



CSOs, Evidence and Policy Influence: A Regional Workshop

**Courtyard Hotel, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
21st & 22nd February 2005**

Naved Chowdhury
Overseas Development Institute, UK

Email: n.chowdhury@odi.org.uk
Web: www.odi.org.uk/rapid

Dennis Rweyemamu
Economic and Social Research Foundation

Web: <http://www.esrf.or.tz/>

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Opening Session	1
Introduction and Outline	2
ESRF Case Study	3
Use of Evidence in informing Policy Process in Tanzania: the Case of ESRF – <i>Allan Mlulla (ESRF)</i>	3
Discussions	5
ODI Presentation 1	7
Research-based Evidence, CSOs and Policy Processes: Parallel Universes? – <i>Julius Court (ODI)</i>	7
Group Session 1	8
Group 1 – Tanzania	8
Group 2 – Tanzania	8
Group 3 – Uganda	8
Participant Observations	8
ODI Presentation 2	9
The RAPID Framework and Tools for Policy Influence – <i>Julius Court and Naved Chowdhury (ODI)</i>	9
Group Session 2	10
Group 1 – Tanzania	10
Group 2 – Tanzania	10
Group 3 – Uganda	11
Discussion	11
Group Session 3	12
Group 1 – Tanzania	12
Group 2 – Tanzania	12
Group 3 – Uganda	12
Discussions	13
Information User Survey	14
Vic Sutton (Talent Consortium)	14
The Way Forward	15
Conclusion	15
Annex 1: Tanzania Workshop Programme	16
Annex 2: Workshop Participants	17
Annex 3: Evaluation Results	19

Executive Summary

Overseas Development Institute (ODI) has engaged in research and policy analysis for the past 40 years and is now in the process of launching a new programme designed to strengthen the capacity of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in using research-based and other forms of evidence to promote pro-poor national and international development policies and practice. Active functional capacity of this programme is set to benefit from experiences drawn from 25 countries worldwide by tapping into the ability of CSOs in influencing policy through facilitation and engagement of a series of workshops worldwide.

The eastern Africa workshop of ODI's new Civil Society Partnerships Programme's (CSPP) Regional Consultation was held in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on the 21st and 22nd February 2005, in collaboration with the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) – Tanzania. ESRF is a research and policy analysis institution and carries out research, conducts policy dialogues, and prepares position papers and policy briefs; all as inputs into the policy process in Tanzania.

This two day event included a regional workshop session followed by a national seminar. The regional workshop involved 22 participants from CSOs within Tanzania and from Uganda and focused mainly on the issues of CSOs and policy influence cutting across both countries. The national seminar generally focused on issues pertinent to the Tanzanian CSO environment and involved participants from various CSOs in the country and representatives from donor communities.

The objectives of the sessions were to provide a forum for representatives from policy research institutes and non-governmental agencies to discuss the opportunities and challenges for CSOs to use evidence to inform policy, learn about the latest worldwide research and practice in this area, share experiences about ongoing activities and identify opportunities for collaborative work.

Two presentations were made on Policy in Tanzania: (i) Use of Evidence in informing Policy Process in Tanzania: The Case of ESRF; and (ii) Research-based Evidence and the Policy Process: The Case of Tanzania. These case studies presented by ESRF staff demonstrated the policy making process in Tanzania, the challenges in bridging research and policy, the necessities involved in the policy process, and the efforts and challenges of ESRF as a research and policy analysis institution. The workshop activities included country-wise group discussions on policy processes, the contribution of CSOs in informing policy and discussions based on the presented case studies.

Participants at the workshop made a number of suggestions for further work to help them to promote pro-poor approaches to policy makers in Tanzania.

Opening Session

The facilitator, Mr Andrew Mchomvu, welcomed the participants to the workshop and began by outlining the activities to be undertaken and the itinerary to be followed for the day. He then welcomed Julius Court from ODI (UK) to provide opening remarks before the officiating of the workshop would be done.

