Developing Recommendations for Security Sector Reform

Photo Credit: AusAID

A Women's Guide to Security Sector Reform
Training Curriculum

DCAF
a centre for security,
development and
the rule of law

INCLUSIVE SECURITY

DCAF

The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) is an international foundation whose mission is to assist the international community in pursuing good governance and reform of the security sector. DCAF develops and promotes norms and standards, conducts tailored policy research, identifies good practices and recommendations to promote democratic security sector governance, and provides in-country advisory support and practical assistance programmes.

DCAF's Gender and Security Division works through research, technical advice and regional projects to support the development of security sectors that meet the needs of men, women, boys and girls; and promote the full participation of men and women in security sector institutions and security sector reform processes.

Visit us at: www.dcaf.ch. Contact us at: gender@dcaf.ch.

Inclusive Security

Inclusive Security is transforming decision making about war and peace. We're convinced that a more secure world is possible if policymakers and conflict-affected populations work together. Women's meaningful participation, in particular, can make the difference between failure and success. Since 1999, Inclusive Security has equipped decision makers with knowledge, tools, and connections that strengthen their ability to develop inclusive policies and approaches. We have also bolstered the skills and influence of women leaders around the world. Together with these allies, we're making inclusion the rule, not the exception.

Visit us at: inclusivesecurity.org. Contact us at: info@inclusivesecurity.org.

Please get in touch with us if you would like to translate this guide.

ISBN: 92-9222-438-7

Cite as: Inclusive Security and DCAF. *A Women's Guide to Security Sector Reform: Training Curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: Inclusive Security and DCAF, 2017.

MODULE OVERVIEW:
Developing Recommendations for Security Sector Reform

Learning Objectives

- Participants are able to describe and identify the three components (what/who/how) of an advocacy recommendation.

- Participants are able to draft advocacy recommendations that identify who should do what and how.

Background Resources for Trainers

- Bastick, Megan, and Tobie Whitman. *A Women's Guide to Security Sector Reform*. Washington: Inclusive Security and DCAF, 2013. www.dcaf.ch/Publications/A-Women-s-Guide-to-Security-Sector-Reform

- Inclusive Security. *Inclusive Security: A Curriculum for Women Waging Peace*. Washington: Inclusive Security, 2009. www.inclusivesecurity.org/training-resources/

- O'Neil, Carrie and Nanako Tamaru. *Advocacy for Inclusive Security Curriculum*. Washington: Inclusive Security, 2017. www.inclusivesecurity.org/training-resources/

Time	Description
5 minutes	**14.1 Introduction to the Module** 14.1.1 Facilitator Talking Points
45 minutes	**14.2 What is an Advocacy Recommendation?** 14.2.1 Activity: Components of an Advocacy Recommendation
45 minutes	**14.3 Advocacy Recommendations for SSR** 14.3.1 Activity: Developing Recommendations
5 minutes	**14.4 Wrap Up** 14.4.1 Facilitator Talking Points: Points to Take Away
	Adapting the Module **Assessment Questions**

Total Time: 1 hour 40 minutes

14.1 Introduction to the Module

14.1.1 Facilitator Talking Points

Background for Facilitator

This section introduces the purpose and learning objectives of the module.

Materials Needed
None

Learning Objectives
Participants are able to identify the purpose and learning objectives of this module.

Time 5 minutes

Facilitator Talking Points

- Thinking about advocacy as a cycle, you begin by analyzing the problems that you want to address then move through the following stages: research security issues, build coalitions, plan for action, develop recommendations, deliver your advocacy message, and monitor and evaluate progress. In previous modules, we built skills and understanding around researching security issues, building and maintaining coalitions, and planning for action. In this module, we will learn how to develop recommendations for security sector reform.

- After this module, you will be able to:

    – Describe and identify the three components (what/who/how) of an advocacy recommendation.

    – Draft advocacy recommendations that identify who should do what and how.

14.2 What is an Advocacy Recommendation?

14.2.1 Activity: Components of an Advocacy Recommendation

Background for Facilitator

This section introduces the three components of an advocacy recommendation: what, who, and how.

Participants will practice identifying the what/who/how in the Sample Advocacy Recommendations handout (see annex). Drafting recommendations for the first time can be challenging, so taking the time to work through these examples will set participants up for success when developing their own recommendations.

