POLICY INFLUENCE PLAN

3ie’s mission is to fund policy-relevant impact evaluations that can produce evidence that can improve policies and practice in international development. Individual impact evaluations will have the most policy relevance in informing decision-makers directly responsible for them and other actors who can gain from more and better evidence about what is working or not. 3ie also wishes to improve policy relevance by funding studies that go beyond whether it works and include how and why it is working or not. The relevance of any findings depends on whether or not they are taken up and used. That is why 3ie asks all of its grantees to develop, from the beginning, a policy engagement and communication plan for how the team will be promoting uptake of study information and findings into policy and practice.

3ie calls this the policy influence plan (PIP). It is composed of a set of sections and tools that are meant to help teams think through and outline main contextual considerations, stakeholders and means of engaging that support communicating study evidence to identified decision-makers and other policy influencers whom the team sees as playing a role in promoting uptake of the findings. This template allows you to summarise this information, which will be the basis for 3ie monitoring and understanding your progress reporting on your policy-related activities.

Please indicate the following information:

1. Name of the focal point for the PIP in the evaluation team:
2. Email and Skype contact information:
3. Total budget being allocated for the activities described in this PIP:

A completed PIP must approved by 3ie before the first tranche payment is approved. For each reporting cycle, grantees are requested to report on their policy influence activities (as per the guidelines in Annex 2). Like any work plan, this is a living document and an active strategy. Policy context is dynamic and opportunities for engagement emerge all the time, therefore, the strategy will need to be fine-tuned or revised throughout the implementation of the evaluation.
Why is context so important?

Context influences how research is conducted, as well as the results. It also is a major influence on any change or not in policy and practice. Often the most influential of factors is the political context, which includes the formal political system and the politics and formal and informal political processes of the institutions involved the research. Political context also includes the role of political influencers, including donors and multilateral actors. Another dimension of context is the role of actors, including the interests, values and beliefs of key stakeholders. The power they hold or do not hold, formally or informally, is very important to capture and understand. The role of knowledge (evidence), including the incentives or barriers to using evidence, is a third important context to understand. Finally, understanding the role of knowledge intermediaries or brokers in translating and promoting evidence is also important.


Keeping in mind the four aspects of context outlined above, please explore the opportunities and constraints your context presents.

1. What opportunities does the context present, which makes this evaluation research and the issues it seeks to address timely and relevant? For example, is there an election coming up where the issues are being discussed? Is there public interest in a problem the programme is addressing?

2. What context factors that present a high risk of hindering policy or practice change in line with the study findings?
**RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

Certain contextual factors present risks that, if not adequately recognised and mitigated, could hamper or even derail uptake of study findings. Examples include opposition from actors who are against implementation or success of the programme being evaluated; upcoming elections that prevent actor from taking positions or actions needed to support policy change; a lack of financial resources to make needed changes; high turnover of key actors needed to support the programme and study. If a risk is out of your control and it could derail the programme implementation or uptake of findings, it is very important to recognise them explicitly. Reliance on only one key stakeholder with the power to determine what happens to your findings is also very high risk.

Likewise, there can be particular opportunities that can be exploited that can enhance the chances that the study will be effectively implemented and findings used.

Please identify context factors that present a high risk of hindering policy change in line with the study findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Degree of control 0=none, 1=some; 2=likely to control it</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Actions to exploit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IN-COUNTRY PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION PARTNER**

Based on your interaction with the in-country programme implementation partner during the proposal preparation grant stage, what makes you confident that the study will be useful to your implementation partner?

Of the assumptions underlying the programme theory of change, please identify those related to policy change which are required for successful uptake of the findings, and which are at medium-to-high-risk of not holding good.

---

**NOTE**
The questions in this section are with particular reference to the implementing agency on the ground.

**GUIDANCE**
In responding to this please articulate how you feel the study question will be helpful to in-country programme implementation partner in making decisions about programme design based on the resources available to them.

