

UNDERSTANDING AND INFLUENCING POLICY

Advocacy Handbook for Diaspora and Small Organisations Working in International Development

Gibril Faal



Policy
A policy described government, private "Statement of Inter important organiza



advisory
ad-vis-ory advise; giving a role.
ad-vo-cacy /ædv of support (to a ca her advocacy of wo or work of an adv ad-voc-ate /ædv publicly in favor



Photo credits: AFFORD, afronews.co.uk, hagueinternsassociation.org
keele.ac.uk, researchccess.com, texty.nl, The Promota

www.afford-uk.org

UNDERSTANDING AND INFLUENCING POLICY

**Advocacy Handbook for
Diaspora and Small Organisations
Working in International Development**

Gibril Faal



Understanding and Influencing Policy: Advocacy Handbook for Diaspora and Small Organisations
Working in International Development

© Gibril Faal, 2014

ISBN: 978-0-9928913-0-5



Published by: GK Partners

111 Buckingham Palace Road
Victoria, London SW1W 0SR
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 3004 6172 Email: info@gkpartners.co.uk www.gkpartners.co.uk

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the permission of AFFORD. This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced without fee for teaching and training purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission is required for all such uses.

The contents are the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the views and policies of AFFORD, Comic Relief or The Baring Foundation.

Design, typesetting and production: The Promota (020 7237 7317)

Printed by Evolution Print, Sheffield, England

**This handbook was published as part of the Africa-UK programme, with support from:
Comic Relief | Baring Foundation | GK Partners**



The Baring Foundation



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
----------------	----------

Section One

What is Policy?	7
------------------------	----------

Need for Definition of Policy | Policy as Framework | Policy Documents | Examples of Policy Documents in International Development | Diaspora Input in Development Policy | Policies in the Real World.

Section Two

What is Advocacy?	21
--------------------------	-----------

Defining Advocacy | Key Components of Advocacy | Acting on Behalf of People | Influencing and Changing Policy | Practical Purpose of Advocacy | Conceptual Purpose of Advocacy | Forces of Change and the Forces of Continuity | Adopting Strategies and Applying Techniques | Organisational Vision and Alliance Building | Classification and Examples of Advocacy Techniques | Lobbying and Lobbyists.

Section Three

How to Influence Policy	43
--------------------------------	-----------

Policy Influencing Frameworks and Tools | Clarity of Advocacy Goals | Types of Policy Interventions | Approach to Setting Advocacy Goals | Composition of the Policy Community | Networking and the Six Degrees of Separation | Policy in Non-Democratic Societies | Perception, Actuality and Reality | Approach to Developing Advocacy Action Plans | Reflection on Problems and Solutions | Alliance Building and the Five Stages of Partnership | Win-Win Negotiations | Approach to Making an Advocacy Pitch.

Annexes

58

- The first annex need to start on an odd number even if it means a blank page.
- The second and third annexes will take up odd and even pages.
- For the second pages of the second and third annexes, the text can be moved down one more space from the banner heading.

Bibliography

63

For users, this section is just as important as the body of the handbook. Current print out shows that it is squashed and not reader friendly.

- The publication references should be size 12 font with spaces between them
- The titles of the publications should be italicised in line with the standard referencing formats (see MS Word document)
- There are 3 journal publications in the list, for these, it is the name of the journal that need to be italicised; namely:
Journal of Applied Probability 43
Social Networks 1
Sociometry, Vol.32, No.4
- For the linked documents, the titles are size 12 and the hyperlinks are size 10. Please see MS Word document for set up including size and style of sub headings of links.

Preface

AFFORD was formed in 1994 by diaspora Africans, to ‘expand and enhance the contribution that Africans in the diaspora make to Africa’s development’. This was a response to the disjuncture between mainstream international development and diaspora action. In its early years, AFFORD had a dual strategy: firstly, engage mainstream policymakers and influence them to understand, accept, recognise and support the extensive development work of the African diaspora; secondly, enhance the development knowledge, skills and capacity of diaspora organisations and individuals. Although much progress has been made in the past twenty years, this strategy is still relevant to diaspora-development. Over time, AFFORD has gained extensive experience and credibility in policy advocacy as well as capacity building. The emergence of the Common Ground Initiative and the Africa-UK programme in 2011 is partly due to the advocacy successes of AFFORD. The charity has used its unique expertise to develop its advocacy training package and to produce this handbook.

General Engagement Methodology

AFFORD developed, pioneered and operates a classic engagement, policy and capacity-building methodology for diaspora-development. This methodology has six key components, which are reflected in the advocacy handbook and training course:

- I. Undertake structured and diligent engagement; demonstrating long term commitment and gaining stakeholder trust
- II. Focus on realistic opportunities and facilitate short term wins; whilst inspiring commitment to longer term ambition for the sector
- III. Build complementary, strategic and enabling partnerships; thereby facilitating enhanced capacity and networks in the sector
- IV. Innovate, pilot and test out new themes and schemes; thereby facilitating progression, renewal and dynamism in the sector
- V. Produce resources that are informed by concepts; but are of practical use to those ready and willing to undertake progressive actions and activities
- VI. Insist on uncompromising high quality; countering the self-perpetuating low ambition, pedestrianism and mediocrity associated with and often expected of diaspora and African organisations.

Policy Advocacy Challenges

AFFORD has a good understanding of the policy development needs of the diaspora, gained through: twenty years of ongoing contact and engagement with people involved in development; designing and delivering a wide range of training, support and capacity-building programmes; learning lessons from practical projects such as ‘Helping Africans Influence London (2003-2004)’ and ‘Phase One of the Africa-UK programme (2011-2012)’. The policy advocacy challenges faced by diaspora and small organisations can be summarised as follows:

- Lack of knowledge of specific policy status in the relevant sectors
- Lack of knowledge of general policy frameworks and processes

- Lack of skills in developing coherent policy-related proposals
- Lack of skills in effective engagement and influencing
- Lack of resources to undertake policy campaigns.

These challenges are due to a number of practical factors. Diaspora and small organisations are often involved in delivering thematic development programmes directly to beneficiaries. Policy and advocacy are not central preoccupations; they are incidental and marginal issues dealt with as and when they arise. Unlike large organisations and institutions, they do not have teams of professional staff devoted to policy work. Their restrained resources imply that they need sharper policy-related skills, so as to prevent advocacy being a wasteful distraction or a catalogue of failures.

In my interactions with policymakers across the world, I sense that they sometimes see diaspora and small organisations involved in policy advocacy as well-meaning, but bumbling and cantankerous amateurs. Lack of appropriate knowledge and skills creates and reinforces such negative and damaging stereotypes. The handbook uses illustrations and examples of different types of national, international and organisational policy frameworks to introduce the reader to the sort of detail they need to master if they are to be effective policy advocates.

Structure of the Handbook

The main challenge in preparing the handbook has been the need to restrict its length. As a result, important themes and points have been omitted, for example advocacy monitoring. However, the handbook complements a very interactive 2-day training course which provides an opportunity for exploration of other issues. It is hoped that supplementary guides and briefings will be produced in the future. I have also devised new simple and easy-to-use frameworks and tools including 'Composition of the Policy Community' and 'Approach to Developing Advocacy Action Plans'. These provide the grounding for methodical understanding of the topics, equipping readers to pursue further policy advocacy work by themselves. A number of guiding and searching questions are posed to assist readers with their independent explorations.

I have also modified and brought in concepts and tools from other disciplines such as social psychology and marketing to further enhance the effectiveness of the policy advocate. These can help readers find their policy-related strengths, irrespective of their size or circumstances. The handbook is a practical guide with specific examples, reflecting the circumstances and perspectives of diaspora and small organisations working in international development. It may not be the ideal bedtime reading, but as a resource, it can help readers and users:

- Gain understanding of the concepts and practices of policy and advocacy
- Gain new skills and define advocacy roles in line with existing capacity
- Plan and implement specific policy advocacy campaigns.

Gibril Faal

London, March 2014

Section One

What is Policy?



Need for Definition of Policy

It is frustrating that while we need definitions to create clarity, the process of defining phenomena invariably leads to awkward complexity – especially in the social sciences. Nevertheless, we must persevere; we must have greater clarity; we must have good working definitions. In the world of advocacy where one is often seeking to challenge and change what goes on in external institutions and organisations, it is imperative to maximise focus and purposefulness, and minimise distraction and confusion. Definitions help us identify what we do. Adopting working definitions also highlights what we do not do. This limiting aspect is just as important in the fertile world of policy, which is characterised by plurality, multiplicity and complexity. Policy advocacy is fertile ground where the unfocused advocate can easily be drawn into interminable circles of ineffectual actions and futile endeavour. Then what happens? One can easily become frustrated, cynical and bitter. That is no good. Many good activists have fallen into cynicism, resignation and withdrawal – a loss to the very cause that inspired their original foray into advocacy for change. So, the dry and boring exercise of trying to define policy is not merely academic indulgence, it is about achieving advocacy success, maintaining a sound mind and preserving the pleasant disposition of policy advocates!

Policy as Framework

To put it simply, a policy is a framework; not too dissimilar to the physical frame of a painting. The frame creates focus on the painting as a subject, identifying it as the matter of principal importance. The phenomena that are outside the frame are not part of the painting. They are not what people should concentrate on. Yet the character and nature of that surrounding surface or environment is important in terms of how the painting is viewed and perceived.

www.oxforddictionaries.com	<i>“a course or principle of action adopted or proposed by an organization or individual”</i>
www.merriam-webster.com	<i>“a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body”</i>
www.thefreedictionary.com	<i>“a plan or course of action, as of a government, political party, or business, intended to influence and determine decisions, actions, and other matters”</i>

A policy is a framework that sets out and provides guidance about the positions, interests, actions, activities, projects and programmes of institutions and organisations; in relation to specified themes or issues. A policy also provides direction on how the relevant actions are implemented through guiding principles, priorities, plans and procedures.

Policy Documents

The policies of governments, international agencies and major non-governmental, civil society and commercial organisations and institutions tend to be formal in nature. The policy is evidenced in the form of written documents, which may be given a variety of titles. In the UK for example, government policy on a specific subject may be contained in a White Paper, strategy paper, policy paper, departmental report, review document, declaration or other published documents. Irrespective of names given to the publications, policy documents tend to cover most or all the following headings:

- Policy Goals and Priorities
- Policy Scope and Limits
- Applicability and Timescale
- Roles and Responsibilities.

Examples of Policy Documents in International Development

A policy is whatever the policy document says! This may appear to be a simplistic claim, but it does offer a practical approach to appreciating the nature of policy. It is indeed the case that a policy document, whatever form it takes, will state the specified policy. Naturally, the more policy documents one studies, the better one understands what policy is all about. Furthermore, by examining selected policies of varied institutions and organisations, one encounters different document formats, highlighting the diversity of approaches.

Not all policies are presented in a formal, structured and documented manner. Policies can also be manifested through unwritten implementation and conventional practices.

In the UK, the government policy formulation process can involve the publication of several versions of a policy document:

Green Paper, White Paper, Parliamentary Bill & Act of Parliament

A selection of policy documents on international development are presented in the boxes below. These examples cover a range of institutions and organisations, namely:

- United Kingdom Government (Industrialised Country)
- United Nations (Multilateral Organisation)
- African Union (Continental Organisation)
- European Union (Continental Organisation)
- Africa-Europe Platform (Diaspora Organisation)
- Kenyan Government (Developing Country).

UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT POLICY DOCUMENTS

General Policy

A recent UK government policy document is the January 2013 'The Coalition: Together in the National Interest – Mid-Term Review'. The document highlights the major policy priorities of all the government departments for the period 2013-15. The section on international development is entitled 'Standing Tall in the World' and gives an updated summary of policy priorities within the Department for International Development (DFID).

International Development Policy

- DFID policy documents on a range of development themes include:
- June 2012: 'Faith Partnership Principles: Working effectively with faith groups to fight global poverty'
- February 2012: 'Promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: A DFID Strategy Paper'
- March 2011: 'UK Aid: Changing lives, delivering results'
- March 2010: 'DFID Programme Strategy 2010-2013: Creating a safer environment – Clearing landmines and other explosive remnants of war'

DFID White Papers

- DFID was created in 1997 and since then it has published four White Papers:
- July 2009: 'Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future'
- July 2006: 'Eliminating World Poverty: Making Governance Work for the Poor'
- December 2000: 'Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor'
- November 1997: 'Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century'

The Diaspora and the 1997 DFID White Paper

The African Foundation for Development (AFFORD) was set up in 1994 with the mission to “expand and enhance the contribution Africans in the diaspora make to Africa’s development”. The charity was a pioneer in highlighting and explaining the reality and importance of the diaspora-development nexus. It also implemented an advocacy programme to influence the mainstream actors in international development. The goal was to improve understanding, increase acceptance, and mobilise support for strategic diaspora input in the development of countries of origin or heritage. AFFORD’s early advocacy influenced the inclusion of the limited statement on page 68 of DFID’s first White Paper (1997):

“We will seek to build on the skills and talents of migrants and other members of ethnic minorities within the UK to promote the development of their countries of origin”.

