Association for Progressive Communications

Evaluation report on

Communications and Information Policy Programme

Prepared by:
Debbie Budlender
Community Agency for Social Enquiry
Cape Town, South Africa

April 2006

Table of contents

Introduction

Background

The overall goal of APC's Communications and Information Policy Programme (CIPP) is to ensure that the interests of civil society are addressed in ICT policy and are supported in ICT practice. When APC first launched its global ICT policy monitor project in 2001, it had three main activity areas:

- monitoring and analysis of ICT policy and regulation: Activities include research, documentation and dissemination; analysis and background papers on a range of topics;
- building knowledge and expertise to enable civil society to take informed part in policy discussions and debate. Activities included development of plain-language documents;
- mobilising participation of civil society organisations to build information society policy and practice that supports social justice and human rights. Activities include working with allies to make interventions in the World Summit on an Information Society (WSIS) process and supporting the establishment of sub-regional WSIS mobilizing networks; interventions in other ICT development / governance bodies; and interventions with relevant social organisations.

Subsequently the goals of CIPP were refined to include a stronger focus on:

- capacity building;
- supporting locally-driven policy advocacy;
- influencing ICT policy from a gender equality perspective; and
- building understanding and collaboration between different groups working on ICT policy at national level, particularly among media, civil society and the private sector.

Work is carried out at three levels:

- regional ICT policy monitor projects in Africa, Latin America & the Caribbean;
- global CIPP and global ICT policy monitor activity; and
- specific projects, including the national ICT policy portal initiative supported by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Commonwealth Telecommunications Union (CTO) civil society capacity building and curriculum development project.

Over the years, APC has been successful in obtaining support from a wide range of donors for CIPP activities. This evaluation focuses, in particular, on CIPP work funded by three donors, as follows:

- the activities of the ICT Policy Monitors in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) supported by HIVOS and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC);
- the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO) civil society capacity building project supported by DFID through Building Digital Opportunities funding to CTO; and
- global networking and advocacy activities supported by Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED) in 2003-4.

The ICT Policy Monitor projects in Africa and Latin America had the following objectives:

- developing an information resource for civil society organisations that wish to be active in ICT policy;
- raising awareness in civil society of ICT policy issues; and
- empowering civil society organisations to develop ICT policy that meets their needs, and to encourage CSOs to lobby for an Information Society that builds social justice and human rights, at national, regional and global level.

The CTO project's objectives were primarily:
- producing an *Internet Policy for Beginners* handbook;
- producing ICT Policy training materials and curriculum for civil society organisations;
- piloting the materials in training workshops

The EED-supported projects focused on three main activities:
- the production of *Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy – the WSIS*,
- APC advocacy efforts, participation and intervention in international fora, specifically the WSIS and the World Social Forum (WSF); and
- national ICT policy portals developed by APC members. (The first national portal project was with Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), with EED support after that.)

The goals of the evaluation as defined by APC were to:
- enable learning that can be channeled into addressing problems and increasing the impact of CIPP activity;
- assess the extent to which APC met the stated goals and deliverables of the project activity being evaluated;
- assess outcomes of APC's CIPP activity in terms of CIPP goals, especially the goal of enabling civil society organisations to engage in ICT policy development to promote an information society based on social justice; and
- assess outcomes of APC's participation in the WSIS process, both at the level of influencing outcomes and raising awareness and building capacity

The evaluation was planned in close consultation with APC staff, and in particular, with the executive director Anriette Esterhuysen. The evaluation process commenced in August 2005, but took much longer than planned. The main reason for the delay was the heavy involvement of both APC and most other informants in WSIS-related activities. This resulted in slow responses, if at all, and the need for many reminders. Eventually, with the assistance of APC staff, an adequate sample of responses from key informants was obtained.

APC requested that the evaluation not be totally restricted to the work under the three specified projects. This makes sense in terms of APC's overall approach, where the different projects – both within CIPP and beyond – are planned to complement each other. (CIPP has strong links with the other two APC programme areas, namely Strategic Use and Capacity Building, and the Women's Networking Support Programme (WNSP). Staff from these projects were included as informants in the evaluation.) The close complementarity is reflected in reports to donors, in which it is sometimes difficult to discern where a particular activity falls. The picture is further complicated by several donors sometimes co-funding particular activities, as well as donors for a particular activity changing over time. In an attempt to retain the desired focus, the first major part of this report is organised according to the specific projects to be evaluated. However, other parts of the report reflect on APC's impact

more generally, while attempting to point out where the particular projects might have played a part.

The report does not attempt to tell the story of each project, or to enumerate everything that has been achieved. This task is well achieved in APC's existing reports to donors, at least as far as narrative reporting is concerned. (Donor and evaluator concerns around indicators are discussed further below.) Output indicators of 'deliverables' rightly form part of monitoring rather than evaluation, as the latter should focus more on 'outcomes' or 'results'. This report therefore does not attempt a careful matching of what was delivered against what was foreseen in project proposals. It is, nevertheless, suggested that this exercise be undertaken both as the basis of future planning and in regular reports to donors as it seems that APC is sometimes being over-ambitious in setting its output targets. Such over-ambition is unnecessary, as the organisation is an active, energetic one that does not need to 'over-claim'.

Another reason for not focusing on what the organisation could itself produce is that one of the main advantages of evaluations is that they offer an organisation a chance to hear 'outside' voices to add to what they themselves know. This feedback is in many ways more important than that of the evaluator. A repetition of facts culled from APC reports or from APC staff thus seems less of a priority than a report on what the various people interviewed said. In addition, because APC is a very active organisation, an enumeration of all activities would make this report even longer than it already is. Instead, in the first main section, the report attempts to draw out particular aspects of the activity worthy of mention in an evaluation.

In line with the original planned timing of the evaluation, the report focuses on activities achieved from 2002 to mid-2005. In particular, it omits activities related to WSIS II in Tunisia except insofar as these were raised spontaneously by informants.

Methodology

The methodology was derived through 'brainstorming' by the evaluator of a wide range of possible ways to obtain information, followed by refining of these ideas through interaction with the APC executive director and other staff. The options were limited by the fact that it was agreed that the evaluator would not travel to meet face-to-face with informants or participate in activities. The final list of methods was as follows:

- Interviews with APC staff;
- Interviews with representatives of member organisations of APC;
- Interviews with representatives of partner organisations (including gender partners) i.e. those with whom APC has worked closely;
- Interviews with representatives of the free software (FOSS) movement;
- Interviews with people involved in the 'civil liberties' agenda;
- Interviews with policy-makers in areas where APC has been active;
- Interviews with trainers on ICT policy;
- Interviews with donors;
- Review (not in-depth) of 'products' such as *ICT Policy for Beginners*, the ICT policy curriculum, the policy web-sites, research papers, policy monitor e-updates, *Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy – the WSIS*; and workshop reports;
- Examination of proposals and reports to donors;

- Cross-categorisation of all the examples of activities in the 2004 annual report; and
- Matrix showing involvement of APC members in CIPP activities.

No budget analysis was done, besides the compilation, by APC staff, of the table below, showing all CIPP funding over the period 2001-2005. Over this period, CIPP was funded to a total amount of US$ 1 648 787. The table reveals the relative size of funding from CTO, EED, HIVOS and IDRC within this overall total, as well as the proportion of CIPP, in budgetary terms, covered by this evaluation. The table excludes a further US$ 103 094 received in 2003 from CIDA, CTO and Open Society Institute (OSI) in respect of an ICT policy workshop for civil society held in Colombia. It also excludes funding received from DFID and DGIS (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and SDC (Swiss Development Cooperation) in 2004-5 for CIPP work not explicitly covered in this evaluation.

CIPP funding, 2001-2005

	CIDA	CTO	EED	Ford	HIVOS	IDRC	OSISA	DFID (CATIA)
2001					42,127	41,533		
2002		8,485			13,216	97,124		
2003		92,234	59,449	42,653	63,048	76,052	59,227	
2004	36,881	37,081	31,409	37,949	81,485	66,875	12,937	211,418
2005			64,916	29,397	61,755	89,757	19,038	272,741
Total	**36,881**	**137,800**	**155,774**	**109,999**	**261,631**	**371,341**	**91,202**	**484,159**

The overwhelming majority of interviews were conducted through email. This approach was adopted because of the expense and time difficulties involved in contacting people around the world, and because the targeted people were all expected to be very email-literate.

As noted above, there was generally a slow response to the email questionnaires. There was a poor to non-existent response from the three people targeted from the 'civil liberties' community Only one responded, saying that she did not have personal knowledge of APC but would forward the questionnaire and a request for responses to the list of the European Digital Rights Initiative, a group of 17 NGOs in Europe working in the field of digital civil rights. Unfortunately, there were no responses to this forwarded request. There were also no useable responses from the four people targeted from the FOSS area. Only one trainer was interviewed specifically about the training. The findings from the other methods are reported below.

There was some discussion around whether to send a request for feedback to a selection of the mailing lists which APC services. The idea was abandoned because of some confusion around which lists would be ideal, as well as a feeling that a request which coincided with WSIS Tunis activities would generate very little response. The APC executive director sent a general message to the APC forum list in mid November 2005 advising recipients about the evaluation and that some of them might be contacted personally. This message asked for volunteers who wished to be interviewed or offer feedback for the evaluation to indicate this. There was one response to this request.

A major challenge in carrying out the evaluation was the surfeit of information. In addition to a multitude of members, partners and other informants to be consulted, there was a multitude of donor reports, a multitude of websites and lists, and a multitude of documents and papers. Evaluation findings suggest that information overload was a problem not only for the evaluator (and contributed to initial low response rates), but also one that could be affecting CIPP's achievements, and that needs to be considered when designing strategies.

The remainder of the report consists of four sections, as follows:
- Activities within focus areas presents findings in respect of activities funded by the three donors;
- Feedback from key constituencies summarises the responses to questionnaires sent to members, partners, policy people, and donors;
- The section 'About APC' provides background information on the organisation and its staffing, as well as feedback from staff;
- The final section presents conclusions and recommendations.

Activities within focus areas

ICT Policy Monitor projects in Africa and Latin America

The idea for the regional monitors project arose out of the success of the European Civil Society Internet rights project in the late 1990s. The LAC and Africa ICT Policy Monitor Projects started in 2001 with support from HIVOS and the IDRC. The specific objectives of the projects were:
- To develop an information resource for civil society organisations (CSOs) on ICT policy;
- To raise awareness among CSOs of ICT policy issues; and
- To empower CSOs to develop ICT policy that meets their needs.

The objectives thus go far beyond the simple establishment of a web-site.

The project was funded by IDRC in the first two years, and subsequently by both IDRC and HIVOS. The proposals for the second period stress that the project would include a focus on the WSIS process.

The monitor web-sites are accessible directly through their own addresses, or through clearly marked content lists on the main APC web-page. In some ways the monitor web-sites are more user-friendly, clearer and easier to navigate than the main APC web-page. On the latter, I (and it seems that some donors feel the same) felt bombarded with two much information on the home page. The signs for navigation from the home page were good in respect of policy and internet rights. However, it seemed that the *Beginners Handbook* was listed together with Annual Reports and the placing of the policy discussion papers was not immediately obvious.

Africa
The English Africa web-site was created in 2001 and was redesigned and relaunched in October 2004. It includes a 'Getting Started' section for new users. It appears to be regularly updated in that each time I visited there was news from that day. There are a large number of news articles – over 88 'pages' in total. Access is facilitated by the ability to browse by country, theme, or both combined. The French Africa site is

much 'smaller'. For example, there are only five as opposed to 88 pages of news. Alternatives, APC's member in Canada and in the Democratic Republic of Congo, assisted with the development of the French web-site.

A 2002 report notes that the Africa ICT Policy Monitor e-Updates were disseminated every fortnight to inform subscribers of new content added to the website. This should also assist users with coping with the multitude of information. At that time the site had content partnerships with Alternatives in Congo, as well as with three non-member organisations (one of these, Wougnet, subsequently became a member) and three news sources. Subsequently content partnerships were formed with the IDRC-supported Research ICT Africa site and with several online newspapers. Chakula was distributed to over 1 000 subscribers consisting of primarily CSOs, government representatives and individuals working for international organisations and/or development agencies. This is a large number, but much less than the 2 000 people promised by end 2004 in a project proposal. However, Chakula is cross-posted to many other lists, which would significantly increase the number of readers. In particular, cross-posting is done to the aisi-l list of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, which would have more than 2 000 recipients.

The newsletter, Chakula, is nicely presented and very readable. Chakula issue no 7 contained 10 pages of useful summaries of WSIS materials. Nevertheless, as with some other APC products, the wealth of information is overwhelming. A separate study would be useful to investigate the extent to which people reading newsletters, listserv alerts, and other similar items subsequently follow up on the full stories.

APC produced four editions of Chakula in 2002, three in 2003, four in 2004 and two in 2005. This was much fewer than planned. A report of mid-2004 explains the reasons for this as shortage of human resources, and the fact that the team decided to focus on the website and on advocacy work related to WSIS. Targets were revised first to 10 and then six issues a year in 2004. These targets were not reached.

Policy Monitor activity is meant to extend beyond provision of information. A HIVOS report of 2004 notes 12 events where APC conducted workshops or made presentations. Of these only one or two were national (in Kenya and perhaps Uganda). Eight of the 12 were held in Africa, although some of these were international events.

The DFID-funded Catalysing ICTs in Africa (CATIA) project started in March 2004, and targeted six countries: Nigeria, Senegal, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya and Mozambique. In July 2004, APC convened a regional ICT policy advocacy workshop in Nairobi as a joint Monitor and CATIA activity. The event was supported by CATIA and the IDRC and brought together 40 participants from civil society, the media and the private sector from more than 10 countries. The policy monitor took the opportunity of the workshop to get feedback on the website, which was subsequently 'revamped'. This reportedly led to a substantial increase in usage (usage figures are provided below). The reports for 2004 and other evidence do not yet suggest as much synergy as could have been hoped for between CATIA and the policy monitor beyond Kenya. This could, however, reflect a gap in the reporting rather than a real lack of interaction between the different projects.

