



NGO Network Advocacy Assessment Analysis

2011

Contents

Executive Summary..... 3

Background 6

Specific Objectives 6

Methodology:..... 7

Results..... 7

 NGO Network Characteristic..... 7

 Network Advocacy Skills and Experiences 8

 Quality of Network Advocacy Plan 10

 Network Advocacy Action Plan Effectiveness..... 13

 Leadership and Management Network Advocacy..... 17

 Constrain and weakness of Network in doing advocacy 19

 Network Advocacy Strengthening 19

 NGO Training needs for capacity development..... 20

Conclusion:..... 20

Acknowledgement

The Advocacy and Policy Institute would like to acknowledge all individual, organizations and advocacy networks such as Help Age International (HAI), Housing Right Task Force (HRTF), Fisheries Action Coalition Team (FACT), Community Peace Building Network (CPN), Cambodian Coalition Fisher (CCF), Pursat Civil Society Advocacy Coordination Alliance (CACA), NGO Advocacy Cooperation Network (NACN), Pesticide Reduction Network in Cambodia (PRNC), Resettlement Action Network (RAN), Land Action Network for Development (LAND), Coalition Integrity and Social Accountability (CISA).

The assessment team also would like acknowledge and extend their thanks to those NGO networks and members who volunteered their time to complete the assessment.

Sincere thanks also go to Mr. HEP Sokhannaro (PCG), Mr. Lam Soheat (API), Mr. Tieng Sophorn (API), Ms. Khun Seavim (API) for their valuable comments, data collection and data entry. Without their effort throughout the assessment, this report would not have been successful completed.

Executive Summary

The Advocacy and Policy Institute (API) is an established leading advocacy capacity building institution in Cambodia. The API designed programme Supporting Civil Society Organizations (**S-CSO**) aims to strengthen the capacity of Cambodian advocates from all sectors and community levels to influence policy makers through the effective design, management and implementation of their advocacy campaigns.

From August to November 2011, API carried out an NGO network advocacy and capacity assessment with 30 selected civil society networks in Cambodia. The assessment identified advocacy experience, challenges, and needs for further strengthening. In total, 126 NGO network members participated by completing a questionnaire survey. The data was collected during NGO network meetings and conferences from August to November 2011.

The NGO network advocacy assessment is a national representative sample survey of NGO's working on advocacy for natural resources management in Cambodia. This is the first time API has conducted a comprehensive assessment of the network's capacity by reviewing its advocacy work, current obstacles and weaknesses. The purpose of this assessment is to provide API with up-to-date and reliable data on the NGO network's skills and experience. As well as the quality of their advocacy planning, leadership and management, constraints and weaknesses with the aim of building and strengthening the NGO network advocacy capacity.

The assessment showed from a total of 117 respondents more than half hold higher education qualifications, but only a few have advocacy experience. Most are trained in land law, environment, leadership skills or information collection.

The majority of network members responded that they have tried to develop an advocacy plan and identify issues to focus on in their advocacy work. However, they have struggled to find solutions particularly working with research projects. It has been difficult to define common goals and measure achievements due to unclear indicators and limited understanding of involved stakeholders.

Many NGO network members claimed that their organisations have good reputations as effective advocates, but lack strong documentation for influencing government policy. Nearly half did not work well with the media in their advocacy work.

Co-ordination amongst the network is required as the majority of members responded that they are unaware what was being actioned or accomplished by its members. Members claimed that monitoring and evaluation was included as a part of their advocacy framework however, challenges or successes were not being properly documented. It highlighted a weakness in the network's documentation and M&E systems.

The majority of advocacy network members are aware of the expected results of their advocacy activities. However, nearly half of the network claimed there are no clear policies or guidelines in resource management. About one fourth are not aware of each other. At meetings, specific roles and responsibilities were clearly defined and important information is widely shared among members however, a few network members complained that communication procedures in the event of an emergency was not clear.

Although network members have a lot of experience and have achieved good results, they are still faced with problems and constraints. This is due to a lack of support from local authorities, sometimes they are threatened or lack solidarity amongst the group. The majority of NGO network members, wish to strengthen their individual advocacy strategies, legal knowledge and improve their relationships with the media.

Of the 85 different training needs of the NGO network members, five key areas have been identified based on a priority index. Network members highlighted their priority training needs as legal skills followed by advocacy skills, advocacy strategy, communication skills, negotiation skills, and advocacy planning skills.

NGO Network Advocacy Assessment Analysis

Background

The Advocacy and Policy Institute (API) is a Cambodian non-profit and non-government organization with a mission to serve the long-term democratic and social development needs of Cambodia through the provision of services in the areas of advocacy and policy development.

Since its formation in July 2003, the Advocacy and Policy Institute (former the Advocacy and Policy Programme of Pact) has become established as one of the leading advocacy capacity-building institutions in Cambodia. It has received widespread positive feedback from both Cambodian and international organizations for its reliability, relevance and professionalism. API has forged its reputation through the delivery of advocacy training courses and the publication of a range of advocacy publications in both Khmer and English. API has also become increasingly involved in direct advocacy and policy activities. From 2011-2013, API is focused on three main programmes including: local democratic programme, freedom of information programme and supporting-civil society organization (S-CSO) programme. The **(S-CSO)** Programme is designed to strengthen the capacity of Cambodian advocates from all sectors and community levels, to influence policy-makers through the effective design, management and implementation of advocacy campaigns. The overall objective of this programme is to increase the number of Cambodian civil society organizations proficient in the design, management, implementation, and evaluation of lobby and advocacy campaigns and initiatives.

To effectively strengthen civil society networks, In August and October 2011, API carried out a NGO network advocacy and capacity assessment with the selected (20-30) civil society networks in Cambodia to identify advocacy experience, challenges, and needs.

