

**BCO Meeting, Panos Office, London
Impact Assessment and Coordination 2
6-7 September 2005**

The meeting started at 10h20.

Session 1: Welcome, Introductions and Expectations

1.1 Welcome and Introductions

1. Chat Garcia Ramilo (APC) – involved in the APC women's programme and APC lead person for BCO impact work.
2. Kitty Warnock (Panos) – Director of Communication for Development Programme, lead on M&E within Panos London, and lead person for BCO M&E
3. Neeltje Blommestein (IICD) – is part of IICD for 4 years and ran the Global Teenager Project before being co responsible for IICD M&E system for the last 1 ½ years and is representing IICD at this meeting.
4. Ivan Kuilis (IICD) – replacing Stijn at this meeting, long involved in learning study in BDO
5. Fiona Power (DFID) – Communications Adviser on communication issues in DFID, looking specifically at knowledge sharing, learning and impact. Fiona will only be present for one day of the meeting.
6. Basheerhamad Shadrach (OW) – Director of OWSA and OW lead person for BCO impact work
7. Lauren Fok (BCO Coordinator)

Mark Wilson (Panos) welcomed the BCO Impact Study working group to Panos's offices in London and stressed the importance of M&E.

Lauren welcomed everybody and gave an overview of the two day programme, including reminding the group of the terms of reference for the working group, as mandated by the BCO Lusaka Meeting.

1.2 Comments on the programme:

- Definitions and terminology – we need to arrive at a common definition of the terms that we are all referring to. It was agreed that we can speak to this when we discuss methodologies, keep it in the back of our minds throughout the meeting and we will return to this at the end of day and agreed to continuous interrogation of the language we use through the course of the impact study.
- Is everybody here a permanent member of the Impact working group? The response was that each organization has a Lead Impact study person who will be the key liaison person for their organization on the BCO working group. This person will be drawing on evaluation efforts of their organization and feeding this into the BCO Impact Group and vice versa. This person may also be responsible for M&E in their organisation.

1.3 Expectations

1. Completed framework and plan for taking impact study work forward in the short, medium and long term, including:
 - Defining the impact study questions
 - Modalities for working together
 - Focus countries
 - Target audiences for study, and how this impacts on the terms of the study itself
 - Dissemination plan for the study, including creative ways to share the findings
2. Identify synergies and how to integrate this study with other evaluation work in our organisations
3. Develop an understanding of how this evaluation links with other evaluation studies that exist
4. Develop a communication strategy that is linked to a dissemination strategy or packaging the final product that focuses on both internal and external learning. This should be linked to the implications for data gathering
5. Deepen our understanding of the BCO programme. Where are we currently collaborating?
6. Plan an evaluation which is bigger than the sum of its parts, ambitious in trying to assess the long-term impact of ICD on society
7. We should be confident that our thinking is worth sharing, of interest to others in the Development community

8. Identify what we are going to learn ourselves, and learning we will be able to share with others outside BCO and find a creative way of sharing these learnings
9. Clarify the terminology and concepts we use, agree usage
10. David's email message was also returned to in terms of the expectations that he had

1.4 Minutes and matters arising

Theory of Change – will come back to this

Clarification of Minutes:

Aims and Objectives refer to the Reasons for working together

Impact Questions relate to What do we want to know

Session 2: Vision and Rationale

Exercise

The question was asked of how this study would add value to the stakeholders, identified at the Lusaka meeting, as being a potential beneficiary of this study. Each person in the meeting was asked to imagine themselves as that stakeholder.

