Communication for influence: Linking advocacy, dissemination and research by building ICTD networks in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA) project , 2008 – 2010: An evaluation of influence and advocacy

8 September 2010

Evaluation conducted by:

Natasha Primo, APC Communications and Information Policy Programme

natasha@apc.org

Canada's International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

This report seeks to provide an evaluation of the advocacy phase of the Communication for influence: Linking advocacy, dissemination and research by building ICTD networks in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA) project, implemented with IDRC funding between 2008 and 2010.

For the purposes of this evaluation, "advocacy" is understood as the activities and processes by which organisations, network(s), organisations or social movements seek to influence public policy, or people's ideas and behaviour with a view to encourage social change. [1] Advocacy groups[2] can advance democracy in varied ways, including:

- Assisting in the development of better public policy
- Ensuring governments' accountability to citizens.
- Giving a voice to (misrepresented) citizen interests
- Mobilizing citizens to participate in the democratic process
- Supporting the development of a culture of democracy

The element of advocacy for social justice is judged by two aspects: (i) the extent to which the definition of social, political and economic problems and policy solutions formulated reflect the interest of those on the social and political margins, and/or (2) the extent to which those in the margins participate in or engage with the advocacy process.

One of the key gains of evaluating advocacy is the reflections on strategies and lessons learnt from the process. In the conclusion of this report, we therefore attempt to distill the lessons we can draw from the project , both in relation to project design and running an advocacy campaign.

The advocacy of the East African ICTD network and GOREeTIC - the two networks in this project respectively operating in East Africa, and West and Central Africa - are assessed in terms of the networks' accomplishments in relation to 5 outcome categories, namely:

- strengthened organisational capacity

- strengthened alliances

---

1   See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advocacy
2   Young, L. And J. Everitt. 2004. Advocacy groups. Vancouver, BC: <u>University of British Columbia Press</u>

- increased data and analysis from a social justice perspective

- increased support for a specific problem definition and solution or policy option, and

- increased visibility of the issue in policy processes resulting in positive policy outcomes.

In term of the outcomes and the outcome categories in the two regions, the following picture emerges:

In East Africa:

- If one had to pick the outcome category best achieved by the members the EAICTD it would be the visibility they brought to internet governance issues.

- One sees a significant shift in the policy posture of governments in the East African region towards the internet governance issue aand participating in multi-stakeholder processes involving civil society and private sector stakeholders. This is evident in the increased visibility of internet governance issues especially in Uganda and Kenya, and the credibility EAICTD partners gained from launching an advocacy campaign that is well rooted in research. The Kenyan governments decision to host the 2010 ICANN meeting, the offer to host the 2011 global IGF, and the Rwandan government's offer to host the 2011 EAIGF are all testament to how the governments have shifted their positions.

- Supported by the research findings there is a convergence of opinions between governments and civil society (and to a lesser extent the private sector) on the key internet governance question of how to deliver more affordable access to the citizens/consumers. This has also led to different stakeholders seeking closer collaboration. Civil society advocates are co-opted onto government task forces.

- There is good collaboration between civil society organisations within the ICT for Development sector. There is however a lot of work to be done to bring the non-ICT sector based organisations into the process and to advocate for affordable access to ICTs as an enabler of development and citizen participation.

In West and Central Africa:

- It is difficult to assess the influence of the GOREeTIC member - and consequent shifts in the policy positions of politicians - because of the changes in and unpredictability of the political contexts in which they had to function over the last year: elections in Benin, a coup d'etat in Niger, and a change in the political leadership of the Communications Ministry in Cameroon. In Benin, the GOREeTIC member could not gain access to politicians in order to advance an advocacy position.

- The one outcome category where the GOREeTIC members can be said to demonstrate their ability was their capacity to adapt to a politically unpredictable and changing environment where their campaigns came up against the political realities – as for example in Niger and Cameroon.

- From the reports of the GOREeTIC members in Benin and Niger, it appears some progress has been made to foster deeper understanding among civil society organisations of the value of ICTs in enabling delivery of developmnt dividends. However, in the absence of a sustained advocacy campaign and media statements from other civil society organisations about ICT4D and UAFs, it is difficult to make an independent judgement.

- The unpredictable political landscape also makes it difficult to judge the behaviour of boundary partners when the GOREeTIC members were constrained in their ability to implement an advocacy campaign.

The **key lessons** on advocacy one can extract from this project are that:

- Strong regional coordination is imperative for multi-country projects, and more so when they are implemented over multiple years.

- Advocacy plans can bump up against political realities which can deflect attention away from the advocacy issue and make it difficult to discern the impact of any of the advocacy activities. It is important that civil society organisation have the capacity to adjust the campaign as best possible and still attain some of the advocacy goals.

- Advocacy campaigns can shift focus, starting with one issue and ending with another. This project was conceived as an opportunity to advance access to broadband by examining why national level telecoms reforms did not yield the expected benefits – increased competition, costs reductions, etc- but then shifted in the advocacy phase from telecoms reform to internet governance (in East Africa) and universal access funds (in West and Central Africa). Such shifts are linked to how network members read the political and policy landscape, and their judgements of what what synergies they can exploit and follow the most strategic way to advance the advocacy agenda.

2. Background/Introduction to the CICEWA project

The Communication for influence: Linking advocacy, dissemination and research by building ICTD networks in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA) project, evolved from a discussion between the Association for Progressive Communications (APC) and the Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet) and was supported by the International Development and Research Centre (IDRC) between 2008 and 2010.

The aim of the project was to build regional ICT development (ICTD) research capacity and advocacy networks in Central, East and West Africa. Overall , this project sought to advance and support calls for universal affordable access to broadband information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure, in Central, East and West coasts of Africa. More accurately:

The overall objectives were to:
- conduct research that will identify obstacles to universal affordable access to broadband ICT infrastructure in a number of countries and sub-regions in East, Central and West Africa and,
- to develop two sub-regional ICT policy advocacy networks that will disseminate research and undertake advocacy on ICTD and access to infrastructure at the sub-regional level, in order to create a sound platform for sub-regional connectivity in East, West and Central Africa that will provide a platform for the effective use of ICTs in development processes.

Specifically, the networks intended:

1) To support research projects on access to ICT infrastructure and ICTD
2) To disseminate and discuss research findings based on the situation on the ground and link them with ongoing initiatives (both own and other research)
3) To explore ways of using research findings to inform policy advocacy initiatives
4) To link research findings on practices of governance and freedom with advocacy using civil society participatory processes[3] and gender evaluation methodology[4] .
5) To undertake policy advocacy initiatives at the sub-regional level and to support policy initiatives at the national level.

The project sought to address this issue by linking research, research communications, network-building and advocacy in an innovative approach to enabling civil society networks and

---

[3]   Andrea Cornwall & Vera Schattan Coelho (eds): *Spaces for Change? The politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas.* Zed Books 2007
[4]   http://www.apcwomen.org/gem/home.htm

organisations to come together and engage in a form of participatory governance at regional and national levels in Central, East and West Africa. The participating countries included Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Uganda in East Africa, and Senegal, Cameroon, Benin, Niger and Congo Brazzaville in Central and West Africa.

The research problem focussed on the continuing deficit in universal affordable access to fixed telecom infrastructure more than a decade after the introduction of telecom reform policy and regulation in countries on the west and east coasts of Africa in the early 1990s. This deficit severely limits the possibility of information and communication technologies being used effectively to enable social and economic development. This problem persists despite the phenomenal increase in access to mobile telecom networks and massively inhibits access to information and knowledge through the internet which still requires broadband connectivity through fixed networks.

The research reports were completed during 2009 and are available on the APC web site. [5]

This report will focus on the advocacy component of the project, in order to see what the process yielded in terms of specified "outcome categories" and what lessons there are to distill.

3. Background to the CICEWA Advocacy Phase

Each of the regional networks conducted their advocacy over two phases. The first advocacy phase coincided with the research phase, and was conducted in 2008 and early 2009.

For the second phase of the advocacy, the researchers and organisational partners in the 2 regional networks met in separate workshops to develop an advocacy agenda and action plan. The separate meetings were primarily necessitated by language skills/preferences – English and French – which made a combined workshop less ideal, but also led to different decisions with regard to what issues to focus on for the regional advocacy action.

A. Network building: East Africa ICTD Network (EAICTD)

First phase advocacy

---

[5] Access the individual country research reports and CICEWA stories via this web page:
     http://www.apc.org/en/node/9321/

The East African ICTD Network (EAICTD) chose to focus their advocacy on internet governance while the researchers were busy with their research. EAICTD developed an advocacy plan that included the following activities:

- Organise national (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda) online discussions on internet governance to identify priority internet governance issues in each country

- Hold one day national face to face meeting in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda that will synthesise the online discussions into recommendations on policy interventions on internet governance to be tabled at the regional internet governance forum in Nairobi in November.

- Organise the East Africa Internet Governance Forum in Nairobi that will consider recommendation from the national workshops and build consensus on the policy issues to be presented at the IGF in Hyderabad, India in December. KICTANet will play the leading role here.

- Publicise the issues and recommendations from the national and regional discussions to create general awareness of internet governance issues

In Uganda and Kenya, the national IGFs were preceded by 10 days of moderated online discussions, using the KictaNet list in Kenya and the I-Network and WOUGNET lists in Uganda. The Kictanet list has a membership of about 300 individuals (including the Permanent Secretary for the Communications Ministry, Dr Bitange Ndemo), while the Ugandan lists had a combined membership of about 800 individuals. Unfortunately, neither Rwanda nor Tanzania were able to organise an online discussion preceding the face to face national IGF meeting.

