



HEALTH REFORM TOOLS SERIES

GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A

Stakeholder Analysis

A Partnerships
for Health Reform
Publication



In collaboration with:

Development Associates Inc. Harvard School of Public Health Howard
University International Affairs Center University Research Co., LLC.



Abt Associates Inc. 4800 Montgomery Lane, Suite 600 Bethesda, MD
20814 Tel: 301-913-0500 Fax: 301-652-3916



Funded by:

The U.S. Agency for International Development

www.PHRproject.com

Health Reform Tools Series

Guidelines for Conducting a Stakeholder Analysis

Prepared by:
Kammi Schmeer
Abt Associates Inc.

Mission

The Partnerships for Health Reform (PHR) Project seeks to improve people's health in low- and middle-income countries by supporting health sector reforms that ensure equitable access to efficient, sustainable, quality health care services. In partnership with local stakeholders, PHR promotes an integrated approach to health reform and builds capacity in the following key areas:

Better informed and more participatory policy processes in health sector reform;

More equitable and sustainable health financing systems;

Improved incentives within health systems to encourage agents to use and deliver efficient and quality health services; and

Enhanced organization and management of health care systems and institutions to support specific health sector reforms.

PHR advances knowledge and methodologies to develop, implement, and monitor health reforms and their impact, and promotes the exchange of information on critical health reform issues.

November 1999

Recommended Citation

Schmeer, Kammi. 1999. *Guidelines for Conducting a Stakeholder Analysis*. November 1999. Bethesda, MD: Partnerships for Health Reform, Abt Associates Inc.

PHR is implemented by Abt Associates Inc., under Contract No. HRN-C-00-95-00024, Project No. 936-5974.13, for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), in collaboration with Development Associates, Inc., Harvard School of Public Health, Howard University International Affairs Center and University Research Co., LLC.

Additional copies of this and other PHR publications can be requested from PHR's Resource Center via email at pub_order@PHRproject.com or downloaded from the project's website at www.phrproject.com.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Introduction	1
Stakeholder Analysis at a Glance	3
Step 1: Planning the Process	5
Step 2: Selecting and Defining a Policy	7
Step 3: Identifying Key Stakeholders	8
Step 4: Adapting the Tools	10
Step 5: Collecting and Recording the Information	13
Step 6: Filling in the Stakeholder Table	14
Step 7: Analyzing the Stakeholder Table	17
Step 8: Using the Information	20
Bibliography	27
Annex A: Sample General List of Stakeholders	29
Annex B: Definitions of Stakeholder Characteristics and Instructions for Filling in Stakeholder Table	31
Annex C: Sample Stakeholder Table	33
Annex D: Sample Stakeholder Interview Questionnaire	35
Annex E: Sample Information Transfer Reference Chart	37

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Derick Brinkerhoff of Abt Associates Inc. for his guidance in the process of developing the stakeholder analysis in Ecuador and these guidelines. I would also like to thank PHR's counterparts in India (Samarthan and the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA)) and Ecuador (BDO Stern and the Ministry of Health) for assisting in the development and implementation of stakeholder analyses exercises in their respective countries. Their input was a valuable contribution to PHR's experience in conducting stakeholder analyses, which led to the development of these guidelines.

Introduction

“Politics,” as much or more than technical information, drives health sector reform. This is true at the sector, institutional and facility levels, where politics directly affects the ability of policymakers and managers to develop and implement necessary reforms. Yet many policymakers and managers in the health sector are not trained to deal with “politics” nor is there information available on how to manage the political process inherent to health sector reform.

In developing this document, Partnerships for Health Reform (PHR) addresses one aspect of managing the “politics” of the reform process: the need for information on key players who have an investment in proposed reforms. Policy makers and managers can use stakeholder analysis to identify these key players or “stakeholders;” predict whether they might support or block the implementation of health reforms; and develop strategies to promote supportive actions and decrease opposing actions *before* attempting to implement major reform at the national, regional, local, or facility level.

The purpose of this document is to help policy makers, managers, and their working groups conduct an “objective” and systematic process for collecting and analyzing data about key health reform stakeholders. It should be noted, however, that even with application of these guidelines and the systematic methodology presented here, information produced by a stakeholder analysis is always somewhat subjective since it is based on what stakeholders communicate to analysts. These guidelines, however, do include suggestions for checking the consistency of answers and other mechanisms to ensure that information is obtained and analyzed as objectively as possible.

This document was developed based on a thorough review of the stakeholder analysis, political mapping, and policy process literature, as well as actual PHR field experience in conducting stakeholder analyses. (Health reform stakeholder analyses were conducted with PHR support in Ecuador and India). The result is a document with instructions and tools that are supported by academic theory and real-life application.

These guidelines present a methodology that yields useful and accurate information on health reform stakeholders. (This methodology can be followed even when conducting a stakeholder analysis with limited time or resources.) The information resulting from the analysis can be used to do the following:

- Provide input into other analyses (i.e., strategic planning, institutional assessment, broader political analyses);

- Develop action plans to increase support for a reform policy; or

- Guide a participatory, consensus-building process (by sharing the information obtained with the stakeholders and encouraging discussion on how to address the concerns of the opposition).

The application of these guidelines is intended to result in policy makers and managers who are more informed about the political environment surrounding their reforms and are better prepared to take action to ensure the full implementation of health sector reforms.

Stakeholder Analysis at a Glance

What is stakeholder analysis?

Stakeholder analysis is a process of systematically gathering and analyzing qualitative information to determine whose interests should be taken into account when developing and/or implementing a policy or program.

Who is a stakeholder? Actors (persons or organizations) who have a vested interest in the policy that is being promoted are considered stakeholders in the process. These stakeholders or “interested parties” can usually be grouped into the following categories: international, public, national political, commercial/private, nongovernmental organization (NGO)/civil society, labor, and users/consumers.

Which stakeholder characteristics are analyzed? Characteristics such as knowledge of the policy, interests related to the policy, position for or against the policy, potential alliances with other stakeholders, and ability to affect the policy process (through their power and leadership) are analyzed.

Why is this analysis useful? Knowing who the key actors are, their knowledge, interests, positions, alliances, and importance related to the policy allows policy makers and managers to interact more effectively with key stakeholders and increase support for a given policy or program. By carrying out this analysis *before* implementing a policy or program, policy makers and managers can detect and act to prevent potential misunderstandings and/or opposition to the implementation of the policy or program. A policy or program will more likely succeed if a stakeholder analysis, along with other key tools, is used to guide its implementation.

What are the steps in stakeholder analysis?

The following are the major steps in the process:

- Planning the process
- Selecting and defining a policy
- Identifying key stakeholders
- Adapting the tools
- Collecting and recording the information
- Filling in the stakeholder table
- Analyzing the stakeholder table
- Using the information

The subsequent sections of this document describe each of these steps in terms of suggested actions and tools to be used to conduct stakeholder analysis around a health reform policy or program.

What can be achieved with stakeholder analysis?

Stakeholder analysis yields useful and accurate information on health reform stakeholders. This information can be used to provide input into other analyses; to develop action plans to increase support for a reform policy; or to guide a participatory, consensus-building process.

To increase support or build consensus for reform, policy makers and managers must take additional steps following the stakeholder analysis. They should use the information generated by the stakeholder analysis to develop and implement strategic communication, advocacy, and negotiation plans or to hold consensus-building workshops.

What resources does stakeholder analysis require?

The resources needed for conducting a stakeholder analysis are: personnel time, travel money, access to a phone, copy machine and computer, and interview materials (paper and pens). The amount of resources needed will depend mainly on the number of stakeholders to be interviewed and how much travel is required to conduct these interviews. As a reference point, a national-level stakeholder analysis that interviews 35-40 stakeholders requires a four-person team working full-time for about two months, depending upon how quickly the interview appointments are made. The working group should consist of at least two persons who are skilled interviewers, knowledgeable about the health sector, able to analyze qualitative information, and computer literate. For analyses involving a smaller number of stakeholders, fewer resources are required.

Steps for Conducting Stakeholder Analysis

Step 1: Planning the Process

Define the purpose of the analysis and identify uses for the results

The first step in conducting a stakeholder analysis is to define the purpose of the analysis, identify the users of the information, and devise a plan for using the information. A discussion of these issues should be led by the “sponsor,” or initiator, of the stakeholder analysis and should include the potential users of the information.

Information generated from stakeholder analysis may serve several purposes: to provide input into other analyses; to inform the development of action plans to increase support for a reform policy; or to guide a participatory, consensus-building process.

Other activities, such as strategic planning, institutional assessments, or application of specific computerized programs like PolicyMaker,¹ often require information on who the stakeholders are, what their positions are related to a policy, how important they are, and so forth. Since stakeholder analysis generates this type of information, it would be useful if such an analysis were conducted in conjunction with the aforementioned activities.

