

Advocacy Strategies for Civil Society:
A Conceptual Framework and Practitioner's Guide

August 31, 1997

(FINAL DRAFT)

Prepared by:

Leslie M. Fox
Independent Consultant

And

Priya Helweg
Associates in Rural Development

World Learning Inc. and Associates in Rural Development
under USAID contract: AEP-5468-I-00-6013-00

Prepared For:

Gary Hansen
Civil Society Advisor
The Center for Democracy and Governance
United States Agency for International Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION TO AND USE OF THIS RESOURCE GUIDE.....	1
A.	Why A Resource Guide on Advocacy Strategies?	1
B.	Developing the Guide and Methodologies Used.....	1
C.	How to Use this Guide: A Road-Map of the Structure and Contents.....	3
II.	ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK: DEFINING THE STATE-OF-THE ART	3
A.	Civil Society Advocacy in Democracy and Governance Programming.....	5
B.	The Virtuous Circle: The Components of a Sustainable Advocacy Strategy.....	5
1.	Advocacy as Citizen Empowerment and Citizenship Building: A Transformational Objective	6
2.	Advocacy as Strengthening Civil Society and Building Social Capital:.... A Developmental Objective	7
3.	Advocacy as Influencing Key Policy Outcomes and Achieving a Reform Agenda: An Instrumental Objective	9
4.	Advocacy Strategizing: A Metaphor for Democracy Promotion Summary and Conclusions	10
III.	CHOOSING THE RIGHT ADVOCACY STRATEGY	12
A.	Developing an Assessment Approach and Methodology	12
B.	Defining Results: Developing an Advocacy Assessment Framework and Indicators	14
1.	Transformational Component: An Empowered Citizenry	14
2.	Developmental Component: A Strengthened Civil Society.....	15
3.	Instrumental Component: Mounting an Effective Policy Influence Campaign	16
4.	Effective and Sustainable Advocacy: A Work In Progress	17

C.	Other Design Issues that Condition Advocacy Strategizing	18
1.	Which Policies and Reforms to Target?.....	19
2.	In Which Political Arena to Operate?	20
3.	Which Civil Society Actors to Invest In?.....	22
D.	Summing Up: Conclusions & Recommendations.....	23
IV.	IDENTIFYING & ADDRESSING ADVOCACY CAPACITY BUILDING NEEDS	26
A.	Empowering Citizens to Participate in Political Life.....	26
1.	Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing	26
2.	Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs.....	28
B.	Developing a Permanent Capacity for Civic Engagement	29
1.	Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing	29
2.	Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs.....	30
C.	Achieving Key Policy Outcomes.....	32
1.	Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing	32
2.	Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs.....	33
D.	US CSO Advocacy Capacity Building Providers	38
1.	Introduction and Methodology	39
2.	Summary Overview of CSO Advocacy Training Activities	42
E.	A Review of the Literature	45

ANNEXES

Annex 1:	List of Individuals and Organizations Interviewed
Annex 2:	Study Questionnaire
Annex 3:	Study Scope of Work
Annex 4:	Advocacy in the Literature: A Review and Findings
Annex 5:	Annotated Bibliography of Advocacy Training Materials and Resource Publications
Annex 6:	U.S. Advocacy Capacity Building Provider Profiles

I. INTRODUCTION TO AND USE OF THIS RESOURCE GUIDE

A. Why A Resource Guide on Advocacy Strategies?

This Advocacy Strategies Resource Guide (Guide) is the primary product to emerge from a larger study on advocacy strategies commissioned by the Democracy and Governance (D/G) Center's Civil Society Advisor. The study, and now the Guide, is intended to serve the knowledge and informational needs identified by USAID Democracy Officers and their U.S. and host country CSO partners involved in the design and implementation of civil society programs with advocacy components. The study was designed at a time (mid-1995) when a number of issues related to civil society's role in the transition to and consolidation of democratic governance were being raised both in the field and at the Agency level. In this regard, the study was to provide: 1) a systematic overview of the range of advocacy strategies appropriate for different levels of political development in southern and transition countries; and 2) a consolidated source of knowledge concerning available training approaches and programs appropriate for these countries. The change from a traditional study and "synthesis report" to a "resource guide" was made in recognition of the practical needs of the field.

As development practitioners, USAID officers and their American and host country civil society partners are concerned with solving concrete problems and achieving well-defined results. As students of the art of development, they have an equal interest in understanding the context and nature of these problems, and the logic that underlies the results they have chosen to achieve and be held accountable for. As discussed in greater detail below, this Resource Guide addresses the dual needs of the practitioner-cum-student of democratic development in general, and advocacy strategizing in particular. It presents a conceptual framework through which advocacy strategies can be more clearly viewed and hopefully understood, including an emerging state-of-the art and best practices. At the same time, it serves as a practical reference tool for field personnel providing:

- 1) An inventory and set of self-generated profiles of the principal U.S.-based organizations that undertake training in advocacy;
- 2) Annotated bibliographies detailing relevant training materials currently in use, and the principal publications dealing with broader advocacy strategy issues.

The Guide is not a cookbook providing a step-by-step recipe for the design and implementation of advocacy programs, and particularly how to mount a policy advocacy or issues campaign. As we discovered early on in the larger study, there are already a good number of high quality "how-to advocacy manuals" in use; the best of them have been identified and are presented in the attached annotated bibliography. Secondly, the countries in which USAID works are far too diverse historically, culturally and politically to permit a standardized approach to advocacy strategizing or for D/G programming in general. The Guide does provide a distillation and synthesis of thinking by the principal writers on the subject and the practical experiences of those organizations that have implemented advocacy programs in each of the principal geographic

regions where the Agency works. In short, it is a practical guide and resource tool for busy practitioners and policy makers.

B. Developing the Guide and Methodologies Used

The study from which this Guide emerges was conducted during late 1996 and early 1997. It entailed interviews with organizations involved in and a review of the literature on advocacy. In both cases, the intent was to cast a wide net and then narrow the inquiry to the more promising organizations and documents that emerged from this process. Interviews were conducted with:

- 1) Those USAID partners, both US PVOs and contractors, that have implemented civil society programs having an “advocacy” objective;
- 2) USAID officers, primarily from the four regional bureaus and Policy and Program Coordination; and,
- 3) A smaller number of international donors, policy institutes and NGOs that were found to be working in a number of advocacy-related areas. **Annex 1**, provides a complete list of organizations and individuals interviewed. In addition to USAID officers, a total of 55 individuals from 38 organizations were interviewed. A questionnaire (**Annex 2**) – based on the study’s scope of work (SOW) and an initial review of the literature – guided interviews with these respondents.

The SOW (**Annex 3**) called for an *annotated bibliography* that provided the primary resource materials on advocacy strategies including the principal writings on the subject as well as practical training materials. The methodology used to identify and inventory training institutions and materials and advocacy strategies and corresponding skills requirements was two-fold. First, the study team depended on interviews with concerned local and international organizations to identify existing documents and potential resources. Secondly, a major document search of relevant databases was conducted. Again, it should be noted that the intent during the research phase was to cast as wide a net as possible. This Guide provides a listing of all documents that were reviewed, and a final annotated bibliography compiled from those found to be most relevant from the study to the needs of USAID and its partners.

Finally, through numerous meetings with Democracy Officers from the D/G Center, the Resource Guide was iteratively developed and shaped into this current and final draft. It is anticipated that it will benefit further from a review and critique by Democracy Officers and PVO/CSO partners both in the field and in the U.S.

C. How to Use this Guide: A Road-Map of the Structure and Contents

The remainder of this Resource Guide is organized as follows:

- **Chapter II** following, provides an analytic framework which includes 1) a general overview of civil society advocacy efforts within the larger sphere of democracy and governance

programming (Part A); and 2) a brief conceptual discussion of an emerging state-of-the-art focused on three *components* of a comprehensive advocacy strategy identified as part of the study exercise (Part B). For those readers with an interest in tracing the evolution in thinking that underlies each of these three strategy components, and the views of the practitioners that have implemented corresponding advocacy programs, **Annex 4**, provides a more in-depth discussion.

- **Chapter III** addresses a range of design and implementation issues that Democracy Officers are likely to encounter as they move from the conceptual and strategic to the practical and operational concerning the development of advocacy programs (Parts A and B). There is also a brief discussion on performance measurement and results monitoring (Part C) as well as a set of conclusions and lessons learned related to advocacy programming (Part D).
- **Chapter IV** turns to a discussion of the skill requirements which indigenous CSOs need to have if they are to undertake effective advocacy in each of the three strategy area components identified Chapter III (Part A). This section then looks at the “supply-side” of the equation, that is, the U.S.-based organizations – current and potential USAID partners – that provide relevant training to local counterparts in any of these areas (Part B). Finally, an assessment methodology, developed during the course of the study, is presented in a simple to use matrix form. D/G Officers and their partners may find it useful in assisting them in evaluating the advocacy capacity and corresponding training needs of indigenous CSOs.
- **Annex 5** provides the annotated bibliography of the major resource materials on advocacy strategies and training materials prepared under the study. **Annex 6** provides the reader with profiles (self-prepared) of each of the U.S.-based organizations that were identified as primary providers of technical assistance and training to host country counterparts in a range of advocacy-related capacity building areas.

II. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK: DEFINING THE STATE-OF-THE ART

As part of the larger advocacy strategies’ study, the team was able to review a significant body of literature touching directly or indirectly on advocacy, plus interview many of the leading thinkers and practitioners in this emerging field. Like the larger field of democracy and governance, and more specifically the empirical realm of civil society to which advocacy is most directly related, our research made it very clear that a true state-of-the-art has begun to emerge and that the beginnings of best practice are increasingly discernable. It is to be able to discuss more operational issues such as what advocacy strategy to adopt, which organizations should be supported to do it, and what skills are required, that we present a conceptual framework. First, however, a discussion of the larger policy context within which advocacy strategizing takes place is presented.

A. Civil Society Advocacy in Democracy and Governance Programming

USAID has historically worked with and supported a wide range of non-governmental organizations, both American and local, in many of its sectoral development programs. The

majority of this assistance was designed to improve their capacity to become better providers of social and economic services to communities and grassroots organizations in the developing South. Increasingly over the course of the 1980s, a corresponding emphasis was placed on the promotion of sectoral policy reform. Like many donors during this period, USAID realized that the success of its country programs was largely dependent on a favorable legal, policy and regulatory environment to enable rather constrain improvements in social service delivery and more broadbased economic growth, particularly for the poor majorities that are the traditional target of American foreign assistance.

Meanwhile, NGOs had themselves long realized that if their micro-level programs and projects were going to have any lasting, wide-spread impact beyond creating artificial islands of well-being amidst the larger sea of want, then macro-level policy considerations would have to be addressed as well. It was this convergence of interests that led to USAID-supported NGO policy advocacy initiatives in such programmatic sectors as health care delivery, primary education, small and micro-enterprise development and natural resource management.

In 1989 the world changed forever and with it the context in which development took place. The new paradigm of sustainable development that began emerging towards the end of the decade acknowledged the importance of a political development objective alongside social and economic ones. The “revolution in voluntary associational life” that was both a cause and result of the democratic openings of the past decade – in the transitioning East as well as the developing South – can now be seen as the precursor of what we today call modern civil society. And, if the first development decade can be viewed as addressing the “*technological gap*” between North and South, the second decade as concerned with “*state-building*,” and the third about “*market-building*,” then the fourth decade must be seen as devoted to *building citizen organizations*, the last piece in the sustainable development puzzle.

In March 1994, USAID issued its *Strategies for Sustainable Development* in which democratization (and good governance) was stated as “an essential part of sustainable development because it facilitates the protection of human rights, informed participation, and public sector accountability.” In the *Guidelines for Strategic Plans: Democracy Promotion* that accompanied the strategies’ policy documents, guidance on a range of design and implementation issues was addressed. Of the four program priorities¹ defined for the D/G sector detailed in these guidelines, that *aimed at initiating or enhancing popular participation in decision-making by all sectors of civil society*, best provides the conceptual home for advocacy strategizing currently being promoted in Agency programming.

As D/G programming has evolved over the past three to five years, civil society objectives and priorities have become increasingly strategic and, at the same time, integrated with and supporting those of other sustainable development sectors. Strategic in the sense that program priorities and corresponding activities aim at *encouraging the development of a politically active civil society* capable of increasing the accountability of state institutions to the governed; and broadening citizen participation in political decision-making processes at both the national and local levels.

¹ The other three priority areas are unrestricted political competition at the national and local levels; respect for the rule of law and fundamental human rights; and effective, transparent and accountable governance structures.

Thus, in the Agency’s democracy and governance sectoral programming, civil society objectives have focused more narrowly on building a capacity within the organizations and institutions that compose it to engage state institutions – and many would say those of the market as well – over issues of public policy and adherence to the rule of law.

Obviously, this goes beyond supporting the service delivery role of development NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) – USAID’s traditional development partners – to the far broader sweep of associations that populate the inclusive terrain of civil society. It has also moved advocacy programming beyond the initial focus of promoting change in sectoral policies to objectives that specifically aim at macro-political or constitutional change and true governance reform. Today, USAID D/G programs from Mali to Indonesia support a diverse range of civil society actors from women’s legal societies to self-governing associations of natural resource users, that aim to influence public policies and decisions benefiting large swaths of society. But, as discussed in greater detail in the following section, these programs of *policy influence* are embedded in a more comprehensive strategy of advocacy that acknowledges the importance of a strong civil society and broadened citizen participation to *sustained and effective* political change and reform.

B. The Virtuous Circle: The Components of a Sustainable Advocacy Strategy

Three different components of a comprehensive advocacy strategy – transformational, developmental and instrumental – have been identified from a review of the relevant literature, and through discussions with organizations providing advocacy training. These components can be loosely conceived of and correlated with stages ranging along an *advocacy strategy’s continuum*, moving from citizen empowerment (transformational), to civil society strengthening (developmental), and concluding with policy influence (instrumental). As discussed in greater detail below, each of these advocacy components or stages provide a gauge for what types of interventions will best promote and ensure effective and sustained political change and policy reform. Depending on where a country falls along this continuum – *from* those with a politically-empowered citizenry and a politically-active civil society *to* those where the majority of citizens have little or no say in public matters and where civil society is weak or non-existent – will determine, to a large extent, which components are incorporated into a given advocacy strategy.

Because continuum models are static in nature – that is, they assume linear progressions of development and depend on snap-shots taken at a given point in time to identify a stage – we also portray our advocacy strategies framework as a dynamic set of *circular* interrelationships in which each component also reinforces the other two through backward and forward linkages best thought of as a *virtuous circle*. Depending on the perspective, citizen empowerment, civil society strengthening, or policy influence could be the necessary link requiring emphasis in an advocacy program strategy; or it could be all three simultaneously. Our interest here is in providing the designer/practitioner of D/G programs with a number of analytic tools through which to assess a given situation as s/he prepares to design and later implement an advocacy strategy. The following discussion expands on these points.

