that such people are generally sympathetic to the NGOs position, but do not view it as seriously as the NGOs do. In such cases the secondary targets may well be medical staff, factory owners, Ministry of Education officials who can all attest to the seriousness of the situation.

It may be that such people are already convinced of the NGOs position but are unclear what they can do to exert their influence, and are constrained by social customs about how such topics can be addressed in public. In such cases it is possible that women's pressure groups can establish new limits on what subjects can be addressed publicly and the NGOs can urge cultural and religious leaders to follow their example. The NGOs may be able to give the primary targets powerful arguments and helpful presentations that they can use.

The important point in identifying the target audience to engage is that this is not a simple matter. Rather than jumping to conclusions about who should be addressed, and who has the power to effect change, the NGO must think, research, enquire, probe - where does the power lie, who has the influence, what tools are needed, what pressures are people under, where are tactical points of entry to the problem.

As we have said before, advocacy is a pragmatic strategy. Advocacy may well be (indeed must be) fuelled by principles and ethics, indignation and frustration, but it is carried out in the real,

political, world where people, particularly people who have power, are themselves subject to influences and the power of others.

Chapter 15: The Ten Elements of an Advocacy Campaign

(This chapter adapts material from CORE's Advocacy Workshop, GTZ's ZOPP, and Team Technologies)

Now you are ready to plan an advocacy strategy for your CSO, it is the time to look systematically at the 10 elements which are necessary for an effective advocacy strategy, and to improve your understanding of the knowledge, skills, and resources required.

The Ten Elements are:

OHT 15/1

- 1. Clearly state the problem or issue**
- 2. Develop a goal and a set of objectives**
- 3. Identify the target audience(s) to engage**
- 4. Identify other groups who are affected or could be affected through your advocacy campaign (positively or negatively)**
- 5. Formulate the advocacy message and identify the media needed to get the message out to the target audience**
- 6. Prepare a plan of action and schedule of activities**
- 7. Identify resource requirements (human, organisational, financial)**
- 8. Enlist support from other key players: other NGOs, the public, government etc.**
- 9. Identify monitoring and evaluation criteria and indicators**
- 10. Assess success or failure, and determine next steps**

Attached is Handout 15/2 which has a list of questions connected to each of these elements for the NGO to think about as it considers its position on these to elements.

*Handout
15/2*

This Handbook suggests that 5 of these 10 elements need further attention because NGOs in Indonesia seem to have difficulty in

putting the ideas into practice. These elements are:

1. Clearly stating the Problem
2. Developing a Goal and Objectives
5. Formulating the Advocacy message and the Media
6. Preparing a plan
8. Enlisting support from other key players
9. Identifying monitoring and evaluation criteria

The remains of this Chapter, therefore, try and address these issues. They deal with the following :

14.1. Strategic Planning

- Identifying and ranking problems
- Turning problems into objectives and ranking objectives
- Clarifying the goal, the objectives, and the activities
- Identifying indicators for the objectives
- Preparing a workplan on the basis of objectives and activities
- Monitoring progress
- Evaluating results

14.2. Formulating messages and using the media

14.3. Enlisting support from other key players

14.1. Strategic Planning

Many CSOs have difficulties in identifying the core problem within a problem environment i.e. deciding which is the critical problem that needs to be tackled - rather than getting bogged down in a lot of associated problems which are, however, not key to the issue. A lot follows from the important task of identifying the Core (or main) Problem. The Objectives depend on dealing with the Problems identified, and the Indicators depend on dealing with the Objectives identified.

The method presented here is derived from the GTZ's GOPP (ZOPP/GOPP - Ziel Orientiert Projekt Planung/Goal Oriented Project Planning). It requires a facilitator who is familiar with the method, cards, tape, and marker pens.

Identifying and Ranking Problems

Step 1: Decide who will be in the planning team. If possible this should be a group comprising both those affected by the problem, those deeply concerned with the

problem, and the staff of the NGO.

Step 2: Assemble those in the planning team and, having agreed the Problem Environment that you are interested in (i.e. the larger topic within which there are problems that you are concerned with), the Facilitator asks the members of the Planning Team to brainstorm problems. The members of the team should concisely write problems of which they are aware on cards - which then should be displayed on a wall, board etc. Once the Facilitator has weeded out doubles, or cards which are incomprehensible, he/she asks all the Team to look at the cards and think if there is any card which illustrates the Core or Main Problem. Once that is found, some cards will be seen to illustrate problems that are causes of the Core Problem, and some cards will be seen to illustrate effects of the Core problem.

OHT 15/3

For illustration, OHT 37 shows a brainstormed set of problems around the topic of Prisoners Rights. This is a theoretical scenario constructed to show the process. It may or may not be accurate about the actual situation of prisoners' rights.

