

Table 1: Output to Purpose Review (OPR)
Building Communications Opportunities (BCO)
(Capturing BCO Partners' Input)

Deleted: \

Part A - Project Data

Green: Partners' inputs required before our meeting in The Hague;
 Yellow: To be discussed and filled in during The Hague meeting;
 Orange: Will need to draw on the thoughts/results of the Impact Team;

Project Short Title	Building Communications Opportunities (BCO)		
Benefiting Country / Region	Africa, Asia & LA	MIS code	APC (732620016) IICD (732620018) OWSA (732620019) Panos (part of Panos' PPA)
Current Project Officer Name	David Woolnough	Approved Commitment	APC (£1,125,000) IICD (£1,275,000) OWSA (£900,000 – will be less) Panos (% of £1,175,000 per year, over 3 years)
Actual Start Date (01/08/2004)	APC (01/08/2004) IICD (01/11/2004) OWSA (01/12/2004) Panos (01/04/2005)	Spend To Date	APC (£412,978) IICD (£721,906) OWSA (£252,591) Panos (£???,000)
Planned End Date (01/12/2007)	APC (01/12/2007) IICD (01/12/2007) OWSA (01/09/2006) Panos (ongoing)	Date of Review	August 2006

Part B - Recommendations

Summary of Recommendations		Responsibility
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

Comment [D1]: Page: 1
Type in here the summary recommendations made at the review.

Comment [D2]: Page: 1
Type in here the name of the person who will action the recommendations.

Part C – Project Scoring Assessment

Goal Statement	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)
Poor people's voice and pro-poor services strengthened through ICT4D (ICD)	<i>Impact team to discuss on Day 2 of learning workshop in The Hague</i>

Purpose Statement	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) *	Progress	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>Some suggestions (but they need discussion and a lot more thought):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) ii) Increased capacity in poor communities /poverty-focused institutions to use ICD iii) Increased south-south and south-north networking of poverty-focused institutions iv) <u>something that picks up the 'investigated' and disseminated aspects?'</u> v) <u>something on added value of doing this together – BCO Alliance</u> <p><i>happy to stretch to five OVI on purpose :-)</i></p>	<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 (possible Output 5?).</p>	<p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>

Comment [D3]: Page: 3
Type in comments on how far the extent to which Purpose to Goal assumptions are being met. How far has the achievement of the Purpose objective is contributing to, or will contribute to, the project goal.

Purpose to Goal

Impact team to discuss on Day 2 of learning worksnop in The Hague

Project Purpose Rating - General / Overall progress assessment *

Justification *

State how far the project has helped to deliver the objectives of the Country Assistance Plan (where appropriate)

Comment [DFID4]: Page: 3
Type in score of either 1,2,3,4,5, or X.

1. = Likely to be **completely** achieved. The outputs /purpose are well on the way to completion (or completed)

2. = Likely to be **largely** achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs have been achieved, particularly the most important ones.

3. = Likely to be **partly** achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.

4. = Only likely to be achieved **to a very limited extent.** Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.

5. = **Unlikely** to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose

X. = Too early to judge. It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This score should be used sparingly.

Comment [D5]: Page: 3
Type in the reasons for the rating/score you have selected ie) the number of outputs on track, strong project management, supportive external/enabling environment etc. What is the likelihood at the moment that the purpose of the activity will be fulfilled at the end of the project.

