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**Evaluation Findings**

Several notable evaluation findings emerged from the data analysis. They are categorized into five major areas: relevance, outcomes and self-perceived impacts, conference content, conference organization and structure, and pedagogical strategies.

**Relevance**

The relevance of the conference was considered to be one of its strongest assets. Respondents indicated that the conference was relevant to their work responsibilities. The relevance of the conference to the respondents’ institutional and organizational needs was rated “above average” (4.03/5.0, the highest mean score for all responses). In addition, 77.8% of the respondents rated a 4 or 5 to the question asking the extent to which the conference was relevant to their future work or functions. The mean for this question was also just at the “above average” level with a mean of 3.98. This implies that the conference was consistent in meeting the primary needs of the respondents.

**Outcomes and Self-Perceived Impacts**

Respondents gave the conference between “average” and “above average” ratings for overall effectiveness (3.68 out of a possible 5 points on the End of Conference Evaluation Results form; see Appendix A). Appendix B shows the conference questionnaire.

The conference respondents reported self-perceived impacts which appear to have been developed as a result of the conference. Many respondents stated that they would review the options given to them at the conference and make recommendations and policy changes based on the knowledge they acquired.

Continuation of the contacts and partnerships made at the conference was deemed as one of the most important outcomes and expectations for the respondents. What will become of these exchanges remains to be determined. But the fruition of these conversations and partnerships will likely ascertain the future impacts of this conference. In addition, respondents stated in both pre- and post-conference replies that greater awareness and urgency of the issues and improved regional cooperation and partnerships between the public and private sectors were critical for global connectivity in Africa. In this light, the objective of the organizers to gather public and private officials together to speak to each other appears to have been reached.

The desire of the respondents to attend another such meeting seems evident—90% of the respondents to the questionnaire said that the conference should be repeated.

Inadequate time for discussion during working sessions diminished the conference’s impact. Respondents complained about the lack of opportunity to discuss issues and topics in depth. They also noted that specific ideas and recommendations to apply new information to their own settings were not discussed.

**Conference Content**

The conference helped the respondents to appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed. Seventy-three percent offered a rating of 4 or 5 to the question, “To what extent did the conference help you appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed,” while the mean was 3.89. Respondents also stated that the conference occurred at the right time, considering their country’s needs.

Conference expectations of the respondents appear to have been met. The expectations most often cited by individuals who were interviewed before the conference indicated that opportunities for networking and partnerships were important, as was an analysis of the issues for global connectivity.

**Conference Organization and Structure**

The informal nature of the conference and its opportunities for interactions (some of the primary goals of the organizers) were considered to be a positive feature by many of the respondents. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents awarded a score of 4 or 5 to this category, while the mean was 3.99.

The conference was attended by a diverse group of participants with various backgrounds representing many different countries. This diversity was a positive feature because it allowed the respondents to exchange different ideas with their colleagues, especially in the small working
groups. However, there was significant gender imbalance at the conference: men outnumbered women by a ratio of about 5 to 1. Although there was a diverse number of participants, several respondents indicated that the unique contributions and needs of women regarding global connectivity were not sufficiently integrated into the program content, nor discussed at the conference. The goals of the conference organizers to achieve diversity in its participants, then, was highly successful in some important domains (e.g., private sector officials, government officials, NGOs, and the donor community), but was notably weak in one area—that of gender. The breadth of countries represented exemplifies the fulfillment of a key objective of the conference and thus became a central success of the entire effort.

Lack of advance documentation and information was a drawback. Sixteen respondents stated that they wanted the conference materials and papers in advance of the conference so that they could be better informed of the issues before the conference started.

The working sessions were better than the plenary sessions in allowing time for dialogue and discussion, but they did not allow time for in-depth discussions nor for the development of specific recommendations. In addition, plenaries afforded little time for question-and-answer periods or discussions, as many plenaries ran too long and served to formalize what was intended to be an informal event.

Technology was underutilized at the GCAC. Four respondents thought it ironic that the conference was centered around global connectivity, yet the Internet access they experienced at the conference was limited or too slow. This was highly representative of the connectivity limitations endemic to Africa which this conference intended to address.

**Pedagogical Strategies**

Seventy-five respondents stated that they had acquired significant gains in learning, new information, and building partnerships. By the end of the conference, these respondents also said that they had obtained a greater understanding and awareness of the key issues. This implies that the respondents did acquire new knowledge which they could apply to their own country-specific situations. However, 29 respondents also stated that there was not enough in-depth discussion of the issues (or that issues were too broad), while others indicated that the conference did not offer suitable policy options or concrete recommendations for follow-up. If the conference was to fully achieve its objectives, recommendations and policy options should have been offered to its participants, as they suggested.

Greater integration of the economic issues and issues surrounding global connectivity was suggested by 3 respondents. The respondents seem to believe that Africa has the economic potential for global connectivity, but lacks the necessary information and recommendations on how this can best be accomplished. This indicates that the conference was generally unsuccessful in providing its participants with the necessary action plans to carry out global information initiatives.

Participant responses to the question, “To what extent did the conference treat issues in sufficient depth,” suggest that issues were not treated in enough detail. Thirty-four percent of the respondents assigned a rating of 4 or 5 and 21% rated it with a 1 or 2, while the mean was for this question was 3.18. While the primary intention of the conference was to provide participants with a broad range of issues and options for global connectivity, many respondents still concluded that these topics were only discussed in enough depth to warrant an average rating.

Economic potentials and constraints for global connectivity were not addressed in depth at the conference. Respondents gave lower ratings to these important issues. When asked if the conference clarified Africa’s future economic potentials, only 38% of the respondents gave this feature a rating of 4 or 5, while 25% gave it a 1 or 2, and the mean was 3.14. The respondents also suggested that the conference was only average in clarifying the role of economics and in integrating it into the issues and options surrounding global connectivity. In addition, when asked “To what extent did the conference clarify Africa’s future economic constraints,” the respondents awarded average ratings: the mean was 3.30 and 40% awarded a score of 4 or 5, while 21% rated it with a 1 or 2.

Respondents saw the need to further discuss and identify suitable policy options for global connectivity in Africa than were offered at the conference. Their responses indicated that the conference treated suitable policy options in an average manner. The mean for this question
was 3.04 and 35% of the respondents rated this aspect with a 4 or 5, while 28% gave it a 1 or 2--these scores are far closer to an “average” than an “above average” rating.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“The books and the studies are now available. What is more urgent now are actions.” (government official)

Introduction and Context

Approximately 320 persons met to address the issues, options, and benefits of the information revolution at the Global Connectivity for Africa Conference (GCAC or the “conference”) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia between June 2 and 4, 1998. Attendees included government and planning officials from developing countries in Africa, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, conference organizers and sponsors, and the media. Eighty-five percent of the registrants (attendees) were men and 15% were women; attendees came from 46 countries.

The conference had several primary objectives: facilitating public-private sector networking, partnership building, and frank discussions of the issues and options for global information connectivity in Africa. Strategically, the conference was a continuation of and a follow-up to the larger Global Knowledge Conference (GK ‘97) hosted by the World Bank and the government of Canada in Toronto in June, 1997, which was attended by over 1,700 persons. In addition, the GCAC was intended specifically for Africa to address the issues and options of global connectivity which arose from GK ‘97.

The World Bank and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) were the primary organizers of the conference, but multiple organizations sponsored and participated in the event including multilaterals, private companies, foundations, and NGOs.

This report details the evaluation results from the GCAC. Specifically, the report summarizes information obtained through several evaluation approaches which included: a questionnaire, personal observation, and semi-structured interviews. The primary source of evaluative data came from the 100 questionnaires which were completed by the respondents. Also detailed in the report are the evaluation design, methodology, analysis, and results, as well as the perceived conference impacts on its participants.

Evaluation Design and Methods

The main purpose of the evaluation was to assess overall participant satisfaction with and key learning from the conference as well as to identify specific recommendations for future conferences. In this context, participants included not only attendees, but also exhibitors, session organizers, and sponsors. A member of the Evaluation Unit of Economic Development Institute (EDI) of the World Bank, the author, carried out the evaluation with the assistance of student aides from Addis Ababa University utilizing both formative and summative evaluation methodologies.

Formative methods were used to provide participant impressions and expectations both before and during the conference. Summative methods were used to measure conference results, learning, and participant feedback.

Several sources of information provided the basis for this evaluation including:

• conference evaluation questionnaires made available on site to all conference participants (summative evaluation);
• participant observation by the evaluator at plenaries, dinners, breaks, working sessions, open space, and informal gatherings (formative evaluation); and
• twenty-seven individual semi-structured interviews with people from all regions of the world and from many conference constituencies (formative and summative evaluations).

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

“This was a good conference. It should be an annual event or at least once every two years.” (government official)

Introduction
Approximately 320 persons met to address the issues, options, and benefits of the information revolution at the Global Connectivity for Africa Conference (GCAC or the “conference”) at the United Nations Conference Center in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia between June 2 and 4, 1998. The conference was organized through a joint effort between EDI and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA). It was, in turn, hosted by the World Bank, UNECA, the Information for Development Program (infoDEV), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), and the African Development Bank.