Policy makers and managers may use the results obtained through the stakeholder analysis to inform the development of their action plans. These plans should identify concrete, and possibly “behind the scenes,” actions that the policy makers and managers will implement to increase stakeholder support.

Finally, policy makers and managers may use the results in open discussions with stakeholders in

an effort to build consensus. Stakeholder analysis information can be used in this process to allow the stakeholders to see a reflection of where they are relative to others and to encourage discussion on how to address the opposition’s concerns. This may be useful when the number of stakeholders is small and manageable and when consensus building was stated as the goal for developing the analysis.

Before proceeding with the next steps, the sponsor should ensure that a consensus exists among the policy makers as to the purpose of the analysis, its proposed users, and the intended use of the results.

Secure resources and support for the analysis

Once the purpose of the stakeholder analysis, its use and users have been established, the sponsor should obtain the financial and human resources necessary to conduct the analysis. If the sponsor is not the final decision-maker in his/her organization, he/she should secure support from a high-level policymaker to ensure that results of the analysis are used recommended strategies are implemented.

Key Resources for Conducting Stakeholder Analysis

personnel time (2-4 people)

travel funds

access to computer, phone, and copy machine

interview materials

¹ PolicyMaker is a computer program (designed by Harvard University) that organizes stakeholder information, provides guidance on strategies to deal with the stakeholders, and creates effective visuals for presenting the information to policy makers.

Identify and train working group

The sponsor(s) of the activity should form a small “working group” (2 to 4 people). The members of this working group are the interviewers and analysts for the stakeholder analysis. The sponsor may guide the process and serve as a reference, or he or she may be a member, and leader, of the working group.

Where possible, the working group members should represent distinct interests and organizations. This helps prevent possible biases that could occur when a single person or institution conducts an analysis. Members’ differing points of view can also assist in interpreting the qualitative and at times ambiguous data that emerge. If possible, the group should include a “neutral” person with no political or other interest in the policy, who is independent of the institution promoting the policy. At the same time, it is useful to include members who have knowledge of the sector, stakeholders, context, and politics related to the policy.

The stakeholder analysis process should be participatory, involving all members of the group from beginning to end. This way, all working group members will be integrated into the entire process and learn how to carry out this type of analysis, thus giving them the experience needed for future efforts. Integrating all working group members into the

process also will increase their understanding and support for the results, while ensuring the accurate translation of interview responses into analysis results.

In selecting the working group, it is important to choose persons with interviewing experience. The interviewer should be able to elicit answers for the questions listed without imposing his or her biases. The working group members also should be able to review and accurately synthesize qualitative information. If the members of the working group do not have previous experience in interviewing, a day or two of training may be required (such as practicing interviewing through role playing). In addition, all members of the group should read these guidelines, be trained in the content of stakeholder analysis, and understand the reason for undertaking the exercise.

Develop a plan and timeline

Finally, the working group should identify the specific steps to be taken in conducting the analysis (following these guidelines) and establish timeframes for each step. The timeline should include all major steps in the process, up to and including the final presentation of conclusions to policy makers. Sufficient time should be allocated for setting up interviews and rescheduling them in case of cancellation.

Step 2: Selecting and Defining a Policy

Select an appropriate policy

It is important to note that for a stakeholder analysis to be useful, it must be focused on a specific policy or issue. Policy, as used in this document, refers to any national, regional, local, or institutional project, program, law, regulation, or rule. In most cases, the sponsor of the stakeholder analysis will have a policy in mind that he or she would like the analysis to focus on. But, before beginning the analysis, it is important to ensure that the policy in question is an appropriate topic for a stakeholder analysis.

The following are some basic criteria for evaluating the appropriateness of health reform policies as subjects of a stakeholder analysis:

The policy should be specific and “definable.” Policy makers and managers should avoid conducting an analysis on a policy that has not been thought through or that is too general to define in concrete terms. This is important to ensure that specific interview questions and responses can be developed around the policy.

Sample Policies Appropriate for Analysis

- deconcentration of the Ministry of Health
- resource allocation based on production
- hospital autonomy/decentralization
- new budgeting mechanisms at the hospital level

The policy should be socially and politically controversial so that it merits the investment of resources to determine what aspects are controversial and to whom.

The policy should be key to the current reform efforts. It should be important enough to justify dedicating the resources needed to implement recommended actions that emerge from the analysis.

Sample Policies Not Appropriate for Analysis

- health sector reform (too general)
- modernization of the MOH (too general)
- providing computers for all MOH offices (not a central or priority health reform topic)
- increasing national spending on health (may not be a controversial topic for the health sector)

Define the policy

Once a policy is chosen for the stakeholder analysis, the working group should work with policy makers to define the main ideas and concepts. Since basic ideas, not the details of the policy, will need to be explained to the stakeholders later in the process, simple, concise definitions should be developed.

Sample Health Reform Policy Definitions

Deconcentration of the MOH: the permanent delegation of decision-making power to provincial directors, area chiefs, and hospital directors in:

- naming and managing personnel
- buying equipment and supplies, and
- utilizing funds generated by the facilities.

MOH resource allocation based on results: to provide resources to Ministry facilities based on the volume of services they provide and whether they meet client needs. The specific resources that would be allocated based on results include:

- facility and general administrative budgets,
- personnel allocations, and equipment distribution.

Step 3: Identifying Key Stakeholders

The identification of the key stakeholders is extremely important to the success of the analysis. Based on the resources available, the working group should decide on the maximum number of stakeholders to be interviewed. The working group should then follow the steps below to define the list of stakeholders (beginning with an open list that can be reduced if needed).

Compile and review existing information related to the policy

The working group should gather and analyze any written documents related to the selected policy. This will help to identify potential stakeholders and, perhaps, their connection to the policy.

Develop a list of all possible stakeholders related to the policy

Initially, the working group should identify all actors who could have an interest in the selected policy. Since health reform policy can affect or be affected by actors outside the health sector, the group should not limit potential stakeholders to the health sector. Specific stakeholders can be identified from the following sectors: international/donors, national political (legislators, governors), labor (unions, medical associations), public (MOH, Social Security, Ministry of Finance), private for profit, and nonprofit (nongovernmental organizations, foundations). Civil society is also an important sector to consider if the community or consumers have a direct interest in the policy. It is important to consider the potential stakeholders in different geographical or administrative areas within one organization.

Develop a list of priority stakeholders with input from experts

Since resources, time, and finances for the analysis will be limited, the list of stakeholders to be interviewed must be prioritized. Experts who know the sector, policy, and players can help in this process.

Potential stakeholder groups for national-level health reform policy

- MOH (central, regional, local, facility levels)
- Ministry of Finance
- National Institute of Social Security
- Health facility directors
- For-profit/non-profit health organizations
- Politicians
- International donors
- Organized community groups

Potential stakeholder groups for facility-level health reform policy

- MOH (central, regional, local, facility levels)
- Ministry of Finance
- National unions connected with facility
- Facility director or manager
- Facility board
- Facility doctors
- Ministry of Finance Facility nurses
- Facility nonmedical staff
- Facility labor union representatives
- Users/organized community groups

The working group should consult with 2 to 3 persons who have extensive knowledge of the health sector, its actors, and the power of those actors to influence the policy. Experts could be representatives from donor organizations, health reform projects, a national health council, private consulting firms that have worked in health, other sector-wide organizations, or persons who have worked in various positions in the health sector, such as ex-MOH authorities. Ideally, these experts should not be stakeholders themselves.

Two working group members should meet with the experts to identify potential stakeholders from the various sectors mentioned. The discussion should focus on persons or organizations that may be related to or affected by the particular policy and have the ability to affect the implementation of the policy.

The working group should also ask experts about the availability of written information, including specific stakeholder statements related to the policy.

Using the experts' information, the working group should prioritize the list of potential stakeholders to include only those individuals who have a direct interest in the policy and could impact its implementation. Actors who are not organized or do not have the ability to affect the specific policy should not be included.

Annex A lists the general groups for a health financing policy, as well as justifications for their inclusion. This list may vary by country and policy, but a justification for the inclusion of stakeholders ensures that only those directly related to the policy are selected.

Once the stakeholders are chosen, the working group should develop a contact list, with the stakeholders' names, addresses, and phone numbers.

Step 4: Adapting the Tools

Generally, very little secondary information is available on stakeholders. As a result, the working group should plan to interview the priority stakeholders identified to gain accurate information on their positions, interests, and ability to affect the process.