Step 3: The Facilitator produces a "Problem Tree" by positioning the problems in the form of a "Tree" with a trunk (Core Problem), Roots (Causes) and Branches (Results). He/she joins the cards by connecting lines of logic. Such lines show that, in the case of the relation between problem cards: "if (such and such happens), then (such and such will happen)". The relationship between cards should be a logical and demonstrable one. See OHT 36 for an example of a Problem Tree on Prisoners Rights derived from the brainstorming.

OHT 15/4

If there appears to be a gap where the logic is not clear, then the Facilitator writes another card to fill that gap - and gets the consent of the rest of the planning team to do so.

Turning Problems into Objectives and Ranking Objectives

After you have finished constructing your problem tree and testing the logic of the connections between the cards, then comes the

time to turn your problems into objectives - or future desired states.

The facilitator starts at the top of the Problem Tree and writes, with the agreement of the group, a new card to replace each problem card by a card which states the future desired state that will "solve" that problem. For example, if one of your "Result" cards says "hardened criminals" meaning that the effect of prison life is to produce hardened criminals, then the opposite of that is "reformable prisoners" - and this becomes a desired future situation or Objective. Go through the cards one by one, starting at the top, turning them from problems into desired future states.

OHT 15/5

The "Core Problem" now becomes the "Main Objective", "Means" takes the place of "Causes", and "Ends" takes the place of "Effects"

Once that is finished, your Problem Tree is changed into an "Objectives Tree". Look at your Objectives Tree and test the logic of the relations between each card. In some cases you may need to add new cards to fill a gap, or move some cards around to get the logic right. OHT 39 shows an example of an Objectives Tree following the problem tree on the topic of Prisoners Rights.

You have now identified a Main Objective, and the main components for Subsidiary Objectives ("Means" cards). "End" cards will become indicators (see later).

Clarifying the Goal, the Objectives, and the Activities

The Facilitator draws four vertical boxes and marks them, top to bottom:

Goal
Main Objective
Subsidiary Objectives
Activities

OHT 15/6

In the Main Objective box, the Facilitator writes the Main Objective taken from your Objectives Tree. In the Subsidiary Objectives box the Facilitator writes some Objectives from the "Means" part of your Objective Tree. Some of those objectives will look too difficult for the Team, and so they should, after discussion, inform the Facilitator to write down those Objectives which they feel they have a good chance of achieving. A rule of thumb is not to have more than 3 Subsidiary Objectives.

Make sure that the Objectives fit an Advocacy strategy - which, as we decided earlier, means "an organised effort by NGOs to change, influence, or initiate policies, laws, practices and behaviour". OHT 40 gives an example derived from the same Prisoner's Rights scenario. This has produced one Main Objective and three Subsidiary Objectives.

The Facilitator now invites the team to brainstorm again: first, to decide on a Goal. A Goal is a general future state that will be the conclusion of your work. In the case of the topic of Prisoners Rights, the Team might decide that the Goal might be "Humane treatment of prisoners in jail in Zambia". This becomes the Goal towards which all your activities and objectives will lead.

OHT 15/7

Now the Facilitator tests the logic: if subsidiary objective (a) and subsidiary objective (b) and subsidiary objective (c) are achieved, will the main objective be achieved? If the Main objective is achieved, is a possibility of reaching the Goal?

Now the facilitator invites brainstorming again - this time for the Activities. For each subsidiary objective, he/she asks the Team members to think of activities which will achieve the objective, then writes them down, connected by number to their subsidiary objective. See OHT 42 for an example.

OHT 15/8

Once you have written these down you have a list of activities which will lead to certain objectives which will lead to a main objective which will lead to a goal. This is the basis of your plan of action.

Identifying Indicators for the Objectives

Indicators are descriptions of a result that you desired to achieve. They are important because just doing the activity does not necessarily say that any result has been achieved beyond doing the activity. If, for instance, one of your activities is running a training course, then you may consider it a success if the training course duly took place. This does not tell you anything, however, about the result of the training course. A successful training course will result in the graduates being able to use their knowledge in one way or another - that is the desired result, and that is therefore the indicator of success.

OHT 15/9

The Facilitator now draws another column of four boxes, titled Indicators, and puts in each box an indicator of success against the activity or objective you have written in the first column. Again test

the logic - if activity x, then result (indicator) y, if objective a, then result (indicator) b. OHT 43 gives an example.

These indicators show you how to find out if your advocacy program actually shows some results, as opposed to being a collection of activities which does not lead anywhere.

What you have produced is a simple version of a Logframe (Logical Framework Analysis). This same methodology can be used for any project planning activity.

