POLICY INFLUENCE PLAN

3ie’s mission is to fund policy-relevant impact evaluations that provide evidence, which may be used to improve policies and practice in international development. Impact evaluations can provide useful guidance to programme implementers and others associated with the intervention on what works and what does not, and why. 3ie therefore expects researchers to develop a policy engagement and communication plan to encourage study ownership by key stakeholders from the very beginning and improve the chances of study findings informing policy and practice.

3ie calls this the policy influence plan (PIP). It comprises of a set of sections and tools that are meant to help researchers think through and outline main contextual factors and plan stakeholder engagement that will facilitate communication of study evidence to identified decision-makers and other policy influencers whom the team sees as playing a role in uptake of the findings. This template allows you to summarise this information, and will be the basis for 3ie monitoring of the progress made on policy engagement plans. **We strongly recommend you write the PIP in close collaboration with the implementing agency.**

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 disbursed. 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.
CONTEXT

Why is context important?

Context influences how research is conducted, as well as the results. It also is a major factor 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 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 make this evaluation 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 civil society/governmental interest in a problem the programme is addressing?

2. What contextual factors 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 in the ecosystem 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. 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 contextual 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</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0=none, 1=some; 2=likely to control it</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 them in programme planning?

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 within the implementing agency. Other risks could include lack of financial resources to make needed changes; high turnover of key actors needed to support the programme and study, limited staff capacity or buy in from programme staff at all levels and so on.
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.

3ie expects researchers to work closely with the implementing agency, which is the primary audience for the findings and best placed to act on them.

Beyond the implementing agency are key stakeholders at the local, national and global levels who also play important roles in supporting uptake of findings into policy and practice.

Your PIP will benefit from taking into account this expanded range of key stakeholders. 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.

Access and interest alignment matrix
For each of the stakeholders listed above, please provide the requested information in the table below, adding rows where required.

Note:
1. Please provide English equivalent of foreign names, where possible
2. When providing stakeholder name, request you to please spell it out and not abbreviate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder name</th>
<th>Why is this stakeholder important?</th>
<th>Explain your reasons for stakeholders high interest in research question and your high access to them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder name</td>
<td>Why is this stakeholder important?</td>
<td>Will you be working to get them interested in research questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low interest high access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder name</td>
<td>Why is this stakeholder important?</td>
<td>Will you work to increase your access to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High interest Low access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder name</td>
<td>Why is this stakeholder important?</td>
<td>If you will be working to get them interested in research questions, please explain how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low interest Low access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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