Annex 7

1.   MAINSTREAMING ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT THROUGH POLICY DIALOGUE[1]

1.1   Context

In phase I and II (1998-2006), Compas' strength has been documenting specific and practical local experience based on cosmovision and endogenous development concepts. These experiences form the launching path for policy dialogue. Compas' present phase (2007-2010) is a phase of transition from documentation, experimentation and methodology development towards consolidation, mainstreaming and scaling up. This will imply the gradual change from a project set-up to a more institutionalised organisational form, from a "platform mode" towards an "arena mode"[2] of operation.

For this third phase it is envisaged to put into practice a number of options to enhance endogenous development by a conducive policy. Policy dialogue, as it is termed in our discussions, is meant to build up an enabling political environment for the development of such conducive policies. Concrete entry points and themes for policy dialogue will be jointly identified by Compas member organisations in each region, based on the specific needs and opportunities in a given environment. These themes should be relevant for the majority of regional partners. Apart from these also national entry points can be identified as well as international activities important for the Compas network as a whole.

Why is Compas interested in policy dialogue and why is policy dialogue becoming more important in the present phase of Compas? Endogenous development, in order to be sustainable, requires an enabling environment. Little "islands of success" make interesting cases for documentation, as has been done during the first phase, and they serve as a source of inspiration. Since 2003, the Compas network has worked on methodologies and on inter-scientific dialogue on how Endogenous Development can be stimulated. Several publications and the LENDEV guide emerged.

Now the real challenge is to take the lessons learned in specific areas a step further and turn them into recommendations for policy makers, researchers and development professionals at different levels so that they can take measures which will contribute to an enabling environment for endogenous development. Another challenge is to get other fellow (local) communities inspired and benefiting from the experiences from Compas on endogenous development.

Some of the questions to be answered are:
- How can we initiate a meaningful policy dialogue?
- With whom and in which context
- How can we communicate the essence of endogenous development to 'them'?
- What can others do to create an enabling environment for endogenous development?
- Why should they? What is their interest? What worries them in the present situation? Why would they want to change?
- Which opportunities are there for Compas to join ongoing policy dialogues and add a new dimension to them?
- Apart from policymakers, who are the other important actors who help or hinder endogenous development? Should we engage in dialogues with them as well?
- Can we envisage a multi-stakeholder dialogue for enhancing endogenous development?

In the DGIS policy framework, this strategy is called: Action to **influence policy** and thereby to change local, national and international policies, and modify processes and structures that perpetuate or exacerbate poverty and inequality. Within the MFS, policy influence could be exercised by counterpart organizations, broad-based and theme-based co-financing organizations and their networks.

---

[1] This chapter is drafted by Marc P. Lammerink. Iintroductory parts are based on an earlier paper: 'Speed paper: towards a policy dialogue in Compas, by Edith van Walsum, November 2003. Furthermore, experiences with policy dialogue as developed by Prolinnova are also a source of inspiration.

[2] Networks operating in a Platform mode give central importance to fostering partnership, cohesion and information sharing between the partners within the network. Networks that operate in an Arena mode are more outward oriented; their focus is on mediation and negotiation outside the circle of immediate partners. Compas operated in a platform mode during its first two phases, whereas in the third phase it moves more towards an arena mode (which does not mean however that partnership and internal coherence within the network is not important any more). The envisaged inter-scientific dialogues, intercultural dialogue and policy dialogues are examples of the new challenges Compas is seeking.

1.2   Policy influencing and dialogue: some definitions

Advocacy, lobbying and campaigning are all part of policy influencing. They can be described as follows[3]:
- *Advocacy*: Advocacy is creating awareness about the concerns/possible solutions of a specific group. It comprises of a series of planned activities. It is not an event but rather a process. It is an organized influence of attitudes. It targets specific groups and it is about achieving specific outcomes. Advocacy outcomes include: change in policy, practice, attitudes, behaviour, political processes, and systems. In certain instances also training can be part of an advocacy process.

- *Campaigning* is about creating desire/willingness to respond to an issue through mass mobilization. It is designed to exert pressure on decision making bodies. Campaigning should therefore have: a clear issue; a theme; and a mass or popular movement of supporters.