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
<p>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.).</p> <p><u>Suggestion to look at this in terms of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Mainstreaming ICD in 'development sector' as in MDGs</u> • <u>ICT in national development policy and development in national ICT policy</u> • <u>Influencing ICT regulatory environment</u> • <u>Influencing the ICD sector</u> 	<p>APC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Locally driven advocacy campaigns which influence ICD policy/regulatory environments and ICT4D's role in mainstream development agendas</u> (number of advocacy campaigns, evidence of influence, spread and reach in different countries) ▪ <u>CSOs visibly engaged in and influencing mainstream and ICD policy debates</u> (national / regional/ international) ▪ <u>The gender dimension has been incorporated in ICD policy debates at national / regional/ international levels</u> (Number of ICD policy processes in which gender has been included as a key component) – <u>and vice versa (i.e. ICT4D included in gender policy)</u> <p><i>Too focused on just ICD policy, while the Output focuses about ICT4D's role in mainstream development agendas.</i></p> <p><u>AE: yes, but mainstreaming does not feature in our agreement with DIFD.</u></p>	<p><i>On Day 1, we will ask partners to highlight a few headlines on:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Hlghlights</i> 2. <i>Low-points</i> 3. <i>Future innovations and approaches</i> <p><i>for each output, both for their own organisation, and of what they have seen of other BCO partners.</i></p> <p><i>Complete this column prior to The Hague workshop</i></p>	<p><u>National advocacy networks: catia and APC network and now bringing them together.</u></p> <p><u>Networks must have development agenda and be multi-stakeholder.</u></p> <p><u>Feedback from national level: need for capacity building so that local actors can really understand ICT policy and how it relates to development</u></p> <p><u>Worked with regulators in Kenya, West and Southern Africa to mainstream development in ICT and telecoms regulation.</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
<p>Output 1 Contd</p> <p>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.).</p>	<p>IICD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ICD mainstreamed into two or more development sectors in X countries (<u>reflected in SWAPs, PRSP, etc.</u>) ▪ Breadth and depth of IICD policy influences (measured through extent of interaction with a range of stakeholders and decision_makers) ▪ A growing (<u>quantify?</u>) number of <u>local</u> champions actively advocating ICD in X% of countries in which IICD is working_ <u>IICD not sure about that.. perhaps more important to take MSP approach and evaluation by sectors rather than number of champions.</u> ▪ <u>Evidence of positive poverty impact of successfully mainstreamed ICT4D in at least two development sectors (i.e. picking up what happens in a sector or SWAP where IICD has been active for a long time).</u> <p><u>Include as indicator the inclusion of ICT in PRSPs or national or other policies.</u></p>	<p><i>On Day 1, we will ask partners to highlight a few headline bullets of progress / achievements under each output, both of their own organisation, and of what they have seen of other BCO partners.</i></p> <p><i>Complete this column prior to The Hague workshop</i></p>	<p><u>Successes: Getting ICTs into PRSP agenda, particularly Uganda.</u></p> <p><u>Difficulty: Not easy to get ministers involved because it is not a top-down process.</u></p> <p><u>Lesson: You need a process for getting highlevel government involvement.</u></p> <p><u>Lesson: Capacity development of policy people. Grassroots organisation more aware than ministry people.</u></p> <p><u>11 sector policies</u> <u>3 national ICT strategies</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted:

