

## **Table 2: Completion of OVIs by partners Output to Purpose Review (OPR) Building Communications Opportunities (BCO) (Capturing BCO Partners' Input)**

This document should be regarded as a working document which provides information on how the OVIs developed for Table 2 were derived. This is provided to make it easier for partners to track the link between the success criteria defined in their partnership agreements and the three OVIs developed per partner for each of the outputs.

The workshop

### **How the OVIs were derived:**

- 1) This document includes only Part C of the OPR document (**Table 2**).
- 2) Success criteria and thematic areas, as listed in Table 1 below, were drawn from each of the partner agreements with DFID. They have been listed here for ease of use in comparing the proposed OVIs (done by Tina James in collaboration with Lauren Fok) against the success criteria in the agreements.

### **Partners are required, before the meeting in The Hague, to:**

- 1) Reflect on the proposed OVIs (highlighted in yellow) and produce a final list of OVIs, with changes if necessary, which will be used for DFID's OPR and against which progress will be measured in the OPR. Complete the progress column in **Table 2** (sent separately) – this will be used for your presentations on Day 1 of the meeting in The Hague.
- 2) It is assumed that partners may wish to change the OVIs to better reflect their ongoing work.

Green: Partners' inputs required before our meeting in The Hague

Yellow: To be discussed and completed during The Hague meeting

Yellow: Prioritised list of three OVIs which will be used by DFID to measure partner progress in the OPR.

## Part C – Project Scoring Assessment

Purpose Statement	Success criteria / theme areas	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) *	Recommendations/Comments
<p><i>To provide support for (APC / IICD / OWSA / Panos) in pursuit of its strategic objectives that contribute to the overall BCO purpose: “To investigate, mobilise and support key ICT4D (ICD) opportunities that impact poverty”</i></p>	<p><i>I suggest we try to firm up and quantify something along the lines of...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed and inclusive debate, policy dialogue and impact in developing countries, around ICD’s role in mainstream development agendas</li> <li>• Increased understanding within the international mainstream development community, of the role of ICD</li> <li>• Better focused and co-ordinated mainstreaming of ICD’s role in a few priority development sectors</li> <li>• Increased capacity, networking and influence of poverty focused southern based civil society</li> <li>• Poverty impact of ICD evaluated and disseminated to key development audiences</li> <li>• Innovative approaches to poverty-focused ICD supported (and evaluated)</li> <li>• Proactive coordination of BCO Alliance (including a strong knowledge management &amp; communications strategy)</li> </ul> <p><i>BCO Partners’ respective monitoring Frameworks at this level say:</i></p> <p>Support to the following thematic areas:</p> <p><b>APC...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy advocacy on ICD’s role in key development agendas;</li> <li>• Gender equality and women’s empowerment;</li> <li>• Strategic use of ICD by southern based civil society organisations;</li> <li>• Poverty impact of ICD.</li> </ul> <p><b>IICD...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainstreaming ICD;</li> <li>• Stronger voice for southern civil society, enabled through ICD;</li> <li>• Poverty impact of ICD.</li> </ul> <p><b>OW...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICD mainstreamed in key development sectors</li> <li>• Increased capacity, networking and influence of Southern CSOs through ICD-enabled grassroots communication</li> <li>• Impact of ICDs on poverty: assessment and dissemination</li> </ul> <p><b>Panos (BCO Annex)...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy (or think tank) and public debate activities on ICD</li> <li>• Radio content and capacity building activities internationally,</li> </ul>	<p>Still to be done</p> <p>Some suggestions (but they need discussion and a lot more thought):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Evidence of mainstreamed activities in development sectors e.g. health, human rights, women’s empowerment, etc (number of sectors, reach and depth across players, evidence of mainstreaming)</li> <li>ii) Range of mainstreamed activities</li> <li>iii) Communications and dissemination strategy developed and implemented</li> <li>iv) Evidence of increased capacity in poor communities /poverty-focused institutions to use ICD</li> <li>v) Evidence of increased south-south and south-north networking of poverty-focused institutions</li> <li>vi) Impact assessment studies undertaken and packaged for dissemination</li> <li>vii) Evidence of ongoing evaluation of partner activities, including sharing of learning through collaborative workshops and shared learning initiatives</li> </ul>	<p>This should be developed at the Hague workshop. Assumption is that indicators for the individual partners are agreed before the workshop and that the time spent in the workshop will be to develop the higher level indicators at the purpose level</p> <p>Also needs to address the higher level OVIs across the whole BCO alliance.</p>