The following tools can be used for gathering and analyzing this information:

Definitions of stakeholder characteristics

Stakeholder table

Interview questionnaire and protocol

Reference chart

Annexes B, C, D, and E contain these tools. The working group should review and adapt these tools to fit the specific policy being analyzed and the information needed about the stakeholders.

Adapt stakeholder characteristics

First, the working group should define the exact stakeholder information or characteristics to be considered. The following characteristics are usually included for each stakeholder: name, position and organization, internal/external to the organization promoting the policy, knowledge of the policy, position on the policy, interest, alliances, resources, power, and leadership. Each of these terms is defined in Annex B.

Based on a review of the literature and PHR in-country experiences, these characteristics have been identified as the most important for the following reasons:

Stakeholder *knowledge* level is important in identifying stakeholders who oppose the policy due to misunderstandings or lack of communication.

The stakeholder's *position* on the policy is key to establishing whether or not he or she will block the policy implementation.

Determining the stakeholder's vested *interests* in the policy will help policy makers and managers better understand the stakeholder's position and possible ways to address his or her concerns.

Identifying possible stakeholder *alliances* is important because alliances can make a weak stakeholder stronger, or provide a way to influence several stakeholders by dealing with one key stakeholder.

The amount of and ability to mobilize *resources* is an important characteristic that is summarized by a power index and will determine with what force the stakeholder might support or oppose the policy.

Finally, establishing whether or not the stakeholder has *leadership* will help policy makers and managers target those stakeholders who will be more likely to actually demonstrate their position for or against the policy (and convince others to do so).

The working group should review and adapt the characteristics and definitions provided in Annex B to the policy being analyzed and the particular culture of the country. It is crucial to ensure that each member of the working group understands the meaning of the final definition for each characteristic.

Once the terms have been defined, a stakeholder analysis table can be created in a word processing application or in a spreadsheet. (A sample analysis table created in Microsoft Excel is provided in Annex C). The table should list stakeholder characteristics across the top row. This title row may vary depending on the exact characteristics and their definitions.

Stakeholder Characteristics and Column Table Titles (full table in Annex C)											
D		E				F	G	H		I	J
Knowledge		Position				Interests	Alliances	Resources		Power	Leader
1. Level	2. Defin.	1. Self	2. Others		3. Final	Advant/ disadvant	Organiza- tions mentioned	1. Quantity	2. Ability to mobilize	Resour- ces average	Yes No
1,2,3		S, MS,	S, MS	I.D.	S, MS,			3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	
		N, MO, O	N, MO, O	#	N, MO, O						

Develop interview questionnaire

Once the working group has chosen and defined key stakeholder characteristics, a standard questionnaire should be developed for interviewing stakeholders. The interviewer should use the questionnaire to guide the conversation during the interview.

In developing the questionnaire, the working group should decide, given the cultural context, the most appropriate way to obtain the necessary information. Asking direct questions may seem the most efficient method but could result in unreliable answers because the stakeholders are not accustomed to communicating in such a direct and candid manner. Questions should be clearly stated, specific, and open-ended wherever possible, requiring the stakeholder to provide more than a simple “yes” or “no” answer. If necessary, several questions may be asked to obtain information on one characteristic, but doing this repeatedly runs the risk of extending the interview beyond the ideal two-hour time limit. (Refer to the section on interview protocol.)

The questionnaire should also include an introductory section that each interviewer can read to the stakeholder (see Annex D). This introduction should state the objective of the interview, identify who is collecting the information, explain what will be done with the information, and assure the stakeholder that all of his or her responses will remain anonymous. The definition of the policy under analysis and any terms that might be ambiguous or unknown to the stakeholder should be explained during the interview. Such definitions and

clarifications, however, should be provided only after the interviewer has explored and established the stakeholder’s level of understanding and knowledge of the policy in question.

The following section on interview protocol suggests a few more tips for improving the interview process.

Develop interview protocol

The working group should discuss and document the protocol to be followed in the interview process. To ensure consistency and objectivity, the following protocol is suggested:

Two-person interview teams should be used, with the interviewers representing different organizations whenever possible.

Both interviewers should take notes, but only one should lead the interview.

Questions should be asked no more than twice, and if the stakeholder still does not provide an answer, the interviewer should move on.

The interview should be terminated at the stakeholder’s request, even if questions remain.

Immediately following the interview, the interviewers should type their notes into one electronic questionnaire per stakeholder. (Interviewers should enter each answer under its corresponding question in the electronic questionnaire.)

The information should be entered in the same words the stakeholder used.

As part of the protocol, each questionnaire should have a place for the interviewer to fill out the name and ID number for the stakeholder being interviewed and the date and city where the interview took place (see Annex D). This protocol, and any other “rules” that the working group sees as important to ensuring the collection of consistent and accurate data, should be established. All interviewers should be clear on how to adhere to the protocol before beginning the interviews.

Test the questionnaire

Before interviewing the stakeholders, the working group should pretest the questionnaire by conducting interviews with a few of the stakeholders. A pretest should be conducted to determine the following:

Interviewers are comfortable with the questionnaire;

The interviewee understands the questions;

Answers provide the information required for filling in the stakeholder table (the table should be filled in for the pre-test interviews);

The interview does not take more than two hours; and

Interviewers successfully adhere to the established protocol.

After analyzing the results of the pretest, the questionnaire and protocol should be modified, if necessary, before proceeding with the other stakeholder interviews.

Develop the reference chart

The final tool needed is the information transfer reference chart or “reference chart” (Annex E). This chart serves two purposes: (1) to provide a means of checking that all the stakeholder characteristics are covered in the interview questionnaire and (2) to aid the working group in transferring the information from the questionnaire to the stakeholder table.

The chart, which utilizes the column titles from the stakeholder table, should be developed after the questionnaire and the stakeholder table have been developed (see text box below). The working group should identify and list the specific interview questions that provide the information for each column. The reference chart should be pre-tested along with the interview questionnaire to ensure that the correct question reference numbers appear beneath each column on the stakeholder table.

Reference Chart (question numbers that pertain to each column on the stakeholder table)											
D		E				F	G	H		I	J
Knowledge		Position				Interests	Alliances	Resources		Power	Leader
1. Level	2. Defin.	1. Self	2. Others	3. Final	Advant./disadvant.	Organizations mentioned	1. Quantity	2. Ability to mobilize	Resources average	Yes No	
1, 2, 3		S, MS,	S, MS	I.D.	S, MS		3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	
		N, MO, O	N, MO, O	#	N, MO, O	#4	#8d	#8b	#8c	Combined	#8a
#1	#3	#6	#13		Analysis	#5	#8e	#11b	#8c	score of	#8c
#2		#7	#14		of self	#7	#8f		#8g	quantity	#8e
#3		#10	#15		and others	#9	#11d		#11c	and	#8f
		Review	#18		info.	#10	#11e		#11e	ability to	#9a
		interests	#19		review	#12	#11f		#11g	mobilize	#9c
		info. for	#20		interests						#9e
		strength			info. for						#9f
		of			strength						
		position			of position						

Step 5: Collecting and Recording the Information

Review existing information

Before beginning the interviews, it is important to gather and review secondary information on the priority stakeholders. This information should be more detailed than the initial secondary information that was reviewed in Step 3. It should include any written or spoken statements regarding the stakeholders' positions on the policy, any goals or objectives of the organizations the stakeholders represent, the position of the stakeholder within the organization (with specific reference to his or her control over resources), and any data on the quantity or type of resources the stakeholders or his or her organization have.

Possible secondary information sources

- Newspaper
- Institutional reports and publications
- Speeches
- Political platforms
- Organization annual reports, staff size, and/or number of offices
- Expenditure data (National Health Accounts)
- Other studies and opinion polls

The secondary information should be filed and used later on, in conjunction with the interview information, to fill in the stakeholder table.

Make interview appointments

As stated in Step 4, since there is usually little secondary information available on stakeholders, the working group will likely have to interview all of the stakeholders from the final list. Even if there is an abundance of secondary information, the working group may choose to interview all stakeholders to gain more insight into their opinions on the policy and other stakeholders.

To begin the process, interview appointments should be made with each stakeholder. Ideally, appointments should be made one to two weeks in advance by the working group member who has the influence to secure appointments with high-level and busy stakeholders. If necessary, the group should seek assistance from the sponsor or policy maker supporting the process.

The interviews should be scheduled at the time and place most convenient for the stakeholder. All attempts should be made to secure an interview with the person indicated and not his or her representative. This includes rescheduling cancelled appointments, if necessary.

To interview stakeholders who work in a region outside the working group's base city, two working group members should travel to the region and interview any and all stakeholders from that region. This trip should be planned well in advance to ensure the availability of all stakeholders. A second option, if the working group does not have travel funds, is to meet with the stakeholder when he or she may be in the working group's base city. If neither travel nor a stakeholder visit to the base city is possible, the working group can interview the stakeholder by telephone. If possible, the telephone interview should be a conference call involving two interviewers.

