The newsletter of
INTRAC
International NGO Training and Research Centre
No. 47 January 2011

ontrac

viewpoint

Empowered to influence: capacity building for advocacy

© 2004 Roobon/The Hunger Project-Bangladesh, Courtesy of Photoshare

Why advocacy?

There has been a huge shift towards placing a greater emphasis on advocacy in development work in recent years. Previous approaches focusing on the service delivery role of civil society organisations (CSOs) are often felt to have had a limited impact. Many argue that civil society can only have a deeper and more sustainable impact if CSOs succeed in influencing key policies, decision makers and the dynamics of power. For many CSOs, this represents a significant shift in the focus of their work and they often lack the skills necessary for conducting effective advocacy.

How best can we carry out capacity building to help CSOs do advocacy work? What is different, if anything, about capacity building for advocacy as opposed to other capacity building interventions? These are questions that INTRAC's latest Praxis Paper –'Capacity Building for Advocacy' – addresses[1]. The paper looks at current practice and thinking about this issue and explores examples of what CSOs are doing on the ground to build their own capacity and that of their partner organisations.

The paper was informed by research with both 'frontline' CSOs working in a variety of advocacy contexts, and CSOs of different sizes operating in different public policy sectors. These organisations shared insights from their good and bad experiences around both giving and receiving capacity building support for advocacy. What emerged was a picture of advocacy capacity building that is complex, multilevel and currently unsystematic in terms of planning, implementation and monitoring for effectiveness and learning.

1 The paper is available to download at www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=698.

Contents

viewpoint

In this issue:

This issue of ONTRAC looks at capacity building for advocacy. Following Chris Stalker's overview of the huge shift towards placing a greater emphasis on advocacy in development work in recent years, and the pertinent issues around this, other articles explore experiences of this complex process from a diverse range of settings.

Sehjo Singh, the director of the National Centre for Advocacy Studies in India, reflects on how the centre tries to strengthen people-centred advocacy through models such as the 'community learning movement'. Rod MacLeod summarises the lessons learnt from capacity development with CSOs in seven African countries around ensuring that the benefits of oil resources can be shared more widely and fairly.

Clare Moberly, INTRAC's new consultancies director, discusses her work with Oxfam in their advocacy programming – an example of an INGO focusing more on national level advocacy and incorporating advocacy into its programming at country level. This highlights challenges such as the new types of skills that staff need if they are to be involved in supporting southern advocacy more. Finally, Jan Knight, Capacity Building Adviser to SAVI in Nigeria, describes this unique initiative and its promising results so far in strengthening advocacy capacity on both the 'supply' and 'demand' sides.

Advocacy capacity at different levels

Advocacy capacity exists at a number of different levels: individual skills and abilities; projects and programmes; organisational capacity; external linkages and the extent of coordination or networking on an advocacy issue; the enabling or disabling environment; and finally, in the ways that the different levels of capacity work together to enhance advocacy.

The importance of identifying where a lack of capacity lies may seem obvious. However, whilst many of the CSOs interviewed agreed that looking at capacity at different levels is useful and logical, in practice it does not often happen in the area of advocacy capacity building. Interventions frequently take place in an unsystematic way and usually focus only on the individual level. Training courses and occasionally mentoring and coaching of individuals are the most used methods for capacity building. Little attention is paid to the other levels of capacity.

Individual capacity building is not without value, and can sometimes extend to benefit the wider organisation. It is however, one segment of a larger interdependent whole. If taken on its own the impact may be minimal. As one respondent said, 'one common factor is that many participants [we train] say that the blockages happen when they get back to their organisation.'

Taking a narrow view on developing capacity for advocacy is unlikely to result in extensive change, but in the case of advocacy the different levels of capacity are crucial. The success of a campaign may be highly dependent on the enabling or disabling environment. An organisation may have a high level of capacity but a lack of networking with like-minded organisations will limit its impact. With advocacy all the levels are critical and all must be addressed.

For an advocacy capacity building intervention to be successful it must take into account that capacity needs are complex and multilevel. Firstly, a quality diagnosis of capacity needs is critically important. Secondly, offering a range of different support methods based on a sound assessment tends to be most effective in securing change. Finally, long-term investment in ongoing support is key. The search for quick fixes is unlikely to be fruitful and expecting too much too quickly can lead to superficial changes.