	<p>particularly in South Asia (the latter including broader than radio activities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HIV/AIDS Programme activities</li></ul> <p><b><i>Under the overall Panos PPA...</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Promoting media pluralism.</li><li>• Promoting information and communication.</li><li>• Promoting media involvement in poverty reduction strategies.</li><li>• Promoting public debate, particularly through the media, on HIV/AIDS.</li></ul>		
--	---	--	--

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
<p><b>1. ICT4D mainstreamed in key development sectors, through informed and inclusive debate and policy dialogue around ICT4D's role in mainstream development agendas (including PRSP, SWAP, etc.).</b></p>	<p><b>APC:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater awareness by CSOs of ICD policy issues</li> <li>• Locally driven advocacy campaigns which influence ICD policy/regulatory environments</li> <li>• Continued production of vital plain language materials that provide input into and sustain the debate and dialogue</li> <li>• Vital materials are repackaged into formats that can be widely distributed.</li> <li>• Vital materials are made available in multiple languages</li> <li>• Coordination between BCO-partners to pool know-how and resources and increase distribution reach especially in target countries</li> <li>• Development of media partnerships that broaden reach so that ICD-related information is picked up by mainstream media in target countries</li> <li>• Discussion papers</li> <li>• Facilitate southern participation in policy forums</li> </ul> <p><b>On Gender ...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence ICD policy and gender policy with the gender and ICD agenda on an international, regional, and national level, including donors and international agencies.</li> <li>• Diversity of organizations and actors engaged in gender and ICD issues and policies</li> <li>• More women involved in ICD policy processes</li> <li>• ICD advocates promoting gender agenda</li> <li>• Increased accessible and visible content on gender and ICD policy (language and style)</li> <li>• Beijing +10 process incorporating our agenda.</li> <li>• Use of tool by diverse initiatives</li> <li>• Consolidated GEM practitioners network</li> <li>• Use of GEM by donors</li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Locally driven advocacy campaigns which influence ICD policy/regulatory environments (number of advocacy campaigns, evidence of influence, spread and reach in different countries)</li> <li>2) CSOs visibly engaged in and influencing policy debates (national / regional/ international)</li> <li>3) The gender dimension has been incorporated in ICD policy debates at national / regional/ international levels (Number of ICD policy processes in which gender has been included as a key component)</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) No of advocacy campaigns undertaken</li> <li>ii) Increased participation by CSOs in policy debates (national / regional/ international)</li> <li>iii) Levels of participation in national, regional and international fora</li> <li>iv) Communications strategy and implementation in place</li> <li>v) Production and dissemination of materials to support mainstreaming of ICD</li> <li>vi) No of publications</li> <li>vii) Evaluation of materials for appropriateness in terms of language, level of understanding, medium for dissemination</li> <li>viii) Increased inclusion of gender in ICD policy debates at national / regional/ international levels</li> <li>ix) Diversity of organizations and actors engaged in gender and ICD issues and policies</li> <li>x) More women involved in ICD policy processes</li> <li>xi) Increased accessible and visible content on gender and ICD policy (language and style)</li> <li>xii) Increased no of champions promoting gender</li> <li>xiii) Active and growing GEM practitioners network</li> <li>xiv) Increased use of GEM by donors (what about other groups?)</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>IICD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWAps worked on/catalysed by IICD and supported by local donors and other international support via Programme Management function;</li> <li>• Volume and quality of informal and formal dialogue taking place with sector ministries;</li> <li>• IICD and local partner network involvement in monthly SWAp meetings held by sector ministries and supporting donor coalitions;</li> <li>• IN partner deliverables: policymaker workshops; media pieces; website; publications...</li> <li>• Sector policymakers active advocacy function in support of IN events, e.g. a Minister doing an opening speech at a showcase event;</li> <li>• Regional IConnect partners (e.g. IConnect Africa) delivery and debate organised around mainstreamed ICD content, via website and printed publication as well as events;</li> <li>• IICD participation in advising European and North American policymakers on mainstreamed ICD (e.g. current policymaking environment in Netherlands and with SDC);</li> <li>• IICD advising international NGOs on the possibilities of ICD in traditional development fields, e.g. through joint ventures with “typical” development organisations;</li> <li>• IICD participating and showcasing of mainstreamed ICD in regional and international development fora;</li> <li>• Connect global on-line services stimulate mainstreamed ICD discussion and debate;</li> <li>• Communities of mainstreamed ICD practitioners and actors are stimulated to debate on a South-South and North-South basis via the IConnect website</li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ICD mainstreamed into two or more development sectors in X countries</li> <li>2) Breadth and depth of IICD policy influences (measured through extent of interaction with a range of stakeholders and decisionmakers)</li> <li>3) A growing number of champions actively advocating ICD in X% of countries in which IICD is working</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Number of SWAps worked on/catalysed by IICD and supported by local donors and other international support</li> <li>ii) Volume and quality of informal and formal dialogue taking place with sector ministries (including how many sector ministries)</li> <li>iii) Regular SWAp meetings which are documented</li> <li>iv) Number and range of workshops (spread in terms of country, sector, stakeholders)</li> <li>v) Extent of use of Websites</li> <li>vi) Number of reports and publications produced and disseminated</li> <li>vii) Quality of reports and publications (content, readability, appropriateness for audience, accessibility)</li> <li>viii) Number of active and effective networks in place</li> <li>ix) Number of champions actively advocating ICD</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>OW:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater collaboration among government, private sector and civil society actors for mainstreaming ICD in key development sectors</li> <li>• Communities of practice for mainstreaming ICD in thematic areas of development targets and goals</li> <li>• Greater