MODULE 4
GENDER AND ENERGY ADVOCACY
TRAINERS MANUAL
AN EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR TRAINERS

As in Modules 2 and 5, the theory in Module 4 is supported by case-practices in which participants have the opportunity to practice new skills and to receive feedback from the trainers and other participants. Apart from Unit 1, every unit is concluded with a case-practice, which deals with the elements of theory described in the unit. In this module, the case-practice is focused around a fictional country – Anchellius – that will play a central role in the analysis, design, formulation and implementation of an advocacy strategy. Thus, as Unit 2 deals with identification of gender and energy issues, one of the goals for the case-practice in Unit 2 is to identify gender and energy issues in Anchellius.

The case-practices have been given the same numbers as the unit and, since there is no case-practice for Unit 1, the first case-practice is case-practice 2.

Information on Anchellius and all other required background information is given in the module as and when it is needed. Some additional general information on Anchellius is provided in Appendix A. If participants feel they need more information than is provided, they are free to “fill in the gaps” by drawing on their own experiences to make assumptions as long as they are realistic and well-described.

For the case-practice, participants should work together in small groups (“teams”), preferably of three people. It is best to form these groups after the introductory meeting when discussing the programme structure. The trainer should ensure that the groups are balanced by mixing experienced participants together with less experienced participants, those with technical backgrounds with those with non-technical ones, etc. Also there should, where possible, be a gender balance.

The participants can work on the case-practice activities after the theory of a unit has been presented and the exercises completed. The trainer should give a short introduction to the case-practice and tell the participants when to hand in their solutions. The duration of the case-practice elements varies from unit to unit, and the time is indicated at the beginning of each unit.

During the case-practice, the trainer should remain available to answer questions from the participants. If a hint is given, the trainer should also share it with all the other participants.

Once the allotted time for the case-practice is over, the trainer should collect the solutions and provide groups with comments and suggestions for improvements at the beginning of the next session. The trainer can then take a couple of minutes to discuss the main issues he or she identified when reviewing the case-practice.

In the last two units, the case-practice takes some sudden turns. These are meant to reflect real situations that occur when involved in advocacy. These last two units are meant to enable participants to see how well they are able to adapt to sudden changes. The trainer should stress that these are not meant to “trick” participants but that, in real life, such situations can occur.

An evaluation form is included in the Appendices of the trainer’s manual.
Trainers guide to Module 4

Unit 1

The first unit introduces advocacy. It deals with the basic elements of advocacy, strategies for influencing policy formulation and implementation, and possible activities (and roles) in the advocacy process. If all the participants already have significant experience with advocacy, the theory of this unit can be kept short and more attention given to discussing their experiences. This will enable individual weaknesses and strengths to become more visible and participants will be better able to formulate Action Plans at the end of the workshop.

Exercise 1.1 (25 minutes). This exercise is completed on an individual basis. The answers an individual gives will be discussed in pairs. Let the participants present their finding on flip charts. Make sure the participants leave room for the answers to Exercise 1.2 on this flip chart.

Discussion point 1.1 (15 minutes) is about the levels of influencing. The five questions start with the lowest level of influencing and lead up to the higher levels. Let the participants first think about the answers for five minutes and then discuss each of the questions in the group. Pay special attention to answers based on experience.

Exercise 1.2 (25 minutes). In this exercise, participants will continue to fill in their flip charts started in Exercise 1.1. They should do this on an individual basis but again discuss their findings in pairs.

Discussion point 1.2 (10 minutes) is a short discussion in which the participants will brainstorm about other possible roles for an advocate. Let the participants explain the roles they propose and ask them why these are especially important for an advocacy process.

Note: there is no case-practice with this unit.
Unit 2

The second unit of this module gives participants skills and tools to identify gender and energy strategies. They will also learn how to determine the context of an issue and which issues are most appropriate for an advocacy process. The trainer should pay special attention to the tools described in the unit.

The trainer can choose to use examples from the participants’ own experiences (the flip charts from Unit 1 can help here) in Sections 5 and 6.

**Discussion point 2.1** (10 minutes). The trainer should ask two or three participants about their experiences with identifying gender and energy issues. Following this, the entire group can brainstorm on tools and techniques for issue identification.

**Discussion point 2.2** (between 5 and 10 minutes). This discussion point can be omitted if the topics were discussed in the introduction session. Participants can give a brief explanation of their organisation, its field of activity and especially the importance of advocating gender and energy for their organisation (for instance, it might be the main focus of some organisations and, for others, just one of many activities).