The conference had several primary objectives: facilitating public-private sector networking, partnership building, and frank discussions of the issues and options for global information connectivity in Africa. Strategically, the conference was a continuation of and a follow-up to the larger Global Knowledge Conference (GK ‘97) hosted by the World Bank and the government of Canada in Toronto in June, 1997, which was attended by over 1,700 persons. In addition, the GCAC was intended specifically for Africa to address the issues and options of global connectivity which arose from the GK ‘97 Conference.

The GCAC was conducted in French and English. Simultaneous translation was provided for all sessions. Open space events were not simultaneously translated. Key characteristics of the conference included:

- Plenaries featuring prominent figures from the telecommunications industry and information networks
- In-depth working sessions built around case studies
- A number of open sessions for informal consultations and discussions
- Ad-hoc meeting groups
- A connectivity fair for informal learning about connectivity options and downstream applications

Attendees included the private sector, conference organizers and sponsors, government and planning officials, university officials, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Overall, 83% of the registrants (attendees) were men and 17% were women.

This report details the evaluation results from the conference. Overall, the report summarizes the evaluation findings from the conference and evaluates the extent to which the conference achieved its primary objectives of facilitating public-private sector networking, partnership building, and frank discussions of the issues and options for global connectivity in Africa. The author of this report led the evaluation and was on-site throughout the conference. Several evaluation methods were used to gather data: direct observation, participant observation, individual interviews, and self-administered questionnaires given to participants and exhibitors. The evaluator also monitored the connectivity fair and discussed participant expectations of the conference before it commenced to assess whether the conference would meet their goals. Additional assistance with the conference evaluation was obtained from graduate students of Addis Ababa University.

The evaluation focuses on participant reaction to the conference, obtained from surveys and interviews administered on-site. The evaluation design was derived from the goals and objectives stated in the conference literature and in discussions with conference organizers. The conference participants were informed of the evaluation and were asked for cooperation. Of the approximately 320 participants, 100 respondents completed the questionnaires which were distributed at the conference on the final day—a response rate of over 31%. In addition, 27 participants were randomly chosen to be personally interviewed formally or informally.
Part Two: “Global Connectivity Conference Overview” of this report outlines the history, goals, and structure of the conference. The evaluation design and methodology are summarized in Part Three: “Evaluation Design and Methods.” Observations and response patterns are discussed in Part Four: “Data Results and Analysis” and Part Five: “Data Results From Participant Interviews.” Part Six: “Conclusions and Recommendations” summarizes recommendations and ideas for improving future conferences such as this one.
PART TWO: GLOBAL CONNECTIVITY CONFERENCE CONFERENCE

OVERVIEW

“More African ministers should have realized that it is their own policies that are holding Africa back.” (university official)

History
The GCAC had its origin in broad intersecting concerns between the World Bank and UNECA. Primarily, the conference was an outgrowth of GK ’97. The conference’s organizers wanted to emphasize growing awareness of the global reach of the information revolution and how telecommunications affects the ways in which developing countries can make immediate and valuable changes to shape their economies and their inhabitants. Specifically, the GCAC was designed to build upon the results of a number of recent and ongoing initiatives focused on the role of information and knowledge in development, including the GK ’97 Conference. Moreover, the GCAC was envisioned as part of EDI’s work for policy dialogue and awareness-raising on issues of information and knowledge for development in the wake of the GK ’97 Conference. According to the organizers,

...by focusing on concrete strategies and options for increasing African connectivity, this conference will help to define specific steps forward in realizing the goals articulated in these ongoing discussions of Africa’s role in the global information revolution.

Planning for the conference began in January, 1998--five months before it was held. The conference was a partnership effort of several World Bank Units (EDI, the Industry and Energy Department, and the Africa Region) along with UNECA, infoDEV, ITU, the Government of the Netherlands, and the African Development Bank. Five major telecommunications firms or consortia served as corporate sponsors: Siemens; Teledesic; RASCOM; World Space; and Iridium. In all there were 46 sponsors for GK ’97, and about 10 for GCAC.

The host site for the conference was the United Nations Conference Center (UNCC) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The UNCC was an appropriate choice for this conference and respondents indicated their satisfaction with the Center on the questionnaire and in conversations with the evaluator. Overall, the conference was held in six conference rooms and on three floor levels; this was more than adequate space for the participants.

Rationale of the Conference
The importance and rationale of GCAC at this stage seemed to be a vital necessity to the continent’s development and to addressing the state of the communications infrastructure in Africa. As an example, international and domestic long-distance telecommunications in Africa are characterized by poor quality service. There are significant costs, moreover, for long-distance communications between African countries and the rest of the world, as calls are often routed through non-African locations. These are just a few of the many limitations in the telecommunications infrastructure in Africa which the conference hoped to explore.

The new technologies that are now available could substantially improve Africa’s connectivity for telecommunications and information networks. Some of these new solutions would include the most advanced satellite, cellular and fiber optic cable technologies and offer the opportunity for vastly improved communications, increased volumes, higher speed and reliability, and a wider range of services, all at lower costs. In this light, the conference was seen as a means by which the participants could analyze the various options of these new technologies.

There are a number of causes for the poor state of the telecommunications sector in Africa. These include problems with restrictive laws and policies, local networks, the management of the operating companies, and pricing strategies. To address these problems, the conference was envisioned to provide significant cost-effective opportunities for the greater integration of Africa into the global information economy. In turn, these benefits could also parlay into positive results for Africa’s overall economic and social development and provide significant commercial opportunities for private investors in Africa.
Although African governments and carriers have been approached in the past by the private promoters of these projects, they have found it very difficult to assess the merits of the various alternatives. A need clearly existed for an objective forum in which to analyze these options and projects, their implications for African countries, and the policy, regulatory, economic and institutional issues raised by these options. The conference was viewed as a means to provide this type of objective forum by which members of the public and private sectors could come together to discuss these vital issues.

**Conference Objectives**
According to the conference organizers and materials, the primary objectives of the Global Connectivity Conference were to:

...provide a forum to assess new connectivity options and how they can contribute not only to improved telecommunications, but also to the wider process of economic and social development in Africa. The conference will explore how the barriers to deployment of new technologies can be overcome, and the policy and regulatory changes necessary to foster private investment in and deployment of these new technologies. The conference will provide a unique opportunity for African decision-makers, promoters and users of these technologies to engage in a focused and frank dialogue on issues and options in enhancing Africa’s global connectivity. It will examine in detail the various technological options available to African countries and the relative benefits and implications of these options.

**Conference Structure and Program**
The conference structure included eight working sessions, 4 per time slot, as well as other activities appropriate to the overall goals of the conference:

i) **Plenaries** that set the discussion framework and articulated main challenges.

ii) **Working Sessions** including toolkit/case studies and working groups which focused on a theme of concern for global connectivity. These sessions were facilitated by moderators, respondents, and presenters.

iii) A **Connectivity Fair** was also held for two days for exhibitions of new technologies.

iv) **Cyber cafes**, on site computer networks.

v) **Open Spaces** for spontaneous meetings and consultations.
Specifically, the conference was programmed according to the following schedule:

**Monday, June 1**
9:30A-12:30P;  
2:30P-5:30P  Conference registration  
6:30P-8:00P  Reception for all participants

**Tuesday, June 2**
9:00A-10:15A  Opening plenary with remarks by various officials from the public and private sectors  
10:15A-10:45A  Coffee break  
10:45A-12:30P  Plenary session: “The Impact of Global Connectivity on Africa’s Development”  
12:30P-2:00P  Lunch  
2:15P-3:15P  Plenary session: “Global Connectivity for Africa: Options and Issues.” This included a moderator, a presenter, and panelists from the private sector.  
3:15P-3:45P  Coffee break  
3:45P-5:15P  Plenary session: “Creating an Enabling Environment for Global Connectivity: Policy and Regulatory Issues.” This included a moderator, presenter, and panelists from the public and private sectors.  
5:15P-6:45P  Connectivity fair  
7:30P  Dinner

**Wednesday, June 3**
9:00A-10:30A  Four separate working groups. Three were centered around issues of global connectivity and one was dedicated to the toolkit/case studies. Each working group included a moderator, a presenter, and respondents from both the public and private sectors.  
10:30A-11:00A  Coffee break  
11:00A-12:30P  Working groups continued  
12:30P-2:30P  Lunch  
2:30P-4:00P  Working groups continued  
4:00P-4:30P  Coffee break  
4:30P-6:15P  Connectivity Fair with sponsor presentations  
7:30P  Dinner

**Thursday, June 4**
9:00A-9:30A  Plenary Session: “Setting the Agenda for Regional Cooperation”  
9:30A-11:00A  Four separate working groups divided by topics of interest for four regions of Africa: West Africa, Central Africa, Eastern and Southern Africa, and North Africa. Each working group included a moderator and presenters from the specific regions represented.  
11:00A-11:30A  Coffee break  
11:30A-12:30P  Plenary: “The Year 2000 Problem”  
12:30P-2:00P  Lunch  
2:00P-3:30P  Plenary: “Lessons Learned and Next Steps”  
3:30P-4:00P  Closing remarks  
4:00P-4:30P  Coffee break  
4:30P-6:00P  Follow-up Workshop on the “Year 2000 Problem”
Conference Participants
Participation was by invitation from the World Bank Group and UNECA. The conference included the following participants:

