

Document 10
BCO Impact Study Report and Outline Proposal v1

For BCO partners' meeting, January 2006, Kathmandu

Report prepared by Kitty Warnock, on behalf of the Impact Study working group

(Note: this report is very informal. The other members of the working group have not yet had the opportunity to comment on it.)

Background

1 This phase of BCO – strong focus on evaluation. Donor need for evidence of impact. Large proportion of budget envelope allocated for evaluation and dissemination of findings.

2 Partners agreed to collaborate in a single impact study: experience of previous BDO study (title date) contributed to their interest in this; also urged by donors particularly DFID. Benefits: scale, sharing knowledge and learning, whole larger than sum of parts, would enable asking questions more challenging than usually possible with organisations' own evaluation, foundation for collection advocacy on role of ICD in development.

Purposes of the study

(As identified by the July 29 BCO partners' meeting)

1. Add to our knowledge of how ICD makes a difference to poverty alleviation (Exploring whether the validity of the assumptions on which our programmes are based)
2. Enable us to carry out more effective lobbying and advocacy for the role of ICD in poverty alleviation (by gathering evidence of impact)
3. Self learning for our own programmes (what works and what doesn't in supporting ICD for social change)
4. Sharing and learning about impact evaluation methodologies.

Process so far (to Jan 06)

1. Session on impact study in BCO partners meeting, Zambia, July 2005; agreed main outlines of a study, and mandated a Working Group to take the process forward to the next stage – a representative of each partner organisation (With KW of Panos London also representing Panos South Asia)
2. Working Group meeting, London, Sept 6-7 2005, with participation of Fiona Power of DFID. Kitty Warnock and Lauren Fok as lead coordinators of the process: further developed the purpose, concept, evaluation questions and processes of the impact study.
3. Sept – Dec 2005: Concept notes developed on three agreed evaluation questions: Voice (Shaddy) , Participation (Kitty) , participation in ICD policy-making and the impact of ICD policy (Neeltje and APC).

4. Discussion of concept notes by email and in phone/email conference calls, December 14 and 16 2005, with participation of David Woolnough of DFID (APC not able to participate)
5. New formulation of Research Question, and TOR for mapping partner projects against this question
6. KW pulled the concept and partner project lists together into a joint paper for discussion by the full BCO membership at the Jan 26 2006 meeting.

Objectives of BCO partners' meeting on Impact study, January 28th 2006

1. Share and discuss with the BCO members the outline proposal developed by the working group.
2. Agree on the proposal and a process for taking it forward (TOR of Working Group etc). Topics to be covered include:
 - o Confirm purpose and target audiences for study
 - o Broad outline of process and role of BCO member organisations: combining existing or already planned evaluations with new and especially-commissioned evaluations; timeframe
 - o Research question and rationale
 - o Selection of projects
 - o Maximising value from resources available

Content of the proposed Impact Study

The four research questions, as proposed at the July 2005 meeting:

(For more detail, see minutes of the meetings, in Dgroup)

1. How do ICD at grassroots help achieve pro-poor growth and mitigate inequalities, towards the achievement of the MDGs and PRS goals?
2. How does “giving voice to the poor” (including through local media) change their lives towards development objectives?
3. How is ICD influencing processes of governance? (transparency, accountability, responsiveness.....)
4. How does ICD policy improve people’s lives?

The research question, current version

“What is the development impact of ICD interventions that strengthen the voice of poor people and enable them to participate in governance and policymaking?”

How this question relates to the BCO basic rationale

BCO Aim is to support NGOs to promote the use of ICD to reduce poverty. BCO’s strategic objectives are:

1. Mainstreaming ICD (ie building strategic use of ICD in all development sectors and policy)
2. Stronger voice of southern civil society and debate, enabled by ICD

3. Demonstrating the poverty impact of ICD

This research question focuses mainly on the second objective, “stronger voice”, and asks – how do we understand stronger voice contributes to development, and what evidence can we find for this? However, the question also contributes to understanding of the first objective, by looking at voice and participation enabled by ICD across the range of development sectors in which BCO partners are involved.