AFFORD used this policy statement to advocate for greater recognition and provision of resources and support. The practical benefits that emerged included:

- Acknowledgement of diaspora practitioners as credible development experts
- Recognition of diaspora groups as distinctive development entities
- Creation and funding of a diaspora-development network
- Creation of funding streams specifically for diaspora organisations
- Better understanding amongst policymakers of the challenges and opportunities of diaspora development organisations

UNITED NATIONS POLICY DOCUMENTS

Millennium Development Goals and Beyond

In September 2000, at the General Assembly of the United Nations, 189 countries adopted the Millennium Declaration. This led to the 2001 'Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration – Report of the Secretary-General', which set out the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs comprise 8 goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators. It became the central global policy framework for international development for the fifteen years 2000-2015.

As part of the consultations for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to succeed the MDGs, in July 2012, the UN Secretary General set up a High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. In May 2013, they published their report 'A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development'. This report made a basic mention of 'international migration' in an 82-word paragraph under the speculative section headed "The Global Impact by 2030". Under its proposed global transformative shift through "forging a new global partnership", the report listed a number of global partners. As with the MDG framework, this important policy consultation document did not mention or recognise migrants and diasporas as partners in development.

Diaspora Input in Development Policy Beyond 2015

AFFORD advocates for the new international development goals to include the following provisions:

- "The diaspora and migrants should be formally and distinctly recognised and mentioned as an important global partner for development, in line with other major partners"
- "There should be long term international grant funding schemes with capacity building and advocacy support, dedicated specifically for diaspora organisations involved in development work in their countries of origin or heritage"
- "There should be international diaspora loan, co-investment and guarantee funds and business support programmes, for diaspora and migrant individuals and companies that operate social, rural, small and medium-sized enterprises which: create sustainable decent jobs; contribute to inclusive growth; and fit within national development strategies and programmes in countries of origin or heritage"

The above provisions were included in recommendations of the Diaspora Ministerial Conference (Geneva, 18-19 June 2013) and the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and International Development – Informal Interactive Hearings (New York, 15 July 2013).

AFRICAN UNION POLICY DOCUMENTS

AU Diaspora Policy

The AU considers the African diaspora as its 'sixth region'. Section 3(q) of its Constitutive Act "invites and encourages the full participation of the African Diaspora as an important part of our continent in the building of the African Union". In April 2005, a committee of AU experts adopted a definition of the 'African Diaspora' as set out in the 'Report of the Meeting of Experts from Member States on the Definition of the African Diaspora'. Earlier in January 2005, the AU's Permanent Representatives Committee had rejected the definition recommended in June 2004 by the first expert committee. The adopted definition states that:

"The African Diaspora consists of peoples of African origin living outside the continent, irrespective of their citizenship and nationality and who are willing to contribute to the development of the continent and the building of the African Union."

The definition focussed on being inclusive of Africa's diverse diasporas and emphasised the importance of input in the continent's development. In May 2012, the 'Declaration of the Global African Diaspora Summit' was adopted. This comprehensive declaration has 3 programme themes and 16 action points as summarised below:

A. Political Cooperation

1. Intergovernmental Cooperation
2. Mobilization of Support

B. Economic Cooperation

1. Government Action to Foster Increased Economic Partnership
2. Mobilization of Capital
3. Partnership in Business
4. Science and Technology
5. Knowledge Transfer and Skills Mobilization
6. Infrastructure Development
7. Information Gathering and Dissemination Capacity
8. Climate Change

C. Social Cooperation

1. Knowledge and Education
2. Arts and Culture
3. Media and Image Building
4. Immigration
5. Human and People's Rights
6. Social and Cultural Issues

EU Policy on Global Development

In December 2005, the EU adopted the 'European Consensus on Development' as a comprehensive policy on international development. The EU institutions are the world's largest multilateral donors, providing more development funding than the World Bank and UN agencies. At the same time, they are the second largest bilateral donors, second only to the United States. Collectively, the EU institutions and member states are the largest development funders in the world. In addition to the collective EU policy, individual member states have their own international development policies, e.g. as set out in DFID White Papers and other policy documents. However, the EU Consensus policy document has commitments to be implemented by both the EU institutions and the member states.

EU Policy on Development of Former Colonies

In June 2000, the EU adopted the 'Cotonou Agreement' as a comprehensive development policy involving 79 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. This policy formally came into effect in 2003 and will remain in force until 2020, subject to reviews every 5 years. The EU's international development policy and funding originated from the Articles within the Treaty of Rome which created the Europe Economic Community (EEC) in 1957. At the time, the first European Development Fund (EDF) was created, mainly to support the former colonies of the European countries. The current ACP policy itself is preceded by 6 agreements, namely 2 Yaoundé Conventions (signed 1963 and 1969) and 4 Lomé Conventions (signed 1975, 1979, 1984 and 1989).

EU Policy on African Development

In December 2007, 'The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa-EU Strategy' (JASP) was adopted by the EU and the African Union. The policy covers 8 development themes, namely: ***Peace and Security, Democratic Governance and Human Rights, Regional Economic Integration, Trade and Infrastructure, Millennium Development Goals, Climate Change, Energy, Migration, Mobility and Employment and Science, Information Society and Space.***

The partnership will be reviewed at the 4th EU-Africa summit in Brussels in April 2014. The previous summits were Cairo in 2000, Lisbon in 2007 and Tripoli in 2010.

EU Policy on Migration, Mobility and Employment

Within 'The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa-EU Strategy', diaspora-development issues are addressed under the theme of 'Migration, Mobility and Employment (MME)'. The document commits the EU and AU to:

- *“Better integration of African migrants in their respective EU and African countries of residence”*
- *“Make further steps towards the facilitation of safer, faster, and cheaper remittances, including for investments; ensure that sufficient data, research and know-how is made available to governments; promote innovative solutions for transferring money”*
- *“Establish regular dialogue on African migrants residing in EU and African countries with a view to addressing their problems”*
- *“Facilitate the mobility of members of the diasporas and/or migrant communities, to allow them to act as agents of development; launch an inventory of diaspora organizations to enhance cooperation; promote co-development schemes”*

The Diaspora and the Joint Africa-EU Strategic Partnership

Following from the Africa-EU Lisbon summit of 2007, the Africa Diaspora Policy Centre (ADPC) organised two groundbreaking policy seminars in 2008 and 2009. It brought together 50 leading diaspora organisations from 10 EU countries as well as policymakers from Africa and Europe. The June 2008 seminar in Brussels was on 'Engaging African Diaspora in Europe as Strategic Agents for Development in Africa'. The October 2009 seminar in Brussels was on 'Participation of the Diaspora in the Joint Africa-EU Strategic Partnership'.

During the proceedings of the October 2009 policy seminar, the African Foundation for Development (AFFORD), which participated in both seminars, drafted a proposal for the setting up of a permanent platform for African diaspora-development organisations in Europe. This proposal outlined the main purpose and activities of an Africa-Europe Platform. It also set out practical action points to be undertaken to make the proposal a reality. By means of a vote, the diaspora organisations accepted and adopted the proposal. In 2010, the EuropeAid funded a project for a Europe-wide African Diaspora Platform for Development. The project was identified as part of the implementation of JASP by the 'Joint Africa EU Strategy: Action Plan 2011-2013', adopted in November 2010, at the 3rd Africa-EU Summit in Tripoli.

AFRICA-EUROPE POLICY DOCUMENTS

JASP and Diaspora Organisations

There is a process in place to create a permanent Africa-Europe Platform (AEP) to support diaspora organisations working on development in Africa. The process followed the policy decisions made at the Lisbon Africa-EU summit in December 2007, where the Joint Africa-EU Strategic Partnership was adopted. JASP itself reflected recommendations and agreements in the Declaration of the Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development (Tripoli, November 2006) and the Declaration of the Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development (Rabat, July 2006).

In October 2009, African diaspora organisations accepted the 'Proposal for Setting Up Platform for African Diaspora Groups in Europe'. A consortium was formed by ADPC (Netherlands), AFFORD (United Kingdom), CGMD (Belgium), FORIM (France), with ICMFD as a technical partner. Europe Aid provided funding for a 3-year project (2011-14). In November 2010, at the 3rd Africa-EU Summit in Tripoli, the AU and EU leaders adopted a 'Joint Africa EU Strategy: Action Plan 2011-2013'. This document acknowledged the emergence of AEP, stating that the Summit:

“emphasized the need to strengthen the role of Diasporas in the African development process, and maximize the development benefits of remittancesand create synergies between.....existing programmes [including the] EU-wide networks of African Diaspora organisations working in the field of development”.

In November 2012, the AEP diaspora expert group adopted the 'AEP Articles of Association' as statute to be used to formally register the Africa-Europe Platform as a not-for-profit legal entity within the jurisdiction of Belgium. The overall aim of AEP is “to improve and enhance the capacity and impact of the African diaspora organisations that are involved in development activities in Africa”. The AEP services will focus on:

- Providing information, guidance and training
- Compiling directories and databases of African diaspora organisations
- Compiling, disseminating and showcasing best practices
- Circulating information about policies, funding initiatives and other opportunities
- Research on improving the role of diaspora in African development
- Facilitating networking, partnerships, collaborations and joint ventures
- Consultations and facilitating common positions on policy and strategic matters
- Advocating on policy and liaising with EU, AU, organisations and agencies
- Campaigns to improve the image and representation of Africa in the media

KENYAN GOVERNMENT POLICY DOCUMENTS

Dual Citizenship and the 2010 Kenyan Constitution

After approval through a referendum, in August 2010, 'The Constitution of Kenya' was promulgated. Amongst other things, the new constitution allowed Kenyans to hold dual citizenship and gave automatic citizenship to any person born of a Kenyan parent anywhere in the world.

In August 2011, 'The Kenya Citizenship and Immigration Act' came into effect with guidance published and distributed at embassies and other channels.

Kenyan Development and Diaspora Policy

In July 2008, the Kenyan coalition government adopted the 'Kenya Vision 2030', as a national long term development blueprint. One of the flagship projects of the Kenya Vision 2030 was the "development and implementation of a Diaspora Policy that provides the necessary legal and institutional frameworks for Kenyans in the Diaspora to participate in the country's development".

In 2011, the government of Kenya published a draft 'Diaspora Policy of Kenya', for consultation. The document stated that:

"The overriding objective of this policy is to mainstream the Kenyan Diaspora in the development agenda by creating an enabling environment into which the Diaspora is effectively integrated and able to make significant contribution to the development of the country. The main thrust is therefore, to harness the Kenyan Diaspora as a resource for development".

The headings included:

- Citizenship
- Remittances, Trade and Investment
- Tourism, Culture and Entertainment
- Consular Services and Protection of Kenya's Diaspora
- Diaspora Database
- Tapping into Diaspora Skills
- Diaspora Administration and Capacity Building
- Connectivity to Information and Communication Technology
- Transferability and Portability of Social Security

Kenyan Constitutional Definition of Citizenship

Chapter 3, Section 14m clause 1, 2 and 5 of the 2010 'The Constitution of Kenya' state as follows:

- *“(1) A person is a citizen by birth if on the day of the person’s birth, whether or not the person is born in Kenya, either the mother or father of the person is a citizen.”*
- *“(2) Clause (1) applies equally to a person born before the effective date, whether or not the person was born in Kenya, if either the mother or father of the person is or was a citizen.”*
- *“(5) A person who is a Kenyan citizen by birth and who, on the effective date, has ceased to be a Kenyan citizen because the person acquired citizenship of another country, is entitled on application to regain Kenyan citizenship.”*

This notice was issued by the Kenya High Commission in the UK

NOTICE

KENYA CITIZENSHIP – ARTICLE 14(1), (2) AND (5) OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Kenya Citizenship and Immigration Act which implements Chapter 3 of the Constitution commenced on 30th August 2011 and effectively repealed the Kenya Citizenship Act Cap 170, The Immigration Act Cap 172 and the Aliens Restriction Act Cap 173, Law of Kenya.

Below is a clarification of the Constitutional Provisions relating to Citizenship.

A person born of a Kenyan parent irrespective of the place of birth automatically becomes a citizen of Kenya by birth.

The Constitution confers automatic recognition to persons holding citizenship of other countries as citizens of Kenya by birth so long as they are able to prove parentage as aforesaid (National identification cards, passports).

Kenya citizens by birth who wish to hold citizenship of other countries which do not allow dual citizenship may voluntarily renounce and would be entitled upon application to regain their Kenyan citizenship.

Kenya citizens by birth who ceased to be citizens of Kenya **by voluntarily acquiring the citizenship of other countries and renouncing the citizenship of Kenya in accordance with the repealed Constitution** may regain citizenship **UPON APPLICATION** in the prescribed manner (See No. 6 below).

The persons who enjoyed dual citizenship but who by virtue of the repealed Constitution renounced or lost their Kenyan citizenship upon attainment of the age of **Twenty Three (23) years** should automatically be deemed citizens by birth.