The 2004 HIVOS report records commissioning of several papers, one of which relates directly to Africa, namely the discussion paper by David Souter on 'African

Participation in WSIS'. The paper was commissioned to help frame discussions at the Nairobi policy workshop. The author is clear that this is an outsider view to the extent that he is not from the continent. He had, however, played a key role in the CTO project and so was not an outsider to that extent.

Earlier reports record earlier products of the African project, namely:
- Country reports on ICT policy development for Senegal, Ethiopia, Kenya, Cameroon and Egypt with five more to be completed by the end of March 2003 (Uganda, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Benin and Morocco). The listing of published and unpublished products at the end of this evaluation reveals that the report for Benin was produced, but not the other four additional country reports as APC decided to focus on thematic reports instead. These research reports were intended to be used as the basis for national ICT policy and civil society workshops.
- A booklet for WSIS highlighting African issues, produced together with AMARC, Media Institute for Southern Africa, Article 19 and the SA Communications for Development. The booklet, 'Our side of the divide', was produced in French and English, and 1 500 copies were distributed at the WSIS second PrepCom in Geneva in February 2003. APC contributed to printing costs and participated in the compilation.

In 2003 APC also commissioned studies on FOSS in Africa, Gender and ICT from APC-Africa-Women's network (the African regional network of the WNSP programme), and ICT and HIV/AIDS by an AIDS activist. (A full – and impressive – list of resources produced by the two monitor projects as well as other parts of APC is attached as an appendix to this evaluation report.)

The Africa project is coordinated by Njenga Njuguna, originally full-time but later on a ¾ time basis. Since some time in 2002 Njuguna has been living in Australia where he is studying. From September 2003 to March 2004 he was assisted on the monitor side by Alice Munyua Gitau, who from April 2004 took on coordination of the CATIA project in Kenya. A proposal to IDRC in 2003 suggests that APC would hire someone else, based in Africa and bilingual in English and French, to replace Njenga as manager of the project. This did not happen. The staffing does not seem sustainable given Njenga's location outside the continent and Alice's involvement in another very active project. It is impressive that the project has been able to achieve as much as it has given this limited staff, but is unlikely to have the hoped-for impact in terms of involving civil society rather than simply informing civil society without someone more 'on-the-ground'.

Njenga was the WSIS civil society caucus co-coordinator for Africa during 2003. Up until the end of 2005 Njenga remained a member of the African WSIS civil society working group.

Latin America and the Carribbean
The LAC project was at first coordinated by Roberto Roggiero and later by Raúl Echeberría. Today the LAC project is coordinated on a half-time basis by Valeria Betancourt, who is physically based at APC's Ecuadorian member, Intercom, and previously acted as the LAC project's information coordinator. The LAC monitor has always had a second half-time staff person to work on the website and the newsletter, first Diana Andrade from Intercom, and later Clio Bugel, based in Uruguay.

The LAC website has many similarities to the African one, but also some differences. While there appear to be fewer news items, the LAC website appears stronger in other aspects. In particular, it has a useful collection of resource documents reflecting legislation and policy in different countries. It also has a range of catalogues commissioned by the monitor. The news section appears to be updated very regularly. The website provides information in Spanish, Portuguese and English.

Like Africa, LAC has also produced fewer newsletters than planned – five in 2002, two in 2003, five in 2004, three in 2005, and one so far in 2006. Two reasons are offered for this – a reduction in financial and thus also human resources, and a strategic decision to engage actively in the WSIS process.

The LAC newsletter was said to reach 200 people in 2004 – substantially fewer than the African one. This smaller size is also reflected in the organisational listings of the two sites, where the Africa site has five long pages containing shorts descriptions of organisations. The difference could, however, reflect more careful choosing and focusing in LAC than in Africa, as well as less activity (and fewer countries), so should not be taken too naively as a measure of effectiveness. A quick glance through the African list of organisations reveals that it includes some government agencies, such as a Kenyan ministry, including at least one for which the country is not specified. The much shorter list on the LAC website includes a useful indication next to each organisation's name as to its primary focus, e.g. gender, FOSS, etc. The large numbers for Africa are even more startling in light of the fact that the continent has the poorest access to ICTs, with only 1,5% of the world's personal computers and 1% of its Internet users. There has, however, been much more donor interest and support in Africa than elsewhere. The reports on the LAC website refer repeatedly to the role played by an advisory committee, which probably helps with the focusing. A similar committee is not mentioned in respect of the Africa web-site.

The 2004 HIVOS report notes the commissioning of several research pieces by the LAC monitor, as follows:

- *Social appropriation of telecentres in Sao Paulo* (Brazil*).*
- *The status of internet rights in Latin America and the Caribbean.* (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.).

Another report notes that the original intention was to use the research and other resources produced in the early years as the basis of a proactive outreach campaign to strengthen the network. This was acknowledged as among the weakest aspects of the policy monitor work.

The LAC policy monitor participated in 14 events during 2004, at some of which it was represented by APC members ITeM (Uruguay) and CEPES (Peru). All these events were located in Latin America. At least one was a national event, in Ecuador. The coordinator's location in Ecuador, and being based at the local APC member, seems to have made participation in activities in this country particularly strong. The interaction included work with the Ecuadorian government in building the national position for WSIS II. The HIVOS report also notes participation in regional partnerships and networks. During 2003 Valeria co-coordinated the WSIS LAC civil society caucus with Olinca Marino of Laneta, Mexico.

The Monitor convened two regional workshops, one at its launch in Uruguay in 2001, and another in Argentina in December 2004.

Both websites are well-used. The total number of individual visits for the LAC website for 2003, 2004 and 2005 were 92 920, 85 082 and 76 845 respectively. For the Africa website there is a very clear increase over time, from 38 561 in 2003, to 82 422 and 226 449 visits respectively for 2004 and 2005.

Both African and LAC reports note problems within civil society. In respect of Africa, the report notes that the WSIS civil society caucus 'was ridden with disagreement, lack of trusted leadership, and the inability to make decisions effectively'. Lack of financial resources and language and cultural differences added to the difficulties. In respect of LAC, the context was said to be 'complex, difficult to work with', and to suffer from limited resources and collaboration.

Both the African and LAC teams participated in the production of *Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy* (see further discussion below) The insert: 'Guide to Running a National ICT Policy Consultation for the World Summit on the Information Society', was inspired by the Ecuadorian national process.

One of the documents reviewed for the evaluation presents CIPP's plans for 2005 in a list of 16 items. Because the evaluation does not cover the full year, we will not document the extent to which each of these was covered. However, it is clear that the list was over-ambitious given the size of APC's staff, and the fact that WSIS II was on the cards. Some of the plans for 'new' activities that were not fully achieved during 2005 include development of a South Asia ICT Policy Monitor, revising editorial policy for websites and newsletters. Others are expressed in terms of 'expansion' and so are more difficult to judge and must wait for APC's annual report for 2005.

Unfortunately, there were limited, if any, direct references to the policy monitors in the questionnaire responses of members and partners. Informants might have been referring to the monitors in their general comments on the APC website and other on-line resources discussed below. Further, the questionnaires showed that both members and partners frequently visited the APC web-page, which always highlights new documents on the regional monitors. It could be that for many users the web-site represents a 'package' and they do not see the separate parts clearly. It could also be that the informants targeted – and in particular the partners – are not, for the most part, the primary audience of the policy monitor web-sites.

The CTO project

The CTO project focused on production of materials in the form of the *Internet Policy for Beginners* handbook and training materials, together with piloting of the materials. The agreement with CTO was for a period of eleven months starting 30th October 2002. The contract required monthly reports, but CTO specified that these could take the form of short verbal and email updates. As a result, the reporting for this project was much less comprehensive than that for other donors.

The handbook

The handbook was described in the contract as a 'plain-language guide that will provide a general overview to Internet policy issues oriented to the perspective of civil society organisations (CSOs). This handbook will be essential background reading material, designed to accompany the training curriculum, but it can also stand alone.' The contract contained a detailed list of contents, as well as

specifications as to number of pages and format. This suggests that the contract was preceded by detailed planning and negotiations. The specifications largely seem to have been followed. The contract also specified that the handbook would cover mainly 'more general (static) issues' so that it would not need to be as frequently updated as the workshop materials. As seen below, some informants felt, probably unrealistically, that the handbook should have included updated material. The handbook would be produced in both on-line and hard copy format, and be available in English, French and Portuguese versions to facilitate wide usage in Africa. The funds available were, however, not sufficient to cover a Portuguese version and at the time of finalising the evaluation, English, Spanish and Croatian versions were available, with a French translation near completion. The Croatian translation was done by Zamirnet, APC's member in Croatia, with minimal financial support from APC.

In December 2003 APC published the handbook as a companion volume to the curriculum. More than 800 copies of the handbook were downloaded in the two-week period subsequence to its being placed on the web. By the end of 2005, 6 608 English and 1 031 Spanish copies had been downloaded. In addition 1 000 English hardcopy editions had been distributed.

Two of the ten members responding to the evaluation questionnaire said that they had read the complete *Internet Policy for Beginners*, four had read 'most' of it, one had read half, two had read a bit, and one had not read it at all. Among those who had read it, one said everything was 'new', one said most of it was new, five said half was new, and two said a bit was new. This might seem relatively surprising feedback from people who are mostly engaged on a full-time basis in ICT issues. However, anyone who has looked at the publication will know the level of detail that it contains on a wide range of topics. In addition, APC's earlier research had revealed that many ICT practitioners were intimidated by policy issues.

Six members felt the level of the publication was just right, while three felt it was easy. Eight felt that the length was just right, while one felt it was too long. Overall, these responses suggest that the publication has 'hit the right spot'. However, one of the informants noted that while the content and level were appropriate for him, it would not be suitable for those who were less educated or less versed in ICT-related topics.

Six of the informants said that they had recommended the publication to others. They had, for example, recommended it to staff, partners, members or allies in government.

Several informants also explained how they had used the publication. One had used it to create a national ICT policy network in their country after the national WSIS consultation. One had linked it to their web-site. One had used it as reference material in preparation of workshops. One had used the references to explore issues in more detail. One had used it for self-briefing before attending policy forums.

Suggestions for improvement included a call for more local examples and case studies. One person suggested that the publication be updated on a regular basis, and include information about all policy-related events.

Five of the ten partners had read at least part of *Internet Policy for Beginners*. One had read the full publication, one had read most, and the other three had read only a

bit. One of those who had not read it, tried to find it on the APC website so as to be able to complete the questionnaire but could not. All five readers had found only a 'bit' of the information to be new. Three felt the level was just right, one that it was very easy, and the fifth that it was 'consistent'. Three felt the length was just right while only one felt it was too long. Three said that they had recommended it to others, including their students.

Two readers had suggestions. One recommended it be updated and 'didactical improvements' in the form of questionnaires and quizzes be added. The second suggested summarising, with reference to URLs for further information. This person also suggested more practical examples, with more of a focus on multi-stakeholders and less focus on information and communication rights.

Curriculum
The same CTO contract covers the development of a workshop curriculum. In contrast to the handbook, these materials would need to be able to be easily customised and updated. While the contract did not detail the content of the materials, it stated that it would need to be supplemented with materials customised to needs of specific civil society groupings, such as education groups, women's organisations, media and human rights groups, and the public access sector. The need for customisation was met by using the modular multi-media training kit (MMTK) format and making all the materials available on the web. This need was further met by having both the LAC and Africa policy monitor teams work on the project, and adding materials after the first draft was complete. The topics covered in the curriculum would probably meet the needs of most of the groups specified above, although perhaps not the education groups.

The contract provided for a two-day training session at APC's Africa ICT Policy Workshop at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) in Addis Ababa in November 2002 to test materials, as well as four-day national training events in South Africa and in another country in either Asia or Africa. (Philippines, Bangladesh, Tanzania or Uganda were suggested.) These training events were to be preceded by trainer preparation sessions intended both to 'consolidate' the methodology and expand the team of trainers.

The contract further listed ten events that APC had identified between the date of the contract and September 2003 where training sessions could be delivered in shorter or longer formats, and with different focuses. By September 2003, APC hoped to have at least 100 individuals and 50 organisations from the CSO sector that had undergone basic training in ICT policy.

The Addis APC Africa Policy Monitor workshop duly took place and was co-hosted by APC, UNECA and Article 19. Funding for the meeting was provided by Article 19, the IDRC, and CTO. The Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa (OSISA), the Open Society Initiative of West Africa (OSIWA) and the International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD) sponsored participants. The workshop lasted four days and its overall aim was to build knowledge and expertise of civil society organisations to engage in ICT policy processes in Africa.

The workshop was attended by close on 100 representatives from NGOs, human rights organisations, media groups, women's organisations, development groups and researchers from 24 African countries. The workshop report details a relatively large number of presentations which constituted the main body of the workshop. However,

it included some group work around four main areas of ICT policy-making, namely the right to communicate; freedom of expression and information exchange; diversity of content, language, ownership and control; and global, regional and national governance of the information society. One of the organisers commented that one of the most exciting aspects of the workshop was the way IT policy was tied to social development. This was assisted by the workshop being conceptualised around APC's Internet Rights Charter.

Only one day, rather than the two named in the contract, was used for testing of the training materials. The report explains the purpose of the sessions using the training materials as being to demystify and explain technical terminology and policy processes. At the end of the workshop, 15 of the 80 participants reportedly expressed interest in becoming trainers.

The policy curriculum was further tested in several workshops held in Africa during 2003. In March 2003, the curriculum was used with about 20 CSOs from Southern African countries at a workshop in Johannesburg. The workshop was funded by the CTO. In April 2004 a one-day policy training session was presented at the Women's Electronic Networking Training organised by APC-Africa-Women in Cape Town. This event was supported by HIVOS. In June 2003 APC again tested the materials at a national capacity building workshop in Uganda. This event was again supported by CTO. Together these workshops should have allowed APC to reach its targets.