Materials Needed
Presentation slides; Sample Advocacy Recommendations (and answer key) handouts

Learning Objectives
Participants are able to describe and identify the three components (what/who/how) of an advocacy recommendation

Time 45 minutes

Facilitator Talking Points

- When developing an advocacy strategy, you begin by looking at the big picture and then narrow your focus. Developing advocacy recommendations is part of this narrowing process. An advocacy recommendation includes three components: an objective (**what** you want to change), an actor (**who** can make that change), and an action (**how** that actor can make that change happen).

- The first component of an advocacy recommendation is the **objective**, which is **what** you want to change (or, the smaller order change that will work toward your overall advocacy goal). *See Module 13 for additional language on the difference between a goal and an objective*.

- There are many ways to achieve an advocacy objective, and it will likely take multiple actions from multiple actors. In other words, there may be several "hows" and "whos" for each "what."

- The remaining two components of a recommendation are interrelated. The **action** (**how**) describes the actions necessary to achieve your objective. The **actor (who)** is the person(s) taking said action.

- For example, imagine our objective is "Build the capacity of police officers to recognize and meet the specific needs of women, men, girls, and boys." Achieving this objective would require many actions taken by many actors, right? Here are some examples of potential action and actor combinations that could support progress toward this objective: *Show the following examples on a presentation slide.*

Advocacy Recommendation

1. **Objective**: What you want to change

2. **Actor**: Who can make that change

3. **Action**: How the actor can make that change happen

ACTOR / WHO	ACTION / HOW
National Police Academy	Incorporate lessons on diverse security needs into courses, trainings, and other activities at the Academy
Police Commanders	Organize trainings for police officers on recognizing and understanding the diversity of security needs in their communities
Police Commanders	Work with local organizations to identify ways for the police to better meet the needs of women, men, boys, and girls

- Let's look at a few recommendations and see if we can identify the what/who/how: *Show presentation slides with **Strong Recommendations Examples** and ask participants to identify the what/who/how – see answer key below.*

Strong Recommendations Examples | Answer Key

Example 1: [who] The Ministry of the Interior should **[what]** establish mechanisms to increase women's participation in security institutions, including **[how]** a quota for thirty percent women among new recruits, childcare services, and professional development to encourage women's promotion to high-level positions.

Example 2: [who] The US Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) should **[how]** create and fund a pilot program that engages policewomen and university students in discussions about the importance of women in the forces and benefits of joining in order to **[what]** increase the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in Pakistan's police forces.

Example 3: The national government should **[what]** expand strategies for women's recruitment into the security sector. Specifically, **[who]** the Ministry of Interior and EUPOL should focus on women's recruitment into the police, targeting widows and victims of war. This can be achieved by **[how]** creating open houses at which women police officers can share experiences with interested women candidates and establishing special recruitment campaigns targeting women in high schools and colleges.

- Let's look at three more recommendations. These are not as well structured as the previous ones. Can you identify what's wrong with them? *Show presentation slides with **Weak Recommendations Examples** and ask participants to identify the what/who/how – see answer key below.*

Weak Recommendations Examples | Answer Key

Example 1: Security officials need more training on women's rights.

- "Security officials" is not specific enough. Who within the security forces should take action?
- The "what" is missing.
- The "how" is not specific enough; what kind of training on women's rights, and for what purpose?

Example 2: Security policies should mainstream gender.

- This recommendation is very vague and it is unclear who it is targeted to or what they should do even if they wanted to make a change.
- What security policy does this refer to?
- What does it mean to "mainstream gender" into a policy?

Example 3: The armed forces should have more female personnel.

- "Armed forces" is not specific enough. Recommendations should target a specific institution/department/individual.
- The "what" is missing.
- "Have more female personnel" isn't a specific action a policymaker can take; recommendations should clearly spell out what actions you want them to take. This recommendation could be improved if it included "such as [create women-only spaces within armed forces, provide funding for childcare and other expenses, etc.]" at the end. Policymakers may not know what barriers are preventing women's participation.

Instructions

Distribute the Sample Advocacy Recommendations handout. Having participants work in pairs or individually, assign each person or group one objective for which they should identify the what/who/how. (5-10 minutes)

Debrief

Facilitator Instructions

In the plenary, select a few of the recommendations to review and invite volunteers to share what they identified. You can refer to the Answer Key - Sample Advocacy Recommendations handout. Draw out the following points:

- The "who" is sometimes an individual and other times an institution/department/council. Determining the "who" in each recommendation depends on your policy environment and the key decision makers.