How will this study add value to your work as a:

..... "Donor"

- Give me information about projects that I should fund? – what kind of projects? – where? - what works and what does not?
- Tell me how to help/guide organizations/partners in implementing and designing more effective projects
- It will help me mobilize more resources for ICT4D if the findings provide enough evidence that ICT contribute to development in significant ways

..... "ICT organization"

- Collecting the evidence of my intervention,
- Based on the evidence, can have a dialogue with beneficiaries of project
- Adapting my activities to meet "negative" aspects of the evaluation
- Understanding if I am using resources efficiently
- Profiting in using study internally to promote organisational learning and work
- Build marketing efforts to position self and get additional funds.
- Use evidence to impact into policy making processes and debates

..... "BCO partner"

- Collaboration between partners
- Opportunity to work with local partners
- Opportunity to publish the work we do on a global level
- Deepen relationship and work with donor
- Deepen reflection process
- Build M+E capacity – integrate into projects more consciously
- Meet the needs of beneficiaries in a more rigorous and thoughtful way

..... "Developing country Government decision maker"

- Looking for evidence that ICT policy makes a difference, is necessary.
- Evidence that ICT for the poor can be cost effective and sustainable
- Evidence that ICT for the poor is a good investment – supports service delivery, inclusion, economic activity, etc?
- Demonstration of ICT projects that involve private sector collaboration and other partnerships (not too burdensome for governments)
- Evidence and arguments on what types of ICT projects are good - good practice guidelines, policy recommendations

How will this study make my life better as a "community person"?

- Improve levels of services targeting me – a poor rural woman and my family
- Improved communication about projects and program
- Better able to express my own needs and wishes (voice) – have a platform to speak and have somebody listen to me
- Better collaboration of development organizations (so one instead of 3 people visit our project)

- Help me to bring my voice to policy dialogue, as donors/implementers understand better how this process works
- Improve services for my family as a result of knowing what works and what doesn't
- Help improve accountability of my government (by improving the role of the media?)
- Get more money see value of supporting initiatives
- Get more money for my community radio station from donors who see the value of supporting it

Comments:

- It was highlighted that this exercise should be read in conjunction with discussions in Lusaka regarding the “reasons for this impact study” and “who it is for”.
- A relationship should be made between the BCO mapping exercise of partner activities and the impact work vis a vis highlighting the projects where there is synergy and projects where collaboration is taking place?
- Is our starting point for this impact study - who our target audience is or from the perspective of the work we do i.e. interventions and policy impact?
- The impact study can also be approached from the perspective of the BCO objectives
- Are we going to focus on joint efforts of our organizations on the ground in answer to a particular question?
- Triangulation approach – ask one impact question of 3 projects in one country or 1 project in 3 countries
- Importance of buy in from local donor desks

The meeting will address some of these comments. However it was concluded that this is a process and that we will need to engage in reiterations of this in future meetings. This will determine how we package the impact study for dissemination and what we will do with it.

Session 3&4: What do we want to find out? Which projects will be evaluated? Identify indicators for each project.

Impact Question	Indicators	BCO Partner Projects that address the Impact Question	Country
<p><u>Scrapped but to be included as part of the framework analysis/ToC</u></p> <p>How do ICD at grassroots help achieve pro-poor growth and mitigate inequalities, towards the achievement of the MDGs and PRS goals?</p>	<p>Availability of more (economic) opportunities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to markets, credit, insurance and financial institutions 2. Can somebody find more opportunities – empowerment issues eg economic 3. Change in status in family, community 4. Improved decision making role 5. Skills development-are skills improved (ICT, management, etc) 6. Increased networks e.g. social, etc? 	<p>IICD: Continues data collection from users of the projects measuring impact in the sectors: ICT in health (Mali, Uganda) ICT in livelihoods-agriculture (Ug, Zam, Mali, BF, Bol, Tan, Gh, Ecua) – besides continues in-country reports, a sector evaluation booklet (almost) completed ICT in Governance (Ug, Tanz, Ecua) ICT in Education (Ug, Tanz, Zam, BF, Bol) – besides continues in-country learning reports, a sector evaluation booklet (almost) completed</p> <p>OW: ICT as instrument that excludes people</p>	
<p>Lead: <u>OWI</u></p> <p>Question A How does “giving voice to the poor” (including through local media) change their lives towards development objectives? OR Giving voice to the poor through ICTs”</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access and use of media tools 2. Strengthened networks –incl access to policy makers 3. Articulation of needs/demands and participation in decision making about their lives 4. Mobilizing themselves to act on their demands 	<p>IICD:info networking – functioning, org body, themes, publishes articles – targeted at ICD comty (projects). Many diff orgs, govt get tog. Sometime theme based, youth, techies, media node. Stage is diff in diff countries – funded by IIC deg swopnet tanzania, inet in Uganda. The impact at the level of the members of the networks will be measured in the coming few months.</p> <p>7. Anybody can be a member. Provide platform to poor indirectly, Also engage in advocacy work Through IICD’s M&E system the voice of the users of the projects is continuously heard and used for learning and improvements.</p> <p>APC:training in use tech eg AA (Action Applications) using tech to provide access to new mediums to give voice, devt of software AA, Aggregating content Wireless – training in setting up wireless networks. Providing new communications mediums Look at who you are training and what using info for. Empowering people to make informed technology decisions Info networking-BPFA eval, review implementation of platform. Trained them in advocacy</p>	