Opportunity and the enabling environment

Questions about **capacity** to influence and seek change are deeply linked to issues about **opportunities** to influence. If opportunities to influence policies and decision makers are limited, perhaps even dangerous, the capacity building intervention will be very different from one in a more open environment. For example, where there is freedom of information it will be easier to undertake evidence-based advocacy than where there is restricted access to information. These issues must be mapped and understood and the capacity building intervention tailored to the specific environment.

Perhaps an 'ideal' approach is to work on both sides of the equation; focusing on the advocacy capacity of communities and the organisations representing them, whilst also supporting the capacity of the advocacy targets – local state officials, civil servants, parliamentarians - to respond meaningfully. The SAVI article later in this issue describes an innovative approach to working at both these levels in Nigeria.

What does increased advocacy capacity look like?

Capacity building interventions for advocacy rely on the capacity building provider having a clear idea of what increased capacity will look like. Ideally, enhanced capacity will lead to advocacy effectiveness.

But what is advocacy effectiveness? The different aspects of advocacy success are not always clear and often contested. For example, if a policy was changed as a result of a campaign, was it changed in the way that CSOs hoped? Is the change radical enough and will the changes be implemented on the ground for the advantage of beneficiaries? What some might see as a principled compromise, others might regard as a shameful sell-out.

Additionally, in what timescale do we measure success? What looks at one point like a victory can rapidly take on a different appearance when politics shift.

When the outcomes are so contested it may seem almost impossible to try to assess capacity development. Although current practice seems to be very weak it can be done. If a clear and plausible route map – or 'theory of change' – is laid out when designing capacity building, one which anticipates what steps will be taken, there can be a reasonable prospect of assessing the effectiveness of an intervention.

A critical time

Increasing numbers of former service delivery CSOs are venturing into advocacy work either at their own will or that of their donors. Now is a critical time to be thinking about how to ensure advocacy capacity building interventions are effective and meaningful. We must look beyond individuals and see capacity as lying across an entire organisation, in CSO networks and the external environment. Although these ideas are not that new, they seem to be new in the area of advocacy capacity building.

Three aspects of advocacy capacity interventions need to be considered and planned in particular; one of capacity building at different levels, one of ensuring that there is a clear picture of advocacy effectiveness in different contexts, and one of advocacy impact i.e. the positive changes in the lives of beneficiaries. Most importantly, for a capacity building intervention to be effective, civil society support organisations must be aware of the complex nature of advocacy and base their capacity building strategies on a clear understanding of the advocacy context.

Chris Stalker
Independent Consultant
campaign4impact@yahoo.com
campaign4impact.org

With Rachel Smith and Dale Sandberg, INTRAC; and Jim Coe, Independent Consultant

Capacity building for people-centred advocacy

The need for people-centred advocacy

How does one bring about social change? The obvious answer is: ideally through non-violent mass-based movements, mobilised through an organisation that ensures that collective wisdom is employed in goal setting, strategising and sustaining the movement.

The problem in reality is that mass-based movements are rare, and mass movements which can actually bring about changes are even rarer. Many factors other than people's consciousness go into the making of the movement, and it is rare that all factors come together to capture people's imagination on a large scale and for a long time. They could maybe happen once in a lifetime, but meanwhile, the desire for change has to be fostered, day-to-day battles have to be fought and the human spirit kept in a state of readiness; for which advocacy is the only means available.

Advocacy, by its very definition, is done on the behalf of someone else. This captures the essential problem that remains: the 'us and them' paradigm. Why is it always 'us' having to do something for 'them', or 'us' not doing enough for 'them'? This question demands constant attention, particularly given the class and power dynamics that most of us development professionals work within.

In this context, the idea of people-centred advocacy seems an attractive and meaningful solution. 'People-centredness' is a value, a process and a design which has a built-in redundancy for its practitioners. It seeks to build capacities of people, making them their own advocates.

The Community Learning Movement

One of the ways in which the National Centre for Advocacy Studies (NCAS) in India tries to realise people-centred advocacy is through its efforts in the Community Learning Movement (CLM). CLM is as a process where critical information is transferred directly to people to enable them to claim their due rights and to seek accountability from institutions of governance.