The national IGFs in the East African countries identified a range of issue the participants considered critical:

Country	Critical Issues
Kenya	The following policy-related areas were identified as potential areas for capacity building: • Policy and legislative drafting • Development of regulatory framework • Benchmarking and e-readiness assessment • Understanding of international Internet governance structures, policies and

	mechanisms The following technical areas were identified as potential areas for capacity building: • Skills to implement security measures at a corporate, national and regional levels particularly the establishment of a national Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) • Investigation, forensics and prosecution skills in relation to cybercrime • IPv6 deployment
Rwanda	• Local content development • Affordable access to the Internet • Management and technical issues around critical internet resources, especially; • Re-delegation and management of the Rwanda ccTLD(.rw) that is currently managed from Switzerland by a private individual • Strengthening the management of the Rwanda Internet Exchange Point (RINEX) • Technical skills to handle the RINEX facility as well as the .rw ccTLD.
Tanzania	The key issues on IG and prioritized them into short and long-term issues. The short-term issues included: • Awareness creation on IG issues throughout the country • The Internet should be made affordable so that all can access and use it. • Developing a legal framework around internet governance and harmonize with any existing policies or regulations. • Prudent management of critical internet resources • Promote multi-stakeholder engagements • Promoting local content especially content using Swahili • Introducing a legally recognized IG body to tackle and handle the above issues. Long term issues included infrastructure development; providing a legal framework for cyber security, privacy and e-transactions; preservation and protection of local content that builds cultural values; and the creation of an Internet Governance agency whose mandate will be to monitor IG policy issues and advise the stakeholders, research and awareness creation.
Uganda	• Increasing access and affordability: Petition the government to adopt strategies to increase bandwidth to ensure equitable distribution especially

	in rural areas. The government would not only provide incentive to invest, but would also invest in improving access.
	• Management of .UG ccTLD: A multi-stakeholder committee representing government, private sector and civil society (NGOs, media, academia etc) should be formed to continue discussions on who should control the .UG ccTLD and other IG issues in Uganda.
	• Capacity building workshops to increase participation of different stakeholders in addressing IG issues in the country.
	• Increase Ugandan participation in international IGF meetings to raise awareness of the country's IG concerns.
	• Uganda must deploy local root servers to keep internet traffic and reduce international connectivity charges.
	• Uganda needs to adopt a .UG policy to resolve domain name disputes
	• The government should set clear procedures to determine the limits of Freedom of Expression.
	• Adoption of a data security law to help in securing private data on the internet.
	• Transition from IPv4 to IPv6.

The first East Africa Internet Governance Forum (EA IGF) used the national IGFs as a building block and was held on 12-14 November in Nairobi, Kenya. The event was convened by the Kenya ICT Action network and co-sponsored and co-organised by the International Development and Research Centre (IDRC), KICTANet, Kenya ICT Board, Information Centre (KENIC), Communication Commission of Kenya (CCK), the Kenya College of Communication Technologies (KCCT), Strathmore University, and members of the East African ICT for Development Network (EAICT4D), and a number of international partners. The forum was a resounding success attracting over 180 participants and more that 30 speakers, including the Executive Secretary of the Internet Governance Forum, Markus Kummer. Markus Kummer noted that this was the first time ever in the history of the IGF to have a regional IGF with a comprehensive grass-roots mobilisation and sensitisation.

The programme of the EAIGF was largely informed by the priority areas identified in the four countries. The forum ran for 3 days and had a total of 8 sessions covering a basic introduction to IG and the role of different organisations and stakeholders in the IGF process.

The stakeholders in East Africa - through the EAIGF - identified five issues that are the priorities for the region's internet development. These issues require concerted and coordinated

intervention by the various stakeholders each playing their own roles. These are:

Universal affordable Access	a. Access to infrastructure b. Affordable access to relevant local Content c. Multilingualism d. National and regional Internet exchange points (IXPs)
Capacity and skills development	e. Strengthening knowledge base/understanding of IG issues at both policy and technical f. Enhance level and quality of local contributions to international IG policy processes g. Develop local community expertise
Legislative frameworks that will create an enabling environment for creation and innovation	h. Provision of legal and regulatory frameworks for use of ICTs for development in the region i. Harmonisation of legal and regulatory frameworks within the East African region
Critical internet resources	j. IPv6 adoption (Transition from IPv4 to IPv6) k. New gTLDs and IDNs l. Collaboration and sharing of best practices and procedures m. ccTLDs and re-delegation of dot UG and RW
Cyber crime, security and privacy (creating a national and regional framework)	n. Protecting national/regional Internet infrastructure o. Protecting personal information

| | p. Spam |
| | q. E-crime and security legislation and developing National and Regional Computer Emergency Readiness Teams (CERT) and Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRT) |

Outcomes from the National IGFs and the EAIGF include:

Kenya:
- KENIC was mandated to be convenor and host of the Kenya IGF

- The EAIGF website has become a repository of IG information in the region. Available on the site are reports of activities, process and substantive issues from all the four countries (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda), the EA IGF draft report and presentations made at the forum. Also available are statements made by East Africans at the third IGF in Hyderabad, India.

Uganda:
- A task force was formed to study the ccTLD management and propose a new structure, which will provide a win-win situation for the current managers and other stakeholders.

- A new Internet Consumer lobby group was formed to advocate for better services from Internet Service Providers.

Tanzania:
- A proposal to form an agency that will be mandated to monitor IG policies and advise stakeholders, conduct research and create awareness on IG issues.

- Tanzania volunteered to host the second East African IGF in Dar es Salaam in 2009.

Rwanda:
- A new association of ICT practitioners was formed. Rwanda ICT Association will bring together ICT and Internet players together to chat the way forward for this sector in the country.

- A proposal to have a vibrant lobby group similar to KICTANet is on the table.

When Alice Munyua tabled the recommendations of the EA IGF at the third global IGF in Hyderabad, considerable interest was expressed in the activities of East Africa. One of the underlying goals of the EA IGF was to contribute to the rebuilding of confidence in Kenya as a destination for international conferences after the political instability following the elections in Kenya in early 2008. KICTANet had successfully bid for the November 2008 ICANN meeting to be held Kenya. After the election violence, ICANN withdrew the event from Kenya and switched it to Cairo. So the EA IGF had this secondary effect with regard to the CICEWA advocacy of clawing back some profile for Kenya as an ICT-savvy country as well as a safe destination for international events.

Second phase advocacy

The EAICTD network held its advocacy training workshop to plan the CICEWA second phase advocacy phase, on 25th-28th May 2009, Lenana Center, in Nairobi, Kenya. The workshop programme was organised to:

- provide an overview of the research reports from each country, and present report of the first phase of CICEWA EA advocacy activities.
- Review various advocacy strategies, influencing policy and working with various stakeholders.
- Review current sub regional ICT policy and regulatory environment.
- Review first phase CICEWA EA advocacy activities, and begin to develop a 2009 EA advocacy plan.

At the end of the East Africa CICEWA advocacy workshop, the partners agreed to pursue advocacy of the key issues emerging from the national research papers within the national and regional IGF spaces, and report on these processes at the global IGFs.

The key issues on which the CICEWA partners agreed to focus their advocacy at the national and regional IGF included:

1. Continuing high cost of connectivity
2. Lack of consumer involvement and their rights awareness as far as e.g Quality of Service (QOS) is concerned
3. Capacity building for government staff to spearhead e-government initiatives.

4. Content and affordable applications that are of value to all
5. Advocate for institutional policy frameworks and ICT bills such as e- governance laws, cyber laws etc.
6. ccTLD still remains a major issue.

Under the leadership of Alice Munyua, Kictanet coordinated an advocacy process leading up to the East Africa Internet Governance Forum (EA-IGF) which was held from 7-9 September 2009 in Nairobi. In 2010, the Ugandan team coordinated and hosted the regional EA IG at the Imperial Royale Hotel in Kampala from 11-13 August 2010.

The goal of the EA-IGF is to create a Community of Practice that will be a sustaining foundation for meaningful participation of East African stakeholders in Internet public policy debates at the national, regional and international level. The EA-IGF model allows for the informed participation, contribution and engagement of community members through the sharing of experiences and skills, solving common problems and challenges, the creation of new knowledge and increasing local capacity and talent.

The East Africa Internet Governance process followed three main steps:

a) **National online discussions took** place at the individual countries for a period of about 1-2weeks, moderated by the national animators.

b) **Face- to- face National Internet Governance Forums were** organized for all the stakeholders to validate the online report, build consensus on national IG issues, challenges and recommendations and contribute to developing the regional EA-IGF programme. The national IGFs provided the building block for the regional EA-IGF.

c) **The regional level EA-IGF** brought together the national IGFs. The regional IGF provided an opportunity for national issues to be debated and discussed at the regional level. The regional process also involved identification and consensus building around five regional issues that would benefit from increased advocacy and/or development of policy. For example cyber security, regional Communication policy, to increasing knowledge, increased regional efforts (for example the regional top level domain and strengthening ccTLD's. This year all the East African countries (Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania and Kenya) participated. In addition, the Southern Sudan government representatives also participated (in 2009)

The reports of the National IGFs are available online and the coordination of the national IGFs and the national online discussions that precede the face-to-face IGFs constitute the main input

from the CICEWA project into the EA-IGF.[6]

The 2009 and 2010 EA-IGF sought to continue to strengthen the national and regional dialogues on Internet Governance as well as:
- Continue to create awareness of Internet Governance issues and contribute to the creation of an East African community of practice
- Continue to build regional consensus on IG issues-building and a community of practice; and
- Begin to discuss the development of a regional East African Communication policy, among other regional policies.

The outcomes of the EA-IGF were submitted to the East African regulatory authority EARPTO, the African Parliamentary Knowledge Network (APKN), the East African Community, as well as, the fourth UN Internet Governance Forum which took place in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, in November 2009. Further, the 2009 EA-IGF set the stage for the 37th ICANN meeting held in Nairobi, Kenya, in March 2010. The recommendations of the 2010 EA-IGF – contained in the report – will also be presented at the 2010 IGF in Vilnius, Lithuania in September 2010.