Kenyans who voluntarily renounced Kenyan citizenship and want to regain it are required to fill Form 5 (Application to Regain Kenyan Citizenship) and forward it to the Kenya High Commission for processing.

Form 5 can be downloaded from the Kenya High Commission website.
www.kenyahighcommission.net

Policies in the Real World

In order to be an effective policy advocate, one needs to understand not only the formal nature of policy and advocacy, but also the myths, unintended consequences and imperfections that form part of the practical realities of policy. Common examples of 'imperfect policies' are discussed below.

Inert Policies

In every jurisdiction, there are lists of adopted policies and even assented laws that gather dust on shelves; neglected, unimplemented, ineffectual and inert. There are several reasons why governments and institutions adopt policies and then fail to implement them.

The reasons why inert policies arise include the following:

- Lack of political will
- Lack of appropriate resources
- Emergence of superseding policies or laws
- Change of personnel, with new principals considering it low priority
- Significant changes in prevalent internal and external conditions and circumstances.

For the policy advocate, existence of a policy by itself is never enough. Policies need to be brought to life in order to achieve the practical goals enshrined within them.

Inchoate Policies

Despite the sophistication and thoroughness of policy making systems, in the real world, one encounters imperfect, uncertain and other inchoate policies. These policies tend to be contentious and subject to challenge and disputation.

Inchoate policies take many forms including the following examples:

- Irreconcilable policies which conflict significantly against other existing policies
- Incomplete policies which lack substantive relevant information and or contain significant gaps
- Inconsistent policies with provisions which are internally conflicting and contradictory
- Informal policies emerging from customary practice without comprehensive written stipulations
- Impractical policies which, although theoretically sound, are difficult or impossible to implement.

Subject to ethical considerations, the policy advocate needs to consider whether it is worthwhile seeking a short term inchoate policy. In the long term, inchoate policies are problematic and undesirable.

Impromptu Policies

Advisers and political minders are always jittery when politicians make statements and speeches extemporaneously or without carefully studying scripts. Amongst other things, they get concerned that impromptu 'on the hoof' policies may be announced. It is indeed the case that seemingly innocent statements made by principal decision makers can amount to 'policy'. These policies are prone to being unstructured, incoherent and reversible.

Impromptu policies arise under different circumstances, including instances when decision makers:

- React under pressure or scrutiny
- Are too keen to create a particular impression
- Are excited, exuberant or carried-away
- Make genuine mistakes which they do not want to correct
- Inadvertently make statements without noticing the full policy implication
- Wish to take a short-cut and override the policy formulation process.

Subject to ethical considerations, the policy advocate needs to consider whether decision makers should be primed or manipulated into making favourable impromptu policies.

Stretched Policies

Sometimes actions and interventions are undertaken, based on very flimsy and questionable policy frameworks. These may still be valid as the action-taker may have stretched the meaning, interpretation, ambit and purview of the policy to its limits. For the willing action-taker, a narrow policy by itself is not necessarily a deterrent for action as policy stretching is a possibility – although the practice may be disingenuous or even unethical.

Policy stretching is possible due to a number of reasons, including the following:

- The policy itself is not clear beyond doubt
- The existence of gaps and 'loop holes' in the policy
- The general elasticity and inexactness of language
- The creative interpretation of the letter and spirit of the policy.

For the policy advocate, convincing the decision and policy maker is of paramount importance. They may not even need to formulate new policies in order to accommodate the actions being advocated for – they may simply stretch existing policy.

Questions to Consider:

- Do you think it is possible to create a technically 'perfect policy'?
- Can you think of other forms of 'imperfect policies'?
- How would you prevent the emergence of 'imperfect policies'?

Section Two

What is Advocacy?



Defining Advocacy

www.oxforddictionaries.com	Advocacy is “public support for or recommendation of a particular cause or policy: from <i>advocare</i> ‘summon, call to one’s aid’”
www.merriam-webster.com	An advocate is “one that pleads the cause of another; specifically: one that defends or maintains a cause or proposal; one that supports or promotes the interests of another”
www.thefreedictionary.com	Advocacy is “the act of pleading or arguing in favor of something, such as a cause, idea, or policy; active support.”

“Advocacy is a strategy that is used around the world by non-governmental organizations, activists, and even policy makers themselves, to influence policies. Advocacy is about creation or reform of policies, but also about effective implementation and enforcement of policies.....Advocacy is a means to an end, another way to address the problems that we aim to solve through other programming strategies.”

Sprechmann, Sophia & Pelton, Emily (2001)

“Policy advocacy refers to advocacy tactics, strategies and initiatives which target changes to policies and legislation. These advocacy initiatives seek to establish new policies, improve existing policies or challenge the development of policies that diminish resources and opportunities for vulnerable groups.”

Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, Ontario, Canada

http://provincialadvocate.on.ca/main/en/what/types_advocacy.cfm (Retrieved March 2014)

“Public policy advocacy is the effort to influence public policy through various forms of persuasive communication. Public policy includes statements, policies, or prevailing practices imposed by those in authority to guide or control institutional, community, and sometimes individual behavior.”

Johns Hopkins School of Public Health (1999)

Key Components of Advocacy

Based on the various definitions and reviews of advocacy practice, it is possible to identify explicit and implicit characteristics of modern public policy advocacy; leading to the formulation of a broad set of key components of advocacy, namely:

- Acting on behalf of people
- Influencing and changing policy
- Adopting strategies and applying techniques.

Acting on Behalf of People

Representation and Participation

Advocacy involves representing and advancing the case of subjects (i.e. people), objects (i.e. issues) or both. Representing the interests of people is more complicated than arguing the merits of particular issues. Nonetheless, to be an effective advocate, one needs to be absolutely clear as to the specifics of what one is advocating and on whose behalf one is making representations or taking action. It is indeed legitimate and common for advocates to be representing themselves, their own defined groups or values and propositions they subscribe to. Such 'self representation' may be described as civic participation in public policy processes. Even for 'self representation', the advocate needs to ask searching questions, including examples set out below.

REPRESENTATION

(Who or what are you representing?)

Questions for the Advocate:

- Am I advocating for definable and identifiable groups of peoples? Am I advocating on discrete public policy issues including: ideals, values, concepts and other socio-economic and development propositions? Is there a cross-over between advancing the case of identifiable 'subjects' and particular development 'objects'?
- Who specifically are the groups and categories of people am advocating for? Am I part of those groups and categories or am I an outsider? What aspects of the people's lives am I making representations on? What aspects of their lives am I not making representations on?
- What specifically are the issues I am advocating on? Am I a practitioner on this issue or am I an observer? What themes within this issue am I advocating on? What themes am I not advocating on?

Questions apply to individuals as well as organisations.

Legitimacy and Mandate

If as an advocate you are representing groups and categories of people, an obvious and primary question is that of legitimacy and mandate. Trade unions, professional bodies and other membership organisations are active advocacy organisations that derive their legitimacy from the democratic mandate given to them by voting members. However, many of the leading NGOs, known for their national and international advocacy are neither elected, nor selected by the groups of people they ostensibly represent. Furthermore, these NGOs have very small memberships, often restricted to a handful of trustees, with few or no members from the categories of people whose issues they represent. This is true with Oxfam GB for example.

Representing Issues Not People

Interestingly, Oxfam GB and other NGOs do not necessarily claim to represent groups of people. In fact, primarily, they advocate on issues, which invariably affect particular groups of people. It is indeed the case that except for membership bodies and syndicates, most advocacy organisations do not represent people, they advocate on issues. This is even the case with diaspora organisations whose trustees and members are predominantly diasporan, because they do not seek or possess a democratic representation mandate from a defined constituency. Their legitimacy and mandate derives from the soundness of their propositions and efficacy of their programmes. Not surprisingly, many of the most effective advocacy organisations are those that are not devoted entirely to advocacy, but deliver practical interventionist programmes. Successful advocacy groups such as Jubilee 2000 which campaigned for, amongst other things, debt cancellations for developing countries, comprised a network of interventionist and practitioner NGOs and institutions.

Basis of Representation

Whether one's advocacy is based on representations on behalf of oneself, for a group of people or on socio-economic and development issues, it is still important to have clear and sound justification (legitimacy) and parameters (mandate) for being involved in the said advocacy. One should ask questions including the examples set out below.

MANDATE

(What is the basis of you making the representation?)

Questions for the Advocate:

- Why am I advocating on these specific issues and themes? Who else is advocating on these issues and themes? Why is there a need for me to also advocate on these issues? Why am I the right person to advocate on these matters? Am I going to compete or collaborate with other advocates? What are the reasons for competing or collaborating?
- Apart from the thematic limits, are there any geographical limits to my advocacy? Will I be advocating at grassroots, governmental, international and other levels? What are the institutional limits and or priorities of my advocacy? What are the reasons for the restrictions and priorities?
- How much time, effort and resources are to be devoted to advocacy? Would I be undertaking non advocacy activities? How much time, effort and resources are to be spent on delivering practical services on related issues and themes? Which other service deliverers and practitioners will I be working with?

Questions apply to individuals as well as organisations.

Helpful and Beneficial Representation

Within the various definitions of advocacy, there is an assumption that the actions and interventions of the advocate would be helpful and beneficial to the people or cause being represented. Yet it is possible, and in some cases even probable, that inappropriate advocacy actions may lead to negative and deleterious effects. It is essential, but not sufficient, that the advocate has interest, commitment, passion and good intentions. Advocates require skills and resources in order to provide helpful and beneficial support to the people and causes they represent.

Competency and Credentials

Lawyers and certain health and social workers adopt as part of their job titles the word 'advocate'. Apart from adherence to all the key components of advocacy (as set out above), they also demonstrate both competency and credentials in order to earn the sobriquet of 'advocate'. Their competency is proven by knowledge and skills gained through structured professional education. Their credentials may take the form of licenses or professional accreditation, often based on assessment of both knowledge and practical aptitudes. In public policy advocacy (except for lobbying in some instances), no such formal qualifications and accreditations are required. Large NGOs and corporations employ teams of advocacy, policy and government relations staff who manage and undertake advocacy and related work. For most small and diaspora organisations, advocacy work is not carried out by dedicated staff. In these circumstances, it becomes even more important that advocates ask themselves introspective questions about competency and credentials, including examples set out below.

CREDENTIALS

(Are you able to suitably make the required representations?)

Questions for the Advocate:

- How would I know that my advocacy is helpful and beneficial? How would I know if my actions are having a negative or counter-productive effect? What are the indicators of advocacy success? What are the indicators of failure?
- Are the positive results commensurate or greater than the time, effort and resources expended on the advocacy actions? Would the desired results happen without my actions and interventions?
- What knowledge and skills do I need to make credible and persuasive advocacy interventions? Do I need to build a team to produce the complement of competencies needed? Will third parties entertain or give credence to my representations? What formal endorsements, accreditations and associations would increase my credibility amongst policy and decision makers?

Questions apply to individuals as well as organisations.

Oxfam GB and the Question of Legitimacy

Introduction: Oxfam GB is one of the largest NGOs working on poverty reduction, sustainable development and humanitarian relief across the world. Advocacy at national and international levels is an important part of its work. It has a department of 'Policy & Practice' with policy and advocacy teams specialising on different development sectors and segments. In 2011-12, its total income was £385.5m, of which £171m (i.e. 44%) came from government and public authorities. It reached 15 million people in 55 countries.

Governance Structure: In 2011-12, Oxfam GB had 20 non-trustee Association members and 12 Council of Trustees members (the maximum allowable number of trustees is 14). None of these members and trustees can be deemed poor or a democratic representative of poor people from across the 55 countries of intervention. Furthermore, the members "are appointed by Council and ratified by the Association", whilst new trustees are "appointed by the Association on the recommendation of Council".

Non-Representative and Non-Democratic: Like many advocacy and other NGOs including small and diaspora organisations, the organisational and governance structures are not representative of the people affected by its advocacy; nor does the structure in any way or form constitute a democratic mandate.

Legitimacy and Mandate:

NGOs such as Oxfam GB and many small and diaspora organisations derive legitimacy for their advocacy and other work, not by being representatives of people, but by making representations on issues, causes and other development propositions. They seek to be judged on their performance on those very issues, not on their democratic credentials. For Oxfam GB, the need for justification is important enough for it to produce and publish a 'Statement of Legitimacy and Accountability' as reproduced below.

Oxfam GB's Statement of Legitimacy and Accountability

Why Oxfam has authority to speak and act on issues relating to our mission to alleviate poverty and suffering, and how we hold ourselves accountable.

Legitimacy: Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are sometimes challenged about their legitimacy to speak out on issues such as world poverty. Oxfam's authority to do so is based on the following:

- Oxfam's experience is wide-ranging and in-depth.
- We have worked with poor people in developing countries for more than 60 years.
- Currently, we're working with more than 1,000 partners in more than 70 countries.
- We employ local people who understand the issues that keep local communities trapped in poverty.
- Our development and humanitarian work is respected by the international community, southern and northern governments, our partner organisations, allies, and other agencies.
- More than 400,000 people in the UK support Oxfam's work through monthly giving.
- Oxfam is an independent charity, and as such does not align itself to any governments.