The NGO network advocacy assessment is a nationally representative sample survey of NGOs working on advocacy for natural resource management in Cambodia. This is the first time API has conducted a comprehensive assessment of the NGO's advocacy work as well as their current obstacle and weaknesses. The primary purpose of this assessment is to provide API's **Supporting-Civil Society Organization(S-CSO) Programme** with up-to-date and reliable data on NGO general characteristic, including: skills and experiences, quality of advocacy planning, leadership and management, network advocacy, constraints and weakness and ultimately for the networks advocacy capacity building and strengthening.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives and areas of assessment are:

- To measure the advocacy knowledge, skills and experience of the network and members
- To measure the quality of network advocacy development plans
- To measure the effectiveness of network advocacy plan implementation
- To measure the leadership and management of networks on advocacy campaigns
- To identify areas to strengthen networks on advocacy campaigns
- To select (five) networks for advocacy capacity support and supporting the policy dialogue with the Cambodian Parliament from 2011-2013

Methodology:

The empirical parts of this assessment are drawn mainly from quantitative methods. The quantitative data focused on advocacy knowledge, skill and experiences of network members. Planned Advocacy Assessment Tools developed by Forum Syd, Diakonia and API have been used for this assessment. A semi-structured questionnaire was designed to assess the quality of network advocacy development plans, leadership and management of network advocacy campaigns, identify areas to strengthen, and to select five networks to offer advocacy capacity support.

In total, 126 NGO network members participated in filling out the questionnaire survey. The data was collected during NGO network meetings and conferences from August to November 2011.

Simple statistical analysis methods were applied when gathering information related to the percentage of different indicators. A computing system was applied for multiple answer questions, and a weight average index was applied for priority calculation.

Results

NGO Network Characteristic

Assessment results indicate that among the 117 respondents, 75% are male. About half or 54% of network members perused higher education, whereas the majority hold bachelor or master degrees (table 1.1).

1.1. NGO Network Characteristic

Gender	Number	%
Female	29	25.0
Male	87	75.0
Total	117	100.0
Level of Education		
PhD	3	2.6
Master	11	9.4
Bachelor	33	28.2
High School level 12	16	13.7
Secondary School	19	16.2
Primary School	5	4.3
Not specified	30	25.6
Total	117	100
Role and Duty		
Preparing/organizing advocacy activities (Implementer)	45	41.7
Leading /managing advocacy activities (Direct Manager)	34	31.5
Consulting to implement advocacy activities (Advisor or indirect manager)	75	69.4
Assisting to organize advocacy activities	52	48.1
Other	12	11.1
Total	117	100
Years with Network		
1	42	35.9
2	18	15.4
3	27	23.1
4	12	10.3
5	14	12.0
7	1	0.9
>7 years	3	2.6

Total	117	100
--------------	------------	------------

Members of the NGO advocacy network hold more than one role in their respective organization. As the results from the table 1.1 above reveal, most of network members did not spent most of their time on direct advocacy work i.e. leading or organizing activities. They play many roles at the same time, but about three third in consultancy roles, followed by advocacy organizing.

More than three thirds or 75% of NGO networks have limited experience working in advocacy. The majority of members have only one to three years, while only small percentage have more than four years experience.

Network Advocacy Skills and Experiences

2.1. Use to get trained

Years	Number	Percentage
Never trained	28	26.4
Got trained	78	73.6
Total	106	100.0

78 members out of 106 or 74% stated they had training in advocacy skills and techniques, while only about one fourth of those responded that they had no training.

2.2. Subject being trained

Trained Subject	Number	Percentage
Land Law	30	26.55
Leadership	17	15.04
Environment	13	11.50
Information collection	12	10.61
Anti-corruption	9	7.96
Total	113	100.0

Having gone through semi-structured questionnaire regarding previous training, 31 different subjects were raised by networks members (**Annex 1**). Some networks member received training in more than one subject. Approximately 27% received training in land law, followed by leadership skills, environment, information collection, and anti-corruption (Table 2.2).

2.3. Key Five NGO most often provide training

Institution	Number	Percentage
Starkampuchea	19	24.67
FACT	10	12.98
PACT	4	5.19
API	4	5.19
CPN	3	3.89
Total	113	100.0

30 institutes (**Annex 2**) offered training to advocacy network member. However, only few were named or remembered. Those led by Starkampuchea, FACT, PACT, API, and CPN respectively (Table2.3).

2.4. Advocacy Experience

Level of Knowledge	Number	Percentage
Low understanding	14	12.0
Good Understanding	68	58.1
Skillful	28	23.9
Very Skillful	1	0.9
Other	6	5.1
Total	117	100.0

Even though their experience in advocacy is relatively short most of NGO advocacy network members claimed that they have good level of understanding (table 2.4). Only few members stated they have limited skills or don't fully understand advocacy skills.

2.5. Advocacy Knowledge Usage

Level of usage	Number	Percentage
Very little	17	15.0
Seldom	47	41.6
Often	34	30.1
Always	15	13.3
Total	117	100.0

Interestingly, the majority of the NGO network has a high level of knowledge in advocacy, however only a limited few regularly use their knowledge (13.3%) (table 2.5).

2.6. Important of advocacy skills for your network

Level of important	Number	Percentage
Nothing	-	-
A little bit	7	6.1
Important	35	30.7
Very important	72	63.2
Total	114	100.0

These figures show the contrast between the frequency of use and the importance of advocacy. Table 2.6 indicates that more than 63% of members stated that advocacy skills are important in their work, but on 13.3% (in table 2.5) regularly use and apply their skills. Further training is required and candidate selection should be considered. Training should be offered to those with the most needs.

2.7. Organization experienced in leading advocacy campaign

Leading advocacy	Number	Percentage
No	12	10.7
Yes	100	89.3
Total	112	100.0

Members were asked if they have any experiences in leading any advocacy campaign, the majority response was "yes". This indicator proves that more or less members have the opportunity to take part in advocacy activities.

