

## How to use the *Level of Engagement* and *Level of Commitment and Action* assessment tools

This step-by-step guide summarises the process for using the *Level of Engagement* and the *Level of Commitment and Action* tools. For details, consult the Guidance document for the respective tool. Please note that the process for applying the tools may need to be adapted to the specific circumstances in each case.

The two tools are designed for assessing *processes* for influencing decisions that are of conservation interest, and the outcomes of these processes.

The *Level of Engagement Tool* monitors the level of engagement by WWF and CSO partners (mainly) with key decision-makers and other targeted actors/organisations in processes that aim to influence them to improve specific policies and practices. The basis of the tool is tracking specific ‘inputs’ to and ‘outputs’ of this engagement that would *likely* be evident at different levels/stages in the engagement process. The ‘outcomes’ of each process – the extent commitments made/actions taken by targeted actors in response to our efforts – are tracked through the use of the *Level of Commitment and Action Tool*.

The processes to which the *Level of Engagement Tool* should be applied are likely to be joint advocacy initiatives (formal or informal coalitions, platforms, campaigns etc), and to a lesser extent the activities of individual organisations. The application of the *Level of Commitment and Action Tool* focuses on the *corresponding* decision maker(s)/actor(s) that these initiatives are trying to influence.

### Initial steps for using both tools

**Step 1:** Identify the specific focus of your *influencing process* that will be the subject of each assessment. Processes can be very specific (e.g. influencing a specific decision of a ministry or a company; specific content of a particular policy<sup>1</sup> development process) or more general (improving forest governance in a country).

**Step 2:** The use of both tools require that the “context” of the influencing process is defined, and that certain steps have been taken to involve key stakeholders. This table (which is also provided in the Excel template for the tools) summarises the steps that need to be completed in order to agree on the context. In many cases this has already been done completely or in part by the partners that make up the initiative. Facilitate a review of each item, and describe the status of the process in the “Narrative” column of the Excel templates. If important elements are still missing, the partners/stakeholders need to jointly discuss and agree on each item before proceeding with the assessments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Policy is a document with official endorsement

Steps		Description
1	<b>Defining the problem</b>	Describe the specific problem that you want to address. The more specific the better.
2	<b>Define the policy/practice/ decision making gaps</b>	In relation the problem identified above; what are the shortcomings in terms of policy/practice <sup>2</sup> /decision making that could be addressed through advocacy work.
3	<b>Define the realistic aim in terms of improved policy/ practice/decision making</b>	Describe what changes the organisations/coalition would like to see happen and prioritise among goals to focus on. Define goals at 3-year perspective and longer-term goal. At what level(s) of government/administration (local, national etc) should these goals be realized most?
4	<b>Define the poverty outcomes</b>	Consult with affected communities, vulnerable groups local CSOs and grass-root CBOs to ensure that their perspective is/are integrated. Initiate process of participation and representation. Describe main poverty aspects that will be addressed in advocacy activities. Describe what the impact will be on poverty (positive and negative) if your policy aims are achieved (reference here can be made to WWF's policy on poverty and conservation).
5	<b>Designing the strategy</b>	a) Describe who the stakeholders are and how they control or influence the defined policy/practice/decision gap
		b) Identify the decision makers to be influenced.
		c) Describe how these decision makers can be influenced directly or through other stakeholders

## The Level of Engagement Tool

**Step 3:** Identify the team members and key partners/stakeholders that should take part in the assessment.

**Step 4:** Engage with them, in the most practical way, in collecting and reviewing the evidence upon which the assessment will be based. The task of gathering evidence should not be left to one organization but rather jointly undertaken by each participating organization.

**Step 5:** Organise a workshop (or better - piggy back on a planned meeting) to discuss the findings. Start by reviewing the table produced under Step 2 above, in order to ensure that there is consensus among the participants on the context. Record all significant items of evidence in the column "Justification/evidence" in the template (see attachment 1), with comments/justifications where necessary. If needed, adapt the format of the tool to better capture the specific process that is being assessed, but *without altering the fundamentals structure of what is being measured*.