- *Lobbying* is one tool of advocacy. It is about influencing decision makers to make deliberate choices. Lobbying takes campaigning further. It aims at seeking support of influential people. There is need to set out achievable goals linked to existing policy parameters.

The following stages can be distinguished in policy influencing:
- Identifying and stating the issue;
- Collecting the relevant information/Research;
- Design objectives/strategy/plan for policy influencing;
- Identifying /Mobilizing interested people/parties;
- Raising and managing the necessary resources;
- Networking/Forming alliances/coalitions;
- Involving all forms of media;
- Establishing contacts with government;
- Monitor and Evaluate.

1.3   Communication in policy dialogue and scaling-up

The art of communication is basic in policy dialogue, much more than any other of the qualities of an organizer. In policy influencing and scaling-up it does not really matter what Compas members know about endogenous development, if they are not able to get it across. Only if Compas partners can communicate their experiences to other people, that is when others understand what Compas is trying to get across to them.

Normally people only understand things in terms of their own experiences, which mean that an effective dialogue must happen within one's experience. It is a two-way process. If someone is trying to dialogue and the point is not available in the experience of the other party, than one must create the experience for the other party. Also in lobbying, advocacy or campaigning, it is essential not to go outside of people's actual experience.

Another maxim in effective communication is that people have to make their own decisions and for the decision making process guiding questions are important. And finally, of course an important issue in any change process is the personal relationship. With a good relationship people are more open, receptive and messages are coming through in a positive context.
Communication on a general basis without being fractured into the specifics of experiences becomes easily rhetoric and it carries a very limited meaning. For example, the "holistic view", essential in Compas, needs to be made 'consumable' and acceptable for others and after all inspire people. This often means bringing in the personal experience.

Communication should not become too 'big'. Of course, communication in advocacy has to turn around grounded concepts and tangible ideas. However, this is only possible if specific experiences are brought in, which should be small enough to be grasped by the experiences of the others. Issues, also frameworks or 'holistic views' must 'be able to be' communicated. This is essential. Also the issues should be as simple as

---

[3] Adapted from: 'Prolinnova international workshop on policy advocacy, campaigning and lobbying, Tanzania, 2006, page 31

possible to be grasped. It can not be communicated in generalities. Policy dialogue like any communication occurs concretely, by means of specific experiences. General theories become meaningful only when they are absorbed and its specific constituents are understood and than related back to a general concept.

Policy dialogue also needs a multi-dimensional strategy, for the changes being sought are deep and subtle, and cannot be brought about through top-down approaches of advocacy, however well motivated. Effective policy advocacy involves dialogue and communication with different parties involved, including local communities, so that each of these parties get what each find meaningful and not what the Compas partners considers meaningful for them. Communication is an instrument for partnership and participation based on a two-way dialogue, where both the senders and receivers of information interact on an equal footing, leading to interchange and mutual discovery. This involves looking at situations from the viewpoint of other people, and understanding what they are looking for. It means understanding obstacles to change. It means helping people to discover relevant and practical options, and to analyze what the effect is of the choices they make[4].

Change of people is about behaviour and beliefs as well as actions. Most people only tend to change, when they understand the nature of the changes and view it as better or beneficial. They than can make an informed and conscious choice to change and put into action. Unless their particular circumstances are taken into consideration, and their felt needs are met, no effort for change will be successful. This is true both for communities at grass-root level as well as politicians at national level.

For effective communication and thus an effective strategy for policy dialogue a clear picture of the audience, which needs to be reached and influenced, is a prerequisite.

1.4 Main audiences for policy dialogue

Different audiences need to be involved in policy dialogue in different ways. The main audiences at national level which have been identified include: Community groups and organizations, sector professionals, researchers and policy makers and sector directives.

Community groups and indigenous organizations

Men and women in rural communities are what this whole effort of policy dialogue and advocacy is all about. It is their needs, their resources, their strategies, their initiatives and their perspective which are crucial. Often communities are not aware what going back to their own roots and endogenous development can mean for the sustainability of their efforts, and the skills it requires have often been forgotten. Therefore they can greatly benefit from learning about the Compas programme, the local experiences from fellow communities and from better understanding of what cosmovision and endogenous development concepts are all about and what type of support is available. They also need to strengthen their capacities to better analyze their own situation and how to design a strategy for endogenous development, based on their specific needs and opportunities in their environment and which matches their economic, social and cultural circumstances.