**Discussion point 2.3** (10 minutes). Perhaps some of the participants have fieldwork experience. The trainer should give them an opportunity to present their experiences. The point should then be made that it is not always necessary to collect field (primary) data yourself, but that you can use data gathered by others (secondary data) – you can cite the case studies presented in Energia News as good sources. However, the dangers of using other people’s data (in particular uncertainty about its reliability which affects credibility) should be touched upon.

**Exercise 2.1** (30 minutes). Participants work on this exercise individually for the first 15 minutes. They then need to be formed into small groups of threes in which they have five minutes each to convince the other two about the correctness of their strategy. The trainer will need to ensure the five minutes are strictly adhered to. Part of the training is to have participants make the most effective use of time. In advocacy five minutes with a decision maker can be a luxury which needs to be well used.

**Exercise 2.2** (25 minutes). This exercise consists of two parts. In both parts, participants are asked to link gender goals to advocacy issues. Gender goals related to energy issues are discussed in more detail in Modules 1 and 2 of “The Gender Face of Energy”. The analysis proposed is not yet widely used in the energy sector, so the trainer is strongly advised to prepare by reading the appropriate sections in the modules. The aim of the analysis is to ensure that people undertaking advocacy are clear about what gender issues they are actually trying to address. In this context, empowerment is particularly problematic since it can have various meanings and people do not always make clear which they mean, resulting in confusion and misunderstanding.

**Discussion point 2.4** (10 to 20 minutes). This discussion point is actually a small exercise. The trainer should draw a fishbone model on a sheet of paper or on the blackboard. Next, all the participants can give underlying reasons for the indicated problem - and place them on the right bone of the fish. The trainer can opt to use an example from the experiences of the participants.

**Discussion Point 2.5** (15 minutes). In this discussion, participants are asked to think about power relations in the policy formulation process, and the varying amounts of power that different stakeholders can exercise. This discussion point prepares the participants for the next step in formulating an advocacy process: identifying stakeholders. Give the participants a few minutes to individually answer each question. Try to reach a consensus through a plenary discussion.

**Discussion point 2.6** (15 minutes). This discussion point reminds participants that an advocacy event does not take place in isolation but in a context which is shaped by a regulatory and legal framework.
(as well as by traditional norms and values). Institutions also shape gender relations. If these institutions are not formulated in a way that is sympathetic to gender advocacy then trying to achieve goals will be frustrating, if not impossible. This discussion should be carried out in subgroups of two or three participants. Ideally people with similar backgrounds should form a group. The trainer should walk around and ask critical questions in response to the answers the participants give. In the closing few minutes, the trainer can present a summary of the discussions within the subgroups.

**Case-practice 2** (90 minutes). This introduces the case which runs throughout the module. Anchellius is a fictitious country. However, in order to make the case as convincing as possible some of the data presented are real, although not from a single country. For the sake of comprehensiveness, and so not to waste participants time searching for information, more factors are included than would normally be found for such a small country as Anchellius.

In this case-practice, the participants are introduced to Anchellius and its energy sector. After providing a general introduction to the construction of the case-practice, the trainer should give the participants sufficient time to read and understand the background material. The first steps in developing the advocacy strategy are taken here. Participants have three tasks: identifying a gender and energy issue in Anchellius on which they intend to advocate; identifying the underlying causes and consequences of the issue; and identifying the risks and opportunities in an advocacy strategy. The output of Case Practice 2 will be used later in the unit, so participants need to retain the output of the exercise. To ensure that this task does not have to be repeated later, the trainer should at this stage give detailed feedback to participants on an individual basis. The participants are meant to complete the tasks in this case-practice one after the other. When they have all finished, a plenary discussion can review the process.
Unit 3

In this unit, several tools are introduced. The trainer is advised to allow more time for the theory than in other units. If the participants do not understand the theory easily, the trainer can use the tools contained in Module 3 to provide some additional information.

Unit 3 is about identifying stakeholders and the influence they have on you reaching your goals. The theory deals with classifying stakeholders into allies and opponents. The aim is to make the most effective use of allies in an advocacy strategy, and to try to counterbalance or neutralise the influence of opponents. The ways to achieve these goals will depend on the nature of the stakeholders. Tools are presented for the analysis.

Discussion point 3.1 (15 minutes) will be carried out as a brainstorming exercise. The time you allow for this discussion can depend on the time left to complete the unit. The trainer can write all the points that emerge during the discussion on a large sheet of paper and keep this in the classroom to use later as a resource.

