

A Workshop to Promote Evidence-based Policy Making in the Small and Medium Enterprise Sector in Egypt

27th Feb – 1st March 2005, Cairo, Egypt

Appendices



John Young (j.young@odi.org.uk)
Julius Court (j.court@odi.org.uk)
Overseas Development Institute,
111 Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7JD, UK

Table of Contents

Appendix 1: Presentation Slides	1
Appendix 2: RAPID Briefing Paper (Text Version).....	12
Appendix 3: Kenya Animal Health Case Study	18
Appendix 4: Force Field Analysis.....	20
Appendix 5: RAPID Political Context Questionnaire.....	22
Appendix 6: Policy Entrepreneur Questionnaire	27
Appendix 7: Policy Mapping Handout.....	29
Appendix 8: Political Context Questionnaire Results	37
Appendix 9: RAPID Framework 28 Key Questions.....	42
Appendix 10: SWOT Analysis Tools Sheet.....	43
Appendix 11: Other References.....	45
Appendix 12: Participants Evaluation	47


Appendix 1: Presentation Slides



Slide 1




Slide 3



Slide 5




Slide 7



Slide 2



Slide 4



Slide 6



Slide 8

Our Goal

"If we want to change the world, we must first understand it." Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General

RAPID aims to help people to:

- Understand how policy processes work?
- Identify what the problems are.
- Work to improve the availability and use of evidence.

Slide 9

Rationale

Evidence can help

- Identify issues / problems for policymakers
- Prioritize between issues
- Develop strategies
- Improve effectiveness of interventions
- Assess whether a strategy is working

Slide 11

Evidence-Based Policy – key texts

- *Modernizing Government*, UK Cabinet Office
- *The Magenta Book: Guidance Notes on Policy Evaluation*, Chief Social Researcher's Office
- *Getting the Evidence*, NAO
- *Government Action Plan*, Small Business Service
- *Better Policy-Making*, Bullock
- *Evidence-based policy*, Nutley
- *Policy-based evidence*, Sanderson
- *Speaking Truth to Power*, Bardach

Slide 13

Challenges of EBP

- Lack of awareness of the value.
- There is no evidence base to draw on!
- Policy processes are problematic (coherence, consultation, etc)
- Implementation is problematic due to:
 - Lack of capacity
 - New types of accountability resisted by Ministers or risk averse civil servants.

Slide 15

The Opportunity

The results of household disease surveys informed processes of health service reform which contributed to a 43 and 46 per cent reduction in infant mortality between 2000 and 2003 in two districts in rural Tanzania.

IDRC TEHIP Project

Slide 17

Background

- Greater need for evidence due to ...
 - Opening up of policy space
 - Economic complexity due to globalization & liberalization
- But ...
 - Policy processes remain unclear, unparticipatory, etc.
 - Gaps between formulation & implementation.
 - Research capacity remains weak in many countries.
 - Policy systems vary across the world.
- *Researchers and policymakers still often seem to live in parallel universes.*

Slide 10

Getting Evidence (UK Govt.)

- "...good policy making draws on all forms of evidence which include: expert knowledge; published research; existing statistics; stakeholder consultations; previous policy evaluations; the Internet; outcomes from consultations; costing of policy options; output from economic and statistical modelling."

(Strategic Policy Making Team, 1999)

Slide 12

SBS: Use of Evidence



Slide 14

...parallel universes?

Policy makers in the UK cannot be evidence-based because they operate in an environment characterised by:




- Speed
- Superficiality
- Spin
- Secrecy
- Scientific ignorance

Vincent Cable (MP, UK) www.od.org.uk/RAPIDMeetingsEvidence

Slide 16

HIV Prevalence



Source: UNAIDS


Slide 18

Any Questions?

Slide 19

The RAPID Analytical Framework

Slide 21




Slide 23

Existing theory

1. ~~Parson's model~~
2. Parson's model, Wais
3. Tipping point model, Gladwell
4. Content analysis and framework, Giddens
5. Policy initiatives, Roe
6. Systems model (M&S)
7. External forces, Lindquist
8. Room for manoeuvre, Clay & Saha-Roy
9. Street level bureaucrats, Lipsky
10. Policy as social experiments, Riddell
11. Policy Streams & Windows, Kingdon
12. Disjointed incrementalism, Lindvall
13. The 'tipping point', Gladwell
14. Crisis model, Korten
15. Framework of possible thought, Chomsky
16. Variables for Credibility, Beach
17. The source is as important as content, Gladwell
18. Linear model of communication, Shannon
19. Interactive model
20. Single and recurring stories, Communication Theory
21. Provide solutions, Marketing Theory I
22. Find the right packaging, Marketing II
23. Start a response, Kotler
24. Translation of technology, Vohra
25. Epidemic communication
26. Policy communities
27. Adaptive evolution etc, Paine
28. Negotiation through networks, Sabel
29. Shadow networks, Korten
30. Chain of accountability, Fine
31. Communication for social change, Riddell
32. Wheels and axles, Chapman & Fisher

www.edi.org.uk/hp/frameset/theory

Slide 25



Slide 27

Group Work 1:

What are the key factors affecting ...

- Evidence - policy links in Egypt? (general), or
- The use of research on policy in your work?

Slide 20

Definitions

- Research: "any systematic effort to increase the stock of knowledge"
- Policy: a "purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors"
 - Agendas / policy horizons
 - Official statements documents
 - Patterns of spending
 - Implementation processes
 - Activities on the ground

Slide 22

...in reality...

- "The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies"
- "Most policy research on African agriculture is irrelevant to agricultural and overall economic policy in Africa"
- "Research is more often regarded as the opposite of action rather than a response to ignorance"

1. Clay & Saha-Roy (1996), Room for Manoeuvre: An Exploration of Policy Policy in Agriculture and Rural Development, Overseas Educational Tools, London
2. Oram (2002), Policy Research in African Agriculture: Trends, Gaps, and Challenges, International Centre for Tropical Agricultural Research (ICRAT) Research Report No. 21
3. Sun (2005), DFID Research Review

Slide 24


Existing theory – a st

- Policy narratives, Roe
- Systems of Innovation Model
- 'Room for manoeuvre', Clay & Saha-Roy
- 'Street level bureaucrats', Lipsky
- Policy as social experiments,
- Policy streams and policy win
- Disjointed Incrementalism, Kingdon
- Social Epidemics, Gladwell
- The RAPID Framework



Slide 26

Other models



Slide 28

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Case Studies


- Sustainable Livelihoods: The Evolution of DFID Policy
- The PRSP Initiative: Research in Multilateral Policy Change
- The adoption of Ethical Principles in Humanitarian Aid post Rwanda
- Animal Health Care in Kenya: Evidence fails to influence Policy
- 50 GDN Case Studies: Examples where evidence has or hasn't influenced policy



Slide 29

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Paravets in Kenya



Slide 30

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Paravets in Kenya - Lessons

- Policy stagnation, despite
- Powerful pressures for change
- Professional protectionism
- Practical evidence invisible to policy makers
- A few powerful individuals controlled the process
- A crisis
- New champions
- Collaborative policy-research

Slide 31

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Political Context: Key Areas

- The macro political context (democracy, governance, media freedom, academic freedom)
- The sector / issue process (Policy uptake = demand + contestation) (NB Demand: political and societal, Power)
- How policymakers think (narratives & policy streams)
- Policy implementation and practice (bureaucracies, incentives, street level, room for manoeuvre, participatory approaches)
- Decisive moments in the policy process (policy processes, votes, policy windows and crises)
- Context is crucial, but you can maximize your chances

Slide 32

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Evidence: Relevance and credibility

- Key factor – did it provide a solution to a problem?
- Relevance:
 - Topical relevance – What to do?
 - Operational usefulness – How to do it?
- Credibility:
 - Research approach
 - Of researcher > of evidence itself
- Strenuous advocacy efforts are often needed
- Communication

Slide 33

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Links: Feedback and Networks

- Feedback processes often prominent in successful cases.
- Trust & legitimacy
- Networks:
 - Epistemic communities
 - Policy networks
 - Advocacy coalitions
- The role of individuals: connectors, mavens and salesmen, champions.

Slide 34

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

External Influence

- Big "incentives" can spur evidence-based policy – e.g. EU accession, PRSP processes.
- And some interesting examples of donors trying new things re. supporting research
- But, we really don't know whether and how donors can best promote use of evidence in policymaking (credibility vs backlash)

Slide 35

Any Questions?

Slide 36

Group Work 2:
Use the Context, Evidence and Links framework to review the Kenya Animal health Care case study, and see if you can answer the questions.

Slide 37

Feedback and Discussion

Slide 38

Homework:
Identify ONE SME Policy Issue you are currently working on, and would like to be able to achieve greater impact. (NB be prepared to make a MAXIMUM 5 minutes talk to describe/explain it)

Slide 39

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

Outline of the Workshop

Day 1

- General Introductions
- Theory - Research Policy Processes
- The General Context

Day 2

- Identification specific problems
- Policy Process Tools & SME Policy processes in Egypt
- Other policy entrepreneur tools
- What you already do
- Working on the problems.

Day 3

- Strategic Planning
- Programme Planning
- Personal Action Plans
- Evaluation



Slide 41

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

Existing theory – a st

- Policy narratives, Roe
- Systems of Innovation Model
- 'Room for manoeuvre', Clay
- 'Street level bureaucrats', Lip
- Policy as social experiments,
- Policy streams and policy win
- Dajointed Incrementalism, Li
- Social Epidemics, Gladwell
- The RAPID Framework



Slide 43

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid



Slide 45

Issues for further development

Slide 47


Day 2

Slide 40

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

Evidence-Based Policy – key texts


Figure 1 in The Evidence Guide



Slide 42

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

An Analytical Framework



External influences
Socio-economic and cultural influences, donor policies, etc.

The political context – political and economic structures and processes, culture, institutional pressures, governmental radical change, etc.

The links between policy and research communities – networks, relationships, power, competing discourses, trust, knowledge, etc.

The evidence – credibility, the degree of challenges received, research approaches and methodology, simplicity of the message, how it is packaged, etc.