		<p>around their issues thru ict platforms-exists Apc members who work with poor comties</p> <p>OW: 1.capacity building-work with local partner who hand holds for 3 years to train Basic comt newspaper, comty radio, digital content on web-linking with OKN to push and pull content. Comm.- starts with advocacy and then ends with behav change Dev tools for content sharing in local lang. converges with mobiles. 3.grassroot communities to have face to face with govt in dialogue –nat PRA to articulate content issues.</p> <p>Panos: radio clubs. Working with rural women’s assoc in Malawi, Zambia & SA. Began in 1999. proj to give voice to rural assoc. women making prog speaking with auth – enhancing power to them, effect on national broadcaster, are issues raised. Has it changed govt perception of rural women</p>	
<p>Lead: Panos</p> <p>Question B How is ICD influencing processes of governance? (transparency, accountability, responsiveness... ..)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demand and flow of info increased 2. Responsiveness of services increased 3. Civil society voice more structured and influential 4. Political processes being improved 5. Govt policy is influenced by civil society input 6. Media watchdog role does influence govt/corporate behaviour 	<p>IICD ICT in governance projects in Uganda, Tanzania, Burkina, Ecuador (last one starting up). Different profiles, but all focusing on getting better information on gov’t processes to people. Uganda: DistrictNet -> bundling information and bringing it to the public. Burkina: gov’t releasing info to the public. → increasing transparency → direct beneficiaries: a) direct users are local mostly gov’t employees; public is a beneficiary. Indicators will be collected over the next year.</p> <p>OWI Barometer: Accelerating march towards the realization of MDGs. Purpose: <i>evidence-based policy advocacy</i> and grassroots participation for creating an environment of healthy competition among public service providers in SA. Objectives: assess and understand perceptions of marginalized people regarding the pattern of governance of public services in SA region; Delineate patterns of change in public service delivery; Develop alternative mechanisms to improved the access via ICT enabled mechanisms Indicative methodology: participatory, surveys Outputs: bottom-up indicators; alternative particip. Mechanisms; broad system to channel marginalized voices; Outcomes: participatory governance barometer ICT tools: consultation process; standardizing and packaging outputs; offering tools to local champions to talk to the marginalised (e.g. audio recordings); participatory radio Progress so far: first round of PRA consultations → sectors defined (<i>water, health, police</i>)</p>	

