

Advocacy and Influencing Impact Reporting Tool

This tool has been developed to gather further information and evidence on CARE’s advocacy or influencing win. At CARE, advocacy is defined as “*the deliberate process of influencing those who make decisions about developing, changing and implementing policies to reduce poverty and achieve social justice.*”¹ Influencing and advocacy can go beyond government policies, it can include influencing governments, donors or NGOs to adopt a CARE program model or influencing the private sector to change their company policies or operating practices.

This tool captures the significance of the win, the level of CARE and our partner’s contribution, who stands to benefit from the change, and what evidence do we have to support a claim of change or impact. With the wide range of successes within influencing work and the various roles CARE may have played in this win, this tool allows us to identify how significant the win is as well as the significance of CARE’s contribution and our partners.

Success:	
<p>1. What is the advocacy or influencing win? Include details such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the win, and how it was achieved • start date and end date • any incremental wins that happened along the way • the main decision makers that CARE influenced to achieve this win <p>2. Why is this advocacy or influencing win significant? What was the reality prior to the advocacy/influencing win that the win aims to address?</p> <p>3. If this win is part of a larger advocacy or long-term program goal, please describe the larger advocacy/influencing goal?</p>	<p><i>Advocating for a dedicated humanitarian funding pool in Canada (Nov 2015 – Jun 2018)</i></p> <p><i>After years of targeted advocacy (beginning with the swearing in of PM J. Trudeau’s Cabinet in Nov 2015) and working alongside partners in Canadian civil society, the Government of Canada, in its 2018 federal budget (Feb 2018), announced that ““The Government will create a dedicated pool of funding for humanitarian assistance, and a separate dedicated pool of funding for core development assistance.”</i></p> <p><i>This win is extremely significant. As global poverty and the ODA to address it continues to shift towards emergency contexts, Canada’s response to humanitarian disasters is an area of growing importance. This is evidenced by the fact that, as a proportion of Sector-Allocated ODA, humanitarian assistance increased from 9% in 2005, to 12% in 2010/11, to 17% in 2015/16, with a high of 21% in 2013/14. Canadian humanitarian assistance reached \$812 mn in 2013-14 and \$738 million in 2015/16. However, the baseline funding budgeted for humanitarian assistance had remained virtually stagnant at just over \$300 mn per year. The difference between allocated humanitarian funding and actual spending, therefore, was bridged through intradepartmental transfers. This had the effect of reducing the amount of funding going to other programming areas, thereby compromising the timeliness of humanitarian funding for emergencies, and eroding predictability of funding for upholding development priorities.</i></p> <p><i>In order to ensure that Canada is better prepared to respond to needs in emergencies, while also persisting in its other development priorities, CARE Canada worked with other Canadian civil society partners to encourage the Government of Canada to establish budgetary mechanisms that would ensure that humanitarian allocations are predictable and commensurate with actual humanitarian spending.</i></p>
Contribution:	
<p>4. On a scale from high, medium, or low, how would you rate CARE’s contribution to the advocacy/influencing win? (please refer to the scale below the table)</p> <p>5. Describe CARE’s contribution, specify CARE’s unique role as well as the role of other main actors including partner organizations and coalitions.</p>	<p><i>Medium.</i></p> <p><i>CARE is recognized as a leading humanitarian INGO in Canada, and has contributed substantial expertise and human resources towards efforts to secure this advocacy win. For example: CARE Canada articulated the dedicated humanitarian funding ask prominently in our submission into the consultations around the creation of</i></p>

¹ See CARE International Advocacy Handbook for more information

<p>6. What evidence is there that supports our claim to have contributed to this win?</p>	<p><i>Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy; CARE Canada has supported the articulation of this recommendation and supporting rationale in its own advocacy around Federal Budget processes, as well as in the budget submissions of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation; CARE Canada has consistently led efforts among civil society peers to underscore the importance of predictable, needs-based humanitarian funding through meetings with Global Affairs Canada, Finance Canada and political staff. Minutes after the release of Federal Budget 2018, staff from the office of the Minister of International Development called CARE Canada's Advocacy and Government Relations advisor to thank CARE Canada for its role in securing this win. Given that most activities undertaken towards the achievement of this advocacy win were undertaken with fellow Canadian humanitarian organizations, CARE Canada's contribution is rated a "Medium: There is reason to believe CARE contributed substantially, but along with other partners."</i></p>
<p>Potential Impact/Reach:</p>	
<p>7. What is the impact population that is expected to benefit from the advocacy/influencing win? Describe how the win will translate into a better life for these participants?</p> <p>8. If the change we have influenced is fully implemented, can you quantify the number of lives that could potentially be reached by this advocacy win? <i>Please explain how you calculated this number.</i></p>	<p><i>This win has the potential to impact the speed and predictability with which Canadian humanitarian assistance is delivered, as well as the consistency of Canadian funding for its longer-term development priorities. As a result, it will have implications for humanitarian and development organizations receiving Canadian funding, and their beneficiaries.</i></p>
<p>Actual Impact/Reach:</p>	
<p>9. Do we have any evidence to date that these expected outcomes have been achieved? If so, please describe how the win has translated into a better life for the impact population.</p> <p>10. Can you quantify the number of lives that have been improved? <i>Please explain how you calculated this number.</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Reflection and Learning:</p>	
<p>11. What were the main challenges you faced, and were they overcome? If so, how?</p> <p>12. What influencing tactics were particularly effective/ineffective?</p> <p>13. What would you do differently next time?</p> <p>14. What are the next steps or follow-up actions for this advocacy/influencing win?</p>	<p><i>This win is an example of the important role CARE Canada can play as a consistent source of expertise within the INGO sector in Canada, the importance of branching out to other departments and ministerial offices, as well as the luck that comes with timing and changing government priorities - which we cannot control. After years of advocacy work on this ask, CARE Canada seized the opportunity presented by a new Liberal Government whose promises included a focus on deliverology and fixing government systems that often created inefficiencies by working at loggerheads with one another. This win can be attributed to a confluence of initiatives and efforts, including: Our leadership in the development of a joint civil society paper on the importance of predictable, multi-year funding; our strong advocacy efforts around the humanitarian tranche of the Feminist International Assistance Policy consultations; our convening and coordination of meetings dedicated to discussing this issue with officials and political staff at Global Affairs and Finance Canada; our repeated highlighting of the importance of dedicated humanitarian funding at relevant events and panels, and in context-specific meetings with officials, political staff and Ministers; and our instigation or support of letters to relevant ministers on this topic. Next steps and follow-up actions will involve working with partners to</i></p>

	<i>that the dedicated humanitarian funding pool is (a) not allowed to become static, but rather to ebb and flow to correspond with humanitarian need, and (b) does not become an obstacle to more integrated humanitarian and development programming in-line with the NWOW and Grand Bargain commitments.</i>
--	--

Rating scale²:

High: There is reason (evidence) to believe that the change would not have happened without CARE's efforts. This could also include significant actions from partners which we support technically or financially.

Medium: There is reason to believe CARE contributed substantially, but along with other partners

Low: CARE was one of a number of actors that contributed, but this change may have happened regardless of CARE's involvement

² This rating scale has been used by Save the Children to measure contribution in advocacy work