

INCEPTION REPORT

Multi-Country Independent Review of Technological Innovations in ESAR

PREPARED BY:

International Solutions Group

PREPARED FOR:

UNICEF

Contact Us

Brian O'Callaghan, Director of Programs
bocallaghan@theisg.com · www.theisg.com



International
Solutions Group

LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
INTRODUCTION	4
BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW	4
REVIEW PURPOSE	4
REVIEW OBJECTIVES.....	4
STAKEHOLDER MAPPING AND REVIEW FOCUS	5
SCOPE AND REVIEW CRITERIA	6
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK.....	8
THEORY OF CHANGE.....	8
PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORKS	8
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK QUESTION MATRIX	9
METHODOLOGY	10
OVERALL APPROACH	10
DATA SOURCES.....	10
DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND PURPOSES.....	11
FIELD VISIT PROTOCOLS	12
DATA CODING AND ANALYSIS	13
REPORTING	13
SHARING OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS.....	13
CASE STUDIES	13
FINAL REPORT	13
REVIEW MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE	14
ISG TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	14
UNICEF/REFERENCE GROUP ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	14
RISK MANAGEMENT	15
QUALITY ASSURANCE MECHANISMS.....	16
ANNEX A: DETAILED WORK PLAN.....	18
ANNEX B: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	20
ANNEX C: TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR REPORTS.....	29
ANNEX D: UNRESOLVED ISSUES OF PROJECT SCOPE.....	32

List of Acronyms

AE	Aid effectiveness
CO	Country Office
CRG	Reference Group
CS	Civil Society
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ESARO	East and Southern Africa Regional Office
FGD	Focus group discussion
FRG	Field Results Group
GIC	Global Innovations Centre
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human rights
ICT4D	Information and Communication Technologies for Development
INGO	International non-Governmental Organisation
ISG	International Solutions Group
KII	Key informant interview
Logframe	Logical framework
M&E	Monitoring and Review
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD/DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
PO	Programme Office
ProDoc	Project Document
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Introduction

Background to the Review

In 2007, UNICEF began exploring innovative approaches and tools to advance the rights of children, specifically in the area of Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D). The Eastern and Southern African Region, led by the Rwanda and Uganda Country Offices, pioneered the design, development, and scaling of ICT4D initiatives across multiple programmes. This work ultimately identified entry points for ICT4D solutions within traditional systems, and initiatives have been taken forward in health, nutrition, education, and youth engagement, particularly in Malawi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia.

As the tools and approaches evolved over the last seven years, they have been increasingly adopted and applied in other country offices in the Eastern and Southern Africa Region and beyond.

While there has been significant progress in the development and application of ICT4D solutions in Eastern and Southern Africa, a comprehensive assessment of these solutions has not been conducted. The UNICEF Field Results Group (FRG), the Global Innovations Centre (GIC), and the Eastern and Southern African Regional Office (ESARO) seek to review ICT4D solutions that have been implemented in Malawi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia to answer a broad overarching question:

If a UNICEF programme applied one or more ICT4D solutions, how did this application impact the programme (i.e. service delivery, stimulation of demand, cost efficiencies, etc.)?

Review Purpose

The main purpose of this review is to create an evidence-based document that can be used by Country Office (CO) programme sections to decide whether or not the application of an ICT4D solution will enable more effective and efficient achievement of programme results.

The review will also be used:

- To advocate for the use of ICT4D solutions to accelerate the achievement of results for children;
- As a tool to support resource mobilization; and
- For forging new and strategic partnerships.

Review Objectives

The review objectives are:

1. To assess the impact, cost-effectiveness and sustainability of selected ICT4D solutions;
2. To identify characteristics of an enabling environment for effective adoption and scale-up of ICT4D solutions; and
3. To propose recommendations for the adoption, scale-up and sustaining of ICT4D solutions.

It is expected that the review will also provide UNICEF a holistic overview the selected ICT4D solutions and a regional perspective of:

- Key opportunities afforded by ICT4D activities to country programmes;
- The impact of ICT4D solutions on in-country programmes and systems;
- Efforts made and lessons learned in generating national ownership of ICT4D solutions;
- Country-level sustainability efforts, including national government participation/contribution to ICT4D solutions, and;
- The business case for investment in ICT4D solutions.