**Step 6:** Agree on the *Level of Engagement* score (level 0-5) that best matches your assessment of the evidence. Carefully record the reasoning behind the assigned score – this information will be vital for ensuring consistency with future assessments (which may be undertaken by other facilitators and/or participants). Note that different organizations can be at different levels, but you have to agree on a collective level which best reflects the status of most stakeholders.

**Step 7:** Evaluate and record/report your experiences of using the tool.

<sup>2</sup> Practice is an externally recognized way of working defined by the strategic approach.

**Step 8:** Before filing the assessment documents, it may be useful if the facilitator complements the record with additional information about/reflections on the process.

## **The Level of Commitment and Action Tool**

The use of this tool presupposes that WWF and partners have reached a level of engagement where the targeted decision-makers/actors have started to take actions on policy aims earlier selected to be addressed by the influencing process. The first application of the tool will provide a baseline, and should be applied when the Level of Engagement is close to level 3 (when engagement is involving external actors).

The process for using the *Level of Commitment and Action* tool is the same as the steps describes above, but with the following changes/additions:

**Step 4:** Efforts may also be made to engage targeted actors (government and private sector) in providing and commenting on evidence, if and when this is deemed possible and useful.

**Step 6:** Insert “*Level of Commitment and Action* score” in the place “*Level of Engagement* score”.

## Attachment 1:

### Level of Engagement

#### Context description

Steps		Description (for more information see guidance note)	Narrative
1	Defining the problem	Describe the problem that you want to address.	
2	Define the policy/practice/decision making gaps	What are the shortcomings in terms of policy/practice/decision making that could be addressed through advocacy work.	
3	Define the realistic aim in terms of improved policy/practice/decision making	Describe what changes the organisation/coalition would like to see happen and prioritize among goals to focus on. Define goals at 3 year perspective and longer term goal. At what level(s) of government/administration (local, national etc)?	
4	Define the poverty outcomes	Consult with communities and local CSOs and CBOs to ensure that their perspective is/are integrated. Initiate process of participation and representation. Describe main poverty aspects that will be addressed in advocacy activities	
5a	Designing the strategy	Describe who the stakeholders are and how they control or influence the defined policy/practice/decision gap	
5b		Identify the decision makers to be influenced. Describe how these decision makers can be influenced directly or through other stakeholders	