Julius Court thanked ESRF for accepting to collaborate with the ODI in facilitating the workshop and providing the ODI and CSOs with a platform that they would both beneficially use in exchange of experiences and joint learning of the importance of CSOs and evidence in influencing policy. He mentioned two main objectives of the gathering as first, a joint learning experience through which the participants and ODI would capture CSOs experiences on policy and share them accordingly. Second, a joint learning experience for the future, where continuity should be emphasised, since ODI has six more years working on the project and with exchange of experiences, ODI adds value to the work of local CSOs. He went on by explaining ODI as a think tank whose mission is to inspire and inform policy.

Prof. Amani, the executive director of ESRF, was then after welcomed to officiate the workshop. In his officiating speech, the professor welcomed all participants with particular emphasis on the participants from Uganda who had travelled long distances to attend the workshop. He informed the participants that the workshop was very important to ODI and ESRF as a policy research institutes in their functions in influencing policy makers into making informed policy decisions. He emphasised the importance to address the role of the CSOs in policy influence, policy implementation and feedback of experiences, so that continuously policies are improved upon. He went on providing the history of ESRF as a research and policy institute that came into existence in 1994 so as to bridge a gap in the government policy process. The gap in the government was in terms of formulating policy and capacity building within the government so as to do a comprehensive policy process, since policy formulation was government-owned. He made note that the workshop would enrich the work already started by ESRF. He thanked ODI in approaching ESRF in facilitating the workshop because it has provided the best opportunity based on the experiences of ESRF, focus should be given to shifting the main mortar to people who can act as consumers of the services and in this case it is the CSOs, through sharing of experiences, providing evidence and making people more informed on the policy process. On that note, he declared the workshop open.

Introduction and Outline

Naved Chowdhury, the CSPP programme officer from ODI, informed the participants that the workshop is the fifth in a series being held worldwide with the main objective of sharing information and learning from experiences on CSOs and the policy process worldwide.

He provided an introduction of ODI activities, especially those associated with the CSPP. He mentioned that the aim of the CSPP is to strengthen the role of southern CSOs in development policy processes, with expected outcomes of understanding how CSOs use research, improved information from ODI on how research findings can be communicated effectively and creation of a global collaboration.

He explained that the workshop objectives were to provide a forum to:

- Discuss the opportunities and challenges for CSOs to use evidence to inform policy;
- Learn about the latest worldwide research and practice in this area;
- Share experiences about ongoing activities and what works;
- Identify gaps for future work.

He also provided a brief outline of the workshop – that it would include a case study on Tanzania, the factors influencing research-policy links in East Africa, the RAPID framework and practice tools. Other details of the outline included detail context analysis, examples from East Africa on what seems to work, what support and information would be helpful and the way forward for CSOs.

ESRF Case Study

Use of Evidence in informing Policy Process in Tanzania: the Case of ESRF – Allan Mlulla (ESRF)

Allan Mlulla used ESRF as a case study to discuss the key issues in policy formulation and use of evidence in Tanzania. He explained that past experiences show that policies were formulated and implemented without being informed by requisite research. His presentation dwelled on Tanzania's long term policy goals, the current policy process requirements and the evolution of a strong link between research and policy.

He talked of the major questions that ESRF has attempted to respond to in its quest of proper policy formulation:

- How does ESRF attain its goal of influencing policy through research?
- What are the opportunities and challenges faced by ESRF?

He informed the workshop participants that ESRF derives evidence from its work programme which include: research; commissioned studies; policy dialogues; and capacity building. Practical examples from research carried out by the ESRF that have impacted on policy included:

- Social Economic Impacts of HIV/AIDS;
- A study on Trade and Poverty jointly carried out by ESRF and ODI;
- The Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA);
- Public Expenditure Reviews (PER).

Allan continued by explaining the strategies and capabilities ESRF uses in attainment of its goals. Its capabilities included 20 in-house multi-disciplinary research staff, among whom seven are PhD holders and the rest possess Masters Degrees. ESRF has database of external consultants and enumerators. It also has a library, network of modern computers and runs an information centre with Tanzania Online and Tanzania Development Gateway.

ESRF's strategies include credible approach and appropriate research methodologies, publications – for example the Quota Expenditure Review (QER), working paper series, brochures, and organisation of and running of public seminars, workshops and policy dialogues which provide forums for policy debates. Other strategies are capacity building through training, maintaining good relationships with stakeholders and maintaining relationships with other research institutions.