- Policy makers (mainly ministers and senior officials), regulators, and operators from African countries
- Promoters and operators of the various connectivity projects relevant to Africa
- Representatives of user groups in Africa (business people, rural consumers, promoters of information applications for economic and social development)
- Senior figures in the telecommunications and information industries in Africa
- Representatives of international organizations and donors

Conference Costs and Fees
The conference registration fee was $1500 per person. Limited scholarship funds for government officials (ministers and representatives from operator and regulatory agencies), NGOs, and representatives from user groups were provided to about 110 participants by the sponsors and hosts of the conference. Scholarships were given to participants mainly from the African continent. The participants who were not sponsored by the conference also paid for their travel and subsistence.
PART THREE: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS

“I think it’s great that EDI is conducting an evaluation of this conference. I also think that it’s even better that the participants here have been very receptive to the evaluation.” (NGO)

Purpose of the Evaluation
The main purpose of the evaluation was to assess overall participant satisfaction with, and key learning from, the conference as well as to gather suggestions for improvement of future conferences. In this context, participants included not only attendees, but also exhibitors, session organizers, and sponsors. A member of the Evaluation Unit of EDI carried out the evaluation with the assistance of student aides utilizing both formative and summative evaluation methodologies. Every effort was made to ensure that all constituencies were involved in the evaluation.

Central Evaluation Questions
Specifically, the evaluation sought to ascertain lessons learned substantively and organizationally from this conference (and this type of conference) and to answer the following questions:

i) Conference Relevance: Was the conference relevant to the needs of the participants as well as to their job responsibilities?

ii) Outcomes and Perceived Impacts: Might the conference have any impacts beyond the three-day experience (as anticipated by the participants)? What might the conference’s legacy be? Did participants explore any new partnerships related to the conference goals? Did participants initiate and/or plan to initiate any new programs, polices, or strategies for incorporating knowledge and information into the development process?

iii) Conference Content: Were content and focus relevant to the conference goals? Did participants gain access to information/knowledge resources they did not have before?

iv) Conference Organization and Structure: Was the conference structure commensurate with stated learning, networking, partnering, and informal objectives? To what extent and how were the plenaries, working sessions, and open spaces effective? Was the overall conference organization supportive of its goals and objectives?

v) Conference Learning (Pedagogical Strategies): Did participants learn what they hoped to learn? How satisfied were they with the practical nature of their learning?

vi) Lessons Learned for Future Gatherings: What were the lessons learned substantively and organizationally for related future conferences or seminars?

Sources of Information
Triangulation of methods and sources were used in evaluating this seminar. In particular, formative and summative methodologies were used for the evaluation. Formative methods were used to gather participant impressions and expectations both before and during the conference. Summative methods were used to measure conference results, learning, and participant feedback. Three sources of information provided the basis for this evaluation:

- Conference evaluation questionnaires made available on site to all conference participants (summative evaluation);
- Participant observation by the evaluator at plenaries, dinners, breaks, working sessions, open space, and informal gatherings (formative evaluation); and
Twenty-seven individual semi-structured interviews with people from all regions of the world and from many conference constituencies (formative and summative evaluations).

A post-conference questionnaire was envisioned to work best because the organizers believed that the time and participation level of the respondents would be limited. Therefore, a questionnaire was an effective means of obtaining data from those respondents who had little time to complete them. In addition, the evaluator believed that data from interviews with the participants through semi-structured interviews and at informal gatherings would be used to supplement this post evaluation design.

During the planning stages of the evaluation, the questionnaire was thoroughly reviewed and analyzed by members of the Evaluation Unit in EDI and by the conference organizers to ensure its reliability and validity.

**Sampling and Response Rates**

Due to the linguistic diversity of conference participants, they had the opportunity to respond to questionnaires in French or English. Every effort was made to bring the evaluation process to the attention of the conferees:

- Over the conference period, approximately 300 end of conference evaluation questionnaires were distributed in English and French.
- Plenary announcements and reminders by organizers and facilitators throughout the final day of the conference supplemented other efforts to make virtually all participants aware of the evaluation process.

Of the questionnaires distributed at the conference to the approximately 320 participants, 100 usable forms were returned for a response rate of over 31%. Table 1 shows how respondents compare to registrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region:</th>
<th>MEN (264)</th>
<th>WOMEN (56)</th>
<th>TOTAL (320)</th>
<th>MEN (79)</th>
<th>WOMEN (15)</th>
<th>TOTAL (94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>30 11%</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>38 12%</td>
<td>7 9%</td>
<td>5 33%</td>
<td>12 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>211 80%</td>
<td>43 77%</td>
<td>254 79%</td>
<td>62 78%</td>
<td>9 60%</td>
<td>71 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>18 7%</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
<td>22 7%</td>
<td>8 10%</td>
<td>1 7%</td>
<td>9 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>5 2%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>6 2%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Of the 100 respondents who indicated their gender, 94 also indicated what country they were from).

This table clarifies the gender imbalance of the conference. Clearly, men were more highly represented than women in both participants and respondents. The conference did, however, achieve national participant diversity (46 total countries were represented in the

---

1 The exact response rate for exit forms is impossible to compute, given the fact that many participants lost their forms or took duplicate copies at the end of the closing plenary and some left the conference before the final day; moreover, it is impossible to exactly state the number of questionnaires which were distributed.
attendance of the conference and 41 countries were represented in the evaluation). Since the conference was intended for the continent of Africa, the majority of participants and respondents were from Africa as expected, although very few came from North Africa. North America was second in total representation.

**Integration of Evaluation Into The Conference**

Although the evaluation process was conceived as being an integral part of the conference, unfortunately this did not occur. It was envisioned that approximately fifteen minutes would be allotted during the morning working sessions on the last day of the conference to distribute questionnaires and allow participants to complete them. Ultimately, this did not occur due to unexpected format changes on the last day of the conference. To compensate for this change, the evaluator and student aides distributed the questionnaires to all participants upon entering and leaving the morning working sessions of the final day and encouraged the participants to complete them. Drop boxes for completed questionnaires were also posted at various parts of the conference center. Questionnaires were also placed at tables, information sites, and near the drop boxes, encouraging participants to complete them.

Two factors facilitated the evaluation process:
- The assistance of student aides in distributing and collecting questionnaires from the participants as they left each working session during the last day of the conference.
- Announcements made in both plenary sessions and working sessions encouraging participants to return their forms.

**Limitations of the Evaluation**

There were several limitations in conducting this conference evaluation. Notably, there was limited attendance at the conference during the last day when the questionnaires were distributed. This last day “drop off” was influential in reducing the number of participants who could complete the questionnaire and accounts for a lower than expected response rate.

The limitations of self-reported data need to be addressed as well. Self-perceptions of learning gains are generally regarded as unreliable measures of actual learning gains because, while respondents can clearly be objective and reliable in their perceptions, these qualities cannot be guaranteed. Some type of respondent bias must be considered when observing the results of this report.

Self-selection in answering is another evaluation constraint to weigh. The evaluator often cannot control the selection of participants in answering questionnaires, as was the case with this conference. Moreover, self-selection may not offer as diverse a respondent pool as desired and this can lead to unsubstantiated inferences.

The evaluator was also unable to verify the post-conference activities. While respondents did imply that they would use the information and knowledge that they gained at the conference, these must be considered as possible, and not probable, impacts on the respondents.
PART FOUR: DATA RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

“I’d like to appeal to the sponsors to continue supporting the participation of key players in each country. As the person in charge of legislation and policy in government, if I did not have the opportunity to be sponsored, I believe I’d have missed this very important convergence of knowledge sharing and exchange.”

(public sector)

Overview
This section of the report summarizes the detailed findings of the evaluation. The data reported are primarily from the one hundred questionnaires completed by the respondents. Additional comments from observation and casual conversations with the participants are included as well, especially conference expectations of the participants. The questionnaires were analyzed according to their content and coded into themes that best matched the participants’ responses. In particular, closed-ended responses were examined and tallied for their validity; open-ended responses were content-analyzed, grouped by themes that best qualified their responses, and peer reviewed for their validity by another member of EDI’s Evaluation Unit. These responses were then matched to the counterpart questions on the questionnaires.

The results of the analyses are reported here in a similar format to the questionnaire’s design: response numbers correspond to those of the questions. This will allow readers to observe and analyze the quantitative and qualitative results of the questionnaire in a systematic and clear manner. A complete report of the closed-ended responses was processed by an evaluator in EDI’s Evaluation Unit and is included in Appendix A. Some responses total more than 100% due to rounding and multiple answers to select questions.

Analysis of Closed-Ended Responses from Questionnaires
On the questionnaire, the participants were asked to rate various aspects of the conference on a scale of 1 to 5 (a score of one is “minimum,” a score of 5 is “maximum” and another option is “cannot answer”). Specifically, there were 16 questions, both closed-ended (10) and open-ended (6). This section will offer data from the closed-ended responses, while the next section will provide an analysis of the open-ended responses. The questionnaire which was used at the conference is included in Appendix B. A complete data report of the closed-ended responses is offered in Appendix A.