Slide 44

od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

Overview of factors in Egypt

- Top down common
- Ministers key
- Quality of data variable
- Capacity weak
- Coordination poor
- Stakeholder trust low

Slide 46


od RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rpid

- **Operationalising the National Policy Framework**
 - Improve links between SME stakeholders: What incentives would help SMEs to participate
 - Establish Greater Levels of Trust between government and (i) the public, (ii) SMEs
 - Increasing awareness among SMEs about existing schemes to provide support
 - Encouraging big companies to help to develop SMEs
 - Promote technology innovation among SMEs for competitiveness
- **Improving SME access to finance**
 - Establishing credit centres for SMEs in Governorates
- **Improving SME exports:**
 - Encouraging the private sector to establishing a 'Trading House' to promote SME product exports
 - Improve legislation to promote SME exporting
 - Increasing stakeholder buy-in to SME export promotion strategy
- **Reduce tax rate for SMEs**
- **Establish Value Chain Analysis as a widely accepted tool**

Slide 48




Slide 49




Slide 51




Slide 53



Slide 55




Slide 57




Slide 50




Slide 52



Slide 54



Slide 56




Slide 58

What researchers need to do

What researchers need to know	What researchers need to do	How to do it
Political Context: - Who are the policy-makers? - Is there demand for research? - What is the policy process? Evidence: - What is the current theory? - What are the controversies? - How do you fit in? Links: - Who are the stakeholders? - What resources are available? - What are the constraints? - What is the timeline?	- Get to know the policymakers - Identify needs and fears - Prepare for policy opportunities - Look out for policy windows - Establish credibility - Promote successful outcomes - Establish legitimacy - Develop clear options - Use feasible strategies - Call to action the allies - Work through existing networks - Build coalitions - Balance policy tensions	- Work with them to seek consensus - Strategic communication - prepare for known events - Champions for others - Build a reputation - Act on research - Pilot projects to generate legitimacy - Good communication - Build partnerships - Identify key stakeholders, mentors and sponsors - Use informal contacts

Slide 59

Practical Tools



Slide 61

Policy Entrepreneurship Questionnaire



Slide 63


Mapping the Policy Context

- RAPID Framework
- Stakeholder Analysis
- Force field analysis
- Policy Process Mapping
- Influence mapping
- Outcome Mapping

Slide 65

Stakeholder Analysis

- Why:**
- To understand who gains or lose from a policy or project.
 - To help Build Consensus.
- Steps:**
- Identify Stakeholders
 - Analysis Workshop
 - Develop Strategies




Slide 67

Skills of (pro-poor) policy entrepreneurs



Slide 60



Slide 62



Slide 64

The Policy Cycle



(Young and Gains, 2002)

Slide 66

Forcefield Analysis

- Steps:**
- Identify a specific Change
 - Identify forces for and against change
 - Prioritise the forces
 - Develop Strategies to overcome opposing and reinforce supporting forces




Slide 68

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Policy Process Workshops

- Looking at internal policy processes – what works in DFID.
- Small, informal workshop with 7 staff.
- Participatory pair-wise ranking of factors influencing the success of 8 policy processes.
- Worked quite well.
- In DFID - agendas and processes rather than documents are key



Slide 69

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Policy Process Mapping

	Agenda	Formulation	Implementation	Mon & Eval
Government				
Political Society				
Bureaucracy				
Civil Society				
Private Sector				
International				

Slide 71

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Policy Process Mapping

	Formulation	Implementation
Government		
Political Society		
Bureaucracy		
Civil Society		
Private Sector		
International		

Group 1 – Government
 Group 2 – Political Society and Bureaucracy
 Group 3 – Civil Society, Private Sector and International

Slide 73

Tools for Policy Influence

Slide 75

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Implications for SMEPOL

- Need to be able to:
 - Understand the political context
 - Do credible research
 - Communicate effectively
 - Work with others
- Need organisational capacity
 - Staff
 - Internal processes
 - Funds

Slide 77

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Policy Process Mapping

- General Context issues – domestic and international.
- Specific Policy issues (i.e. the policy cycle)
- Who are the Stakeholders? (Stakeholder analysis)
 - Arena: government, parliament, civil society, judiciary, private sector.
 - Level: local, national, international
- What is their Interest and Influence?
- Process matrix + political matrix
- Political and administrative feasibility assessment

[Sources: M. Grindle / J. Court]

Slide 70

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Policy Process Mapping for SMEs

- Participants work on a set of actors related to policy processes
- Steps:
 - Identify key actors that influence SME policy
 - Create Matrix: Organizations and Key Steps of the Policy Process
 - Describe Organizations' formal position in the policy process
 - Describe Organizations' informal influence on the policy process
 - Give a number rating (1=low; 5=high) for the influence each organization has on different parts of the policy process.

Slide 72

Group Work 1:
 Mapping the political process

- Within your area(s) – identify the key actors that influence SME policy formulation and/or implementation
- Outline their formal and informal roles in formulation and/or implementation and write a description on an index card
- Also identify, and write on the card where SME research is undertaken
- Give a number rating (1=low; 5=high) for the influence each organization has on different parts of the policy process.

Slide 74

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Practical Tools



- Communication Tools**
 - Organisational Readiness Assessment
 - Market Segmentation and the Gateway
 - Mapping the Product Life Cycle
 - The Marketing Agreement
 - The Marketing Mix
 - The Promotions Mix
 - Product Mapping
 - The City Platform
 - Pre-sending the Message
 - Contents ready
- Context Assessment Tools**
 - Problem and Objective Tree Analysis
 - Stakeholder Analysis
 - Consequential Analysis
 - Influence Mapping
 - SWOT Analysis
 - Towhee Analysis
- Policy Influence Tools**
 - Policy Plans
 - Partnerships
 - A Lobbyist's Hierarchy of Needs
 - Getting to Top
 - The 8 Ps of Influence
 - Public Participation
 - Competition Analysis
- Research Tools**
 - Equity Studies
 - Focus Groups
 - Workshops

Slide 76

RAPD Programme www.od.org.uk/rpd

Think Tanks – 3 Modes of Influence



www.od.org.uk/RAPD/Meetings/VideoCall/Science_Series.html

Slide 78

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Different Roles

Slide 79

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Log Frame Approach

- Goal
- Purpose
- Stakeholders
- Outputs
- Assumptions
- Indicators / MoVs

Slide 80

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Outcome Mapping

- Focuses on:
 - changes in behaviour
 - how programs "facilitate" rather than "cause" change
- Recognizes the complexity of development processes
- Looks at "logical links" between interventions and outcomes
- Locates programme goals within the broader development context
- Encourages innovation and risk taking
- Involves program staff and partners throughout

Slide 81

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Outcome Mapping: example

Slide 82

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Communications strategy

- Identify the audience(s)
- Identify the message(s)
- Promotion
- Evaluate impact and change as necessary
- Clear Strategy
 - Interactive
 - Multiple formats

The DELIVERI Project:

- Information Strategy / Leaflet
- Materials

Slide 83

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Writing Effective Policy Papers I

Providing a solution to a policy problem

- The policy community
- The policy process
- Structural elements of a paper
 - Problem description
 - Policy options
 - Conclusion
- Key issues: Problem oriented, targeted, multidisciplinary, applied, clear, jargon-free

[Source: Young and Quinn, 2002]

Slide 84

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

Networks

- Roles of Policy Networks
 - Filtering
 - Amplifying
 - Investor / Provider
 - Facilitator
 - Convening
 - Communities
- Policy Code Sharing
- Some networks net; some networks work.

Slide 85

RAPID Programme www.od.org.uk/rapid

How we're doing it in RAPID

- Clear Aim & Outputs
- Building credibility with research/action
- Employing the right staff & staff development
- Good internal systems (Mgt, Comms & KM)
- Programme approach:
 - Strategic opportunism
 - Research / practical advice / stimulating debate
 - Engagement with policy makers & practitioners
 - Community of practice of network
- Financial opportunism

Slide 86


Group Work 2
 What approaches, tools and tricks does SMEPOL already use to influence policy?

- If you can, please distinguish between different parts of the policy process: agenda setting, formulation, decision, implementation, monitoring

Slide 87

Please don't leave without handing in your questionnaires.

Slide 88




Slide 89




Slide 90



Slide 91




Slide 92




Slide 93



Slide 94



Slide 95



Slide 96



Slide 97



Slide 98

Strategic Planning

- Describe what you would like to see (by when)
- Analyse the context now (using the RAPID Framework)
- Use Force-Field Analysis to develop 5 or 6 strategic actions
- Use SWOT to assess feasibility

Slide 99

Group Task:

To develop strategies to:

- Operationalise the National Policy Framework
- Improve policies for SME access to finance
- Improve policies for SME exports

Slide 101

The missing materials..

- ODI Working Papers
 - Annotated Bibliography
 - Context, Evidence, Links Framework
 - 50 Case Studies
- Meeting series Monograph
- Tools for Policy Impact
- RAPID Briefing Paper



Slide 103

Evaluation

Slide 105

Current Policy Issues

- Operationalising the National Policy Framework
 - Improve links between SME stakeholders
 - Establish Greater Levels of Trust
 - Increasing awareness among SMEs
 - Encouraging big companies to help to develop SMEs
 - Promote technology innovation among SMEs for competitiveness
- Improving SME access to finance
 - Improving access to credit
 - Establishing credit centres for SMEs in Government
- Improving SME exports:
 - Establishing a "Trading House" to promote SME product exports
 - Improving legislation to promote SME exporting
 - Increasing stakeholder buy-in to SME export promotion strategy

Slide 100

Group Task Feedback:

c.7-8 minutes from each group to present:

- Objective, Analysis of current situation, Action strategy, SWOT, conclusion, what more needs to be done?

Other participants to think about:

- Have they considered all the factors - is the approach comprehensive, "logical" and achievable?

All to think about:

- Are there implications for SMEPOL?

Slide 102

Other Sources

- The web site
- The CD
- The Meeting Report and CD



Slide 104

Thank You!

Please let us know how you get on!

John Young - jyoung@odi.org.uk
 Julius Court - jcourt@odi.org.uk
 RAPID Programme
 Overseas Development Institute
 111 Westminster Bridge Road
 London SE1 7JD
 Tel: (+44) 207 6203000
 Fax: (+44) 207 6203009



Slide 106

Appendix 2: RAPID Briefing Paper (Text Version)

Bridging Research and Policy in International Development: An Analytical and Practical Framework

The Issue in Brief

Better use of research-based evidence in development policy and practice can help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. But for this to happen more effectively researchers need to do three things:

First, they need to develop a detailed understanding of i) the policymaking process – what are the key influencing factors, and how do they relate to each other? ii) the nature of the evidence they have, or hope to get – is it credible, practical and operationally useful? and iii) all the other stakeholders involved in the policy area – who else can help to get the message across?