		<p>APC (Women ?) participation in the WSIS → other partners as well, facilitating CSOs inputs in the WSIS.</p> <p>PANOS PRSP project: Zambia, Pakistan, Kenya, Ghana Aim: build more public ownership in the PRSPs → openness and transparency from the gov't. (e.g. transparency of budget). Media link: encourage journalists to understand the PRSP process → media scrutinises, and gov't becomes more transparent → journalists work closer also with CSOs. Also, encouraging journalists to collect and pool the voices of the poor (journalists are urban-based and not experienced in talking to the poor). GMOs, AIDS, environment: all with the underlying idea of giving journalists capacities to ask more challenging questions and collect voices of the poor. → <i>journalists keep gov't accountable</i></p>	
<p><u>Lead: APC and IICD</u></p> <p>Question C How does the implementation of ICD policy improve people's life?</p> <p>→ very important question, possibly bringing external policy experts to enhance the evaluation effort (UNECA???)</p> <p>+</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sectoral and national ICD policies are coherent 2. National & sectoral policies are incorporating ICD 3. National and sectoral ICD policy fits into global policy/ies 4. ICD policy promotes tech standardization across borders 5. Link policy to political process: political environ is conducive to policy processes 6. Policies for 1-3 have ICD component 7. ICD policies target previously excluded people successfully 8. Access to ICD within country has become affordable and widespread 	<p>APC Communication and Information Policy Programme 2002-2005 Already have an evaluation plan – selecting an evaluator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information resource ○ Capacity building for CSOs ○ Advocacy efforts at international arena <p>Building CSO capacities how to participate/feed in the policy debates. Majority of indicators around enabling environment Other possible projects: e-governance, e-services</p> <p>IICD Looking into the effects of the scaling-up efforts in various sectors, and on national level. This resulted in several policy projects in Uganda, Bolivia, Zambia and Ghana.</p> <p>Panos Broadcasting policy Strengthen CSO capacity to be more informed about the broadcasting law. Understanding the legal issues in the division between commercial and government radios. Evaluation: tracking regulatory change, dialogue media-CSO-gov't. Does broadcasting policy make any difference? Not in the current evaluation, needs to be build in, although Panos believes it's too early to find impact. We must try to evaluate the processes we have put in place, their sustainability and ownership and likely impact in the longer term.</p>	

<p>C.1 Does multistakeholder participation in the policy-making process make any difference? <i>Was looking into the effects of the policy process itself – not limited to looking at the MS participation...</i></p> <p><i>We spent time thinking about policymaking, but not much time thinking about the impact of policy. We should revisit this in the next stage – but perhaps there needs to be more discussion before IICD produces their “concept note”.</i></p>	<p><i>Note from Kitty: the indicators above are not for Impact of ICD policy on the lives of the poor; they are measuring the success of advocacy in integrating ICD policy into development/sectoral policies. We need to think more about how to measure the impact of such integration.</i></p>	<p>OWI</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lobbying for pro-poor broadcasting and telecom IT policies 2. Community radio for MDGs & disaster management 3. Evaluation of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Infokiosks o e-governance services o telecom penetration <p><i>(NB: point 3 are studies)</i></p>	
---	---	--	--

Session 5 and 7: Brainstorm of Projects that partners wish to evaluate within this BCO evaluation or are engaged in the Impact Questions A, B and C (and the dropped Q1). These tables are not comprehensive and therefore reflect work in progress to be continued (And note, you have already included projects in the chart of questions and indicators above)

Question A : Giving voice to the poor through ICTs		
The Projects	Timeframes	Collaboration
APC: Grace Project and WNSP Grace <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Evaluating how ICTs have been used in building and sustaining networks among women in Africa. Strategic Use of ICTs (QA&B) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Assessing learning/capacity building impacts o Assessing effectiveness of training approaches o Curriculum development o Training of trainers eg itrain online 	Grace ends march 2007. A plan is in place, represents only one of many sub projects	
OW: tracing peoples voices OR evaluation of grassroots work <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ICTs as an instrument to exclude people (Q1) 2. Evaluation of OWs work with grassroots people (Q1&A) 3. Exploring the linkages between voice poverty and other forms of poverty 4. Tracing peoples voice in pro poor ICT and development policies 		
Panos: Radio clubs OR radio research/CATIA program Radio stations – audiences and stations –whether participatory radio makes any difference	Evaluation already happening	
1. IICD: via partner orgs, find a projects on giving voice (like radio project in Burkina in the sector of agriculture) 2. Capacity development – training programme and Itrain Online 3. Information networking – knowledge exchange, lobbying and advocacy		IICD and OW on radio