Conduct interviews and record notes

The interviewers should follow the protocol established by the group, with one person as the principle interviewer responsible for leading the conversation. Although interviewers can attempt to clarify the interviewee's statements, they should not try to summarize responses. If the stakeholder does not understand a question, the interviewer can rephrase the question slightly, but any deviations from the original questionnaire should be noted. After two attempts to ask and/or rephrase a question, the interviewer should move on.

Immediately following the interview, the two-person interview team should work together to enter the stakeholder's answers for each question into the computer. Each stakeholder should be assigned an electronic file containing the questionnaire and his or her answer to each question. These answers should be recorded as literally as possible, without summarizing what the stakeholder was "trying" to say. The objective of this follow-up process is to record the information accurately, legibly, and by question number for use in the analysis process.

Step 6: Filling in the Stakeholder Table

The process highlighted here takes detailed and often lengthy answers from the interviews and arranges them into a more concise and systematized format (for anonymity and to highlight the most significant information). By doing this, the working group can eventually develop clear comparisons among the different stakeholders and concisely present this information to the policy makers who will use it (see Steps 7 and 8). To conduct such comparisons and analysis of the information, the interview responses must first be translated into the stakeholder table. Transferring interview responses to the table accurately requires the working group to use all of the tools developed: the interview guides filled in for each stakeholder, the reference chart, the definitions, and the stakeholder table.

It is useful to have the working group members who served as the interviewers participate in this process, because they can recall the context within which certain stakeholders' statements were made. Group members should analyze the exact responses written in each stakeholder's questionnaire, however, and not rely on their memory.

As part of the tool adaptation process, the definitions developed should explain how to fill in the stakeholder table for each term. These instructions are included in the definitions provided in Annex B, but the process for translating the more complex characteristics, such as position and power, is detailed below.

Determine the stakeholder's position

The position of each stakeholder can be established by analyzing the following:

- Information directly reported by the stakeholder in the interviews;
- Indirect information gathered through other stakeholders and secondary information (i.e., others' perceptions); and
- Interest information.


To obtain indirect information, each stakeholder interview must include specific questions about that

stakeholder's opinions of others (see questions #11 to 20 in the interview guide, Annex D). Any such opinion should be entered in the stakeholder table (Annex C) in the row relating to that designated stakeholder, in the "others" column (column E2).

Column E of Stakeholder Table			
E			
Position			
1. Self	2. Others		3. Final
S, MS,	S, MS	I.D.	S, MS,
N, MO, O	N, MO, O	#	N, MO, O

A stakeholder's positions should be classified in columns E1, E2, and E3, using the established definitions for positions. The full spectrum of position classifications is presented in Figure 1. If desired, low supporter (LS) and low opponent (LO) can be added, but usually the information gathered does not allow for such a detailed disaggregation.

Figure 1: Spectrum of Stakeholder Positions



When determining the final position of each stakeholder (column D3), the working group needs to reconcile any differences between the position that is self-reported (E1) and the position that is perceived by others (E2). Differences can be resolved in the following manner:

When the stakeholder states that he or she is against the policy, this is taken as accurate, albeit subjective, information because there is little incentive for the stakeholder to misrepresent his or her position. For moderate opponents (MO) or

opponents (O), self-reporting should determine the stakeholder’s final position.

In the case of the self-reported neutral or supportive stakeholder, it is important to cross-reference the opinions of others because the stakeholder may have an incentive to misrepresent his or her position.

When a discrepancy exists between the self-reported stakeholder’s position and that perceived by others, the working group must consider the relative weight of available information. This includes the number of other stakeholders who disagree with the self-reported position, whether the stakeholder in question is perceived to be moderately or strongly opposed to the policy, and any knowledge of the stakeholder’s past actions relative to similar policies.

If considered carefully, deciding on the basis of “majority rules” is a possible method for resolving position discrepancies. There must always be a balance, however, so that a person who is in full support of the policy is not moved to a non-supporting position unless the decision is unanimous on the part of all other stakeholders interviewed. For example, if a self-declared supportive stakeholder is perceived to be against the policy by five other stakeholders, and one other stakeholder perceives the principal stakeholder as neutral, the working group could classify the stakeholder in question as moderately opposed (considering the 5 to 2 majority *and* the lack of unanimity on the part of other stakeholders).

The information in the interests column of the stakeholder table can also help establish the final position (particularly when deciding between a moderate or full supporter/opponent, or between conflicting perceptions). The interests column identifies any advantages or disadvantages of the implementation of the policy as stated by the stakeholder. If the stakeholder had very general or ambiguous answers to these questions, it may indicate that he or she is not strongly embedded in the position stated or was not candid in his or her response to the question.

Fill in resources column and create a power index for each stakeholder

Since the main source of a stakeholder’s power is his or her resources and ability to use them, the power index is derived from analyzing the two resource columns in the stakeholder table.

Resources: “a source of support or aid” (Webster). Resources can be of many types—human, financial, technological, political, and others.

Therefore, in order to fill in the “power” column for each stakeholder, the working group must first define the resource columns for each stakeholder according to the definition. The resource category is divided into two parts: the quantity of resources that a stakeholder has within his or her organization (a relative amount compared with the other stakeholders) or area and the ability to mobilize those resources.

Analysts should classify the quantity of resources as follows: 3 – many, 2 – some, 1 – few, and insert the appropriate number into column H1 of the stakeholder table. The ability of the stakeholder to mobilize resources should be quantified in terms of the following: 3 – the stakeholder can make decisions regarding the use of the resources in his or her organization or area; 2 – the stakeholder is one of several persons that can make decisions regarding the use of resources; 1 – the stakeholder cannot make decisions regarding the use of the resources. This score should be inserted into column H2.

Columns H & I of Stakeholder Table		
H		I
Resources		Power
1. Quantity	2. Ability to mobilize	Resources average
3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1

Power: “the capacity or ability to accomplish something...strength, force or might” (Webster). Here, the ability to affect the implementatin of the health reform policy due to the strength or force he/she possesses.

Since “power” is defined here as the combined measure of the amount of resources a stakeholder has and his or her capacity to mobilize them, the two resource scores for each stakeholder should be averaged, resulting in a power index between 3 and 1: 3 – high power, 2 – medium power, and 1 – little power. The final rankings should be reviewed to ensure consistent scoring among all of the stakeholders.

USE ALL TOOLS IN FILLING IN THE ANALYSIS TABLE

A	B	C	D			E			F	G	H		I	J
I.D. #	Position & Organization	Intern/ Extern	Knowledge		Position			Interests Advant/ disadvant.	Alliances Organizations mentioned	Resources		Power Resources average	Leader Yes No	
			1	2	1. Self	2. Others	3. Final			1. Quantity	2. Ability to Mobilize			
			I Level	Definition	S, MS,	S, O, N	I.D. #					S, MS	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1
E	3,2,1		N, MO, O	N, MO, O		N, MO, O								
1														
2														
3														
4														

Annex B: Definitions of Stakeholder Characteristics and Instructions for Filling in Stakeholder Table

- A. I.D. #:** given the stakeholder on the questionnaire.
- B. Position and organization:** Position the stakeholder has and the organization that he/she works for.
- C. Internal/External:** Internal (I)—stakeholders that work within the organization that is promoting implementing the policy; all other stakeholders are considered external (E).
- D. Knowledge of policy:** This column is divided into two parts. The first part, D1, is the level of a knowledge the stakeholder has regarding the policy under analysis. This knowledge should be rated 3 to 1: 3 – a lot; 2 – some; 1 – none. Final rankings should be reviewed to ensure consistent scoring among all of the stakeholders.
- The second part of the column, D2, is to record how each stakeholder defines the policy in question information gathered in question #3 of the questionnaire should be noted here in the stakeholder's own words.
- E. Position: Supports/Opposes/Neutral:** Position refers to the stakeholder's status as a supporter or opponent of the policy. The position of the stakeholder can be obtained by gathering information directly from the stakeholder (i.e., self-reporting); and through information gathered indirectly from other stakeholders or secondary information (i.e., others' perceptions). Thus, the reporting in this column represents the self-reported classification (column E1), the classification by others (column E2), and classification considering both (column E3). The position of the stakeholder should be reported from final classification (column E3).