The concept and practice of CLM has evolved through the years, but its essential features have been: direct participation of people, a collaborative grassroots organisation, a resource person well versed with local conditions, and NCAS support. This is not conceptual or theoretical exchange, but one of immediate and practical consequence to the participant's life – access to, and understanding of, the various provisions made by the government for them. Is basic design is 'learning by doing and doing by learning', which means that each workshop is focused on what learning can be applied immediately by the people and the experience of it brought to the next workshop.

A detailed plan of action is prepared for a period of 18 months, two-day residential capacity building workshops are facilitated needs-based material is produced and circulated, and the community learning procedures in villages and the work done between the workshops is followed up. Such procedures are similar to any good capacity building training, the difference lies in the power of training which demystifies information and puts it in the hands of the people for immediate application.

The best-case scenario is a group of people accustomed to coming together for mutual help, an organisation involved in rights-based work mindful of the fact that their constituency will be launched on the path of self dependence, and a resource person who, in addition to being well versed with the information people want and need to know, believes in people and their potential.

Learning from experiences of CLM

In many settings the results have been a sparkling and definite success. NCAS is rightfully proud to have been part of such CLMs where many villages have been rejuvenated by the energy of people willing to take their lives in their own hands, and achieving a fair measure of change. A field activist in Karnatka working for better implementation of an Employment Guarantee Scheme said: '*... for the first time the rural elite saw landless labourers – mostly women – all from lower castes unitedly approaching the Gram Panchayat (mandatory village assembly) and demanding, yes, demanding that they need to be provided employment within 15 days…*'

© 2010 Mr. Balram Khandare

NCAS workshop with staff from SETU, based in Kushtia, Pakistan

Even where the CLMs have not taken off to this degree due to lack of a good resource person, or problems of understanding on the part of the organisation, or a lack of adequate ground work by NCAS, there has been a considerable 'positive fallout' and the idea has caught on even if the specific programme failed. Individuals have immediately put knowledge to use and have been especially quick to realise the radical potential of the Right to Information (RTI) Act. In one case two young men who had only attended a couple of workshops managed to get the sanctioned scholarships for children in their village by filing an application under the Act and presenting the officers with the information.

CLM participants also use available structures facilitating any coming together of people for other purposes, such as microcredit groups, as mechanisms to transfer the learning to others. It is interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of people willing to spare time and meet travel costs to attend these workshops, are women.

Overall, one lesson that NCAS can share from the CLM is that 'people-centred' capacity building efforts – which respond to well-understood needs at the grassroots – are far more satisfying and some of the gains more immediate, than 'them and us' forms of advocacy.

Sehjo Singh
Director of the National Centre for Advocacy Studies, India
www.ncasindia.org

Striking oil – blessing or curse? Lessons from extractive industry advocacy[1]

An oil discovery is often seen as a blessing – a chance for developing countries to leap forward to the benefit of all their citizens. But sadly, this is rarely the case. Commentators such as Paul Collier argue that abundant natural resources like oil can in fact be a major impediment to development. They often act as a 'trap', which stifles other economic activity and leads to bad governance, coups and conflict.

But is this depressing scenario avoidable? What role can civil society play to produce different outcomes?

Publish What You Pay (PWYP) is a coalition which seeks to address such issues by helping citizens to hold their governments to account. In 2008-09, PWYP Norway worked with 27 civil society participants from seven African countries on a capacity building programme to:

- Link with professional experts on the issues, developing technical knowledge of the oil sector
- Strengthen advocacy skills
- Provide an opportunity to exchange knowledge, experiences and tools.

This article summarises the main lessons learnt from this experience.

1. Accessing information

Solid, credible data is needed for civil society to develop strong proposals for managing oil resources in a better manner. The stakes are high and if 'opponents' identify an error, they can use it to undermine the overall case.

It is usually more productive to target governments rather than the oil companies for information. Oil companies generally regard themselves as accountable principally to their shareholders, while governments are at least theoretically accountable to their citizens.

Another approach is to work with parliamentarians and build their capacity to access information, using their formal powers of scrutiny of government. Developing informal one-to-one relationships with government officials can uncover information via the 'back door'.

© 2004 Ossai Chuks, Courtesy of Photoshare

Oil producing area of River State, Nigeria, where the indigenous population was forced to migrate due to health problems caused by flood water contaminated by oil spills.