Stakeholder Mapping and Review Focus

The table below displays a preliminary list of internal and external stakeholders to engage during this review. A final list of stakeholders to interview will be prepared in consultation with UNICEF.

The table also contains proposed review foci (i.e. results and management) for this Review which presents whether ISG will analyse each representative from a results perspective and/or a management perspective. If necessary, these foci will be revised and before being used to guide data collection.

Table: Stakeholder Mapping and Review Focus

Stakeholder	Representative(s)	Proposed Review Focus	
		Results	Management
UNICEF Staff at HQ/GIC	▪ Reference Group	x	x
	▪ Policy Division staff	x	x
	▪ Programme Division staff	x	x
	▪ NYHQ Innovation Unit	x	x
	▪ Finance staff	x	x
UNICEF staff at CO and Regional Offices	▪ Country Representatives/Deputy Country Representatives	x	x
	▪ Regional Directors/Deputy Directors	x	x
	▪ Programme staff (coordinators, advisors, others)	x	x
	▪ M&E staff	x	x
	▪ Finance staff	x	x
Other UN Agencies	▪ Representatives from other UN entities—UNFPA, UNDP, etc.	x	
Partners/Strategic Partners	▪ INGOs/NGOs	x	
	▪ Government officials: representatives from various ministries, local government	x	
	▪ CSOs/grantees	x	
	▪ Regional bodies	x	
	▪ Private sector businesses, technology companies	x	

Scope and Review Criteria

The scope of the review covers ICT4D solutions selected by the COs from Malawi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia listed below:

Malawi	Rwanda	Uganda	Zambia
Project Mwana	RapidSMS Rwanda – 1000 days	U-Survey	WASH real time monitoring
RemindMi	End user real time monitoring	mTrac	Project Mwana
Results160		Backpack+	U-Report
CVSU mobile case management monitoring		U-Report	
		MobileVRS	

The solutions identified above come from a cross section of UNICEF’s programmatic sectors of Social Protection, Education, Health, HIV/AIDS, Nutrition and WASH.

The review will focus on how ICT4D solutions have effected day to day operations of programming and will not include investigation of beneficiary-level outcomes and impacts.

Timeframe: The review will cover implementation of innovation activities from 2007 until December 2015.

Geographic coverage: The review will assess global, regional and country-level programme components. The project team will conduct field visits in Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, and Zambia.

Review Criteria

The ISG project team will assess programme progress and results using the five criteria of *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact* which align with the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation criteria.¹

The following key questions will drive the research:

1. What is the effectiveness and impact realized by the ICT4D solutions?
 - a. What is the scale of implementation for each ICT4D solution (e.g. geographic coverage, number of users, number of transactions)?
 - b. What is the theory of change underpinning the expected impact of the ICT4D solutions on programme results?
 - c. What differences have the ICT4D solutions made towards achieving programme results?
 - d. In what ways has access to real-time information or the engagement of citizens improved programme performance and reduced monitoring and implementation costs?
 - e. How are stakeholders (especially rights holders) being engaged in new or different ways by programmes that have implemented ICT4D solutions?

¹ United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System November 2013. The evaluation criteria build upon the UNEG evaluation criteria and align with the OECD/DAC criteria

- f. Have programmes with an ICT4D component repositioned the relationship of beneficiaries from passive recipients to active change agents, or is there a difference in the level of engagement?
2. What is the business case for adopting ICT4D solutions in programmes?
 - a. What are the differences between UNICEF-developed solutions and vendor solutions?
 - b. Across the life of the ICT4D solution (design, development, implementation, scale-up, transfer), what is the cost-benefit and value for money of each of the ICT4D solutions and overall for the Country Office?
 - What are the fixed and variable costs of the ICT4D solutions over the project lifetimes?
 - How do these costs compare to the cost of doing “business as usual” for the programmes?
 - What are the opportunity costs?
 - What are the improved efficiencies of the ICT4D solutions?
 - How are ICT4D solutions financed?
 - What is the understanding of Total Cost of Ownership?
 - c. Over time, are the ICT4D solutions the most cost-effective and best value for money for UNICEF, government counterparts, and partners?
 - What would be the cost of not implementing the ICT4D solutions for beneficiaries and UNICEF?
 - d. Are the ICT4D solutions institutionally and financially sustainable?
 - e. Who are the key partners in implementation of ICT4D solutions?
 - What has been government engagement and ownership of ICT4D solutions?
 3. Under what conditions can ICT4D solutions be effectively and sustainably scaled up?
 - a. How did the ICT4D solutions evolve?
 - b. What are the conditions for an effective enabling environment to adopt, implement and scale ICT4D solutions?
 - c. What are the country-level governance structures that enhance ownership?
 - d. How have countries used district level structures to implement ICT4D solutions at village levels?
 - e. What factors enable country-level mobilisation of funds towards modelling and scaling up of ICT4D solutions?
 4. What are the lessons learned from the experiences in the four countries?
 5. What are the best practices for overcoming programmatic and technical challenges, working with partners, and scaling?