Discussion point 3.2 (15 minutes). This discussion point builds on the examples of mapping methods presented earlier in the section. Three examples are given. The trainer should ask the participants to think about further examples. Let the participants work in small groups and, in the last five minutes, discuss the outcomes of these discussions. This discussion point can be omitted if you are short of time.

Exercise 3.1 (45 minutes). This exercise should be completed in small groups and resembles a fictional stakeholder analysis. Details of the stakeholders and some other necessary information are provided. After explaining the exercise, the trainer should give the participants at least 30 minutes to work on the analysis. Then, the trainer should allocate enough time to discuss not only the outcomes of the different groups, but also the process they have been through. The participants will use these tools again in the case practice.

Case Practice 3 (90 minutes) introduces the key stakeholders in the energy sector of Anchellius. Participants have three tasks to perform using tools introduced in this unit’s theory: identifying and mapping stakeholders; performing a force field analysis; and strategies to use with allies and opponents. The participants will work in their teams on these tasks. Time should be allowed for a plenary discussion on the tools.
Unit 4

In Unit 4, the participants design the actual advocacy strategy. The theory covers the final steps of the preparation (analysis) phase. There is a strong link with Unit 6 in which participants will learn how to write an advocacy strategy paper.

The unit describes five advocacy methods. The practical skills needed to use these methods can be practiced using the accompanying Hands-On Activities (HOAs). These HOAs are provided in the Appendices in the participant’s manual. In a five-day course, it may not be possible for participants to do all the HOAs since only four slots have been allocated in the timetable. Three HOAs take two hours each and two HOAs take one hour each. If there is more than one trainer, it would be possible for some of the HOAs to be held in parallel. If time is short and/or there is only one trainer, the participants can be asked which skills they would like to practice.

The unit includes two important tools: the SMART method for constructing gender goals (the concept was introduced in Unit 2 Section 3), and indicators for measuring progress towards reaching the desired gender strategy outcomes.

Although this unit has only one formal discussion point, there are a number of opportunities for discussing participants own experiences in organising advocacy events.

**Exercise 4.1** (25 minutes). This exercise starts with participants working individually and then discussing their answers in small groups. The participants are asked to identify which is the most appropriate advocacy level for four gender and energy issues and which person or organisation is most suited to the task. It is possible that advocacy should take place at more than one level for a particular issue. After 10 minutes, the participants should discuss their answers in small groups. The trainer can walk around and try to sense the general opinion. The final few minutes of the exercise can be used to reflect on this opinion.

**Discussion point 4.1** (10 minutes). The only discussion point in this unit concerns the advocacy level at which participants, and their organisations, are active. Participants can discuss what constrains them from working at other levels.

**Exercise 4.2** (30 minutes). For this exercise, participants will work in pairs for 15 minutes and construct SMART gender and energy goals for three general objectives. If time is short, the trainer can allocate specific pairs of participants to each objective.

The pairs are then asked to decide which strategies they would use in order to reach these gender goals.

Ideas and opinions can be exchanged in a plenary discussion on the goals and strategies. Alternatively, each pair could make a wall-chart of their goals and strategies and pin this to the wall. The participants can then circulate around the room comparing their ideas with others.

**Exercise 4.3** (45 minutes). Indicators are dealt with in more detail in Module 3, and this exercise is very similar to Exercise 3.4 from that module.

The exercise is in two parts. First, the participants have to classify indicators as either quantiative or qualitative. They are then asked to develop indicators for variables linked to an energy programme which is intended to benefit both women and men (but in different ways). The exercise can be completed by participants working in small groups (for 30 minutes) followed by a plenary discussion (15 minutes). Writing clear and relevant indicators that can be easily measured requires practice.

If time is short, the trainer can share out the variables among the groups, reducing the time necessary to develop the indicators, and then discuss the pooled results in a plenary session.
Case Practice 4 has five components (requiring 100 minutes plus 45 minutes feedback). Participants are asked to work in their teams and make decisions about the advocacy strategy using the theory they have learnt in the unit (the topic for advocacy, the strategic methods to use and the level at which they will advocate). The new tools for writing clearer objectives and measuring outcomes are also practiced. Each team will make a ten-minute presentation on the output of these five activities, with feedback from the trainer and other participants suggesting possible improvements.

Hands-On Activity 1 (2 hrs): Networking. This activity is about networking and is important not only for the participants in terms of building their skills but also for ENERGIA since this activity can help to build the network. There are two discussion points.

There is a theoretical section on the form and structure of networks, and a practical approach covering the steps of building a network. Most of the time should be devoted to the accompanying two exercises.