Quality of Network Advocacy Plan

3.1. Develop Advocacy Plan

Develop advocacy plan	Number	Percentage
No	12	10.8
Yes	99	89.2
Total	111	100.0

Table 3.1 shows that the majority of network members take the lead in developing advocacy planning. However, the level of their performance or ability to lead may be impacted by different outputs as detailed in the following section.

3.2. Advocacy Problem Analysis

Leading advocacy*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Problem identification	-	1(0.9)	6(5.4)	34(30.6)	39(35.1)	19(17.1)	12(10.8)	111
Cause and effect analysis	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	6(5.4)	39(34.8)	32(28.6)	19(17)	12(10.7)	112
Clear solution for identified problem, internally	-	2(1.8)	4(3.6)	42(37.5)	34(30.4)	21(18.8)	9(8)	112
Clear solution for identified problem, outsiders	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	14(12.3)	39(34.2)	39(34.2)	11(9.6)	9(7.9)	114
Staff understanding and commitment	-	1(0.0)	9(8.0)	33(29.2)	42(37.2)	20(17.7)	8(7.1)	113

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

As with most problem analysis, problem identification is easy however it is more difficult to find clear solutions or strategies. From this cycle, 65.7% of the network stated they have ability to identify key problems with their advocacy work. Most stated they were able to identify clear solutions for specific problems within their internal group. Some network members (12.3%) stated that their capacity in communication is still weak (table 3.2). Understanding and commitment to solve the problems also needed to be strengthened.

3.3. Research for Advocacy

Research for Advocacy*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Conduct research before advocacy	2(1.8)	1(0.9)	7(6.1)	32(28.1)	43(37.7)	20(17.5)	9(7.9)	114
Research conduct with target group consultation	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	5(4.4)	38(33.6)	42(37.2)	15(13.3)	9(8.0)	113
Research findings documented	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	19(16.7)	38(33.3)	36(31.6)	11(9.6)	8(7.0)	114
Staff trained to do research	9(8.1)	3(2.7)	21(18.9)	35(31.5)	29(26.1)	9(8.1)	5(4.5)	111
Data is systematic organized	2(1.8)	5(4.5)	18(16.4)	24(21.8)	45(40.9)	13(11.8)	3(2.7)	110

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

With regard to advocacy research, the majority of network members stated that it is important to conduct scientific research before any advocacy work. More than 75% of the network claimed that they are good or average at doing research for advocacy and that they consult with beneficiaries when required.

Those who stated they are good at conducting research and community consultation, did however point out their weaknesses, including: documentation, staff capacity to do the research, as well as systematic data storage and management.

3.4. Advocacy Goal Setting (Advocacy Plan)

Research for Advocacy*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Advocacy idea states clear overall goal	-	1(0.9)	6(5.3)	33(29.2)	41(36.3)	22(19.5)	10(8.8)	113
Overall goals has clear specific objectives	-	2(1.8)	8(7.2)	31(27.9)	37(33.3)	29(26.1)	4(3.6)	111
Overall goals understandable by outsiders	1(0.9)	-	7(6.3)	40(35.7)	38(33.9)	20(17.9)	6(5.4)	112
Overall goals are realistic	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	8(7.1)	36(32.1)	39(34.8)	20(17.9)	6(5.4)	112
Overall goals are achievable	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	13(11.6)	39(34.8)	40(35.7)	12(10.7)	4(3.6)	112

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

Setting a general advocacy goal is an “entry” point for advocacy work. More than 75% of the network set a general goal for their advocacy as good or very good. However, the ability to define specific objectives is still an issue as stated by about 10% of the network. A small percentage of network members stated their overall goal was not so clear to outsiders and unrealistic. Although more than three fourth of network could achieve their goal, it was unclear if they achieved 100% or less. Interestingly, about one fourth stated their level of achievements as weak.

3.5. Success Indicators

Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Use indicators in advocacy plan	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	15(13.4)	44(39.3)	32(28.6)	13(11.6)	6(5.4)	112
Indicators understood by all involved person	-	-	19(17.1)	44(39.6)	30(27)	15(13.5)	3(2.7)	111
Indicators measurable by existing resources	2(1.8)	-	18(16.2)	42(37.8)	33(29.7)	12(10.8)	4(3.6)	111
Indicators measured progress toward objectives	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	11(10.1)	39(35.8)	39(35.8)	11(10.1)	7(6.4)	109
Indicators are SMART	-	2(1.8)	10(9.1)	39(35.5)	35(31.8)	14(12.7)	10(9.1)	110

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

Interestingly, most NGO network members (90%) have an advocacy plan but only about one fifth of those use indicators in their advocacy plan (table 3.5). Approximately a quarter are unclear about indicators. This shows that there is inconsistent thinking with regard to joint advocacy activities.

More than 75% have their existing resources to measure their advocacy indicators, whereas one fifth doesn't. This is could be due to the fact that the set indicators were not clear to everyone during the planning process.

3.6. Stakeholder Analysis

Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Stakeholders analysis form	2(1.8)	2(1.8)	16(14.5)	35(31.8)	38(34.5)	13(11.8)	4(3.6)	110
Clearly identify our supporters	-	-	10(9)	41(36.9)	41(36.9)	16(14.4)	3(2.7)	111
Clearly identify our opponents	2(1.8)	2(1.8)	12(10.9)	44(40)	40(36.4)	8(7.3)	2(1.8)	110
Clearly identify neutral person	2(1.8)	5(4.6)	9(8.3)	35(32.1)	44(40.4)	12(11)	2(1.8)	109
Look for alliance and opponents position	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	21(19.3)	43(39.4)	27(24.8)	13(11.9)	3(2.8)	109

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

NGO network members are good at stakeholder analysis, but about one fifth don't have proper form for doing stakeholder analysis. Most of them indicated that they are good at identifying their supporters and opponents, but some members still worry that their ability to identify those people is still limited (table 3.6). The major concern in this stakeholder analysis section shows that the NGO advocacy network members are not able to identify their alliances or their opponent's positions. If training is organized to address issues going forward, coalition building or coordination skills needed to be included.

