



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

STRENGTHENING THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA PROJECT (*BAYAN*)

**THE ROLES OF PALESTINIAN CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

ADVOCACY TRAINING REPORT

April 2007

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by the BAYAN team of DAI Washington.

Table of Contents:

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction.....	2
II. The Roles of Palestinian CSOs in the Legislative Advocacy	2
III. The Challenges Facing Palestinian CSOs in Conducting Advocacy Work in Palestine.....	3
IV. Training Workshops Description.....	5
1. Daily Training Activities	5
2. Workshop Evaluation.....	10
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	12
Annex I: List of Trainees West Bank & Gaza	15
Annex II: <i>BAYAN</i> Advocacy Training Program/West Bank	16
Annex III: Daily Training Program /Gaza	19
Annex IV: Participants Evaluation	20

Executive Summary

BAYAN conducted training programs for the purpose of developing legislative advocacy capabilities of its partner Palestinian Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the West Bank (February 25- March 1, 2007) and the Gaza Strip (March 18 -21, 2007). The two workshops targeted 25 CSO senior staff members representing 14 CSOs (8 CSOs from the West Bank and 6 CSOs from Gaza). The West Bank workshop was led by an international expert, Ms. Kate Head with direct support from *BAYAN*'s technical team. The Gaza workshop was led by a local consultant from Gaza, Mr. Alaa Ghalyeeni and *BAYAN*'s Gaza Manager, Mr. Nael Younis.

The workshops provided participants with the knowledge and skills they need to plan and implement legislative advocacy related activities. Special emphasis was focused on providing participants with practical tools for developing strategic advocacy plans to influence the decision making processes and the work of the legislature to ensure a transparent and accountable legislative process.

Information was presented and participants were given exercises and case studies to provide them with practical experience and to increase their skills. Specifically, some of the topics covered during the training course included:

1. Defining the concept of advocacy in general and in the legislative process in particular.
2. Tools, tactics and mechanisms for creating a comprehensive advocacy plan with a focus on issue advocacy campaign choices and messages.
3. Options and alternatives for influencing decision makers, ministries and lawmakers.
4. Monitoring and overseeing the work of decision makers and the legislature.
5. Challenges to advocacy efforts and possible tactics to address or minimize them.
6. Mobilizing the population and grassroots organizations and the importance of building coalitions.

The two workshops confirmed the need for continued capacity strengthening in several areas including issue development, coalition building, planning techniques, and more advanced advocacy strategies.

As a result of the training, participants succeeded in developing four initial advocacy plans focusing on the following issues:

- Passage of the Judicial Authority Law.
- Allotting more budget to youth unemployment programs.
- Combating violence against women and modifying the Penal Law.
- Achieving civil peace- Enforcing the implementation of Arms Control Law

These draft plans were consensus-driven documents that outlined the overall goal of advocacy efforts, the targeted decision-makers, possible advocacy options, the coalition partners, coalition rules, message development and substantiation and stakeholders' analysis. Additionally, an initial timeline and a budget were developed to give participants an idea of what implementing the program would mean for their organizations.

I. Introduction

The *BAYAN* project is designed to strengthen the accountability and transparency of the legislative process in the West Bank and Gaza. The project is a three year, approximately six million dollars project, which began October 1, 2005. The specific goals of this project are to: strengthen the accountability and transparency in the legislative process; strengthen the broader legislative-interested community, and; implement a small grants program to assist civil society in supporting the above activities.

The project strives to strengthen the capacity of concerned civil society organizations (CSOs) to conduct and engage in advocacy related activities to influence policy-makers and ensure that legislative and decision-making processes are transparent, accountable and reflect the interest and concerns of civil society.

The objective of this assignment was to build on the results achieved under previous efforts conducted by the *BAYAN* team where partner CSOs specifically requested assistance in developing their legislative advocacy skills. As a result, *BAYAN* recruited an international legislative advocacy expert who worked closely with its staff and another Gaza-based expert to deliver the training in Gaza¹. The main objective of the assignment was to provide practical and hands on training to partner CSOs in the West Bank and Gaza Strip in the following areas:

- Formulation of advocacy strategies that meet international standards. This included topics related to Why, How and What to advocate for?
- Familiarizing the participants with the policy advocacy cycle starting from setting the agenda to enforcement of the law/decision.
- Options and strategies for mobilizing and engaging the wider community and policy-makers.
- Tools, techniques and strategies that can be utilized for effective advocacy planning that are appropriate for the local context.
- Utilizing the media to carry out advocacy activities.
- Conducting impact analysis of advocacy programs.
- Improving coalition and networking skills for advocacy purposes.

II. The Roles of Palestinian CSOs in the Legislative Advocacy

Through consultations with more than 38 leading CSO leaders, the *BAYAN* team confirmed that many Palestinian CSOs have a genuine interest and preliminary plans to carry out advocacy activities to influence legislative process and government

¹ By design, a Gaza consultant Alaa Ghalyeen and *BAYAN* Gaza manager Nael Younis participated in the West Bank workshop to gain additional experience and insights. After the workshop was completed, they converted the materials into Arabic and made several changes based on the feedback received. Also, they decided to convert the five-day training into a four-day workshop.

performance, but in most cases, they lack the experience or capacity to fulfill this role. *BAYAN* is well positioned to address the particular needs of CSOs by providing a package of practical capacity strengthening and on the job training to carefully selected CSO partners that would enable them to play a pivotal role in holding decision-makers, including legislatures, accountable to their constituencies and the rest of the population.

Advocacy is essential to ensure that work of the legislature and government is accountable and transparent. In a democratic system, CSOs play an important role in assuring that governmental and parliamentary operations are transparent and open to scrutiny by the public and CSOs.

There are several ways CSOs can support the legislative advocacy, including: information collection, analysis and dissemination, mobilizing the general public to put pressure on decision makers to realize peoples' needs and concerns; organize public gatherings and/or peaceful protests to hold lawmakers and government officials accountable; form alliances and coalitions to advocate for issues of public concerns including the submissions of position papers, policy papers, regulatory impact assessments etc. as ways to influence the decision-making process.

III. The Challenges Facing Palestinian CSOs in Conducting Advocacy Work in Palestine

Discussions during the training sessions and *BAYAN*'s earlier consultations highlighted key challenges to effective legislative advocacy in Palestine including the lack of adequate capacity and understanding of the advocacy process, the political environment, the lack of resources and weakness of coalitions that ran out of steam.