**Scoring table: Level of engagement**

LEVEL	WWF/Partners Engagement in activities and dialogue concerning particular Policy or Practice Issues ('Inputs')	Evidence of Engagement Level – Responses and Results ('Outputs')	Justification/evidence Clearly explain and justify why you arrived at the assessed level. Please elaborate.
0	<b>Start of the Influencing Process</b>	<b>No tangible engagement with key partners or influential actors</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At 'Point Zero' as far as the influencing process goes; just beginning to initiate internal discussions regarding needs and forward plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No key partners or influential actors identified or engaged with, on a tangible or strategic basis, as yet</li> </ul>	
1	<b>Defining the Agenda and Formulating a Plan*</b>	<b>Internal/key partner knowledge and awareness is raised. Opportunities to engage with key target actors and like-minded organizations being sought</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitization/awareness-raising on relevant issues (e.g. need to include particular user groups in policy/practice formulation; need to mainstream climate change/resilience issues through particular sectoral policies, for example forestry or conservation policies);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Levels of awareness/knowledge within WWF and amongst key partners are increasing; and</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desktop review of supporting research/policy analysis;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New relationships are being explored and forming (e.g. with like-minded organizations and with key political actors/organizations that WWF/partners wish to influence).</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participatory appraisal of communities/groups/individuals in programme areas re. particular issues;</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-house discussion/brainstorming/plan of action;</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requesting meetings (e.g. with like-minded organizations; with key political actors); and</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building relationships (e.g. attending events; networking).</li> </ul>		
2	<b>Broader Awareness and Voice - Visibility</b>	<b>External knowledge/awareness is raised. Foundation set for new relationships and influences</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger scale consultation locally/regionally, including CBOs/CSOs/relevant NGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings/event attendance agreed with other like-minded organizations and/or key political actors/organizations;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National level consultation (e.g. key political actors, larger NGOs/INGOs, Think Tanks, research institutes, national networks and coalitions);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of awareness of issue increased amongst networks and key political actors/organizations;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Hearing, Public Auditing fora;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New networks and alliances may be forming;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioning and or using research/work at local level to raise awareness of issue and inform debate;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional relationships between opponents may be breaking down, pathways for renewed dialogue/compromises being opened;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National awareness-raising campaigns; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater synergy of aims/activities between allies, and in terms of influencing and monitoring decision-makers (e.g. establishing a 'network agreement');</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens /constituents play an active and informed role in assessing issues and identifying strategies to address them which reflect the needs of different groups (such as women or youth), guided by for example a relevant CSO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in public behavior, changes in public opinion, evidence of greater awareness on issue; and</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of higher profile of issue in media, or change of media position and/or depth of coverage.</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>More Strategic Lobbying and Representation, Increased Receptiveness of Decision-makers - Publicity</b></p>	<p><b>New relationships/influences are bearing first fruit. Key decision-makers more aware of WWF/Partners' position. WWF/Partners more informed of key decision-makers' position (e.g. plans, constraints and procedures)</b></p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing articles, lobby documents, research/case studies at key events, through campaigns, within working groups and meetings;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more regular/permanent 'seat at the table' for WWF/partners (e.g. invitation to sit on panel/committee/working group; more frequent formal and informal consultations on the policy/practice issue);</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that key decision-makers are interested in consulting with WWF/partners re. particular policy/practice issue on a more regular basis; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Side events attendance;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased sharing of information and plans by key decision-makers with WWF/partners and wider network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWF/partner stance or research/case studies/campaign material being referenced in meetings or media; and</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWF/partner knowledge of key decision-makers plans/viewpoints is enhanced and a revised strategy for engagement is put in place.</li> </ul>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Policy/Practice Issue gains Firm Position on Political/Corporate Agenda</b>	<b>Changing rhetoric and deeper, more regular formal dialogue/exchange on issue</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific formal meeting scheduled to discuss issue in-depth;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy/practice issue entering everyday 'vocabulary' of key decision-makers, and is increasingly moving to being 'on the table' for solid discussion/debate towards tangible outcomes;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue referred to during key meetings/speeches, etc. on a regular basis, or given 'slot' on agenda for working groups or committees, etc; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWF/partners having more regular, involved and formal debate on issue with key decision-makers;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWF/partners requested to present particular information/evidence/case studies/research or to lead a particular meeting or event.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WWF/partners being specifically consulted on particular policy/practice aspects as a matter of course;</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised influencing strategy in place for going forward towards aim of improved policy/practice. Defined roles and responsibilities of WWF, partners and broader network/coalition members. Increased investment from allies, and possibly communities/local stakeholders, in terms of financial and technical resources; and</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opponents of your position may have come out with a new strategy – this may be evidence that your advocacy work is having an effect.</li> </ul>	

Attachment 2:

## **Level of Action and Commitment**

**Context description** (same Description as for Level of Engagement work-sheet)

<b>Steps</b>		<b>Description</b> (for more information see guidance note)	<b>Narrative</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Defining the problem</b>	Describe the problem that you want to address.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Define the policy/practice/decision making gaps</b>	What are the shortcomings in terms of policy/practice/decision making that could be addressed through advocacy work.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Define the realistic aim in terms of improved policy/practice/decision making</b>	Describe what changes the organisation/coalition would like to see happen and prioritize among goals to focus on. Define goals at 3 year perspective and longer term goal. At what level(s) of government/administration (local, national etc)?	
<b>4</b>	<b>Define the poverty outcomes</b>	Consult with communities and local CSOs and CBOs to ensure that their perspective is/are integrated. Initiate process of participation and representation. Describe main poverty aspects that will be addressed in advocacy activities	
<b>5a</b>	<b>Designing the strategy</b>	Describe who the stakeholders are and how they control or influence the defined policy/practice/decision gap	
<b>5b</b>		Identify the decision makers to be influenced. Describe how these decision makers can be influenced directly or through other stakeholders	