3.7. Advocacy Action Plan Development

Action Plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Advocacy work based on written action plan	-	2(1.8)	6(5.5)	25(22.7)	42(38.2)	30(27.3)	5(4.5)	110
Responsibility is delegated to specific activities	-	1(0.9)	14(12.6)	40(36)	41(36.9)	9(8.1)	6(5.4)	111
Activities follow the plan	-	1(0.9)	10(9.2)	34(31.2)	36(33)	24(22)	4(3.7)	109
Plan included starting date and ending date	2(1.8)	1(0.9)	6(5.4)	25(22.5)	41(36.9)	21(18.9)	15(13.5)	111
Our plan seeking outside event as opportunity	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	12(10.9)	33(30)	40(36.4)	15(13.6)	7(6.4)	110

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

More than 90% of network members, stated they agreed that advocacy work required a proper action plan. More than half responded that they are good at writing advocacy plans for their work. However, tasks and responsibility delegation is an issue. Follow-up activities were highlighted as weak points by some network members (Table 3.7).

Planning with a clear start and end date was commonly actioned but planning in conjunction with other events as an advocacy opportunity is relatively weak (11%, stated by members).

3.8. Advocacy Coalition Building

Coalition Building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Coalition formed while conduct advocacy	-	2(1.8)	8(7.1)	33(29.5)	38(33.9)	18(16.1)	13(11.6)	112
Clear defined role and responsibilities	-	1(0.9)	10(9)	31(27.9)	41(36.9)	17(17.3)	11(9.9)	111
Able to create common goal in coalition	-	1(0.9)	8(7.3)	23(20.9)	43(39.1)	27(24.5)	8(7.3)	110
Coalition member committee through the process	-	2(1.8)	5(4.5)	24(21.8)	53(48.2)	16(14.5)	10(9.1)	110
Information and power sharing among members	-	3(2.8)	4(3.7)	27(25)	44(40.7)	16(14.8)	14(13)	108
Well functioning and useful for advocacy	-	2(1.8)	6(5.4)	33(29.7)	39(35.1)	18(16.2)	13(11.7)	111

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

The advocacy coalition results in table 3.8 reveal that most members (>90%) define themselves as good at forming a group and their ability to do advocacy together. However, two interesting points were highlighted including the role and responsibilities of each member were not clearly defined resulting in an inability to come up with a common advocacy goal.

The commitment of members doing group advocacy is just under 50% which is rated as a "good" level..

Information and power sharing among members in the advocacy coalition was rated as good by 40% of the group. These members also stated that forming such a group is really useful for their advocacy.

Network Advocacy Action Plan Effectiveness

4.1 Advocacy M&E

M&E Activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Monitoring is part of advocacy plan	-	2(1.8)	3(2.7)	32(28.6)	43(38.6)	20(17.9)	12(10.7)	112
Successes and failures are documented	-	1(0.9)	12(11)	23(21.1)	44(40.4)	18(16.5)	11(10.1)	109
Use evaluation form measure effort	5(4.5)	2(1.8)	15(31.8)	35(26.4)	29(26.4)	16(14.5)	8(7.3)	110
Evaluation result used for future improvement	-	1(0.9)	12(10.9)	26(23.6)	37(33.6)	21(19.1)	13(11.8)	110
Staff trained on M&E	3(2.7)	2(1.8)	15(13.6)	40(36.4)	25(22.7)	18(16.4)	7(6.4)	110
Advocacy results	-	1(0.9)	15(13.6)	50(45.5)	28(25.5)	12(10.9)	4(3.6)	110

*1: Non-existing, 2: Very weak, 3: Weak, 4: Average, 5: Good, 6: Very good, and 7: Excellent

Almost all advocacy network members stated that monitoring and evaluation is included in their advocacy frameworks. However, success and failure stories are not properly documented. Nearly half of the respondents mentioned that their documentation systems were average of weak (table 4.1).

Interestingly, about 50% stated that they used their evaluation results to measure their efforts. More than quarter (33.6%) claimed that their evaluation system is weak or very weak. In sequences, the results were used in their future improvement (11%). Only 50% of network members use their evaluation result for their work.

Less than half the network stated that their staff are good at monitoring and evaluation, more than 50% rated them as average or weak. If any training is to be provided, M&E for advocacy is highly recommended.

Only 40% of members rated their advocacy results as good or better from their efforts with 60% stating they were not satisfied with their results.

4.2 Rate your organization doing advocacy campaign

4.2.1 Organizational Advocacy Experiences

Advocacy Experiences*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
My NGO conduct advocacy	2(1.9)	5(4.7)	11(10.3)	66(61.7)	23(21.5)	107
MY NGO has reputation as an effective advocator	4(3.8)	4(3.8)	15(14.2)	54(50.9)	29(27.4)	106

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

83% of network members claimed that their NGO conducts advocacy and has a good reputation as effective advocators.

4.2.2 Working with the government

Advocacy Experiences*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Well organized before meeting with government	2(1.8)	12(10.9)	22(20)	58(52.7)	16(14.5)	110
My NGO has created a government relations plan to influence the government during an advocacy campaign	4(3.7)	10(9.3)	26(24.3)	52(48.6)	15(14)	107
My NGO collaborates with the national government well	5(4.6)	9(8.3)	25(22.9)	55(50.5)	15(13.8)	109
My NGO collaborates with the local government well	2(1.8)	12(10.9)	22(20)	58(52.7)	16(14.5)	110

My network meeting with government official many time for doing advocacy	4(3.7)	10(9.3)	26(24.3)	52(48.6)	15(14)	107
--	--------	---------	----------	----------	--------	-----

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

In each advocacy campaign about 60% of NGO network members stated they organized their position or documentation before meeting with the government. (Table 4.2.2)

Nearly one fifth of network members did not have a plan to influence the government. However, this activity was prepared by the majority of the network. About 60% of members stated they have a good relationship with government at all level starting from national to local level. However, nearly half of them did not meet regularly with government officials.