- The recommendations should usually name the department or institution (e.g., Ministry of Interior, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Parliamentary Committee) rather than individuals. However, as part of your larger advocacy strategy, it's still important that you identify **an individual who can take action** as your advocacy target—this is the person to whom you'll deliver your recommendations.

- In some instances, you may want to name a specific individual in your recommendation. This is particularly the case when you know that the specific individual is the key decision maker for your security issue (e.g., Minister of Defense, Police Commissioner, Provincial Governor, Chief Judge, a specific parliamentarian).

Wrap up by emphasizing that there are many different ways to write recommendations, but the core components of strong recommendations are the same—what/who/how. (15 minutes)

14.3 Advocacy Recommendations for SSR

14.3.1 Activity: Developing Recommendations

Background for Facilitator

This section revisits the stakeholder maps and problem analyses completed in Module 10; they will serve as tools for developing strong advocacy recommendations. In advance, review the maps to ensure they will work for this exercise. Display the maps from Module 10; and ask participants to work in the same groups as they did for that module.

This activity can be difficult—if possible, it's helpful to have one facilitator for each group.

Materials Needed

Stakeholder maps developed in Module 10; presentation slides or flipchart; Drafting Advocacy Recommendations handout

Learning Objectives

Participants are able to draft advocacy recommendations that identify who should do what and how.

Time 45 minutes

Facilitator Talking Points

- When mapping stakeholders, you:
  - Thought about a specific gender and security sector issue.
  - Made a list of relevant persons, groups, or institutions with an interest or concern in the issue.
  - Used different colored pens to indicate which of the following categories each stakeholder fell into:
    - Target (someone you seek to influence) – circled in blue
    - Partner (someone who supports the change you seek) – circled in black
    - Spoiler (someone who opposes the change you seek) – circled in red
    - Neutral (someone who does not feel strongly either way) – circled in green
  - Used lines, circles and arrows to indicate how the stakeholders relate to each other.
- You are now going to draft recommendations to present to some of your targets (or those stakeholders who have the ability to take action in support of your objectives). Remember, there are many ways to achieve an objective, and it will likely take multiple actions from multiple actors.
- Before drafting recommendations, it is important to determine **how** these actors can act to implement the policy change you want to see. When thinking about the "how," the solutions must be actionable and within the power of the actor to implement. It is not enough to tell policymakers your objectives, you have to explain what actions they can take—be specific!
- A common mistake that advocates make is delivering recommendations to someone who does not have the power or capacity to take action. For example, if you believe there should be more women police officers in your district, you might develop recommendations for your local police chief—

but what if the decisions about hiring quotas are actually made by the provincial governor or police commissioner? You've tailored your advocacy recommendations to the wrong actor. Careful research about what institutions have the power to act and who within those institutions makes decisions is essential.

- First, consider your objective **(what)**. There may be any number of actions **(how)** that policymakers **(who)** can take to help achieve it.

  – For example, let's say your objective is to create a more inclusive process for drafting the National Security Strategy.

  – Who in your actor map can help accomplish this? How can they help get more women involved? What specific actions could they take? Here are some ideas:

    • You could ask the National Security Council to require consultations with women in civil society.

    • You could ask the Government to commit to formally involving the Minister for Women/Gender Affairs and/or national and regional women's networks in the National Security Strategy consultation process.

    • You could brief influential journalists on the importance of broad based consultation to inform the National Security Strategy.

- The "how" of your recommendation can include proposals for **engaging with the security sector**, like the examples we just discussed. That could include asking policymakers to create a formal security sector oversight body that women can participate in or a local security forum to share information between communities and security services.

- Your recommendations should always be as specific, realistic, and relevant as possible.

  – **Specific**: Words like "sensitize" and "empower" are vague and should be broken down into more clearly defined, measurable terms. For example, "establish a program to empower women" could be changed to "establish a program that equips women with knowledge and advocacy skills relating to security sector reform."