The 2009 EA-IGF included a session for parliamentarians. The aim of the Parliamentarian IG session was to encourage contribution of Parliamentarians to the internet public policy debate in order to begin to discuss a more concrete role for African parliamentarians in the national, regional and global internet governance debate. In 2010, the session for parliamentarians was cancelled Uganda parliamentarians were engaged in building their constituencies in the run up to elections.

The EA-IGF 2009 also witnessed the launch of the Commonwealth Internet Governance Forum (C-IGF), which seeks to encourage greater participation of Commonwealth members and foster links between Commonwealth national and regional IGFs in order to develop informed solutions, and pool good practice to address their needs more directly. The Commonwealth IGF also announced the launch of a travel bursary to support Commonwealth stakeholders to participate at global IGF's. The bursary has been used to support the participation of EA parliamentarians in the global IGFs.

The EA IGF made recommendations on the following policy issues:

- Access to Broadband
- Cyber security, Privacy and Trust
- Policy legal and regulatory issues

---

[6]   http://www.eaigf.or.ke/

- Critical Internet issues
- Consumer issues

B. Network building: GOREeTIC

First phase advocacy

The GOREeTIC network spent some time after the networking building workshop in June 2008 and the research workshop in July 2008, developing its network structure and then developing its first phase advocacy plan.[7] The thrust of the plan was to conduct some online training with members on undertaking policy advocacy and research into the state of universal access funds in five countries – Niger, Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville, Senegal and Mali - while also developing a website and a research dissemination strategy that will come into play once the research is ready.[8] The research will then inform a process of advocacy with parliamentarians and the regulators in each country.

The GOREeTIC network held its network building workshop after the EAICTD Network workshop and has generally been slower off the mark than the East African network. Coordinated by Coura Fall and chaired by Sylvie Siam, the GOREeTIC network began their first phase advocacy by doing research on the universal access polices and funds in five countries.

The main findings of the research indicated that:

- In Benin, there is provision for a Universal Access Fund but it is not operational, nevertheless telecom operators are contributing 1% of their turnover to universal access.
- In Cameroon, a Universal Access Fund was established and has financed multi-purpose community telecentres, but lacks transparency regarding its decision-making and operations.
- In Mali, there is a requirement for the telecom operators to make a financial contribution to universal access, but no fund or mechanism to implement it in practice.
- In Niger, there is provision for a Universal Access Fund but it is not yet operational.
- In Senegal, there are provisions for a universal access fund and significant financial contributions received but it is not yet operational.

Members of the GOREeTIC network began informal advocacy at the national level in each

---

[7]   See GOREeTIC Advocacy Plan attached.
[8] Frédéric Dubois of the APC Communications team assisted with the development of a communications strategy for GOREeTIC.

country to engage with government and the regulator to motivate that universal access funds should be operationalised.

GOREeTIC also undertook to develop an coordinated approach to raise the issue of the operationalisation of universal access funds – targeting the Economic Commission of West African States (ECOWAS) - at their advocacy training workshop in Cameroon (held in September 2009).

Second phase advocacy

The GOREeTIC network convened an advocacy workshop from 2-4 September 2009 in Douala Cameroun, under the leadership of Sylvie Siyam and Coura Fall.

The implementation of the research and first phase advocacy process on universal access was analysed and assessed. The outcomes of the research on universal access were reviewed and second phase advocacy plans developed for Benin, Cameroun, Mali, Niger and Senegal.

The issue of Internet governance was also discussed in relation to the experience of the East African IGF.

Advocacy training was undertaken in preparation for the second phase advocacy process, and the group identified an advocacy plan that would focus on Universal Access Funds in each of the country contexts.

The specific advocacy actions that the GOREeTIC network identified for itself included:

1. Advocate to maintain existing infrastructure and the deployment of infrastructure in under-served and rural areas
2. Advocate for more transparency by the regulators and resource management for the development of the ICT and telecoms sector
3. Advocate to have ICT and telecommunications laws and regulations updated, in order to optimize the administration of UAF and adequate coordination at the sub regional level
4. Build the capacity of media and non government actors to advocate for ICT4D

Members of the GOREeTIC network were contracted individually – from January to March 2010 - to implement an advocacy campaign based on the action plan developed at the September 2009 workshop in Douala. Contracts were signed for UAF advocacy in Benin, Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville, Mali, Niger, and Senegal. Each contractor was individually accountable to the APC on

its advocacy implementation.[9]

Also, in the advocacy plan (see Appendix 1), the regional advocacy for more efficient and transparent UAF administration – and that was to be targeted at ECOWAS - was dropped. There was therefore no imperative for the network members to remain accountable to each other for their national level UAF advocacy work, or as a way to coordinate and build synergy and leverage at the regional level.

4. M&E framework[10]

This evaluation draws on interviews with members of the two networks on their views and reflections about the national and regional advocacy processes they were part of, the reports on activities they engaged and, in places, some online research for evidence of the events and media coverage of the campaigns.

The CICEWA project proposal proposes an outcome mapping approach[11] to the monitoring and evaluation.

Informing the design of the project is a *theory of change* which proposes that "an understanding the political dimensions of the implementation of telecom reform through its practices of governance will create a basis for civil society-led networks to advocate for changes in policy direction that will benefit citizen's practices of freedom and the attitudes of civil society organisations towards."

The indicators for evaluating the impact of telecoms reform advocacy by the civil society led networks are then proposed as:

- Changes in the policy posture of governments and sub-regional bodies regarding ICT policy formulation and implementation, as reflected in official statements, policy and regulatory instruments and media coverage
- Changes in civil society organisations within national or sub-regional spaces with regard

---

[9] The request for individual contracts was adhered to after network members expressed dissatisfaction with the disbursement of the CICEWA research funds (managed then by the regional project coordinator during the research phase).

[10] Thanks to Barbara Klugman for making her own readings and insights on evaluating social justice advocacy available. See http://dl.dropbox.com/u/1369042/Less%20is%20More%20-%20Thoughts%20on%20evaluating_%20advocacy%20%20Dec%202009.doc

[11] Sarah Earl, Fred Carden, and Terry Smutylo, *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs*, IDRC, 2001

to ICTs as enablers of citizen participation in practices of governance and development, as reflected in official statements and media coverage
- Changes in the behaviour of boundary partners will be the key measure of outcome, especially national governments, sub-regional governance bodies and civil society organisations.

In essence we are looking for "credible links" between the network's activities and the changes taking place – that is , looking for a link between the contributions of the network members to the outcomes sought (above).

In this evaluation we try to marry the analysis of the above outcomes with an argument that evaluation of policy advocacy needs to look for strengthened capacity in those factors – or "outcome categories"[12] - that are most likely to ensure organizational/ social movement readiness and creativity to initiate and engage policy processes in the most effective ways possible . This is especially pertinent because the (policy) changes sought may (i) not materialise within the timeframe of the grant award, and (ii) the implementation of policy advocacy is itself an unpredictable process that depends on a diverging range of contextual factors and stakeholders.

The "outcome categories" that we will focus on in this evaluation are:
1. Strengthened organizational capacity
2. Strengthened alliances (including unlikely allies)
3. Increased data and analysis from a social justice perspective
4. Support for a specific problem definition and specific solution(s) / policy proposal(s) to address that problem, resulting in positive policies
5. Increased visibility in the policy processes (of the issues or of marginalised groups) [13]

The combined outcomes and outcome categories provides the outline for the report on the networks activities:

---

[12] Reisman, J., Gienapp, A. and Stachowiak, S., A Guide to Measuring Advocacy & Policy, Organizational Research Services, 2007a. Commissioned by the Annie E Casey Foundation.

[13] See Annexe A for a template of strategies and outcomes for social justice advocacy in Barbara Klugman 2009, available at http://dl.dropbox.com/u/1369042/Less%20is%20More%20-%20Thoughts%20on%20evaluating %20advocacy%20%20Dec%202009.doc

OUTCOMES	OUTCOME CATEGORIES	EXAMPLES
Changes in the policy posture of governments and sub-regional bodies regarding ICT policy formulation and implementation, as reflected in official statements, policy and regulatory instruments and media coverage	Increased support for a problem definition and solutions/policy options	Asks questions about the ability to bring together a group of people who recognize a problem, and then agree around a specific problem definition that speaks to the experiences of those most affected.
	Increased visibility	What were of the negative or positive impacts of changes in context.? How did it impact on an institution's ability to make/maintain links with policy-makers. Did new "political windows" open up with changes in the political landscape such as in the run-up to an election, after the elections of a new party or new president etc. What "problem windows" - such as natural disasters, war or civic unrest – hat require a response from politicians – emerged or that you helped to bring about through social mobilization.
	Increased research and data analysis from a social jusctice perspective	Refers to institutional capacity to undertake research including the development of such research capacity, as well as whether the research findings are disseminated and used to support social justice advocacy.
Changes in civil society organisations within national or sub-regional spaces with regard to ICTs as enablers of citizen participation in practices of governance and development, as reflected in official statements and media coverage	Strengthened organisational capacity	Includes elements like improved organisational conditions for advocacy; "adaptive capacity," enabling staff and network members to work collectively, learning from experience, and fostering creativity in assessing and rethinking strategies; whether a lead organization or coalition is gaining increased legitimacy - including based on perceived expertise -in the eye of its base and allies, and over time, its target decision-makers.
Changes in the behaviour	Strengthened	Enquires whether a stakeholder analysis has been

of boundary partners will be the key measure of outcome, especially national governments, sub-regional governance bodies and civil society organisations.	alliances (including unlikely allies)	done to clarify the mix of stakeholders who are (I) defining the problem, and (ii) defining the policy solutions/options, and understanding their interests and the opportunities to influence them, or neutralise their influence. What was the benefit of the stakeholder analysis?