Sector Professionals

This includes all those who work in agriculture, forestry, livestock development, natural resource management, from planners to field implementers in Non-Governmental Organisations, governments as well as semi-governmental organisations that support communities. It also includes those professionals working in the area of health, community development and environmental studies. Building the capacity of communities to take upon themselves the responsibilities for participatory- and endogenous development is seen by many as a major task for supporting agencies. However, it is important that the understanding of professionals about endogenous development is enhanced and that they get a better idea of the support requirements.

This broad target group may be divided into those already convinced of the participatory development and the ED perspective, taking worldviews and culture seriously, and working actively on its development or struggling with its development for lack of experience and those yet to understand the perspectives.

---

[4]Gorre-Dale E. et al., Communication in Water Supply and Sanitation. Resource booklet, The Hague, 1993

Included in this segment of audience are opinion makers, influential people, representatives from donor organizations, those in the mass media who help set the agenda of the public, and that of politicians and public servants. Part of the challenge in the discussion on endogenous development has been to develop new ways of working so that policy makers, the agriculture-, health- and natural resources sector staff, and users work towards common goals. There are many people in these institutes, who are now becoming convinced that participatory approaches are necessary for effective development programmes, but they do not always have sufficient information and ideas to make this happen. However, endogenous development issues are still relatively unknown to sector staff and there is a need for up-scaling of experiences.

All actions to **influence policy** and thereby to change local, national and international policies, and modify processes and structures that perpetuate or exacerbate poverty and inequality must take into account the different audiences and their needs in order to develop an effective strategy for communication and dialogue on policy issues. For Compas partners it is also important to refer to Poverty Reduction Strategy papers and the role of Dutch Embassies.

1.5   Experiences from the COMPAS network

The Compas network has certain inherent strengths and potentials for dialogue: its constructive position and broad vision based on local expression and diversity of positive experiences. Also its present dedicated partnership and networking mode in four continents is a strength; its links with traditional societies, NGO's, Universities and local government agencies, and finally, its publication and documentation capacity. In phase II (2003-2006), a few successes of larger development efforts being changed have been: Africa for policy formulation (Ghana Wild Fire Policy and Nepad), Latin America for curriculum and research development (Agruco and UMSS in Bolivia) and Asia in relation to the scientific validation of traditional medicinal treatment (FRLHT in India).

However, in many countries more intensified links with policy bodies are desirable. Strategic alliances with likeminded organisations need to be enhanced. More analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) is needed of existing policies against the criteria of ED, and the specific local experiences need to be integrated into the global context. Finally, our own capacity as staff members of most Compas partner organisations in policy dialogue needs to be developed and strengthened.

In phase II, processes have been started already to better define 'policy dialogue'. Also local policy dialogue processes have been started in 2004 in four 'pilot regions': Ghana, Andes, India and the Netherlands. A survey has been organized/has taken place early 2004 on policy dialogue themes, both for regional policy influencing and for international or global policy dialogue. In this survey also important actors and strengths of Compas network on these issues has been explored. This gives a good starting point for defining further the themes and issues. In a meeting with the DGIS on 7 February 2007, it was also stressed that in order to assess the results of policy dialogue, a good baseline of the current situation is important.

1.6   Up-scaling through policy dialogue: fitting the right methods to specific audiences

Policy dialogue and scaling-up of endogenous development
An active strategy for scaling-up and dialogue on the experience obtained in the project is essential for all four major target groups, but the approaches and types of materials will be quite different and may also vary between the different countries.
The different levels of audiences could be addressed with the same message but in different styles. This can include the use of image, sound, painting, mime, photographs, radio programs, popular theatre, videotapes, audiovisual material, poetry, puppets and exhibitions[5]. The communication should be in plain and understandable local language based on daily expressions and accessible to all. For each main target group a number of key materials and media have been identified which will developed from a general concept paper shared between the different countries into country or regional specific materials.

Scaling-up at Community level

---

[5]Fals Borda, Knowledge and People's power, New Delhi. Indian Social Institute, 1985

In the lifespan of this phase different global forums or workshops can be used to inform about the progress in endogenous development and participatory approaches through presentations of interest to sector professionals.