  – **Realistic**: Changing attitudes and behavior is a long-term process. Try to be realistic about what actions you expect policymakers to take. For example, it may not be strategic to advocate for a woman to head the military if all of the senior ranking officers are men. It may be more realistic to call for programs that coach women for promotion into senior leadership.

  – **Relevant**: The "how" of your recommendation should feed into your objective (what). And your objectives (what) should feed into your goal.

Instructions

Distribute <u>Drafting Advocacy Recommendations</u> handout.

In the same groups from Module 10, have the participants use the <u>Drafting Advocacy Recommendations</u> handout to practice developing recommendations. They should focus on specifying the actors (who) and the actions that those actors should take (how). Remind them that:

- Objectives represent the changes that must happen in order to address your security issue or problem and achieve your goal. Alternatively, ask, "What is it that we want to see happen to address our problem?"
- The "who" can be an individual or an institution/organization (e.g., political parties; parliament; police commissioner; Judge).
- Recommendations should be specific, realistic, and relevant.

Each group should develop a few recommendations to deliver to policymakers.

If participants are struggling with developing the "who" and "how," it may be helpful to remind them that there are two ways to develop recommendations. They can first identify the "who" using their stakeholder map and then brainstorm what actions those actors can take (how) to advance the "what"; or they can first identify what needs to happen (how) in order to achieve their "what" and then brainstorm "who" has the power to take those actions. (20 minutes)

Debrief

Facilitator Instructions

In the plenary, invite each group to share their strongest recommendation, and invite suggestions on how it could be made even more specific, realistic, and relevant. (15 minutes)

14.4 Wrap Up

14.4.1 Facilitator Talking Points: Points to Take Away

Background for Facilitator
This section highlights the main points of the module.

Materials Needed
None

Learning Objectives
Participants will understand the main points of this module.

Time 5 minutes

Facilitator Talking Points

• Developing recommendations is an essential component of successful advocacy. If you want to see improvements or change, you have to be able to identify and present solutions.

• Advocacy recommendations consist of three components:
an objective (**what** you want to change), an actor (**who** can make that change), and an action (**how** that actor can make that change happen). Each of your recommendations should outline what needs to happen in order to address your security issue or problem.

• Recommendations are the core of your advocacy message. When you meet with a policymaker, you will build on these recommendations to craft a compelling narrative that will make the policymaker want to take action.

Adapting the Module

Less Time

14.2.1 Activity: Components of an Advocacy Recommendation

14.3.1 Activity: Developing Recommendations **(SAVE 10-40 MINUTES)**

Spend less time working through examples.

More Time

14.3.1 Activity: Developing Recommendations **(ADD 30 MINUTES)**

Use the Identifying Specific Advocacy Targets handout to deepen participants' analysis of their specific advocacy targets, including their level of influence, stance on the security issue, previous actions related to that issue, and the status of their relationship with that target.

14.3.2 Activity: Strengthening Advocacy Recommendations **(ADD 30 MINUTES)**

With more time, this additional activity is specifically dedicated to further strengthening and sharpening the groups' advocacy recommendations.

Facilitator Talking Points

- *Distribute the Strengthening Recommendations Checklist handout (see annex).*

- One way to strengthen and sharpen recommendations is to assess them against our three benchmarks: Specific, Realistic, Relevant. This will ensure that your recommendations are actionable and that you can hold policymakers accountable.

- Are your recommendations **specific**?

  – Watch out for jargon or rhetoric. Words like "sensitize" and "empower" are vague and should be broken down into more clearly defined, measurable terms. Recommendations that refer to a state of mind or a process like "empower" are almost impossible to measure. Process goals like "empowerment" and "awareness-raising" are long-term and elusive. You want to be as concrete as possible about who, what, where, and when. Imagine signposts—or indicators—along the way of what an empowered / aware woman does and put that language in your recommendation. "Establish a program to empower women" could be changed to "Establish a program that equips women with knowledge and advocacy skills relating to security sector reform."

- Watch out for words that can be interpreted in a variety of ways (e.g., accountability, transparency, etc.) and be as specific as possible about what change you want to see.

- Are your recommendations **realistic**?

  - Changing attitudes and behavior is a very long-term process. Try to be realistic about what actions you expect policymakers to take. For example, it may not be strategic to advocate for a woman to head the military if all of the senior ranking officers are men. It may be more realistic to call for programs to coach women for promotion into senior leadership.

