



## **CSOs, EVIDENCE, AND POLICY INFLUENCE: NATIONAL SEMINAR & WORKSHOP**

**SARI PAN PACIFIC HOTEL, JAKARTA, INDONESIA  
14 – 15 JUNI 2005**



**Naved Chowdury**  
Overseas Development Institute, UK

e-mail : [n.chowdury@odi.org.uk](mailto:n.chowdury@odi.org.uk)  
web : [www.odi.org.uk](http://www.odi.org.uk)

**Lili Hasanuddin**  
Yappika (Civil Society Alliance for  
Democracy)

e-mail : [lihasan@yappika.or.id](mailto:lihasan@yappika.or.id)  
web : [www.yappika.or.id](http://www.yappika.or.id)

## **Contents**

<b>Seminar Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Workshop Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Indonesia Case Study</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Annex 1 : Seminar Presentation</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Annex 2 : Indonesia Case Study Presentation</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Annex 3 : Workshop Presentation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Annex 4 : List of Participants</b>	
<b>Annex 5 : Workshop Evaluation Result</b>	

## **Seminar Summary**

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in collaboration with Yappika (Civil Society Alliance for Democracy) held a national seminar and workshop on “CSOs, Evidence and Policy Influence” in Jakarta, Indonesia on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> June. The purpose of the seminar was to discuss how research can influence policy making.

Lili Hasanuddin, Executive Director of Yappika, opened the seminar by briefly introducing ODI and the purpose of the meeting. Representing ODI, Naved Chowdhury welcomed the participants and gave short introduction of ODI, the Research and Policy Development Programme (RAPID) and the Civil Society Partnership Program (CSPP). In his address, Chowdhury emphasized the importance of research and the use of research results in advocacy processes, and also presented lessons learnt from the consultation done in Africa earlier in the year.

Following ODI’s welcome address, Ahmad Wahid, a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives active in drafting of legislation spoke briefly in support of the seminar and workshop. Speaking in a personal capacity, he expressed a strong belief in the need for people’s participation in policy making. Mentioning that he found input from CSOs to have an important role in policy making, he also voiced support for NGO initiatives to participate in policy making through research and using evidence to influence policy.

Policy makers, NGOs, research organizations and universities from Jakarta, Bogor, Semarang (Central Java), Surabaya (East Java), and Lampung (South Sumatera) attended the half-day seminar. After the welcoming remarks, two presentations were made. The first was from ODI, presented by Naved Chowdhury and Cokro Leksono, followed by a presentation of a case study from Indonesia from the Coalition Participatory Policy.

Leksmono began the ODI presentation by introducing ODI and RAPID. Chowdhury continued the presentation by introducing CSPP and its purpose. In essence, it was mentioned that the program wants to partner with CSOs in developing countries so that they can learn from each other and develop ways of working together. In addition, CSPP aims to build capacity of CSOs so that they can better engage with government in policy making using information gathered through research. Several examples were also given during the presentation.

In sharing the Indonesia experience, a joint presentation was made by two members of the Coalition of Participatory Policy, or Koalisi Kebijakan Partisipatif, KKP, Rival G. Ahmad (PSHK) and Sugiarto A. Santoso (Yappika). The case study presented looked at the experience of KKP in advocating for public participation in policy making; specifically, efforts by the KKP to influence the Draft Legislation on Procedures for Law Formulation.

Established out of the shared awareness for the need to ensure that policy making procedures provide a space for meaningful public participation and support marginalized groups, the KKP used a innovative research methods to prove that: (1) people are capable and have the potential to be engaged in policy formulating processes; (2) representative bodies and existing procedures are inadequate; and (3) money and time are not obstacles to participation. Some of the methods used to collect and present the evidence included: monitoring of on-going policy formulation processes at both the regional and national levels; conducting workshops in several regions, inviting members of parliament as resource persons; document research; compilation of success stories of participatory policy formulation processes. The strengthening and widening of networks, combined with contributions from KKP members proved to be effective in using the above methods.

As a result of their efforts, KKP has succeeded in obtaining increased public support (increased membership and involvement in particular events) and support from members of parliament. One of the major highlights of their work has been the adoption of KKP's recommendation into the Law on Procedures for Formulation of Law and Legislation: "people's right to participate in policy formulation processes".

