

**BCO Impact Study
Colombo, Sri Lanka 7 May 2006**

Agenda

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. Apologies**
- 3. Report of process thus far**
- 4. Discussion resolving Activity 1, 2, and 3**
- 5. Ratification of the Impact Study Proposal and Calendar**
- 6. Ratification of the ToR and Briefing document for consultant**
- 7. Review and approve the project selection criteria**
- 8. Review Budget and agree on principles**
- 9. Mandate to Impact Study Working Group**
- 10. Next meeting of Impact Study Working Group**

**Minutes of the
BCO Impact Study
Colombo, 7 May 2006**

Present:

Anriette Esterhuisen (APC), Jac Stienen (IICD), Patrick Kalas (SDC), Steve Buckley (AMARC)

1. Apologies: Lauren and Kitty
2. Process so far
 - (a) Kathmandu identified 3 levels of work –(1) individual impact assessment, (2) bilateral collaborations and (3) BCO wide study focussing on agreed themes and country examples
 - (b) Discussion with DfID led to next stage focus on levels 2 and 3 and dissemination strategy for level 1
 - (c) AE reported that IICD and APC proceeding with level 2 collaboration in Bolivia and Uganda.

- (d) KW and LF moved ahead with consultation on this but proposed a level 3 methodology without country focus but bringing into one method a study of a range of partner projects
- (e) Kathmandu also discussed the value of joint dissemination/publication and this could include a compilation of good practice results from level 1 work.
- (f) SB reported that AMARC moving ahead on its level 1 impact assessment with support of SDC

3. Discussion re Levels 1, 2 and 3

- (a) Level 1 – this is the work of individual BCO members but can have a joint dissemination component such as a joint publication of work drawn from each partner.
 - i. Need to identify relevant existing work, since 2004, and pool this via Lauren.
 - ii. Target audience is particularly donors, policy makers and implementers understood as being in the broad-based field of development rather than those already in ICT4D.
 - iii. Presentation needs to be appropriate to differing needs of these target groups including quantitative and qualitative material and sufficient context for broad-based audience.
 - iv. Outputs might include a DVD with voices, interviews; a short and accessible hard copy publication; and perhaps another, more critical and in depth, desk-based study.
 - v. The work would be based on material provided by the partners but would need an external consultant to pull together the material and then write the dissemination product and compose the dissemination strategy.
 - vi. Consultants might come from a broader development background but would need some familiarity with and commitment to the sector.
 - vii. Possible consultants - Lisette Gast, Frans van Gerwen, Gerd Junne (IICD reccs), Nancy Hafkin (former ICT consultant with ECA), Kate Wilde (formerly with IDRC), Sean O Siochru and Bruce Girard (Nexus/Comunica), Simon Batchelor and associates (Gamos, currently doing CATIA evaluation), Gerster and associated (previous work for SDC), David Souter (ex CTO), James Deane and Alfonso Gumucio Dagrón (Communication for Social Change Consortium), Communications Initiative, Institute for Development Studies, Pete Cranston.
 - viii. Prepare short brief and request a 1 page outline as to how they would approach it.
 - ix. SB to assist KW draw up a consultant outline brief and call for expressions of interest.
 - x. The timeline for level 1 should lead to the dissemination product by September 2006
- (b) Level 2 – this is bilateral work between BCO members looking at their respective practice in one or more countries and leading to a joint evaluation or dissemination product.
 - i. APC and IICD are working on a joint initiative in Uganda and Bolivia
 - ii. Panos South Asia and OneWorld South Asia are working on a joint initiative on pro-poor and access to voice initiatives with a focus on India/South Asia.
 - iii. AMARC and Panos have had preliminary discussions around joint work on media reform.

iv. It was suggested that donor partners in BCO should consider collaborating on review and evaluation of donor policy effectiveness on ICT4D. PK to raise with GW and DfID.

(c) Level 3 – this is joint work between the BCO partners based on an agreed research question and examining different levels of intervention in ICT4D – local, intermediary and governmental

i. The discussion was based on the paper on BCO Impact Study prepared by KW. Points arising from this include: need to be clear about the target audience; need to include problems as well as good examples; if it is to be a serious, independent study then it would need a rigorous and independent evaluator throughout, from identification of indicators, through oversight of the data gathering, to the final analysis and report; the draft research question seeks to measure effectiveness in strengthening voice but not the impact of strengthened voice on development.

ii. It was agreed we need to clearly frame the terrain, if not the wording, of the research question. After discussion of various options the following re-formulation of the question was agreed:

How does communications for development contribute to poverty reduction through strengthening the voices, capacities, communications and networking of the poor and the marginalised, and enable them to influence decisions that affect their lives?

iii. It was agreed that the project should be a substantial and rigorous independent study with the active involvement of the partners in framing the research, supporting the data gathering, advising on the analysis and being consulted in the drafting of the final report. The study is intended for an audience of specialist and generalist development actors but should also contribute to strengthening the institutional and evaluation capacity of the partners themselves.

iv. The methodology should include the three levels of intervention – local, intermediary and governmental – and should be based on empirical data from projects of the partners.

v. The study will need to have two outputs: first being the full study in a form and level of detail that is of use to specialists (donors, governmental policy makers, NGOs) working in the communications for development field; second being a shorter, more accessible report with context and explanatory material designed for non-specialist development actors.

vi. It was agreed that the paper from KW setting out proposed selection criteria and associated methodology could be adopted as a working document. It will need refining on the basis of a revised methodology to be agreed with the external consultant after their appointment.

vii. Consultants brief – it was noted that the process and TORs sections would need substantial revision but otherwise the brief is a good working draft. AE and SB to work on revised draft.

viii. Possible consultants: Above list (point 3(a)vii) to be included + Debbie Budlender.

ix. The timeline for level 3 should lead to a first draft report in May 2007 and the final report and

dissemination products to be available by September 2007.

4. Budget and contributions - The joint BCO work on impact assessment needs some pooled resources for both the level 1 and the level 3 work. Level 1 will require around £5,000 per partner. Level 3 will require around £25,000 per partner. It is assumed this commitment can be guaranteed by the DfID funded partners and that additional resources could be negotiated with some of the other partners. The non-DfID-funded partners will be invited to contribute according to their means with a view to achieving a total budget for Level 3 of c. £200,000 and a total budget for Level 1 of c. £25,000.
5. ISWG Mandate: The ISWG is responsible for:
 - (a) Development of a revised proposal for the joint BCO impact assessment and dissemination work.
 - (b) Oversight of the two studies at Level 1 and Level 3.
 - (c) Preparing and overseeing an MoU for each partner concerning the financial contributions.
 - (d) Preparing and overseeing an MoU for Panos to provide technical administration.
6. Other business:
 - (a) The ISWG needs further clarification from Panos as to their capacity to coordinate the work of the ISWG in view of the difficulties that had been experienced in preparing this meeting.
 - (b) It was noted that work needs to advance on BCO web site including Impact Study. Also that the ISWG has a d-groups list that needs re-activating and updating to include all who need to be on it.
7. Next meeting: It is proposed that this should be 5/6 June in London