Furthermore, the project team places due importance on drawing out the lessons learned in this program (potentially via initiatives that did not result in positive outcomes, or that did not successfully transfer from one country to another). The team will endeavour to collect lessons learned that can inform future innovation work, best practices that have worked and are replicable elsewhere, including areas where the programme could be improved. The team will also explore where and when ‘innovations’ transition to become ‘standard practices’.

Analytical Framework

The analytical framework is provided to guide the content and methodology of the review; that is, to outline what the review should look at, and how ISG will do this. With the Theories of Change (ToC) as a central reference point, the analytical framework will use the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact to assess the progress and results of the different technology-based innovations. These criteria are reflected in the Analytical Framework Question Matrix.

Theory of Change

The starting point of the review are the TOCs for individual ICT4D solutions (and an over-arching TOC for ICT4D solutions), which may be set out in the individual project/programme documents. By focusing on the explicit or implicit TOCs, the project team will examine the relationships and links between factors such as resources and inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, the long-term goal, the context of the interventions, and other influencing factors (e.g. operational, political, technical) that enable or restrict success and facilitate/hinder scale-up.

It is the role of the project team to ascertain and validate the extent to which the causal links that are identified or assumed within the TOCs were explicitly understood and pursued during implementation. This process will increase programme transparency, allowing stakeholders and partners to see the multiple and interlinked factors and components that must work together and reinforce each other. To validate this assessment, the team will make use of the programme documentation (including performance frameworks) to ascertain how it contributed, as a logical model, to the results and the overall goal of the Programme.

Programme Performance Frameworks

For individual ICT4D solutions, relevant performance frameworks (such as logframes) will be used to organise a systematic review of the original goals and outcomes on which innovation initiatives are being evaluated. The project team will be cognisant of political, cultural, and economic factors in the respective countries which may influence effective implementation, impact or sustainability. The risk factors associated with successful attainment of the goals and the outcomes will also be reviewed and analysed to build the business case for ICT4D solutions. Recognition of the assumptions and risks articulated in the project documentation will inform the review/development of the TOCs and the logical models built on this basis. The learning and recommendations derived from the review will therefore be developed in light of the continuing challenges and objectives in which ongoing and scaled-up programming will operate.