Instrumental advocacy – or the process by which concrete policy outcomes or reforms are achieved – is what is normally associated with advocacy, as are the well-defined steps and set of skills and techniques that make the achievement of these outcomes possible. If “doing advocacy” or being an effective advocacy organization was as simple, *inter-alia*, as knowing how to mount a campaign, using the media, or “mapping” power actors and their relationships, there would probably be no policies or reforms left to influence, and we would all be living in some conception of our own ideal world. Fortunately, this is not the case ... at least as far as the need and usefulness of this Resource Guide is concerned.

The research that underlies this Resource Guide has made three points abundantly clear concerning the formulation of an advocacy strategy. First, as important as the tools and tactics of instrumental advocacy are to the achievement of a desired policy outcome, the two other components that precede it along the continuum – citizen empowerment and civil society strengthening – are likely to be essential requisites of an overall strategy of effective and sustainable advocacy. Secondly, while these two components can be viewed as preconditions to the achievement of a desired policy outcome (instrumental objective), it is also clear that there exists a strong backward linkage in which the act of pursuing a specific policy outcome both strengthens civil society and empowers citizens. Similarly we can say that without an empowered citizenry the likelihood of a vibrant civil society developing to represent and press or the interests of the individual vis-a-vis the state and market is not great. Thus, like development in general, achieving democracy-building objectives is more the result of an iterative and interactive process than a linear one ... *a virtuous circle, in short*.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, not only does the pursuit of an instrumental advocacy objective contribute to the empowerment of citizens, the strengthening of civil society, and the building of social capital (see below), it is a true indication of the legitimacy with which people view their political system. The ability and willingness of citizens and their organizations to undertake instrumental advocacy demonstrates an unparalleled commitment to constitutionalism and the rule of law as the favored solution to political decision-making and change.

Each of the following three sections provide a discussion of one component objective of the overall advocacy strategy explained here, which has the ultimate goal of achieving a discrete economic, social or political reform or policy change. This includes a brief conceptual overview of the advocacy objective, how it is defined in that context, and the set of skills and experience that an organization must develop to achieve the advocacy objective or train others in its use. The fourth and final section provides an overall summary and set of conclusions.

Advocacy as Citizen Empowerment and Citizenship Building: **A Transformational Objective**

Definition: *The ability of the marginalized or disadvantaged – the powerless or poor majority – to challenge the status-quo by gaining a sense of their own power, including the capacity to define and prioritize their problems, and then acting to address and resolve them.*

Advocacy as citizen empowerment recognizes the fundamental tenet of democracy, that is, its overall health and strength ultimately derives from an enlightened and active citizenry. One role of a citizen is to make informed decisions about personal as well as collective concerns and interests that s/he chooses to pursue in the relevant political arenas where public decision-making takes place. Achieving the transformational objective, i.e., turning individuals into an active and informed citizenry, does not just happen. It is the result of a long-term process of learning and education which takes place in the home, the classroom, and the organizations that citizens voluntarily form to advance collective interests, solve shared problems or, as Salamon (1995) notes, “to pursue public purposes.” It is in the exercise of civic rights and duties and community obligations, that people are transformed from private individuals to public citizens.

In the majority of newly democratizing countries in which USAID works, the likelihood of finding a broad-based, enlightened and active citizenry with the capacity to participate effectively in public decision-making is not great. While it would be inaccurate to state that instrumental or policy advocacy cannot take place in the absence of an informed and active citizenry, there can be little doubt that strengthening the skills of citizenship – the knowledge of civic rights and duties and the practical tools, techniques and strategies to ensure and discharge them -- increases the likelihood that policy change and reform efforts will be effective, successful and sustained. In short, empowered citizens are best placed to define what issues get placed on the public agenda, and are likely to be the most committed advocates for their own as well as larger societal interests.

While the transformational objective contributes to the achievement of policy goals, the reverse of this maxim is equally true. Phrased differently, the two objectives are mutually reinforcing and strengthen an overall advocacy strategy aimed at policy change. Instrumentalist advocacy contributes to the transformational objective by demonstrating real, immediate, and concrete improvements in people’s lives. The mere act of participating in the process of instrumental advocacy by people and groups that were previously denied such a role is an empowering experience and broadens citizenship to previously disenfranchised groups. A transformational strategy component that does not have a specific objective of winning tangible results for those most concerned is just as likely to lead to frustration and cynicism, as it is empowerment.

In our interviews with both U.S. CSOs providing advocacy training and USAID Democracy Officers responsible for regional programming, a significant number of both respondent groups made it clear that a focus on citizen empowerment and citizenship building was an important component of their advocacy strategies and programming. But even the most “progressive” CSOs implementing a comprehensive advocacy strategy acknowledged that achieving measurable policy outcomes or “winning” was an essential objective of their citizen empowerment programs as a review of their training programs demonstrated.

Advocacy as Strengthening Civil Society and Building Social Capital: A Developmental Objective

Definition: *The ability of citizens to organize themselves collectively to alter the existing relations of power by providing themselves with a lasting institutional capacity to identify, articulate and act on their concerns, interests and aspirations, including the ability to achieve specific and well-defined policy outcomes.*

Advocacy as strengthening civil society and building social capital has the objective of altering the relations of power. In most USAID-assisted countries power asymmetries are the typical socio-political feature of relations between those who control the institutions of the state and those governed by those institutions. A strong civil society is intimately linked to a strong democracy that in turn practices good governance. Because both civil society and democracy are normative terms, so too is advocacy as broadly conceived in this strategy. Civil society (the realm of voluntary association and civic values) is the advocate for and defender of society – and the citizens and communities that compose it – vis-a-vis the state (the realm of political authority and coercion) and the market (the realm of trade and exchange).

The developmental objective of advocacy assumes an imbalance in power relations between the politically organized and society at large which is politically unorganized. Civil society thus provides the unorganized and/or powerless with an intermediating set of organizations, mainly of their own creation, capable of accessing arenas of power and decision-making so that their collective voice is heard and acted on. Strengthening civil society carries with it, then, a commitment, value or vision to “righting” the imbalance in power relations that exist between society on the one hand, and the realms of state and market on the other. Please note that this does not mean making civil society stronger than the state. Rather it means moving CSOs individually and civil society collectively along a continuum of capacity development through targeted interventions of training and technical assistance to a point of parity with the state and market. As discussed below, a civil society that is operating purely in an adversarial or oppositional role to the state and market indicates weakness in all three political realms and democracy itself; while a civil society that is viewed and conducts itself as a legitimate partner in governance matters at the local and national levels is likely to be associated with a strong and healthy democracy.

Building a *functional* capacity for effective and sustained civic advocacy goes beyond building strong, lasting, democratically run citizen organizations with well trained staff as important as these may be. The principal means by which society permanently alters power relations with the *realms* of state and market is through the construction of a *civil society-wide institutional and normative infrastructure* to support individual CSOs who choose to engage in advocacy. If we want CSOs capable of undertaking effective advocacy, then ensuring there are **specialized** CSOs to undertake such functions as: addressing a wide range of capacity building needs including those related to advocacy; conducting research and formulating policy independent of the state and market; developing and promoting the voluntary adherence to a sector-wide standard or codes of conduct; protecting and promoting the rights of the sector; and seeking new and innovative sources of CSO financing.

Effective advocacy, or achieving a well-defined policy outcome, is most likely to occur with an autonomous and strong civil society that has a permanent institutional capability to:

- 1) Access the political arenas where public policy and decision-making take place;
- 2) Articulate and press for desired policy change and reform vis-a-vis concerned public decision-makers;
- 3) Ensure that decisions once made are then implemented;
- 4) Continually monitor policy implementation; and,
- 5) Where necessary, reformulate policies that no longer serve their initial purpose. This is called a developmental objective because achieving capacity – at both the levels of civil society and individual CSO – in these areas takes place incrementally over time.

Civil societies are not born intact and immediately capable of undertaking *civic action* functions of public oversight and broadening citizen participation in policy-making. Nor are they born with a mature set of civic norms and democratic values. Over time it is expected that there will be a gradual increase in the density and diversity of organizational types and a differentiation and specialization of their functions. While institutional pluralism is largely a function of increased political space accorded to non-state actors, donors can support specialization including strengthening CSOs with the skills to influence policy outcomes.

Just as the developmental component of advocacy is a necessary element in the achievement of well-defined policy outcomes, so too does instrumental advocacy contribute to the larger objective of strengthening of civil society, and by extension democracy. It does this by promoting the norms and networks of civic cooperation, or what Putnam calls “social capital.” In the process of trying to achieve a specific policy outcome intra-sectoral linkages, including alliances and coalitions, are developed and strengthened as CSOs with a similar interest join together to achieve collectively what they could not attain individually. And as experience is gained and the issues that confront society become more complex and far-reaching CSOs begin exploring and building inter-sectoral linkages with reformist actors in the state and market. This is not something that can be taught but, rather, is the result of learning to work together to pursue commonly identified interests in a public setting.

The process of instrumental advocacy – whether or not it achieves well-defined goals of policy change – encourages the growth of civic norms of trust, reciprocity, inclusion and tolerance, as people learn how to work together to achieve a common objective. These values underlie the social basis for an individual’s decision to join voluntarily in common enterprise to promote personal and shared interests through collective action. The development and broadening of networks of citizen organizations and the deepening of civic norms – both intended and unintended results of instrumental advocacy – are critical elements of the institutional and normative infrastructure of a strong and autonomous civil society.

The countries in the developing South and transitioning East in which USAID works are far more likely to have an informed and politically active civil society than they are to have a politically

informed and active citizenry. In far too many of these countries, however, the number of CSOs that are politically active is limited to a fairly narrow range of urban-based, elite-led and non-membership based organizations. While this is not itself detrimental to the promotion of needed democratic reforms and progressive social and economic policies, it does pose a number of real constraints to an effective and sustainable advocacy strategy.

Chief among these constraints, identified by both USAID officers and PVO/NGO staff, is:

- 1) the lack of established linkages between the small number of “formal,” politically-engaged and more specialized civic organizations and the far greater number of “multi-purpose” intermediary CSOs and grassroots associations primarily concerned with providing services to their members or clients; and,
- 2) the secondary emphasis placed on the practice of internal democratic governance. The impact of these factors on the instrumental advocacy objective has been, in many cases, to decrease the legitimacy and credibility of advocacy organizations vis-a-vis public policy-makers on the one hand, and the groups on whose behalf they claim to act. Broadening the range of CSOs participating in the policy-making process and increasing the democratic content of their governance practices have been recognized as important elements of a civil society strengthening advocacy strategy objective.

Advocacy as Influencing Key Policy Outcomes and Achieving a Reform Agenda: An Instrumental Objective

Definition: *The process in which a group(s) applies a set of skills and techniques for the purpose of influencing public decision-making; the ultimate result is to achieve a well-defined social, economic or political policy goal or reform.*

Advocacy as an instrumental strategy is a set of tools, tactics or techniques employed to effect a well-defined reform or policy change. In practical terms it matters little what the nature of the issue is or who is promoting the change; the instrumentalist objective is to achieve the policy outcome desired. There is an underlying assumption that a level playing field exists for whomever wants to press for change and advance their particular interest. All that separates the winners and the losers in the policy advocacy process is their ability to mobilize resources and to possess the skills and experience required to mount a successful issues campaign. As it carries no inherent value or has no normative dimension, instrumental advocacy may or may not advance democracy or contribute to its consolidation (e.g., special interest groups whose policy objectives do not necessarily advance the public interest). It is for this reason that an informed and active citizenry working through organizations which promote civic values must inform the content of the policy issues that actually make their way into the public realm where political decision-making takes place.

The instrumental conception of advocacy assumes the policy issue or reform area has been pre-determined and that the political system is relatively open to both citizen and CSO participation in the relevant decision-making arena. In this regard, the objective of advocacy is straightforward: to achieve the policy change, objective or outcome that is desired by a concerned group(s) (CSO, constituency, alliance or coalition). As an operational matter, advocacy is the process by which a concerned group applies a well-understood set of skills, techniques and tactics, to influence the decisions of those with the power to determine a desired policy outcome. As such, policy advocacy is a neutral concept, a tool or instrument; it is a means to a policy end, regardless of the nature of that policy; and it is the group that infuses the policy with its own values, vision or goal.

There should be no mistaking the fact that effective advocacy – or the ability to achieve desired reforms and policy outcomes – is a complex process requiring an ability to analyze the larger policy environment, fashion a corresponding operational strategy or “issues” campaign, and then mobilize the resources (e.g., human, financial, material informational) to make it happen. Chapter IV below provides an in-depth discussion of the steps, skill areas, and resources necessary to mount a successful advocacy campaign.

Advocacy Strategizing: A Metaphor for Democracy Promotion **Summary and Conclusions**

The ability – both as a right and a capacity – of citizens and their organizations to undertake instrumental advocacy as defined and discussed above, says a lot about, and in fact is an indicator of, the nature of democracy and its strength in a given country. This Resource Guide has been prepared under the civil society component of the Democracy Center’s overall program strategy. While it would perhaps be an exaggeration to say that civil society strengthening is the key to successful democracy promotion in the countries in which USAID works, there is little doubt that it has been the missing ingredient in previous development strategies, and is essentially what distinguishes sustainable development from them.

In its simplest conception *civil society* is a proxy for the *citizen*, an institutional means for expressing and achieving individual aspirations and interests through collective action with one’s fellow citizens. It is a principal means by which citizens exercise their citizenship, which includes civic duties as well as rights. Civil society organizations provides one of the most effective means by which citizens participate in the decisions that affect them, their communities and the larger society, while providing a platform to demonstrate their solidarity with citizens beyond their borders. Advocacy seen in this light is far more than a tool or instrument to achieve these objectives; it is a metaphor for the power of citizens and the strength of civil society, critical elements of a healthy public life and a democratic society.

As an advocacy strategy, the transformational component acknowledges the central role that citizens play in defining what issues get placed on the agenda of public decision-makers and thus acted on. In other words, who determines what issues (transformational objective) find their way into the public realm where decision-making takes place is as important as how they get there (civil society strengthening objective), and the means or techniques that are employed to achieve desired outcomes (instrumentalist objective). And in our model of mutually reinforcing

components, instrumental advocacy is an important means to achieving citizen empowerment and civil society strengthening objectives (backward linkages) just as the transformational and developmental objectives are critical components or means to achieve key policy outcomes (forward linkages).

Mastering the set of analytic, strategic, logistic, tactics and management skills and expertise that goes into an effective advocacy campaign does not come easy under the best of circumstances. Under the less than ideal circumstances that mark the nature of most USAID-assisted countries, achieving real, lasting reform or policy change is dependent on the attainment of some degree of the other two component advocacy objectives discussed above. What the initial study has shown in some detail is: ***the inter-relatedness of the three component objectives and the necessity to work on them all simultaneously where minimum conditions have yet to obtain.*** Furthermore, where a country finds itself along the advocacy continuum will determine the nature of the issues that can be addressed by civil society, the types of organizations that undertake them, and the political arenas where these issues are ultimately decided.