Oxfam also carries out important advocacy and policy work, to make sure that governments and international organisations understand the needs of poor people, and work towards improving their lives. Members of the public who campaign for Oxfam help us to convey these messages and to increase awareness of our work.

Accountability: In order to achieve our organisational mission and to ensure that our work has the greatest impact on poverty, we believe it is vital to be accountable to our key stakeholders.

Key stakeholders include the individuals and communities with whom we work; partners and allies; donors and supporters; staff and the wider public; and regulatory bodies in the UK and in countries where we operate.

We are working towards improved transparency and information-sharing, greater stakeholder participation in decision-making, and better evaluation and compliance mechanisms.

This statement was retrieved from Oxfam GB's website in March 2014.

SKILLS RELEVANT TO ADVOCACY

These are some of the key skills advocates need in order to become effective and efficient.

- Research and investigation
- Analysis, interpretation and extrapolation
- Planning and coordination
- Networking and alliance building
- Relationship management
- Communication and presentation
- Negotiation and brokerage
- Diplomacy and persuasion

What other skills do you think are relevant for advocacy?

What aptitudes and personal qualities do you think are needed for effective advocacy?

Is it essential for an advocate to have all the key skills and competencies?

MAIN STAGES OF THE POLICY PROCESS

The main stages of the policy process are:

- Agenda Setting and Conceptualisation
- Formulation and Articulation
- Consultation and Discussion
- Scrutiny and Debate
- Adoption and Ratification
- Implementation and Operation
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Revision and Reformulation

In most instances, the process is iterative and continuous.

Different policy processes operate at different timelines and cycles.

Influencing and Changing Policy

Practical Purpose of Advocacy

Influencing and changing policy and practice is the fundamental goal of advocacy. In the public policy domain, there are competing, contrasting and conflicting propositions being championed and advocated by organisations, institutions and individuals with diverse capacities and capabilities. Thus the advocacy goal of influencing and changing policy needs to be understood within the context of a dynamic public policy space energised by the forces of continuity and the forces of change.

Conceptual Purpose of Advocacy

Advocacy is about actively doing something to seek influence or change. Belief that a different set of realities and circumstances is desirable is a prerequisite for advocacy, but by itself it is not enough. Conviction that change is desirable must be coupled with active support and representations. In practice, there would be innumerable reasons why people and institutions seek change. However, these can be classified into three broad underlying factors, namely: reactive, proactive and functional. (These are illustrative rather than strict categorisations).

Reactive Motivations: This relates to responses and reactions on the direct and indirect; actual and potential; latent and patent effects of existing or proposed policy and practice. Reactive advocacy focuses on seeking counteractive, corrective, compensative and other balancing measures and actions.

Examples of Reactive Policy Advocacy:

- Advocacy by rightwing politicians to end the funding and budgetary guarantee that the UK coalition government accorded to the Department for International Development in 2010.
- Campaign by human rights activists to reverse the 2014 Ugandan government policy of draconian punishments for acts relating to homosexuality.
- ActionAid's Tax Justice campaign to get multinational companies to stop avoiding corporation taxes in the developing countries they operate in.

What other examples can you think of?

Proactive Motivations: This relates to prospecting and innovative proposals for new, additive, anticipatory, experimental and other exploratory policies and practices. Proactive advocacy focuses on seeking imaginative, deductive, pioneering and other forward-looking measures and actions.

Examples of Proactive Policies:

- Oxfam GB providing direct cash grants (referred to as cash transfers) to poor people in developing countries.
- AFFORD proposing tax reliefs or match funding for migrant remittances to developing countries (referred to as RemitAid™).
- Municipalities in Mexico providing match funding for collective remittances earmarked for community projects.

What other examples can you think of?

Functional Formalities: This relates to administrative and management changes in line with agreed or underlying policies and practices. Functional advocacy focuses on seeking updates, compliance, congruity and other adjustment measures and actions.

Examples of Functional Policy Actions:

- In March 2010, the government of Ghana started issuing ECOWAS passports – in line with ‘Protocol A/P.1/5/79 Relating to Free Movement of Persons, Residence and Establishment’ (signed by the heads of state of the Economic Commission of West African States at Dakar, Senegal on 29th May 1979).
- In January 2013, the UK government committed itself to legislate for UK provision of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in the amount of 0.7% of its GNI – in line with the October 1970 United Nations General Assembly resolution.
- In November 2007, the government of Spain agreed to issue work permits and visas to Senegalese workers (mainly in the fishing industry) to try to manage the flow of illegal immigrants from Senegal (mainly young men, using local fishing vessels).

What other examples can you think of?

Engagement, Influencing and Changing

Amongst other things, the art of advocacy involves a process of engagement, influencing and changing. Through engagement with the theme and stakeholders, one develops required knowledge, networks and credibility to have any hope of achieving influence. Thus, engagement in the broadest sense of gaining familiarity of 'objects' and 'subjects' and creating meaningful and interactive relationships is the starting point for any advocate seeking to influence and change policy or practice. Although it may appear that the advocate cannot achieve change without first influencing key policy actors; that is not necessarily the case. The key actors may already have goals similar to that of the advocate. The important factors in such cases may be: the recognition of common purpose; the provision of required support; and coherent and purposeful coordination – rather than any process of influencing.

Conceptual Purpose and Advocacy Action

The conceptual nature of the advocacy exercise may help determine whether the advocate should concentrate on 'influencing' or 'changing'. In general, for reactive advocacy, it is more effective to focus on specific changes because a material policy either exist already or is being proposed. However, for proactive advocacy, influencing is far more important. Policy actors need to understand and be convinced of the general soundness, feasibility, merits and benefits of the innovative and pioneering proposals being advocated. They also need to be willing to accept and address any attendant or perceived risks. From the examples given above about functional advocacy, one can see that it may take decades before compliant policies are brought into effect. This suggests that advocates in this realm need to concentrate on both 'engagement' and 'changing'.

Rational and Emotional Advocacy

Achieving influence and change is both a rational and emotional process. The rational aspects relate to the soundness, accuracy and substance of the proposed policy. Perceived soundness, feasibility and sustainability of the proposal are prerequisite, but are not enough. The process of influencing and effecting change is to a large extent dependent on the contextual emotional factors rather than cold facts, exquisite rationality, academic objectivity, fairness or morality. If rationality and ethics were the predominant determinants of adoption, then jurisdictions would not have been blighted by inane and obtuse policies; and fouled by diabolical and misanthropic practices. On the other hand, the most successful influencers of policy, be they smooth corporate lobbyists, fire-brand trade unionists or oleaginous fixers, are not necessarily the cleverest and most moral of people. However, they are likely to have high emotional intelligence and effective communication skills. This enables them to engage policy actors with the required rational facts and arguments and press the right emotional points at the appropriate time. To influence and change policy and practice, communication skills and emotional intelligence are perhaps the most critical aptitudes. Even when we speak of concentrating on 'engagement', 'influencing' and 'changing', it is more important to understand the conceptual purpose, as which word one uses may be dependent on what communication and emotional advantage one gains. Words and phrases are by themselves charged with emotional and contextual connotations. The aim should be to use words and language that invokes the least resistance and stirs the greatest positive emotions – without dissembling, misleading or obfuscating.

Policy Process and Intervention

Policy development is a dynamic and iterative process rather than a static act. The advocate has a chance to engage with and influence policy at different stages of the process (see box above). Which stages of the process offer the best chances of influence is partly affected by whether the advocacy is reactive, proactive or functional. Each stage may require the deployment of different skills and the use of different advocacy techniques.

Formal Processes

Different jurisdictions and institutions have different sets of rules on how to get involved in the policy process. These rules may not be adequate for the level of influence the advocate requires, but input through the standard mechanisms is essential. For example, in 2011, the European Union opened an eight week public consultation (11 April to 6 June) on its Global Approach to Migration (GAM). GAM was first adopted in 2005 as the “EU’s framework for dialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries of origin, transit and destination” with a technical and financial assistance budget of 384 million Euros for the period 2007-13. This formal consultation was open to governments, organisations and individuals. Some advocates may wish to undertake further influencing actions such as private briefings and informal conversation with the EU officials responsible for the GAM review; and or provision of ‘suggested wording’ on relevant aspects of the policy document. However, it is equally important to make a formal submission to the consultation, to record and reiterate the advocacy points. Some advocates would even coordinate with partners to ensure that multiple and varied submissions are made, in line with the advocacy strategy and tactics.

Importance of Influencing Practice

Engagement, influencing and change relates to both policy and practice. This dual approach is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, even tightly written policies often act as frameworks, leaving lots of room and flexibility for varied implementation. In some cases, the practical application may not even conform to the spirit of the policy. Thus advocacy action can also focus on interpretation, application and implementation, specifically as a means of influencing practice. Secondly, actual practice or ‘evidence on the ground’ is quite persuasive as a means of demonstrating the reality of policy. In some cases, existing evidence and practice can be deemed to override contradictory written policies. Furthermore, in some jurisdictions, ‘custom and practice’ may even have the force of law. Thirdly, in the area of proactive advocacy, practice is one way of proving a concept and demonstrating feasibility and viability – even before the policy is developed or adopted.

Influencing Non-Governmental Institutions

In many fields and sectors, there are important non-governmental institutions whose acts and omissions greatly affect the welfare, livelihoods and circumstances of different groups of people. It is therefore important that engagement, influencing and other advocacy actions should also be directed at these institutions. In the field of diaspora and international development, such advocacy targets stakeholders within: governments in resident or host countries; governments in the countries of origin or heritage; United Nations agencies such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) and UN Development Programme (UNDP); international financial institutions such as the World Bank and African Development Bank; regional institutions such as the European Union and ECOWAS; international NGOs such as Oxfam and Christian Aid; multinational corporations such as Coca Cola and Standard Chartered Bank. Due to their income, market share, operational interests etc, influencing and changing their policies and practices is by itself a worthwhile endeavour for international development advocates. These organisations are also important in terms of their formal and informal partnerships and relationships with governments.

Policy in Non-Democratic Societies

The policy process and dynamics described in this handbook obtains in both democratic and non-democratic countries. Differences exist when it comes to participation, representation and decision making. Whereas in a democratic jurisdiction there would be open and public means of engagement and participation, dictators operate through closed and privileged networks. Furthermore, the different roles in the policy process may be concentrated in the hands of single or few unaccountable individuals or institutions. Paradoxically, changes in policy and practice may occur faster in non-democratic countries. The advocate has only to influence the dictator or a well placed crony – neither of whom is burdened by the need to consult widely or exercise other forms of democratic due diligence.

Forces of Change and the Forces of Continuity

Change: There is no doubt that the fundamental aim of the advocate is to modify, vary, reverse, upturn or otherwise change a state of affairs deemed undesirable from their own perspective. The drive for change – big or small – is again a fundamental characteristic of the human condition. As such, representation and support for change on behalf of oneself, other groups of people or on thematic issues is as old as human society.

Intrinsic Tensions: Furthermore, the attendant psychological, political and practical tension between the forces of change and the forces of continuity is an intrinsic, natural, normal and ordinary feature of advocacy for change in public policy or operational practice. By understanding the conceptual factors that drive the dynamics of change and continuity, the advocate or change-maker is well placed to achieve better results.

Advantage of Status Quo: ‘Continuity’ as represented by existing status quo and prevailing conditions tends to have innate advantages of self preservation and perpetuation. By the time the conditions and circumstances have formed themselves into the norm, thus becoming the status quo, very many stakeholders will have invested, adopted or otherwise reacted for the status quo to become so. These stakeholder reactions occur at conscious and unconscious levels, and involve groups of people who may even be victims or losers within the context of the prevailing status quo. Consequently, people and institutions in general tend to resist change in preference to the certainty they have invested and adjusted to - however awkward or unrewarding it may be.

Normalisation: As part of human survival strategies, humans are neurologically hard-wired to learn to become familiar, adapt and ‘normalise’ whatever conditions we find ourselves in – within physiological limits. Ironically, this adaptability enables humans to adapt to adverse, miserable and diabolical conditions. This is why people are able to cope with some of the most horrendous eventualities and depressing conditions caused by poverty, repression and natural calamities.

Advocacy for Change: However, advocates and would-be change-makers need not despair. There are other psychological, political and practical factors that stimulate change in human society. Broadly speaking, advocates can influence and instigate change by:

- Appealing to people’s ability to imagine and perceive other possibilities
- Stimulating the latent sense of human wanderlust and adventure; and highlighting the rewards, benefits and achievement waiting at the end of the advocacy journey
- Mitigating the actual and perceived risks associated with change and uncertainty
- Demonstrating that the proposed changes are part of a dynamic flow and as such an acceptable variation of the status quo.