Second, they need to develop an overall strategy for their work – identify political supporters and opponents, keep an eye out for, and be able to react to policy windows, ensure the evidence is credible and practically useful, and build coalitions with like-minded groups.

Third, they need to be entrepreneurial – get to know, and work with the policymakers, build long term programmes of credible research, communicate effectively, use participatory approaches, identify key networkers and salesmen and use shadow networks.

Based on over five years of theoretical and case study research, ODI's Research and Policy in Development programme has developed a simple analytical framework and practical tools that can help researchers to do this.

Why Research-Policy Links Matter

Often it seems that researchers, practitioners and policymakers live in parallel universes. Researchers cannot understand why there is resistance to policy change despite clear and convincing evidence. Policymakers bemoan the inability of many researchers to make their findings accessible and digestible in time for policy decisions. Practitioners often just get on with things.

Yet better utilisation of research and evidence in development policy and practice can help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. For example, the results of household disease surveys in rural Tanzania informed a process of health service reforms which contributed to over 40% reductions in infant mortality between 2000 and 2003 in two districts.

Indeed, the impact of research and evidence on development policy is not only beneficial – it is crucial. The HIV/AIDS crisis has deepened in some countries because of the reluctance of governments to implement effective control programmes despite clear evidence of what causes the disease and how to prevent it spreading.

What Influences Research to Policy Uptake? The RAPID Framework

Often, the link between research and policy, or evidence and practice, is viewed as a linear process, whereby a set of research findings or lessons shift from the 'research sphere' over to the 'policy sphere', and then has some impact on policymakers' decisions and practical programmes. Reality tends to be much more dynamic and complex, with two-way processes between research, policy and practice, shaped by multiple relations and reservoirs of knowledge.

The traditional question ‘How can research be transported from the research to the policy sphere?’ has been replaced by a more complex question: ‘Why are some of the ideas that circulate in the research/policy networks picked up and acted on, while others are ignored and disappear?’.

ODI’s theoretical, case study and practical work has identified a wide range of inter-related factors, which determine whether research-based and other forms of evidence are likely to be adopted by policymakers and practitioners. These factors can broadly be divided into three overlapping areas: the political context; the evidence; and the links between policy and research communities, within a fourth set of factors: the external context. The interplay of these four areas is laid out in Figure 1: The RAPID Framework. The framework should be seen as a generic, perhaps ideal, model. In some cases there will not be much overlap between the different spheres; in others the overlap may vary considerably.

The Problem

- *The Policy Process: ‘The whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents. It is not at all a matter of the rational implementation of the so-called decisions through selected strategies’ – Edward Clay, 1984*
- *Relevance: ‘Most policy research on African agriculture is irrelevant to agricultural and overall economic policy in Africa’ – Steve Were Omamo, 2003*
- *Policy Uptake: policymakers ‘seem to regard “research” as the opposite of “action” rather than the opposite of “ignorance”.’ – Martin Surr, 2002*
- *Cost Effectiveness of Donor Resources: ‘Donor countries spend over US\$2bn annually on development research. Is this value for money?’ – RAPID Programme, 2003*

Examples of ODI Work on Research-Policy Linkages

ODI has used this framework extensively in its research and advisory work, including:

- *to analyse four major policy events: the adoption of PRSPs; the development of an ethical charter by humanitarian agencies; animal health policies in Kenya; the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach;*
- *to analyse 50 summary cases studies as part of Phase I of the GDN Bridging Research and Policy Project (Court and Young, 2003);*
- *to structure literature reviews focusing on communications issues, knowledge management, the role of Civil Society Organizations, and how networks work;*
- *in a study of research-policy interaction in HIV/AIDS in developing countries;*
- *in evaluations of the impact of internal policy papers on bilateral donor policy; and*
- *in workshops and seminars with researchers, practitioners and policymakers in Botswana, Morocco, India, Moldova, Kenya, UK and USA.*

For more information on projects, publications & lessons, please visit: www.odi.org.uk/rapid.

Political Context: Politics and Institutions

Research-policy links are dramatically shaped by the political context. The policy process and the production of research are in themselves political processes from start to finish. Key influencing factors include:

- The extent of civil and political freedoms in a country;
- Political contestation, institutional pressures and vested interests;
- The attitudes and incentives among officials, their room for manoeuvre, local history, and power relations.

In some cases the political strategies and power relations are obvious, and are tied to specific institutional pressures. Ideas circulating may be discarded by the majority of staff in an organisation if those ideas elicit disapproval from the leadership.

Evidence: Credibility and Communication

Our findings and experience suggest that the quality of the research is important for policy uptake. Policy influence is affected by topical relevance and, as importantly, the operational usefulness of an idea; it helps if a new approach has been piloted and the document can clearly demonstrate the value of a new option. A critical issue affecting uptake is whether research has provided a solution to a problem.

The other key set of issues here concern communication. The sources and conveyors of evidence, the way new messages are packaged (especially if they are couched in familiar terms) and targeted can all make a big difference. For example, marketing is based on the insight that people's reaction to a new product or idea is often determined by the packaging rather than the content in and of itself. The key message is that communication is a very demanding process and it is best to take an interactive approach. Continuous interaction leads to greater chances of successful communication than a simple or linear approach.

Links: Influence and Legitimacy

Third, our work emphasises the importance of links; of communities, networks and intermediaries (for example, the media and campaigning groups) in affecting policy change. Some of the current literature focuses explicitly on various types of networks, such as policy communities, epistemic communities, and advocacy coalitions. While systematic understanding remains limited, issues of trust, legitimacy, openness and the formalisation of networks have emerged as important. Existing theory stresses the role of translators and communicators. It seems that there is often an under-appreciation of the extent and ways that intermediary organisations and networks impact on formal policy guidance documents, which in turn influence officials.

External Influences

Finally, a synthesis of the RAPID experience emphasises the impact of external forces and donors actions on research-policy interactions. While many questions remain, key issues here include the impact of international politics and processes, as well as the impact of general donor policies and specific research-funding instruments. Broad incentives, such as EU Accession or the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process, can have a substantial impact on the demand for research by policymakers. Trends towards democratisation and liberalisation and donor support for civil society are also having an impact. Much of the research on development issues is undertaken in the North, raising concerns of relevance and beneficiaries' access to the findings. A substantial amount of research in the poorest countries is funded by international donors, which also raises a range of issues around ownership, whose priorities, use of external consultants and perceived legitimacy. As policy processes become increasingly global, this arena will increase in importance.

However, although evidence clearly matters, there has been very limited systematic understanding of when, how and why evidence informs policy. This Briefing Paper provides a synthesis of the main conclusions of recent ODI work in this area and makes recommendations for how research can better contribute to pro-poor policy and practice.

PRSPs: A Case Study of Research-Policy Linkages

In September 1999, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) adopted a new approach to aid – Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). How did the idea of the PRSP come to be adopted? What was the role of research in this process – both 'academic

research' in general and the 'applied policy research' within the World Bank and IMF? An ODI case study traces the various factors that contributed to this far-reaching policy shift.

Political Context: The most important contextual factor that shaped the PRSP initiative was the convergence of debates and controversies in the field of international development in the late 1990s. This led to a widespread sense of there being 'a problem' within the international development policy field even though policymakers did not agree on the exact nature of the problem. The challenges that needed to be addressed – particularly by the World Bank and the IMF – included:

- The questioning of the mandates of the IMF and World Bank – in the light of the 1997 Asia Crisis and the failure of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) to resolve Africa's development problems;
- The 1999 Review of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the campaign to make debt relief 'broader, deeper, faster, better';
- The need to operationalise the new conceptual framework for aid put forward by World Bank President James Wolfensohn's Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF).

The PRSP initiative can be viewed as bringing together all these interlinked concerns, and providing answers or at least partial solutions to the issues that needed to be addressed. It therefore received broad-based support from many different parties.

Evidence: There were three main types of evidence that influenced the emergence of the PRSP initiative. First, academic research contributed, often indirectly, to the major shifts in international development discourse towards poverty reduction, participation, and aid effectiveness. Second, there were important pieces of applied policy research undertaken in the late 1990s, in particular the research related to the ESAF reviews, the HIPC review, the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) Working Groups, and the NGO research on debt relief. This evidence focused more on providing policy recommendations and operational solutions. This was seen as particularly credible when it was commissioned by the IFIs themselves or other donors, demonstrated analytical rigour, and was communicated in a language that was accessible and relevant to World Bank and IMF staff and other donor agencies. Third, an extremely powerful demonstration effect was provided by the positive experience of Uganda in drafting the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). This did much to convince policymakers of the feasibility and merits of the poverty reduction strategy model.

Links: The PRSP story is characterised by a multitude of links between policymakers and researchers in main institutional actors – the World Bank and IMF, Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA), UK and US governments, and the NGO movement. As one interviewee put it, 'none of the players is more than two handshakes away from any of the others'. The formal and informal networks contributed to the speed with which the PRSP ideas were spread and accepted in international development policy.

When Does Evidence Influence Policy?

Emerging results from this and a synthesis of the other ODI studies seems to indicate that research-based and other forms of evidence is more likely to contribute to policy if:

- It fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policymakers, and resonates with their assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge them;
- The evidence is credible and convincing, provides practical solutions to pressing policy problems, and is packaged to attract policymakers' interest;
- Researchers and policymakers share common networks, trust each other, and communicate effectively.

But these three conditions are rarely met in practice. Although researchers and practitioners can control the credibility of their evidence and ensure they interact with and communicate well with policymakers, they often have limited capacity to influence the political context within which they work. Resources are also limited, and researchers and practitioners need to make choices about what they do. By making more informed, strategic choices, researchers can maximise their chances of policy influence.

What Can Researchers Do?