Advocacy defined as an instrumental objective with a clear and organized goal of influencing policy change is one of three intermediate results that contribute to the achievement of an overall objective (strategic) of ***effective and sustainable advocacy***. Advocacy conceived of as an inclusive strategy of political change is a dynamic process that includes citizens and the organizations they create to promote shared interests and advance collective aspirations. Therefore, other factors come into play. The more important of these factors include:

- the empowerment of the poor and unorganized, including their political enfranchisement; the strengthening of intermediary voluntary associations that people join to represent them in political processes and institutions beyond the very local level; and,
- The generation of civic norms and democratic values that inform the choice of policies and reforms that find their way into the public realm.

The purpose of this Resource Guide is not to impose a “right” advocacy strategy that fits all situations, but rather to present a number of programmatic options that USAID Missions and their US CSO partners can take into consideration when designing democracy programs with an advocacy objective. This conceptual discussion and related framework has been provided to assist these partners working with local civil society organizations to begin the process of thinking through basic design issues including:

- 1) which component(s) of the advocacy strategy is most appropriate for their given situation;
- 2) identifying the set of capacity building requirements that identified partners will need to implement it; and,
- 3) Acquainting them with the organizations that can be called on to provide relevant training and technical advice to their partners. In the following chapters we look at specific issues that are

likely to be encountered in the design and implementation of D/G programs with a civil society advocacy component.

III. CHOOSING THE RIGHT ADVOCACY STRATEGY

A combination of programmatic factors and non-programmatic parameters (e.g., adequate resources exist, your country program is not closing down next year, larger foreign policy considerations) ultimately provide the context of design efforts in general, and the choice of advocacy component(s) incorporated into to a D/G strategy, in particular. The principal concern of this chapter is with the programmatic factors that condition the choice of the appropriate advocacy component(s). Presented below are the elements of an assessment methodology that USAID Democracy Officers and their CSO partners can use to evaluate local conditions and make the correct choice in this regard.

Part A provides a general discussion of D/G assessment methodologies and approaches. Part B then turns to the set of characteristics that define an ideal state of capacity for the three advocacy components that make up the virtuous circle/continuum of advocacy presented above. In short, how would you know an *Empowered Citizenry*, a *Strong Civil Society* or an *effective Policy Influence Campaign* if you saw it? Part C, examines three *variables* – the kind of policy reform chosen; the political arena in which decision-making takes place; and the type of CSO undertaking the policy reform – that will likely influence the choice of components. And Part D, is a “Summing-Up” set of design conclusions and recommendations.

A. Developing an Assessment Approach and Methodology

Choosing an appropriate advocacy strategy, as it is for D/G in general, begins with an analysis of the local context. A number of “macro-political” assessment methodologies have been used by the Agency over the past decade to analyze the country context and identify such aspects as the constraints blocking legislative effectiveness or areas requiring constitutional level reform. The D/G Center – as part of its general analytic support to the field – is currently reviewing the more important of these methodologies (e.g., political economy, institutional analysis and design) and will be providing Missions with guidance on the strengths and weaknesses of each in terms of their analytic usefulness. The debate, if it can be called that, is whether the “sector” of democracy and governance lends itself to prescription in the same way as those of economic growth, the environment, and health/population.

A number of “models” take the analysis resulting from the conduct of political assessments and use it to prescribe programmatic solutions to identified constraints or potential opportunities. Perhaps the best known and most frequently used prescriptive methodology is the *political staging and program-sequencing model*. Simply put, the model addresses the question: *can democracy and governance programming be designed and supported as a function of the particular stage of political development that a country finds itself in at a given point in time?* The essentials of the methodology center on the ability to identify or analyze where a country falls along a continuum of political development that runs from pre-transition (authoritarian rule to political liberalization), through democratic transition (first-time multiparty elections) to

democratic consolidation (the ability to withstand extra-constitutional reversals). Attached to each of the stages of a political development continuum are a set of generic interventions that are designed to overcome identified constraints or support promising opportunities

In fact, the *Democracy Promotion Implementation Guidelines* noted above uses a similar, if slightly modified, approach “to establishing priorities and determining the sequence of USAID support” in country-level democracy programming. Of particular interest to the advocacy strategist is the work done by USAID² itself in terms of the design of advocacy programs using this political staging assessment methodology to formulate advocacy interventions. For instance, if a country has been located in stage of “pre-transition” – and is assessed to have: little history of democratic rule, a young and weak civil society, and where citizen rights are few – it is likely that CSOs will find it difficult, if not dangerous to access state decision-making arenas to press for political rights, or monitor the use of public resources. Based on such an assessment, a reasonable advocacy strategy would be one in which donors: pressure – whether overtly or *sotto voce* – concerned governments to expand political space to previously excluded social groups; voice concerns over and contemplate sanctions against human rights abuses; encourage NGO advocacy initiatives in health or environment sectors; support pro-democratic “forces,” through northern CSOs including safe-haven strategies; and promote multiparty elections.

Assessment methodologies and analytic frameworks help us to make sense out of the chaos that normally attends political evaluation in countries unlike our own; or especially in our own. Political staging models, particularly when applied to advocacy strategizing are useful conceptual tools in delineating political development into comprehensible bites. However, as useful as such models are for their analytic power, they can only take us so far in the design process, especially when we move beyond analysis and attempt to prescribe predetermined solutions by assessed stage of development. This is no less true for advocacy strategizing than it is for the larger sector of democracy and governance programming and prioritizing.

This Resource Guide puts forth its own assessment methodology, the *advocacy strategies continuum cum virtuous circle* in which – from the limited, but growing body of empirical evidence that exists – it is posited that instrumental policy advocacy is most likely to be effective and sustainable when there is an informed and active citizenry participating both individually and through their organizations to identify, prioritize and press for personal and collective interests. As the concluding section of Chapter II made clear, advocacy programming cannot be separated from the larger political context and the more comprehensive D/G strategizing within which it resides.

Each of the three components of our advocacy strategy – whether viewed as a continuum or as inter-related and reinforcing elements of a virtuous circle – can also be seen as indicators of a country’s political development, that is, the more citizens are able to exercise their civic rights and duties; the more civil society is capable of expressing citizen interests and values in relevant political arenas; and the more instrumental advocacy is seen as an alternative to non-constitutional means of effecting policy change and political reform, then the greater the chances are that a given country will demonstrate democratic values and practice. The capacity building matrix that we

² See, Hansen, Gary, 1996. *Constituencies for Reform*, USAID, Washington, D.C.

present in Part IV is a direct translation of our advocacy strategies continuum/circle into an assessment methodology.

The approach taken in this Resource Guide to determining which advocacy component(s) is most appropriate to a given situation is based on an assessment methodology that combines the advocacy continuum-cum-circle discussed above and expanded upon in Part B, following, with three advocacy-specific variables discussed in Part C. In short, as a number of U.S. CSO thinkers and practitioners have stressed, there is no alternative to hands on analysis of a given political “context” at a specific political “moment” in terms of fashioning a coherent and comprehensive advocacy strategy.³ The following two sections thus provide an “optic” through which USAID and its partners can view and make sense of their own political moments and contexts.

B. Defining Results: Developing an Advocacy Assessment Framework and Indicators

How do you know which advocacy component to choose—that is the question? Our advocacy continuum-virtuous circle model looks at the end-point of the continuum, i.e., *effective and sustainable advocacy*, as being a function, or result of the interaction of each of the three strategy components. At the same time we have stated that this same end-point is a valid indicator of a strong and healthy democracy, thus linking the two, i.e., effective and sustainable advocacy and a healthy democracy, inextricably in theory.

Here we look at the practice of advocacy strategizing as it relates to democracy promotion. The question we address in this section is: *how would we know an empowered citizenry, a strong civil society, or an effective policy influence campaign if they were sitting across the table from us?* If we know what the desired end-point, or result, looks like in each case, then we have the makings of an assessment tool that can tell us what is lacking by comparing the existing context against this “ideal state of being.” And because the ideal state is another way of expressing the desired level of *capacity* that is sought in each component it also puts us in a position so that we can then take the next step and design a set of interventions to address the identified lacuna(e).

In fact, we also have the makings of a “results framework,” or the set of causal relationships that end in a strategic objective (SO) framed something like *effective and sustainable advocacy achieved* with three intermediate results:

- 1) *An empowered (informed and active) citizenry;*
- 2) *A strengthened civil society; and,*
- 3) *An effective policy influence campaign mounted,* that together lead to the achievement of this SO.

If we can then develop a “bundle” of characteristics that in their totality define each of these intermediate results we will have established a set of *indicators* that answers our initial question of who exactly is that sitting across the table from us and what does she look like. The following three sections look at each of the three components of the strategy and develop a set of indicators

³ See particularly referenced works by Jane Covey and Valerie Miller of the Institute of Development Research.

that describe an ideal state of being. And collectively provide an indicator of both sustainable and effective advocacy and a healthy public life and democracy.

1. Transformational Component: An Empowered Citizenry

Ultimately this advocacy component or intermediate result is closely tied to promoting a democratic political culture or ethic of democracy with a tradition of participatory decision-making and leadership selection at all levels of the polity. This can only be achieved when citizens have internalized democratic values and civic norms and change their behavior accordingly. This is a long-term process that begins with the development of collective problem solving skills and their application to concrete issues. It is a first step in building individual self-confidence and moving beyond a state of isolation, anomie and impotence that in many cases have been generations in the making. This learning-cum-empowerment process takes place in the organizations that individuals create to address common problems and promote shared interests.

These community-based associations are the laboratories where individuals are transformed into citizens through the chemical reaction that takes place when people come together voluntarily to achieve collectively what they were unable to achieve individually. While these voluntary associations have likely formed for more results-oriented purposes, i.e., solving daily economic, social or survival problems, they are the most appropriate locus of citizenship building, or as de Tocqueville noted over 200 years ago, serve as “free schools of democracy.”

An empowered – informed and active – citizenry is one that has (a critical mass of knowledge, skills and learning) the following capacities/characteristics:

- Functionally literate and numeric citizens
- Skilled facilitators capable of leading citizens through a process of self-awareness
- Leaders that have “in-the-public” interest rather than “in-the-private” interest values
- An understanding of the merit of joining together in voluntary association to achieve collective objectives
- An ability to identify, prioritize and deliberate on public (shared or collective) problems
- An understanding of the process of public decision/policy making
- An awareness of its economic and social rights, including laws, policies and regulations
- An awareness of its political rights and duties as citizens
- An understanding of the basic functioning of a constitutional democracy, including both its political institutions and processes
- An ability to act on and resolve locally-identified problems (see components 2 and 3)

2. Developmental Component: A Strengthened Civil Society

The principal result of this component is a civil society capable of acting on behalf of citizens to represent and advance their interests vis-a-vis political power-holders. As discussed in Part C, below, this includes market actors, traditional authorities and international institutions in addition to governments at either the central or local levels. Or as the *Democracy Promotion Guidelines* propose, a politically active civil society is the intermediate result that is really being called for in a

larger D/G strategy but is equally required in an advocacy program. While we would not propose undertaking an effective and sustainable advocacy strategy unless one of the objectives (or intermediate results) was a politically active civil society, this has to be put within the larger goal (SO) that includes a citizen empowerment objective. In other words a politically active civil society derives its strength and equally important determines the policy agenda through community or collective problem solving that includes economic and social concerns in addition to political ones.

At the heart of a strengthened civil society is an empowered citizenry with the bundle of capacities described above. In this sense, the *transformational* component is inclusive of the *developmental* and the *instrumental* components on the advocacy strategies' continuum. On the other hand, citizens become empowered as they learn to associate in the organizations that they create to address commonly identified issues including achieving key organizational objectives through successful engagement with political decision-makers. This is an example of the mutually reinforcing backwards and forwards linkages nature of our virtuous circle model.

Citizen organizations are the building blocks or primary level of civil society. But beyond the fundamentals of this iterative and mutually reinforcing relationship, what are the characteristics of a strong civil society capable of representing citizen interests, and when necessary engaging political decision-makers to ensure that these interests are heard and acted on. We make a distinction between the “sector” of civil society with its own unique set of capacities and the individual CSOs that compose it. The logic underlying this proposition simply states that without a number of “sector” specific capacities individual CSOs will be unable to become effective representatives and advocates for their members, clients or the public at large. Thus, a strengthened, politically active civil society would have a set of indicators-cum-capacities at both levels.

At the Level of Civil Society

A strengthened civil society capable of supporting politically active CSO members is one that has (the following capacities/characteristics):

- Achieved a critical mass (density and diversity) of CSOs
- Achieved a significant degree of differentiation and specialization vertically and horizontally
- Specialized CSOs undertaking such functions as representation and coordination; policy analysis, formulation and analysis; and conflict management and dispute resolution
- Networks of autonomous communications composed of both CSOs and media
- An internal sectoral capacity to provide training and technical assistance in a number of technical and management areas
- Developed and gained adherence to an internal (sector) standard or code of conduct

At the Level of the Individual CSO

A strengthened, politically active CSO is one that has (the following capacities/characteristics):

- an agreed upon vision and mission which includes citizen representation and civic action
- a governance structure that promotes participatory decision-making and leadership selection
- a strategic plan with well defined objectives/results and performance indicators
- generic management development skills including resource (financial, human, information) management and activity design, planning, management and evaluation
- an institutional sustainability including resource mobilization strategy
- strong linkages to and is grounded in the surrounding community
- a constituency outreach, building and education program
- an understanding of the need to build intra-sectoral (civil society) linkages including participation in federations, unions, networks, coalitions and alliances
- an understanding of the importance of building inter-sectoral linkages with state and market actors
- an ability to mount an effective advocacy campaign (see component three below)

3. Instrumental Component: Mounting an Effective Policy Influence Campaign

Citizens either directly or through their organizations (CSOs) undertake policy influence or what we have called here instrumental advocacy. On the advocacy continuum, the instrumental component is last in terms of the set of capacities that citizens and CSOs need to acquire in order to ensure achievement of an effective and sustainable advocacy strategy. In other words, and as a general principal, the capacity to be able to mount a successful policy influence campaign would be one of the last sets of skills to be acquired by the majority of citizens or CSOs in a given civil society. Although as noted above, there will emerge overtime “specialized” CSOs that are capable of undertaking advocacy efforts regardless of the degree to which an empowered citizenry exists and a politically-active civil society has been attained. The issue is not that such efforts will take place; it is whether they will be effective and sustainable. This is discussed further in section 4, below.

Thus, there is a unique set of skills, techniques, and approaches, tactics and methodologies that will permit definition of this component and permit it to be assessed and measured. An effective policy influence campaign strategy is one in which citizens or CSOs:

- Understand each of the stages in an advocacy/issues campaign process
- Determine and choose a specific issue/policy/reform to be addressed in the campaign
- Develop the issues campaign through a strategic planning process
- Have skills in mapping power relations (power mapping) and stakeholder analysis
- Are able to mobilize identified resources (e.g., votes, money, people, expertise)
- Are able to conduct policy analysis including research and data collection
- Are able to formulate policy, draft legislation, develop legal briefs
- Are able to build coalitions and alliances with identified organizations
- Can undertake policy/reform implementation monitoring and oversight
- Are able to evaluate policy implementation and reformulate it as appropriate
- Are able to effectively use public and private media

- Can run an effective public meeting
- Are able to choose from among the range of advocacy tactics, techniques, operational strategies that which is most appropriate and implement accordingly

4. **Effective and Sustainable Advocacy: A Work In Progress**

It should be clear by this point that the issue is no longer from which of the three advocacy components to choose in designing an advocacy strategy, but rather which of the individual elements or capacities **within** each of these components to address at a given point in time in a given context. The assessment methodology we have chosen to use here has identified a idealized set of characteristics that describe each of the three components in a holistic advocacy strategy. No country in which USAID and its U.S. CSO partners work is going to meet these idealized notions of an empowered citizenry, a strong politically-active civil society or an effective policy influence capacity. This should not be particularly surprising given the fact that most of them have known only authoritarian rule in one form or another for at least four decades and often for a century or more.