Intern/ Extern	Knowledge		Position			Interests Advant/ disadvant.	Alliances Organizations mentioned	Resources		Power Average	
	1	2	1 Self	2 Others	3 Final			Quantity	2 Ability to Mobilize		
	I Level	Definition	S, MS,	S, O, N	I.D. #						S, MS
E	3,2,1		N, MO, O	N, MO, O		N, MO, O					
According to their position	1 2 3	3	6 7 10	13 14 15 18 19 20	# on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide	Working group analysis of columns E-1 and E.2 Refer to info. in column F for strength of position	4 5 7 9 10 12	List organizations mentioned 8d 8e 8f 11d 11e 11f	8b 11b	8c 8e 8g 11c 11e 11g	Average

Questionnaire

Date: ___/___/___
City: _____

ID #: _____

INTRODUCTION:

We are from (organization name) and we are conducting a study on behalf of (sponsor name if appropriate) to explore the opinions of several important actors who are interested in the improved management of the Ministry of Health. As an important actor in the health sector, it is crucial for us to obtain your opinion and that of your organization.

We plan to conduct about 35 to 40 interviews to produce a general report on the opinions of the major health sector actors. The information obtained through these interviews will be for the direct use of the consultants on the analysis team, and will be presented in a general report to (insert organization for whom report is done if appropriate) without identifying individual opinions.

We would now like to ask you a few specific questions about your opinion regarding the implementation of deconcentration of the MOH.

YOUR OPINION:

- Have you heard of the Ministry of Health policy on “deconcentration”?
- If so, how did you hear of it?
- What do you understand “deconcentration of the MOH” to mean?

The Ministry of Health has defined “deconcentration” as “permanently delegating control over resources to the Provincial Directors, Hospital Directors and Area Chiefs.” The decisions that these levels would have control over include 1) naming and managing personnel, 2) buying equipment and supplies, and 3) using any funds earned at each facility.

- What are the potential benefits to you and your organization of the deconcentration of the MOH as the Ministry has defined it?
- What are the potential disadvantages to you and your organization of the

Step 7: Analyzing the Stakeholder Table

Once the stakeholder table is complete, the information needs to be “analyzed.” Such an analysis should focus on comparing information and developing conclusions about the stakeholders’ relative importance, knowledge, interests, positions, and possible allies regarding the policy in question.

From the information in the stakeholder table, the working group should be able to conclude the following:

Who the most important stakeholders are (from a power and leadership analysis);

What the stakeholders’ knowledge of the policy is;

What the stakeholders’ positions on the specific policy are;

What the stakeholders see as possible advantages or disadvantages of the policy (interest analysis); and

Which stakeholders might form alliances.

The specific steps for developing these five analyses are detailed below.

Carry out power and leadership analysis

Although the intent in prioritizing the stakeholder list (see Step 3) was to select only those stakeholders with power and leadership, the first analysis is designed to use the information from the table to further prioritize the stakeholders within the selected group interviewed. This second prioritization, based on actual data and a more select group, allows policy makers and managers to focus resources on addressing the concerns of the most important of the priority stakeholders.

The “importance” of stakeholders is defined here as their ability to affect the implementation of the policy. Since power and leadership are the characteristics that determine a stakeholder’s ability to affect or block the implementation of a policy, these two characteristics are the basis for the first “importance” analysis.

Power: Quantity of resources and ability to mobilize those resources for or against the policy.

Leadership: A willing to initiate, convoke, or lead an action for or against the policy.

For this analysis, the working group should divide the stakeholders into three groups (see Table 2.5):

Group 1 – those who have leadership and high power (level 3)

Group 2 – those who have leadership and medium power (level 2)

Group 3 – those who do not have leadership but have high to medium power (level 2 or 3).

This is based on the premise that those with leadership and power will be most able to affect policy implementation, but powerful stakeholders who lack leadership may still be able to affect the implementation through their power alone.

Example results of power/leadership analysis

Group 1: Leadership & High (3) Power	Group 2: Leadership & Medium (2) Power	Group 3: No Leadership & Medium or High (2 or 3) Power
Minister of Health	Local politicians	MOH Provincial Directors
Minister of Finance	Hospital Directors in regions A & B	MOH Central Directors
Labor Union A	Area Directors in regions A & B	MOH Reform Project
Labor Union B	Hospital Workers' Association	Regional Organization
Workers' Association	Nurses' Association	International Donor B
Medical Association	International Donor A	

Identify the stakeholders making up these three groups by organization rather than by name in order to preserve their anonymity. Each of the three groups should have a name (it could be simply group 1, 2, or 3).

The stakeholders may not fit into any of these groups, i.e., they may have no leadership and low power. Such stakeholders may be removed from the analysis at this point to focus attention on those stakeholders within the power/leadership priority groups. In the case where a small number of stakeholders are being analyzed, or if the working group wants to represent all stakeholders in the power/ leadership analysis, a fourth group can be added for those with no leadership and low power (level 1).

Analyze knowledge data

The stakeholders' level of knowledge related to the policy also is often of interest to policy makers and managers. This level of knowledge can be presented as a general conclusion, especially if it is similar for the majority of the stakeholders, or the stakeholders can be divided by their level of knowledge: 3, 2, or 1. The latter option is useful for targeting a communication strategy for a specific group of stakeholders, namely those with the lowest knowledge of the policy. These stakeholders would appear in Group 1 for knowledge level.

The information found in the knowledge data can be crossed with the power/leadership analysis to highlight the importance level of the stakeholders with a low knowledge level. This cross-analysis would result in an even smaller priority group for targeting communication strategies.

The knowledge data can also be cross-referenced with the position of the stakeholders to determine if those opposed to the policy have a consistently low level of knowledge. If so, this would indicate to the policy maker or manager promoting this policy that communicating or advocating the objectives and basic tenets of the policy could reduce the opposition.

Analyze stakeholders' positions

In analyzing the position information from the table, the following aspects can be determined:

Total number of supporters

Importance of supporters (cross-reference with power/leadership analysis)

Knowledge of supporters (cross-reference with knowledge data)

Advantages and disadvantages of policy implementation to the supporters (cross-reference with interest data)

Knowledge of whether these supporters are internal or external to the organization developing the policy (cross-reference with the internal/ external classification)

Support "clusters" – stakeholders in the same sector who support the policy (cross-reference with organization information)

Total number of opponents

Importance of opponents (cross-reference with power/leadership analysis)

Knowledge of opponents (cross-reference with knowledge data)

Advantages and disadvantages of policy implementation to the opponents (cross-reference with interest data)

Knowledge of whether these opponents are internal or external to the organization developing the policy (cross-reference with the internal/external classification)

Opposition "clusters" – stakeholders in the same sector who oppose the policy (cross-reference with organization information)

Neutral stakeholders, their importance, knowledge, and interests

Although the working group can identify such conclusions directly from the stakeholder table, the development of a position map often helps analysts to pull out and organize the information needed to make conclusions. For example, support or opposition "clusters" can be easily identified on a position map. Step 8, Using the Information, discusses how to develop the position map. This

may be useful for the working group in conducting the position analysis as well as in presenting the information to policy makers and managers.

Analyze interest data

The interest data can be used either in conjunction with other analyses or alone as general conclusions. In cross-referencing the interest data—the policy implementation advantages and disadvantages the stakeholders identified—with other data, it can be used to explain the positions of the stakeholders or to emphasize their knowledge of the policy (i.e., if irrelevant advantages and disadvantages were identified, it may represent a misunderstanding of the policy). The interest data can also be cross-referenced with the power/leadership data to indicate what the most important stakeholders may have to lose or gain from policy implementation.

When used by itself, the interest data can be presented as a list of the potential advantages and disadvantages that the policy presents to the stakeholders. This is most useful if many stakeholders identified the same advantages and disadvantages. In this case, the working group can identify the concerns of the majority of the stakeholders regarding policy implementation.

Analyze alliances

Possible stakeholder alliances can also be identified from the table information. The alliances can be identified in two ways: (1) by referring to the stakeholder table to see if stakeholders mentioned organizations that they would work with to demonstrate for or against the policy or (2) by referring to the position “clusters” (the stakeholders with similar positions and within the same organization or subsector). As previously stated, the “clusters” can be easily identified from the development of a position map.

The alliance information should be cross-referenced with the position data to identify those alliances that may be potential sources of support, as well as those that may work together to oppose

the policy. The working group can suggest or encourage policy makers to develop specific strategies based on these key alliances, either to reinforce a potentially supportive alliance or to separate a potentially threatening alliance.

The alliance data can also be cross-referenced with the power/leadership analysis results to highlight those alliances that are potentially the most supportive or threatening to the policy implementation.

Develop additional results

In addition to the information listed on the stakeholder table, other information gained from the interviews may be used to develop key results and conclusions. When transferring the information from the questionnaires to the table, the working group should note the following other information relevant to issues:

- Stakeholders who were not included in the priority list but were mentioned often by those interviewed;

- Stakeholders’ global impressions of other stakeholders or their organizations;

- Suggestions for the implementation of the policy; and

- Any expectations that the majority of the stakeholders have in relation to the policy process.