awareness on the role of ICD in achieving the MDGs and alleviating poverty</li> <li>• Donors and policymakers draw on OneWorld Southern Centres' advice on ICD matters</li> <li>• Innovative approaches and best practices in the use of ICD for sustainable development</li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Grassroots participation and influence in mainstreaming ICD in development sectors</li> <li>2) Successful multistakeholder collaboration evident in mainstreaming ICD activities (number of successful mainstreaming activities which involve a broad range of players)</li> <li>3) Innovative approaches and best practices in the use of ICD for sustainable development</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Level of support for ICD networks</li> <li>ii) Number and range of collaborative activities by multi-stakeholders</li> <li>iii) Number and range of active partners</li> <li>iv) Number of reports and publications produced and disseminated (by thematic area)</li> <li>v) Quality of reports and publications (content, readability, appropriateness for audience, accessibility, thematic areas)</li> <li>vi) Increased use by donors and policymakers of publications, websites, advice centre</li> <li>vii) No and quality of workshops, meetings and seminars in support of ICD mainstreaming</li> <li>viii) Level of advocacy activities (number and type e.g. online, face-to-face)</li> <li>ix) Establishment of working and active helpdesk in South Africa</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>Panos:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>More coverage by the media of pluralism and information society issues.</i></li> <li>• <i>Greater range of stakeholders including women and women's groups, engaged in activities and policy advocacy.</i></li> <li>• <i>Improved quality of stakeholder engagement – better information, stronger analysis, gender-sensitive, more effective.</i></li> <li>• <i>More dialogue between government and different civil society groups including groups representing the poor and marginalised.</i></li> <li>• <i>Participation in seminars of high-level actors; seminars produce outcomes.</i></li> <li>• <i>More evidence available of the poverty impact of ICD.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>More dialogue between government and different civil society groups including groups representing the poor and marginalised (assumes existence of baseline studies)</b></li> <li>2) <b>Increased production and dissemination of outputs relating to PRS, etc with evidence of wide use by a range of stakeholders</b></li> <li>3) <b>Level and extent of engagement with global, regional and national policy makers to promote more effective communication strategies for HIV/AIDS, TB, and poverty reduction</b></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. ICT Toolkit briefs produced and disseminated</li> <li>ii. Positive feedback and evidence of their value to and use by journalists</li> <li>iii. ICT Report(s) produced and disseminated</li> <li>iv. Positive feedback on their value to and use by journalists, in-country experts and policymakers.</li> <li>v. Journalists at WSIS</li> <li>vi. Published coverage from WSIS</li> <li>vii. Website supporting journalist</li> <li>viii. Evidence of value and use of website for journalists</li> <li>ix. National media/policy dialogues on pro-poor ICT policy held</li> <li>x. Evidence of their impact</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Meetings and seminars held on ICD and PRS in developing countries</li> <li>ii. Research and analysis of ICD and PRS produced and contributes to seminars etc</li> <li>iii. Toolkit briefs on Poverty and trade issues produced and disseminated, international and country-specific</li> <li>iv. Positive feedback on their value and use by journalists</li> <li>v. Improved media coverage of PRS in target countries</li> <li>vi. Research and analysis of the role of media coverage in the response to AIDS, published and disseminated</li> <li>vii. Policy advice document on communication in response to TB, published and disseminated</li> <li>viii. Citizen monitoring of UNGASS commitments – research published and disseminated</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p>PANOS <b>On International Policy...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panos' participation in policy discussions and partnerships continues to be sought by key agencies.</li> <li>• Key elements of Panos' approach are adopted by key agencies.</li> <li>• Continued positive response from global policy actors to Panos reports etc, and continued use of Panos reports by these actors.</li> <li>• Participation in seminars of high-level actors; seminars produce outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>PANOS On HIV/AIDS...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Journalists have developed the capacity to encourage public dialogue and debate, using the media to enhance accountability within HIV/AIDS public policy.</li> <li>• Participatory, inclusive and transparent decision-making is made on HIV/AIDS at a national and international level.</li> <li>• Those most affected by HIV/AIDS communicate their views and concerns to national and international media and policy agents.</li> </ul> <p>National and international policy and donor processes on HIV communication are informed through Southern originated, Southern driven information and analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) International dissemination of publications</li> <li>b) Articles in international development journals</li> <li>c) Contribution to international meetings</li> <li>d) Active membership of international alliances, debate fora etc.</li> </ul> <p>As above plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Engagement with global, regional and national policy makers to promote more effective communication strategies for HIV/AIDS, TB, and poverty reduction:</li> <li>b) Publications produced and disseminated</li> <li>c) Papers presented at meetings, and published</li> <li>d) Active participation in international and regional meetings and alliances etc</li> <li>e) Presence of southern journalists to cover international meetings: profile raised of southern journalism, capacity built of southern journalists, media coverage produced in-country, during conferences, and internationally</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