Adopting Strategies and Applying Techniques

Planning and Action

To increase chances of advocacy success, it is essential that there is a definite and realistic plan that sets out the advocacy goals on a long, medium and short term basis. The conceptual nature of the advocacy should be clarified. This will help with the identification of the policy process stages that are to be given higher priority. The plan should also identify suitable tools and techniques to be used and applied during the course of the advocacy. (Part three of the handbook provides practical guidance in goal setting and action planning).

Advocacy and General Strategy

Although the nature of each advocacy exercise will determine the character and details of the action plan, it is important that all actions are based on a general strategic framework. This broader and strategic approach enables organisations to map out partnerships, relationships, alliances and networks on a longer term basis – leading to effective organisational development as well as structured advocacy exercises. In fact, most small and diaspora organisations working on international development undertake advocacy not as their sole preoccupation. They generally deliver services in specific development themes such as health, education, enterprise, and tend to advocate only on matters related to their thematic interests. As such, strategic positioning and planning based on core thematic interests is a sound basis of augmenting their advocacy function.

Vision, Mission and Advocacy

One way of mapping out beneficial strategic partnerships and relationships is through comparison and analysis of vision and mission statements. This mapping and planning exercise can be undertaken as long as ‘vision’ and ‘missions’ are known, irrespective of whether they are published as single statements or not. See below for further explanation.

Organisational Vision and Alliance Building

A vision is not something that an organisation aspires to create, become, or deliver itself; rather it is an ideal. A vision may be shared by many people, organisations and institutions, but no single entity can take responsibility for achieving it all by themselves. For example, the vision of the diaspora organisation Mifumi is:

“A world where women and children are free from violence and oppression and where everyone has the opportunity to realise their full potential”.

A vision is not an action either. It is the ideal that reflects the organisation’s hopes. If the ideal were achieved, then the organisation would no longer need to exist. **One of the advantages of having a clear vision is that it enables the organisation to recognise its potential partners, allies and supporters.**

Framework for Mapping Advocacy Collaborators

Shared Vision and Collective Action: To realise an organisational vision (such as Mifumi's), it is essential to have collective action and diverse input from a wide range of organisations and institutions, each playing a specific role. *All the entities that share the same or similar visions are all potential partners and collaborators.*

Organisational Mission: The mission is the contribution that the organisation is going to make towards the achievement of its vision. It is an action statement that describes the core activity and function of the organisation. Mifumi's mission is:

“Protecting Ugandan women and children from violence through community-based outreach”.

Collaboration, Competition and Advocacy: Whereas all organisations that share Mifumi's vision are potential partners, those that share its mission are technically potential competitors. Understanding the intrinsic strategic implications of the difference between an organisation's vision and its mission will enable organisations to develop sound frameworks for partnership and collaboration on advocacy, irrespective of actual and potential competition.

- Organisations that share Mifumi's vision and mission and deliver similar services are potential 'primary advocacy collaborators' despite also being technically 'friendly direct competitors'.
- Organisations that share Mifumi's vision and mission but deliver different and complementary services are potentially 'primary advocacy collaborators'.
- Organisations that share Mifumi's vision, but have different mission and deliver different services are potentially 'secondary advocacy collaborators'.
- Organisations that do not share Mifumi's vision, but have similar mission and deliver similar services are potentially 'secondary advocacy collaborators'.
- Organisations that do not share Mifumi's vision or mission, but deliver similar services are generally 'not suitable as advocacy collaborators' and are likely to be 'direct competitors'.
- Organisations that do not share Mifumi's vision or mission and deliver different services are generally 'not relevant as advocacy collaborators'.

Advocacy and General Tactics

In addition to having a strategic outlook, small and diaspora organisations can adopt general tactics which are likely to be relevant and applicable to most, if not all their advocacy exercises. The broad tactics should also give them an advantage in the public policy forums populated by large and well resourced professional, institutional and experienced public relations, lobbying and other advocacy outfits. Advocacy by small and diaspora organisations should be based on the following priorities:

- Conceptual insight of the subject matter
- Practical and operational experience
- Connection to relevant networks
- Coordination of appropriate alliances.

Feasibility of the Recommended Tactics

Given that small and diaspora organisations work on specific development themes, they can develop specialist knowledge, understanding and insight of their thematic discipline. Their smallness and or diaspora characteristic should help them find a niche, enabling them to bring genuine new specialist perspectives on the themes and sub-themes they work on. Similarly, they can experiment and undertake pilot and small scale projects that demonstrate practical feasibility and viability. In fact many small diaspora organisations successfully implement projects through informal, ad hoc and in-kind funding, producing beneficial results. This provides a basis for demonstrating operational experience, especially in activities and sub-themes that do not attract grant funding. For example, diaspora individuals and organisations had for many years operated volunteering schemes for professionals (especially in health and education) even before the notion of diaspora volunteering was conceptualised or funded by any government or institution. Given the known reality of meagre resources and limited formal and internal capacity, small and diaspora organisations need clear pre-existing networks which they can tap into easily at the appropriate times in order to deliver meaningful results. For example in the UK, diaspora organisations can access free world class pro bono legal support through the Advocate for International Development (A4ID) network. Finally, with insight, practical experience and access to support from networks, small and diaspora organisations can play effective alliance coordination roles for advocacy exercises. This may appear as if they are 'boxing above their weight', but within the circumstances, they may be better placed for a leadership role than larger and better resourced partner institutions and organisations.

Advocacy Tools and Techniques

There are very many advocacy tools, techniques and actions used across the world. Some require more resources than others. An advocacy plan shall identify which main tools and techniques are to be used. These would depend on whether they are feasible, given the capacity and capabilities of the advocate organisation. Actions should also be limited to what is legal and ethical. In recent times, online and social media have brought new dimensions to some of the traditional techniques and opened up new advocacy opportunities. In general, the tools and techniques can be classified in terms of the direct effects sought, such as:

- General and public awareness-raising
- Attention and headline seeking
- Technical engagement
- Representation and engagement

Classification and Examples of Advocacy Techniques

General Awareness-Raising

Leaflets, Posters & Advertisements
Shows, Exhibitions, Plays & Films
Online & Mobile Video Clips
Tweets & Text Messages
Mailshots & Emails
Meetings & Rallies
Media Coverage & Features

Attention and Headline Seeking

Public Stunts & Street Theatre
Civil Disobedience & Direct Action
Demonstrations & Marches
Hunger Strikes & Sit-Ins
Summons & Court Action
Mock Trials & Mock Funerals
Celebrity Endorsements

Technical Engagement

Press Information; Private Briefings; Technical & Expert Papers
Report Publications; Draft Policy Documents; Suggested Policy Wording

Representation and Engagement

Petitions, Letter & Postcard Writing; Parliamentary & Ministerial Lobbying
Victim & Witness Testimonies; Expert & Independent Endorsements
Formal Presentations & Briefings; Formal Consultation Submissions
Private Meetings & Social Events; Informal Discussions & Dialogue
Evidence to Enquiries & Committees; Facilitated Fact-Finding Visits
Parliamentary Meetings; Party Conference Fringe Events
Parliamentary Motions & Statements; Ministerial Questions
Private Members' Bills; Civil Litigation & Private Prosecutions

- *The list of advocacy techniques is not exhaustive. What other techniques can you add to the list? Give real life examples when each of the techniques was used in policy advocacy.*
- *The classifications are broad; actions may fall under more than one classification. What other classifications can you suggest?*
- *Which individual and organisational advocates do you admire most? What are their particular advocacy techniques? To what extent do they demonstrate good communication skills and emotional intelligence?*
- *Some advocates use confrontational, oppositional and even belligerent styles in the way they apply advocacy techniques; what are your views on such approaches? Is there a difference between the adversarial system as used in the UK parliament and confrontational advocacy styles?*

Lobbying and Lobbyists

- Undue and Corrupt Influence:** Lobbying specifically relates to efforts to influence government and governmental agencies. Although lobbying has been regulated in the USA since 1946, scandals regarding unethical and criminal behaviour still abound and there is widespread concern about the undue and corrupt influence of corporate and special interest lobbying.
- The Business of Lobbying:** Lobbying is an industry by itself – involving specialist consultancies, law firms, trade and professional associations, commercial corporations, advocacy groups etc. It is estimated that there are over twenty thousand lobbyists in Brussels and Washington alone. It is a multibillion dollar global industry. In December 2008, the Public Administration Select Committee of the UK House of Commons published a report ‘Lobbying: Access and influence in Whitehall’. It recommended, amongst other things a public register of lobbyists. Consequently, the Association of Professional Political Consultants (APPC), Chartered Institute of Public Relations (CIPR) and Public Relations Consultants Association (PRCA) created a new organisation called the UK Public Affairs Council (UKPAC) *“to begin implementing the Committee’s recommendation for a public register”*. By February 2014, their voluntary self-regulatory public register had nearly 2,000 entries of lobbyists, working for over 2,500 clients.
- Lobbying Regulation in the UK:** On 5 July 2010, two months after the formation of a coalition government, the Deputy Prime Minister, as part of a statement on political and constitutional reform, announced that a statutory register of lobbyists will be created. On 27 July 2010, the Board of Directors of UKPAC held its first meeting. In 2013, there were several scandals about lobbying by parliamentarians receiving payments. This contributed to the UK coalition government enacting the ‘Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act’ (shortened as Lobbying Act 2014) which came into force in January 2014. The law stipulates that a person is deemed to be involved in consultant lobbying if *“in the course of a business and in return for payment, the person makes communications within subsection (3) on behalf of another person or persons”*.
- Legal Definitions:** Subsection (3) of the Lobbying Act 2014 defines communications as *“oral or written communications made personally”* to a Minister or senior official of the rank of Permanent Secretary, relating to *“the development, adoption or modification of any proposal of the government to make or amend primary or subordinate legislation.....[or] any other policy of the government; the making, giving or issuing by the government of, or the taking of any other steps by the government in relation to.....any contract or other agreement.....any grant or other financial assistance.....any licence or other authorisation..... or the exercise of any other function of the government”*.

Lobbying and International Development Advocacy

- **Statutory Register of Lobbyists:** The UK Lobbying Act 2014 introduces a Register of Consultant Lobbyists. Persons who are not on the register are prohibited from undertaking consultant lobbying. There are concerns that the law will adversely affect civil society organisations that undertake advocacy and lobbying activities. However, certain groups of persons – intended to include NGO, trade union, charity and civil society workers – are exempted from the lobbying prohibition. A person is exempted if her/his business “*consists mainly of non-lobbying activities, and the person acts generally as a representative of persons of a particular class or description [and lobbying communication] is incidental to the carrying on of those activities*”.
- **Impact on Development Advocates:** Although the law provides for civil and criminal penalties against non-compliance, reading the legislation leaves one with the concern that the provisions relating to lobbying are very narrow and will have little or no effect in reducing unethical and corrupt practices. This is particularly so for the well-resourced multinational entities which pay for strategic lobbying services. At the same time, it is indeed possible for international development organisations and charities to be inadvertently caught up in the resulting petty bureaucracy.
- *How ethical or corrupt is lobbying in European and developing countries that you are familiar with? What is the nature of the unethical and corrupt lobbying practices?*
- *Are diaspora and small organisations disadvantaged when it comes to lobbying as a specific form of advocacy? Is international development a subject that is more difficult to lobby on?*
- *Find out how African entities lobby governments in Europe and the USA; What are the main issues that African corporate and civil society organisations lobby on? What issues do African governments lobby on?*
- *To what extent do governments of developing countries use lobbying firms in Europe and the USA? To what extent do they use their diasporas to lobby foreign governments? To what extent do they use NGOs?*
- *How easy or difficult is it to lobby decision and policy makers in European and developing countries that you are familiar with? To what extent do statements and commitments of government officials translate to policy action?*





Section Three

How to Influence Policy



Policy Influencing Frameworks and Tools

The process of influencing is not a pure science; it is an art about connecting with diverse people and groups. It is about making people see things from your perspective, sympathise with your cause and become convinced enough of your argument for them to commit to it. However, there are a number of ascertainable factual and technical factors that need to be in place for effective influencing to occur. For example, in policy advocacy whereby one is seeking specific acts or omissions, it is important to know the right people who need to be influenced. There is no point convincing and influencing people who can in no way facilitate the emergence of the policy you desire. Yet identification of people may not be straightforward within a complex and expansive policy environment.

In every task, especially in complex and intricate disciplines, it is always useful, perhaps even essential to use analytical frameworks and operational tools in order to be effective and efficient to attain greater impact. For diaspora and small organisations that do not have teams of policy advocacy professionals working for them, the ability to adopt, adapt and apply these tools becomes even more important as their scarce resources need to be used efficiently and purposefully.

To help policy advocates increase their chances of effectively influencing policies, new frameworks and tools have been created; and tools from disciplines such as social psychology and business have been adapted for application in policy advocacy. These are practical, technical and methodical frameworks, based on sound conceptual and analytical groundings. The core portfolio of policy influencing frameworks and tools are:

- Kipling's Wisdom: 5W & H Approach to Setting Advocacy Goals
- 7Ps: Composition of the Policy Community
- Networking and the Six Degrees of Separation
- 6Cs: Approach to Developing Advocacy Action Plans
- Alliance Building and the Five Stages of Partnership
- Win-Win Negotiations: Framework for Policy Engagement
- SPICE: Approach to Making an Advocacy Pitch.