4.2.3 Working with Media

Working with media*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
My NGO has created a media plan for our advocacy campaign	2(1.8)	4(3.6)	23(20.9)	60(54.5)	21(19.1)	110
My NGO regularly shares information through the media	2(1.7)	9(8.3)	27(25)	53(49.1)	17(15.7)	108
Conducted media interviews on behalf of your NGO	15(14.3)	18(17.1)	17(16.2)	42(40)	13(12.4)	105
My NGO has issued press releases several times.	5(4.8)	12(11.4)	25(23.8)	45(42.9)	18(17.1)	105
My NGO has a media contact database	2(1.9)	6(5.7)	16(15.1)	60(56.6)	22(20.8)	106
News reporters have contacted several times	11(10.7)	14(13.6)	22(21.4)	42(40.8)	14(13.6)	103
My NGO has conducted press conference several times	7(6.7)	11(10.6)	36(34.6)	39(37.5)	11(10.6)	104
My NGO has a media file and media log.	5(4.9)	8(7.8)	23(22.5)	50(49)	16(15.7)	102

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

Table 4.2.3 indicates that about 70% of network members created a media plan for their advocacy campaign. This is really interesting as more than a quarter of them were not aware that their organization has a media campaign plan in advocacy activities. Although many NGO network members regularly share their information to outsiders through the media, half of them never do or have done before.

Of the 105 responses, about 55 or 60% of NGO network members have done media interviews on behalf of their respective organizations; while almost half are not aware about media activities within their organizations.

About 50% of network members issued joint press releases for their advocacy work, while less than half of them had regular contact from the media for interviews.. About 80% of network members have a media contact database in their office. Almost half of the network has no experience conducting a press conference. 64% stated their organization has a media file or media log.

4.2.4 Working with coalition

Working with coalition*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
My NGO works effectively in coalition with other NGOs	2(1.9)	5(4.7)	15(14)	69(64.5)	16(15)	107
My NGO has created a coalition plan and sets clear responsibilities and resources of each coalition member during an advocacy campaign	1(0.9)	5(4.6)	16(14.7)	60(55)	27(24.8)	109
Our coalition usually has a plan and sets clear goals and objectives	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	13(11.9)	57(52.3)	34(31.2)	109
Our coalition usually accomplishes its goals and objectives	1(0.9)	7(6.6)	21(19.8)	59(55.7)	18(17)	106

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

More than 75% of network members claimed their NGO works very effectively with other NGOs. Similar figure also rate NGO network in their creation of a coalition plan with clearly set responsibilities and resources of each group during each advocacy campaign. Approximately 20% of the network complained that their coalition did not have a clear plan, goals and objectives for their coalition (Table 4.2.4).

Nearly half the network was unsure if the coalition achieved their goals or objectives accordingly to their plan. This is could be due to poor coordination and unclear common understanding as highlighted in the question.

4.2.5 Working on legal system

Working with coalition*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
My NGO has created a legal strategic plan for our advocacy campaign to ensure implementation rule of law.	3(2.8)	6(5.5)	22(20.2)	59(54.1)	19(17.4)	109
My NGO understands how to use the courts system in our advocacy campaign	3(2.8)	8(7.5)	29(27.4)	54(50.9)	12(11.3)	106
Citizens come to my NGO to seek help while their rights been abused	1(0.9)	5(4.6)	14(12.8)	68(62.4)	21(19.3)	109
My NGO conducts full interviews and gets all of the necessary information from a client/beneficiary with a legal problem	1(0.9)	2(1.9)	19(2.8)	62(57.4)	24(22.2)	108
My NGO keeps good records of all client interviews and progress on cases	1(0.9)	2(1.9)	22(20.4)	68(63)	15(13.9)	108
My NGO works well with lawyers to help clients/beneficiaries solve their problems	3(2.8)	6(5.6)	33(30.8)	49(45.8)	16(15)	107

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

Working within the legal system is an important component in advocacy processes. However, about one fourth (28%) of the network did not have a strategic legal plan for their advocacy campaign to ensure the implementation the rule of law. Only 60% of members understand how to use the court system in their advocacy campaign, while nearly half of those were not quite sure or do not know.

Almost 80% of the network stated that the local community has approached them to request assistance with human rights abuse. Network members conducted interviews to gather all related information from their clients to assist with their case and to insure they do not encounter any legal problems. However, about 20% of NGO network do not have proper documentation management systems for recording their client stories or legal history.

It was noted that approximately one third of the NGO network stated their respective NGO did not work well with lawyers to support their clients or resolve problems. This could be due to a lack of legal knowledge. The analysis showed that only 50% of NGO network members are able work with lawyers to assist their clients.