In terms of key lessons, KKP found that: (a) the benefits of evidence in influencing policy are both pragmatic and empowering; (b) innovative methods and techniques bring results; however, (c) the impact of evidence largely depends on its strength vis a vis existing discourse, the nature of political parties, and the openness of legislation procedures.

## **Workshop Summary**

The workshop component of this event began on the later half of Day 1. Of the approximately 20 participants attending, half were also present at the morning seminar, while the other half were new arrivals.

The workshop started with a more comprehensive explanation of the RAPID context, Evidence and Link Framework and several examples from other countries regarding policymaking. An open discussion followed the presentation, with some participants sharing their own experiences in advocacy and research. Several key points from the discussion were:

- In the Indonesian context, one of the challenges faced by CSOs in policy advocacy efforts is the complexity of the process itself.
- It is possible that the issue is not necessarily research per se, but rather the political processes that involve many stakeholders and many interest, including external pressure.
- Maintaining independent research and advocacy is important. Clear objectives, good planning and sound budgeting can prevent external interventions. When building links with government, it is important to be cautious of the degree of compromise to be made.
- Experience in and lessons from applying pressure and influencing the government and policy makers to include recommendations for people's participation needs to be shared and applied in future policy advocacy efforts.

The second day of the workshop started with a review of day 1 by the facilitator, Lili Hasanuddin. This was followed by a presentation by ODI showing how the CEL framework was used to analyze the political context, evidence and links that contributed to the evolution of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Approach during the late 90s. Participants were then asked to select a number of case studies from the Indonesian context, and use the framework to analyze them. With this example in mind, the participants were asked to divide into groups and choose a case study to which the CEL framework would be applied.

Three case studies were chosen: (1) Forestry Participatory Poverty Assessment in Bantaeng and Bulukumba, South Sulawesi – Center for Economic and Social Studies; (2) Mechanism for Public Service Complaints in Semarang, East Java – PATTIRO; and (3) Poverty Alleviation in Lampung, South Sumatera – URDI. The assignment for each group was to: 1) analyze the case study using the CEL framework; 2) identify key factors that enabled the CSO to influence policy; and 3) feedback and input to the CEL framework.

From the group discussions, a number of key reflections were identified:

- Political will is essential
- Government needs capacity building, and there needs to have a shared perception within government on specific issues

- Policy advocacy will succeed if evidence is obtained in collaboration with policy makers. For example, all stakeholders take part in a training and field simulation together with communities to gather evidence
- Strong links between stakeholders is important
- Capacity building among stakeholders is important
- Appropriate strategies are needed when influencing policy makers
- Civil society has to be actively involved in gathering evidence
- In the context of links, it is important to support representatives or spokespersons who have been chosen and are trusted by the people in using evidence to bring about policy change

Some of the key factors affecting the ability of CSOs to influence change were:

- The establishment of horizontal (within the district) and vertical (with government at the provincial level) link to facilitate efforts to influence policy.
- CSOs need to increase their capacity to obtain evidence and package it in away which in user friendly and easily understood by the government.
- “Packaged” evidence has to be given to the right person at the right time in the right way.
- CSOs have to increase their capacity to be a mediator between donor agencies – government – and the people.
- Research, both qualitative and quantitative, is insufficient to convince policy makers. Therefore efforts to bring together policy makers in the beginning of research is necessary.

At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to provide recommendations as to how ODI can support CSOs in influencing policy. The feedback from the participants is presented below:

NO	KEY ISSUES	SUGGESTIONS
1	Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for potential policy influence activities</li> <li>• for research and advocacy</li> <li>• for field testing tools at the district and city levels</li> </ul>
2	Campaign and Information Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign on the importance of research and policy advocacy</li> <li>• Sharing of the CEL framework</li> <li>• Information sharing and dissemination</li> </ul>
3	Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODI to link with more local CSO partners</li> <li>• Civil society partnership for research based advocacy</li> <li>• Develop collaboration between researchers-advocacy activists-policy makers</li> <li>• Build an institution (networking) as a place for shared learning from various issues in policy advocacy</li> <li>• Make a mailing list for ODI implementation tools</li> <li>• Collaboration for further study of methodology</li> </ul>