Once an assessment using the proposed methodology has been conducted and the degree to which a given country measured up to the ideal bundle of capacities identified for each component, a strategy could be tailored to a given country. Certainly Sri Lanka or Indonesia where literacy is widespread will not require addressing this result to the extent of a Niger or Mali. On the other hand, in Indonesia where citizen participation is limited and voluntary associational life is virtually non-existent beyond the most local level, a different strategy would need to be developed from Mali where associational life has always been vibrant and just awaited the political events of the early 1990s to unleash it further.

With unlimited resources and time we could work towards the achievement of the appropriate set of results under each component based on the outcome of such an assessment. The design challenge would be simply to determine the order or sequence of required capacities in each component and then match similarly ordered capacities from each into a coherent set of advocacy interventions. Each of the three sets of capacities above has been so ordered. There is little doubt, however, that regardless of where a country came out in such an assessment, elements from each of the three components would be targeted for support. The same could just as easily be said for the United States where in fact each of the three components are the object, not of foreign donor support, but rather concerned members of American civil society. The point to be made here is two-fold.

First, achieving an idealized state of being, whether its a health democracy, or effective and sustainable advocacy is continually a **work in progress**. In the case of the U.S. and other industrialized democracies it is a question of renewal; in the majority of countries where USAID works it the construction of a capacity from the ground up. In both cases, citizen empowerment, civil society strengthening and an effective policy influence capacity must be constantly to be learned and relearned. Likewise, while the fundamentals remain the same in each new approaches and methodologies are continually being refined to enhance the effectiveness of interventions designed to address identified short-comings. Which brings us to the second point. It is no

accident, as we discuss in the concluding chapter, that much of the fundamental work that has been done in addressing needs under these three components as well as much of the new work in such areas as adult learning and popular education come out of the *evolving* American democratic experience.

While acknowledging that all three components require some degree of intervention under virtually all country strategies, there are a range of other design factors that will tilt the balance away from or toward one component over another. First of all, it should be clear that USAID is not the only actor that is working towards the achievement of these three sets of results in a given country. Other donors, concerned governments and local people themselves have their own priorities and particular expertise. Secondly, USAID in few countries has signed on to implement a program on a countrywide basis. Geographic focus becomes important in the drive to become strategic and achieve results. Thirdly, not all results defined under a D/G strategic objective will necessarily be achieved through that SO. Other SOs often target the same implementing partners and or the same results as the D/G SO in the achievement of their results. The use of NGO intermediaries and functional literacy programs to achieve mutual objectives are good examples of this factor.

These three issues along with such non-programmatic parameters as available funding and time horizon of the country program all determine which component and which elements are designed into an advocacy program. The final set of design issues which affect advocacy strategizing are presented below.

C. Other Design Issues that Condition Advocacy Strategizing

In developing an advocacy strategy three final and *inter-related design issues* must be addressed:

- 1) The nature of the principal policy or reform *issue(s)* identified as susceptible to citizen and/or CSO influence;
- 2) The political *arena(s)* most appropriate to the policy change and open to citizen and/or CSO influence; and,
- 3) The civil society *actor(s)* best placed to push for the adoption of the given policy or reform in the identified arena.

In developing the advocacy component most appropriate for a given country, a Democracy Officer would assess each of them with an eye towards what is deemed feasible over the given strategy period. The following three sections look at each of these variables in turn.

1. Which Policies and Reforms to Target?

For the better part of two decades USAID Missions have identified constraints in the legal, policy, fiscal and regulatory environments that would likely inhibit their ability to implement program strategies and thus achieve desired results. Some of these constraints would be taken on, and still

are, through “policy dialogue” with host-country partners and, in many cases, in collaboration with other donors. Others would be promoted with and through local non-governmental partners, both CSOs and private sector actors. What distinguishes country program strategy development since the early years of this decade is the addition of a political dimension to social, economic and environmental ones in terms of the policy and reform issues being addressed. This – the addition of democratic development to other sectoral objectives – is what distinguishes sustainable development from previous models or paradigms that have guided our strategy development in earlier periods. It is also what increases the likelihood that country program strategies will succeed today.

In this regard, policy, legal, regulatory and fiscal reform can essentially be categorized into those which have a *macro-political* or constitutional level impact; and those with a *sectoral* or operational significance which touch on the social, economic or environmental concerns of significant societal groups. *Systemic* or macro-political reforms include those that define the nature of societal governance. The “rules,” rule of law or “rules of the game,” established at the macro-political level reflect, in principle, the social contract agreed upon between state and society over the degree and nature of power that the latter has agreed to cede to the former in the conduct of the public’s business.

Systemic reforms address such issues as:

- 1) Electoral, legal and decentralization processes;
- 2) The allocation of powers and authorities among and between the principal political institutions; and,
- 3) Adherence to a rule of law and the guarantee of basic human rights and civil liberties including freedoms of association, speech, assembly, press.

Because a number of decisions – such as budget-making and allocations, land use and ownership, and treatment of minorities or disadvantaged groups (e.g., women, children, the poor) – have either a broad political impact, or are highly sensitive in social terms, they are normally treated at the macro-political level.

In contrast, the ability to achieve *sectoral* policies and reforms operate under “rules” established at the macro-political level. Fundamentally, they address how “public” resources are allocated and managed to achieve public “purposes.” As such, there is a continual tension between what constitutes the “public” interest as distinct from the “private” interest, including sizable social groupings and “special” interests. Sectoral policies deal with issues related to:

- 1) the type and method of delivering *social and safety-net* services to society as a whole (e.g., health, education) and for specific social groups (e.g., the handicapped, pensioners, orphans); and,
- 2) Both the macro-*economic* and specific economic sub-sectors and interests (e.g., micro-credit, labor, agriculture, herders, fisherfolk); and 3) the *environment*, including decisions over the

use, allocation and management of collectively held natural resources. Policies and reform agendas related to each of these three areas will generate winners and losers!

Two issues emerge from this analysis which are of immediate concern to program designers. The first addresses the set of “rules” (e.g., policies, reforms, laws, and regulations) that should be tackled in a given D/G program. Put differently, which type of desired change, i.e., macro-political or sectoral is possible within the existing political “context.” The argument has been made in both the literature and by practitioners that without an enabling environment at the macro-political level there is probably little likelihood that citizens or their organizations will be able to participate in decision-making in areas that more directly affect their economic and social well-being. Conversely, an equally strong argument has been made that where the political context limits non-state participation in governance matters, and where there is little toleration for dissenting views over the fundamentals of political life, influencing policies or promoting reforms related to sectoral issues is a more realistic strategy, and one that may eventually lead to participation in the area of systemic reform.

USAID country programs and U.S. CSO partners have been and continue to support policy reform in both areas, often simultaneously, and interestingly enough, in a range of political contexts, including a few that could be best defined as authoritarian. The following factors should be taken into consideration when choosing which type of policy reform to address in a country program:

- Are international donors permitted to support local CSOs with a macro-political reform agenda that include issues of human (civil, minority) rights, rule of law or “extra-constitutional” (police, military) abuses? And, to a lesser extent, oversight of government performance in such areas budget expenditures; decisions related to the allocation of public resources? If not, working through international NGOs either locally-based or off-shore may be possible where a civil society strengthening objective is attempted. Above all, consideration to the safety of targeted CSO actors must be calculated and such interventions as safe-haven included in any strategy.
- Where macro-political reform is not possible, then all three strategy components can be considered in a program that aims at promoting sectoral policy change. How, a D/G SO allocates its resources and results vis-a-vis other program sectors will have to be worked out within the framework of the larger country program strategy and programmatic and non-programmatic factors. Certainly there is no shortage of reform or policy issues in each of the other sectors. A strategy would likely look at trying to ensure that the issues that do get chosen are firmly linked to the identified needs and interests of the majority. At a minimum, they should not cause them more harm, because they are unable to make their voice heard.

2. In Which Political Arena to Operate?

Public decision-making – both related to sectoral policy change and macro-political reform – takes place in a number of political arenas from the community or neighborhood level to rapidly emerging global institutions of governance. We use “political” arena because public decision-

making is largely about *the exercise of power*. The ability of non-state, non-market actors to gain access to these arenas is largely a function of their own power relative to other political actors as well as their perceived credibility as legitimate partners in the process of public decision-making. Thus, in addition to the issue: type of policy change or reform being sought, is the issue: political arena or the locus where the relevant decision-making process takes place. The following discussion of political arenas is taken from the perspective of both citizens and their organizations. Four principal categories were identified during the larger study exercise:

a) Constitutionally-Mandated or State Arenas

The political arena where most formal decision-making takes place is composed of the *macro-political institutions* that are mandated through constitutional means. This includes the three branches of the central state; elections, referenda, and recalls; and decentralized or sub-national governments whether democratically elected or appointed.

Political society, or the combination of electoral processes and political parties, is a principal arena of public decision-making. Elections, whether for political office or as a means of determining public policy (e.g., referenda) provide ordinary citizens with a means of directly influencing key policy outcomes on a regularized basis. The electoral process including political parties is highly susceptible to organized lobbying and advocacy campaigns as citizen groups, coalitions and alliances mobilize, aggregate and articulate societal interests in support of single issues or broader political, social and economic policy reform.

Local government and particularly municipal, communal or county governments, are increasingly becoming an important, and perhaps more relevant, locus of decision-making for the majority of a country's citizens especially where true devolution of authority and resources has been accomplished, and local leaders are democratically-elected. As a general principle, local governments are more open and responsive than central state institutions to citizen concerns. Certainly this is the pattern emerging in much of Latin America, Eastern Europe and several Asian countries including the Philippines and Bangladesh.

Newly emerging or special forms of governance such as water user or irrigation authorities, special grazing districts, and even autonomous regions are increasingly being imbued with their own rules structure and legitimacy derived from constitutional or other legal instruments. As countries continue to address social, economic and political problems that have resisted traditional solutions, new forms of governance emerge to address them.

b) Political Arenas within Society Itself

Here we distinguish between *traditional* and *modern forms of governance* that while falling outside the purview of the state and with no constitutionally sanctioned rights over citizens have demonstrated their ability to control the lives of ordinary citizens. There can be little doubt, for instance, that the church and other religious groups, as well as traditional institutions of governance such as the chieftancy have as much influence over the condition of people's lives as the constitutionally mandated institutions discussed above. Changing the "policies," if not the attitudes and behavior of these traditional institutions can have and already has had, an impact on

such a diverse range of issues as human rights, reproductive rights and land tenure, to name but a few.

At the same time, we are beginning to see new forms of governance, often voluntary in nature with their own internal rule structures, which are increasingly taking on public functions that were once the sole prerogative of state institutions. In this regard, a wide range of natural resource-user associations (e.g., forest and water users), social service-providing organizations (e.g., parent - teacher associations, women-run village pharmacies) and even some economic interest groups (e.g., credit unions, cooperatives) make decisions that affect their members and, in a number of cases, the larger public that resides within their area of operations.

In both cases, the degree to which internal decision-making processes including leadership selection are open, transparent, participative and accountable, often determine whether these groups will be effective in serving member and public interests.

c) The Market and the Private Sector as Political Arena

The importance of the market as an arena of decision-making touches virtually every segment of society. In many associations of rural producers (e.g., cooperatives, credit unions, peasant organizations), organized labor, and informal sector actors (e.g., micro and small enterprises), among others, are probably affected more by a range of private business and corporate interests (e.g., transporters, commercial banks, importers) and parastatals (e.g., marketing boards, development banks) than they are by state decision-makers.

d) International Arenas of Decision-Making

The international arena including such actors as bilateral donors and international financial institutions, intergovernmental organizations (e.g., the United Nations, regional organizations) and multinational corporations have had as much impact, albeit indirectly, on the lives of southern and eastern citizens as any national political arena. Where national governments are either unable or unwilling to adequately represent if not protect the interests of their citizens in these “extra-constitutional” bodies then civil society at the national, regional and global levels becomes a necessary alternative.

In summary, as designers of advocacy strategies we need to consider that any institutional arena of decision-making that affects a significant number of people, particularly the less powerful, could and should be viewed as a legitimate domain of donor support. While the policy issue or reform will likely be a principal determinate of the appropriate arena, we need to ensure that our own conceptions of democracy promotion do not cloud other areas that may be of greater importance to the majority of people both in the short or longer terms. And secondly, the choice of political arenas that a donor supports will have significant implications in terms of the degree to which a broader array of citizens become involved in political decision-making; and the nature of CSOs that participate these same processes.

1. Which Civil Society Actors to Invest In?

Little more than five years ago, it would have been difficult to identify more than a handful of what would today be considered civil society actors in most countries in which USAID and its partners now work. One can go so far as to question whether, prior to 1990, civil society even existed in many of these countries, if defined simply as an “autonomous realm of voluntary associational life that exists between the household and the state.” The situation has obviously changed dramatically since that time and with it the question of which of the many new organizations now populating the terrain of an autonomous civil society merit donor support. Pre-transitions present a fairly unique situation for advocacy strategizing. While a range of specific policies and reforms may be possible in other program sectors (e.g., health, environment and economic growth), in the macro-political realm we are talking about nothing short of a total regime (rules) change, including the rights of association, assembly, speech and press. These rights are obviously a precondition to undertaking instrumental advocacy. In such a context, any “pro-democracy” force would be a legitimate object of assistance efforts, keeping in mind the danger that such support could bring to those being assisted.

The challenge in design really takes place once multiparty elections have been held marking the beginning of democratic transition. While staging models talk about early and late “phases” of the transition stage, this does us little good in determining which set of actors to target. Policy reforms in the democracy sector as well those that fall under other strategic objectives will be too numerous to count. Civil society organizations that were supported during the pre-transition may disappear after elections; or their concerns and interests may turn out to be at odds with those of newly-elected democratic governments and/or with USAID’s own program objectives. Labor unions and student organizations are a good example of how principal “political” actors in the pre-transition can become obstacles to economic and social reform in the post-transition. And equally perplexing, that many CSOs – particularly those that are urban-based, elite-led and with narrow constituencies or interests – may take up policies or reform issues that are detrimental to the larger public interest (e.g., labor unions in Africa that want to maintain low agricultural prices, impacts on the livelihoods of the rural farming majority). Some related issues – framed as questions – that need to be consider in the choice of CSO investments include:

- Does it matter whether a CSO’s governance structure promotes participatory decision-making and democratic leadership selection or not? The argument has been made in some Missions that what is important is that the reform or policy gets passed, not necessarily who promotes it. The question then needs to be asked whose agenda is being addressed? Does support of less than democratic, tolerant, representative or trustworthy CSOs contribute to citizen empowerment, or a broader strengthening of civil society objective, (e.g., increased density and diversity at lower levels of association).
- Does it make more sense to invest resources in traditional NGO intermediaries that may not have any membership among the communities in which they work; or would a long-term strategy, which focuses our interventions towards promoting horizontal linkages at the grassroots level, and later the vertical federating of community-based organizations into

higher levels of association make more sense. The choice of investment will obviously have an impact on issues of citizen empowerment and civil society strengthening.