He also identified opportunities and challenges that ESRF would take on. These opportunities in areas where policy-related competencies are urgently needed included: the existence of weaknesses in general development management; policy analysis capacity and issues such as globalisation; new emphasis on poverty reduction; and complexities of different international and regional trading agreements. He identified the challenges facing ESRF as financial constraints, low effective demand from private sector, retention of quality staff and stakeholder-driven operating environment.

The presentation was concluded with remarks on how the linkages between policy processes and relevant research are maturing, and viewing it as an opportunity for CSOs to indulge in; how it is now inevitable in Tanzania that policies would be developed without the hindsight of policy research and the foresight of policy analysis; and how there is a need to re-think effective ways of financing policy research.

Discussions

The presentation on the ESRF case study was discussed with the participants providing their contributions to the floor. These contributions included experiences of evidence influence on policy, concerns about the current situation, observations, propositions and suggestions. Below are the main issues discussed by the participants:

- There are difficulties in claiming that a particular research has had an impact on policy formulation. It even becomes more difficult in providing proof of impact. This boils down to the fact that most of the time the credibility of the institution is questioned. However, it was noted that ESRF has on several occasions responded to requests from policy makers to provide evidence to inform their decisions. But attribution still remains difficult and normally occurs in subtle ways.
- There was a question on the extent to which CSOs are involved in the collection of evidence or information for influencing policy and whether they simply react to an agenda by the government or deal with real issues at hand.
- It is important to realise that research is not the number one evidence provider in effective policy formulation and not the only means of getting rid of failed policies. Failure in policies should not be attributed to lack of research information because it could be resultant of poor issue identification or poor prioritisation.
- Favourable terms of reference are required when researcher and client are engaged in a research agreement, especially where external funding could affect the findings and hence poor policy formulation. Sometimes there are complicated relationships between the researcher and the client that could affect effective policy process.
- It was noted that with the policy formulation being a top-down process, beginning with the initiating ministry calling out a task force, the results of the process will definitely be affected by the choice of procedure. Emphasis, however, should be at community level so as to let the people understand and demand change. Stakeholder involvement and evidence collection should be separated and the findings should be disseminated so as to avoid duplication.
- Funding for policy research is made only to mainstreamed policy research organisations with minimal active involvement of the private sectors in issue and agenda identification. Though funding is still made possible by the government for research, it is only made for core research by mainstreamed organisations. However, it was also noted that there was no systematic way for developing an agenda.
- Accountability of policy makers was minimal before the 1990s and even after, however there are funding organs such as the World Bank that make it a prerequisite for policy research to involve other stakeholders, especially from the private sectors.
- In order to assess the impact of CSO's contribution on policy process, it is important to assess how rich the policy document is in comparison to what was there before.
- Most governments should move beyond the 'politics of presence' and participation by invitation, and call it fair representation of their people's mass

need for change. Should CSOs wait to be invited by policy makers in order to push for change?

- The costs of good dissemination – printing enough copies, postage to various key organisations, etc – should be recognised by funding agencies so as to enable results to reach the grassroots. The people will not be willing to provide information in the future if results do not get back to the grassroots.
- Policy has to be locally defined and the interface between a ‘policy’ and a ‘decision’ be made clear. Influence of power centres at the grassroots is also very important.

ODI Presentation 1

Research-based Evidence, CSOs and Policy Processes: Parallel Universes? – Julius Court (ODI)

Julius Court led the participants through his presentation on research-based evidence, CSOs and policy processes. He provided a brief background on the general situation of CSOs and their potential for influencing policy. He provided examples to real life situations and how these situations were able to influence policy process.

He discussed key factors that oppose the CSO influence on policy as: lack of capacity; lack of local ownership; poor ability in translating data into evidence; lack of data; donor influence; crises and political factors. However, he also mentioned factors that support CSOs: the growing interest of governments in CSOs; CSOs gaining confidence; the strength of networks between CSOs; the media; and evidence of the value of CSO involvement.

