**Sudoe Training 29 June 18**

**Adapting Lobbying to the Needs of the 21st Century**

**Who is satisfied with the state of democracy in the EU? [5mn]**

* Robert Dahl, “equal opportunity for everyone to influence the decision”
* Do we have that level playing field?
* 70% dissatisfied, same for national, less for local
* Representative government at stake – dual system of representation, elected officials and unelected power brokers
* EIU Democracy Index: gradual decline over the past 15 years
* Surveys on lobbying – particularly bad image
  + Perception among policy makers at national and EU level: not sufficiently regulated; too many corporate lobbyists offering unethical inducements; half believe that NGO’s are not sufficiently transparent about the interests they represent and more than half base their arguments on emotions vs facts
  + Perception among citizens
* A 1/3d looking to new forms of government
* Authoritarian or participatory forms of regime

**The needs of the 21st century [10mn]**

* Introduction to concept of VUCA
* What does it mean for lobbying?

**So what do we want lobbying to look like in 2030?   
Word cloud on the spot [12mn]**

* What characterizes lobbying today? (in your organisations, in Brussels, in national capitals, in relation to your customers, etc)
* How do we want it to be characterized it in 2030? Key words
* What new processes, methods, regulations etc are in place?

**Policy-making and dialogue between corporations, civil society and government can be different [5 x 5mn]**

**Agora Energiewende** – since 2012

* ECF and the Mercator Foundation founded Agora Energiewende to tackle the challenges posed by the energy transition.
* In the Council of the Agora, key stakeholders in the energy policy debate come together on a regular basis.
* Federal and state authorities; EU representatives; labor unions, consumer organisations, grid networks, power-intensive companies, energy industry, scientists…
* place of open and honest discussion and exchange – underpinned by scientific expertise
* official mandate is to develop academically rigorous and politically feasible pathways for transforming energy systems toward clean energy in Germany and across the globe.
* Because its core funding comes from philanthropic organisations, Agora is fully autonomous, operating independently of business interests and political pressures.
* acts as an intermediary between decision-makers, stakeholders, scientists, and the media by combining research, dialogue, and outreach.
* dedicated team of more than 30 experts examines a host of issues crucial to the energy transition.
* Both in-house and outside studies
* investigate topics such as efficiency, market design, supply- and demand-side technology, flexibility, energy economics, power system planning, and political change processes

**What do we learn?**

* Imperfect but relatively little conflict - Avoiding battle of trenches is possible
* Make an issue larger to solve it
* Combine opposite parties and visions
* State as catalyst – Horizontal

**CEPI** - 2011

* In 2011, the leaders of the Confederation of European Papier Industries, CEPI, had a private meeting with the then Climate Commissioner, Connie Hedegaard. This was a time when the European Commission was asking of all heavy energy users to reduce their GHG emissions by 80% by 2050. “No way”, they all answered. Roadmap after roadmap, projecting BAU into the future, with a sprinkling of technological innovation, showed a maximum of 40-50% reductions.
* The leaders of CEPI however, in that private meeting, made a deal: if they considered seriously ways to reach 80% emissions reductions, Connie Hedegaard would consider much more leniently one of the paper industry’s key lobbying asks.
* So they set about imagining a different future, where not only emissions would be reduced by 80%, but revenues for the industry would be increased by 50%. A low-carbon and prosperous paper industry was thus the vision and starting point for a backcasting – as opposed to forecasting – exercise. This was already a breakthrough relative to the other industries. But how not to take one’s wishes for reality?
* In order to imagine this future, CEPI launched a competition, the “2-team project”, with resources allocated so that staff within the federation, within its member federations’ own staff, individual companies and interested outside parties, could work on thinking through how to make this future a reality, including by tapping into expertise outside the industry.
* And it worked: a few months later, the CEPI leaders went back to Connie Hedegaard and announced that, yes, they could do 80% emissions reductions, by reinventing the types of products the industry would produce and the services it provides. It even identified a few technological breakthroughs which it had patented.

**What do we learn?**

* A different approach leads to more effective lobbying – today CEFIC
* Backcasting, from vision to today, not BAU and BDUF
* Gamification Playfulness without consultants
* “Power of vision”: looking longer term allows competitive interests to work together
* Crowdsourcing

**Ireland’s Citizens Assembly** – since Oct.2016

* a body comprising the Chairperson and 99 citizens, randomly selected to be broadly representative of the Irish electorate, established to consider some of the most important issues facing Ireland’s future:
  + making Ireland a leading in tackling climate change
  + how best to respond to the challenges and opportunities of an ageing population
  + manner in which referenda are held
  + fixed-term parliaments
  + and abortions
* On abortion, the 99 heard from 40 experts in medicine, law and ethics over 5 weekends
* They heard from 6 women directly affected by the 8th amendment, and from 17 deeply involved lobby groups. In all, they received 13,500 submissions
* By the end, they had an “almost uniquely comprehensive understanding” of abortion, said Ms Justice Laffoy, chairwoman of the Assembly.
* Despite a belief that they would opt for action on rape, incest and fatal foetal abnormalities, but no more, they confounded everyone.
* They emphatically rejected (87.3%) the 8th, saying it should not be retained.
* 64% voted for abortion “without restriction as to reason” up to 12 weeks.
* For anti-abortion campaigners, the notion that randomly chosen citizens could listen to all arguments and reach such a liberal conclusion was appalling. Soon, they accused it of not being representative.
* The citizens proved not only to be representative of the country, but uncannily so. On Friday, 66.4% of voters marked Yes on the ballot, knowing that there would be abortion without restriction up to 12 weeks.
* The body recommended other radical transformations, including a GHG agricultural tax or ending subsidies for peat extraction
* The Citizens’ Assembly drew on the template offered by the Constitutional Convention, which had recommended a ballot on same-sex marriage

**What lessons can we learn from this?**

* Collective intelligence possible under the right conditions
* A referendum can be prepared on highly complex and sensitive matters by a proper deliberation infrastructure:
  + time,
  + informed,
  + balanced arguments,
  + consideration for trade-offs
  + conscientious
* Really asking citizens can unblock stalemate created by lobby groups.