D. Summing Up: Conclusions & Recommendations

An issue that brings much of the previous discussion into focus, i.e., “the cross-cutting nature of D/G programming,” is in fact so relevant that it has been taken up as a study issue by the Agency’s Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE).⁴ The issue can be framed as a question: is democracy and governance a *discrete* (stove-pipe) sector with a unique set of results contributing to the achievement of a higher set of sustainable development objectives? Or, is it a *cross-cutting* sector in which its results should be incorporated and achieved through other strategic objectives, i.e., economic growth, health and population, and the environment? Or is it a mix of both?

In a sense this problematic revolves around both the concept and reality of “civil society” itself as a discrete component within the Agency’s D/G program and particularly when juxtaposed to other D/G components, that is, the rule of law, electoral systems, and governance. Electoral processes, ROL, and governance can be said to be “purely” related to achieving D/G results (e.g., more accountable governments, predictability in the application of laws, decreasing human rights abuses). Civil society as both a concept and reality is nothing more than a set of institutions and organizations autonomous from the state that have the potential to contribute to the achievement of these political or *demand-side* functions. This includes their ability to undertake policy advocacy and political reform efforts on behalf of society vis-a-vis the state over both systemic and sectoral issues. In short, they are **a principal means to the achievement of these other D/G objectives.**

But at the same time, many CSOs also have an entirely different set of *supply-side* functions related to providing their members, clients or the public at large with economic, social and safety-net, and environmental services. Thus, these CSOs are often involved as partners in other USAID-supported sectoral programs (strategic objectives) and contribute to the achievement of relevant results in them. CSOs that undertake these dual functions are far more likely to be involved in advocacy efforts that arise from their sectoral work as policy constraints emerge that affect their ability to adequately serve their members or clients. Does this mean they are uninterested in larger macro-political issues that condition their ability to serve their constituencies? Not necessarily. In some cases it is simply a question of knowledge and skills; in others a matter of opportunity.

When civil society programs are designed to focus on achieving policy change and reform at the macro-political level, the tendency, therefore, has been to focus on a narrow range of *specialized CSOs*, or civic advocacy organizations as they have been called, who have a principal mandate to do instrumental advocacy. As such, human rights organizations, bar associations, and the media among others have been targeted and supported as the principal means for ensuring that desired

⁴ The new study looks at “Integrating D/G Programming with that of other Development Sectors,” and will be examining such issues as: under what conditions should D/G programming be integrated into other sectors of Mission activity? In terms of achieving results in other sectors, when is it important to incorporate D/G components?

policy reform take place. Additionally, CSOs representing special interests such as labor unions, professional associations and business groups, have long been seen as pro-democracy forces and supported under D/G programs with an objective of bringing about policy change and political reform. In some circles, in some regions and in some countries, the wisdom in the heavy “democracy” sectoral investments in this latter group is increasingly being questioned.

When macro-political reform has become the principal objective of a civil society program and specialized CSOs are targeted as the best means to achieve it, then instrumental advocacy normally becomes the sole focus of the overall strategy. The extent to which civil society building in general or CSO strengthening in particular is undertaken largely hinges on whether:

- 1) The specific skills to “do advocacy” exist;
- 2) Grant funding is being made directly available to local organizations; and,
- 3) There is capacity to measure performance and report on results.

Citizen empowerment is not normally a consideration in such programs. In some cases, “non-programmatic” parameters such as a looming country close-out or a fixed country program presence (e.g., Central and Eastern Europe) reinforces the narrow emphasis on instrumental advocacy.

Conversely, civil society strategies that cross-cut a country’s sustainable development program portfolio and target *multi-purpose CSOs* that have a principal service delivery function are far more likely to formulate a broader advocacy strategy that incorporates a civil society strengthening component in addition to an instrumental advocacy one. While policy reform initiatives largely center around sectoral issues, CSOs that see certain issues such as decentralization and democratically-elected local government as critical to their own programs and the welfare of their clients or members can and have become key advocates of macro-political reform.

And it is in countries where “popular participation” has been part of the development lexicon and practice for two or more decades – and particularly where traditional forms of voluntary association have managed to persist during even the most authoritarian of times and eventually emerge into strong and vibrant modern civil societies – that citizen empowerment has become a critical component of not only civil society initiatives but larger D/G strategies and entire sustainable development programs. And perhaps this is the critical element to keep in mind when designing *effective and sustainable* advocacy programs. That is, they can not be separated from the larger program strategy context in which they are being conceived. If sustainable development is our ultimate goal, then informed and active citizens must be at the center of decision-making as well decision-implementing processes. And for them to be effective policy-makers and implementors they need to work through strong institutions and organizations that have a degree of permanence and that generate civic norms and democratic practice through the mere act of voluntary participation in them.

The point was made above that, all other design parameters being equal, how do we choose the advocacy strategy component(s) and the corresponding bundle of elements, most appropriate to a given country context. Here we conclude with the suggestion that, all other design parameters being equal, in the majority of USAID country programs, a holistic strategy working on all three components simultaneously is the most appropriate strategy for achieving both democracy sector objectives as well as broader sustainable development results. However, ***unless instrumental advocacy is a specific objective, outcome or result of the program design, then empowering citizens and strengthening civil society should probably not be undertaken***—at least not as a “democracy sector” activity. It is the act of citizens or CSOs engaging the state, the market, or traditional forms of governance – the less powerful challenging existing power relationships or politics – over policy or decision making, that distinguishes a democracy sector program from those that aim to achieve results through citizens and civil society under other strategic objectives. In short, an advocacy strategy as part of a larger civil society or D/G program must have sector specific as well as a cross-cutting objective if it is to be considered a democracy sector activity.

IV. IDENTIFYING & ADDRESSING ADVOCACY CAPACITY BUILDING NEEDS

In this final chapter, the Resource Guide first refines each of the three individual advocacy strategies and then outlines for USAID Missions and U.S. CSO Partners (both actual and potential) with the specific set of capacity building skills required to operationalize each of the three strategy components discussed herein (Parts A, B, and C). This is followed with a discussion and review of those U.S. CSOs involved in the provision of related capacity building assistance to indigenous CSOs in the countries where USAID works (Part D). Finally, the results of the literature review, and particularly useful training materials are presented (Part E).

In order to identify relevant capacity building needs for each of the three components of the advocacy strategy presented in this Guide, it is necessary to first begin looking at the functions that each actor, i.e., citizens and CSOs, is expected to undertake through the concerned component. Knowing the functions that these actors are to undertake, it is then possible to define the skills areas and expertise that they need to carry them out. While this discussion also provides more design specific guidance on what each component strategy would look like “operationalized,” there is no attempt to design an actual step-by-step “advocacy” program, particularly for the instrumental advocacy component. This is the work that the US CSOs that were interviewed and profiled for this study currently do and could be tapped to undertake for USAID Missions and their American and host country CSO partners. Each of the three strategy components is discussed in turn below.

A. Empowering Citizens to Participate in Political Life

The achievement of USAID’s overall democracy and governance strategic objective or result, *sustainable democracies built*, ultimately rests with an empowered citizenry capable of acting individually and collectively to ensure their interests as well as those of the larger polity are heard and acted on. Attaining the advocacy strategic objective or result defined above, *effective and sustainable advocacy achieved* is equally dependent on an empowered and active citizenry. Thus, an intermediate result framed as *sustainable citizens built* ties a citizen empowerment strategy

equally to both the Agency’s goal of sustainable democracies and the ultimate objective proposed in this Guide, sustained and effective advocacy. As such, we need to point out again at this point, that a citizen empowerment strategy is a singularly *political* result that contributes to these two other higher level political results.

1. Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing

In developing a strategy of citizen empowerment, we must first recognize that it is not necessary that every citizen and every CSO become a skilled advocate, that is, capable of undertaking “instrumental advocacy,” including acting on every issue that faces the polity as a whole. What is important, however, is that all citizens and CSOs ideally – or a critical mass practically – are aware and capable of acting on a range of issues – economic, social, cultural, environmental and political – from the local to national levels. While political scientists decry the falling levels of citizen voting in the United States and other industrialized countries, it is often forgotten that citizens have other means of expressing their political selves, and that is through the tens of thousands of neighborhood associations and community-based organizations that are addressing problems ranging from failing school systems to polluted water to joblessness and crime. It is only when they run up against problems having their origins in the legal, policy, fiscal or regulatory environment that they need to become “political” and think about how to influence public policy and/or promote political reform. In short, the strategy must be based on the premise that every person is potentially capable of becoming politically active citizen.

The operational challenge of the citizen empowerment strategy is how to target and deliver capacity building assistance to people who, in addition to having a political “self,” also have social, economic, environmental and cultural ones, mirroring the underlying conception of sustainable development itself. Two operational issues emerge from this challenge and deal with issues of sequencing of support. First, is whether citizens are targeted individually or within their organizations? And the second concerns the nature and content of the capacity building interventions that are designed to facilitate their empowerment. Because the two issues are inter-related in operational terms they are discussed together.

This strategy component proposes that in the great majority of countries in which USAID works that targeting citizens in their organizations is the most effective way to promote the empowerment objective. Beside the relatively small number of specialized “civics” (e.g., human rights organizations, women’s legal associations, policy institutes) whose principal purpose is to engage state actors over issues of a macro-political nature, the vast majority of citizen organizations are community-based, relatively small and concerned primarily with addressing local problems. Thus, while we are designing a set of largely capacitating interventions that have a decidedly political objective, i.e., to empower citizens, we are targeting what are primarily multipurpose organizations whose concerns are primarily social and economic. The resolution to this issue is by defining politically empowered (active and informed) citizens *as those who exercise control over their lives through participation in the decisions that affect them individually and collectively.*

A quick way to illustrate the content and sequencing of a citizen empowerment strategy, taking the above into consideration, is to focus on civic education programs, a D/G programmatic area that USAID Missions have developed and implemented in each of the principal regions. The logic of the citizen empowerment strategy presented here would follow the sequence presented in Chapter III above. Thus, a “traditional” civic education program – one that is not tied to citizen empowerment as part of a larger advocacy strategy – would come later in the strategy component *sequence* after people were in groups they joined voluntarily; were utilizing adult learning methodologies, including functional literacy, that helped them to identify, prioritize and identify their problems; and were capable of developing strategies for addressing them.

In the virtuous circle advocacy strategy presented here, however, civic education with the objective of building an informed citizenry, begins in the earliest phase of the citizen empowerment process. Thus the *content* of civic education programs would focus on helping citizens gain control over their lives – economic and social as well as purely political – by providing them with the knowledge, skills and expertise to participate in decision-making processes at the local level and beyond. *Civic education* thus becomes a precursor to *civic action* which includes instrumental advocacy, and encompasses the bundle of skills areas that are associated with an “ideal state of being” of an empowered citizenry (see Chapter III).

The content of a civic education program would start with the issues that most directly affect the welfare of citizens as the focus of building problem solving capacity. Thus, in the early stage of a citizen empowerment capacity building strategy, citizen members of CSOs would, for instance, learn about the policies and laws that govern their ability to secure credit, run their own schools, manage natural resources in their communities, or that define their rights to public finances. It would further discuss in *which political arena* decisions related to these issues were made and *who the political actors* were that made them. Before citizens can act they must be informed and equipped to do so. That is the purpose of the broadly conceived civic education intervention proposed here. And, it contrasts to the largely “political” content of most citizen education programs that are not tied to a citizen empowerment, which often target citizens individually, and which disseminate information such as the universal declaration of human rights or the substance of the country’s constitution.

2. Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs

One of the principal emphases of a citizen empowerment strategy is to ensure that citizens are able to define their concerns or interests, establish a corresponding set of priorities, and then act, whether individually or through their organizations, to achieve them. This strategy component addresses the concern of *who* defines *what* policy issue or reform agenda gets placed before “public” decision-makers or powerholders. The *rationale* for pursuing the transformational component of the overall advocacy strategy is that issues originating from a broad citizen base will have more sustained support and will be taken far more seriously than those that come from a single organization or coalition without strong grassroots involvement. In short, those CSOs presenting the issue, policy or reform, as well as the issue, policy or reform itself, will have the credibility and legitimacy necessary to withstand political opponents at any point in the process of achieving key policy outcomes (see Part C, below).

A citizen empowerment or participation strategy is based on *transforming* individuals, men and women, often isolated from each other and larger social, economic and political processes, into **active and informed citizens**. Central to this strategy component, however, is the operational tenet that citizen's, people's or community-based organizations – the primary units of civil society – remain the essential focal point of the operational strategy because, as writers from de Tocqueville to Putnam have noted, these are the “free schools” where citizenship is best learned, where people are most likely to grow and develop as citizens, and where the civic values of social capital are generated. While these grassroots CSOs are normally created to address common problems or promote shared interests in social and economic life, *the concern of a D/G advocacy program is with building the civic skills and capacities necessary for participation in political life*. However, as noted above, the conception of “political” as relates to a citizen empowerment strategy goes to the heart of politics which simply put is about exercising power for “civic” purposes.

Because many civic education and action skills and capacities are used by citizens in other “life” pursuits (e.g., individual and collective problem solving around social, economic and even survival issues), USAID Missions and their CSO partners must consider how to share the challenge for achieving results jointly when in addition to a D/G strategic objective, one or more other SOs requires “empowered citizens” to achieve their stated results.

Having further refined this operational strategy and identified the “functions” of an empowered citizen, we are now ready to identify the capacity building areas that need to be addressed by technical assistance providers. We would just note that the transformational advocacy component is a building block of both the civil society strengthening and instrumental advocacy components. Its aims are “political” with the ultimate objective being the ability of citizens to undertake instrumental advocacy through politically active CSOs. Thus, the specific set of skills, knowledge and expertise that are unique to this strategy component must also prepare politically empowered citizen to participate in CSOs and, when necessary, to engage in policy influence campaigns designed to achieve well-defined policy outcomes.

An effective and sustainable citizen should possess the following capacities:

- Functionally literate and numeric
- The ability to distinguish between the “public” interest and “private” interest
- An understanding of the benefits of voluntary association to achieve collective objectives
- The principles of democracy and good governance practiced internally
- An ability to identify, prioritize and deliberate on public (shared or collective) problems
- An understanding of the process of public decision/policy making
- An awareness of economic and social rights, including laws, policies and regulations
- An awareness of his/her political rights and duties as a citizen
- A basic understanding of the functioning of a constitutional democracy

B. Developing a Permanent Capacity for Civic Engagement

On our continuum of advocacy strategies, civil society strengthening follows that citizen empowerment. However, we have also pointed out that the principal locus of citizen learning and empowerment is in the organizations that they create themselves. It is strengthening these primary units of civil society into enduring institutions capable of producing new generations of citizens capable of promoting and defending their interests, which is the object of this strategy component. It is, therefore, both of these functions of civil society and its organizations that a capacity building strategy must address simultaneously.

1. Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing

The developmental advocacy component recognizes that civil society's capacity to engage the state, market or other arenas of political decision-making is an evolutionary or "developmental" process. As such:

- It takes place over time due to the simple fact that it is highly dependent on the *quantity and quality of citizen participation*; and
- The individual CSO is no stronger than the members that compose it, just as the wider "realm" of civil society depends on the diversity, density and effectiveness of individual CSOs.

Thus, our focus is on operational strategies that seek to strengthen individual CSOs as well as the linkages between them, both at different levels of association (e.g., primary, intermediary and tertiary); and between the relatively few CSOs with specialized civic action (democracy sectoral) functions, and the great majority that are multipurpose in nature. In short, the principal objective of this strategy component is to build the capacity of both the sector of civil society and the organizations that compose it as a means for developing a long-term, more sustainable means for citizens, and particularly the poor and disadvantaged, to gain a "voice" and participate in decision-making at the local level and beyond.

The challenge for USAID, and its U.S. CSO partners, is how and in what sequence to build these two sets of mutually inter-related capacities; or put differently, how to build strong primary, intermediary and tertiary units of civil society so that the individual citizen is connected to and can participate effectively in political processes taking place beyond the local level. In order to reach the individual grassroots CSO – the locus where citizen empowerment capacities are built – an **intermediary** range of CSOs must exist that can work with and strengthen them. Capacity building at the grassroots level has historically been the province of international, including U.S. NGOs, and increasingly their southern and eastern NGO counterparts. The nature of these interventions, however, has generally related to the needs of their programs in social, economic, environmental and emergency relief sectors. Viewing D/G as a sector itself with its own unique set of capacities requires either "retro-fitting" existing NGOs with new skills and/or strengthening new and more specialized ones as they emerge to meet the new requirements of the changed context. In either case, the intermediary CSOs working at the grassroots level in D/G matters will (or should) be homegrown.

But intermediary CSOs are also needed to represent the interests of grassroots CSOs vis-a-vis public decision-makers in political arenas beyond the very local level. As noted in chapter three, the principal strategy issue is whether to support and build the capacity of traditional NGOs to fulfill this function, or considers promoting and/or working with more complex federated structures of grassroots CSOs. Not only is this a fundamental strategic or developmental decision, but also the practical implications in terms of capacity building strategies are equally stark.

Whether it is the traditional development NGO or the federation of grassroots CSOs that undertakes the civic action function, the capacity building skills will be essentially the same, i.e., those of instrumental advocacy. However, the fundamental difference in organizational type based on governance structure – NGO decision-making and leadership selection is limited to a self-appointed board and management unit while a federated body makes decisions and chooses leaders democratically by members – leads to an entirely different set of internal capacity building needs. Particularly where intermediary CSOs are multipurpose in nature, and undertaking sectoral as well as D/G functions, this Guide recommends a strategy that invests in federated bodies over the longer term. This is, in fact, the strategy undertaken, *inter-alia*, in the Philippines, Bangladesh and Mali where USAID programs have had the greatest success in achieving both overall D/G as well as more limited advocacy objectives.

Finally, at the tertiary level, are a far smaller number of much more specialized *support* CSOs that: a) provide services to intermediary and, to a lesser extent, primary level CSOs; and b) address needs unique to the sector itself. Thus, some support CSOs will target the capacity building needs of intermediary CSOs who work with primary level CSOs (transformational advocacy) and also engage state and market actors at district or regional levels (instrumental advocacy). Other “sector” level CSOs will target such issues as protecting and promoting the rights of civil society itself vis-a-vis other macro-political actors and, in some cases, in larger regional and global political arenas. USAID and its U.S. CSO partners will also have a significant role to play in building capacity at this level in a civil society strengthening strategy.

2. Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs

As concerns individual CSOs, whether grassroots, intermediary or support, an operational strategy would look at building capacity in two basic areas: that is, a capacity to undertake what might be called *democratic self-governance* and secondly, *civic action*. The former is directed at building internal skills, knowledge and expertise; and the latter to influencing external decision-making structures. Under the rubric of democratic self-governance we include developing a governance structure that promotes democratic decision-making and leadership selection; strategic planning and management (e.g., formulating results frameworks and performance measurement systems); generic resource management skills (e.g., financial, information, human); and resource mobilization. These are the “traditional” capacity building skills that have long been subsumed under NGO institutional development programs. They are necessary to a CSO’s ability to undertake effective and sustained policy advocacy. But following the logic of the comprehensive “advocacy” strategy proposed here, they would not be undertaken in a D/G-

financed activity unless they were tied to achieving the concrete results (policy outcomes) of instrumental advocacy.

At the level of building or strengthening a sectoral capacity to undertake civic action – the ability of CSOs to engage other political actors over public issues including policymaking and governance performance – there are a number of critical interventions to be considered. In general, the strategy places the focus on primary level CSOs, the building blocks of democracy and development and the principal locus of citizen participation, but acknowledges the limitations of effecting change beyond the very local level. In order to increase or leverage the political impact of primary levels of associations (and by extension their citizen members), a civil society strengthening strategy would promote the building of horizontal networks of solidarity among similar organizations and eventually their vertical federation into higher levels of association.

CSOs at each of the three levels of association that compose civil society and who undertake D/G-related functions as discussed above, need to have a range of capacities to achieve developmental or civil society strengthening/social capital building component objectives. They will need to demonstrate a capacity in the following areas:

At the Tertiary or Support Level of Civil Society

CSOs at this level should demonstrate capacity in the following areas:

- Specialized sector-wide functions such as representation and coordination; policy analysis, formulation and analysis; and conflict management and dispute resolution
- An ability to build broad based intra-sectoral coalitions, alliances, networks, etc., that also link the primary to tertiary levels and thus generate wide-spread support and legitimacy
- An ability to provide training and technical assistance in a number of technical and management areas related to democratic self-governance and civic action capacities

At the Level of the Individual CSO

A strengthened, politically active CSO at either the intermediary or grassroots level should demonstrate capacities in the following areas:

- An agreed upon vision and mission which includes citizen representation and civic action
- A governance structure that promotes participatory decision-making and leadership selection
- A strategic plan with well defined objectives/results and performance indicators
- Generic management development skills including resource (financial, human, information) management and activity design, planning, management and evaluation
- An institutional sustainability including resource mobilization strategy
- Strong linkages to and is grounded in the surrounding community
- A constituency outreach, building and education program
- An understanding of the need to build intra-sectoral (civil society) linkages including participation in federations, unions, networks, coalitions and alliances
- An understanding of the importance of building inter-sectoral linkages with state and market actors

- An ability to mount an effective advocacy campaign

C. Achieving Key Policy Outcomes

The last element in an effective and sustainable advocacy strategy is the ability to achieve key policy outcomes through a capacity to mount an effective issues campaign. While this is the last strategy component on the advocacy continuum, as discussed in greater detail below, circumstances often dictate that it be undertaken before optimum conditions have been obtained through achievement of objectives made possible by the other two advocacy strategy components.

1. Refining the Strategy Component & Issues of Sequencing

When citizens and their organizations turn to instrumental advocacy as a means to effect policy change and political reform it is an indication that they believe their efforts have some chance of success. Increasing these odds is what the instrumental advocacy strategy addresses. While this means acquiring a set of skills, tactics, techniques and approaches related to “issue’s campaigning,” in many countries in which USAID works the application of this capacity often takes place under situations that are less than favorable in terms of the larger macro-political environment. Thus, selecting the appropriate issue, the political arena in which it takes place, and the CSO best placed to undertake it is critical to *the achievement of key policy outcomes*, the instrumental advocacy objective. It is equally critical to achieving transformational and developmental strategy results that are affected by it through backward linkages.

For the majority of grassroots CSOs, regardless of the degree of political space that exists within a given polity, “sectoral” issues are likely to be most relevant to their immediate and long-term needs. The single exception would relate to the abuse of human rights or civil liberties committed by traditional authorities against their charges in informal political arenas. Beyond these informal arenas of decision-making, grassroots CSOs may be able to achieve desired sectoral policy outcomes in other local level political arenas including decentralized local government and business or commercial concerns operating at the very local level. Increasing the odds of favorable policy outcomes obtaining at the local level as well as in higher level arenas that decide issues of interest to the grassroots CSOs, will depend on whether there are intermediary CSOs capable of extending local interests by engaging these political arenas. In a weak and undifferentiated civil society with little citizen involvement, traditional development NGOs are likely to be the most effective actors undertaking instrumental advocacy on behalf of grassroots CSOs and their communities at all levels.

A given civil society may have no choice in tackling macro-political issues in the absence of both an empowered citizenry and strong, politically active civil society. Either fundamental political rights are so abused and/or there are such a plethora of key political reforms necessary to substantively change the balance of power between state and society that the few CSOs operating at the macro-political must act. However, achieving success at this level, i.e., sustained policy change or political reform, is far more a function of external donor pressure in the initial stages than it is the sophistication of a specialized CSO’s capacity in issues campaigning. Professional associations (e.g., bar associations, business groups), labor unions and particularly the

independent media, while having few roots to the local level are often viewed by the state with some degree of legitimacy if not anxiety. Although it likely that they will more have success in promoting sectoral issues such as urban pollution and economic reform. NGO consortia and networks as well as cooperatives, credit unions other “apex” organizations representing grassroots CSOs will likely be the only organizations pressing for more liberal associational laws with expanded benefits.

2. Functions Define Skills and Capacity Building Needs

In order to define capacity building needs under the instrumental advocacy component we need to look at two areas of an operationalized strategy that CSOs would undertake in attempting to change or influence policy or effect political reform. The first area centers on the process of policy influence; and the second, the range of advocacy or lobbying tactics and strategies used in achieving specific policy changes. The following two sections address each of these operational areas in turn:

a) Stages in the Policy Influence Process

Our concern here is with how an *issues’ advocacy campaign* is designed, launched and evaluated. The literature, including CSO training materials reviewed during the study phase, present a fairly clear and consistent framework in terms of the broad stages, and the steps within them that constitute the *policy influence process*. Virtually all the models reviewed included the following stages and steps within them:

Stage One: Developing the Strategic Plan

A successful advocacy campaign does not just happen. It is the result of good planning, from choosing the issue that will become the focus of the campaign; to an assessment of the resources required to mount it; to selecting the most appropriate campaign strategy. The following steps contribute to the development of a strategic plan:

Issue identification/agenda setting: the very first step in the process is often the most important. Framed as questions the following points must be considered when developing policy influence strategies: What issues, whether in the form of desired policies or reforms or even problems, get chosen and acted on including getting placed in the concerned political arena? How are they chosen? How are priorities established from among the multitude of issues, policies, problems, etc., that exist at any given time? Who chooses the issues and sets the policy agendas? How open and participative the process is obviously makes a difference to what issue or problem gets addressed and who participates during its implementation. As discussed significant detail above, which of the strategy component(s) is chosen will largely determine how the issue, policy or problem is identified, prioritized and selected. The role that donors play in this stage is often a major determinant of the issue or policy reform selected. As a rule of thumb, risks to the CSO need to be calculated before intervening.

Assessing the External Policy Influence Environment: Defining potential institutional allies or enemies as well as the political arena most appropriate to the issue chosen is a critical step. A range of analytic tools and methodologies, including “power-mapping” exercises and “stakeholder analyses” are used in this step. Constituencies with a similar interest in seeing the selected issue acted on are identified as a first step in the building of coalitions, alliances and the mobilization of members or clients; as are the principal groups that are likely to oppose the desired policy change or reform.

Policy Analysis and Formulation: In many, if not most, cases of policy influence and issue campaigning a policy or law has to be analyzed and formulated or drafted before an actual campaign is mounted or advocacy takes place. What is the position that is being taken by the group vis-a-vis a certain policy, law or reform? Has it been well-researched? Can it be backed up factually? Is the analysis sound? Is the position well-articulated and appropriate to the concerned decision-making body (political arena)? If the group campaigning for policy change or reform is to be taken seriously, it must have demonstrated a credible capacity for policy research, analysis and formulation; or gone to those who have the corresponding skills.

Assessing Resource Needs: A critical component of any plan or campaign is an assessment of its resource needs including those that are currently available from within the group/coalition and those which must be raised or mobilized. The type of resources required for a given campaign is dependent on a number of factors including the identified political arena and the nature or composition of the advocate group itself. And money is by no means the only or even the most important type of resource in all campaign strategies. Mobilizing volunteers, votes, and powerful allies can be just as important as financial contributions.

Choosing and Planning the Right Campaign Strategy: Achieving a desired policy outcome will ultimately hinge on the nature of the campaign strategy or advocacy tactics chosen. The range of such strategies is numerous and is discussed in more detail in the following section. Suffice it to note here that the choice of strategy including a range of tactics is a function of a number of factors that are identified in early steps. The factors include the nature of the issue or reform; the arena of decision-making that it takes place; the composition of the group or coalition pressing for the change and those opposing it; and the range of resources available to the advocate in pursuit of its policy goals.

Stage Two: Mounting the Campaign/Managing for Results

Implementing the plan involves a range of individual actions that require a significant degree of coordination and timing. Thus, during this second stage the emphasis turns from design skills to the management of both resources and relationships including partners, clients and even opponents. The objective of these efforts is with achieving the desired policy outcome or campaign objective. But since the concerned CSO or alliance normally does not implement the concerned policy or enforce the law – it is mainly limited to attempts at influence – then in addition to mounting a successful campaign it must also have a capacity to monitor its implementation or enforcement by the concerned agency (e.g., the central executive, local

government, a corporation or traditional authority). In short, a successful campaign is one in which the result or desired change is sustained over time.

Stage Three: Evaluation and Reformulation

Even when a policy or reform has been successfully implemented and sustained over time, the conditions that gave rise to it will have changed – in some cases as a result of the policy reform itself – requiring an evaluation of its impact and perhaps a reformulation of the initial strategy. At a minimum, any organization will want to evaluate the validity of its design as well as the effectiveness of its management of the campaign itself. Capacities required in this stage include not just those of evaluation, but analysis and design skills as well.

Each of these three stages and several steps has a set of corresponding skills that CSOs should possess to be effective in influencing policy change or political reform. It is in stage two, however, that involves the choice of specific “campaign or operational strategies” designed to achieve key policy or reform outcomes. It is to these strategies that the discussion now turns.

b) Operational Campaign Strategies

There are a wide range of campaign or “advocacy” strategies that CSOs have employed to influence policies and pursue reform. Most, if not all of these strategies are part of the training programs of U.S. CSOs and have been used extensively by them in training programs in each of the principal regions. Valerie Miller⁵ offers a comprehensive set of operational strategies that CSOs employ in this regard. The following provides a brief summary of the most important of these strategies.