Analytical Framework Question Matrix

Focus	Key Areas of Research	Methodology	
		Target Groups	Tools
Context of ICT4D Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are selected ICT4D solutions being implemented (pilot vs. scale-up)? What was the process for initiation/development of ICT4D solutions? Who are the key partners/stakeholders in ICT4D initiatives? What is the level of commitment of these stakeholders to ICT4D solutions (global, regional and national)? What is the extent of uptake of the selected ICT4D solutions? What is the quality of data in ICT4D solutions? How verifiable/analysable are resource flows? 	<u>Government partners</u> Govt. Ministries (health, children, education, technology) Local government	Document Review KII Focus group discussions
Programme Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did national and local counterparts/stakeholders participate in ICT4D solutions design? To what extent do individual ICT4D solutions reflect UNICEF/national priorities/strategies? How aligned are ICT4D solutions goals/objectives/outcomes with development challenges identified in project documentation/TOCs? 	<u>International partners</u> UNICEF Country Offices	
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How supportive is the enabling environment for uptake of ICT4D solutions? What are the key elements? What has been the cost of ICT4D solutions vs. the cost of undertaking alternative interventions (opportunity cost)? How have ICT4D solutions been financed/budgeted for? What are the constraints? Do ICT4D solutions demonstrate good value for money? What is the quality of monitoring of ICT4D solution outcomes in relation to data collection, analysis and reporting, costs, actions? 	<u>National Partners</u> Local NGO/INGO partners, tech companies	
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do the ICT4D solutions work – how are strategies leading to outcomes? What are the criteria for selection/adoption/development of ICT4D solutions? Do these create an effective business case? What, if any, are the differences between the four countries in ensuring effective implementation of pilot ICT4D solutions? How successfully are countries taking ICT4D solutions to scale? How effective was capacity building of stakeholders in design, development, implementation, monitoring and scale-up of ICT4D solutions? 	<u>Other actors</u> Others involved in ICT4D initiatives	
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has UNICEF support to stakeholders/partners led to increased ownership and institutional capacity? To what extent are ICT4D solutions sustainable, replicable and/or scalable? Did changes in the macro-level environment impact on sustainability of ICT4D solutions? 		
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have outcomes led to impact – as stated in programme documentation/TOC? What are the results of ICT4D solutions at the community level? How have results varied across programme locations, including ICT4D solutions approaches to local contexts? What are the unintended positive or negative achievements? 		
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key lessons/best practices in designing, developing, implementing, monitoring and scaling up of ICT4D solutions? What are the preconditions necessary for funding the development and implementation of effective & scalable models/pilots? 		
Recommendations for UNICEF, donors, partners, govt. etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the strategies, processes, tools & requirements for ICT4D solutions, particularly with respect to programmatic & technical challenges? How can partners in governments, civil society & private sector support future programming? What are the best partnership approaches/models? How can promising ICT4D solutions be identified, implemented in pilot form, and scaled up? 		

Methodology

Overall Approach

The review will rely on a suite of action research methodologies that collect both qualitative and quantitative data. These include a desk review of documentation, key informant interviews and focus group interviews with stakeholders. In addition, where significant programme activities or sector meetings are taking place in the offices we visit, we will use direct observation to collect additional data (See also Data Collection Methods, below).

Guiding Principles

In addition to the review being in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Review and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Review, ISG will use a range of participatory methods to ensure that key stakeholders and partners are centrally involved in reflective and forward thinking processes and will adhere to the following principles:

- **Consultation** with, and participation by, key stakeholders so as to ensure that the assignment is fully relevant to its users and stakeholders, and that the evidence and analysis are sound and factually accurate. Consultation will be iterative and each stage will be informed by and build upon earlier project work.
- **Methodological rigor** to ensure that the most appropriate sources of evidence for answering the analytical framework are used in a technically appropriate manner. The project team will use different data sources and various methods throughout the process of the study to triangulate information – checking and corroborating findings to ensure that they are consistent. An analytical framework to ensure that all issues are addressed, as a guide to investigation and as a tool for analysis will be developed.
- **Technical expertise and expert knowledge** to ensure that the assignment benefits from knowledge and experience in the fields relevant to technological innovations in development and that it contributes to building the body of evidence around what works, what does not work, and in each case why.
- **Independence** to ensure that the findings stand solely on an impartial and objective analysis of the evidence, without undue influence by any stakeholder group.

In this context, our approach incorporates best practice evaluation/review criteria and principles for effective development assistance as well as norms and standards of the OECD/DAC framework.

Data Sources

The Review will use four main sources of data: secondary programme/project documentation/data, key informants, group interviewees, and field observation.

Secondary Documentation & Data: Reviewing programme/project and other relevant documents and data (including technical outputs, monitoring data and costs related to the ICT4D solutions) allows the project team to gain a fuller understanding of the selected ICT4D solutions and their key stakeholders. All relevant documents sourced by UNICEF and the project team will be reviewed as the assignment moves forward in order to inform case study reports and the final report.

Key Informants: A list of key informants to be interviewed (either individually or in a group discussion format) at the global and country levels will be developed in consultation with the review manager and review reference group. This list will include UNICEF staff at global, regional and country levels, primary stakeholders in each country (e.g. staff from government partners), as well as external

stakeholders (CSOs, INGOs, private sector providers) and individuals who are utilising or benefitting from ICT4D solutions.

Field Observation: Field visits to observe the implementation of initiatives in a community setting will be finalised in consultation with UNICEF. During the field visits, the project team will take note of and incorporate their direct observations into the country case studies and final report. Observation carried out during field visits will assist in triangulating with and validating other data sources, notably interviews.