Definition of ICD: The BCO partners have always accepted a broad definition of ICTs that is not confined to computers and internet applications, but includes any electronic, broadcast, narrowcast and tradition mediums including the radio, telephone, television, video and newspaper.

BCO partners’ aims and approaches, and how the question relates

The proposed question contributes directly to the core strategic goals of the BCO member organisations:

Panos

Key elements of Panos’ strategy are:

- Strengthening the voice of poor and marginalised people in development discourse at every level – community, national and international;
- Fostering debate – public debate at every level, and dialogue between and among policy makers and different sectors of society including the poor and marginalised.

OneWorld

To be added

APC

To be added

IICD

To be added

Hivos? Bellanet? DFID? SDC?

To be added

Rationale for the Research Question: Poverty reduction and good governance

A key focus of much current international discourse about development is “good governance”. (World Bank, UN agencies, Africa Commission, NEPAD.....). Good governance is seen as the key to increasing the share of national resources going to the poor, creating opportunities and empowering the poor to act on them, enabling economic growth and encouraging entrepreneurship... The term Good governance embraces many things and different users focus on different aspects. It is commonly understood to include:

- Government that allocates resources and provides services in a way that is efficient and effective; responsive to the needs of citizens including the poor
- Rule of law, and equal access to justice
- Usually, democracy: Government that can be held accountable by citizens, and influenced or replaced if it does not govern in citizens' interests – through democratic election processes, through various sorts of feedback, dialogue and pressure (including media).

Good governance requires, on one side, government that is efficient and responsive, effective knowledge management and access to information, transparency, political processes for responsiveness and accountability. On the other side, empowered citizens – who can gain information about services, rights, opportunities, skills etc, make informed decisions, act individually and collectively, claim entitlements, assert their place in the national life, engage in political processes.

All these – on both government and citizen side – are dependent on information and communication. And the potential of today's information and communication technologies has enormously expanded the possibilities of developing the flow of communication which should underpin good governance.

The BCO impact study question seeks to explore mainly the “empowered citizens” side of this equation, but also refers to the capacity of governments to respond.

Other relevant strands in development thinking today:

- Communication and learning theory – horizontal communication, dialogue rather than top-down one-way information flows: recognising that speaking is as important as receiving, that dialogue and debate at community level are as important as dialogue between citizens and government
- Communication for Social Change: change involves changes in attitudes and behaviour, which are social phenomena rather than individual. Such changes result from social communication, not from individuals receiving information.

The Impact study question seeks to explore BCO partners' activities in stimulating and enabling these processes of dialogue at different levels, and their impact.

The impact research question in more depth

How does ICD enable poor people to have a voice in governance and policymaking?

Theory of how voice contributes to participation and good governance

| Level | Aspects of Communication | Role of media and ICTs? |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Community level (Discussion, knowledge sharing and decisionmaking within communities) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Voice of disempowered is heard within community o Sharing and discussing leads to attitude and behaviour change o Building of knowledge o Decision-making on common issues o Building knowledge of rights, policy options, participation opportunities o Articulation of interests, demands, positions etc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Voice and dialogue in local media o Receiving information and building knowledge through media o Receiving information and building knowledge through ICTs |
| 2. Intermediary and “Aggregation” level – (Communities engage with authorities, service deliverers etc; voice of communities is transmitted to policymakers etc; networking among CSOs...) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CSOs build membership, representation, information flows, advocacy positions, advocacy capacity o Media enable knowledge sharing and debate, including with politicians etc o Media hold governments accountable o Local service deliverers identify local needs o Local representative politics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ICT-enabled CBOs and CSO networks etc o Media, local and national o ICD used by local service deliverers o Media and ICD used in local political processes o ICD enable livelihood opportunities |
| 3. Government creates opportunities for engagement and “listens” and responds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o E-governance – making information and services available o Transparency, public monitoring opportunities (eg budgets) o Public feedback points o Consultative processes, ability of government to respond o Local representation systems, political processes, elections o Political will to respond to public concerns | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Media building awareness of opportunities for engagement o Media watchdog role for transparency and accountability o e-circulation of information within government sectors and e-information available to public o ICT and media channels for public expression of needs etc and service deliverers able to respond to these (management, priority-setting, policymaking etc) o Public access points eg telecentres |

Annex: Preliminary mapping of BCO partner projects against these levels of the Question

Process and resource questions to be considered

The process is:

1. By the end of 2006, gather evaluation studies from BCO partner projects selected for their fit with the question (some already completed, some being undertaken in 2006).
2. In the first quarter of 2007: synthesise, analyse, produce a report

There are many possible projects to be included in the study:

Some have already been evaluated

- We will review these to see if they add insight/evidence to the Question
- Option to revisit some projects, or primary research data, to seek further information relating to the Question?

