

BCO Learning Day

Mapping BCO Impact

DFID, London

Tuesday, 25th January 2005

1. Participants list for Day 2

Styn van der Krogt, IICD (SKrogt@iicd.org)
Anriette Esterhuysen, (anriette@apc.org)
Karen Banks, APC (karenb@gn.apc.org)
Pete Cranston, OneWorld (Pete.Cranston@oneworld.net)
Basheerhamad Shadrach, One World Asia (basheerhamad.shadrach@oneworld.net)
Priscilla Jere, OneWorld Africa (priscilla.jere@oneworld.net)
Kitty Warnock, Panos (Kitty.Warnock@panos.org.uk)
Sameer Padania, Panos (Sameer.Padania@panos.org.uk)
Kishor Pradhan, Panos Asia (kishor@panossouthasia.org)
Lucy Lamoureux, Bellanet (llamoureux@bellanet.org)
Loe Schout, Hivos (l.schout@hivos.nl)
David Woolnough, DfID (D-Woolnough@dfid.gov.uk)
Nicola Woods, DfID (N-Woods@dfid.gov.uk)
Geraldine Kouadio, SDC (Geraldine.Kouadio@deza.admin.ch)
Piet den Heijer, DGIS (piet-den.heijer@minbuza.nl)
Simon Batchelor, Gamos (Simon@gamos.org)
Warren Feek, Communication Initiative (wfeek@comminit.com)
Claire Sibthorpe, CATIA (claire@catia.ws)
Lauren Fok, BCO/IICD (lauren@womensnet.org.za)
Ivan Kulis, IICD (ik@ecdpm.org)

2. Introduction

The focus of the BCO Learning Day was to map and assess the impact of the activities undertaken by each of the partners. *Mapping* our activities, *sharing* our approaches and (possibly) *coordinating* our plans are important steps towards building a coherent and systematic evidence of the impact.

In brief, three **objectives** were set for the day:

- To gain a greater mutual understanding by the BCO partners of their individual plans for impact assessment
- To learn from international experience
- To identify a common co-ordination mechanism for sharing impact assessment between the group and to a wider international audience

Three **documents** were **distributed** during the day and will be made available on the BCO workspace:

- Evaluation Methodologies for ICD Programmes – Guidelines;
- Impact online discussion group information and invitation;
- Lessons on evaluating communications campaigns (influencing policy change).

3. Remark on the BCO outcomes

At the outset of the discussion, the issue of the *outcomes* of the BCO programme surfaced again. The coordination group will need to send an “expanded version” of the outcomes: one pager document that clarifies “dry” outcomes, as they are currently spelled in the project document.

4. DfID and impact

By way of introducing the tool for mapping the BCO activities, Nicky Woods (DfID) presented the DfID plans on assessing their impact.

- **A 3-year Impact Programme will** be launched in a few weeks. It will focus on building the evidence of ICD impact in the sectors of **governance, growth, health and conflict**. Geographical focus is not planned. The programme will be **a coordinated network** of ICD champions who will **map impact evidence**(on poverty). internally and externally. Among others, the participants will be DfID, USAid, IDRC, DGIS, InfoDev, FAO and WHO.
- The network will be composed of several components: a) content-wise, each organisation will provide their experience (eg. USAid on the health sector); b) advisory groups will be set up to include academics; c) contributors will be pulled in from a broader network. In addition, there will be an important communication component that will feed the results, work and advice to policy makers and practitioners.
- How do BCO and CATIA programmes feed into this picture? The idea is to establish **mechanisms and channels** that will ensure **regular feedback** of our work in the larger Impact Programme. The tools and mechanisms will be defined during the first 6 months of the Impact Programme. However, the Impact Programme will **not** exert any **influence on the methodologies** of the BCO partners.
- Apart from the Impact Programme, the DfID Research unit has added a 10% extra communication budget on to all future projects. The objective of this “communications boost” is to ensure the findings systematically reach policy and decision makers.
- There is also an ongoing **debate** on **Quantitative and Qualitative Assessments of the Impact of Communication**, done in collaboration with the World Bank, FAO and Communications Initiative. This is one of the major themes that will be addressed at the World Congress on Communication for Development to be held in Rome, Autumn 2005. The input from the e-forum will feed into the design of the Congress. The space can be reached at http://info.worldbank.org/etools/devforum-reg_wccd1/reg.htm

5. Implementing agencies and impact

Nicky and David from DfID introduced the BCO Alliance to the **Poverty Map**. The Map draws on the *Theory of Change* and tries to visualise the *information flow* between different stakeholders. It maps the intervention of each partner according to the “stakeholder group” partners are reaching. Underlying the Theory of change is the question “what do we expect to happen in a changing world and how are people/stakeholders changing?” The Map or jigsaw does not reflect a cyclical process.

An *Indicator* is defined by:

Measurable in 2 years but predict social changes in 10 years.

Each partner was invited to **present areas and objectives of their activities**, according to the headings set by the “**Poverty Map**” **matrix** developed in the context of the Impact Programme.