By analyzing information related to these areas, as well as the five basic analysis results previously mentioned, the working group can develop a list of conclusions or results to be presented to the policy makers.

The working group should then consider how this information could be presented or used within other analytical frameworks. The next section provides some guidance in this area.

Step 8: Using the Information

Using the information generated by the preceding analysis is an integral part of the stakeholder analysis process. The working group, by virtue of its role in information gathering and analysis, is responsible for organizing, disseminating, and explaining the results in a way that will ensure that the sponsor or other policy makers and managers can use the information to **take action**.

The use of the information generated by the stakeholder analysis should be discussed during Step 1: Planning the Process, and should be reviewed again once the results have been analyzed. As previously mentioned, there are various ways that the information from a stakeholder analysis can be used: to provide input into other analyses; to develop action plans to increase support for a reform policy; or to guide a participatory, consensus-building process.

This section offers guidelines on how to present the results. If the policy makers and managers plan to use the results obtained through the stakeholder analysis to take concrete, and possibly “behind the scenes,” actions to increase stakeholder support, only those persons involved in implementing the follow-up actions should be included in the presentation and discussion of the results. If the purpose of the presentation is to share the results to build consensus among the stakeholders, then all the stakeholders should be invited to attend. Although these guidelines address general issues about presenting the results, if the sponsor or other policy makers plan to use the results to build consensus, they should work with professional facilitators to guide the discussion.

General results presentation format

Two persons from the working group should be selected to make the presentation, and the remainder of the group should be available to help answer any questions that arise. A date should be set when the sponsor and other relevant policy makers or stakeholders can meet for at least a two-hour presentation and discussion session.

The presentation may include a short introduction on the stakeholder analysis, but it should focus on the results of the analysis, not the process itself. Since policy makers and managers must prioritize and focus

on the most important information, the presentation should be a concise synthesis, not a review of all the information obtained or the entire stakeholder table. If the results will be presented for a consensus-building process, the key areas that the stakeholders will discuss should be presented.

The remainder of this section provides some suggestions for presenting key information.

Who is important? Presentation of power/ leadership analysis results

One way to present the most important conclusions is to focus the presentation on the three groups that emerged from the power/leadership analysis, i.e., the first finding from the analysis. The three groups can be presented as organizations that have the potential to impact the success of the policy.

PowerPoint is an effective tool for such a presentation, because it has colored squares that can be used to represent the power/leadership level of each stakeholder consistently throughout the presentation. For visual emphasis, more intense colors can be used to represent higher power/leadership indexes, and, therefore, higher importance. For reasons of anonymity, the boxes should be labeled with organizations’ names and not individual stakeholder names or job titles.

Sample of how to use PowerPoint to present power/leadership analysis results


Other visual aids may be used if PowerPoint is not available.

Where is the support/opposition?

Presentation of stakeholders' positions

The second finding—the supporting, neutral, or opposing positions of stakeholders—can be presented using a position map developed with PowerPoint or other visual aids. Using the map, presenters can quickly illustrate which actors support or oppose a policy, how important that support or opposition is (by color) to the success of the policy, and where these stakeholders are by sector. The colored boxes representing each actor from the three power/leadership groups should be placed on the map in accordance with the sector to which they belong (vertically) and their stakeholder position as established in the stakeholder table (horizontally).

Sample position map



on the map, organization in the of the below map). The other rows should be labeled with the sector categories used in the stakeholder list (i.e., international, national political, public sector, NGOs, labor, etc.). The rows should be labeled in order of the proximity of the sector to the policy origin. For example, for a policy being developed by a centralized group in the MOH, the central MOH sector is closest to the policy origin and is given the row immediately adjacent to the policy origin row. In this example, the labor sector, which is external to the MOH and far from the direct influence of the policy developers, is placed farthest from the center

row. Once all rows are labeled, the stakeholders can be placed within the row that represents their sector, or overlapping two rows if they act within two sectors.

Adapting the map, the column titles, which represent the positions of the stakeholders, should not need to be changed. In placing the colored boxes (i.e., stakeholders) on the map, those who are strong supporters (S) should be placed on the far left of the first column, while moderate supporters (MS) should be on the right side of the first column within the row that represents their sector. Those who are strong opponents (O) should be placed on the far right of the last column, while moderate opponents (MO) should be placed on the left side of the last column within their sector's row. Any neutral actors should be placed in the middle column, in the row representing their sector.

If colored squares are used, the following conclusions can be presented:

Total number of supporters

Importance of supporters (cross-reference with power/leadership analysis)

Whether these supporters are internal or external to the organization developing the policy (cross-reference with the internal/external classification)

Support "clusters" – stakeholders in the same sector who support the policy

Total number of opponents

Importance of opponents (cross-reference with power/leadership analysis)

Whether these opponents are internal or external to the organization developing the policy (cross-reference with the internal/external classification)

Opposition "clusters" – stakeholders in the same sector who oppose the policy

Neutral stakeholders and their importance

Since the knowledge and interest data cannot be represented on the map itself, the working group presenters can refer to these data when explaining the positions as seen on the map. They can also develop additional ways of presenting the knowledge and interest data as suggested below.

Presentation of knowledge data

As suggested in Step 7, the knowledge data can be presented in two ways: as a general conclusion, especially if the level of knowledge is similar for the majority of the stakeholders, or as a graphic representation of the three levels of knowledge.


The graphic representation of the three knowledge groups is particularly useful in cross-referencing the power/leadership information with the use of colored boxes. Using a slide similar to that seen below, the working group presenters can highlight to the audience the level of knowledge of the most important stakeholders.

PowerPoint presentation of knowledge data

Knowledge Levels		
Group 1: Low (priority for communication strategy)	Group 2: Medium	Group 3: High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Politicians for Regions A & B Ministry of Finance International Donor B Hospital Workers Associations Workers' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minister of Health Provincial Directors, MOH Medical Association Regional Organization Nurses' Association 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labor Union A Hospital Directors in Regions A & B Area Directors for Regions A & B Labor Union B Reform Project

Who might work together? Presentation of key alliances

Although alliances can be identified by “clusters” on the position map, the working group can present additional alliances that stakeholders may have identified but are not evident on the position map. Since an audience often cannot simultaneously absorb all of the information presented on a map, presenters also may want to use a slide similar to the one shown in Figure 5 to emphasize alliances.



Presentation of other results/conclusions

After presenting the initial findings, the group should then present key overall conclusions. The conclusions can repeat any particularly important conclusions demonstrated in the position map and other graphics. This information should focus on what the policy makers and managers need to consider when implementing the policy. These conclusions may be presented in a list format, and the statements should be concise and clear.

Sample conclusions on the deconcentration of the MOH

All, except one, of the stakeholders in Group 1 (the most important group) act partially or entirely outside of the MOH.

Within the MOH the local level has more leadership than the central and regional levels.

It is possible to work with the stakeholders through their alliances, or with individual stakeholders.

Most stakeholders have little knowledge of the policy, and relate it to self-financing and privatization.

Stakeholders identified several potential benefits of implementing the policy:

- a) improved quality of service for the user;
- b) more effective use of collected funds;
- c) improved personnel training and performance.

Sample conclusions (continued)

Stakeholders identified several possible disadvantages of implementing the policy:

- a) diminished local level budget;
- b) implementation of self-financing and privatization;
- c) diminished power, status, and function of the central level of the MOH
- d) transfer of corruption to the local level; and instability within the labor force.

Many of the stakeholders conditioned their future support on:

- a) the clarity and continuity of the policies and processes;
- b) the transparency of the processes
- c) their participation in the process
- d) the demonstration of positive results

Presentation of recommended strategies

Finally, the working group presenters should always place the results within a context of recommended actions and next steps so that the sponsor and other policy makers or managers know how to use the results presented.

To guide these follow-up actions, the working group should develop strategies to achieve the following five basic goals:

Maintain the support of those stakeholders who are currently supporters

Increase power and leadership of the supporters

Convert the opponents to supporters

Weaken the power and leadership of the opponents

Convert the neutral stakeholders into active supporters (i.e., convince them to support the policy and increase their power and leadership where necessary).

Two types of strategies can then be identified to meet those goals: general strategies and strategies

for specific stakeholder groups. To develop the general strategies, the working group should analyze the interests, concerns, and misunderstandings common to most stakeholders.

Sample general strategies for increasing support for decentralization of the MOH

Clarify to the stakeholders the vision, objectives, and benefits of decentralization, as well as its relation to the modernization of the MOH, with the aim of strengthening their knowledge.