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p>OW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Grassroots participation and influence in mainstreaming ICD in development sectors</u> <i>(delete? how measure? Is this a repeat of below?)</i> ▪ <u>Successful multistakeholder collaboration, including grassroots participation,</u> evident in mainstreaming ICD activities <u>in at least X countries</u> (number of successful mainstreaming activities which involve a broad range of players) ▪ <u>Innovative approaches and best practices in the use of ICD for sustainable development</u> <i>(investigated? Quantify?)</i> ▪ <u>X thriving and influential communities of practice for mainstreaming ICD in mainstream development sectors</u> ▪ <u>? something to pick up grass level ICT4D enabled poverty impact?</u> 	<p><i>On Day 1, we will ask partners to highlight a few headline bullets of progress / achievements under each output, both of their own organisation, and of what they have seen of other BCO partners.</i></p> <p><i>Complete this column prior to The Hague workshop</i></p>	<p><u>GEETA TO ADD ONE WORLD SOUTH ASIA'S REPORT</u></p> <p><u>One World Africa: Zambian PRSP process OWA organised a process with other CSOs a national meeting on the National Plan. OWA lead team on ICTs and government agreed that OWA could present position paper.</u></p> <p><u>Main lesson: Be inclusive and participate, including involvement from grassroots.</u></p> <p><u>People within government appreciated the input of OWA and vice versa.</u></p> <p><u>Future: ICT in PRSP might be needed in an OVI for OWA.</u></p> <p><u>Difficulty: Phone in programme was used to get grassroots participation. That did not work because</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p>PANOS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More dialogue between government and different civil society groups including groups representing the poor and marginalised (assumes existence of baseline studies) <u>delete? vague? don't have a baseline?</u> ▪ <u>Improved quality of stakeholder engagement – better information, stronger analysis, gender sensitive, more effective.</u> ▪ Increased production and dissemination of outputs relating to PRS, etc, with <u>evidence of wide use by a range of stakeholders</u> ▪ Level and <u>influence</u> of engagement with global, regional and national policy makers to promote more effective communication strategies for HIV/AIDS, TB, and poverty reduction 	<p><i>On Day 1, we will ask partners to highlight a few headline bullets of progress / achievements under each output, both of their own organisation, and of what they have seen of other BCO partners.</i></p> <p><i>Complete this column prior to The Hague workshop</i></p>	<p><u>Panos South Asia: Programme</u></p> <p><u>Nepal: broadcast weekly on radio over 9 months – achieved the engagement of government and built dialogue</u></p> <p><u>If we were to look at numbers of people involved from policy makers is quite significant and PSA have the data.</u></p> <p><u>Key lesson: Capacity building component: training reporters and assigned different reporters to different topics.</u></p> <p><u>Future outlook: we can do this on a larger scale, do more preparatory work with government people.</u></p> <p><u>Difficulties: Bringing together people from different government departments to the studio. Easy to get reports and CSOs involved.</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: extent

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<u>AMARC</u>		<p><u>Nigeria: awareness raising at national and regional level of value of community radio.</u></p> <p><u>Engaged international support.</u> <u>Brought together development planners and financing institutions</u> <u>Process will lead to establishment of 5 regional community radio stations in Nigeria.</u> <u>And commitment from government on establishing an advisory group to produce legislation on CR.</u> <u>SUCCESS: level of dialogue.</u></p> <p><u>By influencing regulation you are mainstreaming development: radio for development.</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
<p>2. Increased capacity, networking and influence (i.e. Voice) of poverty focused southern based civil society organisations, through their strategic use of ICT4D</p>	<p>APC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Production, <u>effective dissemination and evidence of widespread use by southern civil society</u> of advocacy tools (online campaigning and low cost connectivity) ▪ <u>Increase in the participation, usefulness and impact of</u> ITrainOnline (number and growth of active partners, growth in available materials online, evidence of increased accessibility and usage). ▪ Establishment of an active and operational practitioners' network <i>(what is this?)</i> ▪ <u>Capacity building... rather add an OVI on this ... in using current and emerging tools that elevate voice.</u> ▪ 			
	<p>IICD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>At least ten</u> local NGO partners improve the quality and reach of poverty-focused services to end-users ▪ Number and range of resource materials produced and disseminated <i>(delete? just measures activity?)</i> ▪ <u>Increased influence/voice of at least three national networks of southern practitioners that lobby and advocate mainstreamed ICD.</u> ▪ Number, <u>range of, and evidence of influence on,</u> stakeholders reached through IICD advisory services 			

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

- Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering
- Deleted:** and successful
- Deleted:** Successful coordination of
- Deleted:**
- Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

- Deleted:** L
- Deleted:** project
- Deleted:** have
- Deleted:** d
- Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering
- Deleted:** r and
- Deleted:** of