An article produced by one of the participants on the Uganda workshop reports that 30 participants, drawn mainly from CSOs (but including parliamentarians), and coming from Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Ecuador (Valeria), attended the event, which was organised together with Wougnet and I-Network, a national network of organisations and individuals funded by IICD. Unsurprisingly given that Wougnet was one of the organisers, there seems to have been significant attention to gender both in terms of participants and in focus. Disappointingly, the report mainly consists of a short description of the content of each session, but not the method. It does state, however, that the course was preceded by a train-the-trainer session, which was attended by ten of the participants.

In late 2003 APC organised a workshop in Cartagena, Colombia which aimed to train close on 40 civil society activists as trainers in ICT policy. The workshop had simultaneous translation into Spanish and English. Approximately two-thirds of the participants were from LAC and the rest from Asia, Africa, Western and Central and East Europe. Five of the participants were from APC's WNSP programme. This workshop was funded by CIDA, CTO, the Open Society Institute and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

The Cartagena workshop constituted the most comprehensive testing of the curriculum. The main objectives of the workshop were:
▪   To build knowledge and expertise among strategically positioned civil society organizations' in order to enable them to engage effectively in ICT policy processes at national, regional and global levels; and
▪   To build a network of trainers who are able to train other CSOs at regional and national level.

The preparation for the workshop seems to have been very thorough. It included translation of all material into Spanish, and a questionnaire which allowed each

participant to introduce themselves to the group, and to inform each other (and the facilitators) about their experience, background and expectations.

Fairly early in the workshop it seems to have become evident to both the organisers and participants that the planned agenda attempted to cover too many topics in too little time. The agenda was thus revised so as to allow time for exchange of information and discussion among participants. Each day began with a training of trainers session which evaluated the previous day's activities and discussed how things could have been done better. By the end of the workshop the facilitators had come to the conclusion that pedagogical aspects of the curriculum such as learning outcomes needed to be revised. The facilitators also recognised the difficulties in satisfying a group of participants with very varying needs and backgrounds. In particular, the fact that the workshop included a small, but significant, set of participants from outside the region was a challenge, and a source of unhappiness to some of the LAC participants. To aggravate matters, the workshop was combined with APC's Council meeting, and many of those from outside the region were thus very much 'experts' compared to some of the LAC participants.

APC also co-hosted (with IICD) an ICT policy training workshops in Quito in November 2004 which used the APC curriculum. Participants included the coordinators of IICD's national initiatives in Bolivia, Ecuador and Jamaica alongside Ecuadorian stakeholders. Participants included representatives of national and local government, the private sector, academia and civil society.

There is also a 3-day workshop in Delhi, hosted by Global Internet Policy Initiative India. The trainer was the then CIPP programme manager, Sonia Jorge. In addition, the CATIA project provides opportunity (and need) for further use of the workshop. The curriculum has already been used at two CATIA/Africa ICT Policy Monitor events: The APC Africa ICT Policy Advocacy workshop in Nairobi in July 2004, and its French equivalent in Kinshasa in February 2005. The advocacy modules were tested at a workshop with media activists in Morocco in October 2004. There have also been requests for workshops in LAC, Central and Eastern Europe, and Asia.

Some of the workshops described above were explicitly designed as train-the-trainer events. Others included a component of train-the-trainer, perhaps for a subset of participants. All included other objectives in addition to training trainers. While APC seems generally satisfied with the curriculum it has produced, it bemoans the fact that a shortage of trainers, and the busy schedules of those who have been trained, mean that it is unable to meet the demands it receives for training. In effect, APC has probably contributed to this situation by the attempt to combine training of trainers with other objectives. From the organisers' side, it means that attention cannot be focused as much as desirable on the training of trainers aspect. In addition, a noticeable aspect of the workshops that have been run is the multiplicity of trainer-facilitators. One possible motivation for this is that trainers then have a good grasp of the particular content that they are covering. If, however, APC is serious about having the curriculum used more frequently, it might want to think about how a smaller team could manage delivery.

As noted above, the curriculum website uses the MMTK format that allows users (at least theoretically!) to build up their own workshop from the components. The site is clean, attractive and well-organised. Each section or session includes traners' notes, powerpoint presentations, exercises, evaluation for participants, and evaluation of material. As with so many aspects of APC, the product shows evidence of widespread

collaboration in that there is a rage of different contributors of sections. Of the four sessions on digital divide, two focus on gender.

In terms of level, some of the materials are not in very easy English. They are likely to be difficult for a second-language reader, or one who has not got tertiary education. To add to the difficulties, some of the pieces use a relaxed colloquial style. While this is more interesting than easy English, it is also more difficult. The fact that the materials are available in Spanish does not solve this problem, as some users will have neither English nor Spanish as a first language.

The curriculum page gives an email address to contact for support. Unfortunately, this address is so overwhelmed by spam messages that APC is considering closing it. This source therefore cannot provide any indication as to the extent to which the materials are being used and/or the extent to which materials are being adapted.

There were limited references to the training in the questionnaire responses and there were no questions relating specifically to training. However, nine of the ten member responses indicated that the organisations concerned had benefited from training. Further, training was received by more organisations than all other types of support. Two of the ten partners who responded said that they had recently visited the web-site in search of training materials. One of the members volunteered that he very much liked APC training because it was based on 'true research work' and 'in-the-field experiences', and used good resource persons. It was not, however, clear whether he was referring specifically to training using the curriculum.

Only one trainee completed a questionnaire. In addition, through evaluator error, a trainer who had used the curriculum completed a questionnaire designed for trainees. He afterwards said that he was puzzled by some of the questions, but felt that the questionnaire was perhaps appropriate as he was learning while training. His responses are therefore combined with those of the trainee.

There was disagreement as to whether the course was too short or just the right length. (In fact, the workshops discussed did not cover the full course.) The level was rated as either 'easy' or 'just right'. Training materials were rated as very useful, but too short by one informant. Methods, which combined lectures and group work were found to be 'eye-opening', 'useful', and the overall atmosphere was more 'friendly', 'open' and 'frank' than other training experienced. Both people, however, felt that there was a shortage of national expertise and knowledge reflected in the workshops of which they were part. One commented on the usefulness of sharing with people from other countries. One of the informants felt that there had been less follow-up by APC than for training events attended which were organised by other players. This person nevertheless felt that he had been able to use what he had learned in multiple ways.

Another trainer who had been involved in the development of the materials said that, in retrospect, he would have focused less on traditional workshop mode and more on skills and networking. As he expressed it, when participants 'go back to their communities, it is good to know all the acronyms, but what is more fundamental is that people are empowered to act over other things'. He suggested that the workshop itself should therefore 'point' people to where they could find materials rather than presenting content, and rather concentrate on how to work with people and organise campaigns.

EED-supported project

As noted above, the EED-supported projects had three main activities. However, it was agreed that the national policy portals would not be a primary focus of the evaluation. While the first phase of the national policy portals project was said to have been successful, the second phase has not proceeded as planned, largely due to capacity problems. APC therefore plans to pick up the activity during 2006. The evaluation therefore focused on the production of *Involving Civil Society* and activities around WSIS and the World Social Forum (WSF). (There is, in fact, very little beyond brief mentions of activities in relation to WSF.)

The idea of a booklet and the general support around WSIS engagement emerged out of EED's admiration for the work that APC had done in the first phase of WSIS, and its desire to support further work that could draw on the existing experience. The funding in respect of the national portals represented a continuation of activity previously supported by CIDA.

Involving Civil Society

APC produced *Involving Civil Society* in partnership with the Campaign for Communication Rights in the Information Society (CRIS), a campaign which it had helped establish. The booklet was produced in English, French and Spanish. It attempted to highlight the key civil society issues and demands from the different regions in which APC worked. It attempted, in particular, to include a gender perspective. It was launched in September 2003 at WSIS prepcom 3 in Geneva and distributed in hard copy as well as on-line. By the end of the year, there had been 5 693 downloads of the English version, 3 468 of the Spanish version and 2 897 of the French version. This popularity was way beyond what APC had expected. By the end of 2005 the total number of downloads of the English, Spanish and French versions were, respectively, 11 514, 10 494 and 8 742.

APC had previously developed a step-by-step practical guide for CSOs on how to participate in WSIS or other national ICT-related policy-process. As noted above, the booklet drew heavily on the Ecuadorian national experience. As with the booklet, the guide was produced in English, French and Spanish. Because of its popularity, it was produced as a 12-page insert to *Involving Civil Society*.

Given its success, APC considered producing a similar publication to *Involving Civil Society* for phase II of WSIS but did not do so. A staff member explained that in part the failure to do this reflected the shift in APC's role from facilitating participation of others to paying more attention to position rather than process.

Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy had reached fewer of the ten member informants who responded to the evaluation questionnaire than had the handbook. One had read all of it, three had read most of it, and two had read half of it. But four had not read it at all. Of those who had read it, one said most of it was new, two said half was new, two said a bit was new, and one said nothing was new. In terms of level, the overall feeling was that it was just right. However, one informant elaborated that there was a difference between different parts of the publication. Thus while the part on CRIS issues was 'just right' in terms of level, the sections dealing with WSIS background documents and national consultations were too easy. There was uneven satisfaction with the length of the publication. Three felt it was just right, but one felt it was too long and another that it was two short.

Only two informants said that they had recommended the publication to others. As with *ICT Policy for Beginners*, this publication was also linked by one of the informants to a web-site, and used by staff and in workshops. However, this happened less often than   with *ICT Policy for Beginners*. Suggestions for improvement included making it more WSIS-centric, integrating material from issue papers such as the one on internet governance, providing examples and case studies of CSO engagement, and adding to the CRIS issues list.

Only four of the ten partner informants had read at least part of *Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy*. This is not all that surprising as the booklet would not have been relevant for all partners One had read most of it, one had read about half the publication and two had read only a bit. The person who had read most of the publication, said most of the information was new. Two others said only a bit was new, while one said nothing was new. Two readers found the level easy, one found it just right, and the last found it just right to difficult. One elaborated that while it was 'just right' for her because of active involvement in WSIS, it would be difficult for others as the presentation was 'rather academic … UNese language'. Two informants said the length was just right. However, both of these had read only a bit of the publication. Only one informant said that they had recommended the publication to others. Another said that they had used it as background information when preparing country-based workshops.

One suggestion for improvement was offered, namely that there be more emphasis on the possibilities of collaboration with other sectors.

Involvement in WSIS
An APC report provides the following long list of the different ways that the organisation was involved in WSIS 2003 (The list is supplemented by one or two items not included in the list, but referred to elsewhere):
- Participating in all official WSIS preparatory meetings and the Summit;
- Participating in regional preparatory meetings in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe;
- Convening the Civil Society Content and Themes group at the Paris Intersessional Meeting, July 2003 and PrepCom IIIA, Geneva, November 2004;
- Producing key publications including a thematic position paper on gender for the Global Knowledge Partnership;
- Convening civil society regional caucuses in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Playing a leading role in several thematic working groups including the NGO Gender Strategies Working Group, the WSIS Gender Caucus, the Patents Copyrights and Trademarks working group, the privacy and security working group, the human rights caucus and the community media caucus;
- Presenting two workshops (one on gender and inclusive policy-making, and the second on ICT and trade) for government delegates as part of the WSIS Institute coordinated by the United Nations Development Programme;
- Making submissions on draft documentation;
- Representation in national delegations in several countries;
- Making the attendance of active APC members and partners to preparatory meetings and the summit possible by facilitating financial support;
- Hosting and facilitation of all websites and mailing-lists at the WSIS civil society domain (wsis-cs.org);

- Key civil society websites and reports on WSIS for Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa;
- Co-writing the civil society statement released in December 2003, based on civil society inputs, in our capacity as one of the facilitators of the 'content and themes' group; and
- Exhibiting and presenting at the ICT4D platform in Geneva in December 2003.

APC was also able, through CIDA and IDRC funds, to provide support to six national members to convene national report back meetings after the December 2003 WSIS. The members were Bluelink (Bulgaria), GreenNet (United Kingdom), ITeM/Chasque (Uruguay), FMA (Philippines), TAU (Argentina) and Sangonet (South Africa).

The funding for this wide range of activities did not come only from EED. One event which was supported by EED took place in late 2002 when more than 350 activists and academics attended the third Global Communities Networking Partnership Congress (GCNP) in Montreal, Canada. APC co-coordinated the Internet Rights Theme at this event together with the GCNP organisers. The GCNP congress finished with a half-day session in which APC presented its plans for supporting civil society participation in WSIS.

APC engagement did not stop after the WSIS 2003 event. In particular, Anriette Esterhuysen was appointed as a member of the Task Force on Financial Mechanisms (TFFM) for ICTD task force. Her appointment in itself reflects the high esteem and profile gained by APC during WSIS 2003. Similarly, APC was represented at the second of the two working groups appointed by the United Nations after WSIS I by Karen Banks and APC council member Carlos Afonso of Brazilian member RITS. In early 2004 APC commissioned a series of discussion papers on key issues that emerged during the WSIS process, including papers on financing ICT infrastructure, internet governance, e-strategies and African involvement in the WSIS. As will be seen below, these papers seem to have reached and been appreciated by many people. APC's participation extended through to WSIS II, but that is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

Observers from within and beyond APC have written or are writing on the achievements of civil society at WSIS. Most list both positive and negative points. In terms of quantitative measures, Chakula Issue 7 of 2003 records the results of a comparative analysis produced by civil society volunteers of three documents: The Draft Declaration of Principles that came out of the Paris Intersessional in July, the comments by CSOs as developed at the beginning of PrepCom3, and the latest version of the Draft Declaration of Principles that came out on 19th September. The comparison shows that approximately 60% of civil society proposals were rejected outright, 15% were more or less adopted, and 25% appeared in the draft declaration.

Anriette's paper, 'Whose information society?', suggests that the qualitative achievements were substantial. In particular, WSIS made significant gains in respect of public participation. Perhaps even more important, it shifted the debate from a purely technical one to one situated in broader development debates.

Sean O'Siochru of CRIS, the other key civil society at WSIS, has also written several papers assessing civil society achievements. In terms of the achievements of WSIS itself, his assessment is fairly dismal. He bemoans the failure to recognise a new

paradigm of ICTs for development, the lack of attention to the erosion of civil and human rights in relation to internet and ICT use, and the failure to release new funding mechanisms for ICT for development. He cites as a potential achievement the development of a multi-stakeholder forum where the state and future of the internet can be debated.