Some projects have not yet been evaluated, but evaluation is planned during 2006 as part of the partner organisations' regular evaluation work

- Option to shape the evaluation approaches and questions to meet the requirements of the Impact study
- Option to go further, the evaluation to be designed specifically to contribute to the Study, with common indicators etc
- Option to carry out some evaluations in collaboration among BCO members, or using a shared consultant....

If no evaluation is already planned:

- option to commission evaluations specifically for this Study.

How many project evaluations can each organisation "contribute"?

In the majority of cases, each organisation is responsible for carrying out and covering the costs of evaluation of its own projects. Each organisation will commit itself to doing this in such a way as to contribute to the Study, for a certain number of projects, to be decided. To discuss: how many projects is each organisation able to "contribute" to the impact study?

To discuss: will it make for a more focused discussion and study if we narrow down the number of projects to be included in the Study – by country groupings, type of project, or what other criteria?

Role of external consultant:

We envisage employing an external consultant(s) at some stage:

- Certainly to carry out the synthesis, analysis and writing
- Probably to review and help us refine the evaluation question, indicators etc once we have made the selection of projects
- Possibly to carry out some of the evaluations?

This consultant, and the hard costs of publication, need to be covered from common or pooled resources. Need: budget, and contributions from BCO partners' share of BCO funding?