Data collection tools and purposes

Document and data review

The document and data review will form the initial assessment of the programme at the national and global levels. The document review will identify best practices, strengths and weaknesses, and will also begin to examine the impact related to the program. Finally, the project team will use the insights gained from the document review to inform further development of the key informant interview guides.

Dependent on the volume of material available, the project team may draw a sample rather than reviewing all documentation. The materials will be provided by UNICEF and relevant partners as well as from ISG's own research, as required. These materials will provide greater insight regarding how UNICEF's ICT4D solutions have been carried out in different contexts that have several dimensions and use different management modalities. The detailed desk reviews will enable the team to engage in a reflexive examination to learn how, when and in what manner ICT4D solutions were used in a given setting. The team will be able to examine in greater detail the types and elements of these activities, the extent to which they have been effective in terms of outputs and results (planned vs. actual), and best practices.

Since documentation and data from the four countries will be reviewed at the earlier stages of desk review, this data may also highlight topics and issues that we may want to explore in much more depth during country and regional office visits.

Key informant interviews

Semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with a wide variety of stakeholders are an ideal method for obtaining in-depth, qualitative information. The main advantage of this method is that it will promote serious reflection and response by people knowledgeable and engaged by the programme in each country in a setting of trust and confidentiality; the project team will be able to probe and follow-up with interviewees in a way that surveys or other static instruments do not allow, potentially yielding more nuanced information relevant to the assignment.

KIs will be conducted, to the extent possible, in an informal setting. Typically, these interviews will be with a single respondent, but in some cases, the respondent may invite two or three people. The project team will record responses by detailed note taking and, whenever possible/appropriate, using a digital recording device. Confidentiality will be maintained and records will be held securely.

In cases where individuals are unavailable for face-to-face interviews, the project team will administer the interview virtually. Draft interview guides for various stakeholders can be found in Annex B.

Focus Group discussions

Face-to-face facilitated discussions with small groups of individuals, including partner staff and community members will allow our project team to engage in meaningful inquiry with an array of stakeholders who may not be suited to a direct interview format. The wider goal of focus groups is to promote self-disclosure among attendees, foster dialogue, and allow the conversation to 'take on a life of its own', thereby adding a richness to the discussion that could not be achieved through a one-on-one interview. It also often allows for sensitive topics to be addressed in order to ensure these topics

are addressed properly during the assignment. It is our experience that individuals are more likely to share their perceptions/opinions in a group setting with others of a similar background/experience.

FGDs will be conducted, to the extent possible, in an informal setting. Focus group participants (which can number 4-12 people) will be gathered and organised dependent on their relationship to the specific initiative, past experience, and other characteristics as appropriate. The project team will record responses by detailed note-taking and, whenever possible, using a digital recording device. Confidentiality will be maintained and records will be held securely.

Focus group discussions will follow the same guides as Key Informant Interviews, which can be found in Annex B.

Field Visits (Observation)

Observation provides the opportunity to document activities, behaviour and physical aspects without having to depend upon stakeholders' willingness and ability to respond to questions. The main added value of the field visits and observations will be to review first-hand the activities as implemented by the programme and outcomes achieved. Field visits also assist in validating other data sources, notably interviews.

During the field visits, the project team will take notes and incorporate their direct observations into the Country Case Studies and final report.

Field Visit Protocols

Dependent on the availability of chosen field visit countries, ISG will use the first field visit as a pilot in order to test the data collection methodology and tools. This would allow for any modifications to the tools prior to subsequent field visits. If it is not possible to carry out a pilot field visit, the project team will communicate often to ensure that data collection in all four countries is carried out analogously, informing other team members of any substantial modifications to the tools.

Prior to arrival

The ISG team, well in advance of departure, will prepare brief scopes of work for each of the field visits. These scopes of work will:

- Set out the purpose/objectives of the visit;
- Explain the methodology to be applied (including presentation of the research tools);
- Introduce a draft agenda for the visit (in consultation with UNICEF);
- List the key individuals (internal and external to UNICEF) to be interviewed; and
- Specify any logistical requirements of the project team.

The UNICEF CO teams will be given the opportunity to provide feedback and input on the fieldwork prior to finalization of the scopes of work, as well as provide further detail on key personnel and documentation to be included in the Review. The COs will be asked to provide a point person who will be responsible for arranging meetings, logistics, etc. prior to the field visit. Additionally, prior to the visit, the ISG team will collect additional country-level documentation to further inform the field visit.

