CPI Work Plan Call

6/10/16

Attendees: Ariel, Phil, Lisa, Kathy

Will need to add details in for the evaluation where they left a one liner about AidData.

2 activities seem very similar. How do they differ? Is the first one more election related than the second one? but it’ll be going on simultaneously with the first one. The first one is aimed at changing political party platform and the 2nd one is more broad?

Two broad categories of outcomes: 1. Party level outcome, CPI wants party platforms to change. 2nd set of activities related to collective action outcome. But the two activities are linked.

In both cases they will be holding meetings (dialogs, town halls, etc.) at some of those there will be political parties (candidates participating) but at others there won’t be political parties participating. Seems like the same treatment with a slight twist on it.

Component that is buried in draft: top down approach. Meet with members of the national assembly to emphasize citizens needs.

[computer crashed..sorry!]

Quasi experiment rather than an actual RCT. Look at strength of signal from different sources across population. Don’t need to push for an RCT because it’s hard to tell the scope of units so we might end up with a small number to randomize from

We would like good adim data to understand where they are broadcasting from and stations.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Meeting based activities;

- sub communes?

Much of the document is still abstract and vague. Nothing specific and concrete.

Theory of change as CPI describes is vague but Krista has wedded to it. But it is reasonable for us to question whether or not the meeting at the national level and local levels between CPI and agent CSOs and population is really all that’s required or should we add incentives based ways to get people to buy into this. Can raise from a literature perspective because collective action needs to have something on the line besides just discussions.

“Astounding that USAID thinks this program is going to lead to more responsive government. Alternative is we just test this and see no treatment effects that’s not great for anyone since we know it’s unlikely that this will produce sustainable effects.”

We should be frank about this and how it won’t work (as the literature states).

Given that they want to do this, what other treatments should we propose that they add that would actually make changes in behavior?

* At meetings: What about those meetings can we propose that they change?
  + Citizens who show up at these meetings: what do they learn and how does that translate into action or translate into a more demanding community that can hold accountable the political parties and politicians? Will this lead to sustained citizen engagement? Will citizens continue to demand a responsive govt.? It’s hard to produce and sustain that
  + One way is stronger/longer citizen engagement…continue to discuss these issues and mobilize around them in their own CSOs that then translates into continued demand and pressure on the politicians.
  + Will that require additional intervention? Will they have to have external resources?
* What if at each of these meetings they committed to creating a standardized set of snapshot of citizen priorities. Some agreed upon tools that could be used to ask if the candidate changed his or her promises to better reflect these priorities. Transparency based mechanism. Something like a scorecard or a standardized set of priorities/citizen needs.
  + Still could be a one off intervention
* Something that might stick….Transnational citizen accountability movements that are reaching historic levels of powerful levels of influence. Movements that have organized large followings where citizens build their own clubs that are franchises of national movements. They exist to hold leaders accountable. Why is Niger not doing this? Nigeriens weren’t taking to the streets and leaders have been conservative. People are less effective in Niger. Can we leverage that public relations/image as a form of soft sanctioning? If we bury that message…wondering why Nigeriens aren’t standing up for their rights…it might stick with them. In the upcoming local election might be more active.
  + Would this matter more for elites and activists or citizens?
    - Could word questions to reflect this
  + Speaks to the issue as to why people would show up and continue to be engaged.
* Like scorecard but the question is: how do citizens continue to use that to ensure that politicians continue to be engaged. Do we need another intervention to ensure that? Newspapers? Radio?
* Open question: what would it take to motivate Nigeriens to get involved?
* One way to break this up:
  + Using HH invitation method – vary the kind of message/intensity of encouragement and test what kind of participation we get
  + Vary whether or not the meetings themselves generate sustained interest
  + Test whether or not additional follow on initiatives have a sustained effect.
  + Track community meetings (whether they continue to do this)
  + Outreach: Texts? Radio? Newspapers?
* Texts: reminders of priorities and whether or not something would change, sent from CSOs…do regular reminders about responsiveness of politicians affect their participation?
  + Have meeting, some people get reminders about what was agreed upon and actions taken and then see if that matters
  + Issues: literacy, too many texts?,

\*\*\*\*Randomize invitation (wording, intensity, etc) --> Meeting (scorecards/ list of priorities?) --> randomize text follow ups

Does it matter more for neighbors to think of you or is it important for you to get important services for your community?

Could have up to 4 different messages

* High encouragement arm: we promise to provide them a small payment (per diem for travel time) for attendance
  + Would a relatively cheap financial incentive significantly help
* Have people turn in invitations at meeting to measure who is attending
* Challenging to assign at HH level
* Some of the meetings will have standardized needs recorded and publicized
* Some individuals will receive follow on reminders about scorecards (texts/radio)

Much of what we’re adding are CSO actions, which are not detailed well in the work plan. Would be worthwhile to make at least a few references (not explicit citations) but will explain why we think they need encouragement for attendance and why the follow on after the meetings is important

Phil can help add information. We can add more information in a longer plan/ pre-analysis plan for Mission and CPI. Work plan addition will be short. Ariel will draft up some language about the way we will introduce the information.

2nd activity is more consistent than 1st activities. Would have a harder time standardizing 1st set of activities than 2nd activities. Ask them to clarify why they are different. Calendar is contingent on CSOs and relationships between them

Everything begins in August but probably not realistic. If it’s not feasible in the future we can cut it back to being just stuff after the election but right now let’s push for anytime commune meetings or below is subject to these randomized interventions.

Panel survey.

Baseline, invites, follow ups. Invites to those in our panel surveys with some reserved as a comparison group.

Next Steps:

* Ariel will write up his part this afternoon or tomorrow morning
* Ariel will write a note to Elliot, send COB Monday (Don’t copy Krista)
* Lisa will send her part Saturday morning
* Phil will send Monday morning
* Put together parts on Monday