<p><b>2. Increased capacity, networking and influence (i.e. Voice) of poverty focused southern based civil society organisations, through their strategic use of ICT4D</b></p>	<p><b>APC:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Online campaigning toolkit based on FLOSS software</i></li> <li>• <i>Increased capacity of southern software developers through their collaboration in developing the toolkit</i></li> <li>• <i>Software development programming and skill sharing event (based on the toolkit development) in Africa</i></li> <li>• <i>Reassessment of Itrainonline based on input of southern ICD trainer community</i></li> <li>• <i>Diversification of ITO membership/participation</i></li> <li>• <i>Integration of outcomes of this assessment in ITO structure, objectives, governance and content</i></li> <li>• <i>Practitioners network/exchange and development of strategic approach to ICD training based on assessment of changing training needs in the ICD end user community</i></li> <li>• <i>Knowledge of examples of different types of good practice in providing low cost connectivity from around the world (from wireless to email only networks, exploring technical solutions AND business models)</i></li> <li>• <i>Learning event that shares skills and promotes appropriate technology and lost cost connectivity as viable solutions</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Production and successful dissemination of advocacy tools (online campaigning and low cost connectivity)</li> <li>2) Successful coordination of ITrainOnline (number and growth of active partners, growth in available materials online, evidence of increased accessibility and usage)</li> <li>3) Establishment of an active and operational practitioners' network</li> </ol> <p>i) Successful coordination of ITrainOnline (no of partners, growth in available materials online, accessibility, usage)</p> <p>ii) Completed and usable advocacy toolkit based on FLOSS software</p> <p>iii) Level of use of the online campaigning toolkit</p> <p>iv) Completed training workshop in Africa on online campaigning – number of people trained, number of women trained, range of participants / organisations</p> <p>v) Establishment of an active and operational practitioners' network</p> <p>vi) Production and dissemination of good practice materials on low cost connectivity</p>	
	<p><b>IICD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Local NGO project partners have improved the quality and reach of poverty-focused services to end-users;</i></li> <li>• <i>The work of national networks of Southern practitioners that lobby and advocate mainstreamed ICD is being catalysed and publicly broadened through IICD advisory services in technical and business fields;</i></li> <li>• <i>Through IICD advice and support on ICD based mechanisms like web-based newsletters and video DVDs, enable local civil society to reach more stakeholders.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Local NGO project partners have improved the quality and reach of poverty-focused services to end-users</li> <li>2) Number and range of resource materials produced and disseminated</li> <li>3) Number and range of stakeholders reached through IICD advisory services</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>OW:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Marginalised communities empowered to run advocacy centre and demand services</i></li> <li>• <i>Communities' ability to produce radio programmes</i></li> <li>• <i>Radio programmes produced by communities broadcast on mainstream radio stations and their voice heard by authorities</i></li> <li>• <i>Grassroots voices mainstreamed in regional, national and local newspapers and their plight debated for policy change</i></li> <li>• <i>Number of grassroots stories produced and syndicated to media outlets</i></li> <li>• <i>Replication of grassroots advocacy centres in Africa and peer-peer learning process</i></li> <li>• <i>Enhanced content from African grassroots on the web</i></li> <li>• <i>OW Radio content downloaded and recycled among community radio stations</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Grassroots voices evident through community radio, and in the mainstream media (print, radio, online)</li> <li>2) X (Number) of effective and sustainable grassroots-run advocacy centres operating in Africa, South Asia and Latin America</li> <li>3) Increased capacity in communities to produce radio programming content (quantity, quality, number of skilled people producing content)</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Number of marginalised communities running active and sustainable centres, helpdesks and services (at least 20 in South Asia)</li> <li>ii) Number of women running centres and services</li> <li>iii) Range of services effectively offered by centres</li> <li>iv) Number of community radio programmes broadcast on mainstream radio</li> <li>v) Number of grassroots stories produced and syndicated to media outlets</li> <li>vi) Number of grassroots stories disseminated through the internet</li> <li>vii) Extent of OW radio content downloaded and recycled among community radio stations</li> <li>viii) Number of publications produced on ICD topics</li> <li>ix) Number of training workshops with community broadcasters (Asia, Africa)</li> <li>x) Establishment of a broadcasters network (Africa)</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria ( as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>Panos:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSOs and their members feel empowered to debate, initiate debate and dialogue, within their community and beyond it.</li> <li>Journalists have developed commitment to seek the views of the poor and allow them to speak for themselves.</li> <li>Increased production and exchange of local and international radio content.</li> </ul> <p><b>On Building Media Capacity...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual journalists/editors continue to cover the issues after the project support is finished.</li> <li>Coverage of issues including the voices of the poor is institutionalised in media (e.g. job descriptions, funding allocations, programme/ feature slots).</li> <li>Media space continues for communication in which the poor actively participate.</li> <li>Increased recognition by different stakeholders in countries of the value and role of “pro-poor” media.</li> <li>Positive feedback from journalists on the briefing material provided.</li> <li>Media coverage reflects greater range of relationships with stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSOs visibly engaged in and influencing policy debates at community (and national?) levels</li> <li>Increased production, dissemination and exchange of local and international radio content with a pro-poor focus (reach and volume of programmes, content analysis)</li> <li>Development of a cadre of trained journalists (X number) with pro-poor specialised expertise and reporting functions</li> </ol> <p><u>a) Interworld radio:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vii) Interworld radio programmes produced</li> <li>viii) IWR radio programmes used by member stations</li> <li>ix) IWR commissioning and editorial process built capacity of commissioned southern journalists</li> <li>x) Southern studios established</li> <li>xi) Studios used, useful to in-country stations and journalists</li> <li>xii) Grants and fellowships for content production to partner stations</li> </ul> <p><u>b) Oral Testimony projects</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Projects carried out with journalists to gather testimonies on aspects of poverty – testimonies written and made available</li> <li>ii) Testimonies are used in media outputs</li> <li>iii) Panos partners increasingly incorporate the OT methodology into their work: manual disseminated; specific manuals; requests for training etc to OT programme</li> </ol>	

