



Document 6

Summary of Discussions and decisions of the BCO Meeting in Kathmandu, Nepal, 26-28 January, 2006

Day One: 26 January, 2006 (Thursday), Hotel Himalaya

This is a summary of decisions. For a full transcript of the minute, please go to www.bcoalliance.org/

Following the BCO partner reports, the partners were divided into two groups and were asked to discuss one question each from issues that emerged from the reporting.

Question for Group 1: Mainstreaming ICD as an instrument within development institutions

The group agreed it was important to focus on local community groups. These organizations ranges from demands driven to peer networking or bringing in multi-stakeholder partnership to promote models of ideas and issues relating to mainstreaming ICD. An example was used where if there is no radio existing in local communities then BCO Alliance members can enable them to negotiate the development discourse and can be an effective actor in developmental work.

Question for Group 2: How do we use media as a development partner?

Following points were noted by the group.

1. Multiple roles of media
2. What can we do for the media?
3. Media survey
4. Media policy survey
5. Capacity building
6. Innovation

It was identified every country has different media playing different roles for different audience. One needs to do a data survey to identify audience. What NGOs can do for the media: training and capacity building; working with editors and even technological issues such as implementing ICTs. Neutral spaces could also be created between media and policy-makers to rectify the distrust that exists between them. The media should not be realized that they are only being used as a media, so there is need to develop confidence and understanding. In cases of media monitoring in civil society, one needs to work with civil societies and NGOs on sometimes identifying stories or differentiate public broadcaster from commercial and so on. BCO members can work and advocate media regulations. Capacity building is also possible in terms of being innovative and creating new spaces.

A suggestion was made to form a media website as a “shadow cabinet” by bringing all activists together. For example, the chief minister in Chattisgarh (a state in India) logs into www.cgnet.in to look at citizen’s grievances.

BCO Coordination 2006

1. On BCO donor facilitation:

The need to expand the BCO donor group was discussed. It was noted that the strength of BCO is that it has historically had a mix of donor agencies. BCO is also unique as there are not many donors, as such, networking or attempting to harmonize efforts within a specific sector. These are good selling points to the outside world.

There are suggestions of different donors on the table that come with similar views and can facilitate more resources. BCO includes donors coming largely from ICT or media organizations and not so much from the core development organizations. It helps to have non-ICT or non-media as they usually are the donors who have more access to broader policy dialogue.

The question is not about bringing more donors but also partners as there are broader ways of implementing BCO objectives.

- A short summary of the BCO Alliance be prepared that is available online
- Donors to be invited to next BCO
- It was emphasised that the donors should have a clear view on criteria to include new partners and networks
- We should flag that discussion in the next meeting in The Hague
- We need to brainstorm about a larger strategic alliance and a clearer framework.

2. On Project and Country Mapping

The map is very influential and is being used as a way to show other donors how we are delivering. The map is critical. This is a tool that can be used for donors to decide the number of countries where they might work in cooperation with NGOs.

- Need some analysis on geographical analysis

3. A financial report will be presented in BCO meetings on coordination.

4. On Communication: go as simple as possible.

5. On next BCO meeting:

The coordination office will submit a proposal to the “BCO List” regarding proposal for next BCO Alliance Meeting.

Learning Day topics chosen:

SN	Topic	Votes
1	HIV/AIDS Communication	1
2	Multi stakeholder partnership (MSP) approach to most effective advocacy strategies, policy change in favour of voice	7
3	Role of ICD in building democracy	5
4	Role of communications and media in development	4
5	ICT policy advocacy, regional + national	2
6	Mainstreaming ICD, progress + change	0
7	Topic to support impact study	0
8	Role of knowledge in development	0
9	Role of ICT in disaster preparedness	4
10	Bilateral agencies, policies + relationships	0

Day Two: 27 January 2006 (Friday)
Impact Assessment

The following general points emerged:

1. In identifying the audience of the Impact Study: donors who are champions of ICTs as well as donor who are skeptical of ICTs; internally within our own organizations and networks and lastly everyone is our audience but we need to prioritize this last category.
2. This Impact study has the potential for innovation
3. Source external evaluator to conduct evaluation and to offer assistance particularly from a methodological point of view.
4. Civil society should also be involved in ICT4d to increase their capacity and has been hard to convince rural based civil society
5. BCP partners would like to learn from impact assessment what works better. For example what environment is required for ICTs to work?
6. It is important we don't only look at success stories

Research Question

The following list of terms was discussed for the reformulation of the research questions.

Scope:

- Focus only looking at our projects
- Open to include projects outside of partners

Audience:

(Focus: Non-ICT related Development community)

- Decision-makers related to donors, national governments, and government policy makers
- Donors
- Implementers

It was agreed upon that BCO Alliance will consider placing primary focus on non-ICT related development community in the dissemination strategy.

Elements:

- Not only governance and policy-making and implementation but also empowerment
- Mainstreaming ICTs for economic growth as well as voice dimension
- Voice

The Following notes were taken in course of impact study discussions.

Flipchart 1:

1. Comparative study in giving voice in three countries: Andean, East Africa and South Asia
2. Thematic studies. e.g.: a) Livelihood – Economic impact; b) Investigation into information networks, country level communications
3. Pull all evaluations together and draw out conclusions (critical mass): Collating – unpacking – development communications strategy and dissemination strategy (repackaging)
4. Commission someone to do it: Communications - Doesn't have to be collective (Assess coordination of © participation; Focus on 4-5 key ©)

Flipchart 2:

1. Panos South Asia and AMARC: Voice-governance (community radio) in South Asia
2. a) HIVOS and IICD on networking

- Extract of extending voice to the poor
- Difference IICD: Compare ICT 4D networks and non-ICT 4D networks
- Possibly CAOW Portals
- b) Using OWSA (Bellanet – Southern Voices Online) as a case study at international and national level
- c) Evaluation on ICT Policy Monitor = HIVOS + APC + IDRC
- 3. One World: Health – Livelihood – Economic Impact
 - Comparative study of 10 states in India, radio content, online and print
- 5. IICD: Economic impact in livelihoods – mainstreaming ICTs, decision makers
 - IICD + APC: Networks + policy – health
 - IICD + HIVOS: How ICTs can?
- 6. Panos: Country communications TOG + AMARC + OW
- 7. Bellanet: mapping in groups raising voices

Flipchart 3:

1. Common Impact: Develop proposals further and present
2. Thematic: partners to move on own proposals for collaboration
3. Individual Partners to define communications strategy for target audience on proposals made

Decisions:

1. BCO Coordination for common impact assessment and draft TOR
2. Consultant for individual partner communications strategy and draft TOR
3. Impact assessment meeting day in May or September
4. Impact WG to develop proposals in No 1
5. Partners to fill in template by February end for all 3
6. Partners to nominate delegations into WG
7. Lauren and Kitty will make a proposal on “Impact Assessment Process” and next meeting.

end