The CSOs that participated in the training workshops exhibited a basic understanding of the need for legislative advocacy. However, they lacked knowledge of what advocacy entails and the skills necessary to conduct effective advocacy activities. Foremost among these challenges is the lack of adequate or sincere will on the part of the CSO leadership to create an advocacy plan and follow through with implementation. Some organizations seem comfortable with the status quo, and what they have done in the past in terms of tactics like town hall meetings, media programs or public awareness programs. While it is important that organizations build on past success, they also need to consider expanding their options to fit the situation, respond to growing needs and demands and continue to innovate.

The uncertainty surrounding the political situation is another key challenge to effective advocacy work in Palestine. The lack of a schedule and a systematic work of the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC) and the creation of the unity government were seen as both an opportunity and an impediment by participants.

The delay and unpredictability of the PLC schedule would allow more time for participants to lay the groundwork and meet members in their home areas as needed. CSO representatives also felt that the creation of the unity government will pressure many of the Ministers to be responsive to the public. They said that former ministers needed to leave a legacy and the incoming nominees would need to establish themselves.

In both cases, the Ministers were more likely to respond to requests from organizations and citizens.

In the Minister selection process, participants said they felt powerless to impact this process. This is different than in most countries where organizations persuade allies in government and the press to support their issue-friendly nominees, or make statements against nominations that go against their interests. The participants thought that suggesting names or making statements on nominees for ministerial positions was inappropriate.

Another important impediment to advocacy is the split effort among CSOs. While several CSOs may be active in any given area, they usually do not adequately coordinate their efforts. Although it is not usual that competitive organizations choose not to work together, it is also true that organizations often find their niche in organizing or constituencies. Also, CSOs do not usually look to other CSOs for coalition opportunities in enhancing areas where they may be weak.

A further impediment is the inadequate resources. Due to the state of the Palestinian economy, CSOs are primarily dependent on foreign donors for operating funds. Because these funds typically come in the form of time-limited grants, CSOs find themselves going where the money takes them rather than maintaining a consistent on-going oversight effort. Inconsistent funding means CSOs spend more time looking for resources and less time advocating for change. It is worth highlighting however that while resources are necessary to implement programs, it is also true that most advocacy efforts require a minimal budget of printed material and meeting costs.

To address these challenges, the trainers presented positive international cases of those advocacy organizations that overcame similar or related obstacles. This was done to get participants to focus on what they could actively do to make change. Throughout the training program, the trainer provided examples where other advocacy organizations with little resources and with significant political issues were able to achieve victories.

Despite these challenges, all participating CSO representatives were eager to engage in advocacy despite their lack of knowledge and the aforementioned challenges. Some of the organizations had more extensive experience than others in advocacy. Based on their evaluations of the course they thought the training brought them new tools and skills to take to their organizations and coalitions.

There was also interest in additional training. *BAYAN* is uniquely positioned to provide additional capacity strengthening on advocacy and related subjects such as issue advocacy, legislative process reform, and developing grass roots support. In addition, *BAYAN* can play an important role in helping the CSOs to work together in coalitions and to maintain on-going efforts.

IV. Training Workshops Description

Overview

Two legislative advocacy training workshops were conducted in Ramallah (February 25-March 1, 2007) and in Gaza City (March 18-21, 2007), respectively. (See Annex I for list of trainees). The training provided 25 professionals from 14 partner CSOs with the knowledge and practical skills that will better position them to fulfill their advocacy role. The training focused on how CSOs might best use advocacy to ensure that transparent and accountable procedures and practices were implemented and followed by decision makers. The training was based on adult learning principles and included both individual and group exercises to ensure that the participants are acquiring the required knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

The training began with a discussion of the definition of advocacy in both international and Palestinian contexts. After that, participants were provided with practical tools needed to develop an overall advocacy strategy, including the art of building coalitions and ways to influence decision makers. Throughout the sessions, the participants identified advocacy issues and problems, decision makers, advocacy tactics and developed messages and coalitions. At each stage of the process, the training focused on the policy-making process and advocacy for specific positions.

The workshops became an opportunity for the participants to sharpen their skills and take away practical steps in advocacy organizing that can be applied to current projects. Over the duration of the workshops, the participants divided into four groups and worked on their own advocacy plans.

For the more experienced participants, the training allowed them to take the time that they would not normally have when making plans, and expand their tactics beyond what they would not usually implement. For the new participants, this training was an opportunity to learn from the trainers, the other participants and through exercises.

Details on daily activities are provided in Annex II and Annex III

1. Daily Training Activities

Day One

The overall advocacy cycle was defined together with how it fits within the overall democratic political system, and international examples were provided to give an expanded view of issue work around the world. The importance of the planning process was discussed, as an organizational and strategic tool within organizations or coalitions. The difficulty with creation and implementation of plans was outlined to get participants to focus on challenges common in countries around the Middle East and the world. Building on the lessons from the Ramallah workshop, the Gaza workshop focused more on the local context in the first day.

The first day was also used to analyzing problems and selecting issues and to determine advantages and disadvantages of coalition work in Palestine. Participants were asked to look at an issue and analyze it to determine whether it was a result of a policy or legal challenge, trouble with implementation of the law or a lack of public awareness of the law or its remedies.

The issue selection exercise showed the tendency of participants to have the CSO fix the problem rather than asking the government. The difference between projects and advocacy was also blurred because Palestinian CSOs traditionally have done the work of government. In discussions, some of the issues were so large that it was easy for participants to get distracted on different aspects of the problem, issue or solutions.

The day ended with a discussion on that, good issues do not always make the best advocacy campaign issues. The best campaigns are those that build victories, develop and build the organization and expand the organizations' public profile.

Based on the written evaluations of the first day, the participants said that they learned a useful model to analyze problems. One participant said, *"I can work on analyzing the problem, and know whether it is connected to policy, law or application."*

The participants also learned from others through the debate among other participants. One participant said, *"It was very helpful session in that the other organizations have a different background. We got to know each other, but also found a common ground."*

Day Two

Based on participants' written evaluation from the first day, the consultant and BAYAN team decided that the work groups would be adjusted to have the participants choose two issues instead of individual organizational issues. In the Ramallah workshop, one of the groups decided to focus on youth unemployment and the other focused on amending the Judiciary law. In Gaza, one of the groups focused on combating violence against women through modifying the Penal Law and the other focused on achieving civil peace through enforcing the implementation of the Arms Control Law.