O'Siochru is, however, more optimistic about the achievements of civil society and states that, in fact, civil society did not go into the process with significant hope that there would be concrete achievements in terms of the issues mentioned above. He is pleased with the level of civil society participation in some informal working groups, with the level and quality of organisation building that took place despite limited resources, and with the fact that WSIS provided a section of civil society with 'a crash course in UN summitry and international relations and advocacy'. Thus while previously it was mainly the private sector that was able to lobby informally, civil society had gained some skills in doing this, and some legitimacy in terms of its right to do so.

O'Siochru sees the parallel Civil Society Declaration as both a success, in stating civil society's vision, and a failure, in that it reflected the inability to get these ideas reflected in the formal outcomes document.

Civil society's achievements in respect of WSIS, and APC's contribution to the achievements, are also well covered in the responses from members and partners during the evaluation.

Five of the ten member informants had attended the 2003 WSIS event, three of them accompanied by other members of their organisations. Two came from organisations which had representation at WSIS although they had not themselves attended.

Five respondents felt able to reflect on what civil society had achieved by participating in WSIS activities in 2003. A sixth informant said that he could not say as both civil society and government of his country 'had a very poor showing'. One of the five who responded reported on achievements at the national level – that her organisation had been able to 'build good bridges with government' and was invited to join the national WSIS taskforce. The others all reflected on achievements at global or regional level.

Among the achievements that were noted was having an input on the output documents as well as issues discussed in plenary sessions, recognition of civil society as a relevant actor in UN conferences and multilateral processes more generally, raising awareness of the potential of ICT for development, building relationships with governments at national level, acknowledgement by some governments of the limit of the market framework, and increased networking and alliances at regional and global level between CSOs.

Six informants answered the question as to APC's contribution to these achievements. All were clear that APC had played a lead role in coordinating civil society activity, facilitating civil society engagement, and provision of information. The facilitation was said to have happened in multiple ways. Thus in addition to helping coordinate the civil society plenary and providing funding, APC participated in and often led regional caucuses, played a particularly important role in the team on gender and ICT, built understanding through workshops and national and regional

ICT policy portals, and provided on-line workspaces for discussions and for reporting back on what was happening. APC's proposals in respect of financial mechanisms and internet governance were also said to have laid the basis for the civil society position on these topics. As one informant summed it up: 'APC's role in the process makes it difficult to imagine civil society having a similar impact on this process without APC's participation in it.'

All but one of the ten partner informants had attended WSIS in 2003. Other representatives of the tenth's organisation attended the event. Of the nine who attended, in all but one case they were accompanied by other representatives of their organisation. WSIS was thus a key event for all the organisations that responded. One informant reported that they were the 'main actor organising civil society through their members'.

Several informants referred to papers that they or others had written or were writing on the achievements of civil society participation in WSIS. Most often mentioned was networking and the establishment of long-term relationships, as well as a broadening of the agenda beyond the technical and market-based, and towards a rights-based (including gender) focus. More specifically, one informant noted that civil society had been able to get some proposals inserted into, and some objectionable language removed from, official documents. Two felt that civil society had developed new ways of working within international forums through their experience, while one felt there was greater understanding of the limitations as well as potential of ICTs. One person commented on the media impact of civil society engagement – 'we squeaked'! On the negative side, one informant felt that the achievements were 'sub-optimal' given the large expenditure of human and financial resources by civil society.

Nine of the ten informants responded to the question as to APC's contribution to civil society's achievements in relation to WSIS. Typical comments were 'very significant', 'substantial', 'considerable', 'key' and 'pushing the envelope'. Karen Banks, in particular, was named as having been one of the main actors. Several informants described CRIS as the lead actor, with APC described as a member of CRIS. However, one of those who made this point said that APC acted as civil society's 'intelligence service' because they had 'members and friends' involved in such a wide range of WSIS activities. Several informants also mentioned the role that APC played in the development of civil society positions on issues. One emphasised the role that APC, and WNSP in particular, played in getting gender on the agenda.

Feedback from key constituencies

This section summarises the responses to the questionnaires addressed to members, partners and policy people. As noted above, members are organisations that have formally affiliated to APC, whereas partners are organisations that APC regards as key collaborators. Some aspects of the responses from the constituencies have already been included in above in relation to the three focus projects. This section discusses the aspects not covered above. Each sub-section begins with a brief description of respondents for that category.

Feedback from members

The member questionnaire was sent to 20 people, from 17 organisations out of the total of 41 members that APC has. After some reminders, ten responses were

received – half of the people contacted. Several of the respondents were member representatives of APC's council, the overall governing body.

The questionnaire consisted of five sections covering: information about the person and organisation; the relationship with APC, APC resources, WSIS, and some general questions.

About the respondents and organisations
Four of the 10 respondents were female. Inside the organisations of the nine people who answered the question, there were 20 male and 13 female managers. Seven of the 13 female managers were in a single, women-oriented, organisation. Among the others, women managers only outnumbered men in one other organisation – the other women's organisation.

Three organisations were based in Africa, two in Latin America, two in Asia, two in Europe and one in North America. Most were thus in developing countries. The two based in developed countries said that at least part of their work was international. Overall, four of the organisations described themselves as working nationally, two as working internationally, one as working regionally, and the remainder as having both a national and regional or international scope. Seven of the ten thus included national work in their scope.

Four respondents had English as a home language. However, all but one of the informants said that they could understand and read English 'very well', and eight said that they could speak English 'very well'. The exception said he could understand and read well, but his speaking was poor. Nine of the organisations said that English was either the main language of the organisation, or one of the working languages. The exception was a Spanish-speaking organisation.

All but one informant said that they had 24-hour access to the internet. The exception – from an organisation based in Africa – said that access depended on the availability of electricity, but he had 24-hour access when the electricity was working. All are thus well able to access on-line resources and electronic communication.

Seven of the informants had started working in their organisation in the 1990s, and three in 2000 or later. Three of the organisations had been established in the 1980s, five in the 1990s and two in 2000 or later. Two had started doing ICT-related work in the 1980s, two in the 1990s, and five only in 2002 or later. (One did not answer this question.) For half the organisations ICT-related work was thus relatively new.

All but one of the organisations mentioned some aspect of ICTs among the main focus areas of their organisation. The exception was an organisation which said that their focus was support for civil society organisations working for social justice. Two named women and ICTs as the primary focus, while at least one other included gender among the focus areas. Only one strongly stressed technical assistance such as web-site development and technology planning and consultancy among the focus areas. However, this organisation also said that lobbying and advocacy for progressive change in respect of communication rights was also among the focus areas. Another organisation provided support for telecentres and portals. Overall, however, the organisations described themselves as dealing more with development and policy than technical service provision.

The above patterns accord with the fact that half (5) of the organisations had ICTs as their main focus, two had ICTs as a major focus, and only one organisation said that ICTs was a minor focus for them.

When asked to specify the ICT-related focus areas, one simply said that all their focus areas were ICT-related. Others referred to a wide range of different areas of operation, including promotion of access and affordable options, such as FOSS; capacity building; local content development and management; information sharing; and promoting ICTs for development more generally. One again stressed the promotion of ICT use by women and women's organisations.

The next question further restricted the focus to the main ICT *policy* issues on which the organisation worked. Issues mentioned more than once included ICTs and environmental sustainability; inclusion and universal access; gender; FOSS, broader participation in governance and policy-making; and privacy/security issues.

Relationship with APC
One of the organisations had joined APC in 1990. Eight had joined in 2000 or later. (One did not answer the question.) Most have thus joined since APC's shift in terms of membership policy and focus away from being a network of internet service providers (ISPs) to being a network promoting the use of ICTs for development.

When asked why they became a member of APC, the most common response was to become a member of an international network of organisations. Several stressed the fact that it was a network of organisations with similar political positions and values. Other stressed the ability to learn from others' experiences, to participate in joint projects, and to strengthen their own standing by being part of a larger network. At least one had been part of the decision to establish APC. Several others had joined very recently, but often after working informally with APC for some time.

When asked what they had gained by being a member of APC, the most common responses were about exposure. This included exposure to experiences of others, exposure to new tools and technologies, and exposure to new ways of understanding ICTs and development.

The most common response to a question as to how their organisation had benefited from being an APC member was enhanced profile or credibility, and participation in projects (mentioned four times each). An Africa-based organisation said that they displayed the APC logo prominently because of the value they felt that others would accord them on account of their affiliation. Other common responses were direct or indirect funding support, networking and exposure to the international community, enhanced knowledge about best practice and issues (all mentioned three times); skills development/ training and participation in processes such as WSIS (each mentioned twice) and technical support, unspecified support, and enhanced ability to mobilise partners.

When asked more specifically about assistance received from APC, nine of the 10 said they benefited from training opportunities, eight from funding, seven from technical support, four from facilitation and five in 'other' ways. None said that they had not benefited in any of the specified ways.

Among those who said that they had been helped in 'other' ways, there were several mentions of facilitation (either by APC, or opportunities for the organisation

concerned to facilitate), as well as attendance at workshops and conferences. (The word 'facilitation' is sometimes interpreted to mean financial subsidisation, so these responses should be treated with caution.) One organisation said that they had been given contracts for various pieces of work. Among the most interesting was an organisation in Africa which said that Karen Banks had, through contacts, managed to persuade their service provider to review their subscription cost downwards.

In a true network, members should both benefit and contribute. Respondents were thus asked in what ways their organisations had contributed to APC. Here the most common response was implementation of or participation in projects (6 responses). Participation in APC governance was mentioned three times. Mentioned twice were participation in drafting WSIS positions, representation of APC at events, participation in on-line meetings, mailing lists, etc, undertaking contracted work, and general strengthening of the network. Other responses were influencing and assisting APC to strengthen its work in French, sharing of information and experiences, dissemination and advocacy of APC positions, provision of mailing lists, supply of web applications, and feedback on connectivity issues at grassroots level. These responses suggest a high level of participation in the network.

When asked if the organisation's membership in APC had changed the way the organisation worked, two said that they felt sure that their membership had shaped what the organisation did but did not find it easy to specify how. Three gave more specific positive answers. One said that membership had increased their involvement in regional projects, made them focus more on ICT technical skills building, afforded them better insight into how ICT projects elsewhere in the global south worked, and provided opportunities for hiring skills from a global pool. The second said membership had made them more aware of the FOSS alternative and this, in turn, had encouraged the organisation to focus on this area. They were also considering entering the area of ICTs and environment. APC membership had also encouraged the organisation to align its strategies more with APC thrusts, and in particular to have a broader, global picture. Similarly, the third said that membership had made them locate their work more in the international arena. These responses suggest a marked impact on several of the organisations.

When asked how APC could be more helpful to their organisation, one said that thus far APC had always provided whatever support they asked for. Funding, establishment of project partnerships, organisational assistance (logistics, administration, needs analysis, planning) and facilitation of knowledge sharing between members and staff were each mentioned by two informants. The last-named was explained by one of the informants as needing to find ways of allowing members to play a more central role in elaborating APC positions. In his words, 'It is very difficult for a member to follow the level of discussions and activities that are related to making a [policy] paper.' Other suggestions were facilitating regional activities, and organising training workshops on areas such as FOSS migration.

Respondents were asked how they would describe APC to someone who did not know the organisation. All responses contained words such as 'network', 'community', or 'coalition'. Two described it as a 'network of networks'. Several included in their description the aim of contributing to the use of ICTs for development and human rights. One noted that APC was an 'international resource centre' for expertise and materials in relation to development.

The next question asked what informants regarded as the strength of APC's policy work. APC's success in partnering with a wide range of stakeholders on a range of different topics was named by four informants, as was the organisation's credibility, and the development of 'solid, consistent and defendable' policy proposals which brought together country and regional positions. Training at regional and national level, content development through ICT policy portals and publication were each named by two people. Two informants each named APC's international advocacy and lobbying, its firm membership base and support, and its presence and ability to participate in a 'vast array' of policy forums as strengths. Finally, informants noted that APC's work was based on local knowledge and practice, and praised its promotion of public awareness of ICTs for development.

Eight informants nevertheless had suggestions as to how APC's policy work could be improved. Most of the suggestions related to finding ways of involving APC members better in the policy work. The suggestions in this respect included strengthening the link between the global advocacy and members' work in their own countries, and use of less jargon so that there was better understanding. Lesser use of jargon would also assist with the other issue which emerged in response to this question, namely garnering more support among non-ICT development organisations and the general public.

Informants were asked what changes they had seen in APC over the years that they had known it. Those who had recently joined generally felt unable to answer this question. Among the others, the responses were often similar, and different responses were often related. Most often mentioned was that APC was undertaking more and bigger projects than previously. Also mentioned often were the larger and more diverse membership, larger staff, and greater availability of funding. In respect of the first, one informant noted that growth of membership, if too fast, meant that new members were not properly integrated. Several informants alluded to tensions around the larger staff and a perception among some members that too many resources were being channelled to staff rather than to members. Of particular importance to this evaluation is the perception of two informants that APC was now placing a greater emphasis than before on policy, exemplified by activities around WSIS. One informant felt that APC now had greater clarity and direction than before.

One informant took the opportunity of this question to note concern over the English orientation of APC, in terms of culture and outlook as well as language. It is not clear if this was seen as a new development or simply an ongoing concern.

APC resources
Only one of the ten informants said that they had not visited the APC web-site at all over the past four weeks. Two claimed to have visited the web-site more than ten times. It is possible that the evaluation targeted on a period that was more busy than usual, because it overlapped with preparations for and follow-up on the WSIS Tunis meeting. However, this meeting could as well have resulted in fewer web-site visits because informants were busy with other tasks.

When asked why they had visited the site, three informants said they accessed the intranet for organisational purposes, and two each said they were interested in blogs, news, or unspecified information gathering. Two were more specific about information, referring to information about members and information about WSIS respectively. A further informant wanted to get access to members' websites, while another wanted to check the dates of events. One informant visited the APC web-site

so as to make links to the organisation's own web-site. The APC web-site thus appears to be fulfilling a range of purposes.