Evidence from ODI's work so far provides preliminary recommendations in four areas, which are laid out in the following table:

What you need to know	What you need to do	How to do it
<p>Political Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who are the policymakers? ▪ Is there policymaker demand for new ideas? ▪ What are the sources / strengths of resistance? ▪ What is the policy-making process? ▪ What are the opportunities and timing for input into formal processes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get to know the policymakers, their agendas and their constraints. ▪ Identify potential supporters and opponents. ▪ Keep an eye on the horizon and prepare for opportunities in regular policy processes. ▪ Look out for – and react to – unexpected policy windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with the policy makers. ▪ Seek commissions. ▪ Line up research programmes with high-profile policy events. ▪ Reserve resources to be able to move quickly to respond to policy windows. ▪ Allow sufficient time & resources
<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the current theory? ▪ What are the prevailing narratives? ▪ How divergent is the new evidence? ▪ What sort of evidence will convince policymakers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish credibility over the long term. ▪ Provide practical solutions to problems. ▪ Establish legitimacy. ▪ Build a convincing case and present clear policy options. ▪ Package new ideas in familiar theory or narratives. ▪ Communicate effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build up programmes of high-quality work. ▪ Action-research and Pilot projects to demonstrate benefits of new approaches. ▪ Use participatory approaches to help with legitimacy & implementation. ▪ Clear strategy and resources for communication from start. ▪ Face-to-face communication.
<p>Links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who are the key stakeholders in the policy discourse? ▪ What links and networks exist between them? ▪ Who are the intermediaries and what influence do they have? ▪ Whose side are they on? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get to know the other stakeholders. ▪ Establish a presence in existing networks. ▪ Build coalitions with like-minded stakeholders. ▪ Build new policy networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partnerships between researchers, policy makers and communities. ▪ Identify key networkers and salesmen. ▪ Use informal contacts.
<p>External Influences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who are main international actors in the policy process? ▪ What influence do they have? ▪ What are their aid priorities? ▪ What are their research priorities and mechanisms? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get to know the donors, their priorities and constraints. ▪ Identify potential supporters, key individuals and networks. ▪ Establish credibility. ▪ Keep an eye on donor policy and look out for policy windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop extensive background on donor policies. ▪ Orient communications to suit donor priorities and language. ▪ Try to work with the donors and seek commissions. ▪ Contact (regularly) key individuals.

RAPID has been testing and developing the practical applications of this framework through a series of case studies and international workshops. It is clear that the conditions of the political context, the evidence, the links and the external factors vary greatly according to the particular situation. Further information on the use of the framework in a variety of specific contexts will be presented in subsequent Briefing Papers.

Source Material

This Briefing Paper is based on work conducted in the RAPID Programme at ODI, and particularly draws on the book *Bridging Research and Policy in International Development: Evidence and the Change Process* by Julius Court, Ingie Hovland and John Young (ITDG, 2004).

The RAPID Programme

ODI's Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) programme aims to improve the use of research and evidence in development policy and practice through research, advice and debate. The programme has four main themes:

- The use of evidence in policy identification, development and implementation;
- Improving communication and information systems for development agencies;
- Better knowledge management to enhance the impact of development agencies;
- Promotion and capacity building for evidence-based policy.

We would like to acknowledge support for this work from: the UK Department for International Development, the Global Development Network, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, and the Merck Foundation.

Overseas Development Institute
111 Westminster Bridge Road
London SE1 7JD
UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 7922 0300
Fax: +44 (0)20 7922 0399
rapid@odi.org.uk
www.odi.org.uk/rapid

Appendix 3: Kenya Animal Health Case Study

This case study explores attempts to legalise paravets in Kenya, who were for many years running decentralised, community-based animal care in various regions of the country. The Organisation of African Unity/International Bureau for Animal Resources Pan Africa Rinderpest Campaign (OAU/IBAR) was one of the central agents pushing for a change in policy. Given a brief history of the context and progress towards policy reform, we want you to place yourself in the year 1998, when those working to legalise paravets faced a critical fork in the road. Your task is to imagine how OAU/IBAR responded and with what impact.

Teaching Purpose: To explore the relationship between research and policy-making, and consider ways that, in the Kenyan context, the eventual policy shift in favour of paravets providing community-based livestock services could have been speeded up.

The story so far...

In the colonial era, and immediately after Kenya gained independence, most clinical vet services were provided by private practitioners and by 'Vet Scouts' who were informally trained and provided care across the regions. These Vet Scouts were phased out in the 1970s, when 'African Socialism' instituted free livestock services for all, provided by the government. Private practitioners went out of business. The reforms created more professional, accessible care in many areas, but those living in the arid and semi-arid regions of Kenya had almost no access to the new service.

It was this problem that paravets – men and women trained to administer basic animal care - hoped to address, through decentralised, community-based animal care. From small pilot projects in the early 1980s, expansion came in 1986 with the arrival of a UK-based NGO, the Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG). They set up a programme of training paravets, with the intention of testing the approach and (if it proved successful) promoting it to policy-makers. But all the while the work of the paravets was illegal. The policy-making arena at that time looked unsympathetic: two policy papers aiming to liberalise paravet practices had failed in the planning and implementation stages, and the Director of Veterinary Services (DVS), Dr Wamukoya, appointed in 1990, was highly conservative.

In this climate, the development of further paravet schemes went on quietly, unbeknown to both the DVS and the Kenya Vet Board (KVB). The numbers of trained paravets continued to rise but many of them, unable to work legally without the supervision of a qualified professional vet, were becoming disgruntled and opted to work for private practices that were springing up as a result of the DVA's privatisation scheme in 1994. By 1997, there were a number of paravet schemes throughout the arid and semi-arid areas of Kenya, meeting annually at the ITDG vet workshops. One participant who had been lobbied to attend was Dr Kajume, a Regional Director of Veterinary Services, who became convinced of the approach and began to support the legalising of paravets. But the rest of the DVS chose to turn a blind eye. Eventually, OAU/IBAR started to negotiate with DVS directly on the potential development of a new programme, just as DVS and the KVA were beginning to acknowledge the scale of paravet programme nationally, and regarding them as a threat to both veterinary professionalism and their budding private practices. ITDG had stopped running training workshops, having run out of money.

A turning point...

In 1998, the KVB published a full-page advertisement in the Kenyan national newspapers pointing out that it was illegal to train community animal health workers, and saying that any vets doing so risked being struck off the register. Your challenge, as members of the OAU/IBAR, is to consider how to respond. Discuss...

Questions

- How could the move towards legalising paravets been brought about quicker?
- What could have been done in 1998 by OAU/IBAR to make the process smoother?
- What are the lessons for bridging research and policy?

What happened next?

The KVB's advertisement alarmed everyone who work on community animal health schemes. ITDG had no money with which to bring the interested parties together. OAU/IBAR, still waiting for approval from DVS on their co-operative paravet scheme, were very keen to find a solution, and came together with the Netherlands Development Agency to fund a workshop to bring all stakeholders together. Dr Kajume was made responsible for developing the workshop, and he advised ITDG that representatives of all key parties should be present in the planning committee as well as the actual workshop event. A number of research studies on livestock services which had previously been obstructed, were unblocked following the KVB's advert. A comprehensive study of each region, which included stakeholder workshops and wide discussion of findings emerged.

In 1998 the DVS eventually signed a Memorandum of Understanding allowing PARC-VAC (an OAU/IBAR programme) to establish a paravet scheme, and established an international workshop bringing together knowledge on schemes from Uganda and Tanzania as well as Kenya. Acknowledging the shift in times, the ITDG workshop was renamed the Decentralised Animal Healthcare Workshop, which reflected the perspectives of all main stakeholders. The workshop endorsed the paravet approach and established multi-stakeholder groups to develop guidelines and standards for paravets in Kenya. It recommended a review of legislation and policy on animal health care. ITDG obtained funding for three years further work with a renewed commitment to specific outputs relating to policy reform.

The Director of Veterinary Services was supportive of the process of policy review. In the following years, many new NGOs tried to set up further paravet schemes. Most of these were implemented them too quickly and most collapsed, attracting significant criticism to paravets as a whole. Changes in the KVA executive committee undermined support for paravets, and a motion to ban paravets programmes altogether was only narrowly averted. Tellingly, the issue was not at all discussed at the following KVA annual general meeting. Finally, the KVB and DVA approved minimum standards and guidelines for paravets in early 2001. Since then, the animal health policy review process has continued and at the OAU/IBAR anniversary party in November 2001, the Minister of Agriculture promised to push the new policy through cabinet if it could be completed by February 2002. Although it was completed on time, it was poorly drafted, and was rejected by the KVA at their annual general meeting. The KVA has recently petitioned the DVS to withdraw the document so that their input can be included. It seems that the story of legalising paravets in Kenya may have several chapters more yet.

For more information, see the GDN case study:

http://www.gdnet.org/rapnet/research/studies/case_studies/Case_Study_01_Full.html

Appendix 4: Force Field Analysis


Introduction

Force field analysis was developed by Lewin (1951) and is widely used to inform decision-making, and in particular in planning and implementing change management programmes in organizations. It is a useful method for gaining a comprehensive view of the different forces (their source and strength) involved in a policy or organizational change.

Force field analysis can clarify the 'driving forces' and identify obstacles or 'restraining forces' to change. As a result it can help identify the relative priority of factors on each side of the issue. For bridging research and policy, it can be used to analyse the forces affecting a situation or to assess the forces affecting whether particular research might be adopted as policy. It might also be used to identify where research may help tip forces towards a change.

Detailed Outline of the Process

A force field analysis is carried out with a group using a flip chart or overhead transparency. The first step is to discuss and agree on the current situation and the goal of the policy or institutional change. This goal should be written on the chart or transparency between two columns. All the forces for change should then be listed in one column and all forces against change in the other column. The next step is to brainstorm the 'driving' and 'restraining' forces and write them in the appropriate column. The 'driving' and 'restraining' forces should be sorted on common themes and/or prioritised according to their 'magnitude' towards change by assigning a score to each force, ranging from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong). The last and the most important step is to discuss action strategies to reduce the 'restraining' forces and to capitalise on the 'driving' forces. The resulting table might look like the following:



Source: Mind Tool, available at <http://www.psywww.com/mtsite/forcefld.html>

A Good Example

Force field analysis has been used in diverse fields ranging from organisational change to self-development. There are some good examples of practical applications of force field analysis from India. One example used force field analysis to focus on the factors responsible for the poor state of primary education in State of Bihar. Another case focused on the factors inducing and inhibiting migration in the State of Orissa. For details of both cases, see:

www.worldbank.org/participation/PRSP/plna/plan_03604.pdf

Another case details the use of force field analysis in a school situation to assess the potential to change from teacher-centered methods of working to greater pupil participation in planning. See:

www.crossroad.to/Quotes/brainwashing/force-field.htm

Further Information

For original literature of force field analysis see: Lewin K. (1951) 'Field Theory in Social Science', Harper and Row, New York.