(a) *Collaboration strategies:* are used when relatively high levels of compatibility and agreement exist on policy issues between state and civil society; the same could be said for other power arenas (e.g., market, local government, traditional authorities). CSOs collaborate with the state in, for example, delivering public services, that is, in implementing public policy. By demonstrating their ability to be effective partners in this supply-side governance function, CSOs may then be asked to participate in helping to formulate policies in their area of expertise. NGOs and community-based resource user associations have had considerable success in being invited (with donor encouragement) by a significant number of African governments to participate in the formulation of National (and local) Environmental Action Plans (NEAP) based on their early work in conservation and natural resource management.

(b) *Modeling strategies:* involve the design and demonstration of workable development approaches the state then incorporates into desired policies. Community-based health care, primary (girls) education and number of safety-net services have been sectoral areas where development NGOs have had significant success in influencing government policymaking with innovative and successful programs. The Bangladesh Primary Education Program which was started by a number of Bangladeshi NGOs is perhaps one of the best examples of how NGOs

⁵ See, Miller, Valerie, 1993. *Policy Influence by Development NGOs: A Vehicle for Strengthening*, prepared for the Arnova Conference, Toronto.

were able to influence both government and NGO policies and expand what was a pilot program into a nationwide program.

(c) **Education strategies:** primarily specialized CSOs provide research data and background materials to state decision-makers as well as the general public on policy issues and draft legislation. In West Bank/Gaza a number of policy institutes and research centers are undertaking research, analysis and policy formulation which is in some cases being provided to the Palestinian Legislative Council which lacks its own congressional-like research service. There are also several survey research and polling firms whose work is paid close attention to by both the Palestinian Authority and the public at large. There is little doubt that policies are significantly affected by their work that is viewed as balanced and fair.

(d) **Persuasion strategies:** Specialized CSOs that undertake their own policy research, analysis and formulation, take these policy outputs and use them directly or provide them to other CSOs better able to advocate in the appropriate decision-making arena for policy change/reform. Two “tactics” that flow from this strategy are presented below:

- i. **Clout Tactics:** mobilizing popular support through coalition-building, accountability sessions with legislators, using opinion leaders for lobbying, or get-out-the-vote efforts during electoral campaigns, etc. The idea is to present decision-makers with an overwhelming show of support for a given policy change or political reform. While clout tactics depend on demonstration of popular support, the specific tactics used stay within the rules of the game.
- ii. **Negotiation Tactics:** the ability of groups to demonstrate clout are better placed to negotiate from a position of equality vis-a-vis other political actors at various points in policy-making process. Indigenous peoples in Brazil among other countries use both sets of persuasion tactics. The use of these tactics pertain as well to minorities, the poor and other socially marginalized groups including the urban poor in the Philippines and the rural peasantry in a number of central American countries.

(e) **Litigation strategies:** use of the court system to uphold or challenge existing and new legislation or challenge a proposed policy. While one of the least used political arenas for most of the past four decades, as judicial systems gain a measure of independence from the executive branch they are increasingly used to challenge constitutional abuses. Pertains equally to corporate world where consumer associations from the United States to Tanzania challenge product safety on behalf of the general public.

(f) **Contestation strategies:** use of protest and confrontation in a variety of ways to draw attention to the negative impacts of state policies and to bring pressure for change. Strategies are used in a variety of policy arenas and involve a number of players and advocacy targets.

Other authors and a number of CSOs have discussed the use of such related strategies as: coalition or alliance building and forging inter and intra-sectoral alliances; fundraising and mobilizing resources; public relations campaigns; and information and media strategies.

This advocacy component requires a finite set of skills that concerned organizations must possess to achieve their policy objectives. They include

- Knowledge of the stages in an advocacy/issues campaign
- Choosing the issue/setting the agenda
- Mapping power relations (power mapping)
- Resource mobilization (e.g., votes, money, people, expertise)
- Policy analysis including research and data collection
- Policy formulation, legislative drafting, developing legal briefs
- Building coalitions and alliances
- Policy/reform implementation monitoring and oversight
- Evaluating policy implementation and reformulation as appropriate
- Effective media use
- Running an effective public meeting
- Effective public speaking skills
- The range of (and being able to choose from the) available advocacy tactics, techniques, operational strategies/issue or advocacy campaigning

D. US CSO Advocacy Capacity Building Providers

The original study terms of reference called for a review of organizations involved in the field of advocacy and particularly those that provided international training and technical assistance in this field. The same requirement was maintained as it was determined that a *Resource Guide* would be the useful document to USAID Missions and their US and local CSO partners. This section provides an overview of the findings of this review.

1. Introduction and Methodology

During the course of the advocacy strategies' study a total of 40 US CSOs and 3 for-profit consulting firms were interviewed (see Annex 1) to elicit their views on "advocacy" strategizing and to determine the extent of their involvement in advocacy programming. Of these 43 organizations 22 were participating as grantees, sub-grantees or contractors in an USAID-financed development program. From our initial review of the literature and first round of interviews with many of these organizations, the Team developed its *Advocacy Strategies* conceptual framework. The framework, which included the three component strategies as well as an initial list of corresponding skills per component, was presented to USAID in January 1997. When the decision was made to move from a study to the preparation of this Resource Guide, the Team was charged with identifying those organizations that were delivering training and/or technical assistance in the advocacy field. Our criteria for selecting organizations that would be included in the Guide was two-fold:

- 1) that they were undertaking two or more components of the advocacy strategy in their international projects and programs of which one was instrumental advocacy;

- 2) that they were directly delivering capacity building interventions using their own staff and not through contracts to other organizations.

Next the Team developed a *matrix* of skills by advocacy component that were considered necessary elements either singly or in combination to promote increased capacity among their local partners. From our initial interviews we identified 19 organizations that met the above criteria and asked them to fill in the matrix. We also asked them to prepare an organizational profile indicating their expertise in the field of advocacy. Table one below, provides the completed matrix and Annex 6 contains the profiles of the 19 CSOs.

TABLE 1: SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE ADVOCACY TRAINING

TRAINING SKILLS	ADF	AED	AF	AI	CEDPA	PP	CAI	CC
I. TRANSFORMATIONAL ADVOCACY:								
<i>CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT</i>								
Adult Learning & Popular Education Methodologies		X	X	X	X		X	X
<i>Problem/Issue: Identification, Prioritizing, Solving</i>	X	X	X	X	X			
<i>Civic Education & Political Learning</i>	X		X	X	X		X	X
<i>Targeting Appropriate Decision-Making Arena</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Public Deliberation Methodologies</i>			X	X	X			X
<i>Identifying & Facilitating a Common Vision among CSOs</i>	X	X	X	X	X			
II. DEVELOPMENTAL ADVOCACY:								
<i>CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING</i>								
<i>On Becoming an Activist/Social Organizer</i>	X	X	X	X	X			X
<i>Approaches & Techniques to Community Organization</i>	X	X	X	X	X			
<i>Building & Using Political Power</i>	X	X	X	X	X			
<i>Conducting an Organizational Needs Assessment</i>	X		X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Formulating a Mission Statement</i>	X		X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Resource Management (e.g., human, financial)</i>	X		X		X			
<i>Establishing an Internal Organizational Structure</i>	X		X	X	X			
<i>Promoting Internal Democratic Practices</i>	X		X	X	X			
<i>Strategic Planning</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Constituency Outreach, Building & Education</i>	X	X	X	X	X			X
<i>Coalition Building (e.g., federating/horizontal linkages)</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
<i>Gender Analysis</i>								
III. INSTRUMENTAL ADVOCACY								
<i>INFLUENCING POLICY OUTCOMES</i>								
<i>Managing an Advocacy Campaign</i>	X	X	X	X	X			X
<i>Choosing the Issue/Setting a Policy Agenda</i>	X	X	X	X	X			
<i>Power Mapping/Stakeholder Analysis</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Resource Mobilization (e.g., human, financial, votes)</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Policy Analysis</i>	X	X	X	X		X	X	
<i>Research & Data Collecting</i>	X	X	X	X		X	X	
<i>Policy Formulation</i>	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
<i>Drafting Legislation & Legal Briefs</i>	X		X	X		X		
<i>Choosing the Appropriate Issue Campaign Strategy</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Coalition and Alliance Building</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
<i>Running a Public Meeting</i>	X	X		X	X			X
<i>Monitoring Policy/Reform Implementation</i>	X	X		X		X		X
<i>Evaluation of Campaign Strategy & Implementation</i>	X	X		X		X		X
<i>Policy reformulation</i>	X	X		X		X		X

SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE ADVOCACY TRAINING

TRAINING SKILLS	IDR	TSP	IPPF	MSI	NDI	POA	PACT
I. TRANSFORMATIONAL ADVOCACY:							
<i>CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT</i>							
<i>Adult Learning/Popular Education Methodology</i>	X	X		X	X	X	
<i>Problem/Issue: Identification, Prioritizing, Solving</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Civic Education & Political Learning</i>	X	X		X	X	X	
<i>Targeting the Appropriate Decision-Making Arena</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Public Deliberation Methodology</i>		X		X	X	X	
<i>Identifying & Facilitating a Common Vision among CSOs</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II. DEVELOPMENTAL ADVOCACY:							
<i>CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING</i>							
<i>On Becoming an Activist/Social Organizer</i>		X		X	X		
<i>Approaches & Techniques to Community Organization</i>		X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Building & Using Political Power</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Conducting an Organizational Needs Assessment</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Formulating a Mission statement</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Resource Management (e.g., human, financial)</i>		X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Establishing Internal Organizational structure</i>	X	X		X	X	X	X
<i>Promoting Internal Democratic Practices</i>	X	X		X	X	X	X
<i>Strategic Planning</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Constituency Outreach, Building & Education</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Coalition Building (e.g., federating/horizontal linkages)</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Gender Analysis</i>							
III. INSTRUMENTAL ADVOCACY:							
<i>INFLUENCING POLICY OUTCOMES</i>							
<i>Managing an Advocacy Campaign</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Choosing the Issue/Setting a Policy Agenda</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Power Mapping/Stakeholder Analysis</i>	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Resource Mobilization (e.g., financial, human, votes)</i>		X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Policy Analysis</i>	X	X	X	X	X		
<i>Research & Data Collecting</i>	X	X		X	X		
<i>Policy Formulation</i>	X			X	X		
<i>Drafting Legislation & Legal Briefs</i>					X		
<i>Choosing the Appropriate Campaign Advocacy Strategy</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>Coalition and Alliance Building</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Running a Public Meeting</i>	X	X		X	X	X	
<i>Monitoring Policy/Reform Implementation</i>	X	X		X	X		
<i>Evaluation of Campaign Strategy & Implementation</i>	X	X		X	X		
<i>Policy reformulation</i>				X	X		

SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE ADVOCACY TRAINING

TRAINING SKILLS	UI	WOLA	WL/PIDT	WL/SIT			
I. TRANSFORMATIONAL ADVOCACY:							
<i>CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT</i>							
Adult Education & Popular Learning Methodologies	X	X		X			
<i>Problem/Issue: Identification, Prioritizing, Solving</i>	X	X					
<i>Civic Education & Political Learning</i>	X			X			
<i>Targeting The appropriate decision-making arena</i>	X	X		X			
<i>Public Deliberation Methodology</i>							
<i>Identifying & Facilitating a Common Vision among CSOs</i>							
II. DEVELOPMENTAL ADVOCACY:							
<i>CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING</i>			X	X			
<i>On Becoming an Activist/Social Organizer</i>	X		X	X			
<i>Approaches & Techniques to Community Organization</i>	X		X				
<i>Building & Using Political Power</i>	X	X	X				
<i>Conducting an Organizational Needs Assessment</i>	X		X	X			
<i>Formulating a Mission Statement</i>	X		X	X			
<i>Resource Management (e.g., human, financial)</i>	X		X				
<i>Establishing an Internal Organizational Structure</i>	X		X				
<i>Promoting Internal Democratic Practices</i>	X		X				
<i>Strategic Planning</i>	X	X	X	X			
<i>Constituency Outreach, Building & Education</i>	X		X				
<i>Coalition Building (e.g., federating/ horizontal linkages)</i>	X	X	X	X			
<i>Gender Analysis</i>							
III. INSTRUMENTAL ADVOCACY							
<i>POLICY INFLUENCING</i>				X			
<i>Managing an Advocacy Campaign</i>		X		X			
<i>Choosing the Issue/Setting a Policy Agenda</i>		X					
<i>Power Mapping/Stakeholder Analysis</i>		X					
<i>Resource Mobilization (e.g., money, people, votes)</i>		X					
<i>Policy Analysis</i>		X		X			
<i>Research & Data Collection</i>		X		X			
<i>Policy Formulation</i>		X		X			
<i>Drafting Legislation & Legal Briefs</i>							
<i>Choosing the Appropriate Advocacy Campaign Strategy</i>		X		X			
<i>Coalition and Alliance Building</i>	X	X		X			
<i>Running a Public Meeting</i>	X						
<i>Monitoring Policy/Reform Implementation</i>				X			
<i>Evaluation of Campaign Strategy & Implementation</i>				X			
<i>Policy reformulation</i>							

Just as a final note, it should be clearly stated that the Team members that conducted the study and prepared this Guide made no attempt to “evaluate” or “assess” the capacity of the interviewed and profiled organizations to deliver training and technical assistance in the advocacy field. Our primary interest was in gaining their input into the study and later the Resource Guide; and secondarily to have the opportunity to review their writings in this newly emerging field and the training materials that they had developed and used in their international programs. While we realize it is possible that a number of important organizations – either those interviewed or those not found – we believe that the organizations included in the matrix are, by and large, the principal organizations providing, or with the potential to provide, assistance in USAID-financed D/G programs with an advocacy component.

2. Summary Overview of CSO Advocacy Training Activities

Based on the study undertaken for this Guide conclusions can be reached concerning CSO training activities in the advocacy field in a number of areas. While we provide summaries of these activities in this section, individual profiles exist for each of the organizations interviewed.