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
<p><b>3. Poverty impact of ICT4D evaluated and disseminated to key development audiences.</b></p>	<p><b>APC:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Application of GEM to poverty oriented initiatives and dissemination of the results</i></li> <li>• <i>Implementation of poverty focused ICD seed fund that</i> <i>Integrates gender concerns</i> <i>Prioritises women's participation</i> <i>Enables extraction of learning</i></li> <li>• <i>Online information dissemination platforms that are well used, and receive positive feedback from the target use community</i></li> <li>• <i>Discussion/position papers on critical issues that add to the pool of thinking and knowledge on ICD</i></li> <li>• <i>More critical debate on ICD and poverty impact</i></li> <li>• <i>Southern and civil society voices that are influential in key ICD policy forums</i></li> </ul>	<p>Three key OVIs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Presence (volume and quality of input) of Southern and civil society in ICD policy fora at national, regional and international levels</li> <li>2) Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies (volume, quality, reach)</li> <li>3) Extent of application of GEM to poverty oriented initiatives and dissemination of the results</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Evaluation methodologies developed and implemented on ICD projects</li> <li>ii) Number of applications of GEM to poverty oriented initiatives</li> <li>iii) Communications and dissemination strategy in place</li> <li>iv) Publication and dissemination of evaluation studies</li> <li>v) Online information dissemination platforms that are well used, and receive positive feedback from the target use community</li> <li>vi) Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies (volume, quality, reach)</li> <li>vii) Presence (volume and quality) of Southern and civil society in ICD policy fora at national, regional and international levels</li> <li>viii) Number of women benefiting from ICD activities / seed funding</li> </ol>	