4.2.6 Community mobilization

Community Mobilization*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
My NGO regularly shares information with the public	1(0.9)	11(10.2)	33(30.6)	48(44.4)	15(13.9)	108
My NGO regularly shares information with beneficiaries	1(0.9)	7(6.5)	26(24.3)	56(52.3)	17(15.9)	107
My NGO has created a public outreach plan to mobilize the community during an advocacy campaign	-	5(4.5)	20(18)	62(55.9)	24(21.6)	111
My NGO usually shares information through public forums, workshops or seminars	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	6(5.4)	62(55.9)	39(35.1)	111

My NGO usually shares information through written documents (flyers, briefing papers, etc)	2(1.8)	7(6.4)	12(11)	55(50.5)	33(30.3)	109
Mobilize community to meet and discuss to identify problems, threat, challenges	-	2(1.8)	5(4.5)	73(66.4)	30(27.3)	110
Set up community core group or community representative to lead advocacy	1(0.9)	2(1.9)	15(13.9)	62(57.4)	28(25.9)	108
Build capacity to core group or community representative	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	12(10.9)	66(60)	28(25.5)	110
Research and collect information related to the problems	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	8(7.4)	70(64.8)	28(25.9)	108
Support community core group meeting to develop plan to address their issues	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	12(11.1)	60(55.6)	31(28.7)	108
Assist the core group to communicate and finding support from other NGOs, media	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	17(15.5)	64(58.2)	26(23.6)	110
Support community representative to advocate the government officials directly on their issues	2(1.8)	2(1.8)	14(12.6)	66(59.5)	27(24.3)	111
Provide technical support to core group to organize the open advocacy campaign	1(0.9)	4(3.6)	17(15.5)	67(60.9)	21(19.1)	110
Learn from communities for project reflection	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	9(8.3)	73(67)	24(22)	109

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

Table 4.2.6 indicates that less than 50% of network members stated their NGO regularly shares information with the public while about 30% stated they did not know. Only 7% of NGO network member stated they did not share information with their beneficiaries. More than three fourth or 75% of NGO network members created a public outreach plan to mobilize the community to join in an advocacy campaign.

With regard to sharing information with the public, about three fourth usually share information through public forums, workshops or seminars, while more than 90% of NGO network members share information through written documents e.g. flyers, briefing papers, etc.

More than 90% of members mobilize the community for meetings to discuss and identify their problems, threats and challenges. Approximately a third has experience setting up a community core group or appointing a community representative to lead advocacy and build capacity. Research and information collection for addressing community problems is actioned by 90% of the networks members.

Nearly 20% of members have no experience assisting the core group to communicate and finding support from other NGOs or media. 75% of members have supported community representatives with technical support to organize open advocacy campaigns and to advocate government officials directly regarding their issues.

4.3 Success of advocacy campaign

Advocacy Result*	Number of Response	Valid Percentage
Fully successful	3	3.4
Partially successful	63	70.8
In the process of resolution	17	19.1
Not success	3	3.4
Do not know about the status	3	3.4
Total	89	100

Interestingly, as a result advocacy campaigns, only 3.4% of the network stated they were fully successful while 71% were partially successful (Table 4.3). About 90% of network members reflected on what they documented as their lesson learnt for future work (table 4.2.6).

Leadership and Management Network Advocacy

5.1 Element for success

Element for Success*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Has clear structure	3(2.8)	4(3.7)	19(17.6)	50(46.3)	32(29.6)	108
Wider group and multidisciplinary	2(1.8)	3(2.8)	20(18.3)	56(51.4)	28(25.7)	109
Leadership with skills and discipline	1(0.9)	2(1.9)	18(16.7)	63(58.3)	24(22.2)	108
Clear system for conflict resolution process	1(0.9)	2(1.9)	20(18.7)	61(57)	23(21.5)	107
Good interpersonal and reliable by its member	1(0.9)	-	12(11.1)	64(59.3)	31(28.7)	108

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

80% of network members had a clear structure and multidisciplinary team. The majority stated that their leaders were equipped with skills and discipline. However, about one fourth highlighted that the group does not have a clear system for conflict resolution (table 5.1).

5.2 Membership

There is a set of criteria of being a member in the advocacy network. The table below shows that more than 70% of network members agree that there is need to criteria for both new and old network members. Only a few network members are unsure or do not agree on this.

Our network has criteria's for new members loyal members

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	1.7	1.8	1.8
	Not sure	18	15.4	16.5	18.3
	Agree	63	53.8	57.8	76.1
	Totally Agree	26	22.2	23.9	100.0
	Total	109	93.2	100.0	
Missing	System	8	6.8		
Total		117	100.0		

5.3 Participation

Participation*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
All member well aware about expected outputs	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	17(15.6)	64(58.7)	26(23.9)	109
All member come from identified institutions	2(1.8)	3(4.5)	16(14.5)	60(54.5)	27(24.5)	110
Each members hold decision making level	2(1.9)	4(3.7)	18(16.7)	61(56.5)	23(21.3)	108
Clear policy and guideline in resources management	2(1.9)	5(4.7)	47(34.6)	50(46.7)	13(12.1)	107
Clear membership and decision making policy	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	19(17.9)	67(63.2)	18(17)	106
Define clear role and responsibility	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	12(11.9)	66(60.6)	28(25.7)	109

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

In leadership and management, participation from members is a key element for success. Table 5.3 shows that more than 75% of network members stated that their advocacy members are well aware of their expected outputs and of taking part in particular advocacy activities. Most members come from known institutions with high profiles.

Nearly 50% of the network claimed that there is no clear policy regarding resource management, although 80% stated they have a clear membership and decision making policy as well as clearly defined roles and responsibilities amongst members. When selecting leaders there are clear procedures in their internal policy and procedure (table 5.4).

5.4 Leadership

Leadership*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Clear policy and procedure for selecting leaders	1(0.9)	-	14(12.7)	62(56.4)	33(30)	110
Clear define public role and responsibility	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	15(14)	61(57)	29(27.1)	107

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

The assessment also found that more than three fourth of the NGO network stated the network has a clearly defined procedure for decision making and conflict resolution. (Table 5.5)

5.5 Decision making

Decision Making Tools*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Clear define for decision making tools	3(2.8)	3(2.8)	17(15.9)	62(57.9)	22(20.6)	107
Clear conflict resolution procedure	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	9(8.3)	66(60.6)	29(26.6)	109
Policy procedure for decision making for monthly or urgently	2(1.9)	2(1.9)	28(26.2)	59(55.1)	16(15)	107

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

5.6 Members identity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	4	3.4	3.6	3.6
	Disagree	7	6.0	6.4	10.0
	Not sure	32	27.4	29.1	39.1
	Agree	54	46.2	49.1	88.2
	Totally Agree	13	11.1	11.8	100.0
	Total	110	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.0		
Total		117	100.0		

With regard to membership identification, approximately 50% agree that their network advocacy members have clear identities, while more than one fourth is unsure about each others identity. These results are in line with the alliance and opponent identification. For effectiveness the future advocacy, management and leadership, advocates need to recognize this point.