**GUIDANCE**
While responding to this question you are encouraged to refer back to the theory of change as presented in the accepted proposal, noting especially programme roll out related assumptions that rest on adequate buy in from key stakeholders.
**STAKEHOLDER MAPPING**

Please identify and list key individuals and/or groups that will be essential to engage with, as well as those that may hinder your policy influencing efforts. We recommend that the team engages with stakeholders throughout the evaluation.

The agriculture innovations grants are new and unique in 3ie in that they ask teams to work closely with the implementing agency, which is the primary audience for the findings and best placed to act on them. Further, these grants have the active support and engagement of the donors, IFAD and AGRA, who also play important roles in supporting uptake of findings into policy and practice, especially at national, regional and global levels. Your PIP will benefit from taking into account this expanded range of key stakeholders at the local, national and global levels.

It would be helpful to further segment these into those you have access to and those, while being key, are outside your circle of influence or direct engagement.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest in the research question</th>
<th>Will you be working to shift their position?</th>
<th>Study team’s access to the stakeholder</th>
<th>Will you work to increase your access to them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5 (0=No interest, 1=Low interest and 5=High interest)</td>
<td>(Y/N)</td>
<td>0 to 5 (0=No access, 1=Low access and 5=High access)</td>
<td>(Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the stakeholders listed above, the ones you consider most important to your policy influence plans, please plot them in the quadrant below using the following instructions:

1. Who has the power to decide? Put them in the centre
2. Who are the less powerful players that influence decision-maker? Write their names in the appropriate category
3. Who of these have the most influence? (circle them)

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Please provide a detailed plan for engaging relevant stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. You will be requested to report progress on those activities and provide supporting documents including list of participants, key takeaways or follow-up plans from meetings, presentations, blogs, articles, policy briefs, memos and other related knowledge products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key milestones</th>
<th>Why-Objectives of the engagement</th>
<th>Who-Stakeholders</th>
<th>How-Channels</th>
<th>By whom-Focal Point</th>
<th>Estimated total cost for the identified activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Specify approximate timelines within each evaluation stages. These should be aligned to your Deliverable and Disbursement (D&D) schedule. Tranche numbers are only indicative. Your project may have less or more than 5 tranches depending upon the study duration | *Please summarise here why you are engaging with the identified stakeholders? e.g. awareness raising, updating on study progress, earning a buy-in from sceptics, sharing preliminary results or disseminating final results. | * Of the stakeholders identified above, please specify which ones you would engage with at what stage of the project | *Specify the channels used for each stakeholder or group of stakeholders (an indicative list is provided below):  
- Meetings  
- Design/ Training/ Dissemination workshop  
- Participation in online forums/ working groups  
- Media interviews/briefings/opinion pieces/ social media/ blogging  
- Presentation at conferences  
- Study outputs such as briefing notes and videos | *Name the people from the team who will bill time for the activity |

Tranche 2

Tranche 3

Tranche 4

Final Tranche
EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Do you have a systematic approach to monitor whether your policy influence strategy is on track and you are progressing towards your policy objectives? What tools will you use to systematically collect this information? Please note you will be requested to report on 3ie indicators appended to the document.
Checklist: 3ie Indicators for Policy Influence Monitoring

3ie recommends that all studies track the following output, uptake and impact level indicators:

**Output / Intermediate indicators:**
- # of meetings to discuss evaluation or building policy relevant relationships
- # of events at which material related to study presented
- # of participants in those events (estimate)
- # of participants who are policymakers (estimate)
- # media clippings
- # knowledge products (e.g. policy notes, briefs, memo, articles, working papers)
- # specific evidence based policy recommendations in the study

**Uptake indicators:**
- # of stakeholders and policymakers present at the launch/dissemination workshop
- Feedback from policymakers on the study findings
- # articles/study and policy brief downloads
- # policymakers invitations to present the findings
- # citation in government/donor agency strategy documents
- If the study was posted on the IA website
- # websites where study was posted

**Impact indicators:**
- Changes in programme policy, design, practice or budget contributed to by the study findings.
- Change in attitudes, e.g. if the IA is planning to commission another IE
- Changes in public discourse on questions addressed by the study