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p>OW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grassroots voices evident through community radio, and in the mainstream media (print, radio, online) <i>(quantify?)</i> ▪ X (Number) of effective and sustainable grassroots-run advocacy centres operating in Africa, South Asia and Latin America ▪ Increased capacity in communities to produce radio programming content (quantity, quality, number of skilled people producing content) 		<p><u>not prepared well-enough (e.g. they expected money). In the end they did not participate effectively.</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
<p>Output 2 Contd</p> <p>2. Increased capacity, networking and influence (i.e. Voice) of poverty focused southern based civil society organisations, through their strategic use of ICT4D</p>	<p>Panos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSOs visibly engaged in and influencing policy debates at community and national levels Increased production, dissemination and exchange of local and international radio content with a pro-poor focus (reach and volume of programmes, content analysis) Development of a cadre of trained journalists (X number) with pro-poor specialised expertise and reporting functions 			
<p>3. Poverty impact of ICT4D evaluated and disseminated to key development audiences.</p>	<p>APC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence (volume and quality of input) of Southern (and?) civil society in ICD policy fora at national, regional and international levels <i>(is this more of a measure for output 2?)</i> Effective dissemination of at least X influential evaluation and impact studies (volume, quality, reach, feedback from target audiences) Extent of application of GEM to poverty oriented initiatives and influential dissemination of the results Increased awareness of the poverty impact of ICT4D among at least X key development audiences <i>(may apply to BCO Alliance as a whole?)</i> 			

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- Deleted: (
- Deleted: ?)
- Deleted:

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- Deleted:
- Deleted: Publication and

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p>IICD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact studies are produced on country, sector and processes behind ICD and widely disseminated (<i>delete? unclear?</i>); At least X successful, scaleable demonstrative ICT4D projects – and evidence of Y projects that have gone or are well on the way to going to scale (<i>latter would be from earlier pilot projects</i>) Increased evaluation capacity of local partners (incorporation of M&E in project planning, successful completion of evaluation methodologies and M&E studies) Dissemination of evaluation and learning fed into <u>and picked up by</u> national, regional and international policy debates 		<p>SUCSESSES:</p> <p><u>Have an evaluation partner in each country evaluating the activities in each country (including organizations, participants, members from information networks, policy processes, etc.), and they are actually learning from them within IICD through focus groups and reports</u></p> <p><u>Have measured “perceived” impact, asking users in each sector how the network has impacted their life, etc.</u></p> <p>CHALLENGE:</p> <p><u>dissemination not done so well, has been an internal learning tool, difficult to determine what to highlight and what remains internally, in what way</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Evidence of

Deleted: in

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
Output 3 Contd	<p>OW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Successful implementation of evaluation methodologies and M&E studies (volume, quality, level of participatory approaches) <i>(delete? internal? vague?)</i> ▪ Successful establishment of three functioning regional networks in Africa and Latin America respectively <i>(doing what? Is this about building southern M&E capacity?)</i> ▪ Publication and dissemination of evaluation and impact studies, including best practice models (publications, website, radio programmes, Digital Opportunity Channel) <i>(delete? measuring activity not output? Could replace with APC version of similar...?)</i> ▪ <u>Effective dissemination of at least X influential evaluation and impact studies (volume, quality, reach, feedback from target audiences)</u> ▪ <u>? Something to pick up your range of original success criteria: "Enhanced awareness and understanding of the role of ICT4D in..." at least three development sectors:</u> 		<p><u>SUCSESSES:</u></p> <p><u>Participatory methodology on evaluating the impact of ICTs</u></p> <p><u>Results of implementation of this methodology with two networks in the CA social economy sector which has succeeded in identifying needs, challenges, priorities and actions to be taken in terms of strategic, appropriate and collective ICT integration</u></p> <p><u>Participatory methodology for planning strategies for integration of ICTs in this sector</u></p> <p><u>Results of the methodologies being sistematized to be shared among countries and others in the sector</u></p> <p><u>CHALLENGE:</u></p> <p><u>Future challenge to measure the impact of the integration of ICTs on the economic gain of these networks/sectors</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p>Panos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of increased evaluation capacity in Panos staff (incorporation of M&E in project planning, development of evaluation methodologies, successful completion of M&E studies) ▪ Communications and dissemination strategy in place and implemented for M&E studies (impact studies?) <i>(can we expand this to include feedback from target audiences?)</i> ▪ Level of active participation in <i>(of?)</i> NGO networks and fora discussing impacts of ICD, <i>and the extent to which these are anecdote- or evidence-based.</i> 			