Comment [D1]: Page: 11  
Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>IICD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local M&amp;E partners can effectively evaluate the economic and social impact of local ICD initiatives;</li> <li>Scalable, demonstrative southern led opportunities of mainstreamed ICD are facilitated and supported, to make a base from which to draw these M&amp;E results;</li> <li>Local M&amp;E partners through focus groups and other events, critically discuss results with national partner networks – for both learning and accountability;</li> <li>M&amp;E results and findings are fed into the national policy debate through IN partners and programme management function;</li> <li>M&amp;E theory and methodology is discussed and debated in key fora, such as the BCO, with lessons and experiences being channelled to wider audiences via BCO products;</li> <li>BCO realises ICD country studies that review impact and learning;</li> <li>M&amp;E results on impact and learning are fed into regional Iconnect partner sites and publications as well as at the centre;</li> <li>Impact studies are produced on country, sector and processes behind ICD and widely disseminated;</li> <li>IICD advises policymakers, both in the South and North, making use of M&amp;E learning and accountability.</li> </ul>	<p>Three key OVIs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact studies are produced on country, sector and processes behind ICD and widely disseminated;</li> <li>Evidence of evaluation capacity in local partners (incorporation of M&amp;E in project planning, successful completion of evaluation methodologies and M&amp;E studies)</li> <li>Dissemination of evaluation and learning fed into national, regional and international policy debates</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of successful scaleable, demonstrative ICD projects</li> <li>Evidence of evaluation capacity in local partners – successful completion of evaluation methodologies and M&amp;E studies</li> <li>Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies (publications, website)</li> <li>Number of workshops held with local partners and documentation of learning</li> <li>Dissemination of evaluation and learning fed into national, regional and international policy debates</li> <li>Impact studies are produced on country, sector and processes behind ICD and widely disseminated;</li> </ol>	