- a) All organizations undertake advocacy programs in at least one of the principal regions in which USAID works; and many of them work in at least one more.
 - **AFRICA:** AED, CAI, TAF, AI, CEDPA, PP, NDI, IDR, PACT, MSI, WLI/PIDT, WLI/SIT
 - **ASIA:** AI, TAF, PP, CEDPA, WLI/SIT, PACT, NDI, IDR
 - **LATIN AMERICA:** TAF, ADF, IDR, PP, CEDPA, WOLA, PACT, POA, NDI, IPPF/WHR
 - **CEE/NIS:** ADF, CAI, PP, CEDPA, WLI/PIDT, NDI, JHU/IPC,
 - **MIDDLE EAST:** TAF, CEDPA, PP
- b) All but one organization undertake interventions in the citizen empowerment component; all provide capacity building in civil society strengthening; and all undertake relevant interventions in the instrumental advocacy component (see matrix).
- c) All organizations work with indigenous CSOs; a number work with government agencies; and several target business actors. Several organizations stated that they only work with other organizations that take on “ethical” issues that touch the public interest rather than for organizations that promotes private narrow interests. The majority has developed their advocacy programs within a “public interest” paradigm.
 - MSI supports a network of business firms in West Africa; PP works with commercial groups
 - The AED SARA Project works with researchers and policy analysts in Africa that are largely government Ministries of Health
 - The Advocacy Institute, the Union Institute and WLI/SIT determines their partners based on the nature of the issues they choose to pursue, i.e., public versus private
 - The Asia Foundation and CEDPA focus largely on improving Women’s rights

- WOLA promotes social justice in Latin America
 - Partners of the Americas and NDI promote citizen participation and empowerment
 - JHU's Third Sector Project promotes a strong sector in Central and Eastern Europe including values of philanthropy, volunteerism and civil society's (non-profit sector's) role in a democratic system
- d) A number of organizations target a specific programmatic sector; others focus on macro-political or systemic issues, including disadvantaged and minorities, that affect the entire polity; and the majority attend to both.
- IPPF/Western Hemisphere Region, CEDPA, the Futures Group/Policy Project and AED/SARA all target the health and population sector with either a primary or secondary focus on women
 - NDI, WOLA and JHU/Third Sector Project largely focus on enhancing the strength of democratic institutions in civil society
 - TAF's G-WIP program has direct mandate to improve the legal and political rights of women
 - IDR, Partners of the Americas, PACT, WLI/SIT, WLI/PIDT and ADF work with a range of CSOs, CSO alliances and disadvantaged/minority group in a range of sectoral areas
- e) All organizations have developed their own advocacy materials for use in their training programs. A majority has developed a "core" set of generic training materials that are then adapted for the specific situation or during the actual training activity itself.
- The Advocacy Institute, Futures Group/Policy Project, CEDPA, WLI/SIT, IPPF, IDR, TAF, ADF, JHU/TSP and AED/SARA Project have all developed core training materials including in training manuals or guides covering both instrumental and developmental advocacy
- f) All organizations have developed their training materials in English; over half of them have developed and/or translated training materials into languages other than English (e.g., Arabic, Tagalog, Spanish, Swahili, French, Russian, Bulgarian).
- WLI/PIDT, CEDPA, NDI and ADF have developed training materials and conducted training in Russian
 - CEDPA, WLI/SIT, ADF, AED/SARA and TAF have developed training materials and conducted training in French
 - CEDPA, WLI/SIT, WOLA, IFFP/WHR, Partners of the Americas, and TAF have developed training materials and conducted training Spanish
 - CEDPA, IPPF/WHR and TAF have developed training materials and conducted training in Arabic
 - NDI, POA and CAI have developed training materials and conducted training in Portuguese (e.g., Mozambique, Angola, Brazil)

- JHU/TSP has developed training materials in a number of CEE countries, while ADF and WLI/PIDT have developed materials in a single CEE language, i.e., Croat and Romanian
 - CEDPA has also developed training materials in Chinese and Hindi
- g) all organizations used a range of participatory training methodologies and approaches; the majority use adult learning methodologies and problem solving techniques.
- TAF uses a non-formal education methodology; learning by experience and small group work
 - PACT uses a “critical incidents” methodology and has developed a self-assessment capacity building instrument
 - POA uses Kettering Foundation’s National Issues Forums and Public Deliberation Methodology
 - AED takes an participatory, adult learning approach, and uses role playing, case studies and social marketing techniques
 - JHU’s Third Sector Project uses “enablement training” techniques to empower organizations, communities and individuals
 - IPPF’s training methodology is heavily focussed on participation and achieving measurable results
 - CEDPA use an experiential training methodology focusing on participation, role playing, case studies, lectures and videos
 - The Policy Project’s (Futures Group) training is intended to increase counterparts’ ability to create and use policy tools and modeling techniques
 - Advocacy Institutes methodology is an “organic” process that relies on the participants to develop the process; in short, it is highly participative
- h) All organizations conduct training programs overseas in their on-going programs or at the request of other organizations; a small number have developed US-based training programs or at least include a component of US-based training in their overall program activities.
- Advocacy Institute has developed a three week US-based training program
 - TAF/G-WIP’s programs hold regional training programs (in addition to in-country training) in each of the principal regions except CEE/NIS
 - IDR in conjunction with the GEM Project works in the eastern and southern Africa sub-region working targeting sub-regional networks
 - The JHU Third Sector Project provides trainees with short-term internships with US non-profits and a training of trainers program in the US
 - Partners of the Americas conducts training for US CSOs promoting minority rights (in addition to regional training and individual in-country training programs)
 - WOLA, which targets change in American foreign policy towards Latin America has increasingly developed partnerships with CSOs throughout the region and brought them to Washington to learn about the American policy making process

- WLI/SIT through its Global Partnership Program holds training activities in Bangladesh, Zimbabwe as well as the US. It also has a US-based advocacy training program “International Policy Advocacy: Democratization, Civic Participation and Public Policy Training in collaboration with Advocacy Institute and the Center for Citizen Advocacy
 - CEDPA trains regionally as well as in the US with training programs lasting from one to five weeks
- i) Several USAID-financed “projects” have developed advocacy training materials including “how-to” manuals, specifically focussing on instrumental advocacy (see following section).
- j) While most organizations target indigenous CSOs with advocacy programs that target political arenas or issues from the national to the local levels, a small number operate regionally or even globally in terms of the arena or issue targeted.
- WOLA targets both the US executive and legislative branches as well as supporting its partners in their own work
 - IDR works with a range of African sub-regional networks that target national as well as regional decision-makers and works closely with regional support organizations in Asia and Africa
 - IPPF works at the regional and international levels on family planning policies
 - Partners of the Americas and WOLA work with networks and supranational CSOs at the regional level although the later has found it more effective to work with national level CSOs
 - PACT works largely at the national level with networks, consortia and other support CSOs and increasingly promotes cross-national and cross-regional alliances
 - PACT and IDR have increasingly focussed on promoting “inter-sectoral” alliances and partnerships between CSOs and business and/or government agencies to promote change

E. A Review of the Literature

Along-side the review of organizations providing training or technical assistance in the areas of advocacy strategizing, the Team was asked to do a review of existing training materials being employed in advocacy programs. Not only was an in-depth review of training materials undertaken but a broad based literature review was conducted to identify how advocacy strategizing was being conceived of and treated by development thinkers and practitioners. The following two sections provide the findings from these reviews. Annex 5 contains a bibliography on training materials with the principal materials annotated; and a separate bibliography on resource documents identified as relevant to advocacy strategizing. It should be noted that a number of major training manuals or guides are currently in preparation by several of the organizations interviewed and profiled. Also, because of proprietary concerns, the Team was either unable to collect a number of documents or received only the concerned table of contents.

1. Training Materials

The attached bibliography notes an extensive number and diversity of training materials which US CSOs have developed and/or adapted for use in their international advocacy training programs. According to our discussions with the organizations interviewed and profiled for the study there is a significant amount of materials that are developed on a case-by-case basis for specific client groups. The majority of training materials that were reviewed, annotated and collected during the study related to instrumental advocacy and to a lesser extent the civil society-strengthening component. In fact, many of the training documents reviewed included both strategy components and treated them equally in their presentation. A smaller number incorporated the citizen empowerment strategy component in a holistic training approach; the reason for this latter finding is discussed in more detail below.

The basis for many of the training materials in current international use that combine both civil society strengthening and instrumental advocacy are derived from work undertaken by a range of US-based organizations concerned with domestic issues, including social justice and public interest advocacy. Perhaps the best known of this genre is the publication put out by the Midwest Academy entitled: *Organizing for Social Change: A Manual for Activists in the 1990s*. Utilizing this base document together with publications released by the Advocacy Institute, the OMB Watch, The Independent Sector, the Union Institute, and IPPF, other organizations such as CEDPA, The Asia Foundation, InterAction, and the SARA Project, have adapted them to their work overseas.

In this regard, the Institute for Development Research (IDR); the Center for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA); the Futures Group/Policy Project; the Academy for Educational Development (AED)/Support for Analysis & Research in Africa (SARA) Project; The Asia Foundation (TAF)/Global Women in Politics (G-WIP) Program; America's Development Foundation (ADF); Creative Associates International (CAI)/Communities in Transition Division; and Management Systems International (MSI)/Implementing Policy Change (IPC) Project, have developed a number of practical, hands on manuals that portray an emerging "state-of-the-art" in instrumental and developmental advocacy strategizing. In fact, much of the newly emerging and innovate work both in terms of concrete training materials development and more conceptual writing on the subject of advocacy strategizing is the result of a handful of individuals working independently or in affiliation with the organizations noted above. The annotated bibliography presents most of their work in this regard.

Concerning the civil society strengthening strategy component more specifically, a number of points need to be made. First, only a handful of the above organizations have fully developed a well-conceived training program that targets capacity building at the level of civil society itself. Among those that have, IDR, PACT, World Learning/PIDT and the Johns Hopkins University's Third Sector Project figure prominently. The notion that civil society can be conceived of in sectoral terms and that it can be strengthened through the conscious design and implementation of capacity building programs has only recently come to the forefront of development thinking and practice.

Secondly, capacity building interventions targeted towards individual CSOs are significantly further advanced than that of the sector, largely because of the long-term work undertaken by a range of US and international CSOs related to traditional NGO capacity building programs in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Much of this work was itself financed by USAID. What is of interest, however, is the shift by a number of US CSOs from NGO to CSO capacity building in recognition of a distinct new set of needs and requirements related to the latter. Thus, organizations like World Learning, PACT, IDR, the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), and TAF are beginning to focus on the need for internal democratic governance practice and to begin focusing on such D/G-specific capacity building areas as conflict management and alternative dispute resolution. Some of the best new work related to CSO capacity building has been undertaken through USAID's New Partnership Initiative (NPI) and can be found in the recently released NPI report available in hard copy or at the USAID website.

Citizen empowerment training materials are intimately tied to adult learning and popular education approaches and methodologies. The focus of these approaches and methodologies is on concrete problem solving and empowerment at the individual, group and community levels. They include self-awareness approaches to individual and group empowerment, but are tied to a definite goal of increasing citizen participation in political or public life. Two of the best known US-based organizations working in this area and that have developed relevant methodologies are the Kettering Foundation through its National Issues Forums using *public deliberation* methodologies; and the Highlander Research and Education Center's work in Appalachia using a range of community problem-solving and empowerment strategies and methodologies. It is work in these areas that underlies much of practical overseas programs of such organizations as Partners of the America's Citizen Participation Program that operates throughout Latin America and National Democratic Institute's (NDI) in its country-level civic participation programs. Both programs are USAID-financed.

Finally a number of organizations have developed self-assessment approaches and methodologies that can be used with CSOs to help their members work through and define problems or identify common issues that can be jointly addressed. Two organizations interviewed during the study – World Learning/PIDT with its NGO assessment instrument; and PACT with its critical incident methodology and CSO self-assessment instrument – offer the best training tools under the citizen empowerment component.

2. Resource Materials

Much of the literature related to advocacy strategizing, just as that related to advocacy training materials, has been written by American scholars and practitioners coming out of a number of academic disciplines, domestic social movements and international development experiences. This should not be surprising as the United States has been a leader in all three components of the advocacy strategy presented herein, that is, citizen empowerment and political participation; civil society strengthening and social capital building; and issues campaigning and policy advocacy. While a wide range of documents were used to develop the advocacy strategy used in this Resource Guide, the following were particularly useful and highly recommended to those with an interest in delving further into area of democracy building:

Bobo, Kim, Jackie Kendall and Steve Max (1991). *Organizing for Social Change: A Manual for Activists in the 1990s*, Midwest Academy, Seven Locks Press, Minneapolis

Bratton, Michael, 1990. *Non-Governmental Organizations in Africa: Can They Influence Public Policy?* In Development and Change, 21:12

Brown, David L, and D. Ashman (1996). *Participation, Social Capital and Intersectoral Problem Solving: African and Asian Cases*,

Carroll, Thomas F (1992). *Intermediary NGOs: The Supporting Link in Grassroots Development*. West Hartford, Connecticut, the Kumarian Press.

Covey, Jane (1992). *A Note on Policy Influence*, IDR Reports, Volume 9, No. 2, Institute for Development Research, Boston, Massachusetts.

Covey, Jane (1994). *Accountability and Effectiveness of NGO Policy Alliances*, IDR Reports, Volume 11, No. 8, Institutional for Development Research, Boston, Massachusetts.

Clark, John (1992). *Policy Influence, Lobbying and Advocacy*, in Making a Difference, Edwards, M. and David Hulme, Earthscan Publications, Oxford, U.K.

Crosby, Benjamin L. and Deborah M. Orsini (1996). *Developing Lobbying Capacity for Policy Reform*, Technical Notes 3.7, Management Systems International for USAID's Implementing Policy Change Project, Washington, D.C.

Fox, Leslie (1995). *Civil Society: A Conceptual Framework*, Thunder and Associates, for USAID/Global Bureau, Center for Democracy and Governance, Washington, D.C.

Gaventa, John (1995). *Citizen Knowledge, Citizen Competence and Democracy Building*, Working Paper for PEGS Conference on "Citizen Competence and the Design of Democratic Institutions," Washington D.C.

Hansen, Gary (1996). *Constituencies for Reform: Strategic Approaches for Donor-Supported Civic Advocacy Programs*, USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No. 12, Center for Development Information and Evaluation, USAID, Washington, D.C.

Mathews, David (1996). *Elements of a Strong Civil Society and a Healthy Public Life*, The Kettering Foundation, Michigan.

Miller, Valerie (1994). *Policy Influence by Development NGOs: A Vehicle for Strengthening Civil Society*, IDR Reports, Volume 11, No. 1, Boston, Massachusetts

Miller, Valerie (1994). *NGO and Grassroots Policy Influence: What is Success?* IDR Reports, Volume 11, No. 5, Institutional for Development Research, Boston, Massachusetts

VeneKlasen, Lisa (1995). *The Challenges for Democracy Building: Practical Lessons on NGO Advocacy and Political Change*, in NGOs and Civil Society, INTRAC, Oxford U.K. and written for Center for Development and Population Activity (CEDPA), Washington, D.C.

The attached Bibliography contains these and a wide range of other documents related to the three strategy components.

TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS AND PROJECTS

ADF	America's Development Foundation
AED	Academy for Educational Development
AF	The Asia Foundation
AI	The Advocacy Institute
CEDPA	Center for Population and Development Activities
PP	The Policy Project: The Futures Group and CEDPA and Research Triangle Institute
CAI	Creative Associates International
CCA	Center for Citizen Advocacy
IDR	Institute for Development Research
TSP	The Third Sector Project - Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
KF	Kettering Foundation
MSI	Management Systems International/Implementing Policy Change Project
NDI	National Democratic Institute
POA	Partners of the Americas
PACT	A Development Enterprise
UI	The Union Institute
WOLA	Washington Office on Latin America
WL/PIDT	World Learning, Inc: Projects in International Development and Training
WL/SIT	World Learning, School for International Training

ANNEXES

- Annex 1: List of Individuals and Organizations Interviewed
- Annex 2: Study Questionnaire
- Annex 3: Study Scope of Work
- Annex 4: Advocacy in the Literature: A Review and Findings
- Annex 5: Annotated Bibliography of Advocacy Training Materials and Resource Publications
- Annex 6: U.S. Advocacy Capacity Building Provider Profiles