Communicate the definitions and consequences of decentralization, decentralization, self-financing, and privatization.

Inform stakeholders regularly on achieved tangible results from the implementation of decentralization.

Develop new forms of participation in developing and implementing decentralization for actors within and external to the MOH.

Demonstrate the transparency and consistency of the process of developing and implementing decentralization.

Develop information about the stakeholders that will facilitate negotiation with the opponents.

To develop specific strategies, the group should consider the position of each stakeholder, his or her interests (column F of the Stakeholder Table), and the five basic strategy goals. The working group should develop specific ways of addressing the concerns of the individual stakeholders and securing their *active* support (i.e., increasing their power and leadership so they can demonstrate this support). Figure 7 on the next page offers an example in PowerPoint of how to present this information.

The working group should present these strategies to the sponsor and other policy makers or managers present, with the following caveats:

To be most effective, certain strategies may need to remain confidential, known only by a select group of policy makers implementing the policy.

The strategies should be developed in further detail through concrete *action plans*, *communication plans*, and *negotiation packages*.

The implementation of the strategies will require the commitment of additional time and resources from the sponsor.

The implementation of the strategies will require the development of a select group of professionals trained in communication, facilitation and mediation, and negotiation techniques.

It is not always necessary or feasible to implement all of the strategies immediately. In presenting the strategies, the working group should identify a few, select priorities for immediate action (i.e., next steps) by the sponsor or other policy makers or managers. Depending on the analysis results, the working group may recommend the implementation of one key strategy for all stakeholders, or the implementation of several strategies to address the needs of several stakeholders. In the latter case, the working group should recommend which stakeholders should be targeted for strategy implementation, given the often limited resources for implementation. The group can recommend that the following stakeholders be targeted for the first stage of strategy implementation:


Supporters with little power and leadership – focus on ways of increasing the power and leadership of these stakeholders.

Neutral stakeholders with medium to high power and leadership – focus on convincing the stakeholders to support the policy and on increasing their power and leadership where necessary.

Opponents with high power and leadership – focus on negotiating for the opponents’ support and decreasing their power and leadership if they remain opposed.

Figure 2 illustrates a visual prioritization of stakeholders to be targeted for the initial strategy implementation.

Figure 2: Matrix for Identifying Stakeholders to Be Targeted by Strategies



Once the stakeholder groups are prioritized, the working group should present the stakeholders’ interests and the specific strategies for addressing their needs. This can be done either in a list or in a table, created in a word processing application or in a PowerPoint figure, highlighting the power and leadership index of the priority stakeholder with the colored boxes. (See text box on next page for a sample slide.)

Following the presentation, the working group should be available to answer questions regarding the process, results, and recommended strategies. If possible, the members of the group should be involved in further developing the strategies into action plans. If that is not possible, the working group should follow up with the sponsor and the other policy makers and managers who attended the presentation to check on the status of the implementation of the strategies.

Sample PowerPoint presentation of strategies

POSITION	INTERESTS	
<u>P/L 1 Supporters</u> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: yellow; padding: 5px; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: 5px auto;"> Provincial Directors </div>	More decision making power; guidance from central level; attention to local priorities	Increase request in defining impleme:
<u>P/L 2&3 Neutrals</u> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: orange; padding: 5px; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: 5px auto;"> Medical Association </div>	Participation in process; increased salaries	Define sp them in p impleme: them of p issue if p incentive

Bibliography

Brinkerhoff, Derick. June 1998. *From Design to Implementation: Stakeholder Analysis in a PHC Project in India*. Abt Associates Inc.

_____. April 1997. *PHR Trip Report: Stakeholder Analysis in India*.

Crosby, Benjamin L. March 1992. "Stakeholder Analysis: A Vital Tool for Strategic Managers." Technical Notes, No. 2. Implementing Policy Change Project, USAID. Washington, DC.

_____. April 1992. "Management and the Environment for Implementation of Policy Change: Part One." Technical Notes, No. 4. Implementing Policy Change Project, USAID. Washington, DC.

_____. April 1992. "Management and the Environment for Implementation of Policy Change: Part Two." Technical Notes, No. 5. Implementing Policy Change Project, USAID. Washington, DC.

Lindenberg, Marc, and Benjamin Crosby. 1981. *Managing Development: The Political Dimension*. Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Reich, Michael R. March 1993. "Political Mapping of Health Policy: Draft Guidelines." Boston, MA: Harvard School of Public Health.

Reich, Michael R., and David M. Cooper. 1996. *Policy Maker: Computer-Aided Political Analysis: Improving the Art of the Feasible*. PoliMap, Brookline, MA. (To order a copy, contact PoliMap, 74 Armory St., Brookline, MA 02446-3909 USA.)

Schmeer, Kammi. September 1998. *Process for Developing an Interest Map in Ecuador*, Technical Report No. 23, PHR Project.

Webster's II New Riverside Dictionary. 1984. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA.

Annex A: Sample General List of Stakeholders

The following table illustrates general information on priority stakeholders to be interviewed, with a justification for each group's inclusion in the analysis.

Sector	Sub-Sector	Internal/ External to the MOH	# to be inter- viewed	Reason chosen/relation to policy
International Agencies/ NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USAID ▪ PAHO ▪ World Bank ▪ IDB 	External	4	External support, in both economic and political terms, has been very influential in determining the direction of health reform efforts.
Politicians	Provincial Congressional Reps	External	3	The provincial representatives have significant impact on the implementation of health reform efforts in the regions and represent the provinces' views to the Congress; those to be interviewed are involved in the issues related to this topic.
	Provincial Governors	External	2	The provincial governors are responsible for implementing the executive plans, and are the coordinators of public institutions at the provincial level.
Public Entities: MOH	Central level (executive, planning, finances, human resources, operations)	Internal	8	The central level of the MOH will be responsible for planning and implementing the policy being analyzed. They will also be affected by this process, mainly in terms of the redistribution of power from the central level to the provincial and local levels, and being held to the new results budgeting
	Provincial and local levels (directors of provinces, areas and hospitals)	Internal	12	Since the process being analyzed includes deconcentration, the provincial and local levels of the MOH will be responsible for implementing many of these changes. In addition, they will be held to new standards for receiving budget, personal and supplies from the central level.
Public Entities: other than MOH	Ministry of Finance	External	1	Since the policy deals with resource allocation, and the Ministry of Finance currently controls this allocation, their support of the new policy is imperative to implement the change.
	Modernization Committee	External	1	The modernization committee has chosen the MOH as its pilot institution to begin public sector modernization efforts; this entity is very involved in planning the specific modernization efforts.
Labor Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Medical Associations ▪ Nurses' Associations ▪ Hospital Workers' Associations ▪ National Labor Unions 	Internal and External	10	The labor sector in the country is very powerful, and through their protests, labor groups are able to stop political efforts that they consider to be threatening their interests. In the health sector alone there are numerous organized labor groups, both within and external to the MOH, from doctor and nurse associations, to hospital and MOH labor unions. These groups, if not in support of this policy, may be able to stop its implementation.

Annex B: Definitions of Stakeholder Characteristics and Instructions for Filling in Stakeholder Table

- A. **I.D. #:** given the stakeholder on the questionnaire.
- B. **Position and organization:** Position the stakeholder has and the organization that he/she works for.
- C. **Internal/External:** Internal (I)—stakeholders that work within the organization that is promoting or implementing the policy; all other stakeholders are considered external (E).
- D. **Knowledge of policy:** This column is divided into two parts. The first part, D1, is the level of accurate knowledge the stakeholder has regarding the policy under analysis. This knowledge should be rated from 3 to 1: 3 – a lot; 2 – some; 1 – none. Final rankings should be reviewed to ensure consistent scoring among all of the stakeholders.

The second part of the column, D2, is to record how each stakeholder defines the policy in question. The information gathered in question #3 of the questionnaire should be noted here in the stakeholder's own words.

- E. **Position: Supports/Opposes/Neutral:** Position refers to the stakeholder's status as a supporter or opponent of the policy. The position of the stakeholder can be obtained by gathering information directly from the stakeholder (i.e., self-reporting); and through information gathered indirectly from other stakeholders or secondary information (i.e., others' perceptions). Thus, the reporting in this column represents the self-reported classification (column E1), the classification by others (column E2), and a final classification considering both (column E3). The position of the stakeholder should be reported from this final classification (column E3).

Stakeholders who agree with the implementation of the policy are considered supporters (S); those who disagree with the policy are considered opponents (O); and those who do not have a clear opinion, or whose opinion could not be discerned, are considered neutral (N). Those who express some agreement, but not total agreement with the policy should be classified as moderate supporters (MS). Finally those who express some, but not total, opposition to the policy should be classified as moderate opponents (MO). Thus, in column E1, the position of the stakeholder as they state it in the interview should be entered (S, MS, N, MO, or O).

