

Policy Brief Prompts

APRU Tech Policy Hackathon 2025

From Insight to Leverage — Designing Policy-Ready Interventions for AI-Driven Economies

Website: <https://www.apru.org/event/apru-tech-policy-hackathon-2025/>

Word limit: 1200 words

Deadline: July 23, 2025

Submit to: programs@apru.org

Your team is asked to expand your original 300-word essay—which addressed a policy problem affecting an underserved community in Southeast Asia with an innovative solution—into a policy brief of approximately 1200 words.

Building on your initial concept, and considering Southeast Asia’s transition into an AI-enabled era of digital governance, labor platforms, and financial automation, the focus of your upcoming essay will shift from innovation to **institutional alignment**. The tools shaping the future are not merely coded—they are adopted, scaled, and governed.

You are encouraged to think across systems: diagnose failure states, map institutional constraints, and design interventions that drive real behavioral and structural change.

Write your brief as a strategic document for a policymaker who has the authority to fund or implement your project. Demonstrate that your team deeply understands the problem and knows how to influence real systems.

Below is the structure with guiding prompts for your 1200-word policy brief. Use these questions to inform your thinking, but do not treat them as a checklist to answer one by one.

Section 1: Problem Diagnosis (~300 words)

- What exactly is breaking—in people’s lived experiences, in the system’s architecture, or both?
- What survival adaptations are already emerging? What informal workarounds are being used?
- Who benefits—financially, politically, or administratively—from this problem

remaining unsolved?

- What is the biggest misdiagnosis of this issue in media, tech, or policy circles?
- What legal, cultural, economic, or algorithmic systems are unintentionally reinforcing this condition?

Section 2: Institutional and Policy Context (~300 words)

- Which specific public agencies, legal frameworks, or digital platforms govern this domain?
- Where are the friction points? (e.g., procurement, inter-agency paralysis, data silos, compliance ambiguity)
- Who holds decision-making power, and who has soft veto power? What are their priorities?
- What past tools, pilots, or reforms have attempted to address this, and why did they fail?
- Are there active policy windows (budgets, strategy refreshes, digital blueprints) that could be leveraged now?

Section 3: Intervention Design and Systemic Leverage (~400 words)

- What does your intervention actually change—behavior, risk flows, power dynamics, visibility, or resource allocation?
- Map one key user or actor. What will they do differently? What motivates that change?
- What enforcement or institutional mechanism ensures durability—even if funding drops or leadership changes?
- What makes this design high-leverage? Does it reduce coordination costs, unlock compliance, or realign incentives?
- What would measurable traction look like within 12–18 months? What data will demonstrate success?

Section 4: Funding, Partnerships, and Traction Path (~200 words)

- What are the estimated costs to build and maintain the intervention in its first year? Show that you've thought it through.
- Who pays—and why would they fund this? What risk, KPI, or mandate does it serve?
- How do you reach that funder, agency, or platform? Do you have a wedge or entry point?
- What is your post-hackathon move—Letter of Intent, sandbox entry, public pilot,

procurement briefing?

Evaluation Criteria

Judges will select teams that:

- **Demonstrate non-obvious systems insight**, framing the problem with strategic precision.
- **Map actors, constraints, and incentives with fluency**—not just cite policy documents.
- **Design for institutional traction and behavioral change**—not just feature sets.
- **Show tactical realism** regarding data access, political timing, funding logic, and follow-through.