

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:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the advocacy or influencing win? Include details such as: <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 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? 3. If this win is part of a larger advocacy or long-term program goal, please describe the larger advocacy/influencing goal? 	<p><i>This section describes the advocacy success that occurred by providing details that fully describe the significance of the win. Advocacy and influencing successes look different in a variety of contexts. What we hope to capture here are incremental changes, or milestone moments, that will ultimately contribute to the long-term impact goal. The second question identifies which sector the win is associated with and the ultimate goal of the advocacy initiative.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>The EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020 consists of commitments made by the European Commission, European External Action Service and 28 EU Member States on gender in external action.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Going beyond development cooperation, the second Gender Action Plan concerns all EU external actions, including political dialogue. The implementation of this Plan is crucial for the delivery on gender-related Sustainable Development Goals and targets by the EU, as it contains pillars on GBV, WEE and voice, combined with an internal pillar to have an internal cultural shift to deliver. It contains elements related to programme outcome areas, such as on SRMH, GBV, WEE (eg with specific indicator on financial inclusion), climate change, women’s voice, etc. The Monitoring and Evaluation process has been strengthened (compared to the previous action plan). Thanks to CARE’s efforts, as a leading member of CONCORD’s Gender Reference Group, the policy document itself became very rich content-wise, but it also went from being a Commission’s document to being an overall EU action plan adopted by Member States and reported on annually. In addition there have been commitments to increase both gender-sensitive and gender-transformative funding at EC level, combined with top level political commitment, which is driving change. At least for EC departments and EU Delegations, implementation and reporting are mandatory and results are considered important. The Commission does not shy away to name and shame EUD’s and member states who are not doing well to implement the GAP. Capacity has also been freed to train and equip (Via a toolkit) EU Delegations to deliver. Therefore it is much stronger than the first GAP, 2010-2015.</i> • <i>How: together with allies in CONCORD’s gender reference group, and at times the European Women’s Lobby and UN Women, we developed a position, built relationships with</i>

¹ See CARE International Advocacy Handbook for more information

	<p>key stakeholders through-out the process so we could influence in turn the European Commission position, then the Member States position (via Luxemburg, the EU presidency) and the European Parliament. Persistent pressure was kept through-out the process, mostly via private advocacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start date: 2015. End date: for the policy itself 2016, but in practice advocacy on (accountability for impactful) implementation will persist till the end, till 2020. • Incremental wins: when Member States that had to write a new or refresh their own gender strategy, decided to base it on the EU GAP, thereby further multiplying impact (eg Spain, France). • Gender unit in DEVCO, CODEV chair Luxemburg, Chair of development committee in European Parliament, EEAS Gender lead <p>2) The EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020 consists of commitments made by the European Commission, European External Action Service and 28 EU Member States on gender in external action, and therefore it is a key part of the EU's implementation of the gender goal and targets in the SDGs.</p> <p>3) Yes, part of influencing EU implementation of SDGs and it is a top priority, hence will remain advocacy priority till the end of the policy, and into the development of GAP III</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>6. What evidence is there that supports our claim that CARE contributed to this win?</p>	<p>This determines the level of contribution by CARE and partners to the advocacy win, and so whether we can reasonably include this case as a CARE "success". Be sure to include anything that was unique to the role that CARE had. The uniqueness of this contribution will help us understand the how significant the win is, especially when looking at CARE relative to other actors.</p> <p>4) High.</p> <p>5) CONCORD's gender reference group was the main CSO group working on this, the only others being UN Women and the European Women's Lobby. Within that group, CARE EU is one of the 3 most active members (with IPPF and CONCORD Sweden), and the one who represents the group in CONCORD's policy direction committee. Moreover, we are the top NGO recipient of DEVCO funding, and have also leverage that way, which is different than IPPF's SRHR focus and CONCORD Sweden which is not in itself a DEVCO partner.</p> <p>6) In the EU updates, we have described at every step of the process, for each EU institution's position, which of our asks were in and which ones not, and what we had to continue to push. We also have an overall analysis at the end of the process, and of the first implementation report in 2016, updating our asks, and reflecting what this means in relation to CARE's priorities. Part of the success is also getting CONCORD to push for messages that are key to CARE programme outcome areas, as CONCORD activates NGO platforms across Europe, in all 28 Member States and thus far beyond CARE presence countries only.</p>
---	--

Potential Impact/Reach:

<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 determines the target population (women small-holder farmers, domestic workers, etc.) and if we can quantify the impact or outcomes of this advocacy work could potentially have. Due to the nature of advocacy and challenges with policy implementation, it is important to distinguish between potential outcomes and actual outcomes and identify the reasons for the gap between the two. Evidence is likely to rely on secondary quantitative data, but with some validation of this claim.</i></p> <p>7) <i>The impact population is very hard to describe. In principle it's any woman in any country outside the EU that the EU works with, and gives financing to.</i></p> <p>8) <i>No, see answer to question 7. In PIIRS we considered to put the number of beneficiaries of ECHO, DEVCO and NEAR funding, but then this would make our numbers explode, and it does not cover political dialogue nor Member States.</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 to date? <i>Please explain how you calculated this number.</i></p>	<p><i>While the above section identifies the potential reach, this section determines the actual number of people that have been reached for policies or programs that have been partially or fully implemented. Include any human interest stories or other communication pieces that relate to this policy win.</i></p> <p>9. <i>We only have evidence of the first year of implementation, which was more about getting the donors house in order, producing basic gender analysis, and ensuring that new programming and the mid-term review of programming would support these commitments. It also has led to increased coordination. The positive impact so far is a massive increase in gender mainstreaming, from 12% in 2010-2011 to 63% by end 2016 (OECD gender marker 1), which is spectacular.</i></p> <p>10. <i>No.</i></p> <p><i>If no actual impact or reach has been achieved yet, skip this section.</i></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/follow-up for this advocacy win?</p>	<p><i>This ensures that learning from this success can be fed into other work, to improve quality and impact into the future, and serve as powerful evidence for our advocacy & fundraising. Consider both internal and external factors.</i></p> <p><i>Take the time to also consider the necessary next steps and follow up. If there's a lot of work ahead, consider developing an action plan for the coming months with designated roles and responsibilities.</i></p> <p>11+ 14. <i>Challenge is to get Member States on board, particularly those that have their own frameworks. Our approach was that EU member states who had a good own framework should focus on getting that implemented, whereas those with none (eg Spain) or those who needed a new one (eg France) had to align closely with the EU GAP. Another challenge is that we lack evidence of real impact on women's lives on the ground, so with CONCORD we hired a consultant to look into this in 4 countries, to generate further recommendations to increase impact.</i></p> <p>12. <i>Clear and consistent positioning, good allies who all considered this a top priority, and following through at every step of the policy development process, and now the implementation process. It was mostly private advocacy, with occasional public pushes (eg Open letter in media to challenge the EC on the status</i></p>

	<p>of the document), based on messaging developed by NGOs like us, who have interesting perspectives to bring.</p> <p>13. Getting more clarity from member states in advance on how it should look to be interesting for them (but which is a challenge in itself given the huge variety between Member States)</p>
--	---

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