Question B: ICD influencing governance		
The Projects	March 2007	Collaboration
IICD: ICT and governance in 4 countries – getting govt info to people		
PANOS: PRSP and other themes – role of media in opening up debate and transparency 1. PRSPs –media and communication in building awareness for communities to get involved in PRSPs and influencing government discourse 2. GMO – who makes decisions, media opening up discourse 3. Aids program – building partnership and ownership for aids communication to reduce prevalence and change behaviour		
OW: Bottom up governance barometer study to explore ICD opportunities – link to MDG – getting grassroots perspectives to introduce competition in service delivery		
APC: facilitating CSOs inputs in the WSIS		

Question C: How does ICD policy improve peoples lives		
The Projects	March 2007	Collaboration
IICD: long term interest in importance of policy - ICT policy development. Experience 'on the ground' through involvement in policy projects.		
PANOS: Broadcasting policy reform		
OW: Studies on various ICD eg info kiosks, e-governance services, telecom penetration		

Question C.1: How does participation of CSO, etc improve ICT policy making		
The Projects	End of contract: March 2007	Collaboration
APC: ICT policy development – involvement of civil society in policy processes Communication and Information Policy Programme 2002-2005 (QC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Information resource o Capacity building for CSOs o Advocacy efforts at international arena o Africa and Latin America o Gender and ICT policies 	Already have an evaluation plan – selecting an evaluator	

Session 6.1: Can we work on all four Impact Questions, or do we need to select?

Mainstreaming ICT, poverty reduction, draw on international thinking into analysis to build a case around 4 themes

Q1-A disconnect exists between growth and inequality paradigm – need to narrow impact Q1. Q1 is too big too ambitious and has too many variables – not going to be credible. On MDGs do we want to focus on sectors and as there is so much already on sectors, not sure we want to do this. It was mentioned that Amarc and Exchange have done work in this area and should be involved should we wish to explore Q1.

➔ **The group agreed to drop Q1 as an impact question.**

Q2, 3, 4

- Need to mainstream poverty into Q2, 3 and 4. In other words we should look at voice through a lens which focuses on poverty.
- Sectors will be integrated into 2-4
- Focus on inequality with respect to the relationship between people and authorities. Also need to acknowledge inequality amongst people eg Dalits
- Voice can include different members of society talking to one another e.g. gender, disabled, as well as poor/marginalised talking to authorities.

Session 6.2: Brainstorm data, research studies, etc that could contribute to this study that already exist?

Comments and Gaps in existing research

- Some are too academic
- Research studies that say the same thing and use the same examples
- Studies where people who have penned the research output but have not visited projects
- Lots of sectoral data
- Lots of stuff on governance but not institution of voice or accountability mechanisms
- ICT policy and media regulation exist in some countries but how important is it? Absence of a communications policy in media and post conflict situations.
- What are key themes in development e.g. governance. How do we build/engage in dialogue that shows evidence that ICT plays a role in the discourse?
- One flagship that will pull in all the different studies
- Does ICT contribute to poverty reduction? Research is underway that looks at measuring poverty in relation to gender equality.
- Impact niche is in “Voice” and “policy” with specific regard to Governance around supply and demand side issues and feedback mechanisms – how do you make voice in service delivery automatic – how do poor people get the most out of services? Through communication policy and tools, how do people access information and ask for it? What communication is necessary for social mobilization to take place?

Fiona from DFID explained that 2 theories/positions about voice exist in DFID:

1. Governance Unit– look at voice in terms of institutional mechanisms to give voice e.g. civic groups and formalizing interaction with government– more *structural approach*
2. Social development Unit – look at participative rural appraisals – what are poor people saying about services e.g. citizen report cards – evaluate local government in a informal way – then use media to highlight concerns – more *process approach*

- There is room for additional info/research about the policy discourse around ICD as a sector – what is it about ICD that is additional or of value add?
- Or one can take a broader developmental approach and assess the role of communications in solving social and infrastructural problems – hook into current policy dialogues
- Governance: go beyond local level and link into international debates as well. Grassroots ➔ global flow (WSIS).