Julius talked about the number of theories available in guiding CSOs in influencing policy. He led the participants through an analytical framework that could be used in the policy process. The analytical framework suggested four major areas of convergence: external influences; political context; evidence; and links. The aim of the analytical framework is to simplify the complexity of how evidence contributes to the policy process so that policy makers and researchers can make decisions about how they do their work to maximise the chance that policies are evidence-based, and that research does have a positive impact on policy and practice.

The constituents of the framework are explained as follows:

- **External Influences:** Socio-economic and cultural influences, donor policies etc.;
- **Political Context:** political and economic structures and processes, culture, institutional pressures, incremental versus radical change etc.;
- **Evidence:** credibility, the degree it challenges received wisdom, research approaches and methodology, simplicity of the message, how it is packaged etc.;
- **Links:** between policy and research communities – networks, relationships, power, competing discourse, trust, knowledge etc.

Group Session 1

The participants were then divided into three groups: the Ugandan participants formed one group and the two other groups consisted of their Tanzanian colleagues. The group work required the groups to identify examples of how CSOs have influenced policy processes in East Africa. Participants were tasked with identifying the issue, how the policy changed or did not change and what were the key factors to influence the change.

Group 1 – Tanzania

The issue identified by the group was corruption and the policy in question was the National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan (NACSAP). The group noted that though the policy was put into effect, it had not been mainstreamed in every government ministry and the involvement of the CSOs in the policy process was minimal for greater impact of the policy. The policy document was also not very clear on the roles of other organisations especially the NGOs. However, no change in the policy has so far been put to effect.

Group 2 – Tanzania

The second group chose to work with the Non-Governmental Organisation Policy (NGO policy). They noted that the policy process began as far back as 1996 when ILO initiated the need for a policy governing all NGOs. The policy was drafted six times with extensive consultations and was ready by 2001. In 2002, the NGO Act was passed by parliament; however, the NGO Act was in contradiction with the NGO policy. But with follow-up, the government has admitted that the Act requires amendment.

Group 3 – Uganda

This group identified the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) for scrutiny. They identified several issues within the policy and decided to focus on the land policy issue as part of the area that the plan was to cater for. Among the issues identified were: (i) accessibility to land as a factor of production; (ii) land tenure affecting land use; and (3) inappropriate use of land. In their discussion, they noted that for places like Karamoja district, which is not suitable for cultivation, the policy was not timely and timed. Other issues that affected the policy process were issues of sensitivity to needs of stakeholders and the complexity of issues surrounding the land issue. As a result of these issues and factors interplay, there is no land use policy however.

Participant Observations

From the presentations on the group work activities, the participants noted the following issues:

- The barriers in the policy process not only hinder the policy formulation but also indicate the complexity of policy formulation;
- The arena between policy makers and legislative procedures is closed. Most policies do not reflect the needs of small scale stakeholders;
- The question of how CSOs can move into the policy process arena.

ODI Presentation 2

The RAPID Framework and Tools for Policy Influence – *Julius Court and Naved Chowdhury (ODI)*

Julius Court gave a presentation on the RAPID framework and reminded the participants that there is an immense body of theories that could be used in policy formulation, making and implementation. He stressed the importance of not overlooking policy narratives because they can serve in showing first hand experiences, but also cautioned of the problems that may result if the narratives were wrong or untrue.

He also emphasised that CSOs need to be able to understand the political context, carry out credible research, communicate effectively and work with other CSOs. He added that importance should be attached to organisational capacity as well, in terms of staff, internal processes and funding.

Naved Chowdhury presented practical tools for policy: communication tools, policy influence tools, research tools and context assessment tools. He provided an in-depth analysis of these tools and their importance in policy process.