PRA: PLA Notes (1999), Issue 36, pp.17-23. IIED, London.

Simple step-by-step guides to carrying out force field analysis are available at:

- www.mindtools.com/forcefld.html for examples of the use of force field analysis in management
- www.psywww.com/mtsite/forcefld.html for examples of the use of force field analysis in psychology

Examples of the application of force field analysis in different areas are available below:

- Change management: www.accel-team.com/techniques/force_field_analysis.html
- Health (MSH & UNICEF): <http://erc.msh.org/quality/example/example5.cfm>

For computer software to conduct force field analysis see:

http://www.skymark.com/resources/tools/force_field_diagram.asp

Appendix 5: RAPID Political Context Questionnaire

This questionnaire is intended to add systematic information on political contexts. We would be very grateful if you could complete this questionnaire.

The information obtained will be treated with the strictest confidence.

In order for us to make effective comparisons, this assessment instrument is a pre-coded, multiple-choice questionnaire. Please try to answer all the questions – and please provide further comments to better explain the situation in your country.

1. Basic Information

Country: _____

Main sector of activities: _____

(i) Who are the policymakers most relevant to your work?

(PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE IF RELEVANT)

Government Officials	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Media	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
Ministry Civil Servants	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO Staff	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
Service Provision Officials	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Donors: bi- or multi-lateral	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
Parliamentarians	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/>

(ii) Relevant component(s) of the policy process

(PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE POLICY PROCESS ARE RELEVANT TO YOUR WORK.)

	VERY RELEVANT				NOT RELEVANT
<u>Problem Identification</u> : the part that shows a problem exists and requires action	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Formulation and Adoption</u> : the part develops and selects courses of action	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Implementation</u> : the part that puts the policy into practice	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Evaluation</u> : the part that assesses the impact of a policy and suggests changes	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

2. Broad Political Context

(PLEASE ASSESS THE NATURE OF THE POLITICAL CONTEXT IN YOUR COUNTRY ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:)

(i) Extent of Democracy and Relevant Freedoms:

	High	Medium	Low
Political Freedom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Freedom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Press Freedom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(ii) Extent of development commitment of ruling elite (especially to the poorest)

HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(iii) Extent of political volatility

HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(iv) To what extent do civil society groups have an input into the making of policy?

HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Specific Policy Context

(WHAT IS THE ISSUE FOCUS OF YOUR WORK? PLEASE ASSESS THE NATURE OF THE SPECIFIC POLICY CONTEXT ON THIS ISSUE.)

(i) Characteristics of the specific policy arena:

To what extent is there:

Policymaker Demand: Are policymakers actively seeking solutions to problems in this area?

High Medium Low

Policymaker Consensus: Do policymakers tend to agree on the policy objectives?

Climate of Rationality: Is evidence discussed or do ideology or rhetoric dominate?

Open Decision-making: The views of relevant stakeholders are considered.

(ii) How important is the issue to the wellbeing of the general public?

High Medium Low

(iii) Policymakers on this issue are influenced by:

Public Interests: the extent policies reflect the wellbeing of the general public

High Medium Low

Personal Interests: the extent policies reflect the private priorities of the policymaker

Special Interests: the extent policies reflect the narrow priorities of a group concerned with a particular issue

4. Policy Implementation

(IN THE SPECIFIC AREA OF YOUR WORK, PLEASE FOCUS ON THE NATURE OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION.)

(i) Are there institutional incentives that encourage civil servants to use research?	Strong <input type="checkbox"/>	Medium <input type="checkbox"/>	Low <input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

(ii) The extent of bureaucrats' capacity to understand research	High <input type="checkbox"/>	Medium <input type="checkbox"/>	Low <input type="checkbox"/>
--	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

(iii) Are there specific mechanisms (e.g. reviews) to draw in evidence in implementation?	High <input type="checkbox"/>	Medium <input type="checkbox"/>	Low <input type="checkbox"/>
--	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

(iv) Characteristics of policy implementation

(PLEASE ASSESS THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY IN YOUR AREA:)

	High	Medium	Low
<u>Transparency</u> – in the decision-making process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Accountability</u> – of bureaucrats for decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Contestation</u> – disagreement over approaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Participation</u> – discussion with stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Flexibility</u> – of an organization in implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Corruption</u> – using public resources for personal gain	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Decisive Moments in the Policy Process

(i) Character of the policy processes

(Please identify which of the following terms best suits current decision-making processes in your specific area of work:)

<u>Routine</u> – policymakers repeat previous decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Incremental</u> – policymakers make small changes and deal selectively with issues as they arise	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Fundamental</u> – policymakers have an opportunity to re-think approaches to policy domains	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Emergent</u> – policymakers have to deal with completely new policy issues	<input type="checkbox"/>

(ii) Extent to which the policy process (and opportunities to influence it) are predictable. Yes, very Medium Not at all

(iii) At present, is there a policy window? (i.e. an opening for new views to enter the policy process) Yes No Don't know

(iv) To what extent is there a sense of policy crisis?	VERY MUCH			NOT AT ALL	
	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

6. The Way Policymakers Think

(i) Characteristics that affect policymakers.

(Please assess the characteristics that affect the way policymakers think in your specific area of work.)

	High	Medium	Low
Extent policy objectives are clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extent cause-effect relationships are clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extent policymakers are open to new evidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extent policymakers have sufficient capacity to process evidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(ii) To what extent do policymakers have adequate information to make informed decisions?

(Please assess the following dimensions in your specific area:)

	High	Medium	Low
Relevance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Type	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(iii) What evidence convinces policymakers in your specific area of work?

	High	Medium	Low
Recognition from their own experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scenarios, stories and arguments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moral and ethical values	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empirical data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence doesn't matter – ideology, personal interests are crucial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Finally ...

What are the main barriers to uptake of research in your policy issue?

(Please provide your assessment by considering the following dimensions:)

ISSUE	VERY LARGE				
	VERY SMALL				
Governance failures – overall systemic problems	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Specific policy process is not open	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other specific process failures – contestation, special interests, etc	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation problems – institutional issues block uptake	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Individual failures – not open	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Research failure – evidence is not relevant or convincing	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other: _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other: _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Other Comments: _____

Appendix 6: Policy Entrepreneur Questionnaire

Use this questionnaire to find out what model of policy entrepreneurship you use. To complete it, read each question carefully, and then rank the four possible answers from 1 to 4, giving 1 to your first choice, 2 to your second choice and so on. There should only be one number in each box. When you have completed the questionnaire, add up all the scores for (a), all the scores for (b) and so on, and complete the table at the end. N.B. The total of all scores should be 150.

	Question	Your Ranking			
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1	When confronted by a new issue in development, my immediate reaction is to (a) Formulate it as a problem to be solved; (b) Send an e-mail to my contacts to see who else is interested; (c) Talk it over with people I meet on my next field trip; (d) Contact the Chair of the relevant parliamentary committee for a chat.				
2	In trying to fund my work, my first line strategy is usually to (a) Find a sponsor who wants a solution to the problem; (b) Find out who else is working on the topic and set up a collaboration; (c) Seek a commissioned study from a Ministry or operational agency; (d) Identify who might gain by funding the research.				
3	My project proposals are usually (a) Focused on a time-line that will deliver solutions; (b) Joint proposals, with collaborators who will carry out parts of the work; (c) In the form of a two-pager I can present to the Ministry; (d) Presented verbally over lunch.				
4	I think of the role of theory in research as (a) Of value, but in the background; (b) Important alongside the theories of other disciplines; (c) Of limited use in the real world; (d) Helpful in small doses, to underpin my 'expert' status.				
5	The best data in research (a) Is simple enough to underpin a good story; (b) Comes from different sources, and is put together to triangulate results; (c) Is based on practical experience in the field, rather than from formal surveys; (d) Can be deployed to shift an argument.				
6	When there is a Steering Committee for my work, I like it to consist of (a) Good communicators, who can help me simplify; (b) A multi-disciplinary mix of other researchers who can help see the problem from different angles; (c) Practitioners who have some experience of struggling with the real implementation problems; (d) Politicians, NGO campaigning staff, and others who can make things happen.				
7	Research works best when (a) It is focused on a specific solution to a specific problem; (b) People from different disciplines bring perspectives from their own different backgrounds; (c) A mixture of researchers and practitioners, merge their different approaches into a single methodology; (d) It happens quickly.				

8	When it comes to writing up, I prefer to (a) Wait until the ideas are truly polished; (b) Share preliminary findings with colleagues as I go along; (c) Test out my ideas in the field before deciding what I think; (d) Try out preliminary ideas on my favourite policy-maker.				
9	Looking at the impact of my work, I have been most successful when (a) I have told stories that others can pick up; (b) The reports are data-based, but also jointly authored with collaborators from other perspectives; (c) The outputs consist mainly of consultancy reports; (d) I've been able to feed ideas quickly into the political process.				
10	The final chapter of a research report should (a) Provide an elegant overview of the 'narrative'; (b) Summarise the various lessons learned by me and my various collaborators; (c) Tell the agencies what to do; (d) Be oriented to the needs of policy-makers.				
11	When I have to choose how to disseminate the results of my work, I give priority to (a) Any format that will reach a wide audience; (b) Publication in cross-disciplinary journals; (c) Briefing Papers or similar for busy policy-makers; (d) Private briefings for key individuals.				
12	I have finished a piece of work when (a) I can tell the story; (b) Our network agrees on the findings; (c) The agency I am working with signs off on the project; (d) I see change beginning to happen on the ground.				
13	I think evaluation of a project should be based on (a) Literature reviews; (b) Assessment by a research network panel; (c) User feed-back; (d) The number of references in the newspapers.				
14	I feel a project has been successful if (a) My key phrases enter the discourse; (b) The people I meet at Conferences tell me they like it; (c) The funding agency asks me back to do more consultancy; (d) Political speeches and policy statements reflect my thinking.				
15	I am happiest (a) Writing; (b) Talking; (c) Observing; (d) Lunching.				
Total score for each answer		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)

Appendix 7: Policy Mapping Handout

Within each level of government (see the table below):

1. Identify the key actors that influence SME policy formulation and/or implementation
2. Outline their formal and informal roles in formulation and/or implementation and write a description on an index card
3. Also identify, and write on the card where SME research is undertaken
4. Give a number rating (1=low; 5=high) for the influence each organization has on different parts of the policy process.