Question 2: Gender
One hundred respondents returned the questionnaires completed. Eighty-five (85%) were men and fifteen (15%) were women. The ratio of men to women respondents, then, was greater than 5 to 1 (5.6/1). The data set reflected this overall gender imbalance. Conference attendees also had a similar imbalance: 264 (83%) were men and 56 (17%) were women—a male/female ratio just less than 5 to 1 (4.7/1).

Question 3: Institution Type
This question asked the respondents to name their institution type and to mark all categories that applied to them. Of the one hundred respondents, four did not indicate their institution type. Out of the 96 respondents to this question, 83 selected only one institution type, 13 selected two institution types, and 1 selected 4 types of institutions. This accounts for the total number of responses of being greater than 100 (there were 113 total responses). Of the 113 total responses from the 100 respondents, the largest amount (22 or 19%) indicated that they were from an International Development Agency. Twenty (18%) said they were from a Public Enterprise/ Central Government Agency. Sixteen (14%) came from a telecommunications ministry in their country, and 9 (8%) were from research/training institutes/policy institutes. There was a good balance of participants from both the public and private sectors, as the organizers had planned.

Questions 4 to 10

Highest Ratings
These questions were posed to gather data on the extent to which the conference met its multiple objectives, as indicated by the personal critiques of the respondents. Most revealing was that 75% of the respondents rated the conference “above average” or “maximum” (a score of 4 or 5, respectively) for the category “relevant to their institution/organization’s needs” (question 4a). This category also received the highest mean (4.03), indicating that the conference was very relevant to its participants.

The primary objective of the conference was to create an informal environment where frank discussion of the issues could be fostered. Question 9 asked the participants to what extent the conference achieved this goal. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents rated this objective with a score of 4 or 5, and the mean score of 3.99 indicates that they strongly believed that the conference had successfully achieved its primary goal.

The relevance of the conference to the participants’ future work was also assessed in question 4b. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents awarded a score of 4 or 5 for relevance to their future work or functions and the mean was 3.98. These high scores suggest that the conference’s relevance was above average for the participants’ future work or functions.

Holding the conference at a critical time for global connectivity in Africa was another of the key goals of the conference organizers. The respondents reacted positively to this goal in question 5b, “To what extent did the conference occur at the right time considering your country’s needs?” by a mean of 3.93, indicating that the average rating was above average. Seventy-three percent of them also rated the timeliness of the conference with a high score of 4 or 5.

Question 6a asked the participants “To what extent did the conference help you to appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed?” Seventy-three percent of the respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 to this question, while the mean was 3.89. These scores indicate that the conference was successful in addressing the urgent issues of global connectivity for Africa.

Respondents gave the conference between “average” and “above average” ratings for overall effectiveness (question 10) with a mean score of 3.68 out of a possible 5 points on the questionnaire.

**Lowest Ratings**

The lowest ratings were given to several aspects of the conference. Question 6e, “To what extent did the conference help you to identify the most suitable policy options for your country” received the lowest mean score of 3.04, with only 35% responding to this question with a rating of 4 or 5 and 28% with a rating of 1 or 2. This implies an overall “average” rating for suitable policy options being offered at the conference. As the next section on open-ended responses will confirm, the respondents indicated that the conference offered them options for global connectivity, but not specific, practical recommendations or actions to take.

Economic potentials and constraints are regarded as key areas to address global connectivity in Africa. Questions 7e and 7f were posed to ask participants if the conference had addressed these important issues. A mean rating of 3.14 (average) was given to question 7e, “To what extent did the conference clarify Africa’s future economic potentials?” Only 38% percent of the respondents gave this feature a rating of 4 or 5, while 25% gave it a 1 or 2. In addition, question 7f, “To what extent did the conference clarify Africa’s future economic constraints?”, similarly received average ratings from the respondents: the mean was 3.30 and 40% awarded a score of 4 or 5, while 21% responded with a score of 1 or 2. These responses suggest that the conference could have better explored ways in which African countries could compete in the global economy.

Respondents’ answers to question 5d, “To what extent did the conference treat issues in sufficient depth,” suggest that issues were not treated in enough detail. Thirty-four percent of the respondents assigned a rating of 4 or 5 and 21% assigned a rating of 1 or 2, while the mean was for this question was 3.18. While the primary intention of the conference was to provide participants with a broad range of issues and options for global connectivity, many respondents still concluded that these topics were only discussed in enough depth to warrant an average rating.

Exposing the participants to policy options was another key goal of the conference. The conference brochure attested that:
...a need clearly exists for an objective forum in which to analyze these [technical, economic and financial analysis] options, their implications for African countries, and the policy, regulatory, economic and institutional issues raised by these choices.

This implies that both private and public sector policy involvement are vital for achieving global connectivity for Africa. Respondents to question 6d, “To what extent did the conference help you assess the consequences of different policy alternatives?”, however, indicate that the conference treated policy options in an average manner. The mean for this question was 3.29 and 42% of the respondents rated this aspect with a 4 or 5 (19% responded with a 1 or 2). These scores are closer to an “average” than an “above average” rating. In sum, more respondents saw the need to further discuss and assess the policy options for global connectivity in Africa than was offered at the conference.

Question 11: Do you think that the conference should be repeated for additional policy-makers and private sector participants?
The respondents overwhelmingly (90%) stated that they would like a repeat conference such as this one; only 10% indicated that they would not. These responses reflect positively upon the conference and indicate that a similar one would be welcomed again.

As a whole, the closed-ended responses, then, show an overall mean somewhere between “average” and “above average” for the conference. Standard deviations were near average (about a rating of 1), indicating that there was some consensus in the opinions of the respondents. Overall, there were no mean scores with “below average” ratings.

Analysis of Open-Ended Responses from Questionnaires
The open-ended responses from the 100 completed questionnaires were analyzed according to their content and grouped into themes or similar categories which best represented the responses. Overall, a number of categories emerged from the content analysis of each open-ended question, which are as follows:

Question 1: Countries
There were 94 respondents to this question. These 94 respondents represented 41 different countries, as shown in descending order in the following table:


**TABLE 2**

**PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th># of Respondents From Each Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi, Zambia, Cameroon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France, Congo, Nigeria, Kenya, Mali</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands, Mozambique, Canada, United Kingdom, Djibouti, Swaziland, Morocco, Mauritania, Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda, Mauritius, Tanzania, Sudan, Italy, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Madagascar, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Cote d’Ivoire, Cape Verde, Rwanda, Algeria, Namibia, Comoros, Burundi, Botswana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that a diverse participant population was achieved both at the conference and for the evaluation. According to the final participant list, participants from 46 countries attended the conference, and 41 countries ultimately were represented in the evaluation of the conference.

Question 12: What features of the conference do you believe contributed to its effectiveness?

A total of 83 respondents replied to this question. The responses were analyzed for their content and placed in the following categories (themes):

- Forty-three respondents (52%) stated that small working groups and open discussions contributed to the effectiveness of the conference. Some of the notable responses from the respondents were:
  - “Working groups discussions provided increased participation and allowed participants to express their views freely.” (private sector)
  - “The dialogue between groups of African high-level policy-makers with private participants contributed to the conference.” (public sector)
  - The quality of resource persons at plenaries and working groups was very good.” (private sector)

- Twenty-seven respondents (33%) stated that the informal nature of the conference, one of the main goals, helped to make the conference more effective. Participant responses included:
  - “I had the opportunity to mingle with many people.” (public sector)
  - “The interactions I had with members.” (private sector)

- The diversity of the participants was another contributing factor to the effectiveness of the conference. Twenty-three respondents (28%) mentioned this. This was one response:
  - “I liked the diversity of the participants--I met with NGOs as well as public and private sector officials and experts.” (public sector)

- Sixteen respondents (19%) noted that the quality of the presenters and papers were effective. This was one comment:
  - “The expertise and quality of both the presenters and papers were excellent.” (university official)
Thirteen respondents (16%) said that the organization of the conference was a factor in the effectiveness of the conference. Their comments included:

- “Meetings were conducted on time.” (private sector)
- “Administrative arrangements were meticulously undertaken facilitating full participation of participants and enriching discussions.” (private sector)

Other categories mentioned by the respondents for conference effectiveness were: diversity of the issues presented (11 respondents, or 13%); increased understanding of telecommunications in Africa (8 respondents, or 10%); and excellent facilities (5 respondents, or 6%).

Question 13: What features of the conference do you believe limited its effectiveness?