Preparing a Workplan on the basis of Objectives and Activities

A Workplan is simply a list of objectives and activities to which you add some more information. You add:

OHT 15/10

- a. Tasks - which are simply the smaller things that have to be done to result in the achievement of the activities
- b. The Responsibility - who is given the responsibility for carrying out each of the tasks?
- c. Budget - what which each activity cost?
- d. Schedule - construct a monthly chart and mark in it when each task will be carried out.

This workplan must be a living document. It should be checked each month to see whether the tasks and activities have indeed been done according to plan. If they have, that is fine: if they havenot, then think why not, plan accordingly, and produce a new workplan with new schedules (or other changes) in it. OHT 44 gives an example of a workplan based on the same scenario.

Monitoring Progress

Once you have a workplan that is accurate and up to date, then monitoring is very simple. Monitoring consists of looking at the workplan and checking whether the tasks and activities have indeed been carried out as planned. Monitoring answers the question "Did we do the advocacy as we had planned?". The workplan is therefore what you are checking. OHT 45 gives an example.

OHT 15/11

Evaluating Results

Once you have a logframe, then evaluating is also simple. It consists of looking at the intended results (shown by the indicators) and checking to see whether the activities and objectives did

OHT 15/12

indeed result in the proposed indicators. Evaluation therefore answers the question "Did we get the results we hoped for?" OHT 15/12 gives an example.

14.2. Formulating Messages and Using the Media

The media and the message which is used in an advocacy campaign should match two groups of people:

OHT 15/13

- the target audience (i.e. the people you are trying to change)
- the support groups (i.e. the people you are trying to get on your side in the campaign).

Different media and messages can play many different roles for you: if you want people informed, then, with the right message, the media can play the role of an educator through information dissemination. If you want people to be persuaded then, with a different message, the media can play the role of an opinion maker through persuasion.

The Message

The message that you intend to use to convince people has to be appropriate to the people you are targeting. It has to have the appropriate degree of complexity or simplicity: it has to be in the right language, and to hit the right tone in the right language.

It may have specific facts, evidence or examples which will make sure that your message is convincing. There may need to be more than one message, targeted at different audiences.

The skills of the advertising profession are what CSOs need for constructing a message. CSOs should see if they can get assistance from sympathisers with such skills.

The Medium

OHT 15/14

The choice of which medium to choose is also very important. Some examples are:

- Audio-visual materials (audio cassettes, video-cassettes, slides)
- Visual material (posters, leaflets, badges, pictures)
- Newspapers, magazines
- TV or radio (news coverage, debates, documentaries, dramas)
- Drama and traditional media

- Song

Consider the following factors:

1. Availability (to whom is a particular media available?)
2. Effectiveness (does a particular medium have any impact on your intended audience?)
3. Accessibility (can we get our material into this particular media)
4. Outreach (how far does this media extend?)

Getting the Media on your side

Media can be thought of as an instrument for you to use to get your message across - but it can also be an ally helping you with your advocacy campaign. CSOs, wherever possible, should sensitize the media to the specific advocacy issue they are concentrating on, and, if possible, should involve the media in their campaign. It is entirely possible that the media can take up your issue and become a partner in promoting it, or it is possible that individual people concerned with the media can help by promoting your issue through the particular parts of the media that they are responsible for.

Here are some possible ways to get the media on your side:

- Lobby people in the media to contribute to your campaign through providing you with free space or time.
- Request media people for their expertise in designing campaign materials and designing a campaign media strategy
- Create alliances with particular media people, especially those affected by the issue, or people who can articulate the problem well so that they can help you in your advocacy work.

Some Cautions in Using the Media

While the media can be very helpful to advocacy CSOs, there are some aspects where CSOs need to be cautious:

- Some media organisations have their own agenda and can distort issues of stories that you feed them to serve their own interests.
- Some media personnel can simply be incompetent at putting over the story that you are feeding them. Interviews, for instance, may well not turn out as you expect. It is usually

better to give the media written handouts that put your case well.

- In some cases the media will be looking to the CSO as a source of "exposure" or "scandal" stories which will increase confrontation and conflict between the NGO and the people who are the target of the advocacy campaign. This may be counter-productive to the CSO in its objective of having constructive dialogue, particularly with the government. On the other hand, the CSO may be interested in confrontation – and will be delighted by every opportunity to embarrass its opponents. (see Chapter 7 particularly for this).