5. Findings of the evaluation

In this section we separate the discussion of the two networks as they focussed on different issues and were also coordinated and organised differently.

A. The East African ICT for Development Network (EAICT4D)

> "One of the main learnings in terms of capacity was we knew already all the way from when we were involved in the CATIA process: about the importance of issue identification, to deal with one issue at a time, to take it all the way, and to follow through on one or two issues each year and to work toward concrete outcomes. Also, the importance of working with all stakeholders. You cannot leave out the government or the private sector, though it is challenging to work with the private sector. And its not just an East Africa challenge" (interview with Alice Munyua).

The EAICTD focussed their advocacy on internet governance. For the first advocacy phase, the network decided to work towards a regional IGF in 2008, following on a national IGF in each of the 4 participating countries: Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda.

Following on a review of the findings from the telecoms reform research and advocacy training workshop in May 2009, the EAICTD decided to continue their focus on internet governance during the second advocacy phase. While the first regional internet governance forum in 2008 included a range of internet governance issues – though broadly focused on broadband access – the internet governance issues for the second advocacy phase were focussed on narrower set of issues:

- Continuing high cost of connectivity
- Lack of consumer involvement and rights awareness about, for example, Quality of Service (QOS)
- Capacity building for government staff to spearhead e-government initiatives.
- Content and affordable applications that are of value to all
- Advocate for institutional policy frameworks and ICT bills such as e- governance laws, cyberlaws etc.
- ccTLD still remains a major issue.

Again, we assess the networks advocacy in relation to the 5 outcome categories.

1. Strengthened capacity

The national and East Africa regional IGFs demonstrates the value of multistakeholder collaboration for delivering on an event – 2010 was the third regional IGF – that are a number of things rolled into one: alliance building process, consensus building, and in the long run, even ICT policy-making process.

The EA regional IGF migrated from Kenya after two regional IGFs in Nairobi (after Tanzania was unable to host the 2009 EAIGF as they had planned to) and was hosted in Kampala in August 2010. In itself, this is evidence of enhanced capacity within the network to (i) host a regional IGF, (ii) build new alliances within Uganda, (iii) attract new donors - in this case mainly Ugandan government and private sector, and (iv) heighten levels of institutional knowledge and understanding of the IG issues at national and regional levels.

In Uganda, the 3 main CSOs involved in ICT4D and IG policy issues combined to form a working group, the Network on Internet Governance (NIG) - including I-network, WOUGNET and CIPESA – and hosted by I-network. I-network itself has more than 1500 individual members from across different stakeholder groups – who by extension have become members of the NIG alliance. All three organisations are actively involved in facilitating discussions on the I-Network discussion list, which much like the Kictanet list in Kenya – involves members from across different stakeholder groups including parliamentarians, the regulator, the communications ministry and private sector members. Al agree that facilitating these discussions deepened their capacities for internet governance advocacy.

Both WOUGNET and CIPESA cite the importance of the CICEWA advocacy skills workshop (in Nairobi, May 2009) for catalysing their growth in the space. For WOUGNET, their participation in the DFID funded CATIA installed some core advocacy skills within the organisation. For CIPESA there was a systematic attempt to deepen understanding of IG issues and, by extension, capacity for internet governance advocacy by (i) reviewing the existing Uganda ICT policies and legislation,with a view to increasing understanding the Uganda ICTD and internet governance landscape and policies, (ii) participating in an Afrinic policy meeting in Kigali, (iii) taking up the responsibility to co-moderate the IG list discussions on the I-Network list, and (iv) taking the lead in organising the 2010 EAIFG meeting in Kampala This created opportunity for much closer collaboration with ICT policy-makers and legislators, bringing them into the process. (Interview with Lilian Nalwoga, CIPESA and Goretti Amuriat, WOUGNET).

Both the East African regional and national IGFs have placed strong emphasis on the need to focus on local priorities rather than try to mimic the global IGF agenda or modalities. Thus, the EAIGF seeks to be a localized process that yields concrete outcomes – on internet governance – for the region. An example is the identification of an issue in 2008 – the private ownership and management of the .UG and .RW ccTLDs – which was subsequently researched and reported on at the 2010 EAIGF, and which may yield a concrete outcome in a year or two (Interview with Alice Munyua).

While follow-through one one or two key issues over a number of years are important, new issues are already being identified for the future IGFs and is an indication that the civil society advocates have developed the capacity to adapt and advocate on new issues as they arise. One of the emerging issues identified at EAIGF 2010 was that of youth and entrepreneurship. "Those are the new buzz words, the buzz development solutions. It is an issue tabled by the Ugandans, and had not being identified by the Kenyans. Now the Rwandans are raising the issue about certification. And once were done with dealing with strengthening ccTLDs I can see us moving towards more work on youth skills development, entrepreneurship and certification issues." (Interview with Alice Munyua).

It is evident that capacity has been enhanced– most clearly in the cases of Uganda and Kenya – in understanding internet governance issues, hosting national and regional internet governance events and to build the necessary support from a range of stakeholders. In Rwanda there is renewed capacity for surfacing internet governance after the government become more engaged in the process and a national – multistakeholder committee was constituted to arrange a national IGF. Unfortunately, Tanzania was unable to host a face to face national IGF in 2010 – due to lack of financial support and capacity – and is lagging behind in terms of building the necessary multi-stakeholder collaboration on internet governance.

2. Strengthened alliances

In Uganda, the opportunity to host the 2010 EAIGF provided ICT-focussed CSOs the opportunity to develop a closer rapport with parliamentarians and the communications ministry, and to move away from their history of mutual suspicion. The organisations participated in regular dialogues with the ministry – quarterly depending on funding. The civil society based NIG are now also represented in the government-led taskforces on ccTLD redelegation, digital migration, and e-waste. Alliances with the Ministry and the Uganda Communications Commissions (UCC) have

been strengthened in the process, and are also positively impacted by the appointment of the (former) WOUGNET director, Dorothy Okello, as the chairperson of the UCC's universal service fund (called the Rural Communications Development Fund or RCDF). [14] This relationship has yielded new collaborations between WOUGNET and the UCC around girls' and access to ICTs. [15] Beyond the ICT institutions, the CICEWA partner alliance is increasingly pursuing relationships with other sectors like education, health , agriculture, and are consequently also engaging donors – beyond the traditional ICT donors – to promote the value of ICTs, the role of information in development, and internet governance (Interview with Ugandan NIG members).

In the region, all the CSO partner/convenors of the national and regional IGF have put substantive effort into building understanding of internet governance issues among parliamentarians and to make them important stakeholders. The 2008 and 2009 regional EAIGFs both had a internet governance forum for parliamentarians, and there are plans to take another delegation of parliamentarians from the region to the 2010 IGF in Vilnius. One of the spinoffs in Kenya is that you have more parliamentarians raising questions about the continued high costs of access, and making the connection between delivery of the national development needs and the access to ICTs. This has led, for example, to new agreements between the Communications Commission of Kenya (CCK) and the Kenyan Institute of Education around providing spaces for online curriculum development.

Parliamentarians' growing understanding of IG and ICT4D issues also yielded requests for Kictanet to subscribe members from outside the traditional ICTs stakeholder groups, and located instead in the energy sectors, marine affairs, and so forth. However, without further funding, Kictanet has not capacity to ensure that the new subscribers gain value from the list – such as continuing to provide weekly or monthly summaries of the debates and exploring the relevance for and link with development. Instead, new subscribers have to make their own sense of the debate which can be highly technical on, for example, ccTLDs. That is opportunity lost to broaden the understanding of how ICT and IG impacts on development and – from a social justice perspective - the inclusion of marginalised communities, or to develop shared understanding of the internet governance and development challenges in the country and region.

The current focus on strengthening ccTLDs led to new alliances between the East African CICEWA partners (especially in Kenya and Uganda) and the technical community, especially in the ccTLD structures and the regulatory authorities. These new relationships also turn on a

---

[14] WOUGNET had been engaged in advocacy for redress of gender discriminiation in the implementatiion of the RCDF, a process that started with the CATIA component on developing multistakeholder ICT advocacy coordinated by APC in 200X to 200Y.

[15]   See "UCC / WOUGNET Partner to sensitize the Girl Child about Gender and ICTs", at
    http://www.wougnet.org/cms/content/view/358/39

growing understanding within the technical community of internet governance issues. This is true for Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania (Interview with Alice Munyua).

With respect to Rwanda, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) representative in the Rwandan Development Board – Information and Communication Technology (RDB-IT) played a pivotal role in getting the state and other stakeholders to take the national IGF process seriously. JICA had supported the participation of East African parliamentarians in the regional and global IGFs in 2008 and 2009. In 2010, a more experienced JICA official joined the RDB-IT and was able to use his position – i.e. as a donor providing technical assistance on ICT4D to the Rwandan government - to effect positive collaboration and to shift the dynamic within 2 months and leverage support for a Rwandan national IGF. Before that, the CICEWA researcher and advocate – being located outside the state – made very slow and negligible progress: "And that's ok. When we did the multistakeholder handbook for the CATIA project, we observed that in some advocacy spaces – like Kenya and Uganda – civil society will take the lead, in the others (like Burundi) it will be the private sector. In Rwanda its clearly the government" (Interview with Alice Munyua).

Rwanda now has an 8 member multistakeholder team – involving 2 members from the private sector, the public sector, academia and the civil society – with a government-appointed chairperson from the Kigali Institute of Technology (KIST). The role of the CICEWA researcher in 2008 and 2009 was recognised and secured him a place in the newly constituted multi-stakeholder working group that will organise the 2011 East African IGF which the Rwandan government committed itself to hosting.[16] The committee also brought in the national association of local government authorities, called LARGA, as one of the civil society stakeholders.