Respondents were asked what other APC documents or on-line resources they remembered reading or using apart from the two specified publications which were discussed above. Almost all answered this question and could mention some materials that they had used. Some answered quite generally. For example, one had 'used APC documents and resources a lot, for training materials, materials for presentations, etc.' Others mentioned specific resources. Among those named were CATIA material, Willie Currie's paper on e-strategies, Adam Peake's paper on internet governance, David Souter's paper on African participation at WSIS, Anriette Esterhuysen's evaluation of the first phase of the WSIS, the APC rights site, Itrain-Online (i.e. the curriculum), Action Apps, the various national policy portals, APC's recommendations to the WSIS on internet governance; MMTK training units on open source technology, and the business plan for NGOs manual.

A separate question asking whether informants had read and used research done by APC generated fewer responses. However, in some cases this would be because respondents had already mentioned research when answering the previous question. From those who answered the second question, there was specific mention of research on the WSIS process, discussion papers on internet governance, inter-connection costs, financing, e-waste, and FOSS. The latter papers are all part of APC's policy work, although not part of the three target projects for this evaluation.

In terms of checklists, two people said that they had read the WSIS guidelines, but only one of them had used it directly. One person said that they had read the Charter, but again had not used it directly. Three informants said that they or their organisations had helped to test the GEM tool.

General
Informants were asked to compare APC with other organisations working in the ICT field. Two respondents remarked on the leadership role played by APC. Two commented on the progressive elements of the organisation. One of these noted that it 'clearly proceeds from a progressive social vision', and felt this was reflected in the way it was managed and operated as a 'community', as well as its 'human-centred view of technology'. The second noted that APC was driven by 'locally grounded' organisations, mainly in the south, rather than by its secretariat, and had a history of active involvement in processes and projects rather than simply being a commentator. The person went on to remark that APC lacked imperial ambitions and was instead committed to openness and sharing. Two informants commented on APC's diversity – that it was 'evolving all the time and decentralised, and that it was 'quite varied and therefore a home to many interests'. The final informant again commented on the fact that APC was hands-on, and intent on making an impact.

When asked what they had personally learnt from working with APC, several commented on what they had learned from being part of a multi-country, multi-language and multi-cultural network. Three said that they had learnt that through hard work and commitment, one can make a difference, even if there is no physical office. Two informants noted specific issues that they had learnt about, such as gender and ICTs. Finally, an informant who is part of APC's management said she had learned about managing relations between members and staff, and understanding differing interests of members.

When asked what advice they would like to give APC through this evaluation, only five respondents answered. From two of these, the main message was 'keep up the good work'. The third wanted APC to help members more in their struggles around sustainability. The fourth recommended that APC work more closely with members on projects and other activities. The fourth recommended 'investment' in networking and innovation.

All informants named at least one other network or umbrella organisation of which their organisation was a member. Only two such networks were named more than once, namely the Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP) and the CRIS Campaign. In the case of the former, one of the organisations naming GKP said that they had recently resigned for financial reasons.

Feedback from partners

Questionnaires were sent to 27 individuals representing (about) 20 organisations which APC considers to be its 'partners'. Ten responses were received, i.e. over a third of those contacted. As with members, in some cases several reminders were needed, including from APC staff. Several of those who responded questioned their status as 'partners', which they seemed to interpret as a closer relationship than they felt existed. One of the partners who did not respond to the questionnaire was interviewed face-to-face. This person was an ex-staff member and the interview focused on that aspect rather than on his experience as a partner. This section thus reports mainly on the other ten 'interviews'.

Several informants noted that they were not responding on behalf of an 'organisation'. One said that the group he was connected with constituted a campaign rather than an organisation. Another said that he had worked with APC since the early 1990s, but did not represent an organisation, despite having worked at times with partner organisations and on related structures. In other cases, too, it is likely that APC's 'partnership' is with particular individuals within an organisation rather than necessarily the organisation as a whole.

The questionnaire consisted of five parts, similar to those found in the member questionnaire.

Informants and their organisations

Six of the respondents were male, and four female. Among the eight who gave management statistics for their organisations, there were 13 men managers and 9 women managers. Only two of the organisations had more female than male managers, and one of these was a women's organisation with four female managers.

Four of the organisations were based in Europe, two in the United States (US), one in Latin America, one in (South) Africa, and one was based in both Malta and Switzerland. The profile is thus significantly different from that of members, which are located mainly in the developing world. However, of the partner respondents, seven were from organisations that operated internationally, the two from developing countries operated regionally, and the remaining organisation operated nationally, regionally and internationally.

All respondents said that they spoke, read and understood English very well. Of the eight that answered the question, six had English as one of the operating languages of their organisation. This was paired with Spanish in two cases and French in a third

case. The remaining organisations had Dutch and Spanish respectively as their operating language. This spread is more diverse than for member informants in terms of international languages. All informants had 24-hour access to the internet.

One of the organisations had been founded as early as 1935 and another in 1976. The rest were founded in 1997 or later. (In at least one case this refers to the project of a larger already-established organisation.) None had started working on ICT issues before 1992. Three had started working on these issues only in the 21st century.

Most described the main foci of their organisations in ways that included ICT issues. The mentioned, for example, communication rights, ICT and development, women and ICTs, community radio, ICTs and diplomacy, and internet governance. However, one organisation described its focus areas as including issues such as human security and peace building and human rights more generally.

ICTs were said to be the main focus for four organisations, a big focus for five, and a small focus for one. The foci in relation to ICT included policy, broadcasting and communication rights, web-site development, training for organisations in using ICTs, advocacy and policy work, gender, community radio services, internet governance and regulation.

A similar, but expanded, list of issues was generated when informants were asked what ICT *policy* issues the organisation mainly worked on. The list included ICT for development, media concentration, trade-related issues, copyright, universal access, pro-poor applications and services, broadcasting, rural access and use, communication rights, network-building and campaigning, awareness raising among social movements, content development, gender and ICTs, convergence, regulation and allocation, take-up of technology, internet governance, protection of public interest, and multi-stakeholder participatory policy processes. A few of the issues named did not seem to be primarily policy-related.

Relationship with APC

When asked why the organisation became an APC partner, several said this was because they had complementary interests. Others became partners through participating in APC activities, doing sub-contracted work for APC, or providing information and facilities. In the case of CRIS, APC became a member of the campaign.

Nine informants named ways that their organisation had gained from being a partner of APC. Four referred to access to civil society networks, and the knowledgeable country-based people in them. Four referred to knowledge and expertise more generally. Of these, two specifically mentioned knowledge about gender and ICTs, and one specifically mentioned expertise in respect of policy development. Two said that they had gained from APC's technical expertise, but said that this referred mainly to the earlier years. Four informants referred to APC's contribution in terms of strong participation and partnership on common goals and activities. The CRIS representative said that APC's contribution, and particularly that of Karen Banks, had been 'absolutely critical. Without them, we would not exist, or not be effective.' One person said that APC had helped develop new initiatives. Another informant said that APC had helped them position their area of interest within the broader context of the information revolution, and that this had led to a shift in the organisation's policy

objectives. These contributions are impressive given that these organisations often do not have formal links with APC.

As with members, we also asked how partners had contributed to APC. Informants said that they had provided APC with experience and contacts (3 responses), with expertise, including through consultations, presentations and papers (3 responses), with support and collaboration on strategies (2 responses), by participating in APC events, by inviting APC staff to present at their events, and with logistics and advice.

Five informants felt that their relationship with APC had changed the way the organisation worked in some way. For CRIS, APC was a member from the beginning and helped to shape it. Two informants said that the work of the WNSP, in particular, had helped shaped what their organisation did. Another said that the organisation now paid more attention to some issues than they would have done without APC's influence, but did not specify what these issues were. The final informant said that collaboration with APC had enabled their local partners to develop their capacity to participate in ICT policy development. This last observation strikes to the core of CIPP's aims.

Three informants said that they had received support from APC in the form of facilitation, two had received technical support, one each had received funding and training support, and three had received 'other' support. The latter included opportunities for consultancy, assistance in setting up an on-line chat forum, and ongoing participation in a national ICT policy work group.

When asked how APC could be more helpful to their organisation, two informants wanted greater involvement from APC when their organisation implemented activities, and two organisations suggested that they and APC should develop a proactive plan for collaboration and coordination of strategies, rather than collaborating on an ad hoc basis, often in reaction to external developments. The organisations focusing on gender wanted ongoing updates of information on this topic, as well as technical assistance. Another organisation would like APC to assist them in gaining access to people and organisations and publicising their research papers. The final informant to answer this question would like APC to place greater emphasis on multi-stakeholder participation, including the private sector, rather than primarily on civil society.

As with members, we asked partners how they would describe APC to someone who did not know the organisation. Almost all the responses included the words 'network' or partnership, the words 'global' or 'international', and the words 'civil society'. About half of the responses emphasised APC's involvement in ICT policy issues, a similar number used words such as 'progressive', 'development', 'human rights' and 'poverty' as a reflection of APC's orientation. Four noted that APC was involved in advocacy, while two each mentioned research and training. Several informants took the opportunity to comment on the intelligence and solid expertise of APC as well as their wide and diverse reach. One noted that APC 'used to be a bunch of hackers with an unclear set of skills' but had redefined itself 'as an advocate for internet rights in relation to human rights.'. Another said that they would recommend to others that they work with APC.

The most common responses when asked about the strengths of APC's policy work included the organisation's in-depth understanding and analysis, including of technical issues, and the ability to galvanise civil society advocacy and lobbying.

Other positive aspects were APC's experience in international processes, the fact that they were balanced – 'not overly strident or rigidly ideological', the rights and gender focus, and their commitment.

When asked what aspects of APC's policy work could be improved, both of the gender-oriented informants as well as two other informants suggested that the work needed to be broadened in terms of reach to broader social movements, development practitioners and women's organisations. As one put it, she would 'like to see APC WNSP being less of a clique in its work'. Another suggested that the broadening could happen through APC taking on issues, such as free trade agreements, of concern to broader social movements. Two people suggested that dissemination strategies could be improved.

Three suggestions were ones on which there could well be disagreement among APC members. One did not really offer a suggestion, but merely remarked that 'inconsistencies of view' between partners made it difficult to pursue some issues effectively. The second again emphasised the need for a multi-stakeholder focus and, in particular, involvement of the private sector. The third remarked that APC was almost 'invisible in the US and should be engaging with US domestic internet policy given its global ramifications. This same informant was uncomfortable with the 'state-centred, dependency/handout' model of development which he perceived APC as supporting.

Two informants said that they had not been involved long enough to have seen any changes in APC over the years. Three felt confident that there had been significant changes. All referred in one way or another to the shift from being a network of ISPs to being a policy and advocacy-oriented organisation. One said that APC's original mission was to support NGOs in using new technologies to network and exchange information, and seemed to see the development into being a support network for ISPs as a deviation, which the introduction of the women's programme had helped to correct. This informant saw APC's policy work as a 'logical extension' of the shift given that current obstacles to NGO network are more related to policy than connectivity issues. The shift in focus had been accompanied by an opening up of membership.

The only other change noted was greater openness to involving a broader range of stakeholders, including the private sector.

APC resources
Five of the ten partner informants said that they had visited the APC web-site once or twice over the past four weeks. Reasons included looking for training materials (two mentions), looking for a WSIS-related document, consulting the GEM website, and research.

When asked what APC documents, on-line resources and research they had seen or heard of other than the two target publications, gender featured prominently. GEM was mentioned twice. Also mentioned were the women on-line handbook, various gender papers which an informant had cited in her own writing, and a post-Beijing survey. The paper on internet governance was also mentioned more than once, but one informant felt that it was too 'centrist' and 'showed no grasp of the real political issues'. Other resources which were mentioned were the advocacy toolkit, the ICT policy workshop CD-rom (i.e. the training curriculum), the paper on international

interconnection costs, and APC's statement on the Internet Corporation of Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

One informant said that they had used the GEM tool as a resource, and found it excellent. Another said that they had been 'employed' to implement it in one of the countries they worked in. A third said they would use it if funding became available. A fourth had attended a GEM workshop, but not used it.

General

When asked how APC compared with other organisations in the field, two said simply 'well', while one said APC was 'incomparable'. Of those who were more specific, at least three mentioned the commitment to civil society, although one seemed to feel that the activist angle could be a drawback. Two informants noted the gender focus, although one of these was a negative comment on the gender imbalance in APC staff profile. In terms of emphasis, one emphasised the southern focus, and another the 'reliable and good politics'. Three informants commented on the fact that APC combined a national and international focus. Two commented on the good quality of the work. One commented on the 'high' credibility.

Three informants were able to name things that they had personally learnt from having worked with APC. Two of the responses were positive, and covered learning about the debates on gender and ICT, technical assistance from the gender programme, knowledge about ICT policy, and, at the personal level, friendships. The negative response noted that 'even sending 16 emails to a coordinator will not ensure an answer…Working through individuals usually has better results.'

The advice offered to APC was varied. Several informants phrased their advice in a way that emphasised that it was intended to strengthen what APC was already doing, rather than as a criticism. Several informants suggested the need to broaden the base with whom APC worked 'beyond the usual suspects', whether in the area of gender, internet governance, or social movements. Allied to this was the suggested need for more capacity building, as well as a recommendation that APC 'understand well who your audience is and communicate to all of us'. At least two informants were concerned about the sustainability of APC's work, whether in terms of maintaining financing given donor 'waves', or staff becoming burned out. One wanted more work on local content development.

All informants could name at least one organisation or network of which they were members. At least two came from organisations that were themselves networks. The only networks with more than one mention were CRIS and GKP.

Feedback from policy people

Seventeen people from a total of ten organisations were contacted in the category of policy people. Six, from four organisation, responded. One said he was responding in his private capacity, while another did not state this but seemed to do so as well. Four of the respondents were men.

In terms of organisational or individual focus, two informants worked on international telecommunications policy, two on internet governance, and two on women's empowerment and rights. This profile reflects the fact that all had been engaged in WSIS and the most recent – or only – contact with APC for many of them was WSIS.