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: ¶

Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p><u>AMARC</u></p>		<p><u>SUCCESSSES:</u></p> <p><u>Interested in measuring the impact of community radio on poverty, throughout the organization, this is is a success in that the members and stakeholders are engaging in this exercise to measure impact and have the base for this already prepared (activities)</u></p> <p><u>Have successfully held roundtables with 250 people, a core group of community radio practitioners, donors, academics, etc., and dissemination of this process via the website</u></p> <p><u>Building material to be used for communication and dissemination of these results</u></p> <p><u>Future Successes from this process:</u></p> <p><u>Success will be to identify the barriers to community radio, nature of the enabling environment, challenges, how this impairs what would be</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p><u>IDRC</u></p>		<p><u>SUCSESSES:</u></p> <p><u>Looking at methods to evaluate infostates for development, in partnership Orbicom (taking on the previous research on measuring the digital divide), have a book is published and launched, published on website</u></p> <p><u>Trying to study emerging countries that are gaining on the digital divide, to learn from, results have been published in the “Digital review of Asia Pacific”, measures how ICTs are being used in 29 economies, to what extent successful, what extent not</u></p> <p><u>In the process of creating indicators for measuring ICT sector and regulatory performance, primarily in Asia but with the Learn Network, also in Africa</u></p> <p><u>No longer use logic framework but on outcome mapping, more behavioural changes of people and institutions</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
	<p><u>DFID</u></p>		<p><u>SUCSESSES:</u></p> <p><u>Have succeeded in that David is a person that others within DFID, from other departments, can go to for information, illustrates that people from other areas want to know more about ICT4D, if the Minister gets asked questions then there are people are able to respond</u></p> <p><u>Secretary of state made a speech on the role of ICT for development</u></p> <p><u>Have engaged with the chief science advisor, a credible voice for getting these messages across in DFID, and for engaging with economists, policy advisors, etc.</u></p> <p><u>Commissioned research on evidence base in order to develop policy</u></p> <p><u>CHALLENGE:</u></p> <p><u>Can't make the policy until we have the evidence to back it up (anything that stands up to academic scrutiny), have commissioned</u></p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
 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	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Progress	Recommendations/ Comments	Score
<p>4. Proactive coordination of the BCO Alliance, including an effective knowledge management and communications strategy.</p>	<p>Three key OVIs (should apply only to APC and IICD):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) Regular learning workshops with documented outcomes which are disseminated <i>(bit weak?)</i> <u>Should we not have one OVI for the 'knowledge management' and another for the 'communications strategy'?</u> <u>Development and implementation of an influential BCO communications strategy (on key learning and impacts emerging from the BCO Alliance).</u> <p>PANOS and OW not included here – not responsible for coordination <u>(but IICD's and APC's ability to co-ordinate relies critically on Panos, OW, Amarc, etc.'s willingness to be co-ordinated and commit the time – so I would merge 4 & 5)</u></p>			
<p>5. Proactive collaboration across the BCO alliance to address ICD</p>	<p>Combined BCO Alliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>At least X</u> 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) <u>Active participation in</u> regular learning workshops, with documented and disseminated evaluation of learning outcomes Collaborative impact assessment studies (volume, quality, publication, dissemination) <u>Evidence added value...?</u> 		<p>Suggest that all the combined BCO alliance indicators are discussed at The Hague workshop</p>	

Comment [D6]: Page: 4
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 [TJ7]: 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].