Arrival in country

The project team's activities in-country will be agreed upon in the scopes of work. The CO point person will have made all the logistical arrangements for the visit to maximize the efficiency of the team's visit. Each visit will entail time spent in:

- The specific Country Office (2 days)
- Meetings with key programme stakeholders (4-6 per day, depending on logistics)

Post-visit

Upon conclusion of the visit (time permitting), the project team will debrief CO staff with respect to their key findings over the course of the visit. Further, drafts of Case Study Reports will be shared with specified CO staff for feedback prior to finalisation.

Data coding and analysis

ISG will code qualitative interview/discussion data into meaningful categories, enabling the organisation of notes and determining themes or patterns common to KIIs/FGDs. After field visits, while information is still fresh, the team will perform initial coding. This review process will help our team continually refine our questions and share our findings internally.

After completion of field visits the team will begin a process of “focused coding” – combining smaller, related themes into one category, subdividing repeated codes into sub categories or eliminating codes that have become outliers. This process should result in a manageable number of codes that can be thoroughly analysed.

The team will then finalise the analysis of the qualitative KII data by extracting the meaning and significance of the coded themes and integrating these with the themes, findings and lessons obtained through the other data collection methods discussed below.

Throughout this process, the project team will ensure validity and reliability through triangulation, the use of standardized data collection tools, and compliance with OECD/DAC and UNEG standards in Review.

Reporting

Sharing of preliminary findings

As previously stated, preliminary findings from each country field visit will first be shared with in-country staff as part of a field visit debriefing session at the end of each field visit (time permitting). This presentation to country staff will provide a platform for our project team and UNICEF staff to discuss initial findings, gather initial feedback, and identify any errors in fact or misinterpretations.

Case Studies

Prior to the development of the final report and following completion of document review, virtual interviews, and field visits, the project team will develop four Case Study Reports (one for each field visit). An outline for Case Study Reports can be found in Annex C.

Final report

The Team Leader will oversee all analysis and report writing, providing quality assurance and consistency.

Data collected and analysed during the document review and field visits as well as information presented in the Case Study Reports will be used to develop the draft Synthesis Report. Thus, the draft Synthesis Report will include both global level and country specific findings. The format for the final report can be found in Annex C.

The Draft Synthesis Report will be submitted to the Review Manager at UNICEF who will then share the draft with relevant Country Offices and the reference group for review and compile all feedback for the project team.

Presentation and Dissemination of findings Workshop

The project team will hold a virtual debriefing workshop with UNICEF staff from HQ (NY), the ESA Regional Office and the four Country Offices. The details of the final report debriefing will be finalised in consultation with UNICEF after submission and initial review of the draft final report.

Revision and Submission of final reports

After receiving feedback on the draft Synthesis Report from the relevant UNICEF stakeholders, the project team will make the necessary revisions and submit a final Synthesis Report to UNICEF.

Review Management and Quality assurance

ISG Team Roles and Responsibilities

ISG will be responsible for timely and effective execution of the Review process as well as the timely submission of assignment deliverables, as agreed upon in the Inception Report (this document). An overview of specific roles and responsibilities of individual project team Members are described in the table below.

Table: project team Roles and Responsibilities

Title	Name of team member	Responsibilities
Core team members		
Team Leader	Stephen Ladek	Mr. Ladek will lead the development of the data collection tools, participate in data collection activities (including piloting) and will lead in the analysis and reporting aspects of the project.
Technical Specialist	Mark Irura	Mr. Irura will assist the team leader in tool development, participate in data collection activities and provide quality assurance through review of project deliverables.
Technical Specialist	Brian O'Callaghan	Mr. O'Callaghan will provide quality assurance and ensure methodological rigor through review of and input on project deliverables.
Technical Specialist	Michael Klein	Mr. Klein will assist the team leader in tool development, participate in data collection activities and provide quality assurance through review of project deliverables.

UNICEF/Reference Group Roles and Responsibilities

As outlined in the ToR, the Review will be managed by a reference group consisting of team members from ESARO, FRG, GIC and COs. The reference group will provide review, comments, and guidance on the overall review process. The ESA Regional Office will manage the day-to-day aspects of the review process.