**Gandhi’s Satyagraha** - 1906-1914

* term satyagraha was coined and developed by Mohandas Gandhi
* satya: "truth", agraha: "insistence" or "holding firmly to" = holding onto truth
* he deployed in his earlier struggles in non-violent campaign against a law discriminating Indian communities in South-Africa
* An example of agent-led change: Gandhi invented unconventional campaign in the way it was run, commitment to defying the conventional patterns of violent resistance

**What lessons can we learn from this?**

* Values can move mountains
* We don’t talk enough about values

**Denmark’s Party Alternativet** – launched in Nov.2013

* Processes and policies founded on **six core values**:

1. Courage.

2. Generosity.

3. Transparency.

4. Humility.

5. Humour. “Without humour there can be no creativity. Without creativity there can be no good ideas. Without good ideas there can be no creative power. Without creative power there can be no results.”

6. Empathy.

* **6 debate principles**:

**1. We will openly discuss both the advantages and the disadvantages of a certain argument or line of action.**

“This gives citizens an opportunity to see why we think that the advantages of a certain policy outweigh its disadvantages.”

**2. We will listen more than we speak, and we will meet our political opponents on their own ground.**

**3. We will emphasize the core set of values that guide our arguments.**

“Politics is always about value-based prioritization and that is something we embrace, even though statistics and expert views do play an important role in illuminating facts.”

**4. We will acknowledge when we have no answer to a question or when we make mistakes.**

In case they don’t know “we will communicate this clearly instead of evading the question.”

**5. We will be curious about each and every person with whom we are debating.**

**6. We will argue openly and factually as to how The Alternative’s political vision can be realized.**

**What lessons can we draw from this?**

* Doing politics differently is possible, including saying “we don’t know”
* Values again can be central to unblocking thinking

**In my book on creativity in politics, the 4 keys to unleashing collective audacity:**

* Inclusiveness – diversity of perspectives enriches solutions
* Collaborative methods – not just by adding people, but with methods to allow people to deliberate and come to smarter outcomes
* An approach that embraces complexity, constraints, and mistakes
* A global approach, throughout the societal debate and policy process, from the definition of the problem, it’s framing based on deep values and vision of the future, to unfolding of policy options and evaluation

**>> We recognize these values in the cases I’ve mentioned here**

**The rules for effective lobbying[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Are these rules still valid? In the right order? Anything missing? [10mn x 2]**

>> Group work / sharing

**1. Be transparent about your interests:**Policy-makers see a lack of transparency as a poor lobbying practice and for one in two respondents to the survey transparency was a factor in deciding whether to speak to a lobbyist.

**2. Be aware that your audience is not only ‘in the room’:**Policy-makers are increasingly reporting to their colleagues and the public on who they meet and on what issue – so act transparently.

**3. Get your timing right:**Get in early – but not too early – and follow the issue through all stages of policy development. Entering the debate too late is considered by many policymakers to be poor practice.

**4. Understand the legislative process and its technicalities:**Avoid a common criticism of both ‘corporate’ and NGO lobbyists by knowing what a decision-maker is able to do, when, and according to what procedure.

**5. Think politically:**Identify the focus of political argument, the values and interests involved and the potential basis for consensus. You will not always get 100% of what you want, but the compromise-builders are often successful.

**6. Back up political arguments with evidence**: Independent reports and science help to convince policy-makers – those surveyed criticised lobbying based on emotion rather than facts.

**7. Identify your ultimate audience and clearly set realistic objectives at the beginning of your campaign**: Be prepared to adapt your strategy in response to both external and internal changes.

**8. Know the wide range of people that you need to talk to, but target the right decision-makers at the right time**: Policy-makers are more likely to meet you if the topic is in their field of expertise or is of interest to them.

**9. Mobilise people to act**: Search for allies and work within coalitions whenever possible. Different policy-makers value the input of different groups of lobbyists, so working together in partnerships and even temporary coalitions can bear fruit.

**10. Ensure that your message gets through online**: While digital sources are less influential than meetings and briefings, policy-makers do frequently look at the websites of companies, industry associations and NGOs – check that you are giving the right first impression.

**11. Recognise Europe’s diversity:**Keep in mind the local, national and European dimensions of a policy issue and leverage the differences in attitudes between policy-makers in different countries.

**12. Be creative and memorable from start to finish:**Briefing materials, events and other activities that draw attention to your messages help lead to success.

**WHAT CAN WE DO DIFFERENTLY FROM NOW ON? [20mn]**

**Pairs with post its of different colours (Different colours, people have to match up with someone who has same colour):**

* **Principles**
* **Techniques**

**What will we do differently tomorrow: one personal commitment each [5mn]**

1. Borrowed from the Association of Accredited Public Policy Advocates to the European Union [↑](#footnote-ref-1)