Where there is a serious lack of transparency, one tactic is to tease information from the government by publicising what is *thought* to be the state of play. If the government claims it is wrong, civil society organisations (CSOs) can ask for the right information, which is then harder to withhold.

2. Raising public awareness

Governments find it difficult to ignore mass movements involving their own populations. A shift in public opinion can affect public support for the government and swing votes at elections. A challenge here is that extractive industry issues are often very technical, both for CSOs and even more so for the public.

Starting from people's own experiences provides a strong entry point. This is harder to do before production has begun, but becomes powerful once local people start to experience the effects of oil extraction.

In contexts where people are used to listening respectfully to their 'seniors', town hall-style meetings can help to stimulate debate and raise awareness of extractive industry issues.

3. Community involvement

Once a local community is aware of the issue and ready to undertake action, it needs support and guidance on how best to influence the management of the oil sector.

Those targeted by advocacy campaigns may raise questions about the legitimacy of civil society actors and who they represent. To counteract this, mass mobilisation events (e.g. concerts with famous stars etc), demonstrate that there is a strong constituency behind a campaign.

4. Influencing governments

There is the understandable tendency on the part of civil society to treat the government as 'the enemy'. However, more can sometimes be achieved by developing relations with sympathetic officials and politicians.

Carefully planning meetings with government officials can bring better results:

- Include both more conciliatory members and more challenging members in a civil society delegation ('good cop – bad cop').
- Acknowledge what the government is saying and not just launch into the civil society position.
- Frame arguments in similar language to that used by the government.
- Present the case with financial information on how much authorities are losing through lost royalties and tax revenues.
- Submit alternative proposals from civil society indicating how the government will benefit.
- Always end a meeting with a clear follow-up agreed.

1 This article is based on 'Praxis Note 52 – Striking Oil: Blessing or Curse? Supporting civil society advocacy to ensure that the benefits are shared', available to download at: www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=684

5. Capacity development

The recruitment of the participants deliberately included a mix of trade unionists, journalists, NGOs, and gender/women's rights organisations. While having an interest in the same issue, many had not previously collaborated. Through the programme, diverse coalitions developed at the country level and a regional network was established, based on a recognition of the added value of combining their differing approaches and skills.

The range of countries selected also enabled the exchange of experiences across Africa. Some of the participating countries (Nigeria, Mauritania) have been producing oil for many years, while others are about to start production (Uganda) and yet others are at the incipient stage of issuing licences to prospecting companies (Zambia, Mozambique).

Participants particularly benefited from tools to negotiate the technical aspects of fiscal and financial analysis. The gaps of several months between each of the programme's three modules allowed scope for implementation and reflection on experience gained.

Conclusion

Most of this does not apply exclusively to the issue of advocacy on oil, or even the extractive industries more broadly. As such, these practitioner reflections are to a large extent reaffirming what has already been discovered.

Better results can be achieved through reflecting on and applying these lessons learnt such as: the importance of a strong information base, communicating information clearly at the local level to create engagement; willingness to enter into dialogue with government from a clear stance, and learning from peers in a long-term capacity building programme.

Rod MacLeod
Programmes and Research Director, INTRAC
rmacleod@intrac.org

Leveraging change – what new skills do INGOs need to effectively support national advocacy?

In 2007-09, Oxfam GB implemented a strategic planning process across the organisation. Each country office produced a 'National Change Strategy' that looked at the question, 'How does change happen in this context and how can Oxfam best contribute to it?'. This led to a greater emphasis on integrating advocacy into programming at a country level, demanding new types of skills of staff.

Strategising with a focus on progressive change

For over a decade Oxfam GB has been evolving ideas about programming with a focus on social change. The organisation's mission is not just to alleviate poverty, but to eliminate it, by contributing to change that tackles its underlying causes. Country teams have tried to move away from the 'project behind every bush' approach, to build programmes which include portfolios of projects that are complementary, mutually reinforcing, and aim to make a lasting difference to poor people.

The strategy exercise undertaken by Oxfam GB in 2007 built on this thinking as well as being influenced by others in the sector[1]. It focussed on trying to understand better how changes happen at a national level. Oxfam is known for its global level advocacy and campaigning work, such as on trade. This remains important, however, many changes that have the most direct impact on poor people take place at a national level and are led by national actors. The exercise encouraged reflection on what appropriate contribution Oxfam GB could make to those changes and tried to identify how best to focus that small contribution in a way that would have the biggest effect.