With the exception of Tanzania, it is evident that national level alliances around internet governance are progressively being strengthened in East Africa. At the regional level too, new relationship are being forged with diverse Burundian stakeholders. Private sector actors from Burundi have contacted Kictanet for support in building a strategy for raising IG awareness and alliances[17] and participated in the 2010 EAIGF. In 2009, a representative from the Burundi Ministry of Transport, Post and Telecommunications also participated in the regional IGF held in Nairobi.

3. *Increased capacity for research and data analysis from a social justice perspective*

---

[16] This offer by the Rwandan government to host was made at the 2010 East Africa IGF in August 2010.
[17] Interview with Alice Munyua, August 2010.

Respondents from East Africa reported that the CICEWA project improved their capacity for doing policy research and conducting ICT policy advocacy processes, as well as deepened their understanding of an human rights approach to ICT policies: "We understand better now that consumer rights is at the crux of the ccTLD issues. We took the research on ccTLDs and tried to incorporate all these issues – consumer rights and consumer protection, data protection, privacy, access to the internet. So we may be talking about ccTLDs but it is in the context of people having limited access to the internet. So we have tried to centre the human rights issues into the way we approach the question of strengthening ccTLDs." (Interview with Alice Munyua).

As part of its advocacy strategy, the I-Network developed a practice of writing position papers – incorporating the views of select key informants and the results of online opinion polls on ICT4D and internet governance issues - and submitting these to the Ugandan ICT ministry and parliamentarians. Topics are selected from whatever issues are contentious on the i-Network discussion list and for which there are different policy options. (Elisha Wasukira, I-Network Coordinator)

There is however a lag in the extent to which the media or think tanks take up these issues as human rights or social justice issues. Some CICEWA partners report that government institutions are responding to calls – based on social justice arguments - to update their policies: for example, the CCK gender policy now includes a clause on online violence. There is also some public debate in the media about giving cybercrime against women similar treatment as domestic violence, and about reviewing the sexual harassment legislation to add a clause on online harassment. So there is some acknowledgement of the gender aspect of cybercrime and an growing engagement by the public and the media.

The East African CICEWA partners are all agreed on the value of research and evidence-based advocacy, and its importance for building credibility and alliances. This recognition of this relationship is at the core of the CICEWA project and has informed the advocacy irrespective of the internet governance issue – whether that is strengthening ccTLDs or cybercrime and security issues.

4. Problem definition and policy processes resulting in positive policy outcomes

The focus of the regional IGFs from 2008 to 2010 show a shift from a broad focus on access to infrastructure agenda to more specific concerns like weighing in on debates on managing critical internet resources, protection of privacy, cybercrime, and a more nuanced discussion of human

rights issues in the information society in East Africa. While these are themes also discussed in the global internet governance forum, the discussion at the national and EAIGF – and the priority given to these issues - are guided by the understanding of the local and regional challenges.

With the arrival of 3 fiber-optic cables on the East African coast in the last 18 months and plans to expand the terrestrial network, it is inevitable that ICT4D applications and internet governance issues will gain coverage and prominence in policy debates. Besides the challenge of harmonising across different national network infrastructure and regulatory frameworks, governments in the region also have to develop national policies and programmes that promote ICT uptake and usage by citizens and consumers.

In the last 2 years the ccTLD issue rose on the Ugandan and Rwandan governments' agendas as they increasingly regarded it as a national identity issue and an asset that should not be held by private individuals. It has led to the concerted push for ccTLD redelegation in Rwanda and Uganda, while in Kenya the communications legislation was recently amended, to include clauses on internet governance issues like ccTLD management, electronic transactions, and content regulation. The issue was first flagged by Ugandan CSOs at the 2008 IGF when they highlighted the uncertainties and challenges that arise from having the dotUG ccTLD owned and managed by a private individual. This concern led to a research project into challenges confronting ccTLDs in the region, with a view to informing policy-makers and strengthening and protecting ccTLDs against – among others - new gTLDs approved by ICANN. This concern also coloured the 2010 EAIGF participants' responses to proposals for a dotAfrica - and even a dotEAC - domain.

The ccTLD thread is one that spans several years – starting in 2008 - and seems to now be leading to government action, including national policy and even legislation. The national and regional IGFs focus on local issues and the stakeholders' commitment to generate recommendations and actionable points seem to increase the legitimacy of the national and regional IGFs, as evidenced – among others - by the growing participation of senior government officials, regulators, and political leaders.[18] This "local relevance" factor and emerging consensus among government and civil society seems to also be the main reason behind the   increased participation by the technical community and the regulators (among others).

Contrary to what seems like apparent agreement between CSOs and the East african governments on the relevance of internet governance discussions, a similar understanding with

---

[18]   See the report on th EAIGF and the section on the way forward for recommendations at
     http://www.eaigf.or.ke/files/EAIGF_2010_Report.pdf

the private sector waxed and waned. The participation of the private sector in national and regional internet governance fora still lags behind and would likely require more advocacy about the relevance of internet governance to, among others, the cost of running business. Collaboration between CSOs and the private sector was strong in the early 2000s when the governments in the region were less accessible and ICT policy documents were still "top secret." In the current – more open – context, it has become more difficult to draw the larger East African private-sector into the internet governance policy debate.

More recently, the EAICTD partners have struggled to find support from the traditional ICT4 donors for the national and regional IGF processes. Traditional ICT4D donors have shifted to other issues such as, among others, the MDGs, poverty alleviation and climate change, and suggests a divergent understanding of the the importance of ICTs and internet governance for development. Donor targeted advocacy on internet governance may therefore still be important and advocacy materials on internet governance should be prepared. A positive spin-off is that increased funding by the state institutions and local ICTs business does imply a growing understanding of and ownership of the process by these stakeholders.

Overall, then, one sees the greatest convergence on the importance of internet governance between East African governments – especially in Uganda and Kenya - and civil society, while the understanding of the private sector and ICT4D donors have not quite coalesced with the emerging importance attached to internet governance issues. That said, there is nevertheless financial support from the private sector for events focussed on internet governance policy debates as the understanding of its relevance penetrates.

5. *Increased visibility of internet governance issues*

The Kenya government has formally offered to host the 2011 global IGF if the UN General Assembly votes to extend the mandate of the UN Internet Governance beyond 2010. Also in 2010, Kenya hosted the 37th ICANN meeting, a "dress-rehearsal" to show that it can host an international internet governance meeting. Another key indicator of the visibility that internet governance is gaining in the region – in large measure a result of the EAICTD advocacy – is the offer by the Rwandan government to host the 2011 East African IGF. And While Burundi was not able to hold a national IGF before the 2010 EAIGF, Burundian government and private sector actors are engaging in the regional internet governance policy debates.

While Tanzania held national IGFs in 2008 and 2009, [19] it had problems mobilising multistakeholder support for a regional IGF process. The second regional IGF – in 2009 – was meant to be hosted by Tanzania but a lack of capacity led to the meeting being hosted by Kicatnet in Nairobi for the second year in a row. In 2010,   Sharing With Other People Network (SWOPNet), the Tanzanian CICEWA partner, conducted an online discussion but did not manage to convene a national IGF meeting. According to Abubakar Karsan of SWOPNeT, the upcoming elections in Tanzania has consumed most of the people's attention. Further, while there may be some public awareness of internet governance issues, donor funding is mostly targeted at elections-related activities in the lead-up to the elections. And while the communications ministry has been open to engagement, "most politicians - especially at the local level - do not understand the internet governance issues and see it as having to do with computers." Overall, however, the most visible debates in Tanzanian still are more focussed on affordable access and ICT4D applications – in agriculture, education, health, and so forth. SWOPNeT itself - and the donors who support them - were very engaged in drafting and making submissions to parliament on a media services bill as well as freedom of information legislation (Interview with Abubakar Karsan).

The CICEWA partners invited parliamentarians to every previous regional IGF and hosted a parliamentary forum on internet governance since 2008. This has had a positive spin off with Kenyan parliamentarians raising the profile of ICT4D and internet governance issues by asking more questions about continuing high costs broadband costs and the uptake and application of broadband by other development sectors like agriculture, education etc. More Kenyan people from other sectors have joined the Kictanet discussion list, thus making it possible – at least - to deepen understanding of the relevance of ICT4 and internet governance for development. However, the lack of door funding means that the civil society actors no longer have the capacity to regularly summarise and break down the relevance of the list debates for advancing a development and human rights agenda.

One of the biggest push factors in the region was the landing of 3 fiber-optic cables on the East African coast in the last year: the privately funded Seacom cable, the East African Marine Cable System (EASSy) funded by the private-sector arm of the World Bank and regional telecommunications companies, and The East African Marine System (Teams) spearheaded by the Kenyan government (in response to the EASSy cable and based on its view that the terms are too favourable to South Africa). The cable landings have shifted the policy debates from the call for "access" and opened the dialogue space to new issues, including frameworks for how people make use of all this broadband access. One example - though contrary to a human rights approach to content matters and online privacy issues – is the apparent convergence among

---

[19]   See the 2009 report at http://www.eaigf.or.ke/images/NIGF/2009/Tanzania_Nigf.pdf

different Kenyan stakeholders about the need for content monitoring and regulation in broadcasting, on mobile networks as well as on the internet. The stance emanates from the role of radio and print journalists as well as mobile phone users and platforms in spreading hate messages during the 2008 post election violence. While undoubtedly there are dissenting voices they are not very visible or audible in the EAIGF space. Security concerns seems to outweigh freedom of expression concerns and also underscores acceptance of the call for the registration of all simcard (from an approach where people routinely bought and discarded multiple sim cards.

