CPI Work Plan Call - June 13th, 2016

Ariel, Kathy, Phil, Lisa

One of the treatments at the dialogs could involve the quality of public goods in their communities vs. other communities. Lisa vaguely recalls from the CPI, someone had qualms about providing that information leading up to the elections. Whoever was presenting the most recent LASDEL information to CSOs withheld political party approval ratings.

It doesn’t seem like CPI is interested in implementing citizen priorities. CPI seems to think citizens should come with their own priorities and CPI will then provide them to politicians.

Can float the idea of providing information treatments but we will probably run into roadblocks. Should think about the treatments at the meetings as something that is recorded or taken out of the meetings rather than whats brought into them. Also concerned about the multiple CSOs running the meetings. This could create a lot of different types of meetings.

We don’t need to necessarily introduce an actual treatment because we think they will probably agree to put in a few lines but not the whole thing and we will need to keep hashing it out.

Sometimes information proves quite effective but other times = nothing. Across the board, these will probably be citizen priorities: Afrobarameter (Nigeriens think these are 5 important issues).

Strength of evaluation will be individual, not meeting. Still challenges with power at communes.

Lisa’s fits under Ariel’s 1st point (informational encouragement design)

Phil’s fits under Ariel’s 2nd and 3rd point (what are we asking them to do at the meetings themselves)

Phil: Also look at average treatment effects, compliance. Cross cutting 1 and 3 (invited but no additional follow up, etc.). Can look at endline survey reported activities/participation in each group. We might want to add that as an additional outcome. Could look at both short and long term outcomes.

To Do:

Ariel will copy paste Lisa and Phil’s, and give a bit more intro.

Phil will send.