**BCO Impact study – map of projects for potential inclusion
First draft - January 2006**

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Level 1: Voice being strengthened at community level | | | | |
| Information networks | IICD | Many countries, Africa and Latin Americ | How satisfied are the end-users with the knowledge sharing activities? | Already planned - Feb – August 06 |
| Farmers' cooperative – Fepassi | IICD | Burkina Faso | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How satisfied are the end-users with the services of the project (their voice heard on the radio)? How is the target group impacted in terms of awareness, empowerment, economic and organis-ational impact? | Already planned – due July 06 |
| Ministry of Tourism website, | IICD | Uganda | As above | ? |
| Global Teenager project | IICD | Ghana, Bolivia | As above | Available |
| APCOB - Multimedia Materials on Indigenous people Department Santa Cruz | IICD | Bolivia | As above | ? |
| Radio community project by Association Pag-la-Yiri in Zabre | IICD | Burkina Faso | As above | Already planned – due July 06 |
| IABER-TV | IICD | Burkina Faso | As above | Already planned – due July 06 |
| Radio clubs | Panos (Southern Africa) | Zambia and Malawi | Are women more able to participate in home and community-level decisionmaking, and make claims to service providers? | Already planned – Due March 06 |
| Pulaar language radio programmes | Panos (West Africa) | Senegal | Do the programmes stimulate debate and exchange of info in the community? | Needs new study – local consultant |
| Participatory programmes in local radio stations | Panos | Pakistan, Uganda, Zambia | As above | Ongoing study |
| Children's voice radio programmes | Panos (Caribbean) | Caribbean | Impact on attitudes to children, their capacities, practical results? | ? |
| Oral Testimonies on environment | Panos (London and Caribbean) | Jamaica | Has the experience and publication stimulated debate, confidence and action in the community? | March and 3 rd quarter |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Level 1: Voice being strengthened at community level | | | | |
| Oral Testimonies on Resettlement | Panos | Zambia, Botswana | As above | ? |
| Ek Duniya Gyan Patrika (promoting the use of print media and electronic media as means to voice community issues) | OWSA | India, Nepal | Is the community able to highlight issues related to health, sanitation and availability of drinking water through it? Is the community able to voice their concerns to authorities who provide these services to them? | |
| Open Knowledge Network programme | OneWorld – South Asia and Africa | India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Kenya, South Africa, Senegal | Can community create content in local languages? Can community mobilise this knowledge? Impact on behaviour and livelihoods ? | ? |
| Ek Duniya Ek Awaz (Community Radio program: Capacity building + program broad/narrowcasting) | OWSA | India, Nepal | Creates awareness and debate on social and local issues within and across communities? Are experts willing to join hands with the communities who produce these radio programmes? | ? |
| African voices programme | One World Africa | African countries | Is African voice harnessed among communities resulting in respecting local and traditional wisdom and practices in Africa, and policy shift to harvesting such knowledge? | |
| Ek Duniya Kayee Kahaniyan (Grassroots Stories: online portal) | OW | India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh | Can community voice issues through storytelling? Is this a natural and useful methodology? | |
| Ek Duniya Soochanalaya (Grassroots Advocacy Centers) | OW | India, Nepal, Sri Lanka | Can centres advocate for their rights? Is information disseminated resulting in empowerment and demand for services? | |
| Ek Duniya Sawal Jawab (Agriculture & Livestock Question-Answer helpline) | OW | India | User satisfaction? Impact on livelihoods? | |
| Evaluating and improving the impact of ICTs | OW | Costa Rica, Honduras, and Guatemala | Improved productivity skills among community members and entrepreneurs? | <i>Q: Is this a "voice" project?</i> |
| Social economy sector and fair trade (visibilizing and building capacities in the strategic appropriation of ICTs) | OW | Central America | Are the strategic use of ICTs result in building capacities in mainstreaming fair trade practices? | |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|---|-------------|--|---|--|
| Level 1: Voice being strengthened at community level | | | | |
| UMAL Radio –network of community radios and participatory platform | OW | Central America | Do the network and platform provide enough opportunities for people’s participation? | |
| Awards Projects - Gender and ICT Awards - Hafkin Prize - Betinho Prize | APC | Various | How have awards contributed to sustainability, upscaling and mainstreaming of ICD initiatives that focus on empowering poor and marginalized communities? | |
| Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM) | APC | Various | Mapping of changes in gender policy and practice of organisations and institutions that have been trained in GEM: How has GEM contributed to gender accountability in ICD initiatives? | |
| Training Projects - FOSS - Wireless - WENT - Itrainonline | APC | Various | How has technology training contributed to capacity of organisations and institutions to develop and implement ICD that contribute to empowering communities (?) or contribute to poverty alleviation (?) | |
| ICT Policy monitors and Portals (regional and national) | APC | Africa, Latin America and Asian Portals; Various countries including Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, DRC, Egypt, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, UK, Uruguay. | How do research and information increase awareness and capacity of various actors in policy advocacy? | Evaluation of APC’s policy and portals project ongoing through survey and interviews. An evaluation report will be produced by mid 2006. |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Level 2: Intermediate / aggregation level | | | | |