The group exercises were focused on targeting decision-makers that were involved in youth and labor issues. Participants were asked who or what would influence the decision maker to take a position or action on an issue. The purpose of the exercise was for the participant to shift their perspective and understand what and who influence the decision-maker. The exercise or mapping these influences allowed the advocates to see the decision makers' pressure points.

During the targeting exercise, some of the ministers were designated as the decision makers and others were given the role of a coalition partner. On the youth unemployment issue, the Youth and Labor Ministers were seen more as allied supporters than decision makers. On the youth unemployment issue, the Minister of Finance was viewed as the decision maker that the supportive ministers could influence alongside the coalition.

The Judicial Authority Law group identified the High Judicial Council as a decision-maker but, also as a potential opponent. As both a decision maker and opponent, they were asked to identify tactics to influence or neutralize them.

The violence against women group identified two groups of PLC members as decision makers in this case. The first group comprised liberal and moderate PLC members including members of Fatah bloc and leftist blocs. This group has been perceived as potential allies and supporters. The second group comprises PLC members affiliated with Hamas. This group has been perceived as a potential opponent. The participants in this group have been asked to identify relevant tactics to influence or neutralize the potential opponents as well as other tactics to substantiate the position of the supportive PLC members.

The civil peace group identified the Minister of Interior as a decision maker in this case but, also as a potential opponent. As both a decision maker and opponent, they were also asked to identify tactics to influence or neutralize him.

There was a presentation and discussion about ministers and ministry staff taking positions, and moving policies or programs through their government agency. This is often the largest challenge within large institutions. Minister support does not necessarily mean ministry staff support or action. Having a ministry strategy was not something that the participants had done in past issue efforts.

The PLC was also a topic for presentation and discussion. The conversation turned to organizational tactics to hold elected officials accountable. Various tools were discussed, including collecting statements, asking politicians to write letters of support and endorsement of issues through public events.

A tracking form to record parliament members' positions was shared with participants to show how record-keeping can be used to do pre-vote counts and to identify and target the undecided members. The training also included a discussion of how to strategically build support throughout the parliament by addressing leadership, committees and members and asking them to mobilize their colleagues.

The participants identified the political parties and bloc leadership as the primary motivating factors for both the ministers and the parliament members. The participants also discussed what if the bloc leadership was to take action that the other members would follow. They also cited political statements and party documents from the campaign period as being important to reference in meetings with political leaders.

The second day was concluded by introducing the SWOT analysis to the participants which was applied on their respective issues, and the results were shared with the rest of participants. The main idea of introducing these various tools was to encourage the participants to become more analytical by identifying their relative strengths to build on them, to know their weaknesses and try to overcome them, and to appreciate and take advantage of the available opportunities. Finally, participants were encouraged to identify the threats and/or challenges that would face them in their work so that they could come up with strategies to minimize or mitigate them.

Based on the written evaluations, the participants said they learned new and effective ways to approach decision-makers. One participant said that the group learned how to *“deliver my goals and ideas of the institution to the minister or PLC member.”*

Day Three

Day three was devoted to message and substantiation development exercises. The day finished with a role-playing exercise delivering those messages in mock meetings to a minister and a PLC member.

To start the meeting the participants did a joint message box as a group. The message box is a format to diagram arguments for and against an issue to create the strongest and most effective message. When it came to doing their own message box in the smaller groups, they seemed to do better with simpler framework of arguments in favor or against an issue. This was more of a two-sided box. The exercises started by brainstorming on a large white board and later choosing key phrases and words to create a stronger message.

This was unlike other countries where the organization starts with a solid message and later adjusts the message according to a discussion of the opponent’s messages. Compared to other participants, the Palestinian participants did better in articulating an opponent’s message first and later defined their messages based on their best argument in response.

Participants were asked to substantiate their messages with stories, data or graphics. The participants were good at identifying the necessary research or stories that they needed to best make their case to decision makers.

The role play exercise involved an official presentation to their target minister or Parliament leader; two roles that were played by the Chief of Party. This tied in the previous days’ results of defining the motivations of the decision maker and message development. The minister was extremely difficult and disruptive, but the exercise underscored how difficult it is to deliver a message without having a meeting strategy.

Day three ended with the groups creating professional messages and substantiation for the judiciary law and the increased budget for youth unemployment. The participants became more versed in their message through discussion and practice.

The participants’ increased understanding of message development as a longer, detailed process was one measure of success of the training. The participants developed a far greater understanding of the difference between advocacy messages and slogans or statements.

In the participant evaluations they said that they were pleased to learn the message development process and to have positive results. One participant said they learned *“the key messages to be directed at the point.”* Another said they learned *“how to anticipate the attitude and response of decision makers and how you respond to these.”*

Day Four

In the Ramallah workshop and based on participant feedback, day four started with an active discussion of what worked well with coalition organizing efforts in the past. Positive examples of past coalition efforts included the last election monitoring effort and the change of the women's quota. In Gaza, days four and five were combined.

Both of these coalitions were mentioned as examples of best practices. These practices included the division of labor, clear rules and job responsibilities, and region assignments. These were mentioned as important components to successful coalitions to duplicate with future coalition efforts. These best practices came back when the groups were asked to draft coalition rules for their current advocacy plans.

The day's exercises involved identifying an issue of interest to each organization and then identify the interests of other organizations to recruit to their effort. In this, they would also have to 'pitch' what each coalition member would be asked to do.

It was interesting that in some cases when the organizations pitched their coalition efforts that the issue grew and changed based on their conversations with other groups. This snow-ball growth of issues from one topic to an expanded group of issues is not typical in other countries coalition efforts.

Some participants had difficulty with this exercise because when they asked by others to join them in coalition, they felt compelled to reciprocate and join their coalition efforts. One participant complained that she would have five additional projects as a result of this effort. The methods and ways to decline participation in a coalition were discussed but the participants were divided on how to handle this in a polite and culturally sensitive way.

The results from this planning day were that the teams took this information and identified potential coalition partners and their interests in joining the judiciary and youth effort. The groups also identified coalition best practices that could serve as proposed coalition rules about decision making or task assignments.