In Exercise 1 (20 minutes), participants work in pairs. Everyone is asked to draw a network they are involved in (10 minutes). Given the secondary objective mentioned above, it might be useful to suggest to participants that they draw their “ENERGIA network” which would also link to Discussion point 1. In the remaining ten minutes, the participants should compare their network with their partner.

Discussion point B.1 (10 minutes) relates to the way ENERGIA functions as a network. This gives the participants an opportunity to discuss the role of ENERGIA in their advocacy work. Feedback from this session can also be helpful to ENERGIA in strengthening its relationship with its members.

Exercise 2 (60 minutes) consists of three role-plays related to different aspects of building a network. Role-plays 1 and 2 each involve two participants (and each should take five minutes to enact), and role-play 3 involves six participants (15 minutes to enact). The trainer should encourage as many participants as possible to take on a role. The trainer should distribute the roles (to achieve a “realistic simulation” only the basic instructions are included in the participant’s manual so that the “actors” do not know what to expect from each other). Allow five minutes for preparation and a further five minutes after each role-play for discussion.

Discussion Point B.2 (10 minutes) ends the session and gives participants the opportunity to reflect on networking as an activity. A gender issue is raised in the final question - who are the better networkers: men or women? This should make for a lively discussion and a good point on which to break for further discussion over tea or coffee.

Hands-On Activity 2 (2hrs): Lobbying. This activity gives the participants an opportunity to build their lobbying skills. Sometimes people see lobbying and advocacy as the same thing; however, advocacy is much broader and participants should, by now, have taken that idea on board. Some people are not comfortable with lobbying for a number of reasons. One of these is the cultural and personal barriers to approaching and getting across your point to a person in authority who you have not met before. There is also a gender-specific issue of women not always feeling comfortable with approaching men in authority. This is an aspect dealt with in HOA 2 which includes one discussion point and two exercises.

The theory indicates various activities that constitute lobbying. Participants may have other suggestions. Most of the activity is taken up with with making direct contact with people in authority. Table C.1 sets out procedures for a meeting with a decision-maker. This can form the basis of a plenary discussion. Do participants agree? Are steps missing? Or things they would do differently?

Exercise 1 follows from this discussion. The exercise is a role-play (55 minutes in total: 10 minutes explaining the exercise, 15 minutes preparation, 20 minutes for the meeting, 10 minutes to discuss
results). There are five roles which can be found in the appendix of this manual. Apart from the chair, who should prepare his or her own role with some help from the trainer, the roles should be prepared in small groups although only one person from each group should play the part while the remaining participants act as “advisors”. The trainer should select a participant with the appropriate skills to act as meeting chair. The trainer should only allow groups to see their own role. During the role-play, the meeting participants are allowed to consult their “advisors”. Set the room out as for a formal meeting, with tables in the centre and chairs for the five protagonists around the table with name cards. Advisors can be seated behind their appropriate spokesperson.

Discussion Point C.1 (10 minutes), related to negotiating, follows on from Exercise 1 and makes a link with the next exercise. Participants are asked about their experiences with negotiations. For many women, their experiences of negotiations have been very hostile. The theory, supported by Exercise 2, gives suggestions on how to diffuse some of the hostility through good preparation and being able to read the signals of what people are actually saying. Participants may be able to add to the tips given in the text.

Exercise 2 is a role-play negotiation between two participants, with the rest of the group being given the task of identifying what is going on during the negotiation. The activity will take 35 minutes and involves work on individual, pair and class levels.

**Hands-On Activity 3 (2 hours): Dealing with the media.** This activity helps participants prepare for being interviewed by a reporter and in preparing a press release. There are two exercises. Although there are no discussion points, the trainer can ask participants if they have ever been interviewed by the media and what their experiences were. Do those with experience have any tips to share (either commenting on Table D.1 or adding to the tips listed)?

**Exercise 1** is about being interviewed (30 minutes). Participants need to learn to stay focused and not to say things that can be misconstrued or sensationalised by journalists. The exercise is carried out in pairs, with everyone getting the chance to be both an interviewer and an interviewee. The trainer should try to encourage participants to form a pair with someone they do not know so well. Although the activity is targeted at helping participants to give a successful interview, it can also be seen as an opportunity for those participants who run a newsletter to practice interviewing, getting the interviewee to answer your questions not their own! Five minutes is allowed to prepare questions, followed by five minutes for the first interview, after which the pairs should swap roles and repeat the process. The experiences can be discussed in a plenary session (15 minutes). A second type of interview is included which can be done if there is time.