| Information networks – Lobbying and advocacy | IICD | Uganda, Burkina Faso, Mali, Bolivia | How are members influencing policy processes? | Already planned – results Feb – Aug 06 |
| Grassroots Options web publishing, NE India | Panos South Asia | India | Has online “voice” led to any increased interest in the area from NGOs or govt? | ? |
| PRSP and Radio Nepal | Panos South Asia | Nepal | Does media coverage raise people’s awareness of policy-influence opportunities? | ? |
| CSOs, media and poverty | Panos (West Africa) | Benin | Does radio strengthen CSO/community links? | Done |
| PRSP media coverage | Panos (West Africa, London) | Ghana, Pakistan, Zambia | Does media enable people to hold governments accountable? | ? |
| Local radio and elections | Panos Paris/Central Africa | DRC (and perhaps Burundi) | Has media coverage improved conduct of, confidence in and participation in elections? | Impact evaluation due in Q3-4 2006 |
| Grassroots Caucus (platform for grassroots communities to voice concerns and interact at international forums) | OW | Asian and African countries | Has caucus provided space for the community members’ to raise issues at WSIS plenary? Impact on WSIS thought process? | |
| Network of women’s organizations for gender policy advocacy to WSIS | OW | Central America | Did ICTs strengthen networking and advocacy? Impact on WSIS gender policy debate? | |
| OWSA MDG Portal on South Asia | OW | India, Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka | How are ICTs aggregating and amplifying grassroots voice, mainstreaming grassroots concerns and reaching national and international policy level with an alternative voice? Impact on learning and sharing, and collective advocacy among communities of practice on MDG themes? | |
| OWA edition on development and human rights | OW | African countries | As above | |
| UMAL edition on development and human rights | OW | Latin and Central American countries | As above | |
| Community Radio Policy Advocacy | OW | India | Has community of practice resulted in any policy change? | |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|--|
| Level 2: Intermediate / aggregation level | | | | | |
| OWSA Partners dGroup Platform | OW | Africa, South Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean | Developing community of practice? Partners using the tool for nurturing alternative voice, opinions? | | |
| Bottom-up governance barometer research | OW | Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and India | How has a bottom-up consultative process enhanced the understanding of MDGs? | | |
| Pro poor ICD policy support to government | OW | India, Nepal, Zambia | Has civil society voice influenced policy development processes? | | |
| Pro poor ICT research | OW | India, Pakistan, Nigeria and Croatia | Do ICTs allow citizens to increase knowledge of public services and their rights and to feed back? | | |
| Knowledge based advocacy for achieving MDGs | OW | India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka | How have OWSA's annual meeting been effective in advocating for a people-centric implementation process in the run upto achieving the MDGs? | | |
| Costa Rican Network for the Right to Communication | OW | Costa Rica | Impact of networking? | | |
| Mesoamerican Network for Popular Communication; Mesoamerican Social Forums – Communication Platform | OW | Mesoamerica | Impact of networking and social fora? | | |
| Strategic Use of ICT training for Central American social organizations | OW | Central America | How do organizations mainstream ICTs in their work? How have strategic use of ICTs in Central America been instrumental in creating social organizations? | | |
| Capacity building in evaluating the impact of ICTs in social organizations | OW | Mesoamerica | How have training programmes to build capacity among CSOs in evaluating the impact of ICTs have resulted in the strategic use of ICTs? | <i>KW Note: This one seems rather tortuous!</i> | |
| GEM, see Level 1 above | APC | | | | |
| Training projects, see Level 1 above. | APC | | | | |
| ICT policy monitors and portals, see level 1 above | APC | | | | |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|---|-------------|----------|--|--|
| Level 3: Government responding to citizens' "voice" | | | | |
| Kinandoni project | IICD | Tanzania | How satisfied are the end-users with the services of the project. How is the target group impacted by the project in terms of awareness, empowerment, economic impact and organisational impact. | Available – aug03 and June04 and Nov05 |
| DistrictNet - improved communication and information sharing between central gov and districts End-users: civil servants | IICD | Uganda | Idem | Available – sept04 <i>Q: is this a "responding to community voice" project?</i> |
| Ghana dot gov – government portal | IICD | Ghana | Idem | ? |
| CIDOB - Information on Conflicts and Negotiations in Communitarian Original Indigenous Lands in Bolivia | IICD | Bolivia | Idem | Available – 2003 and aug04 and July05 |
| MACA - Policies and Strategy for implementing ICTs for the Livestock Sector | IICD | Bolivia | Idem | Available – July05 |
| Projects in formulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participacion Ciudadana - 'Ciuddaania informada' Strengthening the local/ regional participation in the independent news agency informing the civilians on participation of the civil society to build a stronger democracy Radio La Luna - Digitizing the 'memory' of the social struggles in Ecuador. A multi media production, based on existing materials form organisation. Acope / AMJUPRE - Improving | IICD | Ecuador | How satisfied are the end-users with the services of the project. How is the target group impacted by the project in terms of awareness, empowerment, economic impact and organisational impact. | Expected end 2006 |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|-------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Level 3: Government responding to citizens' "voice" | | | | |