Group Session 2

The groups were required to respond to the following questions after their discussions:

- What approaches, tools and tricks would you use to influence policy?
- What works?
- (If you can, please distinguish between different parts of the policy process: agenda setting, formulation, decision, implementation, monitoring)

Group 1 – Tanzania

The group chose to work with HIV/AIDS policy and identified their approach to be that of using pressure groups, both local and international. They identified the following as tools they would put into use:

- Mass media
- Advocacy
- Mainstreaming in educational curricular
- Prioritising in planning
- Political will

The group identified that the tools which would work in most situations were training to develop competency in all sectors and targeting the most vulnerable groups. They mentioned that agenda setting was initially difficult and complex, but picked up with experience gained. The multisectoral approach was used for different players. The implementation was guided by TACAIDS / NACP with increased funding and commitment. Monitoring was said to be still weak due to low capacity and lack of coordination capacity to implement actions through different sectors.

Group 2 – Tanzania

The group identified a number of tools and approaches that it would use in the policy process:

- Informal networks
- Seminars, workshops, training
- Media i.e. newspaper articles, editorials, advertisements, campaigns
- Negotiations
- Popular arts i.e. drama, music concerts
- Competitions i.e. essays
- Information materials
- Case studies
- Shadow policy/position papers
- Mobilisation
- Research
- Working through donors

The group went on further in representing what tools would work for which stage of the policy process. Their discussion was summarised as shown

Parts of Policy	What Works
Agenda Setting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. media 2. mobilisation 3. competition 4. popular arts
Formulation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. seminars 2. Negotiations 3. shadow policy / position papers 4. research / policy analysis 5. working through donors
Decision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. working through donors 2. informal networks
Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. training 2. information materials 3. research / policy 4. case studies
Monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. media 2. case studies 3. research

Group 3 – Uganda

This group identified the following tools that could be used in the policy process:

- Research
- Networking
- Lobbying
- Reports
- Providing feedback to donors, communities, governments

Regarding parts of policy, they proposed that agenda setting and monitoring would be influenced by conventional research, while formulation depends on technical input.

Discussion

The group work ended with discussion points being levelled towards the presentations. The issues that stood out were that capacity building needed more focus, since there would be need to use as many different tools as possible. The importance of a shadow policy was emphasised, as it would show the degree of seriousness of the CSOs in pushing forward their policy contributions, agenda and demands and may enhance a degree of acceptance with policy makers.

Group Session 3

The groups were given a case study on animal health care in Kenya. The case study explored attempts to legalise paravets in Kenya, who were for many years running decentralised, community-based animal care in various regions of the country. The aim was to explore the relationship between research and policy making, and consider ways that, in the Kenyan context, the eventual policy shifts in favour of the paravets.

Group 1 – Tanzania

The group identified that the political context of the study was during the time that abolishing private practice provided more strength to the public sector. There was great room for conservatism of the veterinary profession against the high demand of services in remote rural areas. Poor collection of evidence hindered the process of pushing for a favourable policy for the paravets. The links identified were Dr. Kajuma in his capacity in the veterinary board.

Group 2 – Tanzania

The group identified the following tools that would help push for a favourable policy in legitimising the paravets:

- Use of force field analysis i.e. through capturing the plight of small-scale pastoralists, value of the paravets to the community, map demand against vet capacity;
- Build on positives of existing access and quality concerns;
- Prepare an alternative policy that includes the views of OAU, ITDG and paravets;
- Informal meeting between Kajume and Wamukoya.

The group were also able to extract lessons for bridging research and policy. The lessons mentioned were:

- Each party involved in the policy process safeguards their own interests even at the expense of others;
- In the Kenyan case study, it was important to have provision of alternative services when the paravets services were stopped;
- The importance of problematising the issue;
- The acceptance of change is not easy in the case of policy process.

Group 3 – Uganda

The group identified tools that would assist in the policy process: publicising the issue of paravets, discuss and link with policy, networking, and identifying and making clear the sources of interest. They described the political context as one of conservatism, threats to vets income and profession and participatory approaches were taking root. Evidence gathered from the case study was the running out of business of the private vets, lack of access to services by the people living in arid and semi-arid areas and research studies on livestock. The external influences included ITDG, OAU/BAR and knowledge and skills and experience sharing from outside. The links included ITDG, OAU/BAR, SNV and Dr. Kajuma.

Discussions

The groups discussed in general what the case study shed light on; they agreed that the case study brought to light the difficulties involved in policy formulation / making and it also showed the complexities of the policy process. Parallel intervention does not work instead the use of teams in pushing for an agenda is more appropriate. Lessons from the study showed that people are very defensive of the loss of state or income; that it is important to identify the problem and know the issues that surround it; the use of force field analysis is important in identifying the problem and simple research in working out the rationale.