On Theories of Change...

Partners are working on them, and they are in various stages of development. It was emphasized that developing a ToC is useful for internal organizational learning.

BCO will develop its own theory of (social) change, as part of the implementation process.

➔ **The group takes on the challenge to build a BCO ToC that will serve to frame the overall impact study.**

Session 8: BCO partner roles, inputs and responsibilities (collaborative and peer review of partner specific studies). Managing the implementation process? Coordinate the evaluation project

Expected Outputs of the BCO Impact Study

- ➔ *We want to publish a synthesized document that shows the impact of the work that all the BCO partners are engaged in, based on BCO Partner collaboration on the respective Impact question to demonstrate ICT-enabled poverty reduction.*
- ➔ *The group takes on the challenge to build a BCO ToC that will serve to frame the overall impact study.*
- ➔ *It can include "multiple" documents comprising the writing up of partner specific evaluations around impact questions, and will be disseminated.*
- ➔ *Dissemination strategies and activities to share our findings*

Comments noted:

- Different structural relationships exist within each of the BCO partner organisations with regard to partners, members, local partners
- Need to Define ICD, ICT4D, ICT4all, ICT and media, etc and the differences in meaning between them
- Partner projects are different - some are programmes, some are projects, some are implemented in partnership with local partners or global networks, some are analyses, partners have different approaches
- Linking up with others – all can go into the mix

Approaches to collective collaboration on Impact

Collaborative Thematic approach

Option 1: 3 task forces that elaborate 3 impact questions, and develop and implement full-fledged impact study

The lead organization would be responsible for, together with the task team:

- ➔ Developing the rationale/ToC
- ➔ Bringing together the partners involved to discuss the framework and findings
- ➔ Deciding on the projects to be evaluated/measure impact

Advantages:

- easy to find lead organization per question
- going in-depth
- bringing innovative analysis
- comprehensive
- real expression of collaboration effort
- draws on the strengths of each partners
- learning would be stronger
- building M&E capacity broader
- rich cross-fertilisation
- really global

Disadvantages:

- potential bias of lead organization
- internal struggle to allocate money
- resources / time
- longer decision-making time (democratic process)
- risk of finishing with 3 different studies

Preference: APC, OWI, Panos

South to South exchange

Option 2: each individual partner engages around a certain topic, without a collective effort. Synthesis doc is just a collection of individual findings

This option entails:

- ➔ we do our own stuff, and then hand the paperwork to the consultant to draft a synthesis.

Advantage:

- Takes less time
- Still interesting

- o Less challenging
- o Easier
- o Less expensive
- o Strengthens your own case with the donor

Disadvantages

- o Less credibility
- o Less opportunity for p2p review (→ less learning)
- o “Blinkered” approach

Bilateral Country/thematic approach

Option 3: individual studies, with partners collaborating on specific themes or impact question and/or specific countries

This option entails:

- identifying the synergies
- synthesis study is analyzing the value added of the collaborative effort

===

Proposal from Chat: → identifying the synergies → we can also expand it and have this approach inside one theme/country. **EACH THEME, DIFFERENT METHODOLOGIES**

===

Advantages

- o Easier to work in smaller groups
- o Easier to identify synergies between 1-2 partners rather than all 4
- o More interrogative of either theme or country

Innovation on one theme approach

Option 4: Innovative study only on one question, with “collection” of existing evidence on other questions

- rationale on 4; compilation of 2&3

Advantages:

- o Innovation would be very clear, as we would focus on only one theme
- o Easier to organize and manage

Disadvantages:

- o We would focus only on policy
- o Policy might not trickle down
- o Missing opportunities for innovative research on questions 2 and 3
- o Focusing on the areas where we have the least

Preference: IICD

What does it mean to be a “lead”?

Develop analytical framework; identify what is known/available; call in consultants to work on the gaps

Session 9: Wider Impact

Role of Hivos, Bellanet, DGIS, SDC

1. Explore and determine what projects they are engaged in that could feed into the impact questions
2. Teams can coopt any of the other BCO partners
3. Draw on the wider BCO research body of knowledge

Role of an external evaluator/resource person? Who?