| <p>the local governance through strengthening womens participation and performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundacion Futuro Latina America - Improve the participation of youth in local government (as deccribed in Ecuador's Law) by letting them monitor the Law of the transparency of information • Association de Municipalidades de Ecuador - Assist municipalities in the accomplishment of the Law on the transparency of information • Consorcio de desarrollo local - Improving the information flows between the three local governance bodies – Municipality – Junta Parroquial – Province ○ Jubileo 2000 - Battling the external debt. Project focussing on informing the civilians on the external debt situation of Ecuador | | | | |
| Policy recommendations to Indian and Zambian government | OW | India, Zambia | Have the governments been responsive to the policy recommendations from MSPs under OW efforts? | |
| eGovernance Portal | OW | India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka | How is the rate card of eGovernance received and seen instrumental in strengthening eGovernance work in South Asia? How are the best practices signposted on eGovernance Portal been helpful in learning and sharing of ideas and experiences within South Asia? | |
| Linkages with the Delhi government on public grievances system | OW | India | How have ICDs been effective in managing public grievance redressal? | |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|-------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Level 3: Government responding to citizens' "voice" | | | | |
| Pro-poor public services enabled through ICTs | OW | India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Croatia | How have governments responded to pro-poor ICD toolkits developed by the community members? | |
| Gender and ICT Policy Advocacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beijing Platform for Action Reviews - National Processes - GenderIT.org | APC | Various: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philippines, South Africa, Uganda, Argentina | <p>How has advocacy on gender and ICT contributed to integrating gender issues and perspectives in ICT policy environments in both global and national levels?</p> <p>When people-centred policies are adopted, eg universal service obligations, are they implemented with awareness of women's specific contexts?</p> <p>Methodologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sampling of policies that specifically address gender issues in global, regional and national ICT policies and their impact on women's empowerment; o Tracking of gender and ICT advocates in global and national bodies; o Case study of effective gender policy process in national level; o Gender evaluation of the implementation of the Rural Service Development Fund in Uganda | |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|---|-------------|--|---|--|
| Level 4: Multistakeholder participation in policy-making | | | | |
| Embedding in the National ICT policy | IICD | Bolivia | Indicators ICT policy development: While examining this question at level 3, we could look at four broad indicators: 1 – Examine the actual stakeholders (is it really multistakeholderism, how many, who are they) 2 – Effective participation (how are they participating, do they rate their own level of participation as effective, are they lobbying?) 3 – Relevance to poverty alleviation (is the ICT policy pro-poor? Is it linked to PRSP's, SWOP's, national policies etc?) 4 – Awareness and empowerment (Are the stakeholder more aware and empowered? Measure effects of training efforts at individual level.) 5 – What role can ICT's play in the overall policy process? | |
| Embedding at the agriculture sector | IICD | Bolivia | Idem | |
| National ICT policy development | IICD | Ghana | Idem | |
| Health ICT policy development | IICD | Uganda | Idem | |
| MTTI ICT policy development | IICD | Uganda | Idem | |
| National ICT policy development | IICD | Uganda | Idem | |
| Education ICT sector policy development | IICD | Tanzania | Idem | |
| National ICT Policy Advocacy | APC | BCO: Uganda and Bangladesh CATIA: DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal; APC members: Argentina, | How do inclusive, consultative and participatory policy processes impact on national policy and implementation environments (?) | Case studies of national policy processes that highlight: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - multistakeholder participation - development of specific ICT policy that promotes |

| Project | BCO partner | Country | Evaluation question | Status/timing of evaluation |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Ecuador, Brazil, Philippines | | universal access (VOIP or WIFI?) or open content (South Africa creative commons?) |
| <p>Global and Regional Policy Advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSIS - Internet Government Forum - Open Access policy advocacy in regional policy (SAT3, EASSY) | APC | Various | <p>How do global policy processes influence regional and national ICT environments?</p> <p>Do global policy processes lead to more participative policy processes at national and regional level?</p> <p>How do global processes influence mainstream ICD agenda – priorities, funding, etc?</p> <p>Are global policy processes effectively influenced by, or concerned with ICD issues?</p> | <p>Case studies of how WSIS relates to national policy in Kenya, Ethiopia, India, Ecuador, Brazil and Bangladesh is being prepared.</p> <p>Research on WSIS phase 2 on the extent and impact of developing country participation.</p> <p>Monitoring regional action plans that emerged alongside, or as a result of, the WSIS, e.g. e-LAC 2007 and the Africa Action Plan.</p> <p>Mapping of southern networks involved in ICT policy.</p> |