In conclusion, the EAICTD seemed to have run an advocacy strategy that yielded positive outcomes on a number of different fronts. While there is uneven understanding and capacity to run an advocacy campaign on – and build alliances around - internet governance between, say Uganda and Tanzania, there is nevertheless a heightened awareness of internet governance issues awareness across the region. One can reasonably expect this to have a positive spin-of in Burundi and Tanzania in the next few year.

If there is one element that would need strengthening it would be to advance a more nuanced social justice analysis of a number of the issues that are newly emerging in the region, such as for example, the issues of privacy as against the push for a security agenda. The argument for content regulation in Kenya, for example, needs to be tempered through a critical engagement with human rights activists who similarly share the goals of avoiding and discouraging ethnicity-based violence such as Kenya experienced in 2008.

B. GOREeTIC

The GOREeTIC network focussed their advocacy on the need to establishment and/or effi ciently manage the UAFs in Benin, Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville, Mali, Niger, and Senegal. [20]

The issue was first identified in mid 2008 while the telecoms reform research was underway . At the time, the GOREeTIC members organised an online advocacy training and embarked engaged in some fact finding on the national UAFs.

For the second advocacy phase, the GOREeTIC members undertook to engage in awareness-raising, based on their results of their research, and to continue with their advocacy for cheaper access and the role of the UAFs in facilitating affordable access.

---

[20] For this report, we were only able to interview the GOREeTIC partners in Niger, Cameroon and Senegal. The 3 interviews were conducted by Lisa Cyr in the APC Communications team and the notes translated into English for this author.

1. Strengthened capacity

For most of the members of the GOREeTIC network, the September 2009 advocacy training workshop in Douala around the national Universal Access Funds was their first opportunity to reflect on possible strategies to influence boundary partners (or target groups). The partner in Niger noted that "[o]ur organization has always been a strong organization because we believe in the work we do. Internally, we have good human resources and have the necessary resources to lead an advocacy campaign. But the CICEWA project helped increase our organizational capacity, especially where advocacy techniques were concerned." (Interview with Wilfrid Mama, Niger)

Some of the GOREeTIC partners – like ProtegeQV in Cameroun and Alternatives Niger - arranged further workshops to share their learnings with other staff in their organisations as well as their advocacy networks, thus reinforcing and embedding the newly acquired skills and capacities.

In Niger, a coup d'etat necessitated a change of focus and strategy – one of the indicators of organisational capacity is the ability to read the political context and to shift and re-organise activities and advocacy in response to changes in the political context - and to work more closely with women and youth. The political turmoil and the inability to do any awareness raising on UAFs – as planned – led Alternatives Niger to refocus their activities to (I) provide advocacy training for youth and women already involved in a radio-based education programme that is focused on ICTs and (ii) to host radio debates on issues of ICT access and invite guests from different stakeholder groups (like consumer associations, ICT industry associations, and civil society).[21]

> "Here we have changed the orientation of our project – we went through some political difficulties (a coup d'etat) and the authorities were more concerned with political issues than what we were concentrating on, so we really focussed our work on youth and women. … Our biggest success was easily training the youth and getting the youth engaged. For me this was the most rewarding and interesting work – to see the enthusiasm this generated for them, especially the technical advocacy campaigns. Many did not even know what advocacy was, many of them are students and so they were very happy to learn about this and how its done. If I were to go through a process like this again, I would say one of the most important things would be even more training on advocacy. Especially since we are then training others, I think I could have gained from more training on the issues, on advocacy and so on. This to me was the most important

---

[21]   Email communication from Wilfrid Mama.

aspect of the CICEWA project and what I would focus on if I were to do it again.(Interview with Wilfrid Mama).

This decision to refocus the advocacy - and to include a capacity building component targeting women and youth – demonstrates the strength and confidence of the GOREeTIC partner to change direction when the political situation made it impossible to implement the UAF advocacy plans. The GOREeTIC partner still managed to raise awareness about the ICT access issues but had to go to a target audience that were probably at the margins of the original advocacy strategy.

In Cameroon and Niger, the GOREeTIC partners built others' advocacy capacity as well as that of their own staff. In both cases too, the changes in the political context demanded some resourcefulness – to which the partners were able to respond to. In the case of Senegal, the GOREeTIC advocacy contributed to the naming by the President of a candidate to lead the Universal Service Fund.

2. Strengthened alliances

GOREeTIC members who were interviewed reported that their profi le in the national ICT sector – and for some n the region - had increased as a result of their participation in the CICEWA research and advocacy on the UAFs. Within a multistakeholder approach, access to the political leadership and policy-makers are key to any strategy to have advance your positions and issues . The network members are therefore mindful of and actively seeking to strengthen access to and relations with the ICT ministries. These also have powerful spin-offs for organisational capacity: Thus ProtegeQV notes that "[t]he fact that we met with the minister of telecoms and other personalities in the sector has changed our place in the ICT sector. It legitimized us and gave us more importance within the sector, and people took us more seriously because our research had new and precise numbers. We spoke to the old and new minister, and were asked to share the information with them. It also allowed us to get support by the minister for our new projects.

This research and advocacy also had positive outcomes for relationships with other CSOs in the ICT4D sector. For ProtegeQV, the research and advocacy campaign was a catalyst for developing a closer relationship with a regional grouping like the African Civil Society for the Information Society (ACSIS): "[w]e had no relations with them but we invited them to the Software Freedom Day 2009, and the advocacy workshop and so since that time, we've been working together. ACSIS is a great contact to help diffuse things, events, etc. And they consider us experts in the field. Through ACSIS, we will invite other organizations and so on, and ACSIS invites Protege QV

to come speak about UAF and the CICEWA research."

For Oridev (in Benin), the partnerships within the GOREeTIC network are as valued as those with other national partners: "[t] he org has come out of the project much more strengthened and able due to the fact that new partnerships were formed with other organisations with similar objectives that all worked on the CICEWA project. Oridev is now a part of the GOREeTIC network, and through that relationship, two studies were carried out." Further, '[o] ur network and support base has grown simply by working with other organisations who now know and support our cause even if they are not ICT related organisations, such as Créaction Bénin and Nouvelles perspectives Afrique which is a civil society organisation that does advocacy work on many issues."

Niger made extensive use of radio broadcasting in its advocacy campaign: "The radio debates were quite successful and made people think about the big questions related to access. The youth got so engaged they actually requested a national forum on universal access – and the minister supports this." These debates also led to deeper understanding with the radio sector and other media about the UAF, the telecommunications sector. But the reach was also beyond the mainstream into more marginalised communities: "We realized that there were many other people that were concerned with the price of broadband and UAFs and so on that did not speak French, and so we also organized debates in our national language and why they should advocate for this."

In the aftermath of the military coup, Alternatives Niger has managed to get the support of the new Communications Minister for a forum that will bring together all the stakeholders including the trained youth, telecoms operators, consumer groups, and will be opened by the Minister. The event had to be postponed a number of times – due to the coup, and then an accident of the Alternatives Niger coordinator – and is scheduled for September 2010. The purpose of the forum is to return to the advocacy for greater efficiency and transparency in managing the universal service fund (Email communication from Wilfrid Mama).

The GOREeTIC partners used different means to build awareness of the issues and to create new possible allies. Radio was often used as the main medium for awareness raising in Niger and Cameroon, while the Senegal partner favoured informal face to face meetings. The drawback with radio while you reach large number is that – in the absence of a specific campaign – is that you cannot be certain about who will commit to your campaign. In the absence of an established recognised political leadership this is probably the only avenue for building awareness of the issue. In Senegal, in contrast, working with a known and recognised political elite, the strategy to approach people close to the policy process in face to face meetings was likely to yield results. Which it did, in some respects.

3. *Increased capacity for research and data analysis from a social justice perspective*

Members of the GOREeTIC network reported n increased confidence in doing research and advocacy. Some like ProtegeQV had never been involved in research projects before: "In terms of organizational capacity, we worked on a UAF study – this increased our research capacity skills as well as how to present research. This required us to learn how to do this type of work, something we had never done." ProtegeQV used their participation in the CICEWA project to build a new skill that has since led to new opportunities for conducting research – in an IDRC funded project where they will study the impact of education in rural areas - and with that the potential for ongoing engagement with a new Minister of Communications. "Research certainly raised our awareness about what is going on. The government has already installed 34 telecenters and will install 300 within cameroon. The fact that we worked on CICEWA made us question this community approach and how effective it is at improving access for the population. It is at this point that we proposed this research to the IDRC within the Amy Mahan project. To me, this is one of the biggest results of the CICEWA project."

In other contexts however, access to information was a major problem and hampered the research and advocacy. In Benin, staff within Benin Telecom would only speak on condition of anonymity. In Senegal, "every time we needed to speak to someone from the government or a journalist, there was a fee to it. As a result, our funds ran out more quickly than calculated (so budgeting was a problem), and the information we needed was always hard to get a hold of." (Interview with Coura Fall)

4. *Increased support for a specific problem definition and policy solutions/options*

In terms of access to politicians and the opportunity to engage in policy debate with government officials, the experiences of the GOREeTIC network in the different participating countries are varied. In Niger, the sudden changes in the political landscape – while a set back in some respects – also created new opportunity for engagement:

> "Our role as researchers and advocates in the process of telecoms reform are important in order to change the opinion of decision makers. There are many different ways to do this, and I think the most efficient and sure fire way to do this is by mobilizing people to advocate. There the reflection day that we will organize because things are a bit calmer now, and with the support of the minister, I think the reflection day will lead to results. We now have more confidence and she can already be considered as an ally, though no

concrete changes have taken place yet in terms of drafting laws. The regime is currently under transition and so there actually are no laws, in a way. So we are only half way now and the transition will end in March 2011 so there is still time to influence the creation of new laws."