  - Realistic recommendations also reflect the limits of available funding and staff. While you may want the lead mediator to hire a gender advisor, they may be constrained by a lack of funding. (Hint: You could draft recommendations targeted at international donors to fund a gender advisor to make this more realistic.)

- Are your recommendations **relevant**?

  - The "how" of your advocacy recommendation should advance your objective (what). And your objectives (what) should advance your goal. It's important to make sure that your recommendations support the change you hope to achieve.

  - Remember that your advocacy targets must have the power/influence to take the action you want to see.

- Let's review one example together: **[what]** To increase police officers' awareness of women's unique security needs, **[who]** the National Police Academy should **[how]** develop and deliver a mandatory course on women's rights for all new recruits within the next year.

  - *First ask participants to identify the what/who/how, then move on to the discussion questions.*

  - Is it specific?

    - Fairly specific, but could provide more details on what a course on "women's rights" entails.

  - Is it realistic?

    - We would need to consider whether the National Police Academy has the resources to create a course in a year, but this seems reasonable.

  - Is it relevant?

    - The "how" of the recommendation definitely feeds into the objective and the National Police Academy seems like the right institution to take this actions.

Instructions

Have participants revisit their recommendations (alternatively, you could have them swap recommendations with another group) and ask them to assess these recommendations against the three benchmarks: specific, realistic, relevant.

Debrief

Facilitator Instructions

If the groups swapped recommendations, have them work together to give feedback and generate ideas for strengthening the recommendations.

If the groups reviewed their own recommendations, debrief with the discussion questions.

Discussion Questions

- How did your advocacy recommendations perform against the three benchmarks?
- Did you find the benchmarks helpful to further tailor your recommendations?

Assessment Questions (Blank)

Q.14.1 Circle all the components of an advocacy recommendation:

    a. What (What change do you want to make?)

    b. Who (What actor can make the change you want to see?)

    c. How (What action can the actor take to make the change happen?)

    d. Why (Detailed information about all the reasons the change needs to be made.)

Q.14.2 Effective advocacy recommendations are: (select one)

    a. Specific, realistic, and relevant.

    b. Simple, specific, and lengthy.

    c. Realistic, complicated, and beautiful.

Assessment Questions (Answer Key)

Q.14.1 Circle all the components of an advocacy recommendation:

    a. <u>What (What change do you want to make?)</u>

    b. <u>Who (What actor can make the change you want to see?)</u>

    c. <u>How (What action can the actor take to make the change happen?)</u>

    d. Why (Detailed information about all the reasons the change needs to be made.)

Q.14.2 Effective advocacy recommendations are: (select one)

    a. <u>Specific, realistic, and relevant.</u>

    b. Simple, specific, and lengthy.

    c. Realistic, complicated, and beautiful.

ANNEX

Sample Advocacy Recommendations

Pakistan

Objective 1: Increase the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in Pakistan's police forces.

- US Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) should:
  - Create and fund a pilot program, in coordination with local civil society organizations, which engages policewomen and university students in discussions about the importance of women in the forces and benefits of joining;
  - Increase the advocacy capabilities of policewomen by funding training that propels them to push for improved services;
  - Continue to evaluate and fund the reform of infrastructure and policies that hinder the retention of policewomen, including lack of office space, transportation, bathrooms, and flexible working hours;
  - Build the capacity of female police to counter violent extremism by:
    - Providing specialized training on tools to counter violent extremism;
    - Developing skills for early warning response; and
    - Ensuring they are adequately equipped.
  - Support women's inclusion in community policing mechanisms and ensure these mechanisms are both gender-responsive and conflict-sensitive; and
  - Fund programs to sensitize the police and other law enforcement agencies about the importance of inclusion and the effective role of men and women in countering violent extremism.
- US Department of State, Office of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs and INL should support a sustained media campaign to enhance the profile of Pakistani policewomen in countering violent extremism.
- US Department of State should fund a capacity-building program for Pakistan's Women's Parliamentary Caucus with a focus on women's inclusion in law enforcement.
- US Congress should:
  - Include in any extension of the "Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act," or subsequent legislation, a specific authorization for funding the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of Pakistani policewomen, as well as inclusion of these efforts in any reporting requirements for the monitoring of US aid to Pakistan.
  - Require a portion of law enforcement funding in future appropriations bills for Pakistan to be utilized for the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in the Pakistani police forces and law enforcement agencies [see appropriations request language].