Sixty-four respondents answered this question. The following categories emerged from the content analysis of their responses:

Twenty-one respondents (33%) stated that no specific recommendations/conclusions/solutions were made at the conference. These were the most revealing responses:

- “Presentations were not supported by hard facts which could’ve persuaded governments to change.” (NGO)
- “There wasn’t a strong effort to explain why it is necessary to connect the interior of our countries.” (private sector)
- “Some panels discussed ideas and problems, but not specific solutions.” (public sector)
- “A bit too much emphasis on technical, regulatory issues at the expense of emphasizing how connectivity can and does impact in social and economic development, such as food security, improved health, and education.” (NGO)

Twenty-one respondents (33%) said that time constraints were problematic during the conference. Some of their comments included:

- “Some moderators took too much time talking and left no room for participants.” (private sector)
- “Too many parallel activities which limited participation.” (NGO)
- “Very short time for practical discussion; the program was very tight.” (public sector)
- “Administrative problems (e.g., bank issues) which consumed too much time.” (public sector)

Limited documentation was another contributing factor to concert effectiveness, according to 12 respondents (19%). Their responses were:

- “Lack of advance material/abstracts of papers to be discussed in conference.” (private sector)
- “Documents not ready on time to for participants to use and consult beforehand.” (public sector)
- “Case studies didn’t include any country-specific experiences.” (private sector)
- “The participant list didn’t include e-mail addresses.” (NGO)

The weakness of plenary sessions was mentioned by ten respondents (16%):

- “Ill focused. Too dry, formal, and unnecessary.” (NGO)
- “Speakers spoke too long and there was not enough time for discussion. This severely limited the impact of the conference.” (public sector)
- “Had no exchange and only a few new statements.” (NGO)

A lack of awareness among many African participants and between them and the private sector was another theme which was mentioned by 7 respondents (11%). Their responses were:

- “Generally, many African participants have little knowledge of these issues.” (public sector)
Five respondents (8%) said that there was too much redundancy in the conference.

- “Same redundant discussion in the working groups.” (public sector)
- “Quite a bit of duplication—the main issues were exposed by the second day.” (NGO)

The other features mentioned by the respondents were: lack of discussion on Internet technology; low involvement of user groups; and language barriers.

**Question 14: What do you believe will be the most important outcome as a result of the conference?**

Seventy-five respondents answered this question, most of which were skewed toward one response (raising awareness). The following themes were prevalent:

Raising awareness and exposure to the issues/being better informed were similar responses from 49 respondents (65%). Clearly, a majority of respondents thought that this was the most important outcome as a result of the conference. Their quotes included:

- “More work to be done in the creation of awareness and capacity-building by African policymakers.” (public sector)
- “The urgency it has put on policy makers for reform of the telecommunications sector in African countries.” (public sector)
- “The awareness of the African governments to carry out the implementation of major projects towards the relief of poverty, especially in rural areas.” (public sector)

Creation of partnerships/contacts and regional cooperation were also mentioned by 23 respondents (31%) as an important outcome. The following responses support this theme:

- “Shared knowledge with others” (NGO)
- “Realization of the need for closer cooperation and sharing of experiences.” (public sector)

Seventeen respondents (23%) stated that implementation/follow-up/action plans were an important outcome of the conference. These were the following responses:

- “An action plan for all the conclusions and recommendations.” (public sector)
- “Re-establish the importance of connectivity to Africa’s development.” (private sector)
- “An agenda for the follow-up.” (public sector)

Other themes included: closer examination of the impact of the Internet and telecommunications on development; more positive attitude toward new projects among African decision-makers; and consensus building.

**Question 15: When you return to your office, are there one or two things you will strive to do as a result of the conference?**

Fifty-seven respondents answered this question, which was asked to assess possible post-conference impacts. The following themes were revealed:

Reviewing options/taking follow-up actions/making recommendations and policy changes were mentioned by 44 respondents (77%) as actions they will strive to accomplish as a result of the conference. Some of their quotes included:

- “Sensitize top leadership on the necessity to have investment in telecommunications as a priority.” (public sector)
- “Seek opportunities to assist in expediting introduction of the Internet in Africa and application to development needs.” (NGO)
- “The books and studies are now available—what is more urgent now are actions” (public sector)
- “Get the politicians and technocrats more aware of the urgency of these issues and to stop the ‘business as usual’ attitude.” (private sector)
Fourteen respondents (25%) saw the need to build on contacts and partnerships made at the conference. The following quote explained one respondent’s view:

- “I will build stronger partnerships with my colleagues and with the private sector, and undertake regional initiatives that will help my country.” (public sector)

Capacity-building and school initiatives were another central theme mentioned by the respondents. Thirteen respondents (23%) mentioned these quotes:

- “To promote cooperation between African universities and all universities in areas of content development and capacity building.” (university official)
- “Africa needs to consider the younger generation more—we need to improve connectivity for schools, colleges, and universities. Without this, we will remain on the receiving end and have no capacity.” (public sector)
- “To help strengthen the regulatory framework through the enhancement of capacity-building.” (private sector)

Four respondents (7%) to this question said that they would obtain Internet access upon arrival to their home countries. This was one respondents’ quote:

- “Right away, I will establish the university network and provide Internet access to both academic staff and students. The next step is to connect all schools within the region as well as business.” (university official)

Use of knowledge/learning gained at the conference was also mentioned by four respondents. The following were some of their quotes:

- “Yes, I learned a lot from the conference and will use the knowledge I gained here to finalize our national communication policy before taking it to the stakeholders.” (public sector)
- “I personally have learned a lot and promise to teach others on this and put as much effort on the ideas I got, especially the Telecenters to globally connect Africa.” (private sector)

Other respondents mentioned that they would address the following themes: the Year 2000 problem; advocating more rural community access; and being more open-minded in terms of connectivity.

**Question 16: Any other comments?**

This question was created to allow respondents a final opportunity to express additional topics that were not covered by the questionnaire. Twenty-two respondents offered their views, most of which were too diverse to be grouped into similar categories; however, a few primary categories did emerge:

Eleven respondents (50%) elicited positive comments on the conference. These were the respondents opinions:

- “Well organized.” (private sector)
- “Interesting and informative.” (public sector)
- “Congratulations: a successful initiative. Thank you.” (public sector)

Additionally, three respondents (14%) commented that the conference should be repeated at the national level. Two (9%) indicated that there should have been more specific, in-depth subjects in the user groups. Additionally, two respondents said that the connectivity fair was poor, while two more stated that the conference needed better coordination.
Summary

The analysis of the closed-ended and open-ended responses to the questionnaire suggests several key findings. There was a diverse group of respondents at the conference. Forty-six countries were in attendance at the conference, while forty-one countries were represented for this evaluation—a very positive outcome; however, women were underrepresented. The goals of the conference organizers to achieve diversity in its participants, then, was highly successful in some important domains (e.g., private sector officials, government officials, NGOs, and the donor community), but was notably weak in one area—that of gender. The breadth of countries represented exemplifies the fulfillment of a key objective of the conference and thus became a central success of the entire effort.

The relevance of the conference to its respondents was rated positively (“above average”). Respondents indicated that conference was relevant to their institution/organization’s needs (this question receiving the highest mean score for any category) and relevant to their future work or functions. In addition, the respondents believed that the conference occurred at the right time considering their country’s needs. These responses suggest that the conference was pertinent to the respondents and that it could positively influence future work in their countries.

One of the primary objectives of the conference organizers appears to have been met. When asked if the conference created an informal environment where frank discussions of the issues could be discussed, respondents indicated that it had in an “above average” manner. The overall effectiveness rating given to the conference by respondents, however, was between “average” and “above average” (a mean of 3.68). Taking into account these two primary categories, the conference appears to be rated by the respondents between “average” and “above average” overall.

Suitable policy options and Africa’s future economic potentials and constraints were not well identified at the conference, nor were the issues discussed in depth according to the respondents. This suggests that while the conference seems to have successfully identified key issues of global connectivity for Africa, it did not discuss them in enough detail and, moreover, it only identified options in an average manner. Since the conference’s objectives were to explore both issues and options of global connectivity for Africa, the respondents’ comments imply that these could have been discussed more thoroughly.

Having a greater awareness of the issues and the creation of new partnerships were indicated by the respondents as the most important outcomes as a result of the conference. Moreover, their responses indicated that making recommendations and policy changes and building on the contacts they had made at the conference were some of the objectives that they would strive to accomplish once they returned to their jobs. This implies that the respondents perceived that the conference did influence them positively and could lead to future impacts in their countries.
PART FIVE: DATA RESULTS FROM PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

“The Internet is not the only solution to our problems—there must be a connectivity pluralism in Africa.” (government official)

Overview

This section of the report provides in-depth responses from the 27 participants (interviewees) who were randomly chosen at the conference and interviewed through a semi-structured interview process by the evaluator and the student aides. The evaluator posed several similar questions from the questionnaire to the 27 participants interviewed. This offered the interviewees an opportunity to further explain their thoughts and reactions to the conference in an informal environment. Efforts were made to ensure the confidentiality of the interviewees, as their names were not asked, nor written on the interview sheets.

Interviews with the 27 participants were transcribed, content analyzed, and grouped into categories (themes) that best represented their responses. In order to ensure reliability and validity of the responses, the evaluator and two members of EDI’s Evaluation Unit peer reviewed the categories and agreed that they were appropriate. In addition, each interviewer was instructed to clarify the participant’s responses before ending the interview in order to validate the responses. Appendix C includes the interviewer guide and the interview questions.

Question 1: Gender

Of the 27 participants interviewed, 20 (74%) were men and 7 (26%) were women.