Two informants had, however, been aware of APC since the 1980s, although one said that they only had proper contact from 2002, in the WSIS process. A third became aware of APC when preparing a short-list for the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG). A fourth became aware of APC about four years ago, probably also through WSIS although this was not stated. The fifth respondent said she had been aware of the organisation when working at headquarters of the organisation, but engaged with APC only when she was based in a regional office. The final informant was not aware of APC until he received the email about the evaluation. This person expressed interest in knowing more, but could not answer any of the other questions.

At least one of the informants, when asked what their previous interaction with APC had been, he referred to commissioning a study from staff of two APC partners. Beyond this, most informants answered this question by speaking about interaction around the WSIS process, whether in facilitating civil society participation, through participation in meetings, inviting them to comment and make input, and engaging on specific issues such as privacy and financing. Of these, three named specific individuals with whom they had interacted, including Karen Banks (mentioned three times), Anriette, Willie Currie (CIPP manager) and Carlos Afonso. One informant said that he had used APC studies, for example on interconnectivity costs, in his own research. Both informants from the women-oriented organisation referred to interaction beyond WSIS, including participation in the Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP), support for the GEM methodology, inviting them to speak, production of a regional report on gender and ICTs, production of a 'gender assessment' of a UNDP-supported project, contracting them to undertake other specific tasks, and more generally drawing on their expertise. One informant noted that APC's input documents had been used in preparing the successive drafts of the WSIS outcome documents, as well as in a publication of his organisation. Another noted that APC regional advocates from APC members had provided advice.

Partners' descriptions of APC again emphasised the 'progressive' nature of the organiastion, and aspects of civil society, of mobilisation and lobbying, of equitable and affordable access. One commented, in particular, on APC's ability to work with grassroots groups as well as UN organisations without losing its credibility. This same person named APC as '*the* strategic player in the NGO community in global policy processes around ICTs.' Another emphasised that APC was 'skilled on the issues'.

Informants felt that APC's work in areas related to their own focus was strengthened by its closeness to the grassroots, its rights-based perspective, its experience, its knowledge both of issues and actors, and the fact that it was not focused on a single issue and therefore was 'able to give a more balanced viewpoint backed up by solid research'.

Only three informants felt in a position to suggest ways in which APC's policy work could be improved. One felt that the work appeared to be closely associated with too few countries. The second felt that issues such as privacy had been neglected, perhaps due to APC's development perspective. This person also suggested that APC's communication with non-members could be improved as it had access to actors that others might not have access to. The third felt that APC was not always 'professional' enough in terms of delivering on time and ensuring quality control. The weakness was primarily attributed to the organisation's taking on too much work and perhaps not planning adequately.

Only two informants felt that they had known APC well and long enough to be able to comment on changes in the organisation. The first noted, with approval, that it had become more international and now focused more on the demand than the supply side. The second felt APC was more visiable, articulate and policy-focused than before.

None of the informants were a member of an APC-related listserv, although one received APC information through other listservs.

Four said that they had recently visited the APC website, while the fifth had visited previously when working on ICT issues. The main reason for using the website was to find documents and contact details. The informants generally achieved what they wanted through these visits. Two products, in particular, were singled out – an 'excellent' paper on international interconnection costs, and the GEM methodology, which was funded by one of the informants. Another informant commented more generally that APC publications were generally 'made very thoughtfully'.

Only one informant had advice to give APC through the evaluation, namely that there might be room to improve cooperation with other networks. The suggestion was based on an apparent conflict between APC and another gender ICT caucus during the WSIS process. No other informants referred to this conflict.

One informant had such a high regard for APC that he was considering applying for a job with them in the near future. Another ended the interview with high praise for the 'dedicated, smart, strategic and great team players' who form the APC women's programme. A third commented that working with APC had been an enjoyable experience.

Feedback from donors

Four full donor responses were received, one of which was submitted jointly by two staff from the same organisation and accompanied by several internal assessment documents. In respect of a second donor, two staff submitted responses independently of each other. The useable responses included only two of the four donors associated with the three projects targeted by the evaluation. One of the missing responses was EED, where unfortunately the person originally responsible for the project has since left the organisation and the current staff person consulted with colleagues but felt that they did not know enough to give considered feedback. The person who had left noted that APC were 'providing constructive leadership at various levels' of the WSIS process when there was still contact.

The other missing response was in respect of CTO, where again the person originally responsible was no longer with the organisation. However, David Souter, who was previously with CTO, responded in the capacity of 'partner' and his responses to some of the questions addressed to donors are thus included in this evaluation. In addition to donors of targeted projects, the responses included one from a multilateral agency that has provided smaller amounts of funding or commissions to APC, but is keen to continue engaging in this way with the organisation.

The responses to a question as to how they would describe APC to someone who did not know the organisation were very similar to those offered by other stakeholders. The word 'network', and sometimes 'network of networks' appeared in the first sentence of all descriptions. All descriptions also referred to the development,

empowerment, or progressive element of the work in some way. All but one noted that the work focused on CSOs. One of the descriptions went on to note that the African network was less extensive than elsewhere in the world, despite the executive being mainly based in Africa.

When asked what made their organisation decide to fund APC, most of the responses referred to the uniqueness or innovativeness of APC and its work. Several also alluded to its international reputation and reach. Two were particularly interested in the ability to span national, regional and local levels, a strength based on its membership structure. One of the organisations found the focus on women particularly attractive, but noted that there had been criticism that APC's sexual politics were too progressive for some countries in Africa outside of South Africa.

Informants were asked whether they had achieved what they hoped through their funding support to APC. One response went carefully through the three objectives of their funding, and felt two were fully met while one was partly met. Further, the achievements were felt to be very sustainable. The area of relative weakness was awareness raising, in that several of the planned activities were not achieved.

Another informant noted that APC's project was 'very ambitious'. This donor found the implementation less 'visionary' than expected, although concrete objectives such as the establishment of the web-page had been achieved. The relative lack of performance was attributed to weaknesses in the membership base or use of this base, combined with too much fluctuation in APC staff. The area of least apparent achievement was said to the lack of visible active civil society involvement in Africa.

The remaining two donors were generally satisfied with the programmatic achievements. However, two donors noted that financial and information systems needed to be strengthened.

In response to the question as to why there had been shortfalls in achievements vs expectations, one donor expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that this evaluation had been postponed for so long, as such an exercise could provide reasons. In the absence of an evaluation, the donor suggested some possible reasons. These included weaknesses in APC's formal planning approaches, such as development of indicators, as well as lack of follow-through on some aspects of implementation because of busy travel schedules. There was also a concern about the slow growth in membership base if APC wanted to claim to speak on behalf of civil society. Finally, there was a concern about the female dominance among the staff, the dominance of whites, and the presence of several staff members who were not from developing countries.

All the donors felt that they had seen some changes in APC, even though some had known the organisation for a relatively short time. The main change noticed was the more active role that the organisation was playing in global policy forums, and the emergence of a clearer policy agenda. Two of the donors noted that this change, while positive, raised challenges in respect of regional and national work – and could risk the neglect of the latter. One donor felt that APC had become less doctrinaire in its approach to policy debates, but wished that the debate could be more tailored to the African context.

Donors listed a range of strengths, including the global country-based network, its ability to mobilise members and others, the ability of key staff to participate and

have influence in global forums, the web-based information platforms, the organisation's capacity to learn and adapt, the collaborative style, the good combination of informal and formal ways of interacting with members, the rights-based and development agenda, good programme design and project management, financial stability, solid leadership and the democratic governance structure.

Most commonly mentioned as the aspect of the work needing improvement was work at the national and regional levels, and monitoring and evaluation. There was concern among at least two donors about the need for better tracking of results. Donors noted some improvement in this respect with the development of indicators, but noted that they remained at the output rather than outcome level.

Donors also pointed to the main concerns that they had as a funder. One wanted greater feedback from the 'beneficiaries' of CIPP, so as to be able to judge the impact of interventions such as workshops. One wanted greater dialogue with stakeholders in Africa about the factors holding back the growth of the internet. At a practical level, one suggested the use of an outcome mapping methodology to at least measure the effects (contribution) of APC's work given the difficulties in measuring impact (attribution). Three was also concern about institutional capacity, although the person who ranged this felt it was slowly being addressed. Perhaps related, there was a suggestion that there needed to be more delegation of tasks. Donors indicated that APC was very open to discussion of weaknesses and suggestions, and responded in an open and honest way.

When asked to compare APC with other organisations working in the same field, most gave a short response – such as that there were few, if any, similar global networks working on these issues, or that they were 'one of the most interesting, innovative networks I work with'. One responded at more length, and pointed to the fact that APC was membership driven, had expertise in providing services to members, and was skilled in networking. However this person suggested that in Africa, in particular, it was probably not adequate to rely on virtual communications. At the same time, the difficulty of doing face-to-face work in a continent of 53 countries was acknowledged.

All of the donors had received publications and three of the four responses commented on particular publications. (The fourth only 'browsed' the publications.) All three mentioned the policy handbook. One suggested that this was so useful and timely that it could be made into a wiki to allow civil society to update and improve it. Two had also read the GEM. A donor who visited the web-site and other on-line resources regularly commented that APC 'is a place to browse, not graze' given the sheer amount of information available. Another donor commented favourably on APC's recommendations on internet governance ('good analysis of the state of play and suggestions for the way forward'), the paper on interconnection costs ('useful information'), the paper on e-strategies ('good analysis and advocacy approach' which evolved further since), the paper on financing the information society in the south ('provocative, good summary of global public goods discussion… [but] could have done more to explore alternative approaches').

The donors who responded had accessed the APC website between two and approximately 20 times over the last six months. There was general agreement that the site contained a wealth of information. However, one informant described the site as extensive rather than intensive, and suggested that there needed to be more analysis and mediated discussion 'to get beyond the overload and sift and find the

jewels'. This observation matched another comment that the website was probably a 'labyrinth for others, less involved ones'. Another noted some 'kinks', for example that searching by country did not pull up all the relevant items, or arrange them appropriately. The suggestion of using wiki was repeated. One respondent asked when a French version of the web-site would be available.

Finally, those donors who had raised some criticisms ended by stressing their overall satisfaction with and admiration for the organisation. Their comments came thus more from their keen interest in APC's work and what they could contribute towards the donor's own objectives rather than from unhappiness.

About APC

Before drawing conclusions, it is important to situate the above findings in the context of who APC is today, and what it was previously. It is also important to record feedback from staff about their perceptions of APC's policy-related work.

History

APC was established in 1990 as a global membership-based community of ICT users and service providers working for development and social justice. In the early years APC was essentially a network of ISPs servicing the environmental and development sectors. As the number of service providers increased and the environment for ISPs became more competitive, it was no longer either necessary or possible for most APC members to continue to provide this service. Many therefore shifted their focus to building databases, websites, providing training and other new areas of operation.

In 2000 there was a formal vote to shift the focus of membership of APC. The shift included removal of the rule that there be only one member per country. More fundamentally, as noted by many observers cited above, the shift saw APC increasingly engage with policy issues. It was out of this that CIPP was born.

The membership of some APC members reaches back into the earlier period. As noted above, of those who responded in this evaluation, many had joined more recently. The membership figures shown below, comparing December 2004 to end February 2006, suggest that APC seems to have shown some growth over the last year to 14 months. The growth has been concentrated in Africa, although Europe still has more members than another other single region. (Mexico is classified as Latin America.)

Region	December 2004	February 2006
Africa	7	10
Asia-Pacific	6	7
Europe	11	11
Latin America	8	9
North America	4	4

To provide some idea of the extent to which current members are policy-oriented, two matrices were prepared for the evaluation. (see appendix for matrices) The first is based on the case studies ('outstanding stories') included at the end of APC's annual report for 2003. While these case studies do not represent all member activities, the patterns revealed could indicate both the types of activities common

among members and what APC thought would appeal to readers of the annual report. For each of the case studies, the table indicates whether policies issues seem to be addressed either directly or indirectly. Overall, the table suggests that only a limited number of organisations are addressing policy issues directly in their core project activities.

The second matrix reflects member participation in CIPP activities, and is included as an appendix to this report. Unfortunately, the categories used in the spreadsheet do not exactly match the three focus areas for this evaluation. The matrix nevertheless gives a good sense of the extent to which APC members have engaged in policy-related work through APC.

The matrix reveals that there are very few organisations with no participation at all in CIPP. The main gap is in North America, where none participated, and Europe, where three organisations of 11 did not participate. In these regions, which mainly bring together 'developed' countries, many of the members date from before APC began to focus on policy work. In contrast, in the LAC region, it has been the older members who have been most active in relation to policy.

Looking only at the numbers, Europe dominates in terms of WSIS online space and WSIS national portals, Africa and LAC dominate in terms of grants, and Europe again dominates in respect of the policy portals. The grants focus on Africa and LAC is obviously appropriate. The numbers also do not reflect the depth of involvement of particular members. In particular, many European members might have been on the WSIS list and followed developments, but were not among the most active members in a substantive sense. In addition, some members engaged in the WSIS process, but not beyond that. Further, the WNSP and members with a stronger gender focus were very active during WSIS I, but decided not to engage to the same extent with WSIS II.

Despite these caveats, the matrix confirms very wide engagement of APC members in CIPP-related activities.

Staffing

APC is a virtual organisation and the different staff members are based in several countries and cities around the world. Decision-making therefore is done online and during face-to-face meetings. As for other informants, interaction with staff for this evaluation was mainly through email. In comparison with those used for other informants, the questionnaire for staff was far more open-ended. The initial response was also often followed up through further email communication.

Ten current staff members were thus targeted and 'interviewed' through a simple questionnaire followed by specific questions. These included the executive director, core APC staff, WNSP staff working on policy issues, and two staff playing support roles in respect of information. A former staff member who previously coordinated CIPP but now heads a partner organisation was interviewed face-to-face. The interview focused on CIPP rather than his current organisation, and his responses are therefore discussed in this section together with those of other staff.