	Formulation	Implementation
Government		
Political Society		
Bureaucracy		
Civil Society		
Private Sector		
International		

- Group 1 should focus on Government
- Group 2 should focus on Political Society and Bureaucracy
- Group 3 – Civil Society, Private Sector and International

See the attached example:

An Example of Policy Cycle Mapping in the Field of Social Assistance

Levels	Agenda Setting	Policy Formulation	Policy implementation	Monitoring & Evaluation
National level				
Public bodies				
The National Assembly (the Parliament)	The parliament is the national legislative body – each member of the Parliament has a legislative initiative	The Parliament adopts laws, decisions and declarations; it determines taxes; approves the composition of the Government; ratifies international treaties, etc.		Mainly through “Parliamentarian control” and approval of the execution of the state budget The Court of Auditors, controlling the state budget spending, is elected by the Parliament
The Council of Ministers (the Government)	The Council of Ministers is a central collective executive power body with general competence. It is the responsible institution for the development of the overall social policy in Bulgaria	Among policy tools of the Council of Ministers are strategies, programs, plans, decrees, regulations, ordinances and decisions.	The Council of Ministers shall co-ordinate other public administration bodies for the sake of the implementation of a unified state policy. Apart from the compulsory interaction with all state institutions, legislative body, local authorities and judiciary, the Government shall have co-operation with management bodies of employers' and employees' organisations, organisations for social protection and other NGOs	Overall monitoring and control - the Council of Ministers may suspend the acts of the lower level administration
Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP)	The Minister of Labour and Social Policy develops, co-ordinates and implements the state policy in the field of social assistance.	The Minister may adopt regulations, ordinances and instructions.	Management and coordination of respective subordinated bodies	Execution of overall control in respect to activities of subordinated bodies
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works	The Minister of Regional Development and Public Works is responsible for the creation of accessible environment and public facilities for people with disabilities	The Minister may adopt regulations, ordinances and instructions.	Management and coordination of respective subordinated bodies	Execution of overall control in respect to activities of subordinated bodies

Ministry of Transport and Communications	The Minister of Transport and Communications is in charge for provision of transport services, adjustment of the transport environment to people with disabilities and developing of special regulations for trafficking, signal system and parking places for people with disabilities	The Minister may adopt regulations, ordinances and instructions.	Management and coordination of respective subordinated bodies	Execution of overall control in respect to activities of subordinated bodies
Ministry of Health Care	The Minister of Health Care creates consultancy and diagnostic centres for examining the needs of rehabilitation and social integration of people and children with disabilities (elaboration of specific programs suitable to their needs, use of contemporary facilities for training deaf and blind kids and adults)	The Minister may adopt regulations, ordinances and instructions.	Management and coordination of respective subordinated bodies	Execution of overall control in respect to activities of subordinated bodies
Ministry of Education and Science	The Minister of Education and Science is entitled for the implementation of 'integrated' education, establishment of consultative and diagnostic centres, assessment of children's needs for rehabilitation and social integration, etc.	The Minister may adopt regulations, ordinances and instructions.	Management and coordination of respective subordinated bodies	Execution of overall control in respect to activities of subordinated bodies
Agency for Social Assistance - a body with MLSP	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts	The Agency is responsible for the implementation of the State policy for social assistance (provision of social assistance benefits and social services)	The Agency exercises control over the implementation of the social assistance policy through a specialised unit – the Inspectorate Prepares annual reports for the situation of social assistance and submits them to MLSP
Employment Agency – a body with MLSP	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts in the field of employment promotion and VET	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts in the field of employment promotion and VET	The Agency is responsible for the implementation of employment programs, for the establishment of centres for vocational training of people with disabilities and provision of information to job seekers;	Control over the implementation of employment programs

State Agency for Child Protection (SACP) – subordinated to the Council of Ministers	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts in the field of child protection	Prepares drafts of policy documents and regulative acts in the field of child protection	SACP is in charge for governance, co-ordination and control of child protection activities	Control of the implementation of national and regional programs; Control over the compliance with the standards of social services provided to children; Analysis of the implementation of state policy in this field
Social Assistance Fund with MLSP			Provision of funding for social assistance targeted programmes and social services, provided by municipalities and registered legal/physical persons, for the construction and maintenance of premises for provision of social services, etc. The State budget is the main source of income of the Fund.	Control of the funded projects / programs
Rehabilitation and Social Integration Fund - with MLSP			Provision of financing for: purchase of technical facilities for disabled, social aid, subsidies to specialised enterprises of disabled, setting up of an accessible environment and implementation of VET programmes. The State budget is the main income source of the Fund.	Control of the funded projects / programs
Public-Private Consultative Bodies				
National Council for Tripartite Partnership - consists of representatives of the Government and the employers and employees organizations	The Council is the body for the co-operation and consultation between social partners in the setting agenda in the field of labour relations, social security and standard of living issues.	Consultation and cooperation in policy formulation (in respect to the Government's acts only)		

<p>The Council for Social Assistance This is a public-private social consultative body with MLSP. The Council consists of representatives of MLSP and various ministries, nationally represented organisations of employers and employees, as well as NGOs, which are performing social assistance activities in public interest.</p>	<p>Consultative functions</p>	<p>Consultative functions</p>		
<p>National Council for Promotion of Employment - This is a public-private social consultative body with MLSP; include representatives of public administration, social partners and NGOs</p>	<p>Consultative functions in the field of labour market policy – provision of opinions on draft of regulative acts and policy documents; submits drafts of regulations.</p>	<p>Consultative functions in the field of labour market policy – provision of opinions on draft of regulative acts and policy documents</p>		<p>Assessment of the effectiveness of the labour market policy</p>
<p>The National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues NCEDI is composed of representatives of different ministries, non-governmental organisations, ethnic and religious minorities, and is chaired by a Minister without Portfolio..</p>	<p>Prepares drafts of strategies and measures in the field of minorities integration and demographic issues</p>	<p>Consultative functions</p>	<p>Coordination (with the state bodies and NGO) of concrete measures in execution of accepted international obligations, referring to the protection of rights of Bulgarian citizens, belonging to minority groups and their integration; Provision of support to NGOs in execution of national and regional projects in the field of ethnic and demographic issues</p>	<p>Assessment of the impacts of programs / projects in the field of migration processes and demographic / ethnic issues</p>

National Council on Child Protection - a consultative body to the State Agency for Child Protection, consisting of representatives of various ministries and NGOs, which mission and goals are related to protection of children.	Consultative functions	Consultative functions		
National Council for Rehabilitation and Social Integration – set up with the Council of Ministers, consisting of representatives of NGOs which meet specified criteria.	Consultative functions	Consultative functions - all acts regulated the situation of disabled shall be adopted after taking the opinion of the Council		
Economic and Social Council - this is a legal entity, financed from the State budget, consisting of representatives of various ministries and NGOs.	Consultative functions	The Council is a consultative body, providing opinions and analysis on laws, national programmes and plans, related to economic and social development. Provision of such opinions is prepared upon a request of the Chairman of the Parliament, Council of Ministers and in any other case - provided by law.		Elaboration by request or by own initiative opinions and analysis about strategic issues in the field of economic and social policy; Preparation of annual memoranda for economic and social development of the country.
Civic Society				
NGOs working in the social sphere could be provisionally divided into: - Associations for / of vulnerable groups - Think Tanks - Foundations (donors)	Participation in the consultative process mainly thorough - ad hoc structures (commissions, working groups, etc.) - institutionalised public-private consultative bodies; - lobbying / advocacy	Participation in the consultative process	Provision of social services; Participation in the management of social assistance programs / projects if their design envisage public management and control	Carrying out public control through: - participation in collective controlling / management bodies - provision of evaluation of programs and projects - by own initiative

Private sector (the section for NGOs is relevant for the private sector as well) For protection of interests use political parties, NGOs and media	Participation through the structures of social dialogue at national, municipal, branch and sector level	Participation through the structures of social dialogue at national, municipal, branch and sector level		
Media By influencing public opinion exercise indirect impact on all phases of the policy cycle				
Regional level				
Public bodies				
Regional Directorates of the Agency for Social Assistance			Implementation of social assistance policy at regional level	Control on the eligibility of beneficiaries of receive social services / benefits
Regional Employment Offices			Implementation of social assistance policy at regional level	Control
Public-Private Consultative Bodies				
Regional Development Councils Their composition includes mayors of municipalities in the respective region and members of municipal councils of each municipality; representatives of NGOs could be invited as well.	Consultative functions for the development of regional strategies, programs, plans.	Consultative functions for the development of regional strategies, programs, plans.		Preparation of opinions about the annual report on the realization of the regional development plan; Assessment of initiatives of municipalities and NGOs related to regional development.
Regional Councils on Ethnic and Demographic Issues.	The Regional Councils on Ethnic and Demographic Issues are entitled to participate in the development of the strategic plans of municipalities and districts related to social inclusion and respect of rights of minorities	Consultative functions		

Regional Employment Councils – consists of representatives of regional administration and social partners	Consultative functions for the development of regional labor market policy	Consultative functions for the development of regional labor market policy		
Cooperation Councils with the regional offices of the Employment Agency – consists of representatives of regional administration and social partners				Exercise of direct monitoring and control on the labor market policy on regional level.
Local level				
Local self-governance (Municipalities)	Municipal councils are responsible for the development and implementation of social policy at local level.	Municipal councils adopts regulative acts, strategies, programs and plans for local development, they determine local taxes, etc.	Municipalities are providers of social services; Mayors may assign the management of the specialised municipal institutions and social services to registered legal/physical persons; Municipalities may provide use of premises for free to NGOs, which work in the field of social assistance and philanthropy.	Municipal councils exercise control over the activities of mayors and local administration; members of municipal councils are entitled to request information and documents from any public / private organization (institution) unless this not concerns classified information Municipal Councils may appoint ombudsman.
Social Councils – created by the Municipal Councils; consist of representatives of NGOs working in the field of social assistance at local level			Provision of support for the implementation of social assistance activities	Social Councils are entitled to require information from the municipal Directorates of Social Assistance, to notify the Municipal Councils and the regional Directorates of Social Assistance for any omissions and offences found out.
Child Protection Departments – bodies, subordinated to the Social Assistance Directorates			Child Protection Departments are conducting child protection policies at municipal level. They are also obliged to render assistance and co-operation to non-for profit legal organisations, performing child protection activities.	Control on activities of the providers of social services for children