## Scoring table: Level of commitment/action

Level of Commitment and/or Action[1]	Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions	Justification/evidence Clearly explain and justify why you arrived at the assessed level. Please elaborate.
<b>Level 0 – Passive</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
Fairly 'Passive' in terms of commitment to the particular policy/practice issue in general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant interest in or discussion about changing policies or practices;</li> </ul>	
No real interest in or focused dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only limited engagement with general issues to date.</li> </ul>	
<b>Level 1 – Low</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
'Declaratory' in terms of mostly verbal interest or commitment to issues/action shown at this stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrating increased interest and/or knowledge of the issue;</li> </ul>	
Engaging and exploring good practice[2] (on a conceptual basis mostly at this point)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exploring, establishing or participating in new partnerships (with WWF/partners or others);</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement to participate in project, committee or attend a key event/training;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant discussion/dialogue with WWF and/or partner organizations around what constitutes 'good practice';</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification/emergence of 'champions' (e.g. key political figures) for change</li> </ul>	
<b>Level 2 – Medium</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
More active collaboration/co-operation, with more tangible commitments and actions in evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representation/support for WWF/partner position at key event/meeting;</li> </ul>	
Developing policies and practices for change (practical steps towards this end being in evidence, although in the earlier stages of the process)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to or conducting relevant research and studies (e.g. interest in learning from experience elsewhere);</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to and/or initial development or revision of policies and practices to reflect good practice (e.g. targeted companies beginning to develop/revise standards, but limited implementation at this stage);</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New methods, tools, guidelines, etc. being advocated (as part of policy/practice influencing) by WWF/partners are being tried.</li> </ul>	
<b>Level 3 - High</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
Collaboration/influencing results in significant actions that move the policy/practice forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political/media prominence given to issue by 'champions', or other key actors who have been influenced by champions/players;</li> </ul>	
Procedures for change in place (process has gained some momentum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to or evidence that results from studies/research/trials have been integrated into policy or practice;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies and practices have been revised, updated or developed and are seen as an improvement by WWF (in terms of reflecting 'good practice');</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Companies/governments implement standards or policy/practice, albeit perhaps weakly and inconsistently at this stage.</li> </ul>	
<b>Level 4 – Very High</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
Collaboration/influencing results in significant change and key outcomes being achieved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised/updated/new policies and practices being rolled out/implemented more robustly;</li> </ul>	
Supported by investment of financial and human resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased investment (financial and/or technical capacity) in support of 'good' policy/practice and subsequent implementation.</li> </ul>	
Procedures being implemented/rolled out		
<b>Level 5 – Impact</b>	<b>Generic Examples of types of commitments/actions</b>	<b>Justification/evidence</b>
Long term changes in policy and practice in evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of 'secondary' policy and practice initiatives as a result of initial change/outcome;</li> </ul>	

Evidence of 'secondary' impact of initial change (showing sustained commitment to the issue, e.g. initiation of related policy/practice initiatives or supplementary funding)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of 'secondary' (additional/complementary) funding support as a result of change;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of impact at policy/practice level (e.g. sustained commitment in terms of resources and capacity) over time;</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustained interest in issue/WWF position evidenced through media, public meetings, etc. where raised, and subsequent involvement of further actors/organizations.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#">[1] Levels of Commitment and Action by key targeted actors/organizations that WWF/partners are engaging with, as per the stakeholder/influencing mapping exercise (see 'Setting the Context' section of this guidance)</a>		
<a href="#">[2] 'Good Practice' in the context of this tool and guidance is taken to be: policies and practices that are deemed to be 'climate-smart, environmentally sustainable and pro-poor' as far as is practical and possible.</a>		