Only one of the staff members had been employed for APC from before 2000 (in 1999), although a second had worked for APC on a voluntary basis from as early as 1996, and several had been employed by member organisations. Overall, then, most

had been employed after APC had made its shift to being a more policy-oriented, activist organisation. Willie Currie, the current CIPP coordinator, was the most recent recruit among the interviewees, having joined the staff in late 2004. However, Peter Benjamin, the first CIPP coordinator, was among the interviewees, as was Karen Banks, who acted as coordinator of APC's involvement in the WSIS.

All staff described work (and often activist) backgrounds which would have provided a good grounding for their work in APC. As noted above, several had worked for APC member organisations. This gave them a good grounding both in relation to the content of ICT and in respect of understanding civil society. Several had served as advisors to government or other official bodies. Willie Currie personally served on several official policy-making bodies. Anriette had worked in Africa-wide policy initiatives and in particular with the UN Economic Commission for Africa. A few had been involved in international conferences. In particular, there was experience of participation in the 1995 Beijing Conference. This and other experiences, such as Katerina's in the environmental movement, gave some staff members experience of advocacy and organising. Emmanuel Njenga, the African policy monitor coordinator, had a more technical and academic background than other staff. Valeria Betancourt, the LAC coordinator, had been responsible for the newsletter and portal of APC's Ecuadorian member.

Most staff came from developing countries and did not particularly refer to this in the description of their background and skills when joining APC. However, Karen Banks, an Australian, described her prior involvement with ISPs in developing countries, as well as her work for a London-based African research organisation as giving her interest and experience in development. Valeria referred to her work with marginalised urban and rural communities in Ecuador on health issues. Anriette said that her contact with commercial ISP providers while director of Sangonet had exposed her to policy issues that civil society was not really discussing at the time.

When asked what skills and knowledge in relation to the policy-oriented work they lacked when joining APC, the most common responses were a limited international perspective; limited experience of lobbying and advocacy, especially at international level; and limited skills in 'diplomacy' and negotiation. Some staff also said that they had little knowledge of policy issues, whether in general or in relation to specific issues or regions other than their own.

Overall, then, the staff is a strong one. Further, many of the skills and knowledge that were 'missing' when they joined APC have since been enhanced. Given the fast development of the ICT area, including policy, there will always be further learning needed, but the staff is in a good position to do this learning successfully.

There do, however, appear to have been problems associated with turnover or vacant posts. This problem was experienced, among others, with the CIPP coordination post, where there was an interim period between Peter Benjamin and Willie Currie where there was no manager. This is reflected in concrete terms by some missing documentation, and no doubt in other less tangible but equally important ways in terms of institutional learnings. Both regional policy monitors got off to delayed starts because there was no coordinator, and the LAC monitor has seen quite a bit of turnover. For the last period the African coordinator has been based in Australia, where he is studying. The web-site attests to the fact that he is able to do some of the tasks very well from a distance. However, it does not seem feasible for a person thousands of miles away to lead in respect of building civil

society involvement and capacity. It also sends the wrong message to have someone outside the continent coordinating.

When asked what they were most proud of in relation to APC's policy-related work, some staff named the more physical products, such as the handbook, the curriculum, the regional policy monitors, the gender policy portal, and the (multi-lingual) publications. Some staff focused more on activities, such as the interventions in WSIS and other international policy arenas, the CATIA advocacy process in Kenya. Some focused on processes and approach, such as the building of organisations and alliances in both Africa and LAC, the extension of the LAC alliance activity beyond WSIS, building of awareness and 'demystification' of ICT policy issues, linking of national, regional and global issues and processes, the combination of building civil society with engagement in high-level regional and international policy processes, and the 'people-centred' approach of focusing on CSOs. In terms of approach, the gender staff all commented on the inroads they had been able to make in highlighting gender in ICT policy discussions and building alliances and increasing participation in this respect. Several staff referred to APC's position as a (or 'the') leading organisation in this field. Several people referred to the stance of the organisation. One person was proud that APC was not simply a group of 'knee-jerk lefties' but was instead able to engage on hard technical issues. Another noted the direct connection between practice (on-the-ground experience of members) and policy. This same person was proud that APC had the courage to advocate policies which might not be popular, and to listen to criticism in a constructive way.

Most staff focused on what they were proud of in respect of their particular responsibilities. This could suggest either commitment and seriousness about what contribution they personally were making and/or that staff are to some extent working in silos, separately from each other. The latter interpretation receives some support from the responses of some of those who are not CIPP staff that they were not really involved in policy-related work and so could not respond to several of the questions. A silo approach would be understandable given, among others, their location in different parts of the world. It is, nevertheless, something that needs attention if it is true.

Staff was also asked what they would like to improve about APC's policy work. The most common response was the need to allocate more resources (perhaps directly to members) for national and regional work. Several felt that the WSIS work had focused too much energy, time and other resources at the international level. One of these noted that a greater focus at national level would require other developments in the approach, for example, in terms of language and policy 'hooks'. Similarly, several people noted the need to maintain a balance between facilitating civil society involvement in policy work and APC articulating the positions itself, as well as a need to improve consultation with members and thus collective learning. Also perhaps related, was the suggestion that the regional monitor sites go beyond aggregating content produced by others to synthesising as well as providing information and stories that help people engage in policy.

A few people suggested focusing on a few issues, whether at international, regional or national level. Internet governance and open access were mentioned specifically in this respect. However, another staff member felt that APC needed to engage in policy areas (such as environment) which it had not engaged in thus far but which are a priority for members. One also suggested that if the issue was determined on the basis of one in which all members were interested and agreed, there was the

danger of focusing on the 'lowest common denominator' (such as access). At least two people mentioned the need to improve the connection between general policy work and APC's gender advocacy.

In order to probe the possibility of choosing a few issues, and one which was not simply the lowest common denominator, there was some discussion with staff as to ICT policy debates on which partners disagreed. A range of examples was offered. Some of these concerned strategy and tactics as much as, or more than, disagreement on the actual issues. The examples mentioned below point to the range of issues on which there can be disagreement:

- One recent example related to financing issues discussed at WSIS, and more specifically within the TFFM. The disagreement arose when APC staff perceived that the proposals put forward by its member, ITeM, in the discussion paper prepared for APC, had little chance of being supported by the majority and wanted to put forward a compromise position.
- On internet governance the disagreement was primarily between APC and its allies and colleagues in the Internet Governance Caucus, rather than between APC and its members. Here the issues related to oversight and reform of ICANN. In this case, too, however, there was reportedly a debate over tactics between different APC staff. The final area of debate mentioned was how APC should respond to the holding of WSIS meetings in countries with repressive regimes. This debate was seen as having been useful in illustrating the underlying human rights issues around WSIS.
- FOSS was reported to be a divisive issue. APC has fairly strong views on FOSS but has to date preferred to raise awareness and provide information rather than force people to migrate to FOSS. The FOSS issue is important because it extends to intellectual property rights more generally. APC has tried to address the tensions around this issue through a lengthy membership survey process. This approach could in itself help to spread awareness and perhaps change some thinking.
- Differences reportedly arose between APC and some partners in relation to the relative importance of internet access as opposed to other cheaper and possibly more 'appropriate' media, such as radio. More political is potential disagreement around multi-stakeholder partnerships and processes where, in particular, some members might not want to engage with the private sector.

There were varying answers to the question as to how staff had attempted to get gender issues addressed in relation to ICT policy work. Both regional policy monitors have attempted to do this through working with the regional WNSP staff and related organisations. In Africa, there is hope that a new project with Wougnet in Uganda will provide concrete opportunities. In Latin America, where Valeria has been part of the gender structures, integration of gender seems to have been facilitated by this fact. Similarly, the fact that Karen Banks was previously a key member of WNSP has helped to get gender issues raised in the more general policy-related activities.

In terms of the overall web-site, gender appears prominently, and the issue is mentioned in many of the products. However, one staff member noted that the chapter on gender in the Handbook was weak. Another noted that both at WSIS and elsewhere, it was easier to get gender language into documents and theory/principles, but less easy to get this followed through in action plans and implementation. What probably makes things more difficult is that the issues dealt with by WNSP as policy issues (such as violence against women and poverty) are

often different from the policy issues dealt with by the 'core' CIPP. Finally, one staff member felt that APC could be rated quite highly in terms of gender sensitivity, but the same could not be said of many members and partners.

Conclusions and recommendations

Summary of findings on the three projects

The overall conclusion from this evaluation has to be that APC is an energetic, active, committed organisation that has achieved a lot with limited staff and resources. All informants had mostly good things to say about the organisation. Of course, this could reflect some bias in that it is those who are in favour of the organisation who are most likely to be named as informants and most likely to respond. Nevertheless, the sheer number of informants and the nature of their responses suggest that the overall verdict must be positive.

In relation to the three projects, there are some shortcomings. Some of these can be attributed to over-ambitious plans. This is something that needs to be addressed both to avoid APC seeming to fall short, and to avoid burn-out among staff expected to do more than is possible in the medium- to long-term.

The regional policy monitors have performed well in producing information. It is more difficult to measure their performance in respect of stimulating active involvement of CSOs. The difficulties lie, among others, in attributing causation, in the multi-partner nature of many of the activities, and in the overlap with other CIPP (and APC) activities such as CATIA. The multi-partner aspect can, however, in itself be read as a reflection of the extent to which the policy monitors engage with other activists. The monitors clearly made a very important contribution to civil society engagement around the WSIS process. The challenge will be to see whether they can take this forward at national level post-WSIS.

The development of the handbook and curriculum seem to have succeeded beyond APC's expectations. The main area of concern in respect of this project relates to training of trainers. Again it seems that APC has perhaps been over-ambitious in trying to combine too many objectives into individual events. In doing so, it has fallen short on developing trainers.

The EED project performed well in respect of the two activities covered in this evaluation, namely production of *Involving Civil Society* and participation in WSIS (but not necessarily in WSF). *Involving Civil Society* has not reached as many people as Internet Policy for Beginners, but this was to be expected given its narrower focus and purpose. By all accounts APC played a very impressive role in WSIS. The concern is that by focusing its activities on this event, some other activities might have been neglected. In particular, there is a perception among many observers – including people inside APC – that national and regional work has suffered.

General findings

The evaluation leaves no doubt that APC has successfully made the transition from a network of ISPs to a network that promotes civil society engagement in the ICT arena, and especially in relation to policy.

APC is highly respected. This respect comes from a range of different players and extends over technical, advocacy, and political aspects of its work. The evaluation has shown evidence of the varied partnerships that APC uses in its work. This is reflected not only in the number of partners named for the evaluation, but also in the way it has co-organised many of the events described in this evaluation. The ability to engage in such partnerships is itself an indirect reflection of the esteem that others have for the organisation and its work.

One of the strengths of APC's reports is that they include reflection. Nevertheless, there were several indications of weaknesses in respect of monitoring and evaluation more generally, beyond reflection. To some extent these weaknesses seem to reflect weaknesses in planning. For example, documents examined for this evaluation suggest that the output indicators are often over-ambitious, and that the promised outputs are not always compared with achievements after the fact. This is reflected implicitly or explicitly at various points of this report. The exception in terms of APC reporting are a report for Ford Foundation, which has a listing of outputs achieved (although not always quantitative) against what was planned, and IDRC reports against milestones set in the contracts.

APC seems to have good intentions in respect of monitoring and evaluation. For example, many of the proposals have a section near the end which described three levels of monitoring and evaluation. Similarly, in the Cartagena workshop, there were three different forms of evaluation, ranging from daily feedback to a questionnaire completed after the event completed. In contacting informants for this evaluation, it also became evident that some had been contacted in other feedback-seeking or needs analysis exercises conducted by the organisation itself. However, the failure to report against set targets, the over-ambition embodied in some targets, and the delays in implementing this evaluation support the donors' observations that this is an area that needs attention. It could be that by being over-ambitious in what it wants to do in the area of monitoring and evaluation, APC is overwhelming itself.

Issues for consideration

Given these findings and other observations resulting from the evaluation, the following suggestions are offered for consideration. They are offered as suggestions rather than recommendations as they are based on relatively limited engagement with one part of what is a complicated organisation engaged in a large and complicated area.

APC needs to firm up its **monitoring and evaluation**. This need has been clearly expressed by donors. It was also evident in the evaluation in the over-ambition of some targets, and the failure to report neatly against targets.

One informant, in particular, suggested that APC needs to focus the **attention of the regional policy monitors on building of civil society engagement**. In Africa, in particular, there might be need for more on-the-ground rather than electronic engagement, especially given the limited access to electronic communication and the erratic power in many of the countries.

More generally, APC needs to put effort in the coming years into **supporting national and regional work**, and addressing the perception that APC staff are playing too strong a role, rather than facilitating engagement by civil society more

generally. One of the ways of doing this which seems much appreciated by members is involving them in projects.

APC should probably focus on **two or three key policy issues** while providing lesser support on others. Internet governance seems an obvious candidate as one of the issues given APC's recognised experience and expertise on this. The other issues should be ones on which it is easier to work at national level.

APC needs to **beware of becoming too complicated and academic** in the way it addresses issues. If papers are developed, there need to be guidelines or editing to ensure that the final versions are in relatively simple English. More summaries should be developed to assist those who do not have the time, energy or skills to benefit from the longer papers.

APC **need not be concerned about its gender profile**. Indeed, its preponderance of women provides a useful counterbalance to the predominance of men found in this sector overall. However, in commissioning papers and other contract work, APC could make more effort **to solicit contributions from people in developing countries**, and, in particular, from its members. Working in this way may require more support work, but will contribute more to APC's overall aims.

Perhaps the overwhelming message is to **aim lower**!