**Comment [D1]:** Page: 11  
 Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>OW:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Acceptance and usage of methodology for assessing the impact of ICD among various projects</i></li> <li>• <i>Enhanced understanding of the role of ICD for demanding pro-poor public services</i></li> <li>• <i>Enhanced understanding of the role of ICD for strengthening grassroots voice</i></li> <li>• <i>Understanding of the impact of eGovernance services among the poor and the marginalised communities</i></li> <li>• <i>Enhanced understanding among development planners on the strategic use of ICD in development priorities</i></li> </ul>	<p>Three key OVIs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Successful implementation of evaluation methodologies and M&amp;E studies (volume, quality, level of participatory approaches)</li> <li>2) Successful establishment of three functioning regional networks in Africa and Latin America respectively</li> <li>3) Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies, including best practice models (publications, website, radio programmes, Digital Opportunity Channel)</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Successful implementation of evaluation methodologies and M&amp;E studies (volume, quality, level of participatory approaches)</li> <li>ii) Communications and dissemination strategy in place</li> <li>iii) Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies, including best practice models (publications, website, radio programmes, Digital Opportunity Channel)</li> <li>iv) Successful establishment of three functioning regional networks in Africa and Latin America respectively</li> </ol>	

**Comment [D1]:** Page: 11  
 Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
	<p><b>Panos:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>More evidence available of the poverty impact of ICD.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Three key OVIs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Evidence of increased evaluation capacity in Panos staff (incorporation of M&amp;E in project planning, development of evaluation methodologies, successful completion of M&amp;E studies)</li> <li>2) Communications and dissemination strategy in place and implemented for M&amp;E studies (impact studies?)</li> <li>3) Level of active participation in NGO networks and fora discussing impacts of ICD</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Panos' M&amp;E capacity increased – knowledge, strategy, staff time</li> <li>ii) Evaluation of Panos projects carried out and written up</li> <li>iii) Key audiences identified, dissemination strategy in place</li> <li>iv) Results disseminated</li> <li>v) Active participation in NGO networks etc discussing impacts of ICD</li> </ol>	

**Comment [D1]:** Page: 11  
 Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/ Comments
<b>4. Proactive coordination of the BCO Alliance, including an effective knowledge management and communications strategy.</b>	<b>IICD/APC:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>BCO knowledge products are realised and have an added value in overall ICD debate and learning;</i></li> <li>• <i>A smoothly functioning BCO, in which all partners participate and learn from one another;</i></li> <li>• <i>A steadily increasing number of collaborations stemming from the partnership;</i></li> <li>• <i>BCO being cited as a partnership with an added value in international fora;</i></li> <li>• <i>BCO results and expertise being picked up in on- and off-line communications in development.</i></li> </ul>	Three key OVIs (should apply only to APC and IICD): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Effective coordination and management of the BCO alliance (regular and well-documented meetings, assessment of coordination by partner, liaison with donors and partners, project management with regular reporting to donors and alliance partners)</li> <li>2) Regular learning workshops with documented outcomes which are disseminated</li> <li>3) Documentation of learning and impacts emerging from the BCO Alliance – development and implementation of a communications strategy</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Increased number of collaborations between partners</li> <li>ii) Regular learning workshops with documented outcomes which are disseminated</li> <li>iii) Documentation of learning and impacts emerging from the BCO Alliance – development and implementation of a communications strategy</li> <li>iv) Evidence of use of learning outputs by a) BCO partners and the b) broader donor community</li> </ol>	I am confused here – does IICD still have a coordination role in BCO or has this changed? [Tjames]
	<b>PANOS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Sufficient core time to ensure effective co-ordination and shared lesson learning among BCO partners</i></li> </ul>	Not included here – not responsible for coordination	
	<b>OW ?</b>	Not included here – not responsible for coordination	

**Comment [D1]:** Page: 11  
 Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.

**Comment [TJ2]:** Consider splitting the management function of the BCO alliance (which should also be measured) from the BCO collaboration which is the outcome of the combined efforts of the partners. They are very different from each other. [Tina].

Outputs	Success Criteria (as per Partnership Agreements)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Recommendations/Comments
5. Proactive collaboration across the BCO alliance to address ICD	<i>Combined BCO Alliance</i>	Three key OVIs 1) Collaborative initiatives undertaken between partners (evaluated against volume, reach across development sectors and institutions, number of partners involved, level of participation in learning workshops, etc) 2) Regular learning workshops with documented and disseminated evaluation of learning outcomes 3) Collaborative impact assessment studies (volume, quality, publication, dissemination)	Suggest that all the combined BCO alliance indicators are discussed at The Hague workshop

Comment [D1]: Page: 11  
 Type in Recommendations or comments related to the Progress. Explain if progress is not as planned, provide time bound action points by DFID or other stakeholders.