4	Capacity building Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training for applying ODI tools to Indonesian cases</li> <li>• Capacity building for multistakeholders through training on policy formulation (government, CSO, community, policymakers)</li> <li>• Training in each city</li> <li>• Training for policy makers</li> <li>• More detailed follow-up training</li> <li>• Training and internship in Jakarta or to ODI</li> <li>• Training of trainers for workshop participants</li> <li>• Training tools and practice</li> </ul>
5	Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present applicable tools in future workshops</li> <li>• Give more time for the workshop</li> <li>• Use workshop to further develop case studies</li> <li>• Give more time to applying tools to case studies for better understanding and implementation</li> <li>• Workshops for local CSOs, especially outside of Java</li> <li>• Workshops in other cities of Indonesia (not just Jakarta)</li> <li>• Workshops for NGOs having the similar program objectives</li> <li>• Workshop for government</li> <li>• Workshops for research organizations in universities</li> <li>• Workshop for applying tools to real case situations</li> <li>• Community Strategy Workshop for Influencing Policy</li> </ul>
6	Program Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to participate in workshops and training should be prioritized for universities, to support studies in law and legal drafting</li> <li>• Cross visits to study best practices</li> <li>• Involve academia in sharing of research results</li> <li>• Develop Indonesian research manual</li> <li>• Joint program (research + advocacy) + funding</li> <li>• Research on the impact of British aid in Indonesia</li> <li>• Pilot project on influencing local policy with NGOs</li> <li>• Implementation of CEL in the regions</li> <li>• Participation in ODI projects and activities to increase experience</li> </ul>

## **Indonesia Case Study**

### **Is Evidence Useful in Policy Advocacy?**

#### **Public Participation in Policy Formulation in Indonesia : The Policy Advocacy Experience of the Coalition of Participatory Policy 2002-2005**

*Rival G. Ahmad (PSHK) and Sugiarto A.Santoso (YAPPIKA)*

This paper describes the experience of the Coalition of Participatory Policy (*Koalisi Kebijakan Partisipatif* or KKP) in using evidence for advocating participatory policy formulation. KKP is a coalition of CSOs, formed on the basis of experience and awareness that efforts to influence policy formulation will continue to face difficulties if existing policy formulation processes do not provide a space for meaningful public participation, and are not in support of marginalized groups. Advocacy efforts on the Draft Legislation on Procedures for Law Formulation (*RUU tentang Tata Cara Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan, TCP3*) became a first step to establishing a foundation for public participation in policy formulation.

Although Indonesia's political situation became more open in the post 1998 era, its policy formulation procedures are still an inheritance from Soeharto's authoritarian regime. As a consequence, its dominant characteristics and actors strongly reflect a process that distances the people from policy formulation processes.

In its efforts influence the TCP3 Draft Legislation, KKP attempted to verify that: (1) people are capable and have the potential to be engaged in policy formulating processes; (2) representative bodies and existing procedures are inadequate; and (3) money and time are not obstacles to participation. Some of the methods used to collect and present the evidence included: monitoring of on-going policy formulation processes at both the regional and national levels; conducting workshops in several regions, inviting members of parliament as resource persons; document research; compilation of success stories of participatory policy formulation processes. The strengthening and widening of networks, combined with contributions from KKP members proved to be effective in using the above methods.

After 3 years of policy advocacy work, the following achievements have been made: *firstly*, increased public support, both 'active' in the form of joining KKP as members, and 'situational' in the form of participation in particular events. *Secondly*, strengthened support from members of parliament, particularly from the 5 largest factions in the House of Representatives. *Thirdly*, the adoption of KKP's recommendation: 'people's right to participate in policy formulation processes' in the Law on the Formulation of Legislation Regulations.

The key lessons learned from KKP's experience in policy advocacy, specifically in relation to the benefit of evidence in influencing policy are: (a) evidence gathering is both pragmatically (for policy change) and strategically (empowering) beneficial; (b) the methods and techniques used can be varied, and do not have to be *mainstream*; (c) however, the impact of evidence largely depends on its position *vis a vis* the dominant perspectives, the nature of political parties, and the openness of legislation procedures.