Information User Survey

Vic Sutton (Talent Consortium)

An information user survey was conducted based on the following questions:

- What have been the most successful communications channels for reaching policy makers?
- Where do you get your own information about policy process? And which are the two or three most important channels of information?
- How often do you use ODI information materials? How useful were they?
- Which other organisations communicate your work most effectively?
- What role do the media play in policy influence?
- Is there a role for infomediary organisations (IRIN, MISA, and Panos) that can repack research for broader use?

General results from the survey showed that the most successful communications channels are media, face-to-face communication and use of specific events. The internet as a source and interpersonal communication have been identified as means the CSOs get their own information about the policy process. 40% of the participants acknowledged having used ODI information materials and the most useful ones have been the policy briefs. However, more efforts should be given to making their materials more country specific in order to allow comparisons. They also said that information flow is hampered by slow websites. Organisations that have been identified to communicate CSOs work efficiently are the government and NGOs, and international NGOs have proved valuable for their wide networks.

The Way Forward

Major deliberations from the workshop included suggestions on capacity building, publications and communication, funding, networking, research and joint action:

- ODI initiate capacity building through arrangements for in-depth training programmes and conferences on policy analysis and tools, research methodologies, management and financial skills in CSOs.
- The need for exchange of information and knowledge through electronic and other forms of communication, together with the creation of a web link / electronic list that would be used in forging a strong and informed coalition among CSOs in Tanzania in providing evidence to influence policy.
- The need to build and strengthen existing networks among institutions working to influence policy, together with enhanced south-south initiative in facilitation of stronger influence on policy processes.
- The need to form collaborations through joint research with people or organisations with relevant experience, inclusion of policy makers in research and involvement of communities in collection and dissemination of research objectives and outputs.
- There is the need for international input in training so as to enrich experiences and training on poverty analysis. Specific points of reference for Uganda and Tanzania should be identified.

Conclusion

Julius Court thanked the participants, reassuring them that the deliberations will be included in the report of the seminar. He expressed that importance will be attached to the way forward. He also informed the participants that there is a call for case studies by the CSPP and its aim is to capture the situation and let people learn from it. He encouraged the participants to get in touch with them. He ended by thanking all participants for their involvement in the different capacities with which they attended the workshop.

Annex 1: Tanzania Workshop Programme

Day 1: 21st February 2005

08.30 - 09.00	<i>Registration</i>
09.00 - 09.15	Address by Professor Amani, Executive Director, Economic and Social Research Foundation
09.15 - 10.00	Opening, Introduction and Outline Self Introductions by Participants
10.00 - 11.00	Case study from Tanzania, Mr. Allan Mulla (ESRF) Discussion
11.00 - 11.30	Tea/Coffee
11.30 - 12.30	Introduction to role of research-based evidence and CSOs in policy processes Group Work: Discuss examples of how CSOs have influenced policy processes in East Africa
12.30 - 13.00	Feedback and Discussion of the Group work
13.00 - 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 - 14.30	Introduction to the RAPID Context, Evidence and Links Framework
14.30 - 15.00	<i>Discussion</i>
15.00 - 15.30	Tools for Policy influence
15.30 - 16.00	Coffee/Tea
16.00 - 17.00	Group work: Explore in more detail one of the cases you discussed this morning and i) identify the key factors in the context, evidence and links; ii) decide if the framework is useful
17.00 - 17.30	Conclusion of Day 1 and Introduction of Group Work for Day 2
18.00	Cocktail and Snacks

Day 2: 22nd February 2005

08.30 - 09.00	Recap of day 1 – The Context Evidence and Links Framework
09.00 - 10.30	Group work. 3 groups: Each group to study one of the teaching case studies explore the key features of the <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Political Context▪ Evidence▪ Links And answer the question
10.30 - 11.00	Personal work: Based on what you've learned about ODI, RAPID and the CSPP so far, write your suggestions for how the ODI CSPP could help CSOs in East Africa that use research-based evidence to improve their capacity to influence policy and practice
11.00 - 11.30	<i>Tea/Coffee</i>
11.30 - 12.30	User Survey: Information and Communication Needs
12.30 - 13.00	What next in the Partnership Programme in East Africa?
13.00.-.14.00	<i>Lunch</i>