In column E2, the position of the stakeholder as perceived by other stakeholders and/or from secondary information should be entered with a reference to the ID number of the person who stated that opinion. For example, S 32 would mean that stakeholder number 32 stated in his or her interview that the stakeholder under analysis would support the policy. In column E2, the position of the stakeholder as others perceive it should be entered (S, MS, N, MO, or O) with the ID number for each opinion.

Lastly, in column E3, the final determination for the position of the stakeholder should be entered (after entering data from all interviews). This position should take into account the self-reported position as well as other stakeholders' opinions. S, MS, N, MO, and O can be entered in this column.

- F. Interest:** Interest refers to the interest the stakeholder has in the policy—or the advantages and disadvantages that the implementation of the policy may bring to him or her or his or her organization. Advantages and disadvantages mentioned by each of the stakeholders should be entered into this column in as much detail as possible, since the information will be used primarily in developing conclusions and strategies for dealing with the stakeholders’ concerns.
- G. Alliances:** “a union or relationship” (Webster, 1984). Alliances are formed when two or more organizations collaborate to meet the same objective, in this case to support or oppose the policy in question. Any organizations that are mentioned by the stakeholder in the questions related to this item (see connection chart in Annex 7 for specific question references) should be entered in this column.
- H. Resources:** “a source of support or aid” (Webster, 1984). Resources can be of many types—human, financial, technological, political, and other. The analysts should consider the stakeholder’s access to all of these resources.

The resource category is divided into two parts: the quantity of resources that a stakeholder has within his or her organization or area, and the ability to mobilize those resources. The quantity of resources should be classified by the analysts as 3 – many, 2 – some, 1 – few and inserted into column H1 of the stakeholder table. Since this score is relative, final rankings should be reviewed to ensure consistent scoring among all stakeholders.

The ability of the stakeholder to mobilize resources should be quantified in terms of 3 – the stakeholder can make decisions regarding the use of the resources in his or her organization or area; 2 – the stakeholder is one of several persons that makes decisions regarding the use of resources; 1 – the stakeholder cannot make decisions regarding the use of the resources. This score should be inserted into column H2. For example, if the stakeholder has personnel that work for him or her, it can be concluded that the stakeholder has the ability to mobilize these resources because he or she has direct influence over them.

- I. Power:** “the capacity or ability to accomplish something...strength, force or might” (Webster, 1984). Here, power refers to the ability of the stakeholder to affect the implementation of the health reform policy due to the strength or force he or she possesses.

Since “power” is defined here as the combined measure of the amount of resources a stakeholder has and his or her capacity to mobilize them, the two resource scores implied should be averaged, resulting in a power index between 3 and 1: 3 – high power, 2 – medium power, and 1 – little power. The final rankings should be reviewed to ensure consistent scoring among all stakeholders.

- J. Leadership:** “to direct the activity...to start, begin...front, foremost” (Webster, 1984). Leadership is specifically defined here as the willingness and ability to initiate, convoke, or lead an action for or against the health reform policy. The stakeholder either has or lacks this characteristic. This is represented with “yes” or “no.”

Annex D: Sample Stakeholder Interview Questionnaire

Date: ___/___/___

ID #: _____

City: _____

INTRODUCTION:

We are from (organization name) and we are conducting a study on behalf of (sponsor name if appropriate) to explore the opinions of several important actors who are interested in the improved management of the Ministry of Health. As an important actor in the health sector, it is crucial for us to obtain your opinion and that of your organization.

We plan to conduct about 35 to 40 interviews to produce a general report on the opinions of the major health sector actors. The information obtained through these interviews will be for the direct use of the consultants on the analysis team, and will be presented in a general report to (insert organization for whom report is done if appropriate) without identifying individual opinions.

We would now like to ask you a few specific questions about your opinion regarding the implementation of decocentration of the MOH.

YOUR OPINION:

1. Have you heard of the Ministry of Health policy on “deconcentration”?
2. If so, how did you hear of it?
3. What do you understand “deconcentration of the MOH” to mean?

The Ministry of Health has defined “deconcentration” as “permanently delegating control over resources to the Provincial Directors, Hospital Directors and Area Chiefs.” The decisions that these levels would have control over include 1) naming and managing personnel, 2) buying equipment and supplies, and 3) using any funds earned at each facility.

4. What are the potential benefits to you and your organization of the deconcentration of the MOH as the Ministry has defined it?
5. What are the potential disadvantages to you and your organization of the deconcentration of the MOH as the Ministry has defined it?

6. Which of these categories best describes your opinion on the deconcentration of the MOH as the Ministry has defined it? (*Read answer options and circle answer given.*)
- a) I strongly support it
 - b) I somewhat support it
 - c) I do not support nor oppose it
 - d) I somewhat oppose it
 - e) I strongly oppose it

If stakeholder answers a, b, or c, continue below. If stakeholder answers d or e, pass to question #10.

For those who answer “a,” “b,” or “c” to question #6:

7. Which of the three aspects of deconcentration do you support?
- a) Deconcentrated control over naming and managing personnel
 - b) Deconcentrated control over buying equipment and supplies
 - c) Deconcentrated control over the use of funds generated at each facility
8. For those aspects of deconcentration that you do support,
- a) In what manner would you demonstrate this support?
 - b) Would you have many, some, or no resources to dedicate to supporting this policy?
 - c) Would this support be public?
 - d) Would you ally with any other persons or organizations in these actions?
 - e) What conditions would have to exist for you to express this support?
 - f) Would you take the initiative in supporting deconcentration, or would you wait for others to do so?
 - g) How quickly would you be able to mobilize your support?
9. Under what conditions would you choose NOT to support deconcentration?

For those who answered “d” or “e” to question #6:

10. Which of the following aspects of deconcentration do you oppose:
- a) Deconcentrated control over naming and managing personnel
 - b) Deconcentrated control over buying equipment and supplies
 - c) Deconcentrated control over the use of funds generated at each facility
11. For those aspects that you oppose:
- a) In what manner would you demonstrate this opposition?
 - b) Would you have many, some, or no resources to dedicate to opposing this policy?

- c) Would this opposition be public?
 - d) Would you ally with any other persons or organizations in these actions?
 - e) What conditions would have to exist for you to express this opposition?
 - f) Would you take the initiative in opposing deconcentration, or would you wait for others to do so?
 - g) How quickly would you be able to mobilize your opposition?
12. Under what conditions would you come to support deconcentration?

We would now like to ask you a few specific questions about your opinion regarding others' opinions of the implementation of deconcentration of the MOH.

OTHER SUPPORTERS:

- 13. What other organizations, departments within an organization, or persons do you think would support deconcentrating the MOH? (*Probe for MOH and non-MOH stakeholders*)
- 14. What do you think these supporters would gain from the deconcentration of the MOH?
- 15. Which of these supporters would take the initiative to actively support deconcentration?
- 16. Which of these supporters would work together to demonstrate their support for deconcentration?
- 17. Under what conditions do you think these actors would come to oppose deconcentration?

OTHER OPPOSORS:

- 18. What other organizations, departments within an organization, or persons do you think would oppose deconcentrating the MOH? (*Probe for MOH and non-MOH stakeholders*)
- 19. What do you think these opponents would gain from preventing the deconcentration of the MOH?
- 20. Which of these opponents would take the initiative to actively oppose deconcentration?
- 21. Which of these actors would work together to demonstrate their opposition to deconcentration?
- 22. Under what conditions do you think these actors would come to support the deconcentration of the MOH?

Annex E: Sample Information Transfer Reference Chart

C	D		E				F	G	H		I	J
Intern/ Extern	Knowledge		Position				Interests	Alliances	Resources		Power	Leader
	1	2	1 Self	2 Others		3 Final	Advant/ disadvant.	Organizations mentioned	1	2 Ability to Mobilize	Resources average	Yes
	I	Level	Definition	S, MS,	S, O, N	I.D. #			S, MS			Quantity
E	3,2,1		N, MO, O	N, MO, O	N, MO, O				3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	3, 2, 1	
According to their position	1 2 3	3	6 7 10 Refer to info. in column F for strength position	13 14 15 18 19 20	# on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide # on guide	Working group analysis of columns E.1 and E.2 Refer to info. in column F for strength of position	4 5 7 9 10 12	List organizations mentioned 8d 8e 8f 11d 11e 11f	8b 11b 	8c 8e 8g 11c 11e 11g	Average of H1 & H2	8a 8c 8e 8f 9a 9c 9e 9f