**Exercise 2** is about writing a press release. Participants will work individually in preparing a press release about this training workshop. They have 30 minutes to do this, followed by 15 minutes to discuss their output with another participant who will take the role of an editor. The editor must decide whether or not they would include the item in their paper or programme. Press releases could also be pinned to the wall for other participants to compare results in the breaks.

**Hands-On Activity 4 (1 hour): Making a speech.** This activity aims to help participants improve their delivery of a prepared speech. There are no discussion points, although participants can be asked to reflect on their personal experiences of giving a speech and also the good and bad habits they have observed with other people giving speeches. Many people find speechmaking nerve-wracking, and this weakens the delivery. Therefore, some tips are given in the text about ways to make speeches more interesting to listen to – which is not only to do with the content but also the manner in which they are delivered. There is one exercise in which participants are asked to prepare a five-minute speech (20 minutes). All participants have to deliver their speech, and the chair must stop them exactly on five minutes. This is really important because part of the exercise is to learn about timekeeping since vital information can be lost if a speech has to be cut short. Also people’s attention
wanders. If the group is large, the trainer will have to decide whether or not to allow more time for the activity or to split the group. Remember that the participants have opted for this activity, suggesting that they feel the need to practice, and therefore they must all be given the opportunity to perform.

**Hands-On Activity 5 (1 hour): Presentations.** This activity relates to visual presentations using overhead transparencies or sheets and computer-projected slides (PowerPoint presentations). The text gives good and bad examples of sheets as well as tips on giving a good presentation. Participants can be asked if they have other good or bad examples to share with the group. There is one exercise and one discussion point.

**Exercise 1** needs to be planned. 40 minutes is allowed. What is possible depends on the facilities available (overhead projector and transparencies or a computer and beamer) and size of the group. Participants have the opportunity to make one or two presentations. Each participant is asked to prepare a short, five-minute presentation on a topic related to gender and energy. They have five minutes to prepare a short outline on one side of A4 paper. All participants have to then deliver their speeches. The chair must stop them exactly on five minutes. This is really important because part of the exercise is to learn about timekeeping since vital information can be lost if a speech has to be cut short, and also people’s attention wanders. There is then five minutes for the group to give tips on improving the performance. If there is sufficient time and depending on the facilities, participants should then prepare their presentation with a maximum of three overhead sheets (or slides) and repeat the presentation - again with feedback from the group. Had the verbal presentation improved? How did the speaker feel after the second time? What about the sheets? If the group is large, the trainer will have to choose between allowing more time for the activity and splitting the group. Since the participants have opted for this activity, that must feel the need to practice and so they should all be given the opportunity.

The session finishes with Discussion Point F.1 in which participants are given the opportunity to discuss things that can go wrong during a presentation and get tips on how to deal with them. This can be omitted if time is short.
Unit 5

Unit 5 is about composing and assessing a team responsible for an advocacy strategy. It is important to note that, in this module, the advocacy team is seen as a part of an organisation. General tasks (such as administration) are seen as the organisation’s responsibility and not part of the advocacy team’s function. It is also recognised that an organisation may not have people with all of the skills needed to carry out an advocacy activity. The unit suggests ways to overcome such skills shortages. There is one discussion point and no exercises.

The tools presented in this unit are of a generic character; they can be used in various situations for assembling teams for other activities than advocacy. However, in such circumstances, the tools will need slight adjustment to suit the alternative uses.

Discussion point 5.1 (15 minutes). This discussion point starts with every participant individually answering a set of questions. After this, the participants should discuss their answers in their case-practice groups. The remaining few minutes can be spent in a plenary discussion.

Case-Practice 5 (50 minutes plus 15 minutes feedback). There are two activities within this case-practice in which participants use the tools from the unit. They assess group members to see what skills are available for which tasks. If there are gaps, how will they fill them?
Unit 6

With all the information gathered in the previous units, participants should now be able to write their advocacy plans. The focus of the units is increasingly on the case-practice. The trainer should put the skills and tools being acquired by participants into a practical context by referring to participants’ past experiences. There is one exercise and no discussion points.

This unit requires good writing skills. If participants lack writing skills, the trainer can use the workshop material from Module 5 on writing skills as additional training material.

Figure 6.1 provides the structure for an advocacy strategy paper and also provides links to the places in the manual where participants can refer to the appropriate skills.

The second major component of this unit concerns the mechanisms that can be used to deliver an advocacy message. These are summarised in Figure 6.2, and can form a basis for a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of each mechanism and for which strategy they are best suited.