Annex 2: Workshop Participants

No.	Name	Institution	Designation	Telephone	E-mail
1.	Dr. Joseph Mbatia	Ministry of Health	Head, Mental Health and Substance Abuse	0741-616190	jmbatia@muchs.ac.tz
2.	Ronald Zakaria Rwechungura	Forum on Anti-Corruption Initiatives in Tanzania FAITA TRUST	CEO	2123959, 0741-254932, 0741-254932, 0745-543878	Faita_trust01@yahoo.co.uk
3.	Hebron Mwakagenda	NPF	Member Steering Committee	255-22-2124561, 0741-612681	Theleadership2000@yahoo.com
4.	Dr. John Kisanji	TEN/MET	Coordinator	0741-222206	tenmet@africaonline.com
5.	Rose Acen Upor	University of DSM	Lecturer	255-22-2410749, 2774450, 0744-397373	roseupor@yahoo.com , upor@uccmail.co.tz
6.	Rogers V. Cidosa	TRACE	Policy Unit	2701838/40, 0744-834432	trace@cats-net.com
7.	Gladness H. Munuo	TAMWA	Journalist/TV	0744-2857011, 2115278	gladym@hotmail.com
8.	Dr. Hamis J. Mponezya	Tanzania Public Health Association	Programme Manager	2762407, 0744-376250	tpha@muchs.ac.tz
9.	Dennis Rweyemamu	ESRF	Asst. Research Fellow	2760260, 0744-611167	drweyemamu@esrf.or.tz
10.	Allan Syrill Mlulla	ESRF	Research Assistant	2760260, 0744-273822	amlulla@esrf.or.tz
11.	William Simon	ESRF	IT Assistant	270260, 0744- 635480	wsimon@esrf.or.tz
12.	Andrew Mushi	TANGO	Programme Officer	2762208	tango@africaonline.co.tz
13.	Ismail A. Suleiman	Watoto Salama	Executive Director	2650160, 0744-310094, 0745-069993	watotosalama@hotmail.com
14.	Dr. Calista Simbakalia	Health Scope	Associate Director	2150427, 2152214	cimbakalia@yahoo.co.uk
15.	Charles Lwanga-Ntale	Development Research and Training	Director	041 269495, 077 707690	dnt@imul.com

16.	Larok Arthur	Uganda National NGO Forum	Programme Officer	256-31-260373, 256-78-385818	ngoforum@infocom.co.ug
17.	Margaret Mercy Akongo	Tedwii Indigenous Women Development Organisation	Coordinator	256-77-860529, 256-77-860529	Tido_women@tgymail.com
18.	Astrid van Rooij		Consultant	256-77-411828	a.van.rooij@utlonline.co.ug
19.	Charity Kyomugisha	Centre for Basic Research	Research Fellow	256-41-342987, 256-77-414450	ckyomuhisha@hotmail.com
20.	Mugisha Bitature Joseph	Uganda Change Agent Association/Cord	Programme Manager	041-236907, 041-542995	jmbitature@cdrn.or.ug
21.	Vic Sutton	Talent Consortium	Project Manager	27 11 3391440, 27 83 2604533	talent@sn.apc.org

Annex 3: Evaluation Results

18 forms returned

1. What two things you have heard about in this workshop will most help your organization? (Please be as specific as possible)

- Evidence based research
- How to come up with evidence in lobbying work
- Building coalitions and networking on policy issues
- The presentations and discussions
- The range of tools that can be used in assessing policy impact and evidence based policy influencing
- Re-affirming that ‘together we can positively influence policy’
- Using evidence to influence policy processes
- Using the appropriate approach to be able to influence policy
- Policy processes, the role of research based evidence in policy processes
- Practical framework – research and policy development
- Approaches, tools, tricks – policy development
- Successful mechanism in communicating research findings
- Using the analysis frame in our research
- Networking on research institutions
- No one CSO is expert in everything
- Evidence informs policymakers
- The RAPID approach
- Policy influence tools
- Analytical framework
- Tools for policy impact
- That policy influencing is beyond a technical matter and is very political in nature and that calls for appropriate strategies
- Evidence, facts and figures are extremely important in the policy influencing business
- Tools
- Experiences from others
- CSO contributions to policy change