Question 2: Countries

Ten interviewees (37%) were from the United States, 4 (15%) from South Africa, 2 (7%) each from Ethiopia and Switzerland, and 1 (4%) each from Gambia, Malawi, UK, Djibouti, Mauritania, Ghana, Cape Verde, Swaziland, and France. Table 3 shows the breakdown of the interviewees and the countries they were from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of Interviewees</th>
<th># of Interviewees from Each Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, Malawi, Djibouti, Mauritania, Ghana, Cape Verde, Swaziland, UK, and France</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: Title

Seven interviewees (26%) worked for private companies in marketing and business roles; seven were ministers; six (22%) interviewees worked for NGOs; four (15%) were various government officials; three (11%) were telecommunication engineers.
Question 4: Was the conference relevant to your needs?
All 27 replied to this question. Their responses fell into the following categories:

Sixteen interviewees (59%) responded affirmatively, stating that they learned more about the issues and were better informed. The following were notable quotes:
• “Yes. I feel that I can contribute to my colleagues the new ideas that I got.” (private sector)
• “The conference allowed me to have an insight now of the GK follow-up process which is helpful for any organization.” (public sector)

Eleven interviewees (41%) stated that the conference offered opportunities for open discussions. One person stated that the conference:
• “provided an opportunity for discussion and opportunities for development, which is what Africa needs. I met important people” (NGO). Another said that it “brought people together.”

Two persons (7%) were divided in their opinions. These were their quotes:
• “Not really. It didn’t deal much with the benefits.” (NGO)
• “It was a little too specific and technical for my needs, but it did improve my understanding of the issues.” (public sector)

Question 5: Did the conference meet your objectives?
Twenty-six of the twenty seven interviewees responded to this question. Nineteen (73%) responded that the conference created awareness of the issues/sensitized people of the importance of the issues. These were their comments:
• “Yes. I Learned about regulatory aspects in key areas.” (NGO)
• “It taught me more about African issues. In a regional workshop. I learned how important coordination in the regions can help to build up the infrastructure in Africa.” (public sector)

Six interviewees (23%) said that they built a network of key contacts, although two were divided in their opinions:
• “Not fully. I needed more documentation in advance.” (public sector)
• “Somewhat. The focus was mainly on infrastructure and only marginally on content.” (public sector)

Question 6: Did the informal nature of the conference help to foster frank discussion of the issues?
Twenty-three interviewees responded to this question. The following themes emerged:

Fifteen interviewees (65%) liked the open discussions/exchange of ideas. These were some their quotes:
• “Yes. People weren’t afraid to raise challenging questions.” (private sector)
• “Yes. Lots of discussions about regulatory issues which were important to share between countries.” (public sector)
• “The workshop format was the best forum for discussion.” (public sector)

The diversity of the participants was another theme mentioned by 7 of the interviewees (30%). One said:
• “I met partners and players from all over the continent in the corridors at breaks.” (government official).

Two persons (9%) interviewed said that the informal nature of the conference was a setback for them:
• “No. The ministers were not keen on discussing or debating the options--they looked down on people like me.” (private sector)
• “Some speakers spoke for too long.” (public sector)

Question 7: What features of the conference do you believe contributed to its effectiveness?
All twenty-seven interviewees answered this question. The diversity of the participants and experts was a theme mentioned by 15 of the interviewees (56%):

- “The conference brought the right people together.” (private sector)
- “It brought together a critical mass of people from many countries who are in decision-making positions.” (NGO)

Seven interviewees (26%) said that the informal nature of the conference was effective. Five (19%) said that raising awareness was key. The working groups were mentioned as an effective feature by four (15%) who were interviewed. Three (11%) commented on the excellent facilities.

**Question 8: What features of the conference do you believe limited its effectiveness?**

There were 22 responses to this question. Eight participants (36%) said that the issues discussed were too broad. One key quote was:

- “Some seminars didn’t go into detail and just went on and on with surfing over the topics. They didn’t go specifically to the matter.” (private sector)

Three interviewees (14%) said that lack of advance documentation/information was a drawback. These were their quotes:

- “We were not informed beforehand on the issues of the conference, nor did we receive any reports in advance.” (public sector)
- “The list of participants did not include e-mail addresses, I’d like to follow-up with some people I met via e-mail.” (NGO)

Three respondents liked the conference very much and said that there were no aspects limiting its effectiveness.

Two (9%) stated that time constraints were a problem at the conference. Their quotes were:

- “Working groups met at the same time--this made it difficult to attend meetings.” (private sector)
- “There was too much going on in the available time.” (public sector)

The need for action plans was evident. Two interviewees stated that they wanted these. One said:

- “I don’t see any action plan coming out. There is too much personal and political wrestling. The decision-makers should allow the movers to be involved. The technological solutions are there.” (private sector)

**Question 9: What do you believe will be the most important outcome as a result of the conference?**

Twenty-three respondents offered insights on this question. Thirteen (57%) of them said that the urgency and awareness of the issues were the most important outcomes of the conference. One minister stated:

- “Every decision-maker is going to go back influenced in some way or another by the things that went on in this conference.”

Nine respondents (39%) said that better regional cooperation and understanding between businessmen and policy-makers was an important outcome. One person said:

- “I found that collaboration between state, private sector and NGOs is still undeveloped--each complains about the others’ weaknesses instead of understanding their preoccupations.” (government official).
Six interviewees (26%) stated that concrete recommendations and actions were key. These were two notable quotes:

- “Getting Africa connected, not just at a political level, but connecting community centers and universities to the Internet.” (private sector)
- “Hopefully about 12 more Telecenters will be established by 2000 and will work side-by-side with the telecommunications sectors.” (private sector)

Question 10: When you return to your office, are there one or two things you will strive to do as a result of the conference?

Nineteen interviewees responded to this question. Thirteen (68%) said that they would use the knowledge gained at the conference in their jobs. These were three quotes:

- “Present what I learned and incorporate the different ideas I got from people.” (public sector)
- “Keep my technology skills updated.” (private sector)
- “Entrepreneurship development by using international distance education. This could help less developed countries and women.” (public sector)

Seven interviewees (37%) stated that they would maintain/build the contacts they made at the conference.

Question 11: Do you have any suggestions on how the conference can be improved?

Twelve participants interviewed answered this question. Three (25%) said that conference documents were vital to improving the conference. One said he wanted a final list of participants, while a minister said that documents should have been circulated before the meetings. Three others interviewed said they would like more concrete action plans with deadlines and follow-ups, one private sector saying, “I’d like to see more concrete outcomes--real projects that can be implemented and coupled to a common vision.”

Three more wanted more key players invited to the conference such as grassroots representatives and NGOs.

Question 12: Do you have any additional comments?

There were only five responses to this question. Two (40%) interviewees said that the organizers should sponsor those who cannot afford to come. Two said that they would like to participate again. One government official stated that it was the best conference he attended. One private sector participant lamented that, “The Internet connection at the conference wasn’t very good. It’s sad that this conference was on connectivity and the Internet here is so slow.”

Summary

The findings from these twenty-seven interviews are quite consistent with the data from the questionnaires. Interviewees were from diverse professions and different countries. More than half were from developed countries (the US, the UK, Switzerland, and France), but developing African countries (Gambia, Malawi, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Mauritania, Ghana, and Cape Verde) were also represented.

Interviewees stated that the conference was relevant to their needs, which upholds the findings from the questionnaire asking the same question. Both the interviews and responses from the questionnaires suggest that the relevance of the conference was one of its strongest assets.

The informal nature of the conference and its participant diversity were considered to be a positive aspect of the conference, as stated by both the interviewees and the questionnaire respondents. Having diverse participants at the conference was also considered an important aspect by which the organizers hoped to achieve these informal discussions. In this sense, the informality of the conference appears to have fostered frank discussion of the issues among its participants as the organizers hoped it would. Additionally, when asked to state the features of the conference which contributed to its effectiveness, interviewees also echoed the reactions of the respondents in noting that the diversity of the participants and the informal nature of the conference contributed to its effectiveness. It must be noted, however, that some respondents and
interviewees stated that the plenaries were too long and boring and served to formalize what was supposed to be an informal event.

Both interviewees and respondents suggested that the limiting factors of the conference were its broad discussion of the issues and limited documentation of advance materials. In addition, interviewees implied that the broad discussion of the issues lacked specific recommendations and conclusions, which the respondents had also indicated. Time constraints appeared to be another concern for both interviewees and respondents, as they stated that there were too many simultaneous events at the conference and not enough time to participate in all of them.

When asked what would be the most important outcome of the conference, both interviewees and respondents considered that greater awareness and urgency of the issues and improved regional cooperation and partnerships between the public and private sectors were critical for global connectivity in Africa. In this light, the organizers’ objective to gather public and private officials together to speak to each other appears to have been reached. What will become of these exchanges remains to be determined. But the fruition of these conversations and partnerships will likely ascertain the future impacts of this conference.

To assess perceived impacts on the participants, both interviewees and respondents were asked what were a few things that they would do once they returned to their jobs. Both these groups indicated they would use the knowledge that they gained at the conference to review the options presented to them and take follow-up actions for policy changes in their countries. This implies that there could be impacts on the participants and their countries if these partnerships continue to develop after the conference.