14.3. Working with Others - Building Alliances, Coalitions, and Networks

Building groupings with others around an advocacy issue is a complex and fluid process - but such groupings offer a number of advantages to an advocacy campaign:

- They provide strength in unity and numbers, and therefore facilitate greater impact
- Broad based campaigns which are national in character gain greater legitimacy with the public and decision makers
- Groupings enrich advocacy campaigns through the pooling of resources and the availability of a broader range of services and skills
- They provide sharing of information and experience
- They offer additional capacity for nationwide monitoring since other members of the group may well have branches in places that you do not.
- They help to build support not just within a particular sector, but, if you include a wide range of partners, across sectors.

Organisational Groupings

There are three general ways in which organisations group together for advocacy (and be clear that the range of organisations can be wide – Trade Unions, Religious Organisations, Student Groups, NGOs, Youth Groups, Professional Associations). These three are:

1. Networks: this is a group of individuals or organisations who share information, contacts, and experiences for specific purposes. They have usually established a set of rules or protocols to assist them in managing the network. There are now very many networks set up on the Internet which may

be useful in advocacy work, particularly where an issue (like Debt Relief) is important in many different countries.

2. Alliances: these are looser agreements to collaborate on some particular actions between organisations, which do not necessarily have formal rules or obligated resources
3. Coalitions: these are more formal alliances for combined action in which each of the coalition members obligates some resources (possibly financial, human, time, in-kind support etc). Coalitions would probably have a more formal structure with possible a secretariat.

Some Effective Guidelines

- Members of alliances, coalitions or networks should agree a plan of action based on shared values and objectives, and a time frame.
- The capacities and constraints of each member should be determined and tasks assigned accordingly - making realistic time and resource commitments. Members should be held accountable to these commitments
- Some kind of secretariat, formal or informal, should be created to manage, co-ordinate, and control joint efforts, on the basis of clear operating guidelines
- These groupings should be democratically run, inclusive and transparent. Provision should be made for regular consultation and information dissemination amongst members
- A distinction should be made between core groups that make decisions and peripheral support groups that help with specific activities
- Mechanisms should be agreed for intergroup bargaining and conflict resolution.

Things that can go wrong

While groupings offer a number of advantages to an advocacy campaign, we should not forget some of the possible disadvantages. They can be:

- Uneven commitment amongst members
- Power struggles over ownership or inequality of power
- Lack of co-ordination
- Difficulties in reaching consensus and/or the need for too many compromises in order to keep all members happy
- Territorialism and competition amongst members

- Domination by experienced CSOs
- Hijacking of the grouping in pursuit of individual or organisational objectives
- Conflicts of interest
- Unnecessary bureaucracy in decision making
- A few members burdened with too much work, especially where members have different capacity levels
- Inadequate sharing and mutual building of capacity
- Expense of maintaining long term groupings
- Derailment of individual CSO objectives.

Your Advocacy Campaign

Chapter 16: Preparing an Advocacy Campaign

(This chapter adapts material from CORE's Advocacy Workshop)

With all the materials provided in this Handbook, you should have enough tools to enable you to construct an Advocacy strategy. The Ten Principles, together with the check list of questions, will make sure that you think of all the aspects of an advocacy strategy that you need to think of.

For the sake of practice, and to sharpen your skills, it is worthwhile to take an actual example of an advocacy campaign and apply the Ten Principles to it. Where you know some of the actors personally it is valuable to go over the case study with them and learn more of how the advocacy campaign was carried out.

When you are ready to plan your own campaign, however, it is useful to have a structured way of planning for and preparing for it. These can be provided by the worksheets provided which are arranged to fit the Ten Principles.

In internal discussions within your CSO, draft what is needed to fill out the following sections

Developing an Advocacy Strategy

OHT 16/1

- 1. The Problem**
- 2. The Goal**
- 3. The Objectives**

then

For Each Objective

OHT 16/2

1. What is the Objective?
2. What actions or activities are needed?
3. What are the target groups for this objective?

4. What is the appropriate message for this target group?
5. What is the appropriate media for this target group?

then

For Each Activity (action) within each Objective

OHT 16/3

1. What is the activity (action)?
2. What is the time-frame?
3. What are the resources that are needed?
4. What support is needed from other groups?
5. What is the appropriate media for us to use to get support from other groups?
6. What indicators can we use to monitor the implementation of these activities and to evaluate the result of these objectives?

These worksheets, together with a Workplan, should enable you to plan a comprehensive advocacy strategy. Remember, however, that advocacy campaigns rarely go smoothly or in the same way as they were planned. You need to be able to adapt, seize opportunities, modify plans, take advantage of new players or other changes in the environment, and yet keep your eye on the main goal. The people, or organisations which are the target of your advocacy campaign will not just give up their positions in the face of your campaign. They will have to be convinced and persuaded.

The best of luck with your advocacy - and remember that CSSP will always be ready to discuss your ideas with you and offer some (hopefully) useful advice.