Exercise 6.1 (40 minutes). The participants first discuss the exercise in small groups (two or three people) and then compare their results in a plenary discussion (10 minutes).

Case Practice 6 (195 minutes plus 90 minutes feedback) has two components. In the first activity, the participants write an advocacy strategy paper. The teams can divide the elements up amongst themselves. The trainer will need to collect in the finished papers and, after reviewing them, provide feedback to the individual teams. In the second activity, the teams design the mechanisms they will use to deliver their message. The trainer should provide a range of materials in advance, such as large sheets of paper, pens, coloured paper, magazines the participants can cut illustrations from, etc. While the participants are creating their message, the trainer should walk around and offer support and advice where needed. At the end of an hour, the teams should present their message to the whole group and receive feedback from the trainer and other participants.
Unit 7

After designing and formulating the advocacy strategy, it is time for the participants to implement the strategy. The trainer should encourage participants to share their previous experiences of implementing advocacy strategies. There are two discussion point and no exercises. The theory looks at how to translate the activities identified in the advocacy strategy paper into practical action.

**Discussion point 7.1** (20 minutes) is meant to increase the list of do’s and don’ts given just before the discussion point in the unit. In a brainstorming session, all the participants can suggest do’s and don’ts. The trainer should write these down and then (after 10 minutes) discuss with the group their appropriateness.

**Discussion point 7.2** (20 minutes) requires participants to identify which tips are more appropriate for a team leader and which for other team members. This discussion takes place in case teams.

The case-practices in Units 7 and 8 focus on unforeseen events that could occur in an advocacy process. The trainer is advised to warn the participants of this since these events can have quite an impact on the work they have already done.

**Case Practice 7** (90 minutes plus 40 minutes feedback) contains three activities. The first two activities relate to the advocacy strategy paper drawn up in Unit 6, and the third activity is a surprise event. The trainer can decide whether to give feedback to the individual teams by reviewing their outputs after the session or by asking the teams to give presentations. In the third activity, the participants should be asked to present their strategies in order to compare how the various teams approach the situation.
Unit 8

The unit is devoted to the process of evaluating the advocacy strategy. There are no discussion points and no exercises.

Case Practice 8 (4 hours) has two components. The first is another surprise event in which participants have to respond to a surprise press announcement. In the second component, the teams present their final product to the rest of the group and receive feedback from the trainer and the other participants. The time allowed for each team’s presentation will depend on the group size. Feedback at this stage should be as constructive as possible.
UNIT 9

This last activity is generic to all the Modules. It is intended to help participants with their re-entry into their workplace. Time should be made for the participants to at least write their action plan. The trainer should circulate around the group while the plans are being prepared, offering support and advice where necessary. If possible participants should also be able to present and discuss their action plan in plenary. Alternatively they can present them as a poster and the group can circulate and make comments suggestions either verbally to the owner of the plan or add written comments.

The trainer can make a copy which can be kept by the course organisers for their own follow-up and evaluation of the impacts of the training. Participants should be informed of this fact.
EVALUATION AND CLOSING

An evaluation form is included in the appendices. However, the trainer can use their own form. Time should also be made available for verbal evaluation. This session can be facilitated by someone who was not involved in course delivery or organisation. This enables participants to freely express opinions. However, care should be taken that negative criticisms are the view of a majority and not one vocal person.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ROLE PLAYS
APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION FORM
## APPENDIX 1: ROLE PLAYS

### HANDS-ON ACTIVITY 1: BUILDING AND MAINTAINING SUCCESSFUL NETWORKS

#### Exercise 2: building a network (role-play)

NB The trainer is advised to give the participants only their own role and not that of their counterpart in the exercise. Other members of the group forming the audience should not be given the roles but should see their part as a critical member of the audience of a play they will see for the first time.

See in the participant’s manual and earlier in the trainer’s guide for detailed instructions.

**Role-play 1: initial individual contact (2 participants, 5 minutes)**

**Network-builder:**

You are going to start a network to advocate increasing access to affordable energy sources in Anchellius. While you think this is really a combination of the economic issue of increased incomes and the technical one of better technology, you know that the Minister of Energy is very keen on “women’s issues”. Therefore, you conclude that if you are to have any influence with the Minister you had better try to get the local NGO active in gender and energy to be part of the network. Thus, you decide to call the chairwomen of the NGO. The objective of your phone call is to get her interested in your issue in such a way that she is willing to attend a meeting with you and other network-members in the near future. You will have five minutes to persuade the potential network member to attend this meeting.