Objective 2: Strengthen women's inclusion in mechanisms setting Pakistan's strategic priorities, such as the National Internal Security Policy (NISP), the National Counter Terrorism Authority (NACTA), and all negotiations to end violent extremism.

- US Department of State, Department of Defense, and Agency for International Development should use the resumption of the US-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue to raise women's full inclusion in security decision-making as a critical issue. For example, under the counterterrorism pillar, the US should emphasize the need for increased recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in Pakistan's police forces.

- The US should provide resources and technical assistance for the establishment of a national dialogue process in Pakistan—including multi-sectoral and geographically diverse representatives from every province—concerning the need for women's inclusion in setting Pakistan's national security policies. In preparation for a national dialogue process, the US should back an independent, Pakistani-led review of national security policies.

- The US should support a sustained media campaign that highlights the role of women in setting Pakistan's national security policies.

- The US should encourage increased transparency in the establishment of Pakistan's national security policies through capacity-building and technical assistance on peace and security issues for female members of the parliament.

Objective 3: Expand US support for, and promotion of, indigenous, women-led initiatives in Pakistan that aim to counter violent extremism.

- Through the new Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF), ensure a strong process for transparency, including an institutionalized monitoring and evaluation system.

- The multi-stakeholder governing board of the GCERF should comprise a diverse group of representatives including at least one-third women with demonstrated expertise in countering violent extremism particularly from Pakistan.

- US representatives to the Global Counterterrorism Forum and relevant working groups, should:

  - Raise women's contributions to countering violent extremism at the highest levels;

  - Advocate for workshops and best practice guides to incorporate the role that women play in the civil society, security, and government sectors in improving the effectiveness of efforts to counter violent extremism and terrorism.

  - To ensure coordination among international donors, the US Embassy in Islamabad should use the ongoing convenings of donor working groups focused on countering violent extremism in Pakistan for the purpose of:

    - Ensuring relevant societal and religious leaders are effectively included in initiatives;

    - Mapping indigenous strategies; and

    - Assessing programming effectiveness.

Sample Advocacy Recommendations

Pakistan

Objective 1: **[what] Increase the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in Pakistan's police forces.**

- **[who]** US Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) should:

  – **[how]** Create and fund a pilot program, in coordination with local civil society organizations, which engages policewomen and university students in discussions about the importance of women in the forces and benefits of joining;

  – **[how]** Increase the advocacy capabilities of policewomen by funding training that propels them to push for improved services;

  – **[how]** Continue to evaluate and fund the reform of infrastructure and policies that hinder the retention of policewomen, including lack of office space, transportation, bathrooms, and flexible working hours;

  – **[how]** Build the capacity of female police to counter violent extremism by:

    • Providing specialized training on tools to counter violent extremism;

    • Developing skills for early warning response; and

    • Ensuring they are adequately equipped.

  – **[how]** Support women's inclusion in community policing mechanisms and ensure these mechanisms are both gender-responsive and conflict-sensitive; and

  – **[how]** Fund programs to sensitize the police and other law enforcement agencies about the importance of inclusion and the effective role of men and women in countering violent extremism.

- **[who]** US Department of State, Office of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs and INL should [how] support a sustained media campaign to enhance the profile of Pakistani policewomen in countering violent extremism.

- **[who]** US Department of State should **[how]** fund a capacity-building program for Pakistan's Women's Parliamentary Caucus with a focus on women's inclusion in law enforcement.

- **[who]** US Congress should:

  – **[how]** Include in any extension of the "Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act," or subsequent legislation, a specific authorization for funding the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of Pakistani policewomen, as well as inclusion of these efforts in any reporting requirements for the monitoring of US aid to Pakistan.

  – **[how]** Require a portion of law enforcement funding in future appropriations bills for Pakistan to be utilized for the recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in the Pakistani police forces and law enforcement agencies [see appropriations request language].

Objective 2: [what] Strengthen women's inclusion in mechanisms setting Pakistan's strategic priorities, such as the National Internal Security Policy (NISP), the National Counter Terrorism Authority (NACTA), and all negotiations to end violent extremism.

