

CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

Guidance: Developing Government-Level Advocacy and Policy Indicators

This resource briefly outlines how to **understand indicators for different policy objectives** such as **policy advocacy** (advocacy for policy enactment or change); **policy monitoring** (monitoring of policy implementation); and **government action on a policy**; and to provide simple **illustrative examples of logframes** using these concepts.

Who should be involved in developing policy and advocacy indicators?

If a project focuses on CTIP policy, there is usually a policy and an advocacy person, specialist, or team (or a team comprising both – in some cases, this all might be one person). Policy indicators should be developed in partnership with the policy / advocacy staff, and a clear understanding of their objectives.

Objectives and indicators

Policy Advocacy Indicators

The aim of the policy team may be to advocate for a new policy or a change in part of the policy. For instance, they may want to ensure the government:

- Passes a certain policy or legislative act,
- Implements a National Action Plan or something similar,
- Institutes a National Referral Mechanism,
- Amends a currently existing policy,
- Develops a specific SOP or MOU,
- And others

All the work that goes into getting the policy passed or changed is the **ACTIVITY OR OUTPUT and needs outputs indicators**.

The policy itself being enacted or changed is an **OUTCOME with an associated outcome indicator**.

Policy Monitoring Indicators

The aim of the policy team may be to understand and track implementation of a policy, i.e., how it is translating to real life settings, for example, a policy passed that criminalizes TIP and allows survivors to take legal action against perpetrators. In this case the team may want to evaluate and monitor if:

- The policy has appropriate mechanisms in place (i.e. if survivors are able file police reports);
- The service(s) outlined in the policy are available (i.e., the police file reports when asked to);
- The services(s) outlined are being accessed (i.e., survivors feel able to active file reports);
- There is sufficient knowledge/capacity to carry out the policy (i.e., police officers are trained and knowledgeable so that reports get filed);
- There is sufficient budget to implement the policy (i.e., police receive salaries and training under the new policy);
- The policy is having intended impacts (i.e., filed cases are reaching criminal courts);
- ... and many more.

In this case, the above are likely to be measured by **OUTCOME indicators**. CSOs are often engaged in ensuring that a policy is working through provision of training, support, and services and measuring the

CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

Government Action Indicators

The objective of the policy and advocacy team may be to monitor government actions on policy. This might be useful if the policy is very new, and consequences of the policy (outcomes) may not be measurable for some time. For example, the government may have recently passed a policy decentralizing power to local governments so that they can form counter trafficking committees (CTCs). These CTCs should meet regularly to identify victims, coordinate reintegration services, and work on prevention. In this case, the policy team may wish to know:

- How regularly the CTC meets;
- Which organisations and how many individuals are attending meetings;
- If they are open to the public or there are meeting notes publicly available,
- If budgets are allocated to CTCs,
- If budgets are dispersed by CTCs and spending is reported,
- The number of community activities planned and organized every quarter,
- If the CTC is creating local referral networks,
- The number of survivors identified by CTCs,
- ... and so on.

In this situation, the creation of the CTCs is not the outcome, but the actions of the CTC are measured by **OUTCOME indicators**.

Examples of Simple Log frames

Log Frame #1 – The aim is to advocate the government to pass legislation

	Intervention/Aim	Indicator
Aim/Goal	Survivors have the right to obtain comprehensive benefits and services that allow for safe and dignified reintegration	
Outcome	The government passes legislation that provides survivors the right to obtain comprehensive benefits and services that allow for safe and dignified reintegration	Y/N The National Survivor Protection Act is passed
Output	Government takes the lead on advocacy objective	# meetings organized by the government on the objective policy in partnership with project
Activity	Evidence is generated to share with relevant government officials	# studies produced and shared with government officials
	Regular advocacy events are held	# advocacy events held
	Advocacy events are well attended	# event attendees by stakeholder type

CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

Log Frame #2 – The aim is to monitor a protection policy

	Intervention/Aim	Indicator
Aim/Goal	Survivors are able to access comprehensive services that are outlined in The National Survivor Act	
Outcome	Survivors have access to comprehensive services	Quality of life index score
Output	Police identify and refer survivors to services	# survivors referred to services by police
Activity	Police can identify victims and refer survivors to services	# police trained on identification and referral
		Y/N Identification guidelines are developed

Log Frame #3 – The aim is to monitor government committees

	Intervention/Aim	Indicator
Aim/Goal	CTCs are actively engaged in ensuring survivors receive needed services and prevention in trafficking.	
Outcome	There is an active local referral system that fits under the NRM	# service provider organizations offering services in community
Output	CTCs receive money from the central government and spend it transparently	# budget reports submitted for public record
Activity	The CTC meets regularly and meetings are well attended	# attendees of quarterly CTC meetings

A. Summary

Policy indicators should be developed with specific aims of the project staff in mind. Is the aim to pass legislation, monitor a policy and its outcomes, or monitor the effectiveness of government entities?

Once the aims of the M&E are clear, it becomes possible to develop a log frame or theory of change that allows measurement of how an organization influenced either the policy or the policy outcomes.

CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

A Note of Caution on Policy Indicators

Often policy indicators essentially count the number of policies, regulations and/or relevant guidelines. For example:

- # of regulations and/or guidelines established for enforcing anti-trafficking law and/or related legislation;
- # of victim identification guidelines established by the government;
- # of anti-TIP policies, laws, or international agreements developed or strengthened.

However, counting the number of policies is not necessarily useful to understand if governments are making progress: Very few policies are passed within the project cycle and attribution/causation is almost impossible to show.

Counter-TIP practitioners typically know the following about these types of indicators:

1. **Time** - Policies take a very long time to pass into law. It may take several years of painstaking advocacy work, just to see a government change and the policy implemented over-night. Alternatively, a change in government can bury progress overnight. It is very rare that more than one policy will pass in a 5-year project cycle.
2. **Attribution** is mostly impossible when it comes to these types of measures. Normally several stakeholders are engaged in advocacy or technical support and it is nearly impossible to say that XYZ NGO or organization caused the policy change.
3. **Number of** – Credit for the policy may be attributed sometimes, for example, if you worked with the government to develop identification guidelines that become part of the formal identification process. However, the aim of the project is probably to implement one set of high-quality, standard guidelines that are used across the country, with the ability to make modifications based on the stakeholder so they are appropriate, and not to make multiple versions of guidelines that do not interconnect.
4. **Strengthened** – Counting “strengthened” policies may also not be useful. Making changes to government practice takes a long time and, if you are a practitioner, you probably know which area of the law you are working to improve and how. Usually this includes an increased budget, improved capacity to deliver the policy, or improved inclusion of generally excluded groups. It makes more sense to demonstrate these kinds of factors and how you achieved them.
5. **Representation of work and progress** – Probably the most important, after all that hard advocacy work your organization gets 1 count in the MEL plan when we simply count policies.

Another important point is that the indicators that count both policies *developed or strengthened* often mix indicator types; one is policy advocacy and the other can be policy advocacy but is often more likely policy monitoring.

After a policy is implemented, there will be growing pains and things that practitioners, policy specialists, and advocates will want to watch out for. This is part of the policy monitoring process. Policies, under committed governments will strengthen over time, and that progress should be monitored. However, counting every time a government increases its budget or hires and trains staff to enforce the policy, is not useful to understand if the policy is effective.