The participants in their written evaluations said they learned the mechanics and structures of forming coalitions. One participant said that the day was "*very useful and specific concerning elements to be taken into consideration in the process of building alliances.*"

Day Five

The focus of the final day (day 5 in Ramallah and part of day 4 in Gaza) was to finalize and present the four model advocacy plans on the passage of the amended Judiciary Authority Law, the increase in the budget allocation to youth employment programs, combating violence against women through modifying the Penal Law and achieving civil peace through enforcing the implementation of Arm Control Law.

Each group presented their advocacy plan to the rest of the group and received feedback from them using power point presentation.

The presentations outlined: the groups' goals, the decision makers and tactics, messages and substantiation, coalition membership and rules. The plans were specific and focused. When they presented their plans to the other group, much of the feedback on the plans was about issues related to the political environment or clarifying questions about the status of the law or the policies. There was little criticism on the strategic considerations or the plan's details.

The last few hours of the planning week, were focused on the details of costs, structure and timelines. The participants were asked to put together a rough budget, calendar and structure by writing a money, time and staff assignment by each tactic.

The costs for each tactic were initially on the higher end, until participants realized they would be asked to raise the money to implement the effort. A fundraising suggestion of coalition dues or a one time membership fee had widespread support of the participants. Another administrative suggestion was that one or two organizations handle the coalition budget also had support of the group.

The division of work or assignment of tasks was also included in this exercise. This was not difficult for the participants to do. The two planning groups were focused primarily on meeting decision-makers and expanding the coalition membership, so this did not require significant staff or structure to get the work done. Many of assignments were done based on an organizations' previous interest.

The division of tasks by each organization's expertise that had worked well in previous coalition efforts was used again by the judicial group. For example, in the Ramallah workshop, they assigned Filistiniyat to do the media work and Civic Forum to do the town hall meetings. Joint work and assignment were also addressed with the creation of coalition rules.

From the final written evaluations, the participants were pleased with how all the planning and strategies tied together into an overall plan. Most of the comments related to the sequence of the planning. One participant said the *"picture is clear to me how to plan for the lobbying work and networking on various issues."* Still another said that the *"application of ideas was fully integrated."*

The final judgment on the training is the plans. The participants were pleased with their strategies and presentations and were proud to share them with their organizations. The next steps were also discussed with the hope of moving the work of the coalitions forward to implementation.

2. Workshop Evaluation

Observations and Participant Learning

Throughout the two workshops, there were a number of observations about participant learning that may be helpful for future *BAYAN* programs in groups and with individual

organizations. These were gleaned from the trainer's perspective and the evaluation forms after each day.

The evaluation forms were done at the close of each training day. These evaluations were extremely useful for providing the consultants and *BAYAN* management with the timely feedback to make necessary timely adjustment. (See Annex IV on participants' evaluation). In addition, these evaluations informed *BAYAN* team on how participants preferred to learn through their feedback on the agenda, information, materials and exercises.

Below is a summary of the participants' feedback:

- Participants were generally satisfied with the preparation for the training program, the training delivery, and the training venue. They appreciated getting a better understanding of legislative advocacy and were especially pleased with the groups work, role play and group discussions.
- The participants did best with a series of questions each opening session about what has worked in the past. This focused the participants' attention on Palestinian best practices. This also allowed participants to learn from one another. As one participant noted in their evaluation, one of the values of the training was to, "exchange views with others and benefit from their experience in the subject."
- Lectures worked best when they were balanced with discussions in the morning and afternoon. One participant stated "A good method relied on level information and easy presenting and brainstorming."
- The participants took longer at some tasks than expected. Issue choice and messages discussions took longer than anticipated. It was a challenge to balance the democratic process with keeping on a schedule. In participant evaluations some participants complained that some subjects were given too much or too little time.
- The groups worked best with someone to facilitate or provide ongoing guidance within the group. It was positive to have DAI staff available to take this role. For future training it is important to have a facilitator guide the discussion and the trainer(s) to monitor progress.
- In some countries, more information and detail is appreciated. Here, fewer slides and more focused exercise worked better for the Palestinian participants. The groups seemed to enjoy more structured fill-in-the-blank documents so that the participants could think through the advocacy plan and worry less about the instructions. Some evaluations from the first day asked to clarify tasks better, which DAI responded to in the trainings in the following days.
- When there were two or three people working in teams there was less energy and interest. When people from the same organizations worked only with each other, the participants found it similar to their work-day. The ideal size seems to be five or six participants from a variety of organizations.
- A formal presentation of plans forced the participants to focus their discussion and decisions on a written document. A printed PowerPoint document each morning provided everyone an opportunity to review the discussion of the previous day and to make changes and clarify their strategy.

- Those with a style of “learning through doing” saw the whole picture after all the linkages were made at the end of the process. As one participant stated, “the application of the process is fully integrated.”
- The personal baseline was done at the beginning of the training. It asked each participant to write down their quick thoughts on an advocacy campaign and include decision makers, messages and coalition members. After the training was over each participant was given their baseline back to review. This provided a before-and-after point of reference for each of participant. Many thought what they had written was basic and simplistic.
- Materials should be translated into Arabic and the presentation should be done in both languages to make sure that participants can follow the conversation. Some mentioned this as being helpful for the next steps in their evaluation.
- Some participants indicated that the material was extensive and need more time. The trainer felt that this is a valid point and it should be taken into consideration in future training programs.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

At the present time there is a great deal of uncertainty within the Palestine context, a context that makes CSOs advocacy efforts more needed but also complicated. Nonetheless, it is very important that the capacity building efforts of *BAYAN* continue in order that civil society will be better positioned to function in a democratic state once governmental systems are working as planned. Major CSOs are capably staffed and eager to learn their roles in the legislative process. With these thoughts in mind the following recommendations are provided for consideration.

Recommendations for *BAYAN*

- It is important not to lose the momentum of the training and to work with the groups and the participants to take the next steps. *BAYAN* should provide the push forward by sponsoring meetings in the DAI office with the coalition members interested in implementing the plans.
- *BAYAN* can serve as neutral facilitators for these coalition meetings. It would be helpful for *BAYAN* to become the coalition ‘enabler’ as the two organizations present their plans and get buy-in from the other coalition partners.
- *BAYAN* could assign and track meetings and follow-up with a schedule and administrative record keeping to “jump start” the process.
- *BAYAN* can create a parliament meeting report form based on the content suggestions of coalition partners. The report forms can be centralized either on an internal Web site or by DAI circulating a spreadsheet with reports of each meeting. The tracking form is more likely to become a best practice that is adopted by the coalition and their organization members in the future if it is used.