- **[who]** US Department of State, Department of Defense, and Agency for International Development should **[how]** use the resumption of the US-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue to raise women's full inclusion in security decision-making as a critical issue. For example, under the counterterrorism pillar, the US should emphasize the need for increased recruitment, retention, and professionalization of women in Pakistan's police forces.

- **[who]** The US should **[how]** provide resources and technical assistance for the establishment of a national dialogue process in Pakistan—including multi-sectoral and geographically diverse representatives from every province—concerning the need for women's inclusion in setting Pakistan's national security policies. In preparation for a national dialogue process, **[who]** the US should **[how]** back an independent, Pakistani-led review of national security policies.

- **[who]** The US should **[how]** support a sustained media campaign that highlights the role of women in setting Pakistan's national security policies.

- **[who]** The US should **[how]** encourage increased transparency in the establishment of Pakistan's national security policies through capacity-building and technical assistance on peace and security issues for female members of the parliament.

Objective 3: [what/who] Expand US support for, and promotion of, indigenous, women-led initiatives in Pakistan that aim to counter violent extremism.

- **[how]** Through the new Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF), ensure a strong process for transparency, including an institutionalized monitoring and evaluation system.

- **[how]** The multi-stakeholder governing board of the GCERF should be comprised of a diverse group of representatives including at least one-third women with demonstrated expertise in countering violent extremism particularly from Pakistan.

- **[who]** US representatives to the Global Counterterrorism Forum and relevant working groups, should:
  - **[how]** Raise women's contributions to countering violent extremism at the highest levels;
  - **[how]** Advocate for workshops and best practice guides to incorporate the role that women play in the civil society, security, and government sectors in improving the effectiveness of efforts to counter violent extremism and terrorism.

- To ensure coordination among international donors, **[who]** the US Embassy in Islamabad should **[how]** use the ongoing convenings of donor working groups focused on countering violent extremism in Pakistan for the purpose of:
  - Ensuring relevant societal and religious leaders are effectively included in initiatives;
  - Mapping indigenous strategies; and
  - Assessing programming effectiveness.

Drafting Advocacy Recommendations

Problem/Security Issue The security problem we identified that we want to address	
Objective The change we want that can be influenced through advocacy ***What*** needs to happen to address our security problem?	
Who has the ability to take action? What specific action should they take to support our objective (***how***)?	**Who** (individual/institution/organization/department): **How** (the action we want them to take):
	Who (individual/institution/organization/department): **How** (the action we want them to take):
	Who (individual/institution/organization/department): **How** (the action we want them to take):
	Who (individual/institution/organization/department): **How** (the action we want them to take):

Identifying Specific Advocacy Targets

#	Actor	Institution and title	Level of influence (low, medium, high) What is their level of influence related to our security issue?	Stance on security issue/ previous actions What previous actions have they taken on our security issue? Are they an ally or an opponent?	Relationship What is our relationship to them (if any)? Do we have direct access to them or do we need someone to connect us?
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

Strengthening Recommendations Checklist

Strengthen your advocacy recommendations by measuring them against these three benchmarks

---

Are your recommendations <u>specific</u>?

- Watch out for jargon or rhetoric. Words like 'sensitize' and 'empower' are vague and should be broken down into more clearly defined and measurable terms.

- Avoid words that can be interpreted in a variety of ways (e.g. accountability, transparency, etc.) and be as specific as possible about the change you want to see.

Are your recommendations <u>realistic</u>?

- Changing attitudes and behavior is a very long-term process. Try to be realistic about what actions you expect policymakers to take. You cannot expect them to achieve the impossible.

- Realistic recommendations also reflect the limits of available funding and staff.

Are your recommendations <u>relevant</u>?

- The "how" of your advocacy recommendation should feed into your objectives (what). And your objectives (what) should feed into your goal. It's important to make sure that your recommendations are feeding into the change you hope to achieve.

- Remember that your advocacy targets must have the power/influence to take action. A common mistake made by advocates is delivering recommendations to someone who does not have the ability to make that change happen.

Inclusive Security
1615 M Street NW, Suite 850
Washington, DC 20036
202.403.2000
inclusivesecurity.org

The Geneva Centre for the Democratic
Control of Armed Forces (DCAF)
P.O. Box 1360
CH-1211 Geneva 1
Switzerland
+41 (0) 22.730.9400
dcaf.ch