The final question to both interviewees and respondents offered them the opportunity to make recommendations on how the conference could be improved. Both interviewees and respondents suggested again that having conference documentation (e.g., conference papers and presentations, participant lists) available in advance and at the conference would have improved their opinions of the conference. Additionally, more action plans and recommendations were also considered by both groups as means to improve future conferences. However, both interviewees and respondents had many positive comments on the conference when asked this question. This implies that there was a sense of satisfaction among the participants.
PART SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
“Global connectivity is an opportunity and a challenge for the African continent. It is not an impossible mission to achieve” (government official)

Conclusions
This evaluation of the Global Connectivity Conference was intended to provide general information relevant to future planning and to offer specific ideas for making such meetings as effective as possible. The main conclusions and recommendations from the conference can be summarized into three areas: overall ratings; information for possible follow-up meetings; and specific suggestions/ideas/recommendations.

Overall Ratings: Content/Structure/Organization of the Conference
Overall, the Global Connectivity Conference received between “average” and “above average” ratings. The mean rating given to the overall effectiveness of the conference by the respondents was 3.68/5. However, the relevance of the conference to the respondents’ institutional and organizational needs was rated “above average” (4.03/5). This was the highest mean score for all responses. In addition, 77.8% of the respondent rated a 4 or 5 to the extent that the conference was relevant to their future work or functions. The mean for this question was also just at the “above average” level with a mean of 3.98. The relevance of the conference, then, can be considered its strongest asset.

The informal nature of the conference was considered to be positive by many of the respondents. This was a primary goal of conference organizers. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents awarded a score of 4 or 5 to this category, while the mean was 3.99. From these scores, it is implied that the informal nature of the conference helped to foster frank discussions of the issues and did so in an “above average” manner.

When questioned about the extent that the conference helped the respondents to appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed, 73% percent offered a rating of 4 or 5 to this question, while the mean was 3.89. Respondents also stated that the conference occurred at the right time, considering their country’s needs. These responses indicate that the conference was successful in addressing the urgent issues of global connectivity for Africa at the appropriate time.

In addition, the conference expectations of the participants appear to have been met. The expectations most often cited by individuals who were interviewed before the conference indicated that opportunities for networking and partnerships were important, as was an analysis of the issues for global connectivity. As indicated by their responses in the evaluation, these objectives appear to have been attained.

Information for Possible Follow-up Meetings
The conference was attended by a diverse group of participants with various backgrounds representing many different countries—one of the most positive aspects of the conference. However, men outnumbered women attendees by a ratio of about 5 to 1—a significant gender imbalance in conference attendance.

The desire of the participants to attend another such meeting was evident—90% of the respondents to the questionnaire said that the conference should be repeated. It appears that their knowledge of the issues and options presented at the conference would be greatly broadened by another conference of this type.

Greater integration of the economic issues and issues surrounding global connectivity was suggested by the respondents. It appears that many believe Africa has the economic potential for global connectivity, but lacks the necessary information and recommendations on how to best accomplish this. If the conference had fully achieved its objectives, recommendations and policy options would have been offered to its participants, as they suggested. These would have greatly assisted in achieving its primary goals.
Towards the Future: Specific Suggestions/Ideas/Recommendations

Content was a debatable issue at the conference. Many respondents said that there was not enough in-depth discussion of the issues (or that issues were too broad) and others also stated that the conference did not offer suitable policy options or concrete recommendations for follow-up. A future conference which addressed global connectivity issues in depth and which offered specific actions would be very attractive. In addition, the evaluator’s conversations with several participants revealed that the plenary sessions were not well-liked. Many commented that they were too long, boring, not interactive enough, and overly formal.

The small working groups and informal nature of the conference were its primary strengths, according to the respondents. While some commented that the conference was too informal, these were few. However, there were some respondents who indicated that there were time constraints which did not allow in-depth discussion of the topics. Perhaps an additional day for the conference may have helped, or maybe the topics discussed each day at the conference should receive greater attention.

Some participants who were interviewed said that lack of advance documentation and information was a drawback. The organizers should consider supplying the conference materials and papers to the participants in advance for any future conferences.

There were perceived impacts on the respondents. They stated that they would review the options given to them at the conference and make recommendations and policy changes based on the knowledge they acquired. This bodes well that future impacts from the conference should continue even after its completion. It also implies that there was some learning acquired by conference participants.

In conclusion, many new issues and options were explored at the Global Connectivity Conference which led to greater awareness of these issues for its participants. These will likely generate future discussions, debates, knowledge, and policy and technological changes for Africa. The conference appears to have made these issues more evident through its informal environment and by the diversity of its participants. The vast majority of respondents also suggested that they look forward to similar meetings in the future.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“The books and the studies are now available. What is more urgent now are actions.”

(government official)

Introduction and Context

Approximately 320 persons met to address the issues, options, and benefits of the information revolution at the Global Connectivity for Africa Conference (GCAC or the “conference”) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia between June 2 and 4, 1998. Attendees included government and planning officials from developing countries in Africa, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, conference organizers and sponsors, and the media. Eighty-five percent of the registrants (attendees) were men and 15% were women; attendees came from 46 countries.

The conference had several primary objectives: facilitating public-private sector networking, partnership building, and frank discussions of the issues and options for global information connectivity in Africa. Strategically, the conference was a continuation of and a follow-up to the larger Global Knowledge Conference (GK ’97) hosted by the World Bank and the government of Canada in Toronto in June, 1997, which was attended by over 1,700 persons. In addition, the GCAC was intended specifically for Africa to address the issues and options of global connectivity which arose from GK ’97.

The World Bank and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) were the primary organizers of the conference, but multiple organizations sponsored and participated in the event including multilaterals, private companies, foundations, and NGOs.

This report details the evaluation results from the GCAC. Specifically, the report summarizes information obtained through several evaluation approaches which included: a questionnaire, personal observation, and semi-structured interviews. The primary source of evaluative data came from the 100 questionnaires which were completed by the respondents. Also detailed in the report are the evaluation design, methodology, analysis, and results, as well as the perceived conference impacts on its participants.

Evaluation Design and Methods

The main purpose of the evaluation was to assess overall participant satisfaction with and key learning from the conference as well as to identify specific recommendations for future conferences. In this context, participants included not only attendees, but also exhibitors, session organizers, and sponsors. A member of the Evaluation Unit of Economic Development Institute (EDI) of the World Bank, the author, carried out the evaluation with the assistance of student aides from Addis Ababa University utilizing both formative and summative evaluation methodologies.

Formative methods were used to provide participant impressions and expectations both before and during the conference. Summative methods were used to measure conference results, learning, and participant feedback.

Several sources of information provided the basis for this evaluation including:

- conference evaluation questionnaires made available on site to all conference participants (summative evaluation);
- participant observation by the evaluator at plenaries, dinners, breaks, working sessions, open space, and informal gatherings (formative evaluation); and
- twenty-seven individual semi-structured interviews with people from all regions of the world and from many conference constituencies (formative and summative evaluations).
Evaluation Findings
Several notable evaluation findings emerged from the data analysis. They are categorized into five major areas: relevance, outcomes and self-perceived impacts, conference content, conference organization and structure, and pedagogical strategies.

Relevance
The relevance of the conference was considered to be one of its strongest assets. Respondents indicated that the conference was relevant to their work responsibilities. The relevance of the conference to the respondents’ institutional and organizational needs was rated “above average” (4.03/5.0, the highest mean score for all responses). In addition, 77.8% of the respondents rated a 4 or 5 to the question asking the extent to which the conference was relevant to their future work or functions. The mean for this question was also just at the “above average” level with a mean of 3.98. This implies that the conference was consistent in meeting the primary needs of the respondents.

Outcomes and Self-Perceived Impacts
Respondents gave the conference between “average” and “above average” ratings for overall effectiveness (3.68 out of a possible 5 points on the End of Conference Evaluation Results form; see Appendix A). Appendix B shows the conference questionnaire.

The conference respondents reported self-perceived impacts which appear to have been developed as a result of the conference. Many respondents stated that they would review the options given to them at the conference and make recommendations and policy changes based on the knowledge they acquired.

Continuation of the contacts and partnerships made at the conference was deemed as one of the most important outcomes and expectations for the respondents. What will become of these exchanges remains to be determined. But the fruition of these conversations and partnerships will likely ascertain the future impacts of this conference. In addition, respondents stated in both pre- and post-conference replies that greater awareness and urgency of the issues and improved regional cooperation and partnerships between the public and private sectors were critical for global connectivity in Africa. In this light, the objective of the organizers to gather public and private officials together to speak to each other appears to have been reached.

The desire of the respondents to attend another such meeting seems evident--90% of the respondents to the questionnaire said that the conference should be repeated.

Inadequate time for discussion during working sessions diminished the conference's impact. Respondents complained about the lack of opportunity to discuss issues and topics in depth. They also noted that specific ideas and recommendations to apply new information to their own settings were not discussed.