- Many of the participants had many comments related to creating and maintaining coalitions in their evaluations. In the discussions and exercises, there did not seem to be consensus around accepted practices or a shared language around coalitions. This might be an interesting series or day long programs with a mixture of groups or with possible partners in coalition. Some topics to address could include: identifying partners, decision-making, structures, recruiting, dealing with difficult partners and keeping momentum for the short and long-term.
- There was a lot of interest in budget issues on the last day. This was brought up in the evaluations as an issue for many of the participants. They want additional information on this. It may be worthwhile to consider this for mid-level staff or those who in coalition needing a joint budget creation.
- Consider a grant program that would reward the use of innovative or experimental tactics and sharing lessons learned as best practices to a larger community.
- *BAYAN* should work with the Sharek Youth Forum who expressed interest in developing their own internal advocacy unit. *BAYAN* can assist them with the creation of this unit by providing direct advice, training and materials.
- The timeline discussion at future trainings should include a blank calendar for four to six months to provide tools for the participants to work on a schedule.
- There should be an increased discussion of projects vs. advocacy. This distinction was a challenge for the participants, and they continued to fall back on do-it-yourself programs instead of asking the government to take a role. Participants should be asked to diagram the differences.
- *BAYAN* should consider funding the four advocacy plans developed during the course of the workshops.
- It is recommended that *BAYAN* considers providing follow-up training to the same group on issues related to coalition-building and utilization of media.

Recommendations for CSOs

- When forming advocacy coalitions and determining an advocacy issue, it is important that CSOs carefully consider the size of any given coalition to ensure effectiveness and not to jeopardize their efforts.
- It may not be necessary in Palestine to talk too much about whom and what motivates a decision-maker. In other countries this is a far more complex exercise filled with networks and organizations surrounding elected officials. In future training, a list of possible motivations can be identified in advance without too much time devoted to this.

- Organizations should be pushed and rewarded for experimenting with new tactics and sharing them as best practices among the larger issue and advocacy community. Organizations should be the driving force of innovating tactics. They need to be using e-organizing on the internet, developing their own issues, tracking parliament members and drafting amendments and laws. Today, they seem to be stuck in the challenging political environment and tactics that have worked in the past rather than finding new ways to reach and mobilize volunteers and a disaffected public.
- CSOs should work on further developing the advocacy plans that they had developed during the training. The first step is to collect real data and conduct research concerning the selected issues. The second step will be to modify and develop the advocacy plans based on step one. The last step is to implement the plans.
- CSOs should actually take advantage of the existence of *BAYAN* project that is specialized in the Legislative process in Palestine. This is a good opportunity for them to learn, participate in *BAYAN* activities, and also to get funding for their advocacy issues.

Annex I: List of Trainees West Bank & Gaza

West Bank Participants

S/R	Organization	Name	Titles
1.	Civic Forum Institute /CFI	Raji Odeh	Coordinator on DG programs
		Khaled Abu Alya	Civic Education & Training Coordinator
		Alaa Ghaneim	Attorney
2.	Filistinyat	Sahar Haddad	Assistant to the director General
3.	Arab Thought Forum	Hanadi Zghair	Researcher
4.	AMAN Coalition (Muwaten)	Nida' Hinaiti	Project Coordinator
5.	MAS	Wajeeh Amer	Research Assistant
6.	PICCR	Reem Musleh	Public Relation Assistant
		Najah Subuh	Central Filed Researcher
7.	Ta'awon for Conflict Resolution	Khaled Saleem	Capacity Building Manager
		Shadi Zein Eldeen.	Executive Manager-youth
8.	Sharek	Freia Van Hee	Manager for the Dynamic Human Rights Unit at Sharek head office at Ramallah
		Hazem Abu Helal	The project trainer assistant for the unit
9.	NGO Development Center (NDC)	Alaa Ghalayini	Gaza Program Manager

Gaza Participants

S/R	Organization	Name	Titles
1.	Sharek Youth Forum	Eman Yousif AL Bayouk	Projects manager
		Fatma Taha Assad Ashour	Coordinator of Law Unit & Field Supervisor
2.	Palestinian center for democracy and conflict resolution	Dina Mohammed Ali Alanker	Field coordinator
		Mohammad Nafez Al-Natour	Project coordinator
3.	Palestinian commission for human development	Iyad Hussein Ahmed Krunz	Executive Manager
		Suzan Jomaa Mohammed AL-Bayya	Project coordinator
4.	Society Voice Foundation	Hanin Ahmed Abdullah Rezek El Samak	Advisor
		Mohammed Abdullah Mohammed Sroor	Coordinator
5.	Women Affairs Technical Committees	Huda Khamees Salih Eliyyan	Coordinator
		Lubna Zuhair Ismail El Najjar	Volunteer in the advocacy and capacity building for reform project
6.	CIVITAS	Fatma Amean Mohammed Shurafa	Coordinator
		Motasem Mufeed Mohammed El Shakra	CBOs development officer

Annex II: *BAYAN* Advocacy Training Program/West Bank

**February 25-March 1, 2007
En'ash El-Usra Society, Al-Bireh**

Day One: Agenda/ February 25, 2007

8:45 – 9:15	Introduction of Participants
9:15 – 9:30	Introduction to Training Agenda builds over the five days Multiple plans as products Peer review process
9:30 – 10:00	Exercise: Personal Baseline
10:00 – 11:00	Why Advocacy? Kate Head Best practice advocacy stories from around the world Participants Best practice advocacy stories from around Palestine
11:00 – 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 – 11:45	Planning Strategic Plans Challenges to Plans Riding out internal, external problems
11:45-12:30 solutions	Group Exercise: Identify internal, external problems and
12:30 – 1:15	Lunch
1:15 - 1:30	Problems and our issue choices Law or Policy Enforcement Public Opinion
1:30 – 1:40	Coffee Break
1:40- 2:30	Exercise: Map your problems, and possible issues
2:30 – 3:30	Peer Review of the Maps