	Policy take-up of pro-poor development strategies	Regulatory environment	Media & communication s gate keepers	Civil society and service delivery agents		Grassroots take-up of pro-poor development strategies
Panos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inclusive policy created ➤ Donor policies have changed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Media covers comms policy ➤ Better informed champions/journalists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Media covers comms policy ➤ Much stronger dialogue going on ➤ Better informed champions/journalists ➤ Media covers wide variety of issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Civil society locally empowered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Increased quality of radio programming ➤ Include people's voice in radio programmes ➤ Increased media coverage on HIV/AIDS 	
OW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grassroots voice influences policy ➤ Local policy makers influenced by community radio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local policy makers influenced by community radio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Counting / collecting evidence? ➤ Local policy makers influenced by community radio 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ grassroots voices amplified ➤ Linkages people/civil society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improved provision of services/exit options ➤ People aware of their rights ➤ "1 million grassroots academicians" ➤ real people participation in evaluation ➤ p2p networks ➤ K4D at the grassroots level
IICD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ministries are more aware of ICD issues (content from intermediaries) ➤ Policies already in place ➤ Multistakeholder processes ➤ Institutional building -> sectors -> swaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Institutional building -> sectors -> swaps ➤ Multistakeholder processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Institutional building -> sectors -> swaps ➤ Multistakeholder processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ End users influencing organisational approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sector-level analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfaction level of IICD services ➤ Ownership / demand-led level ➤ Critical mass
Bellanet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Increased awareness of national policy-makers, leading to increased commitment to invest in ICDs for peace promotion ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key stakeholders driving the dialogue ➤ Mainstreamed ICDs for peace promotion will have poverty impact ➤ Improved donor coordination through dialogue
APC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Analyse policy outcomes, looking specifically to unintended outcomes ➤ Inclusion of CS in national delegations 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Debate on social issues ➤ Coalition building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Civil voices in regional / global processes ➤ Check list to see if policies match CS criteria ➤ CS drafting and conceptualising policy documents 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Including the excluded in policy change ➤ More access, leading to livelihoods impact

6. Learning from external networks

The afternoon started with presentations from Warren Feek from Communication Initiative and Simon Batchelor from GAMOS. Both presentations are loaded on the BCO workspace, and here are just some key points from the presentations.

Warren gave a series of recommendations on components often forgotten in evaluation projects:

- Large number of project evaluations: what is missing is evaluation of impact across a large geographical and/or population base, combining a number of projects;
- While there is a lot of focus on process, we lack demonstration of direct impact on MDGs proven through research methodologies that are hard for non-communicator to undermine;
- While there is lot of descriptive work, less attention is given to underlying change principles or theories that dictate the work that is being undertaken;
- We share lots of insight and analysis, but we are not trying to quantify (whilst retaining adherence to C4D principles);
- We tend to capture and focus on the complexity: we shouldn't be shy to introduce simplifications that easily convey processes and results
- We use given sets of indicators, while it might be more interesting to compare effectiveness between processes/projects/trends by different indicators;
- Evaluations are often outsourced to outsiders, while neglecting evaluation perspectives of the insiders. Concrete proposal has been made to have BCO evaluation done by insiders;
- Indicators we use are often derived from developed country – and their rational/thinking. We should encourage diversity.

Simon presented evaluation efforts done in the CATIA project.

- CATIA programme started **without baseline or indicators**. The key concept is that of “**stakeholders**”: they are divided in “members”, “boundary stakeholders” and “outer stakeholders”.
The evaluation tries to **trace the change by tracing the information flow** between stakeholders.
- Obviously, this requires identification of a) all stakeholders; and b) expected change at the very beginning of the programme.

Three concrete suggestions given by Simon were:

- Write down your expectations
- Write down your theory of change
- Evaluation should be undertaken by local staff
- Do not pre-set indicators

7. BCO Coordination effort

How can the BCO partners best coordinate their evaluation efforts?

It was emphasised that we are **not** speaking about the **evaluation of the BCO programme**. **Each partner** will engage in an evaluation exercise that does not necessarily has to cover BCO activities, and can involve/focus on other partners. It was noted that a percentage of each partner's budget was earmarked for **evaluation work**.

Following discussion on the work of the BCO partners, the following matrix depicts the three areas and three levels of work that BCO partners is primarily focussed on:

	Grassroots Voices	CS Media	Policy
National			
Donor			
Partners			

Decisions:

1. It was felt that that **policy making and development** cut across the work that all partners are preoccupied with. As a result, the following evaluation research questions were proposed and decided on and the partner that would lead on the evaluation work.

Research Topic to be evaluated	Lead partner
Does grassroots voices influence policy? (Does giving voice to grassroots communities increase their participation and impact in pro-poor policy making?)	OneWorld
Does Civil Society influence policy?	IICD (one national and one sectoral), together with APC
Are media and ICT policies gender sensitive?	APC
Does media influence policy? (How do grassroots voices get into the media?)	Panos
Does global/regional partnership policy processes influence national policy?	APC

2. The dgroup list will be used to discuss methodology/ies sharing (follow-up)
3. According to the above split, lead partners will run e-mail discussion groups and prepare (collaborative) proposals over the next month. Final draft for submission in the first week of March. A report of the evaluation process will be present at the June BCO meeting.
4. Discussion on the proposals will be continued through BCO workspace or/and through bilateral discussions/workspaces. The proposals need to be checked by the group in order to have collective validation and avoid overlap and duplication.
5. Country case studies should be integrated into evaluation exercises.
6. Proposals that go beyond policy issues are also encouraged!

End