Appendix 8: Political Context Questionnaire Results

1. Basic Information

(iii) *Relevant component(s) of the policy process for your work*

	NOT RELEVANT			VERY RELEVANT	
<u>Problem Identification</u> : the part that shows a problem exists and requires action		1	3	1	9
<u>Formulation and Adoption</u> : the part develops and selects courses of action		1	2	9	4
<u>Implementation</u> : the part that puts the policy into practice	2	6	2	4	2
<u>Evaluation</u> : the part that assesses the impact of a policy and suggests changes	5	3	0	4	4

Broad Political Context Opportunities & Constraints

(ii) *Please assess the ability of:*

	VERY LOW			VERY HIGH	
Civil Society groups to advocate on SME issues		4	8	2	
Researchers to Study SMEs		2	1	12	1
Press to Report on SME issues		2	4	10	

2 (ii) *Please assess the extent:*

	VERY LOW			VERY HIGH	
the Egyptian elite is committed to SME policy reform		3	6	3	2
the Egyptian public is interested in SME policy issues		5	3	6	1
civil society groups have an impact the making of policy	1	8	2	4	4

3. SME Policy Formulation Context

(i) Please assess the extent of:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
<u>Policy</u> maker Demand: Are policymakers actively seeking solutions to problems in this area?		3	6	3	2
<u>Policy</u> maker Consensus: Do policymakers tend to agree on the policy objectives?		2	9	2	1
<u>Climate of Rationality</u> : Is evidence discussed or do ideology or rhetoric dominate?		4	2	5	2
<u>Open Decision-making</u> : The views of relevant stakeholders are considered.			10	2	2
<u>Predictability</u> : The extent SME policy processes (and opportunities to influence it) are predictable		2	6	5	

(ii) Policymakers on this issue are influenced by:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
<u>Public Interests</u> : the extent policies reflect the wellbeing of the general public		4	6	4	1
<u>Personal Interests</u> : the extent policies reflect the private priorities of the policymaker	5	3	5	1	1
<u>Special Interests</u> : the extent policies reflect the narrow priorities of a group concerned with a particular issue		3	7	3	1

4. Engagement of SMEs on Policy Issues

Please assess the extent:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
SMEs are consulted on policy issues	1	4	5	3	2
SME engagement is fair across the sector (or are some firms favoured)	1	4	7	2	1
SMEs have an impact on policy	1	6	4	2	2

5. Policy Implementation

(i) Please assess the extent:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
there are institutional incentives that encourage civil servants to use research	3	5	3	1	1
there are specific mechanisms (e.g. reviews) to draw in evidence in implementation	2	3	5	1	1
bureaucrats' have the capacity to understand SME-related research	2	6	5		
bureaucrats' are open to new evidence	3	6	4		

(ii) Regarding the SME policy implementation system, please assess the extent:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
<u>Transparency</u> – in the decision-making process		6	5	2	2
<u>Accountability</u> – of bureaucrats for decisions		2	7	4	
<u>Contestation</u> – disagreement over approaches to SME reform	1	3	5	3	
<u>Participation</u> – discussion with stakeholders		2	6	4	2
<u>Flexibility</u> – of an organization in implementation	1	6	4	2	1
<u>Corruption</u> – using public resources for personal gain	1	3	5	5	

6. Evidence-Policy Links

Please assess the extent that:

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
policy objectives are clear		1	7	5	1
cause-effect between relationships are clear		5	4	3	1

(ii) To what extent do policymakers have adequate information to make informed decisions?

	VERY LOW				VERY HIGH
Quantity		3	8	3	1
Quality	1	5	3	5	
Topical Relevance		1	5	6	1
Operational Relevance		4	2	6	1

What evidence convinces policymakers in your specific area of work?

	High	Medium	Low
Recognition from their own experience	5	8	
Scenarios, stories and arguments	2	9	1
Moral and ethical values		7	4
Empirical data	5	6	1
Visible evidence from pilot projects that new policy options work	7	6	
Evidence doesn't matter – ideology, personal interests are crucial		6	7

Finally ... What are the main barriers to uptake of research in SME policy?

ISSUE	VERY LARGE				VERY SMALL
	Governance failures – overall systemic problems	2	2	4	4
SME policy process is not open to evidence			5	4	1
Other specific process failures – contestation, special interests, etc	1	3	6	1	
Implementation problems – institutional issues block uptake	2	4	3	1	
Individual failures – not open	1	2	4	3	2
Research failure – evidence is not relevant or convincing	1	1	4	4	2
Linking mechanisms failure – evidence is there but not in the right place at the right time	3	2	6		

Other Issues:

- Gaps between stakeholders
- Issues not clear
- Trust
- Policy is government / donor oriented, not SMEs

Implications:

NO stark conclusions – all rather middle-ish

Policy Process Issues

- Implementation is a problem area – generally and regarding inclusion of research in policy.
- SMEs have little impact on SME policy

Links

- Civil society not a powerful sector.
- Press able to engage
- Links between stakeholders is a problem (Solution = networks?)

Evidence

- OK – quality, quantity, relevance
- Key is empirical data plus pilots
- Policymakers own experience.

Appendix 9: RAPID Framework 28 Key Questions

Context

1. Who are the key policy actors (including policymakers)?
2. Is there a demand for research and new ideas among policymakers?
3. What are the sources of resistance to evidence based policymaking?
4. What is the policy environment?
 - a. What are the policymaking structures?
 - b. What are the policymaking processes?
 - c. What is the relevant legal/policy framework?
 - d. What are the opportunities and timing for input into formal processes?
5. How do global, national and community-level political, social and economic structures and interests affect the room for manoeuvre of policymakers?
6. Who shapes the aims and outputs of policies?
7. How do assumptions and prevailing narratives (which ones?) influence policymaking; to what extent are decisions routine, incremental, fundamental or emergent, and who supports or resists change?

Evidence

1. What is the current theory or prevailing narratives?
2. Is there enough evidence (research based, experience and statistics)?
 - a. How divergent is the evidence?
3. What type of evidence exists?
 - a. What type convinces policymakers?
 - b. How is evidence presented?
4. Is the evidence relevant? Is it accurate, material and applicable?
5. How was the information gathered and by whom?
6. Are the evidence and the source perceived as credible and trustworthy by policy actors?
7. Has any information or research been ignored and why?

Links

1. Who are the key stakeholders?
2. Who are the experts?
3. What links and networks exist between them?
4. What roles do they play? Are they intermediaries between research and policy?
5. Whose evidence and research do they communicate?
6. Which individuals or institutions have a significant power to influence policy?
7. Are these policy actors and networks legitimate? Do they have a constituency among the poor?

External Environment

1. Who are main international actors in the policy process?
2. What influence do they have? Who influences them?
3. What are their aid priorities and policy agendas?
4. What are their research priorities and mechanisms?
5. How do social structures and customs affect the policy process?
6. Are there any overarching economic, political or social processes and trends?
7. Are there exogenous shocks and trends that affect the policy process?

Appendix 10: SWOT Analysis Tools Sheet

Introduction

SWOT analysis is a classic strategic planning tool. Using a framework of internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats, it provides a simple way to assess how a strategy can best be implemented. The tool helps planners be realistic about what they can achieve, and where they should focus.

Detailed Outline of the Process

The SWOT framework – a two-by-two matrix – is best completed in a group with key members of the team or organisation present. First it's important to be clear what the policy change objective is, and what team or organisation the analysis is being carried out on. Once these are clarified and agreed, begin with a brainstorm of ideas, and then hone them down and clarify them afterwards in discussion.

An assessment of *internal capacity* helps identify where the project or organisation is now: the existing resources that can be used immediately and current problems that won't go away. It can help identify where new resources, skills or allies will be needed. When thinking of strengths it's useful to think of real examples of success to ground and clarify the conversation. Typical focus questions to help think through these issues might include:

Figure 9: SWOT analysis

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Skills and abilities</i> • <i>Funding lines</i> • <i>Commitment to positions</i> • <i>Contacts & Partners</i> • <i>Existing Activities</i> 	<p>Weaknesses</p>
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other orgs relevant to issue</i> • <i>Resources: financial, technical, human</i> • <i>Political and policy space</i> • <i>Other groups or forces</i> 	<p>Threats</p>

- What type of policy influence does our organisation / project currently do best? Where have we had the most success?
- What types of policy influencing skills and capacities do we have?
- In what areas have our staff used them most effectively?
- Who are our strongest allies in policy influence?
- When have they worked with us to create policy impact?
- What do staff consider to be our main strengths and weaknesses? Why is this? What opinions do others outside the organisation hold?

An assessment of the *external environment* tends to focus on what is going on outside the organisation, or areas which are not yet affecting the strategy but could do – either positively or negatively.

The grid above summarises some of the subject areas that might need considering under both internal and external factors. These can be used as topic headings if working in small break-out groups (a good idea if your group is larger than about eight).

Back in plenary it is often useful to rate or rank the most important strengths and weaknesses (perhaps with symbols: ++, + and 0). In a larger group participants might like to assign their own scores, perhaps by assigning sticky dots. The results can then be discussed and debated.

It is important to keep an eye on possible actions or solutions that emerge and round up with an action-oriented discussion. How can our group build on strengths to further our aim and strategy? What can be included in the strategy to minimise our weakness? And so on.

The SWOT analysis is a versatile tool that can be returned to at many different stages of a project; to structure a review or provide a warm-up discussion before forward planning. It can be applied broadly, or a small sub-component of the strategy can be singled out for detailed analysis. The SWOT often forms a useful complement to a stakeholder analysis. Both are good precursors to Force Field Analysis and Influence Mapping.

A Good Example

The example below shows a possible analysis for a small, start-up NGO considering how to use its new research study to influence government.