Day Two: Decision Makers

9:00 – 9:15	Introduction of the day
9:15 – 9:45	Decision Makers: Ministries
9:45 – 10:30	Exercise: Target Ministers
10:30 – 11:00	Participants present / Target your Minister
11:00 – 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 – 11:45	Influence the Palestinian Legislative Council
11:45 – 12:30	Group Exercise: Best Practices to Influence Ministers / PLC
12:30 – 1:15	Lunch
1:15 - 1:30	Message Development
1:30 – 2:20	Exercises Messages with Opponents
2:20 – 2:30	Coffee Break
2:30 – 3:30	Peer Review of Decision Makers and Tactics

Day Three: Message Development

9:00 – 9:15	Introduction of the day
9:15 – 9:30	Message Development: Ministers and PLC
9:30 – 11:00	Exercise: Work on Messages to Decision Maker
11:00 – 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 – 12:30	Message Development: Ministers and PLC
12:30 – 1:15	Lunch
1:15 - 1:30	Exercise: Work on Tactics
1:30 – 2:20	Work plan Strategic Planning and Working Groups
2:20 – 2:30	Coffee Break
2:30 – 3:30	Peer Review Tactics and Messages

Day Four: Coalition and Finish of Plans

9:00 – 9:15	Introduction of the Day
9:15 – 9:30	Coalition Stories
9:30 – 10:30	Exercise: Coalition Advantage and Disadvantage
10:30 – 11:15	Exercise: Ask Others to Join Your Coalition
11:15 – 11:45	Coffee Break
11:15 – 12:30	Back to Groups to Identify Who in Coalition (Judiciary / Youth Group)
12:30 – 1:15	Lunch
1:15 - 1:30	Tasks Structure Costs
1:30 – 2:20	Groups Finalize Plans
2:20 – 2:30	Coffee Break
2:30 – 3:30	Peer Review of Coalitions and Plans

Agenda Day 5: Review of Strategic Advocacy Plans

9:00 – 10:00	Each Group Reviews their Advocacy Plans on selected issues
10:00 – 11:00	Plan Presentations, Peer Review and Plans Modification
11:00- 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 – 11:30	Budget, Structure, Costs/ Related to plans
11:30 – 12:30	Revisions of Plans Budget, Structure, Timeline Next Steps as Groups
12:30-1:00	Questions and Answers, Evaluation
1:00	Lunch
1:45	End of Program

**Annex III: Daily Training Program /Gaza
(From 18-21 March, 2007, Gaza City)**

Day	First Session (9:00 – 10:45)	Coffee Break (10:45 – 11:00)	Second Session (11:00 – 13:00)	Lunch Break (13:00 – 13:30)	Third Session (13:30 – 3:30)
First Day Sunday 18/3/07	Introduction: Participants registration, welcome remark, participants introduction, training expectations, daily training program, training administration roles		Advocacy conceptual framework: - Understanding politics - The concept of power (individual exercise) - Types of power - Advocacy definition		Advocacy conceptual framework (continue): - Connecting politics, power and advocacy - Five characteristics of effective advocacy - Advantages and disadvantages of conducting advocacy campaign (group exercise) - Advocacy cycle
Second Day Monday 19/3/07	- Review of first day - Selecting advocacy issues - Criteria for selecting advocacy issues - Selecting advocacy issue exercise (individual and group exercise)		- Study of advocacy issue - Problem/issue analysis - Problem/issue analysis exercise (group exercise)		- Triangulation analysis - Advocacy targets - Triangulation analysis exercise (group exercise) - SWOT analysis - SWOT analysis exercise (group exercise)
Third Day Tuesday 20/3/07	- Review of first day - Developing an advocacy plan - Components of advocacy plan - Developing advocacy objective - Characteristics of good objective - Developing advocacy objective exercise (group exercise)		- Developing advocacy message - Characteristic of good advocacy message - Advocacy box (group exercise) - How to develop effective advocacy message - Developing advocacy message exercise (group exercise) - Delivery of advocacy message - Message substantiation - Tailored advocacy message		- Stake holders analysis - Classification of stake holders - Stake holders analysis tool - Stake holders analysis exercise (group exercise)
Fourth Day Wedne sday 21/3/07	- Review of third day - Pressuring Ministers - Pressuring PLC members - Pressuring Ministers and PLC members exercise (Role playing)		- Advocacy activities/tactics - Types of advocacy tactics - Selecting advocacy tactics exercise (group exercise) - Building coalitions - Advantages and disadvantages of building coalitions in Palestine		- Developing advocacy implementation plan - Components of advocacy implementation plan - Developing advocacy plan exercise (group exercise) - Presenting final advocacy plan by the participants (Final exercise) - Implementation - Monitoring - Evaluation

Annex IV: Participants Evaluation

West Bank Participants Evaluation

Mar 11 – 15, 2007

Evaluation for the five days training

How do you evaluate the training of today in terms of method of training and topics and training materials?

1. Good, appropriate and enjoyable
2. It was a very helpful session in that the other organizations have very different background, we got to know each other, but also found a common ground –
3. The method used is good
4. The material today assist in building support plan for advocacy, method is close and involve trainee
5. Very good but needs to work on large groups to discuss topics are among the objectives of *BAYAN* project
6. A good method relied on smooth information and easy presenting and brainstorming, training materials contained smooth and reasonable examples
7. Exchange views with others and benefit from their experiences in the suggestions subject.
8. I think the training the good from all sides specially since it's the first day and surely will be more interactive in the coming days and it's much better in comparison of the first day of the previous training -
9. Methods used by presenting then discussing the implementing is good, suggested topics are general somehow, training material are good
10. Method training is fun because it depends on the trainee participation with the coach
11. Method is good and enjoyable, in my point of view topics tend to public and materials raised are traditional somehow.
12. Good, The topic needs more time to work with groups where there are variations in the interaction of the participants
13. In general the training was good, but there was more interaction on the Topics
14. Good in terms of style and themes, the good also is the commitment of material
15. Methods is very good, topics too
16. Methods is good and the materials presented is good too and also present that kind of institutions
17. Training Method and subject has more concept and clearer and the there is a chance for participants to develop and explain their experience
18. I was lost for the first one and half hour, But then I was more involved on the subject after the work of the first exercise
19. Very good in terms of method, topics and training materials
20. It must be given a longer period of time to determine budgets and the time required for the implementation of the plan and to determine the extent of its powers