Conference Content
The conference helped the respondents to appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed. Seventy-three percent offered a rating of 4 or 5 to the question, “To what extent did the conference help you appreciate the urgency of the issues addressed,” while the mean was 3.89. Respondents also stated that the conference occurred at the right time, considering their country's needs.

Conference expectations of the respondents appear to have been met. The expectations most often cited by individuals who were interviewed before the conference indicated that opportunities for networking and partnerships were important, as was an analysis of the issues for global connectivity.

Conference Organization and Structure
The informal nature of the conference and its opportunities for interactions (some of the primary goals of the organizers) were considered to be a positive feature by many of the respondents. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents awarded a score of 4 or 5 to this category, while the mean was 3.99.

The conference was attended by a diverse group of participants with various backgrounds representing many different countries. This diversity was a positive feature because it allowed the respondents to exchange different ideas with their colleagues, especially in the small working groups. However, there was significant gender imbalance at the conference: men outnumbered women by a ratio of about 5 to 1. Although there was a diverse number of participants, several respondents indicated that the unique contributions and needs of women regarding global connectivity were not sufficiently integrated into the program content, nor discussed at the conference. The goals of the conference organizers to achieve diversity in its participants, then, was highly successful in some important domains (e.g., private sector officials, government officials, NGOs, and the donor community), but was notably weak in one area—that of gender. The breadth of countries represented...
exemplifies the fulfillment of a key objective of the conference and thus became a central success of the entire effort.

Lack of advance documentation and information was a drawback. Sixteen respondents stated that they wanted the conference materials and papers in advance of the conference so that they could be better informed of the issues before the conference started.

The working sessions were better than the plenary sessions in allowing time for dialogue and discussion, but they did not allow time for in-depth discussions nor for the development of specific recommendations. In addition, plenaries afforded little time for question-and-answer periods or discussions, as many plenaries ran too long and served to formalize what was intended to be an informal event.

Technology was underutilized at the GCAC. Four respondents thought it ironic that the conference was centered around global connectivity, yet the Internet access they experienced at the conference was limited or too slow. This was highly representative of the connectivity limitations endemic to Africa which this conference intended to address.

Pedagogical Strategies
Seventy-five respondents stated that they had acquired significant gains in learning, new information, and building partnerships. By the end of the conference, these respondents also said that they had obtained a greater understanding and awareness of the key issues. This implies that the respondents did acquire new knowledge which they could apply to their own country-specific situations. However, 29 respondents also stated that there was not enough in-depth discussion of the issues (or that issues were too broad), while others indicated that the conference did not offer suitable policy options or concrete recommendations for follow-up. If the conference was to fully achieve its objectives, recommendations and policy options should have been offered to its participants, as they suggested.

Greater integration of the economic issues and issues surrounding global connectivity was suggested by 3 respondents. The respondents seem to believe that Africa has the economic potential for global connectivity, but lacks the necessary information and recommendations on how this can best be accomplished. This indicates that the conference was generally unsuccessful in providing its participants with the necessary action plans to carry out global information initiatives.

Participant responses to the question, “To what extent did the conference treat issues in sufficient depth,” suggest that issues were not treated in enough detail. Thirty-four percent of the respondents assigned a rating of 4 or 5 and 21% rated it with a 1 or 2, while the mean was for this question was 3.18. While the primary intention of the conference was to provide participants with a broad range of issues and options for global connectivity, many respondents still concluded that these topics were only discussed in enough depth to warrant an average rating.

Economic potentials and constraints for global connectivity were not addressed in depth at the conference. Respondents gave lower ratings to these important issues. When asked if the conference clarified Africa’s future economic potentials, only 38% of the respondents gave this feature a rating of 4 or 5, while 25% gave it a 1 or 2, and the mean was 3.14. The respondents also suggested that the conference was only average in clarifying the role of economics and in integrating it into the issues and options surrounding global connectivity. In addition, when asked “To what extent did the conference clarify Africa’s future economic constraints,” the respondents awarded average ratings: the mean was 3.30 and 40% awarded a score of 4 or 5, while 21% rated it with a 1 or 2.

Respondents saw the need to further discuss and identify suitable policy options for global connectivity in Africa than were offered at the conference. Their responses indicated that the conference treated suitable policy options in an average manner. The mean for this question was 3.04 and 35% of the respondents rated this aspect with a 4 or 5, while 28% gave it a 1 or 2--these scores are far closer to an “average” than an “above average” rating.

APPENDIX A

Closed-Ended Questionnaire Responses Report

Global Connectivity for Africa: Issues and Options
Query McNamara, EDINP
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, June 2-4, 1998
End-of-Conference Evaluation Results
Results of 100 out of 320 participants in the conference

1. Results of the questions to be answered by category
   (N = Number of responses per category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Your institution type (Mark all that apply)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Development Agency</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Training Institutes/Policy Institute</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Enterprise/Central Government Agency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Ministry</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ministry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Enterprise</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(^1)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Of the 100 total respondents to the questionnaire, 4 did not include their institution types. Out of the 96 respondents to this question, 83 selected only one institution type, 13 selected two institution types, and 1 selected 4 institution types (a total of 113 responses).
11. Do you think that this conference should be repeated for additional African policy-makers and private sector participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the questions on the participants’ opinion of the conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% 1 or 2</th>
<th>% 4 or 5</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. To what extent was the conference relevant to your institution/organization’s needs?</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. To what extent was the conference relevant to your future work or functions?</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. To what extent did the conference focus on the issues you most hoped would be addressed?</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. To what extent did the conference occur at the right time considering your country’s needs?</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. To what extent did the conference allocate adequate time for constructive discussions?</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. To what extent did the conference treat issues in sufficient depth?</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e. To what extent did the conference achieve the objectives that you had in mind when you decided to attend?</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = minimum; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average; 5 = maximum.
2 Proportion of participants who answered with a “1” or “2” out of all respondents to the question.
3 Proportion of participants who answered with a “4” or “5” out of all respondents to the question.
4 Lowest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
5 Highest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
6 Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
7 Number of responses.
### APPENDIX A (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% 1 or 2</th>
<th>% 4 or 5</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. To what extent did the conference help you appreciate the urgency of</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the issues addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. To what extent did the conference help you learn about suitable</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies that you had not previously considered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. To what extent did the conference help you assess the requirements</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of different policy alternatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. To what extent did the conference help you assess the consequences</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of different policy alternatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e. To what extent did the conference help you identify the most suitable</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy options for your country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. To what extent did the conference promote regional initiatives?</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. To what extent did the conference promote exchange of lessons/</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. To what extent did the conference act as a catalyst to discuss</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various technological options available to Africa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. To what extent did the conference explore how the barriers to</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deployment of technological options can be overcome?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e. To what extent did the conference clarify Africa’s future economic</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potentials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f. To what extent did the conference help to clarify Africa’s future</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic constraints?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent did the conference help you to understand the</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connectivity options and their impact in Africa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To what extent did the informal nature of the conference help to</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foster frank discussion of the issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of this conference?</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = minimum; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average; 5 = maximum.
2. Proportion of participants who answered with a “1” or “2” out of all respondents to the question.
3. Proportion of participants who answered with a “4” or “5” out of all respondents to the question.
4. Lowest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
5. Highest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
6. Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
7. Number of responses.

### APPENDIX C

#### INTERVIEW GUIDELINES AND QUESTIONS

**Instructions for Interviewers**

Introduce yourself to the participants. Let them know that you are assisting me with the evaluation of the conference and ask if they would consent to be interviewed. At the beginning of the interview, inform the participants of the interview’s purpose and let them know that it should only last about one half hour. Tell them that their responses and their names will be strictly confidential and will be used only in the final evaluation of the conference which is being managed by the Evaluation Unit of the Economic Development Institute (EDI) of the World Bank. Also ask them if they would like to receive a copy of the executive summary from the evaluation report, since they are entitled to one; however, to do so, we need their names and a mailing or e-mail address from them at the end of the interview.
Please neatly write the responses from the participants directly on the form. If you need more room, continue on the back side of the form. Please ask the participants to clarify or repeat any responses which may be unclear to you.

At the end of the interview, please thank the participant for the interview and let them know if they have any questions that they can call, write, or e-mail me:

Mark D. Bardini
Evaluation Specialist
Economic Development Institute of the World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
202-458-1572
202-522-1655 (fax)
mbardini@worldbank.org

Please interview as many participants as you can. Thank you.
Global Connectivity for Africa: Issues and Options  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
June 2-4, 1998

Evaluation of the Conference  
Interview questions for participants

1) Sex: Male ______ Female ______

2) What country do you live in? ______________________________

3) What is your title? _______________________________________________

4) Was the conference relevant to your needs? Please explain.

5) Did the conference meet your objectives? Why or why not?

6) Did the informal nature of the conference help to foster frank discussion of the issues? Why or why not?

7) What features of the conference do you believe contributed to its effectiveness? Please offer as many as possible.

8) What features of the conference do you believe limited its effectiveness? Please offer as many as possible.

9) What do you believe will be the most important outcome as a result of the conference?

10) When you return to your office, are there one or two things you will strive to do as a result of the conference? Please elaborate.

11) Do you have any suggestions on how the conference can be improved?

12) Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for participating in this interview.