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Documentation of learning and impacts emerging from the BCO Alliance –

Deleted: d

Deleted:

Deleted: C

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: R

Comment [DFID8]: Page: 14
Type in score of either **1,2,3,4,5, or X**.
1. = Likely to be **completely** achieved. The outputs /purpose are well on the way to completion (or completed)
2. = Likely to be **largely** achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs have been achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3. = Likely to be **partly** achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4. = Only likely to be achieved **to a very limited extent** ... [1]

Project Outputs Rating - General / Overall progress assessment *

Justification *

Purpose Attribution *

Comment [D9]: Page: 14
Type in the reasons for the rating/score you have selected and a narrative giving the likelihood at the moment that the outputs of the activity will be fulfilled at the end of the project.

Comment [DFID10]: Page: 14
State how far achievement of project purpose can be attributed to delivery of the project outputs

Part D – Risk Management

The risk level for the project should be reassessed during Annual / Output-to-Purpose Reviews.

Risk Category*	
New risks identified	
Action being taken to monitor / manage risks	
Recommended changes to plans or management strategies in respect of project associated risks	
Does the Logframe Require Revision?	
Do the PIMS Markers Require Revision? [Mandatory for projects approved prior to 01/04/1998]	
Method of Scoring – state the team composition, the methods used to conduct the review, how the scoring was agreed upon, and whether partners and stakeholders were involved.*	

Comment [D11]: Page: 15
Review the risk status of the project by looking at the impact and probability of goal and purpose risks. Type in either **High, Medium or Low** as appropriate.

Comment [D12]: Page: 15
Consider if there are any new risks that have been assessed during the review and rank them according to impact and probability.

Comment [D13]: Page: 15
Type in details of what action is being taken to monitor/manage the risks.

Comment [D14]: Page: 15

Comment [D15]: Page: 15
Type in here details if logical framework was revised during annual review, attach old and new version to this review, highlighting changes. Or comment if current logical frame remains unchanged.

Comment [D16]: Page: 15
Type in here if the review team agrees to amend the PIMS markers, if so you will need to complete a revised Project Header Sheet that needs to be approved at the appropriate level.

Comment [D17]: Page: 15
Type in your comments here.

Part E – Lessons Learned

Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination.*	
1. Working with Partners	
2. Best Practice / Innovation	
3. Project / Programme Management	

Comment [DFID18]: Page: 16
 The objective of this is to capture important practical lessons that can be applied and shared for future programme and project management.

Key Issues / Points of information

Comment [D19]: Page: 16
 Type in your comments here.

If appropriate, please comment on the effectiveness of the institutional relationships involved with the project (eg comment on processes and how relationships have evolved)

Comment [D20]: Page: 16
 Type in your comments here.

What key documentary evidence is available to support the conclusions of this report? List any supporting documents annexed to this report.

Comment [D21]: Page: 16
 Type in your comments here.

Notes for completion

- Where ratings are required please consider the following:
 - 1. = Likely to be **completely** achieved. The outputs /purpose are well on the way to completion (or completed)
 - 2. = Likely to be **largely** achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs have been achieved, particularly the most important ones.
 - 3. = Likely to be **partly** achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
 - 4. = Only likely to be achieved **to a very limited extent**. Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
 - 5. = **Unlikely** to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose
 - X. = Too early to judge. It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This should be used sparingly.
- Note for subsequent annual reviews you should not be using X unless you can justify using this X rating, it is unusual for projects running for 3 years or more to be scored X.
- Once the review is completed a small subset of the data gathered must be entered into PRISM for analysis purposes. There is an online form within PRISM for entering this data. Under the Enter a Review screen / link click the 'Add Performance Review Online' link. The mandatory parts required on the Online screen are marked on this form with an asterisk *.
- Dates should be entered in the format **dd/mm/yyyy** e.g. 24/08/2004

Page: 14

Type in score of either **1,2,3,4,5,or X**.

1. = Likely to be **completely** achieved. The outputs /purpose are well on the way to completion (or completed)

2. = Likely to be **largely** achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs have been achieved, particularly the most important ones.

3. = Likely to be **partly** achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.

4. = Only likely to be achieved **to a very limited extent**. Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.

5. = **Unlikely** to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose

X. = Too early to judge. It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This score should be used sparingly.