21. Very effective because we did the application and compilation of all the plans and ideas of the previous four days
22. Good day, the details are clear and the topics are very good
23. Very good, it gives a clear summary and simplified to work in the past few days and there is greater clarity in how to work
24. Very Good especially it present the integrated plan for the whole idea from the beginning of the workshop.
25. The method was good and it is a continuation for building an integrated plan
26. The training method and sequence presented material was very clear, humanitarian and sequence so that it would be a good idea to the trainee on the Advocacy subject and provide materials and topics supporting the idea and objective of the course
27. Very helpful and enjoyable
28. Excellent – Method is great in terms of test events and used training materials
29. Good, the topics become more interesting, the material is suitable in terms of drafting letters Practical exercises through groups and the mechanism of interviews with ministers and Legislative Council
30. Excellent, It give a clear idea of writing letter reinforced and clear, How to clarify it in the correct way - The themes were easy and applicable
31. Good from all aspects
32. The training was very good and the method was easy and clear and the training material were enough
33. Method, topics and all activities were selected carefully and are very good
34. Training was good and the interaction in determining alliances and the issues of the possible action in addition to the group work, everything was good.
35. Very Good from coach method to the topics that have been dealt with
36. Excellent, was very useful and specific concerning elements to be taken into consideration in the process of building alliances.
37. Very good, method is more enjoyable and topics began the interdependence towards developing a plan and the training material is very good too.

What are the most useful aspects of today training and is the form of the entire debate added quality to your information?

1. At least I can work on analyzing the problem And know whether its connected to policy, laws or application ... etc –
2. Very helpful: models to analyze (Where is the problem ? what, who should be the focus of advocacy –
3. Tables and the debate around it as well in terms of the content and methodology –
4. The analysis of the issues and solutions are more aspects certainly ,In addition it added information no doubt that I gained additional information's -
5. Identify issues of advocacy and present it to the group –
6. The experiences of other countries in the field of Advocacy and networking, Access to these experience even if it is simple –
7. It was focused on four axes, law, policy, application and public opinion the first two annexes are connect to law and the other is quality are there other sides, It did not add any quality of the information I already have -
8. Work groups on the identification of issues and the development of tactics, the joint work with other institutions

9. All sides/aspects are good , and all aspects are useful and added to me important information
10. The most useful aspects is to work through group work and added value to my quality of information
11. Group work, select the topics that is interest to all participants that provided an opportunity for all to engage in the debate and participate in the experiences
12. I have learned new methods and ideas to deliver my goals/ideas or the idea of the institution to the minister or PLC member through the exchange of ideas between participants. How to access the minister and the PLC member through things and people to get their support
13. How to approach the decision maker
14. Compilation and covered all the previous stages in the form of a draft project and opened area for discussion
15. The advantage of today's training was great, in particular they covered all aspects of training and placing a clear sequence
16. No doubt that the issue raised yesterday completed today added a lot of information for me
17. I think that the picture is clear to me how to plan for the lobbying work and networking on various issues
18. The application of the ideas fully integrated
19. Useful, work in groups, team – work, have feedback from others. Learn from the experiences of others, net working, and exchange of know-how ideas.
20. There is a clear topics for discussion
21. The importance of scheduling, financial and structural measures with determining who is doing what
22. The most useful in determining the structural and financial, time and the presentation of information and how analytical thinking in the development of plans
23. Building an integrated plan with regard to advocacy and impact
24. How to strategically plan to attain a strong and effective coalition
25. How to figure out the messages and the key messages to be direct to the point and hot the target, also be effective
26. The drafting of the letter and the mechanism of the interview
27. All aspects are useful, especially with regard to the application and the representation of practical ideas
28. How can you anticipate the attitude and responses of decision makers and how can you encounter these.
29. How to do a workplan
30. Yes, the discussion added value specially in building coalition and the sequence work in the subject
31. Yes, there was expansion in issues, coalitions and discussion with the participated Institution in addition to unloading information on models that help the future work
32. Addressed to the formation of groupings and mechanisms of formation, especially we participated in the formation of clusters rather not to be formed well
33. Practical Training
34. Forming Coalitions, and the institution interesting to participate in these coalitions
35. The most useful things is the link among the topics and various issues, this form of the skill of how to develop an integrated plan

What is the least benefit for the training today?

1. What are the mechanisms that must be used to develop solutions to discover the problem
2. long discussion, could be shorter
3. Focus on the concept and discussing it and to give him more time, not the aim of academic interest, but provide definition
4. Nothing in particular But perhaps having lack information of the Palestinian law
5. Repetition and various examples but there are only two sides, the law and public opinion and therefore the debate over one side
6. Nothing is not useful
7. I feel I benefited from all what was said in the training, both from participants and the coach
8. Identify the experiences of other peoples on the subject of advocacy, Community concern for the issue, and referred to deal with it on the triangle basis
9. The most useful aspects related to sequence steps to develop a plan for Which was work it through the attached tables, which formed new addition to collate information and to work with
10. I find the whole training useful, but the group interaction was low, the reason behind that is the lack of information on the subject or the language
11. I believe there should be more group works to be more effective
12. How to pressure and influence on ministries and the legislative Council by taking tactics
13. The exit of some participants on the subject, and the transition from one subject.
14. Techniques must be used with the minister or/and members of the legislative council is not completed because one of the groups raised the way and did not complete its work and the other did not provide a sequence and clear steps
15. As I mentioned in my answer to the previous question, the beginning of the day was hard somehow and I could not enter the atmosphere of today rapidly
16. What are the future steps in our organization, which we must work after this training, especially we are not in decision-making positions
17. In my point of view addressing to details and to enter into personal issues that are the points preventing the achievement of the basic objective
18. The discussion and the presented ideas added a lot to my information as to count me an overview of the subject of advocacy and networking in addition to the legal background gained as a result of listening discussion
19. Today's training was very good
20. Training on how to refuse to cooperate is another coalition
21. The non-participation of everyone in the group work
22. Using the same examples, which identify the topics and did some repetition

In your opinion, what are the skills and information acquired that would raise the programs of your institution?