5.7 Public relation

Public Relation*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Each meeting has minute, define clear role and responsibility	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	8(7.3)	66(60.6)	32(29.4)	109
Important fact and information shared with member during meeting	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	2(1.8)	62(58.5)	40(37.3)	106
Important information shared with member via phone, fax, email and website	-	4(3.4)	7(6.5)	64(59.3)	33(30.6)	108
Clear communication procedure among member during emergency time	-	1(0.9)	18(16.8)	61(57)	27(25.2)	107
Define principle communication language	1 (1)	6(5.7)	19(18.1)	54(51.4)	25(23.8)	105

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

In each meeting, specific roles and responsibilities were clearly defined. Most facts, data and important information were shared widely amongst members. For urgent matter, information

was also shared via different means including phone, fax, email or website. About 17% of members complained that communication procedures amongst members during times of emergency were unclear. A similar percentage also suggested having a principle language for the community to encourage a common understanding and use of the same language (Table 5.7).

5.8 Meeting facilitation

Meeting Facilitation*	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Set number of regular meeting	2(1.9)	7(6.7)	11(10.5)	55(52.4)	30(28.6)	105
Set clear time, date and place	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	8(7.5)	61(57)	33(30.8)	107
Meeting facilitator is clearly assigned	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	64(59.8)	37(34.6)	107
Clear guideline for setting up meeting agenda	1(0.9)	1(0.9)	4(3.7)	68(62.4)	35(32.1)	109

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

Nearly 80% agree that their regular meeting was set in their planning. Each meeting has a defined time, date and place. Each meeting facilitator and agenda is clearly set and assigned. (Table 5.8)

Constrain and weakness of Network in doing advocacy

6.1 Constrain and weakness

Constrain and Weakness	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Not supported by local authorities	9(8.2)	17(15.5)	20(18.2)	49(44.5)	15(13.6)	110
Community being threaten	12(10.8)	12(10.8)	21(18.9)	47(42.3)	19(17.1)	111
Lack of solidarity	18(16.5)	22(20.2)	30(27.5)	31(28.4)	8(7.3)	109
Not being supported by competent authorities	10(9.1)	20(18.2)	17(15.5)	50(45.5)	13(11.8)	110
Has not enough supported documents	11(10.1)	14(12.8)	22(20.2)	49(45)	13(11.9)	109
Limited advocacy knowledge	3(2.8)	10(9.3)	19(17.6)	62(57.4)	14(13)	108
No clear planning	19(17.4)	25(21.4)	22(18.8)	37(31.6)	6(5.1)	109
Lack of resources	9(8.2)	11(10)	20(18.2)	50(45.5)	19(17.3)	110
Has no supporters	15(14.2)	26(24.5)	19(17.9)	38(35.8)	8(7.5)	106

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally agree

Although the NGO network advocacy members have lot of experience and have achieved a number of results, they are still faced with some problems and constrains. About 50% of members stated they are not supported by local as well as competent authorities. Nearly half stated they had been threaten. About 40% mention problems concerning a lack of solidarity amongst the group as well as limited advocacy campaign supporters.

Notably, more than 50% of network members cited a lack of supporting documents or lack of resources, while about 40% cited that they had working constraints and no clear plan for their advocacy.

Network Advocacy Strengthening

7.1. Network Strengthening

Network Strengthening	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Strengthening advocacy strategy	-	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	66(60)	40(36.4)	110
Strengthening relation and lobbying with government	-	1(0.9)	3(2.7)	57(51.4)	50(45)	111
Strengthening relation with media	-	2(1.8)	6(5.4)	48(43.2)	55(49.5)	111
Strengthening with coalition	-	-	6(5.4)	58(52.3)	47(42.3)	111

Strengthening relation with legal system and lawyers	-	1(0.9)	22(19.8)	54(48.6)	34(30.6)	111
Community empowerment and community mobilization to do advocacy	-	-	6(5.4)	53(47.7)	52(46.8)	111

*1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Not sure, 4: Agree, 5: Totally

Regarding a strengthening strategy for NGO advocacy network members, more than 90% agree that their individual advocacy strategies need strengthening, particularly their relationship building and lobbying with the government and media.

About 90% stated they would like to strengthen their knowledge of the legal system and work closer with lawyers. Network members also stated that community empowerment and mobilization to do advocacy on their own needed to be strengthened.

NGO Training needs for capacity development

Often we want to study the training priority needs of network members to strengthen their performance. Analysis from each response cited different needs and priorities. To achieve this result, construction of an index value needs to be applied. Since there are five values for network strengthening a scale was applied, as follow:

First priority 1.00-0.81	Second 0.80-0.61	Third 0.41-0.60	Fourth 0.40-0.20	Fifth < 0.20
-----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	---------------------	-----------------

The purpose here is to keep the index value between 0 and 1 for convenience and easy interpretation. There are five gaps i.e., <0.20, 0.20-0.40, 0.41-0.60, 0.61-0.80, and 0.81-1.00. So 1 was divided by five steps was computed as 0.20.

For this priority assessment, 117 NGO advocacy network members were asked to mention their five most priority training needs . 85 different training needs (**annex 3**) were identified. A table was constructed with a suitable scale to calculate the priority index against each other and compare as shown in below table.