Strategising through the lens of thinking about how progressive change can happen is different from traditional strategic planning. It requires a more dynamic vision of the context; an understanding of what is emerging and changing and what the alignment of forces is that can help or hinder positive change for poor or marginalised people. This incorporates elements that are more akin to advocacy and campaign planning.

A camera crew in Vietnam prepares a scene for an entertainment education film.

Results

As with many strategic planning exercises, the process itself was often more important than the documents produced,. Getting teams to talk to people outside the organisation, to talk to each other and to challenge their assumptions was crucial. Just asking good questions, in this case, 'how could change happen here?' was a powerful – in some cases transformative – springboard to new ideas and forms of programming.

Focusing on change led to a greater integration of advocacy work into programming at a country level and an effort to try to articulate more clearly Oxfam's role in change. There is no 'one size fits all' that this has produced, but it is possible to see some interesting shifts and examples. These include:

- Reducing programme size on the ground but investing more in strategies for using programme evidence to support influencing work within a sector or issue. In Vietnam, this model of change was summed up in the phrase, 'innovate, advocate, replicate'.

1 DFID drivers of change studies, recent developments in power analysis and political economy approaches all look at similar issues.

- Greater focus on work on the interface between civil society and the state. For example, in Russia support to partner organisations to get their voice heard by government in the right places and in the right way, helped to remove the requirement that people with disabilities had to register annually, greatly improving registration and many vulnerable peoples' access to key health services.
- Emphasis on working in alliances and coalitions for change, including more openness to non-traditional partners. For example, in Malawi, Oxfam provided skills and support to partners in an innovative and high profile national level campaign in the lead up to the 2009 elections, called '50/50', which aimed to get more women candidates in parliament.

Demand for new staff skills

New types of programming have been stretching the types of skills that country teams and programme staff need.

Political literacy and understanding of power

Key to an analysis of change is knowledge of the context. Often INGOs are focused on more formal aspects of policy making and institutions rather than understanding more subtle uses of *hidden* or *invisible*[3] power that control agendas or shape meaning. National staff can play an important role improving analysis of power dynamics and identifying emerging opportunities.

From project implementer to facilitator and coalition builder

Integrating advocacy approaches requires staff to develop skills beyond those of traditional project management and monitoring. This may include recognised advocacy skills such as lobbying and campaigning, but equally as programmes look to bring alliances and coalitions together, staff need 'soft' skills such as facilitation, diplomacy, the ability to manage conflict, and the ability to build consensus.

For example, in Colombia, Oxfam helped coalitions of partners and producer organisations to influence the Food Supply Plan for Bogota, allowing a much greater role for small producers. Given the lack of experience of producer movements and local authorities working together, Oxfam played an important role in helping to open doors and encourage actors to come together. This required a delicate balancing act. Staff needed the skills and sensitivity to do this in a way which was supportive of local actors rather than taking over their space and leadership

Building capacity

How then to build the capacity of staff and teams? The following are some of the strategies that Oxfam has been using.

- **Recruitment** – explicitly investing in a higher number of staff with advocacy skills. These ranged from generic advocacy officers supporting a whole country programme, to research and policy staff working within a programme on specific issues.
- **Training** – formal training and increased access to online resources.
- **Mentoring and accompaniment** – more than training, Oxfam has tried to encourage mentoring and accompaniment, in particular between staff in the central campaigns team and specific country programmes, as well as country and programme exchanges.
- **Financing** – investing more in advocacy activities and structuring budgets in a way that enables programmes to take advantage of emerging opportunities.
- **Team development** – while it is important to build individual skills it is also important to try to encourage teams to collectively scan, read and reflect on their context.

Clare Moberly
Consultancies and Training Director, INTRAC
cmoberly@intrac.org

2 These terms are explored in *Making Change Happen: Power: Concepts for Revisioning Power for Justice, Equality and Peace.* Just Associates (2006) www.justassociates.org, Also available at the IDS-developed www.powercube.net

Strengthening citizens' v

It is a familiar scenario. Even when advocacy programmes have all the hallmarks of success, they can be ineffective if those targeted are not capable of responding positively. Recognising this, in Nigeria, DFID's 'State Accountability and Voice Initiative' (SAVI) is designed to work with both civil society and Government at the same time to strengthen both the 'demand side' and the 'supply side' simultaneously.