There are also some indications of how the new telecommunications Minister may approach the issue: "In the minister's last two messages, she has insisted very much on NICTs and universal access. Soon we will have a much faster connection in the north, which will open up the country." (Interview with Wilfrid Mama).

In Senegal, similarly, the advocacy for better management of the UAF found a sympathetic audience in the telecommunications ministry. Advocacy efforts targeted the regulator (ARTP), parliamentarians and associations and leaders in the ICT sector and calling for regulatory mechanisms and framework for the universal access funds, use of the funds, and advance universal access to ICT infrastructure. These efforts have helped bring about a decision to appoint the director and chairperson on the executive committee of the universal access fund [22] and to launch a pilot project to bring telecoms to under-serviced areas. [23]

In Cameroon, ProtegeQV is engaged in more discussions with the policy-makers though its not yet clear whether this will lead to a meeting of minds on the ICT policy agenda. So far however, the newly established rapport has already yielded financial support from the communications ministry for a ProtegeQV project, and indicates - at the least - some shared notions about the dimension of the problem and ways to address these.

In Benin, in contrast, it is difficult to say whether or not support for the cause has grown, and the link between ICT and development has not been sufficiently made: "With the up-coming elections, lots of attention has been placed on the presidential race and what people on the ground want and need; and since telecommunications laws are not seen as something that affects people on the ground, it gets overlooked." Advocacy efforts in Benin were further hampered by the lack of opportunity to meet the key people in the sector: "When we did however they said they would develop a structure that could manage universal access funds, but we have yet to see this happen." (Interview with Barnabe Affougnon)

The overall lesson that emerges from the GOREeTIC partners' experiences in the West and Central African region is that the best laid advocacy plans can come up again the political realities, which can deflect attention away from the advocacy issue. In Niger and Benin, the coup and the elections in these countries show how an advocacy campaign can be eclipsed when it

---

[22]   See the news article at http://www.lesoleil.sn/article.php3?id_article=56281
[23]   See http://www.aps.sn/spip.php?article68312

bumps up against political instability or shifts in the political landscape. But, equally, the experiences in Niger and Cameroon also show that, with perseverance and patience, it is possible to regain ground lost during changes in the political leadership.

5. *Increased visibility of the Universal Access Funds issue leading to positive policy outcomes*

The visibility of an issue is influenced by a range of factors: how much advocacy there is around it, whether the media understands and takes up the issue, whether consumers understand its potential and demand affordable access, whether politicians and policy-makers feel in any way compelled to address the issue, and the overall political context within which the advocacy is conducted.

It   is clear there is still much do to among politicians and consumers in Benin to raise the profile of affordable ICT access and argue the link between ICTs – and specifically broadband - and development. For OriDev, the upcoming elections and the debates on politicians' elections platforms may provide an opportunity to advocate on cheaper access to ICTs: "We'll also be monitoring [election platforms], and those candidates who do not focus on the development of the telecommunications sector and ensure that it is integrated into their policies, will be targeted in the media." (Interview with Barnabe Affougnon)

For ProtegeQV, managing the transition from one political leader to another appear to have been smooth, and relations with the outgoing minister and other high placed officials could be picked up with the incoming politicians and policy-makers. The research and advocacy had raised the profile of the organisation and the UAF advocacy agenda could be pursued further, and even lead to some collaboration between ProtegeQV and the new minister

In Niger, in contrast, the coup d'etat radically reshaped the political context, brought in new people and with that new alliances that have to be built with the politicians, some from scratch, starting with trying to fin common ground in understanding and defining the problem, and defining the possible solutions:

> "When we had started this information research project, before the coup happened, we were almost there. We were about to obtain signatures with the minister of communications who was about to sign a decree that ordered the Regulation agency to use the universal access funds. So we did all this work and now we need to start over, even if some of the work had been done. We are not back at square one but not far from it." (Interview with Wilfrid Mama)

The second advocacy phase of the GOREeTIC members was really focussed on raising awareness about the universal service funds, drawing on the results of the UAF research in the 5 countries. In order to persuade politicians and policy-makers of one's cause and argument it is important to gain access to the people you need to influence. The Benin experience show how impossible it is when politicians are canvassing for votes, and/or in a context where the role of ICTs for development is poorly understood or not valued.

Across the region - and aggregating the experiences of the GOREeTIC partners - one does not get a sense of the UAF advocacy having been a success, not in any significant way. Certainly there is no sense of heightened awareness of the problems of surrounding UAFs in the ECOWAS region, in the same way that internet governance gained exposure in the East African region. Also, the efforts of the 5 partners were implemented in isolation, with no real time or attempt to catalyse any regional energy and collaboration around UAFs and their potential role in facilitating ICT access in under-served or marginal areas.

7. Summary/Conclusion

The administration and coordination of the advocacy in the 2 regions diverged significantly: in the East African region, Kictanet played a key role in coordinating the advocacy. In the West and Central African region, the GOREeTIC network members decided on a different model and to forego regional coordination. Instead, each had an independent contract and budget to implement a national UAF advocacy plan. These administrative arrangements also seem to have had their effect on the quality of the work.

Between the two, the East African model yielded more verifiable and positive outcomes and demonstrate the value of strong regional coordination, of forging a network where members hold each other accountable and where skills and experience is shared. Aside from the difficulties that flow from interacting with a Francophone network and having to navigate a language barrier, the dispersed uncoordinated model of the West and Central African region resulted in implementation delays as the team did not seem to share experiences or hold each other accountable.

According to Coura Fall: "Face to face meetings and workshops went very well – and I feel we would have needed more face to face workshops in order for better follow up and better results. It's too easy for people to go back home and forget about their commitments if they don't see you in person. There were quite a few challenges actually, because regional coordination was not

properly carried out ..."[24]

Thus the impact of the GOREeTIC network's advocacy on Universal Service Funds - where carried out – was very localised and lacking any of the potential to stimulate a regional policy dialogue on how to improve the practice of using the UFS to advance universal access. This is contrasted with the East African process where a group of core institutions maintained a common agenda – focussed on the delivery of a regional East African IGF as (i) an advocacy agenda in itself and (ii) a means for advancing advocacy on specific internet governance issues (such as strengthening ccTLDs, the need for regional IXPs, etc) - and together managed to raise the profile of the issues nationally and regionally.

APC's CIPP team also lacked internal capacity to effectively support a francophone African ICT policy research and advocacy network. The relationships with the GOREeTIC member were conducted through third parties – to read and comment on the research, to conduct the evaluation interviews – all of which created a barrier to more open and regular communicattion between the research and advocacy coordinators, and the members of the GOREeTIC network.

In term of the outcomes and the outcome categories in the two regions, the following picture emerges:

In East Africa:

- If one had to pick the outcome category best achieved by the members the EAICTD it would be the visibility they brought to internet governance issues.
- One sees a significant shift in the policy posture of governments in the East African region – in the majority of them – towards the internet governance issue as well as participating in multi-staeholder processes involving civil society and private sector stakeholders. This is evident in the increased visibility of internet governance issue especially in Uganda and Kenya, and the credibility EAICTD partners gained from launching an advocacy campaign that is well rooted in research. The Kenyan governments decision to host the 2010 ICANN meeting, the offer to host the 2011 global IGF, and

---

[24]   Interview conducted by Lisa Cyr.

the Rwandan government's offer to host the 2011 EAIGF are all testament to the how the governments have shifted their positions.

- Supported by the research findings there is a convergence of opinions between governments and civil society (and to a lesser extent the private sector) on the key internet governance question of how to deliver more affordable access to the citizens/consumers. This has also led to different stakeholders seeking closer collaboration. Civil society advocates are co-opted onto government task forces.

- There is good collaboration between civil society organisations within the ICT for Development sector. There is however a lot of work that still needs to be done to bring the non-ICT sector based organisations into the process and to advocate for the affordable access to ICTs as an enabler of development and citizen participation.

In West and Central Africa:

- It is difficult to assess the influence of the GOREeTIC member - and consequent shifts in the policy positions of politicians - because of the changes in and unpredictability of the political contexts in which they had to function over the last year: elections in Benin, a coup d'etat in Niger, and a change in the political leadership of the Communications Ministry in Cameroon. In Benin, the GOREeTIC member could not gain access to politicians in order to advance an advocacy position.

- The one outcome category where the GOREeTIC members can be said to demonstrate their ability was their capacity to adapt to a politically unpredictable and changing environment where their campaign came up against the political realities – as for example in Niger and Cameroon.

- From the reports of the GOREeTIC members in Benin and Niger, it appears some progress has been made to foster deeper understanding of civil society organisations of the value of ICTs in enabling delivery. However, in the absence of a sustained advocacy campaign and media statements from other civil society organisations about ICT4D and UAFs, it is difficult to make an independent judgement.

- The unpredictable political landscape also makes it difficult to judge the behaviour of boundary partners when the GOREeTIC members were constrained in their ability to implement an advocacy campaign.

The **key lessons** on advocacy one can extract from this project are that:

- Strong regional coordination is imperative for multi-country projects, and more so when they are implemented over multiple years.

- Advocacy plans can bump up against political realities which can deflect attention away from the advocacy issue and make it difficult to discern the impact of any of the advocacy activities. It is important that civil society organisation have the capacity to adjust the campaign as best possible and still attain some of the advocacy goals.

- Advocacy campaigns can shift focus, starting with one issue and ending with another. This project was conceived as an oportunity to advance access to broadband by examining why national level telecoms reforms did not yield the expected benefits – increased competition, costs reductions, etc- but at then shifted in the advocacy from telecoms reform to internet governance (in East Africa) and universal access funds (in West and Central Africa). Such shifts are linked to how network members read the political and policy landscape, and their judgements of what is the most strategic way to advance the advocacy agenda.