Clarity of Advocacy Goals

- **Specificity:** It is essential that policy advocates must have a clear sense of what their policy goals are. This clarity goes beyond just having a general sense of what is needed or wanted. Clarity means specificity of what is required, and sound understanding of the context and circumstances within which those requirements are to exist.
- **Professionalism:** Prior to any substantive engagement in advocacy or influencing actions, clear goals need to be established. It is this clarity that sets the ground for purposefulness, focus and professional credibility. Too often, diaspora and small organisations make advocacy interventions that betray incoherence, naiveté and a negative sense of amateurism. This not only undermines the individual organisation, it reinforces a negative stereotype for all diaspora and small organisations.
- **Non-Rigidity:** Clarity of purpose does not mean rigidity of position. In fact, when advocacy goals are clear, it becomes easier to make adjustments, modifications and improvements. Clarity of purpose also opens up the options for meaningful engagement with the different relevant stakeholders.
- **Kipling's Wisdom:** Preliminary research and analysis can help clarify advocacy goals. Furthermore, by asking 6 core questions of What, Why, Where, Who, When and How (i.e. 5W & H also known as Kipling's Wisdom), the advocate shall gain greater clarity and better understanding of their policy advocacy goals. This then becomes the sound and credible starting point for effective policy influencing.

Types of Policy Interventions

Irrespective of what the specific policy subject or theme is, policy interventions tend to take three main forms:

- **COMMISSION:** Start undertaking a set of new actions as a means of positively improving the policy status.
- **MISSION:** Prevent planned policy changes from taking place, thereby maintaining the current preferred status.
- **OMISSION:** Stop undertaking set of current actions, as a means of ending negative policy status.

Kipling's Wisdom: 5W & H Approach to Setting Advocacy Goals

WHAT specifically do you want? Do you want a new law or regulation, a new policy framework or provision, a new set of priorities? What specifically is the policy advocacy goal in simple terms that a layperson can understand? Are you sure this goal is not provided for already in the various laws, frameworks and policies that exist? Are there existing provisions that are similar but not suitable for your requirements?

WHY do you want this new policy? What is the justification and rationale for it? How does it fit with other policies, strategies and priorities? Are there any synergies and or new opportunities that would arise as a result of the new policy? What compelling conceptual and practical benefits will the policy yield? What are the anticipated quantitative and qualitative outcomes? Do you have any credible supporting evidence? Do you have support and endorsement from any credible sources?

WHERE will the policy be applied? What is the geographical, thematic or other focus? What is the justification for the chosen focus? What are the gaps in the chosen geographical, thematic or other focus? How does this area of focus fare (in policy terms) with other comparable areas?

WHO would be the people affected directly and indirectly by the policy? Who are the primary and secondary stakeholders? Who are the different types of beneficiaries? Who are the potential partners? Who else inputs in the process of producing the benefits anticipated in the proposed policy? Are there categories of people who will lose out as a result of the policy? Are there issues of exclusion and discrimination? How fair and equitable is the proposed policy?

WHEN do you want the policy to be in place? Does the policy have an expiry or extinction date? Does the policy have in-built review dates? What is the rationale and justification for the policy to be time-limited or perpetual? What is the timescale for the formulation, adoption and implementation of the policy? Is this timescale reasonable for all major stakeholders? Are there specific policy cycles that affect the timing of this proposal? Do you have a schedule and timeline of tasks and activities?

HOW would you achieve the policy goal? What is the strategy for achieving policy formulation, adoption and implementation? What specific stages and processes will you need to go through? What would you do at the different stages and processes? Who are the key leaders and drivers of the advocacy? What resources and materials do you need to produce and provide to stakeholders? How much time do you need from personnel? What financial and other resources would be needed?

- *The list of questions is not exhaustive, you can add to it. The process of answering the questions is iterative. At the end of the process, a coherent advocacy purpose will have emerged. A sound and credible conceptual note can be drafted, leading to the preparation of an action plan.*

7Ps: Composition of the Policy Community

Policy is influenced and made by very many actors and groups of people. It is striking that even for some professional lobbyists and advocates, there is often confusion about who is whom within policy networks and who plays what role. In this new classification, the policy community is categorised in terms that are apt, simple, logical and easy to remember.

The **7Ps** who make up the policy community are as follows:

- **Principals**
(Decision makers at different policy levels)
- **Policymakers**
(Technocrats who advise principals; undertake research, analyses and drafting)
- **Personalities**
(Agents of influence who can access and influence principals and policymakers)
- **Practitioners**
(Entities that undertake practical activities relevant to the policy proposal)
- **Press**
(Print media, radio, television, internet and social media)
- **Personnel**
(People who work for the other 'P' categories)
- **Proponents**
(Advocates and activists who want to change policy)

Why do you think the 'public' is not included as a 8th 'P' within the policy community?

Are policy beneficiaries themselves members of the policy community?

Can you think of any major actors in the policy process who are not covered by the '7Ps'?

PRINCIPALS

- Principals are the decision-makers who have the mandate and authority to make policy decisions. In the UK government, the ministers are the key principals. The Prime Minister, being the 'First Minister' is the principal of principals. One should be mindful that other post holders may have ceremonial roles that appear to make them principals, when in reality they are not (e.g. the monarch in the UK).
- Very often, principals, be it in the government structure, in international agencies or commercial corporations, delegate decision-making to lower ranks. In such cases, the advocate needs to identify the de facto principals operating at the different policy levels.
- Whether the principal exercises or delegates the power of decision-making or not, the normal consultative and staged policy formulation process is still generally observed. This means that in democratic jurisdictions, the principal's power of decision-making does not necessarily result in arbitrary and dictatorial tendencies. In non-democratic jurisdictions, impromptu policymaking by principals is a common and perhaps even normal phenomenon.
- As the real decision-makers, principals are capable of making impromptu and other inchoate policies as discussed in Section One. Newspapers regularly report instances of 'on the hoof' policymaking by principals. Although impromptu policies may be revoked or shelved, many such policies have resulted in major practical actions with significant implications.
- People close to the principals within the policy community are, not surprisingly, deemed to have influence.

Who would you say are the principals in the following organisations: World Bank, African Union, Rio Tinto, Western Union, Oxfam GB, Cooperative Bank?

For some organisations, there may be seemingly parallel sets of principals; what are your thoughts and observations about policy making in such organisations?

To what extent do you think 'secret' principals exist within institutions? Do you think there are instances when 'apparent' and 'real' principals exist within an organisation?

Can you think of instances when principals have made impromptu policies?

POLICYMAKERS

- Policymakers are the technocrats and professionals who undertake research, analyses, consultations, drafting and other relevant tasks, leading to the development and formulation of policies. Although their role is very important, the policies they develop or 'make' are put forward as recommendations and advice to the principals. Principals have the authority to accept, modify, reject or ignore the policies produced by the policymakers. In the real world, principals exercise all of the options open to them on a regular basis. Due to the general hierarchical nature of decision-making, it is possible for a policymaker on a certain matter to be a decision-maker on another. The dual role may also arise on policy matters that are of relatively low importance or priority.
- Policymakers fall into two broad categories, internal and external. In government, the internal policymakers are civil servants and Special Advisers operating at different policy levels. Think tanks are the main source of external policymaking. Unlike academic institutions, their work goes beyond pure and applied research. Think tanks undertake studies and produce policy-focussed recommendations.
- In the UK, the main political parties have links with the think tanks that share their general ideology. Over the past thirty years, many proposals from these think tanks have ended up being important government policies. In fact, there is a busy traffic of people moving from think tanks into government and vice versa.
- In the UK in the past twenty years, some sectors of commerce and industry have also acted as external policymakers. This external policymaking goes beyond the input of trade associations and professional bodies such as the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) and the Defence Industries Council (DIC). The large accountancy firms have been seconding partners to HM Treasury and placing other experts (i.e. donations in kind) within the business and finance teams of opposition parties. These arrangements create an interesting dimension in the internal-external policymaking dynamic. In the pre-Thatcher years, trade unions were important external policymaking entities.
- Some NGOs and diaspora organisations undertake occasional policymaking. They research, analyse, consult upon and develop comprehensive policy documents on specific themes within their areas of expertise. They also access pro bono technical support, for example from City law firms – facilitated by organisations such as Advocates for International Development (A4iD). As it is with work from think tanks, these external policies are used as basis for substantive engagement with internal policymakers and principals.

PERSONALITIES

- Personalities are agents of influence who can reach and influence principals and policymakers. They may not have any direct or specific interest in a policy matter, but they have influence and or access to principals and policymakers. This gives them agency and facilitative roles within the policy community.
- Some people are general policy personalities, able to facilitate access or exert influence on a wide range of issues over a long period of time and perhaps even across jurisdictions. These personalities tend to be the national and international celebrities, stars, socialites, experts, intelligentsia, magnates and other grandees; people with pre-existing influence and or authority. Policy advocates use the patronage of these personalities in their influencing campaigns. Even international agencies deploy them e.g. through UN Goodwill Ambassadorships.
- Other policy personalities emerge specifically within the context of individual policy matters. These non-general personalities gain their influencing and agency status not through their celebrity, fame or general power, but through their incidental relationship with the principals and policymakers involved in a specific policy. The relationship may be through private networks, friendships, school and university links, family relations etc.
- Personalities as agents of influence are so important to the policy community that they raise a number of ethical issues. During the Cold War, the espionage community on both sides recruited and nurtured both general and 'specific' agents of influence to further their respective ideologies and policy priorities. There are familiar stories of how spouses and partners were targeted as means of influencing principals and policymakers.
- One can imagine how informal connections such as gym membership, parent associations at school, local church and alumni networks may be used and abused – to access and influence principals and policymakers. In many countries, there are ethical concerns about the undue influence of policy personalities who emerge through old school networks, Masonic lodges, family relations and other social connections.

PRACTITIONERS

- Practitioners within the policy community are entities that undertake practical activities relevant to the policy proposal. They have empirical and practical experience in the substance of the policy matter. They also are the source of operational evidence and case studies to substantiate, justify and rationalise policy proposals.
- The practitioners in a particular field are primary stakeholders when policies related to their sector are under discussion. This gives them credibility, legitimacy and influence. Practitioners also tend to have their own trade or professional associations. Collective voice and common positions on policy matters tend to increase their influence.
- In the field of international development, many diaspora and small organisations are practitioner entities – delivering projects in developing countries. Some of these organisations also undertake thematic advocacy work. The dual role may be both advantageous and disadvantageous. As a practitioner, these entities benefit from the credibility that comes with empirical involvement. On the other hand, they may be deemed to have vested interests, representing a partisan position. However, policy advocates must not be shy about seemingly lacking impartiality or being non-independent. Policy advocacy itself is about representing particular interests and positions. It is not an exercise in neutrality.

PRESS

- Press within the policy community includes print media, radio, television, internet and social media – the latter being a form of digital grapevine. Even the most traditional and formal press does not limit itself to mere reportage of actuality, it publishes opinions and commentary. News reports themselves are subject to editorial crafting, thereby affecting the messages communicated. New media such as online and social networks are far more subjective and personalised in approach and style.
- It is not necessarily the case that policy advocates need the reports, comments or support of the media – traditional or new – in order to attain success. (Similarly, public awareness or support is not a necessity). A significant number of adopted policies make no discernible or notable appearance in the press. It is arguable that on some subject matters, including aspects of international development, media attention of any kind is a distraction and impediment.
- Although media attention may not be necessary, media opposition is definitely not needed. How the press reports or comments on a policy proposal is very important as principals and policymakers in particular can be influenced by the impressions and perceptions created by media representations. In the UK, some newspapers, magazines, radio and TV bulletins (e.g. Daily Mail, Economist, BBC Radio 4 Today programme and BBC 1 Panorama programme) have relatively significant influence on principals and policymakers. Comparable media organs and outlets exist in other jurisdictions. Some blogs, online and social media sites have gained significant influence and importance in recent years.
- For every sector and policy theme, there is likely to be specialist publications in the form of journals and magazines. Some of these publications command respect as authoritative sources and resources in the specific sectors. Interestingly, failure to be featured in these trade organs may be interpreted as being irrelevant or lacking basic support within the sector.

PERSONNEL

- Personnel refer to the people who work for the other 'Ps' within the policy community. These personnel may be senior executives and advisers or general and auxiliary staff. It is well known that to access major decision-makers, one goes through 'gatekeepers' – who may be a seemingly lowly secretary. Similarly, other staff such as drivers, cleaners and assistants can play crucial roles in facilitating access for policy advocates.
- Most of the government offices in Whitehall are cleaned by minimum income staff working for private cleaning companies. London Citizens, a small advocacy organisation have been involved in a policy campaign for employers to pay a 'Living Wage' which is about £2 per hour more than the statutory minimum wage. One group of principals who can make the decision for change in this case, are the bosses of the cleaning companies. However, in this process, ministers, whose offices are cleaned by these companies can be seen as 'personalities'. In July 2012, cleaning staff (i.e. personnel), left letters making their case on the desks of eight cabinet ministers and the president of the Supreme Court (i.e. personalities). This act was more influential and effective than even briefings given directly to the principals.