What is SAVI?

Change in Nigeria is driven by forces working at both civil society and State Government levels. SAVI is one part of a much bigger programme of DFID support in Nigeria. It aims, through building the capacity of issue-based advocacy partnerships, to promote more efficient and effective use of resources to achieve the MDGs.

It does this by facilitating and mentoring 'advocacy partnerships' which, centred around specific issues, seek to enable citizens' voice (demand) to influence State Government decision-making, and to enhance accountability between those in authority and citizens (supply). Crucially, this involves promoting relationships between civil society organisations, the media, and the State Houses of Assembly.

SAVI is a six-year project, established in November 2008, which currently works across five states of Nigeria: Jigawa, Kano, Kaduna, Enugu and Lagos. These states are perceived as having the political will to reform and the potential for opportunities to promote sustainable systems of good governance. In SAVI's first phase, a political economy analysis was carried out to identify key issues that informed programme development across these five DFID focus states.

Effective advocacy on the supply and demand sides

INTRAC has been working to provide support to SAVI, in particular in the formation and development of advocacy partnerships. What are the insights about effective advocacy that shape these partnerships? SAVI describes effective advocacy to be:

s' voice and State government accountability in Nigeria

1. **Issue-based** – dealing with a tangible problem that people can understand, relate to and sympathise with
2. **Have traction** – building on issues already recognised as a high priority by both civil society and State Government
3. **Evidence-based** – trustworthy, well-analysed
4. **Strategically planned** – well targeted, timed and presented through the most appropriate media
5. **In partnership** – bringing together key players from civil society, media and within State Government, who are concerned about the issue, to form alliances to plan, resource and tackle the issue together
6. **Civilised** – aimed at bringing about constructive dialogue with State Governments, i.e.: demanding rights through negotiation rather than hostility
7. **Replicable** – using what's available on the ground, building and strengthening it to leave lasting foundations that others can learn from and apply to other issues, and supporting the strengthening of institutional memory

A core recognition of the work is that no matter how good advocacy 'demand' is, capacity to respond to this demand is necessary if change is to happen. Therefore, whilst SAVI is working with civil society and State Houses of Assembly to strengthen the effectiveness of the demand side, other DFID State Level Programmes (SLPs) are working directly with Government Ministries to strengthen the supply side to better respond to citizens' demands and needs. The State Level Programmes include: to support governance initiatives to help States function more effectively (SPARC); education (ESSPIN), health (PATHS2), and to support the creation of economic growth (GEMS).

How do SAVI and the SLPs relate?

Each of the SLPs has its own output on 'Voice and Accountability'. Since SAVI and SLPs are engaging with many of the same actors in the states, this framework was developed to put those actors and their relationship to each other at the centre of this framework – not SAVI. What emerged was a structure for exploring and jointly supporting the process of 'participatory governance' for improved service delivery.

© 2008 James Falaiye, Courtesy of Photoshare

A local government council brings community members together to develop a local economic empowerment and development strategy in Nigeria.

The importance of participation and context

Those taking part in SAVI advocacy partnerships comment favourably on the way their experience with SAVI differs from previous experience of working with international donors. Much of the secret of SAVI's success to date, also noted in DFID reviews, relates to **how** it works. Previous experience has shown that placing themselves at the centre of the process would lead to unrealistic expectations of impact.

Instead, each of the SAVI State Teams is supported by national and international technical assistance to develop plans and logframes in a participatory way. This approach has promoted widespread ownership and understanding, in particular of gender equality and social inclusion. The approach is underpinned by a strong understanding that context matters. Each SAVI state faces diverse opportunities and constraints regarding voice and accountability and each State Team has developed its own logframe together with appropriate milestones relating to their own situation.

As SAVI's approach focuses firstly on building partnerships and carrying out participatory situational analyses, before advocacy action is discussed, some can find SAVI's methods slow and confusing. For some, SAVI's methods may involve un-learning a set of expectations on how donor projects usually function. This has required a leap in faith from both SAVI staff and others involved in advocacy partnerships, but, in particular, the centrality of mentoring and facilitation in SAVI's approach to the advocacy partnerships have shown promising results

SAVI believes that the emphasis on strengthening both sides of the advocacy equation, forming partnerships between different actors and emphasising participatory methods, leads to a stronger voice on the demand side, increased accountability on the supply side and a growing sense by both sides of the mutual benefits the approach brings.