Policy orientation of case studies included in APC Annual Report of 2003

Organisation	Country	Activities	Directly policy	Indirect policy
Arid Lands Information Network – East Africa	Kenya	Forum for poor rural people to share ideas	-	Setting up of community access points
Alternatives, Canada	Democratic Republic of Congo	Establishment of civil society portals		
ArabDev	Egypt	Training of teachers to become IT trainers		Access for poor
BlueLink	Bulgaria	Establishment of South East European Regional Environmental Content Sharing Program		Environmental policy
CECS	South Africa	ICT Literacy programme in Southern African countries	Part of curriculum covers digital divide and ICT and rights	Part of curriculum covers how ICTs can be used for social policy purposes
CEPES	Peru	Peruvian Environmental Portal		Environmental advocacy
C20	Australia	Public multimedia interactive storytelling engine		
Colnodo	Colombia	Online tool & support to local mayors offices to create transparency websites		Good governance: Transparency & accountability
EEconnect	Czech Republic	Online handbook on citizens' rights		Challenging abuse by public officials & big business
ENDA	Senegal	Gender and ICTs Network	Dialogue between regulation authorities and women's organisations	Gender analysis of ICT sector
Fantsuam Foundation	Nigeria	VSAT facility		Internet access
FMA	Philippines	Open source software to safely store data in remote server		Safe storage of humans rights data
GreenNet	United Kingdom	Internet Rights website	Privacy	
Intercom	Ecuador	Newsletter		ICT for development coverage

Organisation	Country	Activities	Directly policy	Indirect policy
Jinbonet	South Korea	Online guide to human rights in information society	Information rights	
Labornet	USA	Conference on communication rights & access	Range of isues	
Laneta	Mexico	Technical training for unemployed Mexican youth		Access and skills
Open Forum	Cambodia	Portal to develop Khmer translation of free software		Access
RITS	Brazil	Telecentres		Access
Sangonet	South Africa	ICT Discussion Forum		Role & relevance of ICTS
TAU	Argentina	Community information portal		
Strawberrynet	Romania	Courses in online environmental journalism		Environmental policy
Third World Institute*	Uruguay	Portal for World Social Forum		Social policy
Unimondo	Italy	CRIS Campaign	WSIS	
Wamani	Argentina	Rerpots on state of ICT policy	Range of policies	
Web Networks	Canada	Inuktitut-friendly web hosting and development environment		Access
Women'snet	South Africa	Independence from Sangonet		
Womenshub	Philippines	Draft policy framework document	Digital and gender divides	
Zamirnet	Croatia	Training in computer skills, human rights, e-commerce		Access

* There seems to be an error in the report here in that the portal was, in fact, set up by RITS in Brazil rather than ITeM

CIPP Publications 2001-5

Thanks are due to Karen Higgs for compiling this list.

General publications

Involving Civil Society in ICT Policy: the World Summit on the Information Society
Available in English, French and Spanish.

Guide to Running a National ICT Policy Consultation for the World Summit on the Information Society
Available in English, French and Spanish.

ICT Policy: A Beginner's Handbook
Available in full in English and Spanish and in part in French.

Discussion papers

APC's Recommendations to the WSIS on Internet Governance. By APC(Nov 2005, APC)
Available in English, Spanish and French

Interconnection costs. By Mike Jensen(Sep 2005)
Available in English, Spanish and French

The Centrality of E-strategies in the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Plan of Action. By Willie Currie(May 2004, commissioned by APC)
Available in English

Financing the Information Society in the South: A Global Public Goods Perspectiva. By Pablo Accuosto (ITeM) and Niki Johnson(Jun 2004, commissioned by APC)
Available in English.

ICTs and the environment: E-waste challenges in developing countries: South Africa case study. By Alan Finlay(Nov 2005, APC)
Available in English

Internet governance and the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). By Adam Peake(Jun 2004, commissioned by APC)
Available in English

African Participation in WSIS: review and discussion paper. By David Souter(Jul 2004)
Available in English

WSIS Process and Themes Debated. By Valeria Betancourt (APC)(Apr 2004, APC)
Available in English and Spanish

Whose "information society"? By Anriette Esterhuysen (APC)(Mar 2004, APC)
Available in English, Spanish and Portuguese

Curriculum

2004: APC's ICT policy training materials were improved and updated with new modules relevant to Africa added.
- ICT policy glossary, developed by APC
- Human rights and ICT policy in Africa, developed by APC
- Real Access, developed for APC by Bridges.org
- Universal Access, developed for APC by Claire Sibthorpe
- Advocacy journalism, developed for APC by Highway Africa

Publications from LAC Policy Monitor

1) National ICT policy papers

- Argentina: Convergencia tecnológica y salto cualitativo / Argentina: Technological convergence and qualitative steps. Carlos Alvarez y Rodolfo Rapetti. November 2001

- Informe inicial sobre políticas en internet en Colombia / Introduction to internet policies in Colombia. Efrain Tunjo B., Julian Casasbuenas G. November 2001

- Informe sobre la situación de internet en Costa Rica / Report on the situation of internet in Costa Rica. Walter Farah. November 2001

- Informe inicial sobre políticas de internet en México / Introduction to internet policies in Mexico. Olinca Marino. November 2001

2) Research

- Brecha digital y telecentros: Políticas, Legislación y Nuevas Iniciativas de Acceso a las TIC en México, Costa Rica, Cuba, Colombia, Brasil, Uruguay y Argentina/ Digital divide and telecentres: Policies, legislation and new ICT access initiatives in Mexico, Costa Rica, Cuba, Colombia, Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. Paúl Bonilla Soria. November 2001

- Software Libre para el Desarrollo Tecnológico / Free software for technological development. Rodolfo Pilas y Manuel Pérez. November 2001

- Las mujeres y las políticas de TIC / Women and ICT policies. Dafne Plou. November 2001

- De las Comunidades Virtuales a los Movimientos Sociales. Un esbozo de interpretación / From virtual communities to social movements. Bibiana Apolonia del Brutto. November 2001

- Comercio Electrónico en América Latina. Realidades y Perspectivas / E-commerce in Latin America. Situation and perspectives. Erick Iriarte Ahon. November 2001

- El Papel del Ciudadano y de las OSC en el e-Gobierno / The role of citizens and CSOs in e-government. Katherine Reilly y Raúl Echeverría. January 2003

- Sociedad civil y Proyectos nacionales de TIC: ¿El baile de los que sobran? México, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, Perú, Brasil, Argentina y Chile / Civil society and National ICT projects: Mexico, El Salvador, Costa Rica,

Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Brazil, Argentina and Chile. Miguel Saravia. December 2003

3. WSIS National Papers: Latin American civil society active in the WSIS.

- Argentina. Wamani. January 2003
- Bolivia. CrisBol. January 2003
- Ecuador. Ecuanex – Intercom. January 2003
- Mexico. LaNeta. January 2003
- Dominican Republic. Funredes. January 2003

4. Booklets

- Otro lado de la brecha: Perspectivas Latinoamericanas y del Caribe ante la CMSI / The other side of the divide: Latin-American and Caribbean Perspectives on the WSIS
REDISTIC: Acceso, APC, Funredes, Grupo Redes, Links/UBA, ITDG, RITS, UB
December 2003

- Cúpula Mundial sobre a Sociedade da Informação - um tema de tod@s. / World Summit on the Information Society: an issue for all. Paulo Lima, Graciela Selaimen, Valeria Betancourt. January 2003

- CMSI y temas debatidos / WSIS Process and Themes Debated. Valeria Betancourt. April 2004

5. Training Materials

- Currículum de Capacitación en Políticas de TIC de APC. Actualización, adaptación al contexto LAC y traducción a Español / APC's ICT policy training. Update, customisation to LAC context and translation into Spanish. 2004- 2005

6. Articles for magazines

- La brecha digital: más allá de las fronteras de la conectividad / The digital divide: beyond the limits of connectivity. Valeria Betancourt. Magazine 'Pez de Plata'. January 2005

- La necesidad de involucrar a las comunidades rurales en las políticas públicas de Tecnologías de Información y Comunicación (TIC) / The importance of rural communities' engagement on ICT policies. Valeria Betancourt. Newsletter Intercambios. March 2005

7. Research (unpublished yet)

- Estado de los derechos en internet en América Latina: Argentina, Brasil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, México, Panamá, Perú, Uruguay, Venezuela. / Status of internet rights in Latin America: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Africa Policy Monitor

1. Discussion papers

For an online discussion on civil society's involvement in the WSIS:
- Identifying priorities for Africa
- Financing ICT for development
- Internet governance

- July 2004: African Participation in WSIS: review and discussion paper by David Souter

2. Resources:

- August 2004: A briefing for Africa civil society for WSIS PrepCom III of Phase II of the WSIS

2004: A tool for public, private and civil society stakeholders and decision makers, for integrating gender dimension into ICT policies, to contribute to a fair, plural and inclusive African Information Society.

3. Booklets

'WSIS Africa Perspectives - Our side of the divide' in French and English.

4. Research Reports

- Country reports: During 2002 country reports were produced covering Senegal, Ethiopia, and Kenya. In 2003 additional country reported were produced for Cameroon, Egypt and Benin.

-Thematic reports 2003
* Free and Open Source Software (FOSS)
* Gender & ICT
* ICT and HIV/AIDS

APC member engagement in CIPP

CIPP	Online Spaces			Projects		Events		TOTAL	
APC Member	WSIS	Nat'l Portals	Travel Grant application	Nat'l portals	CATIA BCO Nat'l Policy	WSIS	WSF	CIPP projects	CIPP events
Africa									
1 ALIN					1	1		**1**	**1**
2 Alternatives	1	1	1	1	1	1		**1**	**1**
3 ArabDev		1		1				**1**	
4 CECS						1			**1**
5 ENDA						1			**1**
6 Fantsuam	1			1	1	1		**1**	**1**
7 SANGONeT	1	1		1		1		**1**	**1**
8 Ungana Afrika	1			1		1			**1**
9 Women'sNet				1		1			**1**
10 Wougnet	1				1	1		**1**	**1**
Sub-total	**5**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**9**	**0**	**6**	**9**
Asia Pacific									
1 BytesForAll	1	1	1	1	1	1		**1**	**1**
2 c2o	1	1	1	1				**1**	
3 FMA	1	1		1		1	1	**1**	**1**
4 JCA-NET	1		1			1	1		**1**
5 Jinbonet	1					1	1		**1**
6 Open Forum	1	1	1	1		1		**1**	**1**
7 WomensHub									
Sub-total	**6**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**4**	**5**

North America

1	IGC	
2	LaborNet	
3	Web	
	Sub-total	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

	APC Member	WSIS	Portals	Travel Grant		CIPP Projects Nat'l portals	CATIA BCO	CIPP Events WSIS	WSF	TOTAL CIPP projects	CIPP events
	Europe										
1	BlueLink	1	1	1		1		1		**1**	**1**
2	CAI	1						1			**1**
3	ChangeNet										
4	ComLink										
5	Econnect										
6	Green Spider	1	1	1				1			**1**
7	GreenNet	1	1			1	1		1	**1**	**1**
8	Pangea	1				1		1		**1**	**1**
9	StrawberryNet		1			1				**1**	
10	Unimondo	1	1			1				**1**	
11	ZaMirNET	1	1			1		1		**1**	**1**
	Sub-total	**7**	**6**	**2**		**6**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**6**	**6**

South America

		WSIS	Nat'l Portals	Travel Grant application	Nat'l portals	CATIA BCO	WSIS	WSF	CIPP projects	CIPP events
1	CEPES	1				1				1
2	Colnodo	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Eslared					1				1
4	INTERCOM					1			1	
5	IteM	1	1	1	1		1		1	1
6	LaNeta	1	1	2	1		1		1	1
7	RITS	1	1		1		1	1	1	1
8	TAU	1	1		1				1	
9	Wamani									
	Sub-total	**6**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**6**

SUMMARY		Online Spaces			Projects		Events		TOTAL	
	40	WSIS	Nat'l Portals	Travel Grant application	Nat'l portals	CATIA BCO	WSIS	WSF	CIPP projects	CIPP events
Total members		24	18	15	18	10	23	6	**22**	**26**
% of total m'ship		60	45	37.5	45	25	57.5	15	**55**	**65**
By region as % of total										
Africa		12.5	7.5	10	7.5	10	22.5	0	**15**	**22.5**
Asia Pacific		15	10	10	10	2.5	12.5	7.5	**10**	**12.5**
Nth America		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Europe		17.5	15	5	15	2.5	12.5	2.5	**15**	**15**
South America		15	12.5	12.5	12.5	10	10	5	**15**	**15**

Informants for the evaluation

Organisation	Name
Staff	
Anriette Esterhuyse	APC
Willie Currie	APC
Karen Banks	APC
Karen Higgs	APC
Chat Garcia Ramilo	APC
Ann Tothill	APC
Emmanuel Njenga	APC
Valeria Betancourt	APC
Jenny Radloff	APC
Kaca Fialova	APC
Member organisations	
Natasha Primo	Womensnet
John Dada	Fanstuam Fn
Michel Lambert	Alternatives
Dorothy Okello	WougNet
Pablo Accuosto	ITeM
Danilo Lujiambo	Nodo Tau
Al Alegre	Foundation for Media Alternative
Anna Feldman	Greennet
Milena Bukova	Bluelink
Partha Sarker	BytesForAll
Partners	
Sean O'Siochru	CRIS
Bruce Girard	CRIS
Sally Burch	Agencia Latinoamericana de Información
Peter Benjamin	Open Knowledge Network
David Souter	Ict Development Associates
Loeki Schaeffers	International Institute for Communication and Development
Mavic Balleza	International Women's Tribune Centre
Lin McDevitt-Pugh	International Information Center and Archives for the Women's Movement
Nick Perkins	AMARC
Milton Mueller	Internet Governance Project, Syracuse University
Jovan Kurbalija	DIPLO Foundation
Georg Greve	FreeSoftwareFn
Policy people	
Tim Kelly	International Telecommunications Union
Richard Hill	International Telecommunications Union
Markus Kummer	Working Group on Internet Government
Joanne Sandler	United Nations Development Fund for Women
Osnat Lubrani	United Nations Development Fund for Women
Ralf Bendrath	Heinrich Boll
Trainer and trainee	
Lishan Adam	

Davis Weddi	New Nation newspaper
Donors	
Marjan Besuijen	HIVOS
Heloise Emdon	IDRC
Radhika Lal	United Nations Development Programme
Stephane Roberge	IDRC