1. Analyze of the problem, obtained experience from other countries, suggestions colleagues presented some additions, suggestion of colleagues presented some additions
2. Skills and knowledge: have a framework to analyze a certain issue
3. The chain process in the areas of influence as a prelude to a comprehensive plan
4. Planning skills for advocacy issues

5. How to define the idea and work it on all aspects
6. I believe that all issues and information discussed will reflect on our institution programs, specially the tables that we have been working on
7. A division of the plan to solve particular problem especially awareness techniques
8. This is my first participation in a specialized subject in advocacy especially that our organization works in this kind of issue
9. The training method was coherent, clear and easy special using the exercises which serve to illustrate the presented topics, Topics and training materials are new in style, but includes things we live with, and sometimes not feeling it especially with the absence of a committed law
10. More emphasis on group works in the institution and develops plans of action and to clarify it
11. The identification of issues and tactics regarding the drafting of the letter issues
12. All skills and information
13. Training provided helps in developing my information and skills that I can present to my organization
14. Skills is how to make an advocacy program and how to work it
15. Tactics were used to know our goal whether they were ministers or and how to pressure on them
16. how to be able to relate all pieces together to bring about a comprehensive and strong advocacy plan
17. The importance of strategic planning and teamwork within an organization
18. Theory and benefit them from the application
19. Develop plans and analyze budgets
20. We will have a role in participating in the operations of Advocacy either to participate in the coalition or leadership
21. How to develop ideas and work on implementing them.
22. Developing a plan, time, costs and skills.
23. Awareness and knowledge in writing proposal to support the campaign or develop certain idea – How to do the advocacy
24. Skills tools to analyze and strategic thinking
25. How to do the budget for the project
26. The skill of teamwork, as well as compatibility between participants
27. Developing skills to build a formal integrated plan for advocacy and impact taking into consideration all related sides and parties
28. I believe that after a look at the issue that I had I think I can talk about Advocacy and networking with my institution, which can be used to influence on decision makers resolution
29. While being a part of an organization that it is a member of coalition, I have gained a good knowledge and skills on how to preserve coalition
30. One of the most important information is how to deal with decision makers and persuasion
31. Focus on writing MSG's and tactics and by which we can work to broaden our theme
32. How to draft a letter and the mechanism of access in writing letters
33. Skills: Preparation steps letter,
34. How to supervise and follow-up
35. How to work to build coalitions in support of the institution
36. I can do the work a comprehensive plan for our institution in order to exert pressure on issues that concern us
37. Identification of issues with other civil institutions

38. Practical training in advocacy, and follow a scientific plan
39. The in Information regarding steps to be followed in process of forming coalition
40. To give a greater idea for the discussion on the presented subject
41. The possibility of developing an integrated plan for Advocacy certain issue
42. New knowledge on the necessary steps to establish coalitions
43. I can now develop a comprehensive plan to my institution in a name to advocate a particular issue

Please provide us with any specific proposals to improve training in the coming days?

1. To clarify the tasks better
2. Teaching methods: a little more interaction, more active
3. Stopping more at practical cases contained in training, taking participants view and any lessons learned in order to deepen the process of exchange education
4. Thank you
5. The cluster of other institutions
6. Working groups focus on the issues and promoting transparency and integrity in legislative work
7. very beneficial to give more examples like today
8. To clarify to participants what they should do in the in exercises
9. There was a problem in the language (English) caused an impediment that effect the trainee participation
10. Sections of the work groups
11. Continuation with work groups and selection of topics that is interest to a all
12. More work groups
13. Try to avoid tiredness and boring
14. More exercises/keep the training as a group work to exchange ideas and broaden the debate
15. The need to follow up on the joint exercises, use the Arabic language or having interpreter, today's material is too long need more time.
16. The use of new tools unconventional used in success stories around the world in detail, using trainers experience in this area
17. Compilation of training material and translated into Arabic version, and distribute them beginning to the participants
18. Certain exercises need more time
19. Please provide us with the training material in Arabic after that sending it to their organizations address mail.
20. Continuing to hold the exercises in the development of plans, it is possible to be trained on how to manage alliances and the Department human elements
21. The training need more time, I believe that every participant need to get back to his organization and work with them to build a campaign to pressure and networking on the issue of specific concern to matter to our institution then come back to discuss it with the expert
22. I believe that the organization (preparation) for the training was very good, in addition to the higher coordination and timeliness, and to address the issue of practical training more than hearing and chatting. (I hope that the training in the future will be less time in order trainees has other institutions work to finalize).
23. Nothing, just go ahead with these kinds of exercises
24. Continue in this context

25. Keep interaction and reopened the discussion constantly

Gaza Participants Evaluation
18 -21 Mar 2007, Gaza
Evaluation for the four days training

How do you assess the training?

1. The training method was easy and fun and excellent.
2. The topics that presented were good and presented elaborately for the first time.
3. Acquired at the end of the training a very good outcome.
4. Training style working on the review of the experiences of trainees.
5. Trainees need a manual with more details and information.

What are the most useful aspects relating to the training?

1. All aspects of training were integrated and useful.
2. The debate and the teamwork were excellent.
3. Advocacy concepts.
4. The training on how to persuade ministers, deputies.
5. The identification of all the advocacy campaign stages and components in detailed.
6. The presented practical examples.
7. Knowledge about *BAYAN* project.

In your opinion, what are the skills and information that have been gained,

1. Planning for the advocacy work.
2. Determining and analysis the advocacy campaign issue.
3. Drafting of the advocacy message.
4. Depth analysis of the meeting with personalities.
5. The team work and to work under pressure.
6. Time commitment and negotiation skills
7. Definitions and concepts related to advocacy.
8. How the decision makers think and the challenges within the society.
9. Building coalitions and the changing strategies

Would this training improve your work? If the answer is yes, how?

1. Improve my work especially related to advocacy, lobbying and coalitions building.
2. The amount and kind of information gained will help in field work and work within the institution.
3. Helped me to understand the advocacy message development. This is very useful, especially as I work in coordinating a program with municipalities and serves the community.
4. Will help me in the development of advocacy plans and activities to be carried out by my CSO in the coming period.
5. The experience gained will benefit in the implementation of future advocacy plans.
6. To get my work organized.

7. To become able to work on advocacy campaign in practical way.

What are the less useful aspects relating to the training, please provide us with ant suggestions to improve the training?

1. *BAYAN* project to continue offer such kind of useful training and workshops.
2. To maintain contacts with the trainees.
3. The training needs more than four days.
4. Providing us with a manual that includes all the material.
5. To fund the developed advocacy plans.