PROPONENTS

- Proponents are the advocates – the people and organisations that want to influence and change policies. Despite the activist nature of their role, they are an integral part of the policy community. This is because engagement for policy change is a normal and constant feature in the overall governance and management of modern nation-states – whether democratic or not.
- The other 'inhabitants' of the community, i.e. the 6Ps, have key policy roles, but it is primarily advocates whose function drives change. There are instances when policymakers or personalities also act as advocates or undertake typical advocacy actions. Nonetheless, it is essential to understand the different categories and roles – and when and where they overlap.

6Cs: Approach to Developing Advocacy Action Plans

Clarity of purpose

(Clear sense of what one wants from the policy community)

Commencement

(Starting point based on baseline information of what is existing and what is missing)

Chains

(Connections and networks linking advocates to principals and policymakers)

Channels

(Viable and efficient routes to reach principals and policymakers)

Charts

(Network, advocacy and influence maps and guides relating to the 7Ps)

Catalysts

(Actions to stimulate, activate and excite the appropriate links and connections)

Networking and the Six Degrees of Separation

The concept of six degrees of separation was originally explored in fiction by Hungarian writer Frigyes Karinthy in his 1929 play 'Everything is Different'. The concept was developed by work on network theory, small-world dynamics and social networks undertaken by the American psychologist Stanley Milgram and the Austrian mathematician Manfred Kochen.

The concept is a 'general theory' of social networks, postulating that all human beings are connected to each other within a maximum of six stages/links. Milgram conducted experiments with the US Postal Service by sending un-addressed letters to people in order to determine how many 'hands' they will go through before reaching the intended recipient. The experiments did not by themselves prove the theory of six degrees of separation, but it reinforced the innate awareness of the fundamental connectedness of people even in complex industrial societies.

- ***In the smaller professional and policy worlds such as international development or diaspora-development, the degrees of separation are often less than six. This gives opportunities to small and diaspora organisations to use their networks in order to navigate through and influence the policy community.***

Alliance Building and the Five Stages of Partnership

- Partnership, cooperation and alliance are words that hardly anyone disagrees with. Yet, the ideals these words embody are very often difficult to achieve in practice. This is partly because alliance building and partnership encompass a complex mix of rational, emotional and transitional factors as well as a diverse range of actors.
- In order to minimise the barriers to alliance building and to optimise the chances of successful collaboration, a guiding conceptual and practical framework would be useful. In the corporate world, marketing is a fundamental and 'existentialist' function. Furthermore, through marketing, corporations continue to achieve monumental successes in terms of financial rewards and social engagement. As such, it may be prudent for the civil society sector to borrow concepts from the corporate world to assist with its own efficacy.
- To enhance the alliance building process, understanding of the marketing concept of 'hierarchy of loyalty' may be instructive. This concept postulates that people's affinity or loyalty to objects, subjects and entities goes through five distinct stages; and that the 'partnership' is the highest form of client loyalty.
- The five stages to partnership are as follows:

SUSPECT

*(When people view objects, subjects and entities **negatively and/or suspiciously**)*

PROSPECT

*(When people **test or try-out engagement** with objects, subjects and entities)*

CUSTOMER

*(When people **occasionally engage** with objects, subjects and entities)*

CLIENT

*(When people **regularly engage** with objects, subjects and entities)*

PARTNER

*(When people **define the engagement** with objects, subjects and entities)*

- ***Are there entities you currently call partners who will not qualify as partners according to the 'hierarchy of loyalty' framework?***
- ***To what extent do you need different strategies to engage with the different types of relationships?***
- ***How would you move your current policy relationships to higher levels within the hierarchy?***

Win-Win Negotiations: Framework for Policy Engagement

Alliance building requires different parties working together for a common interest. This necessarily involves give-and-take, as well as the negotiation of relationships. Proactive and consistent use of the 'win-win' negotiations framework shall assist in optimising alliance building. According to Fisher and Ury (1983), win-win negotiations is based on the following four principles:

- Separate people from issues (i.e. concentrate on objects, not subjects)
- Focus on interest, not positions
- Generate options for mutual gain
- Create objective criteria for assessment

As uncomfortable as it may sound, it is the case that people mostly negotiate on a win-lose or lose-lose basis. Win-win negotiation is not necessarily a 'natural' or instinctive approach; it is a rather enlightened endeavour. To practice it well, advocates need to study it, practise it, apply it and be purposeful and methodical at all times; it does not come naturally! However, anyone can master the skills, whether they come from a diaspora-development, commercial, small or large organisation. The approach can be used to build alliances, reduce opposition and influence policy.

SPICE: Approach to Making an Advocacy Pitch

According to Dutton (2010), successful persuasion and influencing can be reduce to a **SPICE** formula:

Simplicity; **P**erceived Self-Interest; **I**ncongruity; **C**onfidence; **E**mpathy

Invariably, the policy influencing process involves presentations to different groups of people. The SPICE formula can be a very useful tool in policy pitching, yet one needs to be mindful that 'perceived self-interest' and 'incongruity' raise issues of ethics and taste.

As in many fields, people's perception is more important than the actuality, in terms of their actions and reactions. According to Dutton, it is enough for people to perceive self-interest for an 'advocate' to be on a winning trajectory – the self-interest need not be real! Beyond the fact that such 'deception' may be discovered at a later date, for ethical reasons, the benefits claimed by advocates need to be honest. Interestingly, the honesty and actuality of the claimed benefits are not by themselves enough to influence or convince the beneficiaries – they need to perceive it as well.

Reflection on Problems and Solutions

We are not peddlers of problems and doom; we are merchants of solutions and hope. Diaspora, minority and marginal communities are beset with multitudes of problems. In many instances, these problems are indeed caused by the unfair, negative and outrageous acts and omissions of others. Blame, finger-pointing and accusations are often justified. Some people, who are affected by such inequities, justifiably perceive themselves as victims. Others, who are 'actually and factually' affected by the same circumstances, respond differently. Victimhood is largely a state of mind. The most effective actors in diaspora-development are those who do not concentrate on problems and victimhood; they delight in finding insightful and enduring solutions. Fixation with, and wallowing in the pits of painful problems, trigger negative neurological reactions; potentially leading to a vortex of angst, anguish and alienation. Focus on, and engagement in the agreeable art of solution-finding, trigger a virtuous circle, potentially soothing the wounds of injustice and enhancing the state of the human condition.

Reflection on Policy in Non-Democratic Societies

Policy formulation is a process that involves different people playing varied roles to produce applicable policy decisions and frameworks. This is true even in non-pluralistic jurisdictions where diversity of opinions and public participation in the policy process is restricted. Absolute monarchs and totalitarian dictators alike, are surrounded, influenced and assisted by coterie of advisers, lieutenants and cronies. Each group at the royal court or at the dictator's palace, in their own practised fashion, affect policy in a major and minor way. Beyond the people in formal roles, non-democratic governments are also influenced by friends, family members and all manner of oleaginous opportunists.

Reflection on Perception, Actuality and Reality

Reality is the coincidence of actuality and perception. A phenomenon may occur actually and factually, yet if it is not perceived, it fails to be reality. There is a high likelihood that no action or reaction emanates from unperceived actuality. On the other hand, erroneous notions and falsehoods may be perceived, contrary to the facts and actuality. In such instances, actions and reactions are likely to occur. It is as if actuality is passive and perception active.

Launch of the Africa-UK Diaspora Engagement Programme

Speech by Mr Gibril Faal – Chairman of AFFORD

Churchill Room, House of Commons
Westminster, London, 16 February 2011

This diaspora-development affair is a most beautiful thing.
And we are yet to see it in its full multi-layered bloom.

In the English language, it is always safe to make two guesses as to the origins of interesting words.
They are invariably Shakespearean or biblical.
Diaspora is biblical; it is about scattered people.

And here's the remarkable thing.
In a world that has become small and is getting even smaller,
Diaspora becomes bigger – in size and impact.

What in yesteryear was forlorn loneliness and isolation of a scattered people,
Today becomes pulsating vibrancy of connectedness and currency.
And therein lies the beauty and bounty of the modern diaspora – and its role in development.

When we remit funds to educate our nieces and nephews in towns across Africa,
Or sponsor Action Aid children in villages in the hinterland;
And when the Honourable Minister announces bilateral grants to Kenya,
Or Home Town Associations ship medical equipment to Kibera;
In a way, they are all part of the collective contribution of the United Kingdom,
And verily, the diaspora belongs both 'here and there'.

This Africa-UK programme, in sum, seeks to highlight, reinforce and enhance interconnectedness,
Between diaspora civil society and national policy makers – in pursuit of global development.

A man wakes up at dawn, resolute to change the world for the better.
He retires at dusk – unfulfilled.
I ask; why is it that one has failed?
In his wise simplicity he says, 'I am outnumbered'.

At AFFORD, we have been most aware that the change-makers are outnumbered.
Thus it is imperative that we talk and walk together,
That we stalk and scorn global poverty and inequality,
And lift the multifarious hazards of deprivation.

Ladies and Gentlemen, like many other matters I observe,
Diaspora engagement and development is a bit like English grammar;
The past was tense
The present is imperfect
I pray, that the future is more participative.

Gibril Faal, London, 16 February 2011.

United Nations High Level Dialogue on Migration and International Development

Remarks by Mr Gibril Faal

**HLD Civil Society Steering Committee Member, Director of GK Partners
& Chairman of African Foundation for Development (AFFORD)**

**Office of the President of the General Assembly
Informal Interactive Hearings on International Migration and Development
General Assembly Hall, New York, 15 July 2013**

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Today, I speak with you about migrants and diaspora as partners in development. On this topic, we have all become Galbraithians. For it was the Canadian-American economist John Kenneth Galbraith, who told us, that: "Migration is the oldest action against poverty. It is good for the country to which they go; it helps break the equilibrium of poverty in the country from which they come". Given what he took to be primal facts, Galbraith wondered: "What is the perversity in the human soul that causes people to resist so obvious a good?"

I posit that people migrate for two broad reasons; to protect life, limb and liberty; or to enhance livelihood and lifestyle. Individuals – bakers and bankers, cleaners and clinicians, seek advancement and development for themselves, their families and communities. These migrants, and their children, and the children of their children often retain a natal, parental and ancestral memory of the country of heritage. This sublime diaspora memory of belonging, compels them to play their role in the development of the country of heritage.

In most instances, fulfilment of this duty and desire becomes easier when migrants and the diaspora are integrated and successful in the country of residence. Thus it is an innate interest of the migrant, that she is a good and productive citizen, in her diaspora life of duality and trans-nationality.

In the past ten years, many national governments, multilateral institutions and other agencies with mandates to enhance human development have recognised that they share a common purpose with the humble migrant, and her age-old ambitions. Despite this commonality of purpose, I hear grumblings. Sometimes from outraged officials, often from disgruntled diasporas. Both bemoan the difficulties of working with the other. Evidently, there is an absence of effective common modalities for working together.

Currently, at best the relationship is one of prospection – of occasional exploratory engagement. At worst, it is one of suspicion and mistrust. Verily, genuine partnership can only exist when suspicions are allayed and prospection surpassed. There are beautiful theories about how to achieve this. Yet the only practical way is through actual, direct, consistent and substantive engagement. Therefore, today, I offer nothing but a reminder, brutal in its simplicity.

For partnership to work, common purpose is not enough. Institutions should understand, acknowledge, value and support migrant and diaspora initiatives – as will be presented today. These already reflect their specific circumstances and characteristics, and their long term strategic objectives.

Migrants and diaspora suffer from consultation fatigue. They crave substantive participation, whereby they act and speak for themselves – supported by their friends and advocates. They are and should be treated as principals in any engagement; not recipients of enlightened benefaction.

Engagement should yield tangible, practical, short term results, incorporating capacity building to further enhance medium and long term participation and action.

For participation to work, common purpose is not enough. Migrant and diaspora organisations should be constant in being merchants of solutions and hope, not peddlers of problems and doom.

We should focus on themes on which we have expertise and experience; insist on efficiency and excellence as a moral imperative, as we reject wasteful indulgences. We should professionalise more of our activities, without killing off the volunteering and self-help input and ethic that motivates us and enhances our work.

There then is a possible framework for practical partnership – common purpose and agreed modalities for enhanced results and greater human development. In his classic book 'Things fall apart', the Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe wrote: "When we gather together in the moonlit village ground it is not because of the moon. Every man can see it in his own compound. We come together because it is good for kinsmen to do so."

And the American writer Christopher Morley, philosophised that: "There are three ingredients in the good life: learning, earning and yearning." And now I remember; people migrate to learn, earn or yearn for a better life. The migrant wants a good life for herself, her family and community. She wants development. Like Galbraith, I too wonder, in mild exasperation, what is it that is so evil in wanting a good life? What is it, I do not know.