To be determined by each of the Task Teams in the process of planning. Each TT will require different knowledge sets and may have different terms of reference for the consultant depending on the focus that is agreed to.

An option that was discussed was the possibility of using the coordination budget to employ a consultant to present BCO group with options for collaboration and/individual Partner evaluations. This option will be taken up, if found to be necessary.

Who the consultant will be, will be defined by the terms of reference.

Session 10: Pull it all together: Developing a Workplan and Process (2005-2007)

The meeting agreed:

1. We will have one impact study with 3 components correlating to the three impact questions (A,B and C) – a synthesis of the 3 impact studies will be compiled into one narrative. The synthesis will be framed within a Theory of Change or theoretical framework.
2. Lauren to bilaterally discuss the approach taken by this meeting to the Impact study with David
3. Send plan to dgroups for further input

Impact Study Workplan (2005-2007)

Output	When	What and Who
Minutes – distribution to team leaders and feedback on minutes for 2 days and then send to BCO dgroups	12 September	Lauren
Decision on options, and identification of lead persons in each organization	21/09	
Organisational leads need to elaborate more on the topics → “embryonic” rationale/concept, timeline, 1-2 page	30 September	Better articulation of question, indicator formulation, start of programs in place
Electronic discussion of concept note giving feedback, suggest consultants and resource people	20 Oct	All, include Fiona and David
Drawing up a plan, terms of reference, methodology, existing data and budget, suggest consultants, building internal m&e capacity, plan for Jan BCO meeting presentation	30 Oct	Team leader
BCO theory of change/framework for the whole impact study for the synthesis report	3 December	Kitty
Meet one day before BCO meeting, decide on coordination of impact study	25 January 2006	Team leaders
January BCO Meeting – each team leader presents on work already done	26-27 January 2006	Plan – toc, rational, 3 themes, indicators, methodology, existing research, timeline, budget
(Commissioning field studies)	May 2006	
Field Studies	August 2006	
Literature review, studies of experiences. Commission		
Findings from field studies & desk studies ready to share	December 2006	
Findings from project evaluation ready to share	December 2006	
Synthesis & writing:	Jan-March 2007	(translation, diff targeted docs)
End of contract:	March 2007	

Terms of reference for the working group

To remain as per the Lusaka meeting.

Role of BCO Coordination

1. Support of team leader
2. Facilitator in online and face to face meetings
3. Explore a mechanism like a Wiki to document raw findings, online resource of findings
4. Lauren needs to clarify time dedicated to impact study coordination as part of her overall Coordination responsibilities

Session 11: Evaluation

Shaddy – achieved a lot without realizing it. Gone through process without having to labour. Positive Agenda has helped tremendously in process. One study and 3 components, lot of collaborative spirit compare with first 2 meetings – competition and now prepared to collaborate. This meeting gives expression to collaborate. Good to have Neeltje – bring a different colour to the discussion – great.

Chat – expectations met. What was good was allowing selves to go with process to come up with critical agreements face to face. From now, more confident of common understanding of where we want to go. Help develop APC contribution and how own process will feed into impact study. Concern for implementation – most difficult part of exercise affecting the whole process is to ensure common understanding and collaboration. Always come back to the questions.

Lauren

Great working with Kitty in preparing for the meeting. Overall it was a good meeting with good energy between everybody. Decision to work collaboratively is extremely exciting and positive. Feel very excited about the process.

Neeltje

Exciting. Was thinking of collaborative effort this would be value add of BCO. Now we have come so far, looking at same questions collaboratively is very valuable, haven't seen it before and never experienced it before. Will report to IICD. Didn't understand extent of mandate – to discuss with Stijn, Goal to be freed for this work.

Kitty

Fulfilled lots of expectations and where we haven't there is a reason. Have a process for doing this. Done what we set out to do. Exciting, taken on a lot, ambitious, hope that it is a spur to do more. Pleasure working with all.