**Network-member (potential):**

You are the chairwoman of an NGO active in gender and energy in Anchellius. You are about to be called by someone who you don’t know but wants you to join a meeting about an issue you believe may be of interest to your NGO. However, you suspect that the caller does not really understand the issues (particularly those related to gender) and certainly only sees the solutions as technical ones. You cannot see what your NGO can gain from participating in the network, but the person about to call will benefit a lot from using your NGO’s name as a network member. However, you do not want to totally alienate the caller, s/he might be useful in the future. So try to avoid participating in the meeting by telling the caller: you can’t come to the meeting due to a prior engagement. Try to find out who the person is and if they will be of benefit to your NGO in the future. After five minutes you will have to end the call to attend another meeting.
Module 4: Gender and Energy Advocacy

**Role-play 2: initial individual contact (2 participants, 5 minutes)**

**Network-builder:**

You are planning to set up a knowledge network on rural energy. You are about to call a potential network member, someone who is an expert on gender and energy. This person has a lot of fieldwork experience in the rural areas of Anchellius and has collected a lot of data on energy needs. You believe this person has a lot of useful information to contribute. However, she is one of those “gender” people always going on about equal rights for women – you really do not see what this has to do with energy (other than giving them better stoves). You are not interested in political action, policy influencing, etc. You want to be able to put the information you share to good use, such as in project proposals on rural energy issues (even smokeless stoves for women). You are busy, and want to limit the phone call to the potential network member to five minutes and invite them to your meeting.

**Network-member (potential):**

You are an expert in gender and energy in an advocacy NGO in Anchellius. You have many years of experience in rural Anchellius and have an extensive knowledge of the energy needs of women and men. Despite all your efforts at advocacy, no-one has taken you seriously. However, your secretary says that someone is going to phone you today. He is only wanting to invite you to a meeting, but you are so happy that finally someone sees the importance of gender and energy and perhaps will not hang-up before some concrete action has been initiated. First of all, you want to bring a whole lot of other people to the meeting who can contribute. Secondly, you want some promises on action from the caller. You are so enthusiastic you lose track of time and try to keep the caller talking.

**Network builder:**

You have invited five potential network members to a meeting about a possible network on gender and energy. Your objective is to learn what everybody knows about this issue, how they can contribute to the network and what they expect from the network. You want the meeting to be rewarding, positive and professional for everyone. Try to get all the network members to agree the goals, objectives and the future direction of the network within 15 minutes

**Network members:**

You and four other potential network members have been invited to a meeting by the network builder. All of you have your own goals for the meeting, and will try to pursue them.

**Network member 1** is sent by their boss – who had promised to go to the meeting – and hardly knows anything about gender and energy. However, you are interested in the network, but will need to discuss it with your boss before any decision can be made.

You and four other potential network members have been invited to a meeting by the network builder. All of you have your own goals for the meeting, and will try to pursue them.

**Network member 2** considers themself to be an expert on gender and energy, and likes the idea of a network as long as everything goes the way they want. You want to be very helpful, and will continuously point out how things should be done.
You and four other potential network members have been invited to a meeting by the network builder. All of you have your own goals for the meeting, and will try to pursue them.

**Network member 3** knows a little about gender and energy and is happy to join the network, but is a very quiet individual. It turns out that they have no idea what a network actually is. At the end of the meeting, if it has not yet been addressed, you can ask what a network is.

---

You and four other potential network members have been invited to a meeting by the network builder. All of you have your own goals for the meeting, and will try to pursue them.

**Network member 4** has had bad experiences with networks in the past and is not keen to join the network unless it is well-organised and transparent. The potential member will be asking about this all the time, while not saying too much about their own role in previous networks.

---

You and four other potential network members have been invited to a meeting by the network builder. All of you have your own goals for the meeting, and will try to pursue them.

**Network member 5** is already a member of a network on sustainable energy that addresses issues surrounding women and energy. You see no point in setting up a new network and feel that these people can join in the existing network.
HANDS-ON ACTIVITY 2: SKILLS FOR SUCCESSFUL LOBBYING

Exercise 1: meeting with a decision-maker (role-play)

NB The trainer is advised to give the participants only their own role and not that of their counterpart in the exercise. Other members of the group forming the audience should not be given the roles but should see their part as a critical member of the audience of a play they will see for the first time.

See in the participant’s manual and earlier in the trainer’s guide for detailed instructions.