8. Annexe

ATELIER DE PREPARATION AU PLAIDOYER SUR LES TICpD DU RESEAU GOREeTIC (AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST ET CENTRALE)
02 au 04 septembre 2009 – Hôtel SOMATEL Douala, Cameroun

....

PLAN DE PLAIDOYER DE GOREeTIC

Axe stratégique N°1 : advocate to maintain existing infrastructure and the deployment of infrastructure in under-served and rural areas

country	Objectives	Activities	Targets	Moyens (USD)	Deadline	Indicateurs de réalisation
BENIN	Contribute to a better converage and deployment of ICT infrastrcutre in rural and hart to reach areas.	Press releases, press articles, radio interviews	Journalistes, organisations de la société civile ou non Les décideurs politiques (Sbee, bénin télécom sa, ministère de la communication et de la promotion des tics, agence de régulation.	700	30 Novembre	Rapport d'activité.
CAMEROUN	Bring decision makers and other figures to see the importance of the problem and strive to improve the actual situation.	Information meetings on the problems and issues due to a lack of infrastrcture	Agences de presse, journalistes Parlementaires, ministères concernés, agence de regulation	200	31/12/09	Rapport de réunion
CONGO	Bring decision-makers and telecoms operators to see the importance of ICT for the econoomic and social developemnt in rural and underserved areas	Press articles to disseminate results on the CICEWA and UAF reserach. Info exchanges on the impact of ICTs on social and economic development with a focus on the	Journalistes, société civile, public en général Décideurs politiques (Ministères PTT et communication, Ministère de la femme) compagnies de télécommunications, organisations de TIC de la société civile, organisations	1000	30/11/2009	Rapport de réunion

		deployment of ICT infrastructure in rural and underserved areas.	des Nations Unies, Ambassades			
MALI	Bring decision makers to assume their responsibilities in the timely implementation of ICT infrastructure in underserved areas.	Diffusing research results of the UAF research : mail, press Distribute the research document	Les organisations des la société civile dans le domaine des TIC L'AGETIC Le CRT La commission parlementaire pour les TIC	300	30/11/09	PV de rencontre
NIGER	Bring decision makers (including the president of the republic) to take firm decisions in order for underserved areas to be serviced. Bring the State to update its infrastructure (mainteance, repairs, replacement, etc.) Bring the minister of communication to order the ARM to manage the UAF.	Organise a day for refletion for restitution and diffusion of the CICEWA research Organise a radio debate on the subject Dissemination of the synthesis and reserach by mail and written press	Médias Gouvernement (décideurs) Opérateurs Tic et Télécoms Autorité de régulation Organisations du secteur des TIC Société civile Associations de consommateurs Personnes ressources	2500	31 décembre 2009	Rapport de la journée de réflexion
SENEGAL	Bring the high authorites and heads of state to make firm decisions to name the president	Organise an event on the UAF to disseminate research to the media,	Coordinateur TIC de la SCA(Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée)	2000	FIN OCTOBRE	Rapport de la rencontre et Publications de la Presse

	of the UAF in order to roll out service in under-served areas.	state and non state actors, ICT and telecoms operators, etc. Disseminate research dcoument via mail Oganise a radio debate in the most popular radio station	Médias Gouvernement (décideurs) Opérateurs Tic et Télécoms Autorité de régulation Société civile Associations de consommateurs Patronat			Enregistrement de l'émission radio

Axe stratégique N°2 : Advocate for more transparency by the regulators and resource management for the development of the ICT and telecoms sector

Pays	Objectifs	Activités	Cibles	Moyens (USD)	Délai	Indicateurs de réalisation
CAMEROUN	Improve transparency related to the financial management of the funds	Dissemination in various forms on rsearch UAF results on the web, pamphlets, press articles Table-ronde télévisée sur le FSU (montants supposés mobilisés pour le FSU et leur utilisation)	Journalistes, organisations de la société civile Journalistes, organisations de la société civile, ART, opérateurs, MINPOSTEL	500	30 novembre 2009	Copies des publications, liens internet DVD copie de l'émission
MALI	Make missions and activities of the CRT public ▪	▪ Lobbying Radio debates	Journalistes CRT	600	30 Novembre 2009	Copies des correspondences

			Parlementaires Les organisations TIC de la société civile				
NIGER	Amener les autorités compétentes en la matière à rendre accessibles les informations relatives à la mobilisation et à la gestion des ressources.	▪ Organising a debate conference ▪ Radio debate Contributing to written press Actions de Lobbying	▪ Médias Parlementaires Gouvernement Autorité de régulation Opérateurs Tic et Télécoms Organisations du secteur des TIC Société civile Associations de consommateurs Personnes ressources	**500**	30 novembre 2009	▪ ▪	Rapport Copie du débat en format numérique Coupures de presse ou liens internet des publications
SENEGAL	Make the actions of the ARTP and how it is managing the UAF funds visible to the public.	▪ Special radio community show ▪ Contribute to newspapers ▪ Meet personally with identified targets ▪ Lobbying	▪ Parlementaires ▪ Décideurs (Etat) ARTP Autorités religieuses Bailleurs de fonds Opérateurs Tic et Télécoms	**500**	NOVEMBRE voir possibilité de le faire lors de IGF national organisé par le Ministère en novembre		Revue de presse traitant le sujet Enregistrement de l'émission radio

Axe stratégique N°3 : Advocate to have ICT and telecommunications laws and regulations updated, in order to optimize the administration of UAF and adequate coordination at the sub regional level

Pays	Objectifs	Activités	Cibles	Moyens (USD)	Délais	Indicateurs de réalisation
BENIN	Make those in charge of laws create laws for the administration of the UAF

Convince decision makers to accelerate the implementation of the UAF administration body. | ▪ Dissemination to the press through articles and interviews.
▪ Radio debates
▪ Meetings with ICT people in Benin to let them now about Goretic and the UAF work | ▪ Agences de presse, journalistes
▪ Ministère concerné, l'Agence de régulation et les organisations TIC de la société civile
▪ Parlementaires | 800 | 30 Novembre 2009 | Articles de Presse Bande enregistrée de l'émission |
| **CAMEROUN** | Update laws to solve the problems identified in reseaerch | Analyse the legal frame and elaborate a proposal document to bring to the government. | Organisations de la société civile oeuvrant dans le secteur, juristes | 1000 | 30 novembre 2009 | Document transmis aux autorités |
| **CONGO** | Follow-up on the application of laws that were recently adopted by the parliament on telecommunicatios and create an autonomous regulatory body | Analyse newly adopted laws   ▪ Write a analysis note on the implications of these for telecetnres and communities. Sned a note to the ministre | Ministère des PTT Organisations internationales qui financent le secteur des TIC au Congo | 500 | 31 Octobre 2009 | Rapports de réunions

Document d'analyse |

		of telecommunications and other parties Meeting with civil society to discuss strategy Direct advocacy to the minster of telecommunications				
MALI	Bring authorities to create laws and regulations for the implementation of the UAF	▪ lobbying ▪ Radio debates	▪ Ministère de la communication, AGETIC CRT Organisations TIC de la société civile	600	15/12/2009	▪ Enregistrement ▪ Emission PV de rencontres
NIGER	Bring authorities to give the ARM real and full power, including the administration of the UAF funds.	▪ Organise an information exchange workshop in collaboration with the ARM and the ministry of communicaitons.	▪ Parlementaires Gouvernement Autorité de régulation Médias Organisations du secteur des TIC Société civile Associations de consommateurs Personnes ressources	**500**	30 novembre 2009	Rapport de l'atelier
SENEGAL	Encourage fair and harmonious laws and regulations and	Organise an infromation breakfast	ARTP Association de consommateurs		NOVEMBRE	Rapport de la rencontre

				500		
	communicate the ew ICT and telecoms code	with the ARTO and the ministry about the new ICT code	Ministère de tutelle Opérateurs Tic et Télécoms Médias	**500**		

Axe stratégique N°4 : Build the capacity of media and non government actors to advocate for ICT4D

Pays	Objectifs	Activités	Cibles	Moyens (USD)	Date ou délai de réalisation	Indicateurs de réalisation
BENIN	Give the neceesary tools so that civil society can advocate properly	Advocacy training workshop	OSC	2500	31 Décembre 2009	▪ Rapport de l'atelier ▪ Photos numériques Couverture audiovisuelle Articles de presse
CAMEROUN	Build a skilled group of SCOs to inflience politics related to ICT4D group onstruire	Training workshop for 15 CSOs related to advcocacy	Organisations de la société civile	2300	31 décembre 2009	Rapport de l'atelier
CONGO	Build the capacity of ICT actors to strategically engage in advocacy and adopt a gender perspectice related to ICTs	Training workshop	Ogrnisations TIC , de femmes et de développement	2500	31 Décembre 2009	Rapport de l'atelier

MALI	Build the capacity of ICT actors to advocate Renforcer la capacité	Organisation d'un atelier de formation sur les techniques de plaidoyer pour influencer les politiques.	• Organisations TIC de la société civile • Leaders d'opinion	2500	24 Décembre 2009	Rapport de l'atelier
NIGER	Bring actors to better understand the issues and use technologu to inflience ICT policies.	Organise an advocacy training workshop Produce shows about the information	Société civile • Organisations du secteur des TIC Associations de consommateurs Médias Parlementaires Autorité de regulation	1500	31 décembre 2009	• Rapport de l'atelier • Modules de formation Copie en format numérique de l'émission de sensibilisation
SENEGAL	Build a lobby made up of media and non state actors in order to exert pressure on the government.	Capacity-building workshop for non government actors on ICT related issues.	• Médias ANE	1000	DECEMBRE 2009	Liste des participants et compte-rendu de la formation des journalists

NB : Alternative Niger prendra en charge la différence de 1000 $ sur le coût total estimatif.