Jan Knight
INTRAC Consultant and SAVI International Technical Adviser – Capacity Building Adviser
jknight@intrac.org

INTRAC training

For more information on these courses, to apply online, and to read details of all our training courses for 2010-11, visit **www.intrac.org/pages/en/training.html**

Advanced Partner Capacity Building

31 January – 4 February 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

The need to effectively support the capacity development of a range of different types of partners means tailoring capacity building initiatives to their specific needs. This advanced level course is for individuals who already have experience in the design or implementation of capacity building initiatives, and will focus on the challenge of effectively responding to diverse capacity building needs. It will explore the methods and challenges of capacity building networks, federative bodies and grass roots community organisations amongst others.

Impact Assessment

23-25 March and 1-3 June 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £550 non-residential/£700 residential

NGOs and civil society organisations are under growing pressure to assess the impact of their development efforts. They need to be able to justify their spending, learn to become more effective and, not least, to be accountable to their stakeholders. This three-day course explores some of the different approaches to impact assessment that can be used by NGOs; the value of planning for impact; and how to build impact assessment into existing structures and systems. It also offers an opportunity to experiment with a number of tools and methods, and with how to use findings for organisational learning.

Advanced Monitoring and Evaluation

14-18 March and 16-20 May 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

This popular course explores M&E in greater depth, building on each individual's understanding and skills of how to develop sustainable and cost effective monitoring and evaluation processes and practices within their own projects, programmes and organisations. It is also relevant for those trying to improve and enhance current M&E processes, or supporting partners to develop and implement effective M&E. The focus is on ensuring M&E contributes towards improving organisational learning and accountability.

Advocacy and Policy Influencing

7-11 February and 6-10 June 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

This course gives participants a thorough understanding of how to influence the policy making process in their own context to achieve policy change. You will learn skills to help you plan and deliver effective advocacy strategies; enhance your ability to lobby decision makers; and gain confidence in the ways in which you relate to different audiences. You will also have a more thorough understanding of power dynamics

Monitoring and Evaluation

9-13 May 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

M&E is an essential component of international NGOs, NGOs and civil society organisations striving to continually improve their work and have greater accountability. This course is designed to develop individual's understanding of what M&E entails, why it is so vital, and, crucially, how to do it well and in a participatory way. The course ensures that those who are new to M&E have a thorough understanding of M&E concepts and have built up the practical skills and the confidence needed to do M&E effectively. Participants will learn to use a range of M&E tools and activities that will help them improve accountability, learning and effectiveness of projects and programmes.

Organisational Development

20-24 June 2011 Location: Oxford
Course fee: £999 non-residential/£1250 residential

The issue of how to develop the capacity of their organisations is high on the agenda for many managers and senior practitioners in civil society organisations. This course is designed for those with some experience of organisational capacity building who wish to use organisational development as a planned learning process aimed at improving organisational performance and self-awareness. The course will provide a range of tools and models for understanding organisations as well as designing and facilitating processes of organisational growth and development.

To receive a printed copy of our open training brochure or to enquire about tailor-made training, contact us at **training@intrac.org** or call **01865 263040**.

ontrac **ISSN 1476-1327**

ONTRAC is the newsletter of INTRAC (the International NGO Training and Research Centre). It is published three times a year. The contents of the newsletter may be freely reproduced and translated, providing the source is acknowledged. INTRAC wishes to thank the NGO Research Programme members for funding ONTRAC: Concern Worldwide, Cordaid, DanChurchAid, Oxfam Novib, Save the Children Denmark, Save the Children Sweden, ICCO, and Trócaire.

To receive a printed copy of ONTRAC, please contact info@intrac.org indicating whether you wish to receive a copy in English or Russian. ONTRAC can also be downloaded at www.intrac.org/pages/en/ontrac.html, where translated versions in Arabic, French, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish, and previous issues, are also available.

INTRAC
Oxbridge Court, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES
T: +44 (0)1865 201851
F: +44 (0)1865 201852
E: info@intrac.org • www.intrac.org

INTRAC is a limited company No. 2663796 and a registered charity No. 1016676