



Terms of Reference: Retrospective case studies

International Budget Partnership

June 2010

Albert van Zyl

A. Background

The International Budget Partnership (www.internationalbudget.org) is a network of Civil Society Organisations that promote pro poor government spending and citizen participation in government budget processes.

Over the last 10 years, members of the network have on numerous occasions succeeded in influencing either the way in which governments make their budgets (budget process) or decisions of what governments spend on (budget formulation) and *how* they spend (budget implementation).

It is important for these successes to be documented and analyzed for two main reasons. First such case studies can illustrate the value of civil society engagement in the budget process to a wider audience such as donors, academics and international organizations. Second, analyzing why and how these campaigns succeed or fail can be instructive to other organisations doing or supporting similar work.

B. Scope of the work

Depends on specific case study

C. Purpose of the work

The purpose of this case study is firstly to document the activities undertaken in this campaign as well as the changes in government behavior, institutions or rules that it contributed to. Secondly the purpose is to identify and describe the factors that contributed to or counteracted the impact achieved by the campaign.

It is important to emphasize that we define impact as changes in government behavior, rules or institutions with regard to the budget, specifically changes in budget process, budget policy or budget implementation. While intermediate impacts such as media coverage or

increased citizen awareness are important in explaining impact, we do not consider these changes as impact in their own right.

In this case study the following changes are examples of impact:

- The place of a cap on payments for individual farmers in the largest farm subsidy program.
- cleaning up the subsidy recipient list

D. Structure of the report

The case study should have 6 main elements:

1. *The issues: What is the organization responding to?*

This section should describe the socio-economic or governance issue that the organization is responding to. This section should draw on documents that describe the extent and the importance of the relevant problem. In this case the following are examples of categories of information that should be included:

- Depends on Case study

These descriptions of the context should form the baseline of the case study; that is a description of the situation before the campaign was implemented. Any change that resulted from the campaign would be changes to this preceding situation.

2. *The organisations's plan to address these issues (including a box on their tactics)*

What was the Theory of Change implicit in these activities? This should include a description of the:

- Objectives: Which changes in budget policy or budget process did the organization/campaign hope to achieve?

- Actions:

The report should describe the activities planned in each of these areas in great detail. This should include both what was planned, but also what impact the coalition hoped this activity would have. How did they think that their activities were likely to influence government? Which activities would put pressure on government and how? Some examples: Generating adverse media coverage can influence aid-dependent governments by influencing donors' opinions. Or grass roots mobilization can sway governments that care what citizens think for electoral or other reasons. Or presenting relevant evidence to governments that share your objectives can influence their behavior. For this case study the IBP is particularly interested in the following impact pathways:

- Depends on case study

- Partners: Who was associated with the campaign and why? This could include CSO partners, trade unions, citizens' organizations, strategic partners in government, the legislature or auditor's office.

- Target audience: Which specific decision-makers were targeted by this campaign? A detailed description of which specific government officials or institutions were targeted and why.

3. *What happened in the campaign?*

The previous section described the coalitions' plans. This section describes what actually happened. This would include:

- A detailed description of the activities of the coalition. Both those that were planned for and those that were not.
- A detailed description of how government responded to the campaign. Who in government responded and why did they respond like this? This description should focus on responses to each of the impact pathways described above. The description should include all reactions both those that the coalition were hoping for and those that were not anticipated. Negative/counter productive responses?
- Which changes in budget process and policy were made by government as a result of this campaign? Which other ways did they respond in? See above for some examples of the impacts that were achieved.

4. *Explaining the changes: Were the changes due to the campaign?*

What are the connections between what the coalition did and how government responded? How were the coalitions' activities received in government? Who in government was central to this process? Why did they respond in this way?

Which parts of the campaign influenced government and why? Which parts of the campaign didn't exert an influence and why?

Three categories of explanatory factors should be considered:

- Internal factors: The strengths and weaknesses of the coalition or organization itself. What role did its strengths and weaknesses in analytical, advocacy and organizational skills play?
- External factors: Were there any external/contextual factors that played an important role in the success of this campaign? Some examples could be freedom of information legislation, the level of organization, the strength or weakness of specific part of government etc.

5. *Other contributing factors*

What are possible alternative explanations for the changes that occurred? Did anything not connected to the campaign happen that influenced government? Were any other actors or circumstances putting pressure on government to change its behaviour?

6. *Conclusion*

What can be learnt from this case study? What can be learnt about the ways in which CSOs seek to influence government? Any good practice lessons for other groups doing similar

work? Any areas of the campaign that should be explored further? Some possible areas may include:

- Depends on case study

D. Sources and Methodology

The product of this case study should reflect a high level of creativity, tell a compelling story and should use multiple media to tell this story (photos, graphs, video, audio etc).

Because these case studies are designed to speak to an external audience in a convincing manner, we expand on minimum methodological requirements below:

- The case study should draw on multiple sources of evidence in order to verify sources and build as solid a case as possible
- The case study should also seriously consider alternative explanations for the changes in government behavior that occurred. In this way it should explain the value added of the CSO campaign in this context.
- Where feasible the case study should also attempt to describe counterfactual situations that were not exposed to the CSO campaign. This could be similar programs in other geographical areas or other programs in the same geographical area.

For source material, the report should at least draw on:

- Media reporting on the campaign
- Relevant documents produced
- Relevant documents issued by the government Interviews with a minimum of 3 government officials/politicians that played a decision-making role on the relevant issues
- Interviews with key members of the coalition.
- Interviews/Focus Group discussions with a minimum of 3 members of the broader coalition involved in this campaign
- Interviews with two or more key members of the broader of community that follow and influence developments in housing reconstruction (donors, academics, government advisors, NGOs not involved in the campaign).