

## Module 3a: Advocacy, policy dialogue and funding Exercise 4 May 2019



Exercises

**Title** Laws, policies and guidelines – How to identify synergies and coherence in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Ecosystem Management & Restoration (EMR) policy messages. How to apply a DRR/CCA/EMR perspective?

**Introduction and background for facilitators:** This exercise builds on the “local level” exercise on *Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Environmental Management (EMR) – overlaps and synergies* which should be introduced before this version to ensure the participants have the basic understanding of practical local-level EMR/DRR/CCA activities.

Participants place papers slips with titles of policies and (government sector) programme guidelines in same three overlapping circles (DRR – CCA – EMR) as in the start exercise; it is meant to stimulate discussion on how each existing government policy, plans programme and/or scheme *currently* addresses each of the 3 IRM components or can *potentially* address all 3 IRM components. This discussion helps participants to identify their policy positions and formulate their policy ‘asks’ for their policy engagement activities.

If followed up with a discussion on governance institutions that house the implementation of the government programmes and schemes, this game can also help map which institutions are best to engage with over which policies for IRM policy advocacy.

**Aim/learning objective:** On completing this exercise, participants will have a better understanding of how and why it may be worth engaging in helping shape/revise/use various policies and guidelines directing local and national development and planning – even though some may, at first, appear less obvious candidates for engagement from a DRR, CCA or EMR perspective.

**Materials and preparation:** Similar to the basic exercise: Participants can use local materials to make the circles – draw with chalk on floor etc.

1. Three (rope) circles for each of 2 group = 6 rope circles. Prepare them in advance: you need about 20 m of rope to make 3 good circles of about 2 m diameter each (so in total 40 m if you want to run two groups).
2. Print the paper slips with titles/descriptions of the sample policies and guidelines in the attached Word file and cut them so each is on a separate slip of paper. Decide if you want to split the slips in two and run two groups in parallel.

**Duration:** 45 minutes to 1 hour

**Participant numbers and/or arrangements:** Participants can be arranged into one or several groups – split the set of paper slips for each group.

- The exercise step by step:**
1. Divide participants into groups, if needed.
  2. For each group, lay out three large circles of rope on the ground so they overlap (like the basic exercise).
  3. Give each group a set of ‘policy slips’ – and explain that these slips contain titles and descriptions of a range of different policies and sector programme guidelines (drawn from real PfR cases).
  4. Give each group 20 minutes or so to sort the policy paper slips within the circles – and decide if it would be relevant to try “influence” any policy change, if possible, or help “interpret” its practical application from a DRR, or CCA or EMR perspective – or if maybe it fits in an overlap zone and could be relevant to influence from 2 or 3 perspectives.  
*For example:* a ‘National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction’, of course, has a focus on DRR, but may possibly be weak on the role of proper watershed management (EMR) as a critical factor for risk reduction, and the strategy may not be planning for more extreme events coming with climate change: then the policy would qualify as a candidate for discussions on the need for becoming explicit on EMR and CCA elements.
  5. When finished, the facilitator gather all participants (all groups) around one of the sets of circles and encourage that group to present how they decided on how to place the paper slips in each of the zones of the circles. The facilitator can ask them about the discussions the group had – and jointly the facilitator and all participants may challenge some of the decision and maybe consider re-arranging the paper slips.

- Discussion items:**
- Do all paper slips actually fit in the “centre” – the overlap zone of all three perspectives (DRR/CCA/EMR) – or are there good arguments to place some of them in one of the “exclusive” zones (e.g. CCA only)?
  - For example, in an agriculture policy/programme on crop diversification, would we need to consider that from mainly CCA and EMR perspective, or would there also be DRR considerations? Which/why?
  - The national and sub-national *adaptation plans* – why might we want to check it, and possibly discuss the needs for considering a disaster (DRR) perspective?
  - Ask participants of examples from their own work – and challenges to reviewing documents from DRR, CCA or EMR perspectives.

**Facilitator tips:** It may be confusing for participants to organize the policy slips so it may take some explanations to get it going. This will especially be true when a general list of policies are used, so try to find real, locally relevant examples for participants to work with.

For general policy slips, the facilitator may need to make it clear that there are, of course, no “correct answers”: Since the paper slips only contains the title of the “policy” or “guideline” document people can only speculate on the real contents and how well it may already include relevant aspects of DR/CCA/EMR. So, the exercise relies on “experience and gut feelings” the participants may have from previous exposure to the realities of policies.