Box 1: Example of SWOT analysis for small NGO

Strengths:

- We are able to follow-up on this research as the current small amount of work means we have plenty of time;
- Our lead researcher has strong reputation within the policy community;
- Our organisation's director has good links to the Ministry.

Weaknesses:

- Our organisation has little reputation in other parts of government;
- We have a small staff with a shallow skills base in many areas;
- We are vulnerable to vital staff being sick, leaving, etc.

Opportunities:

- We are working on a topical issue,
- The government claims to want to listen to the voice of local NGOs,
- Other NGOs from our region will support us.

Threats:

- Will the report be too politically sensitive and threaten funding from sponsors?
- There is a pool of counter-evidence that could be used to discredit our research and therefore our organisation.

The NGO might therefore decide, amongst other things, to target the report to specific patrons in the one ministry, use their lead researcher to bring credibility to the findings and work on building up a regional coalition on the issue.

Further Information

- A New Weave of Power, People and Politics. The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation. Lisa VeneKlasen with Valerie Miller, World Neighbours 2002. www.justassociates.org/ActionGuide.htm
- The Marketing Teacher provides online tools for those involved in marketing and managing. Their resources include a SWOT analysis. (www.marketingteacher.com/Lessons/lesson_swot.htm)
- Useful introductions to the SWOT can also be found at www.mindtools.com/swot.html and www.tutor2u.net/business/strategy/SWOT_analysis.htm

Appendix 11: Other References

A good start is the RAPID Website: www.odi.org.uk/rapid/, and for information about the theory of research-policy links: <http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Lessons/Theory/Theories.html>

On the Policy Process in General

Hill, M. (ed) 1997, *The Policy Process: A Reader*, Prentice Hall: Harlow.

"Street Level Bureaucracy: An introduction." In Hill, M. (ed.) 1997, *The Policy Process: A Reader*, Prentice Hall: Harlow. An excerpt from Lipsky, M. (1980) *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Nielson, S., Knowledge Utilisation and Public Policy Processes: A Literature Review, Evaluation Unit, IDRC, Ottawa, Canada 2001.

Available at: http://www.idrc.ca/evaluation/litreview_e.html

Grindle, M. and Thomas, J., (1991) *Public Choices and Policy Change: The Political Economy of Reform in Developing Countries*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lindblom, C. E. *The Policy-Making Process*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kingdon, J.W., 1984, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Harpers Collins, New York.

Pross, P. (1986) *Group Politics and Public Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Sabatier, P. (ed.) *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, USA: Westview Press.

Sutton, R. *The Policy Process: An Overview*, ODI Working Paper 118. 1999. London: Overseas Development Institute.

http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/R0040a_Bridging_R&P_UK/Abstracts/Bridging_R&P-Abst_092.html

Gerston, L. (1997) *Public Policymaking: Process and Principles*, Armonk, NY : ME Sharpe.

Van der Waldt, G. 'Public policy and policy analysis' in van Niekerk, D., vand der Waldt, G. and Jonker, A., 2001, *Governance, Politics and Policy in South Africa*, Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

On Interest Group Influence

Sabatier, P. and H.C. Jenkins-Smith (1999) 'The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Assessment' in P. Sabatier (ed.) *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Pross, P. (1986) *Group Politics and Public Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lindquist, Evert A. (1988) 'What do Decision-Models Tell Us about Information Use?' *Knowledge in Society* 1(2): 86–111.

"Interest Groups in Policy Making." Lindblom, C. E. (1993) *The Policy-Making Process*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

On Communication & Lobbying

Beach, L.R. (1997) *The Psychology of Decision-Making: People in Organisations*. London: Sage.

Chapman, J. and T. Fisher (1999) *Effective Campaigning*. London: New Economics Foundation.

Hovland, I., 2003, *Communication of Rresearch for Poverty Reduction: a literature review*, ODI Background paper.

Van der Waldt, G. 'Information, Communication and Propaganda in Politics' in van Niekerk, D., vand der Waldt, G. and Jonker, A., 2001, *Governance, Politics and Policy in South Africa*, Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

On Evidence-based policy (EBP) in the UK.

Cabinet Office (1999) *Modernising Government*. Norwich, Stationery Office.

Lee, J (2004) Is evidence-based Government possible?

Marston, G & Watts, R (2003) Tampering with the evidence: A critical appraisal of evidence-based policy-making.

Moseley, A & Tierney, S (2004) Evidence-based practice in the real world

Nutley, S, Davies, H & Walter, I (2002) Evidence based policy and practice: Cross sectors lessons from the UK

Shaxson, L (2005) Is your evidence robust enough? Questions for policy makers and practitioners

Solesbury, W (2001) Evidence based policy: Whence it came and where it's going

NAO, Getting the evidence: Using research in policy making (2003)

An International review on Governments' research procurement strategies. (2003)

On the Use of Evidence in Policymaking (General)

Stone, D., Maxwell, S., Keating, M. Bridging Research and Policy, An International Workshop, Warwick, UK, July 2001

http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/R0040a_Bridging_R&P_UK/Abstracts/Bridging_R&P-Abst_090.html

Beach, L.R. (1997) *The Psychology of Decision-Making: People in Organisations*. London: Sage.

Lindquist, Evert A. (1988) 'What do Decision-Models Tell Us about Information Use?' *Knowledge in Society* 1(2): 86–111.

On SMEs

Julius Court, Enrique Mendizabal and John Young, 2005, *Structured Policymaking on M/SMEs in Egypt: Background Paper for SMEPOL*, ODI.

Comparing Process of Regulatory Impact Assessment in UK and Uganda, Prepared by ODI.

Introducing Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) in Developing Countries: The Case of Uganda – Darren Welch, Bannock Consulting.

Mapping the Policy Cycle: An Example from the Field of Social Assistance in Bulgaria – Elena Krastenova, 2005, Budapest: OSI.

Power Dynamics in the Policy Process: Example Table of Education in Macedonia – Margareta Nikolovska, 2005, Budapest: OSI.

Small Business Services, 2004, *A Government Action Plan for Small Business*, London: DTI.

Small Business Services, 2004, *A Government Action Plan for Small Business: The Evidence Base*, London: DTI.

An example of Regulatory Impact Assessment in the UK: Sunday Trading.

SMEPOL Documents

Increasing Competitiveness for SME Exports in Egypt: General Framework and Action Plan, 2004, Cairo: MOEFT.

Research Policy and Priorities For M/SME Development, Workshop Report, 4-5 September 2000, Cairo: MOEFT, CIDA & IDRC.

Priority Policy Issues for the Development of the M/SME Sector in Egypt, 2002, Cairo: MOEFT.

Procedures and Guidelines For the Policy Development Process: A Policy Formulation Manual, 2003, Cairo: SMEPOL.

Appendix 12: Participants Evaluation

1. Please rate the following aspects of the course:

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Very Poor</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
Course objectives defined and achieved				13	
Concepts explained clearly			2	8	3
Time allocated for the workshop		1	4	5	3
Relevance to my work		1	2	3	7
Course was well-organized				7	6
Overall quality of the course				11	2

2. What two aspects were the most value to your organization and why?

- Learning new concepts of the policymaking process
- Highlighting the importance of evidence
- Theories and concepts on research policy process (x2)
- Procedures of policymaking process
- Mapping the general policy
- Mapping the policy context / stakeholders (Day 2 exercise)
- Identification of specific SME policy
- Using & practicing variety of tools (x2) – eg forcefield, SWOT, etc
- Systematic thinking of policy processes (i.e. RAPID) – not used before in my work
- Better understanding of policy process tools (x3) – we have not been exposed to these
- SWOT analysis (x2) – it enabled me to know how the policy can be implemented
- Forcefield analysis (x3) – useful analytical tool / to specify the supporting and opposing players and stakeholders
- RAPID analysis – comprehensive tool to analyse any issue
- Working groups were very useful
- Strategic planning tools (x2) – Day 3 exercise – instrumental in planning future actions

3. Average rating of the main sessions:

(Participants' score between 1 = very poor and 5 = excellent)

<i>Session</i>	<i>Clarity Of Presentations</i>	<i>Quality Of Content</i>	<i>Practical Usefulness</i>	<i>Total</i>
Theory on Research Policy Processes	3.62	3.62	3.77	3.67
The RAPID Analytical Framework	4.08	3.92	4.15	4.05
Mapping the general policy context in Egypt	3.38	3.23	3.46	3.36
Identification of specific SME policy issues	3.85	3.62	3.85	3.77
Policy Process Tools	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.05
SME Policy processes in Egypt	3.31	3.31	3.69	3.44
Policy Entrepreneur Tools	3.31	3.00	3.46	3.26
Developing Strategies for specific policy issues	3.77	3.85	3.92	3.85

4. Do you have any additional comments on the workshop or suggestions?

- Go in depth through one problem, as one group, and try to find a solution of policy for it.
- Still unclear on best way to design and present evidence to policymakers
- In my opinion, I've learned a lot of things and I think it will help me a lot in my work
- The workshop was very well organized. Thanks.
- The workshop would have been more useful if it took place before formulating a certain policy. This would guide policy entrepreneurs in the process – so I guess the emphasis should be on adopting a current policy to be formulated as a case study throughout the workshop.
- The course needs more than 3 days.
- Good effort done by the facilitators in delivering the workshop. Thank you. **(x2)**
- Just to explain the models in detail – the instructor should be involved in all steps during the focus group.
- The workshop was highly appreciated due to the great deal of effectiveness, participation and discussions. I'm satisfied to a great extent.

5. What follow-up support would be most useful for your work?

- Need mechanisms to evaluate the use of these tools in our policy work
- I think we should keep in touch just to get more about the updates in the field of policy making
- Using analysis and theory in our work
- One of the policies (SME) discussed here during the last day of the workshop should be taken as a case study and months from now Julius and John (or similar expertise) would evaluate steps taken and make recommendations.
- Follow up by email please.
- To be informed about any new courses conducted by ODI or any other sort of information useful to my work in policy and research (through email)
- It would be highly appreciated and import to highlight more on specific SME issues through tailored case studies.
- To use this methodology in my work.
- Practical full case studies with SME specialists from other countries (eg UK, USA, Canada)

Regarding research-policy links, its a matter of how rather than what – I need to learn more about the analysis and techniques.