**Participants observations:**

- What is the meaning of policy and legislation?
- Researches were very important in policy influence and creating strategies for advocacy activities.
- Universities and research institutions more take a site for international organizations and depend on their fund. How ODI took a position from these phenomena?
- How to push and emphasize the state to fulfill the basic needs of the citizens?
- Is it important to strengthen the Coalition? There are much NGOs doing research based on donor needs or donor driven. Advocacy organizations would not sustainable in the future if they fail to empower the communities and depend on international funds.
- Research activities and the results could be a bias because of many interests.

Annex 1 : Seminar / Workshop Presentation

Annex 2 : Indonesia Case Study Presentation

Annex 3 : Workshop Presentation

Annex 4 : List of Participants

Annex 5 : Workshop Evaluation Results

(16 forms returned)

1. What two things you have heard about in this workshop will most help your organization? (Please be as specific as possible)
  - Networking among participants
  - Having knowledge to evaluate our results
  - Knowing how to use the research results to influence policy
  - New approaches for research on the framework of society
  - New funding opportunities for research
  - CEL framework
  - RAPID framework
  - African cases in influencing policy
  - Would be good capacity building for many CSOs in Indonesia if this seminar is conducted as a training. Therefore all materials should be more in-depth and comprehensive.
  - I understood that there is no social impact if we only do research without advocacy
  - Case studies were helpful to make sense of the practical framework strategies
  - Tools provided by ODI workshop
  - Users identification of research results
  - Implementation the results of research for communities
  - Stakeholder analysis
  - Many techniques found from the case study
  - Tools to influence the policy changes
  - Tools about policy impact that can used to evaluate our work, especially in advocacy
  - Opportunity for networking with ODI
  - Techniques for doing policy advocacy
  
2. Please rate the following aspects of the workshop/seminar

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Objectives defined and achieved	1	12	3		
Concept explained clearly	5	8	1	2	
Time allocated for the workshop/seminar	2	4	6	4	
Relevance to may work	9	6			
Well-organized	4	11	1		
Overall quality of the workshop/seminar	6	9	1		

3. Please comment on the overall workshop/seminar quality and value:
  - Workshop useful
  - Good
  - It is very important for NGOs and other researchers
  - I hope this workshop will create good collaboration between CSOs and research institutions to force pro-poor policy change
  - Good value but the time very limited
  - Could be very useful in the form of specific groups for specific issues
  - Very good, it is my first experience that has energized me.
  - The organization of the workshop is great
  - Workshop methodology is quite dynamic, pushing for participation
  - Presentation is very informative
  - The substance of the workshop is not too theoretic, so its not difficult to implement
  - Open opportunities for follow up
  - Jargon free
  - Information-sharing on how to carry out systematic
  - Fruitful
  - The material and facilitators were excellent
  
4. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for future workshops like this?
  - The training should be held in regional places for local CSOs and local government staff
  - There needs to be more training for practice
  - Improve the workshop and be sustainable in Indonesia
  - The workshop is also conducted for university researchers
  - Involve government as policy makers to hear their point of view
  - Involve CSOs which are successfully influencing policy
  - More information and practice
  - More group discussions
  - More sharing
  - More time
  - Resource persons from local NGOs that have a wider experience, government, policy makers and donors
  - Involving more university researchers
  - Translate all print documents
  - The participants should be come from a wider sector of policy advocacy
  - Practice using real facts
  
5. What follow-up support be most useful for your work?
  - Funding
  - Training in research
  - Capacity building how to use research for policy advocacy
  - Networking
  - Internship in ODI
  - Joint program with NGO in Indonesia
  - Distribution of tools in Indonesian language
  - Consultation

6. In your country, to what extent do:  
 (Score between 0 = none 5 = always)

a) Policymakers use research-based evidence to be important in policy making?	2	4	2	2	3	2	5	1	1	5	4	2	2	3	2	2
b) CSOs contribute to policy making?	1	4	2	3	2	3	4	3	2	4	3	2	2	5	3	4
c) CSO's use research-based evidence to inform their work?	5	5	3	3	3	3	5	3	4	3	3	1	2	3	2	3