- Presentations can be planned on international conferences which are important for the issues at hand;
- Presentations can be planned for other meetings such as the Steering Committee of UN and others. During the running of the project colleagues from the partner organizations can be asked to present intermediary results at international meetings or meetings of professional associations in their respective continents.

Furthermore, the setting up of an Endogenous Development Bulletin Board on e-mail could be envisaged for informing about the progress. The Internet could become 'an efficient and powerful way to raise awareness and to build support' for endogenous development.

1.7   Some innovative methods for policy dialogue

In this section some possible innovative methods for policy dialogue are explored. Other methods as the one presented here can also be included during the process.

Citizens' jury
The Citizens jury is a high quality method for engaging a microcosm of the public in the discussion of public policy issues. The Citizens Jury process brings together 18 to 24 randomly selected citizens for five days of hearings in which they hear from a variety of witnesses, deliberate among themselves and report their findings to decision makers and the public. The facilitator of the Citizens Jury does not take stands on issues. Its commitment is to empower the public in a fair and neutral setting to discover, what it believes are the best ways to deal with significant public issues. The Citizens Jury process is very similar to the *Planungszelle*, invented in Germany by Peter Dierlel in the early 1970s. Together these models were introduced in Great Britain in the middle 1990s by the Institute for Public Policy Research in London. Since then the process has spread to Australia, Spain, India and elsewhere.

Rural parliament
Leader+, a rural development programme implemented throughout Europe as part of initiative of EU has used in certain contexts the idea of establishing rural parliaments. Also interesting experiences are gained in Canada.

In Canada Rural Partnership are build upon a strong foundation of dialogues, partnerships, an information outreach program and the Rural Lens—a government's process of seeing the impact of issues through the eyes of rural people. The main objective of such efforts is to reconnect the Government of a certain country with rural countryman and to strengthen the economic and social foundations of rural economies and to ensure the long-term sustainability of rural communities.

One foundation are the ongoing grassroots Rural Dialogue meetings with citizens across the country who know that a strong and successful national economy can only exist when all of its components—both rural and urban—are strong.
In Canada the strategic approach to address issues faced by countryman living in rural areas is based on, but not limited to, four key components that have produced the greatest results:

- A bottom-up approach, allowing communities to develop strategies and approaches for long-term sustainability.
- The use of a Rural Lens designed to make sure that the government, in cooperation with other federal departments and agencies, develop initiatives that make sense for all citizens.
- Continuing to build community capacity—the ability to evaluate a community's assets, build consensus and develop a plan to enhance that capacity.
- Continuing to give communities the tools they need to carry out their strategies.

The bottom-up approach to decision making is a success. This was evident at the second National Rural Conference where countryman come together to share information and discuss ideas for community capacity

Provider (GO and NGO) level perspectives to similar issues investigated by them where the two meet as a Second Tier. The third Tier is then the First and the Second meet with Policy to dialogue based on the various positions they have elaborated differently and jointly

Advocacy forum
A forum comprising of a wide cross-section of society, which meets regularly.

Vision conference
An alternative method to develop new approaches and policies is the Vision Conference, which aroused a lot of creativity and openness for new approaches.

Policy write shops
A group of people, specialist on a certain subject, are brought together to develop and write new enabling policies fro endogenous development, which are later on brought into policy dialogue.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration/platforms
CSO's, GO's, universities and other actors work together for a common agenda and follow strong participatory approaches.

1.8   Further steps for policy dialogue within the Compas network

Steps in the following process can be broadly as follows:
1. **Exploratory phase** – identify themes, issues, emerging policy environments, ongoing dialogues and potential partners in policy dialogue: example of an output: 'From Biodiversity to Bio-Cultural diversity: a review of national, biodiversity policies in Ghana'. Part of this has already been accomplished in 2004.
2. **Internal capacity building** workshop on strategies & skills for policy dialogue
3. **Engage in local/regional policy dialogues**; case studies at national/regional workshops
4. **Broaden policy dialogue** to other Compas areas. Initiate intercultural policy dialogue between regions; international policy conference leading to policy recommendations for NGO's, national governments in south and north, international agencies and donors
5. **Documentation of process and initial results** of policy dialogues (2007-2010); resulting in international synthesis report and policy discussion document (2010).