8.1 Network Training Need for Capacity Development

Network Training Need for Capacity Development	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	Priority Index
Advocacy skills	26	12	5	5	2	0.80
Advocacy strategy	11	7	9	1	2	0.74
Negotiation and facilitation skills	5	9	6	2	1	0.71
Advocacy Planning Skills	7	3	1	5	3	0.62
Legal skills	8	6	2	1	-	0.84
Communication skills	4	5	2	1	1	0.73

*>0.80: First Priority, 0.80-0.61: Second Priority, 0.60-0.41: Third Priority, 0.40-0.21: Fourth Priority, and <.20: Fifth Priority

From the construction index summarized in table 8.1 it shows that the NGO advocacy network members attach their highest priority training needs to legal skills followed by advocacy skill, advocacy strategy, communication skills, negotiation skill, and advocacy planning skill respectively.

Conclusion:

More than half of the NGO network members hold higher education, but few have experience in advocacy work. Although a number a number of members have been trained they have

received training related to land law, environment, leadership skills or information collection rather than advocacy training.

Network members in the past have taken the lead in developing advocacy planning and identifying problems in their advocacy work however they have struggled in developing solutions, particularly working with research projects. It is hard for them to define common goals and measure their achievements. This could be due to their defined indicator was not clear and understood by all involved stakeholders as well as them not working well with the media in their advocacy work.

NGO network members are still faced with some problems and constraints due to a lack of support from local authorities, sometime being threatened or lack of solidarity amongst their group.

From the construction index the NGO advocacy network members have attached their highest priority training needs as legal skills followed by advocacy skills, advocacy strategy, communication skills, negotiation skills, and advocacy planning skill respectively.

Annex 1

1. Trained by NGO
2. Regional meeting and peace building
3. Community Legal Education
4. Leadership
5. Fishing rights
6. Training on environment
7. Fisheries Law
8. Inundated forest destruction
9. Illegal Fishing Gears
10. Violent
11. Gender
12. Climate Change
13. Civil Code
14. Human Rights
15. Constitutional Law
16. Land Law
17. Negotiation Skills
18. Training is limited
19. Other Training
20. Advocacy Training
21. Data collection
22. Peace talk
23. Management Skills
24. Governance
25. Anti-corruption
26. Criminal Code
27. Expropriation Law
28. Social Accountability
29. Sub-national governance law
30. Research and Development
31. Pesticide

Annex 2

1. CLEC (Community Legal Education Center)
2. CPN (Community Peace Building Network)
3. PACT Cambodia
4. FACT (Fisheries Action Coalition Team)
5. API (Advocacy and Policy Institute)
6. VSG (Village Support Group)
7. ADHOC (Cambodia Human Rights and Development Association)
8. DKA (Day Ku Aphiwat)
9. ActionAid
10. Community Capacity Building Organization
11. NDI (National Democratic Institute)
12. CCD (Cambodia Children Development Organization)
13. Star Kampuchea
14. DPA (Development and Partnership in Action)
15. PDP (People Center for Development and Peace)
16. UN (United Nation)
17. PRN_C (Pesticide Reduction Network in Cambodia (PRNC))
18. NGO (Non-Governmental Organisation)
19. CRD (Cambodian Researcher for Development)
20. UNOHCHR(United Nation Office if High Commissioner for Human Rights)
21. BANK
22. WVC (World Vision Cambodia)
23. Independent Public Information Center
24. CNRO (Cambodian Nation Research Organization)
25. CDP (Cambodian Defender Project)
26. CCSP (Cambodian Civil Society Partnership)

Annex 3

1. Negotiation and Facilitation Skills
2. Legal skills
3. Effective problem solving
4. Advocacy Strategy
5. Legal planning
6. Advocacy Planning
7. Land Law
8. Writing Skills
9. Advocacy Skills
10. Criminal Code
11. Fisheries Law
12. Forestry Law
13. External relation
14. Campaign Strengthening
15. Exchange visit
16. Other supports
17. Network meeting
18. Training
19. Human Rights
20. Training on Land Law
21. Proposal writing
22. Report writing
23. Research and investigation
24. Writing media article
25. Training on Human Rights
26. Questionnaire development
27. Lobbying Skills
28. Effective community leadership
29. Environment
30. Out of court conflict resolution process
31. Law, court, fisheries and land
32. Facilitation skills
33. Management skills
34. Planning skills
35. Leadership role and responsibility
36. Budget proposal writing
37. Eliminate illegal activities
38. NGO Cooperation
39. Wider communication
40. API Training
41. Good governance
42. Community role and rights
43. Effective communication with high profile
44. Research skills
45. Community facilitation skills
46. Working in legal system with lawyer and court
47. Case study writing
48. Project writing
49. Taking Photograph and Photocopy

50. Case investigation
51. Community livelihoods
52. Economic planning
53. Legal services
54. Strategic Plan
55. Community activities implementation
56. Role and responsibility of sub-national level
57. Criminal law
58. Legal collection for advocacy works
59. Research and investigation skills
60. Speaking skills
61. Expropriation law
62. Problem analysis for results
63. Data collection
64. Communication and information collection
65. Communication skill with local authorities
66. Group work
67. Organic Farming
68. Agricultural law
69. Rice export policy
70. Water and agriculture policy
71. Clean Development Mechanism
72. Climate Change
73. What is Green House Gas
74. Narrowing gap between the rich and the poor
75. Reduce market price
76. Exchange experiences between local and internal NGOs
77. Success and Failure Case documentation
78. UN declaration on Human Rights
79. Problems grouping
80. Filing complain writing
81. Gender and Sexual Health
82. Community Empowerment
83. Community Organizing
84. Community Youth Capacity Building
85. Successful and Peaceful Advocacy Campaign Integration
86. OPA Activity in the Commune Investment Plans
87. Official anti-corruption reform