METI is not really interested in the meeting. They have a lot of other things to do and do not view engendering their policy as their first priority. Energy policy is about ensuring energy security for Anchellius, through new infrastructure projects and addressing climate change issues. However, the Minister for Energy realises that gender is a very sensitive political issue (the Prime Minister does not want any embarrassments at UN meetings with Anchellius being thought to be dragging its feet on implementing the Beijing Platform for Action). Therefore, their goal for the meeting is to try to sound enthusiastic but to shift as much responsibility as possible to other attendees and – ideally – to get the working party disbanded.

MEWA sees this meeting as an opportunity to increase their knowledge about energy, as the other attendees – they think – know more about what is needed to engender energy policy. They are happy to advise on the process of gender mainstreaming, but lack the background to give advice on the content of an engendered energy policy. However, they do know that providing household energy is the responsibility of women in rural and urban households. This is particularly burdensome and time consuming for these women, damaging their health and preventing them from participating in other activities such as income-generation. Facts which appear to be lost on the METI representatives they have met in the past. Their goal is to get practical information to continue their work. They do not want to do more research since they are under-resourced. MEWA hopes METI can take over some of their responsibilities, since that Ministry has plenty of funds.

The Women’s Rights and Empowerment NGO (AWORE) has finally taken up energy as an issue. This is a new sector for AWORE and they see energy as women’s business in the household and also that they need it for their enterprises. Most importantly, AWORE sees the process of engendering the energy policy as a mechanism for empowering women. Energy in itself can also be a facilitating medium for empowering women. Therefore, energy should be seen as a women’s rights issue: the right to clean affordable energy. It is a pity that METI does not see it in this way, in fact it does not appear to be doing anything to help women. There is a lack of action stemming from the METI-MEWA Gender Working Party. AWORE is not surprised about the lack of progress since METI is only interested in large power projects and not in contributing to achieving social and political objectives. AWORE sees the meeting as a way of demonstrating that AWORE is the leading force in Anchellius on gender and energy. They want to speak to all the key players in order to invigorate the process of gender mainstreaming in the energy sector. Their goal for this meeting is to get concrete promises about actions that will be taken up by the ministries. However, AWORE is not a wealthy NGO and, since this is a new advocacy area for them, they do not want to take on any additional work that might arise from this meeting. AWORE knows that MEWA has no funds, so it is up to METI, a wealthy ministry, to fund the process of engendering the energy policy.
Mr Busmata has invited **Lumos Inc.** to participate in this meeting of the METI-MEWA gender working party. Lumos Inc. thinks this is another one of these working parties which are talking shops and does not actually achieve anything. However, Lumos Inc. attends the meeting because they fear being left out of any decisions and thereby losing opportunities to expand their services. The goal of Lumos Inc. is in general to ensure that electricity is included in whatever is decided upon. However, the goal has become more complicated because the management of Lumos Inc. realises that they have to sound serious about “women’s issues”. The Chairman’s wife is very friendly with the Minister for Women and she has learnt from the Minister how poorly the energy sector is attending to gender equality both in its service provision and as an employer. The Chairman has been spending some very uncomfortable breakfasts recently and his mood does not improve by the time he reaches work. His staff have realised that doing something “for women” will make their Chairman happy and may advance their own careers. However, they know they also have to increase the number of electricity connections to improve the company’s financial performance. Unfortunately, rural customers, particularly women, do not seem able to afford the connection fees so Lumos Inc. hopes that METI will take on this responsibility.
1. Course content

For each of the modules covered in the course, give your rating to indicate the relevance of the module to your work and how well it was presented.

Please give your rating only for the parts in which you participated.

Rating

1 - Poor
2 - Fair
3 - Good
4 - Very Good
5 - Excellent

Presentation | Relevance
---|---
1. Unit 1 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
2. Unit 2 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
3. Unit 3 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
4. Unit 4 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
5. Unit 5 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
6. Unit 6 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
7. Unit 7 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
8. Unit 8 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
10. Course set-up | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]

Select the hands-on workshops followed:

11. Workshop 1 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
12. Workshop 2 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
13. Workshop 3 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
14. Workshop 4 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
15. Workshop 5 | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
18. Case-Practice | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]

2. Individual expectations
2.1 To what extent has this course met your expectations as expressed at the beginning of the course?

1  - Completely met  
2  - Adequately met  
3  - To some extent met  
4  - Not met  

2.2 What subjects/aspects did you expect to be covered that:

were not included in the course ..........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................

were included, but not well covered during the training ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................

3. Course organisation and methodology

3.1 What aspects of the course organisation did you like most?
..........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................

3.2 What improvements would you suggest for the organisation and methodology of the course?
..........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................