Thank you.

Gibril Faal, New York City, 15 July 2013.

United Nations High Level Dialogue on Migration and International Development

Opening Remarks by Mr Gibril Faal

Chairman of African Foundation for Development (AFFORD)
& Director of GK Partners

United Nations General Assembly
General Assembly Hall, New York, 3 October 2013

President of the General Assembly
Secretary-General of the United Nations
Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Seven years after the High Level Dialogue of 2006, in these meditative times of post-2015 reflections, we gather here again to discuss migration and development and seek transformative new approaches. I look out into the room, everywhere I see migrants; itinerant diplomats, first generation emigrants, and the many descendents of migrants, who constitute diasporas in different parts of the world. Sir, this place is full of them!

Given the fundamental and age-old nexus between migration and development, it is quite odd that we have not made as much progress in this field as would have been natural. As nation-states, we operate within demarcated borders, jealous and protective of the proud sovereignty it represents. Yet, ours is a world of 'acreage of land and heads of people'. It appears that we sanctify the acreage of land, and the privileges thereof, to the pernicious expense of heads of people and the humanity therein. We defend against the scheming migrant, who encroaches on our land and realm. Not seeing the aspiring person who yearns for a decent and good life for herself and her family.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

A change of attitude towards migrants and diasporas is imperative if a new partnership is to be established. Partnership with diasporas needs to be based on a solid foundation where suspicion and mistrust are allayed and tokenism surpassed. In these times when we contemplate sustainable development goals and live in a world of Gaia-like global connectedness, we need a new diaspora enlightenment. We need to be comfortable in the transnational characteristic that defines migrants and diasporas. And we need to reaffirm the eternal virtues of trans-nationalism. Some may call us naive; others may even think that we are sandal-wearing bleeding heart liberals; but we would have responded to the empirical needs of fluid and amorphous twenty-first century realities.

Honourable Representatives of Member States,

As a distinct outcome of the High Level Dialogue, civil society proposes to collaborate with States during the next five years for measurable progress on eight points. This action plan is our Memorandum for Engagement, our Writ for Partnership, our Deed for Action. We acknowledge and express our gratitude to you, for accommodating civil society and diaspora voices in these proceedings. We hope that cooperation will become deeper and more cordial in the future. Now we come before you and ask for your endorsement of the five-year, eight-point action plan. As Peter Drucker, the Austrian-American management thinker would have said, 'leaders do the right things and managers do things right'. We call on you as leaders to endorse this High Level Dialogue outcome. This will be a result, real and apt, true and fair. "I have spent many days stringing and unstringing my instrument while the song I came to sing remains unsung." This is indeed the poetic caution given to us by the Bengali writer Rabindranath Tagore.

As we look forward, I am reminded of the audacious advice of Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie, the British-Sierra Leonean co-founder of AFFORD. “Let States, migrants and diaspora, together aspire and work towards full employment” he said. This vision is big and noble enough, to unite all those who yearn to see decent jobs for everyone. That people will have the dignity to live off the honest sweat of their brow. That disillusioned youths will be less receptive to destructive movements and nihilistic ideologies. That migration itself becomes a genuine choice, not a desperate necessity. Perchance, the generation to come will not know of the grotesque horrors and human misery of dysfunctional migration.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I see migrants, with constrained resources and pressured circumstances, extract their families from poverty within a generation. I see governments, multilateral agencies and NGOs with massive resources and state privileges admit the self evident failures of combating chronic poverty. I am a simple man. I make a deduction, perhaps these migrants know how to do development. It is indeed true that for many diasporans, contribution to development in country of origin or heritage is not a job of work, or the fulfilment of a political mandate or even the heroic response to a pinch on the conscience. For them, development is a way of life, the very stuff of life, the support of families, communities and countries. Two hundred million migrants, millions of second generation diasporans, support one billion people in the developing world. Here we are, a veritable partner for development.

Honourable Representatives of Member States, when you go back home, tell them;

Your Excellency Secretary-General, when you report on this dialogue, tell them;

Tell them that migrants and diasporas are ready, able and willing; that as states, we avow a new inclusive attitude towards the trans-national migrant diaspora; that we endorse a framework action plan for partnership. Tell them all, so that all of the world and all of the development stakeholders get to hear the news that in this very place, in two thousand thirteen of the Common Era, we endorsed and heralded a new partnership between migrant, diasporas and state institutions. Tell them so that sceptics and cynics, realists and optimists will come to witness the triumphant hopes and the indomitability of the migrant spirit. Sir, you will tell them, won't you? Tell them.

I thank you all.

Gibril Faal, New York City, 3 October 2013.

- Dierkes, Meinolf et al (eds.) (1987) *Comparative Policy Research: Learning from Experience*, Gower Publishing Company Ltd, London.
- Dutton, Kevin (2010) *Flipnosis: The Art of Split-Second Persuasion*, William Heinemann, London.
- Etheredge, Lloyd S. (ed) (2002) *Politics in Wired Nations – Selected Writings of Ithiel de Sola Pool*, Transaction Publishers, New Jersey.
- Fisher, Roger & Ury, William (1983) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, Penguin Books, New York.
- Franceschetti, Massimo & Meester, Ronald (2006) 'Navigation in Small-World Networks: A Scale-Free Continuum Model', *Journal of Applied Probability* 43, p1173-1180.
- Gardner, Howard (1983) *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, Basic Books, New York.
- Gaure, John (1990) *Six Degrees of Separation*, Vintage, New York.
- Goleman, Daniel (1995) *Emotional Intelligence – Why it can matter more than IQ*, Bantam Books, London.
- Ham, Christopher & Hill, Michael (1993) *The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Hill, Michael (ed.) (1993) *New Agendas in the Study of the Policy Process*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Hogwood, Brian W. & Gunn, Lewis A. (1984) *Policy Analysis for the Real World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- House of Commons (2008) *Lobbying: Access and influence in Whitehall*, The Stationery Office, London.
- Houses of Parliament (2014) *Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act*, The Stationery Office, London.
- JHSPH (1999) *A Frame for Advocacy*, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Center for Communication Programs, Special Publications No. SP 13, Baltimore.
- Kingdon, John W. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*, Little Brown, Boston.
- Macpherson, Stewart & Midgley, James (1987) *Comparative Social Policy and the Third World*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton.
- Nagel, Stuart S. (1984) *Public Policy: Goals, Means, and Methods*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Pettifor, Ann (2011) *Cutting the Diamond – How to shape a movement to make transformational change*, Advocacy International, London.
- Pool, Ithiel de Sola & Kochen, Manfred (1978) 'Contacts and Influence', *Social Networks* 1, p5-51.
- Pressman, Jeffrey L. & Wildavsky, Aaron (1973) *Implementation*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Sabatier, Paul A. (ed.) (2007) *Theories of the Policy Process*, Westview Press, Boulder.
- Sprechmann, Sophia & Pelton, Emily (2001) *Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: Promoting Policy Change*, Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Atlanta.
- Travers, Jeffrey & Stanley Milgram (1969) 'An Experimental Study of the Small World Problem', *Sociometry*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 425-443.
- UKPAC (2014) *Open Letter to the Minister for the Cabinet Office*, UK Public Affairs Council, London.
- Vogel, David (1986) *National Styles of Regulation*, Cornell University Press, London.
- Weimer, David & Vining, Aidan R. (2011) *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Links to Policy Related Documents

Examples of UK International Development Policy Documents (Links retrieved in March 2014)

- HMG (2012) *The Coalition: Together in the National Interest – Mid-Term Review*, Her Majesty's Government, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/229486/HMG_MidTermReview.pdf
- DFID (2012) *Faith Partnership Principles: Working effectively with faith groups to fight global poverty*, Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67352/faith-partnership-principles.pdf
- DFID (2012) *Promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: A DFID Strategy Paper*, Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67438/prom-innov-evi-bas-appr-build-res-resp-hum-cris.pdf

- DFID (2011) UK Aid: Changing Lives, delivering results', Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67584/BAR-MAR-summary-document-web.pdf
- DFID (2010) DFID Programme Strategy 2010-2013: Creating a safer environment – Clearing landmines and other explosive remnants of war, Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67692/de-mining-strat-16march2010.pdf
- DFID (2009) Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future, Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/229029/7656.pdf
- DFID (2006) Eliminating World Poverty: Making Governance Work for the Poor, Department for International Development, London.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/272330/6876.pdf
- DFID (2000) Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor, Department for International Development, London.
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/whitepaper2000.pdf>
- DFID (1997) Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century, Department for International Development, London.
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20050404190659/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/whitepaper1997.pdf>

Examples of UN International Development Policy Documents (Links retrieved in March 2014)

- United Nations (2013) A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development, United Nations, New York.
http://www.un.org/sg/management/pdf/HLP_P2015_Report.pdf
- United Nations (2001) Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration – Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations, New York.
<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/56/a56326.pdf>
- United Nations (2000) Millennium Declaration, United Nations, New York.
<http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>

Examples of AU, EU and Diaspora Development Policy Documents (Links retrieved in March 2014)

- Africa Union (2012) Declaration of the Global African Diaspora Summit, African Union, Addis Ababa.
[http://www.au.int/en/sites/default/files/FINAL%20Diaspora%20Declaration-E-25%20May%20\(1\).pdf](http://www.au.int/en/sites/default/files/FINAL%20Diaspora%20Declaration-E-25%20May%20(1).pdf)
- Africa Union (2005) Report of the Meeting of Experts from Member States on the Definition of the African Diaspora, African Union, Addis Ababa.
<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://www.africa-union.org/organs/ecosoc/Report-Expert-Diaspora%2520Defn%252013april2005-Clean%2520copy1.doc>
- EU and AU (2010) Joint Africa EU Strategy: Action Plan 2011-2013, European Union and African Union, Tripoli.
http://www.africa-eu-partnership.org/sites/default/files/documents/03-jeas_action_plan_en.pdf
- European Union (2007) The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa-EU Strategy, European Union Council, Lisbon.
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/97496.pdf
- European Union (2006) European Consensus on Development. European Parliament, Council and Commission, Brussels.
http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/european_consensus_2005_en.pdf
- EU and ACP (2000) Cotonou Agreement, European Union and The African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, Cotonou.
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/overview/documents/devco-cotonou-consol-europe-aid-2012_en.pdf
- AEP (2012) AEP Articles of Association, Africa-Europe Platform, Brussels.
<http://ae-platform.org/ae-background-documents>
- AFFORD (2009) Proposal for Setting Up Platform for African Diaspora Groups in Europe, African Foundation for Development, Brussels.
<http://ae-platform.org/ae-background-documents>

Examples of Kenyan Diaspora Development Policy Documents (Links retrieved in March 2014)

- Government of Kenya (2011) Diaspora Policy of Kenya, Government of the Republic of Kenya, Nairobi.
<http://www.kenyaembassy.com/pdfs/DraftDiasporaPolicyofKenya.pdf>
- Government of Kenya (2011) The Kenya Citizenship and Immigration Act, National Council for Law Reporting, Nairobi.
http://www.nairobi.diplo.de/contentblob/3356358/Daten/1788002/d_KenyanCitizenship_No12_of_2011.pdf
- Government of Kenya (2010) The Constitution of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting, Nairobi.
<https://www.kenyaembassy.com/pdfs/The%20Constitution%20of%20Kenya.pdf>
- Government of Kenya (2008) Kenya Vision 2030, Government of the Republic of Kenya, Nairobi.
<http://www.vision2030.go.ke/>



In October 2013, Gibril Faal delivered a keynote opening address at the UN General Assembly session of the High Level Dialogue on Migration and International Development. He is the chairman of the African Foundation for Development (AFFORD-UK) and the founder of RemitAid™. Gibril is a board member of funds that invest in international development projects, including DFID's Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) and the EC-UN Joint Migration & Development Initiative (JMDI). He is a member of the civil society International Steering Committee of the Global Forum for Migration and Development (GFMD) and is a senior research associate with the Foreign Policy Centre (FPC). Gibril is also a director of GK Partners – a UK-based company which specialises in socially responsible business.

For five years, Gibril was a lecturer on the postgraduate Global Development Management programme at The Open University. He was also an external evaluator of the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society at University of Oxford. Whilst working on a Department of Trade and Industry project from 2001, Gibril was one of the small team of professionals who developed a social enterprise business support framework in the UK. In 2004, he was appointed a Justice of the Peace and sits as a part-time magistrate.

Gibril is a multi-disciplinarian with an eclectic professional background. Since 1998, he had been appointed to various public functions in the UK by The Home Secretary, The Lord Chancellor, The Chancellor of the Exchequer and The Secretary of State for International Development. He has a Combined Honours degree in Law, Finance and Management, and postgraduate degrees in Environmental Sciences and Development Studies. He studied at five universities in London and has various other professional training in fields such as Policy Analysis, Economic History, Transport and Urban Systems, Environmental and Quality Management, Ethical, Community and Islamic Finance. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts.



Professional / General £20
ISBN 978-0-9928913-0-5