2. Please rate the following aspects of the workshop/seminar

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Objectives defined and achieved	8	9			
Concepts explained clearly	8	9			
Time allocated for the seminar	2	8	7		
Relevance to my work	9	7	1		
Well-organized	10	7			
Overall quality of the Workshop/seminar	8	8	1		

3. Please comment on the overall workshop/seminar quality and value:

- It was very nice
- It was excellently organised, well articulated learning opportunity
- Good
- Participants were well-informed, full of soul and energy
- It has been kept too small to ensure everyone’s participation

- It was well organised and relevant to my duties
- Good quality and value, especially when seen in the light of the current capacity challenge in policy analysis in this 'policy influencing era'.
- It has been good and well organised
- Excellent
- Good quality with excellent pre-workshop preparations; appreciated the handouts
- Good quality handouts, facilitation and content was relevant
- It will be good if the way forward will be implementation
- Of considerable quality and value
- It is very educative, informative and has contributed a lot to our understanding of the evidence-policy links
- The workshop / seminar was very interesting and gave me a lot of new information and ways to strengthen our NGO
- Facilitators were good and materials presented were simple to understand
- I really think the workshop had some value, but the cases presented seemed to be a little abstract; new areas that I couldn't easily deduce to my daily work
- Tremendous value as many experiences come together and are shared
- Good quality and valuable workshop overall; the interactive component of participants has contributed to good quality work

4. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for future workshops like this?

- More time should be allocated for participation, especially in groups in order to create more interaction
- Put concepts into practice
- Yes, we need to know more on evaluation techniques and writing of good proposals as well
- More attention should be paid to national-level workshops first and, funds permitting, regional workshops should be held at the next level - not the other way round
- Earlier notification
- More need for Tanzanian NGOs
- Should be less condensed
- Include more stakeholders, especially policy makers
- Yes I do like to be invited so I can learn more for the benefit of our NGO
- More time should be allocated
- Deductions should be made from more recent and practical experience; having a case presented by someone who was actually involved would be great
- Selection of participants – looks like this is based on personal contacts rather than looking for the real stakeholders
- Such workshops / seminars should be continued

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

- Through email communication and capacity building tracking to review and share experiences of policy engagement
- Initiate - put some concepts into practice
- Continued networking with my organisation
- In my organisation, most of our duty is to make / improve life status of the community where as a result policies are changed so we need to learn more from ODI.
- Collaborative work in policy analysis training
- More pointers to methodology materials given
- Since access to information is still a problem, ODI can help us develop the library / resource centre that we have in place
- Capacity building

- Feedback from organisers on the evaluation
- Policy development research strategies
- Sending a questionnaire regularly (yearly) to check on info usage and research needs
- Organise through a recognised network an annual conference on country basis on research evidence and policy processes
- Networking; resources
- Should not be end of the road for participants
- Continued inclusion in ODI platforms as well as regular information sharing electronically
- I hope you will send all the book to our address
- Policy analysis
- Writing skills
- Support to document our experiences and have these shared in the region and internationally as well
- Funding to support our planned policy analysis and capacity enhancement training in lobbying and advocacy
- Within Uganda, we have to organise this with technical backing from ODI
- Workshop proceedings should be sent to all participants to enable follow up

6. In your country, to what extent do:

(Score between 0 = none and 5 = always)

a) Policymakers use research-based evidence to be important in policy making?	0	5	1	2	3	0	3	2	2	2	1	3	4	2.5	0
b) CSOs contribute to policy making?	5	5	2	5	2	5	2	3	3	1	2	4	4	2.5	5
c) CSO's use research-based evidence to inform their work?	5	5	2	5	3	5	2	3	4	1	5	3	4	2	5