Risk management

For the sake of brevity, a full risk management analysis and matrix is not contained in this report. Consultations with country offices prior to deployment of the review team will include an up-to-date assessment of risks in terms of security, communicable diseases, natural disasters, and other severe threats to the review. ISG assesses that the main risks to the review are as follows:

Figure: Risks and Risk Mitigation

Review Team Members (*Probability: Low*): One of the experts from our team leaves the project or becomes unavailable.

Contingency: ISG will communicate with all staff regularly. Additionally, we have confirmed project team members' availability for the duration of the assignment via an availability spreadsheet. Additionally, ISG has a large network of capable consultants who possess the necessary technical and thematic expertise to carry out this Review. If a team member becomes unavailable during the course of the Review, ISG will, with approval from UNICEF, replace the team member with an equally capable consultant to continue the review as projected.

Access to Stakeholders (*Probability: Very High*): The project team is unable to meet with key stakeholders, groups, organisations, etc. during data collection.

Contingency: ISG will initiate collection of documentation and scheduling of key stakeholder interviews and focus groups discussions from stakeholders immediately after the finalisation of the data collection tools. UNICEF will help to coordinate all data collection activities.

The review is happening during a difficult time period – end of year and holiday season. This may limit access to stakeholders during anticipated field visits. ISG will attempt to contact any unavailable stakeholders via Skype, email or other virtual format.

Missing or Incomplete Documentation (*Probability: High*): Key documentation, institutional memory or program-related data are missing, affecting the team's ability to perform a comprehensive and/or detailed assessment.

Contingency: ISG will maintain a list of all documentation received and will perform the review to the best of its ability with available documents and data.

Insufficient time to conduct all review research and analysis (*Probability: Very High*): The short (~3 months) timeframe imposed on the review due to UNICEF scheduling, coupled with end-of-year unavailability of stakeholders will impact comprehensiveness of data collection and subsequent analysis.

Contingency: ISG will carefully plan for data collection activities in full consultation with UNICEF staff to ensure appropriate lead time and availability is planned.

Drift in Scope of Work (*Probability: Medium*): Leadership expectations change over the course of the project.

Contingency: ISG and UNICEF will communicate regularly about assignment implementation, and will coordinate and confirm all assignment activities prior to implementation.

Delay in receipt of feedback (*Probability: High*): ISG does not receive feedback or comments on written report in a timely manner.

Contingency: All project documentation and reports will be submitted for time stamping; ISG and UNICEF will agree on feedback timelines. UNICEF and the reference group will coordinate feedback and commenting internally.

Decision-making (*Probability: Medium*): The project team encounters a situation where they do not agree on a particular aspect of the review or content of a deliverable.

Contingency: Clear decision-making protocols will be developed in the Inception Phase of the assignment. Additionally, the project supervisor and ISG are responsible for the quality of all deliverables and will work to find consensus of the highest quality.

Unclear communication and distinction of roles (*Probability: Low*): Unclear division of roles and responsibilities between team members, the Reference Group, and UNICEF.

Contingency: At the outset of the assignment the project team and ISG, will consult with their counterparts at UNICEF to discuss the activities and responsibility of the team based off of the RFP. Additionally, the division of activities are included in this Inception Report.

Quality Assurance Mechanisms

ISG will incorporate the following quality assurance mechanisms in our initial approach and throughout the data collection and analysis process:

- **Inclusion:** ISG’s approach to data collection will utilise a transparent, participatory, consultative process that meaningfully involves and engages key stakeholders in the process. This participatory approach is inherent to all aspects of the Review including design and planning, data collection and analysis during the inception phase with UNICEF, reporting and results dissemination. Engaging stakeholders as active participants allows them to reflect, analyse issues from their own experience, identify what works and does not work, and to take responsibility for the changes they recommend. As such, this approach contributes to building the capacity of stakeholders to be key actors in their own development and empowers them to obtain results. A participatory process also promotes accountability, ownership, and recipient “buy-in”, and enhances the relevance and subsequent use of the Review’s findings and recommendations.
- **Appropriateness:** As discussed in the ToR, the Review will use a mixed-methods approach and will be participatory in nature in order to ensure that the data produced answers the key questions in the ToR as well as those developed during the Inception Phase. Specifically, the project team will work with UNICEF during the inception phase to finalise the data collection tools. These tools will then be piloted by the team Leader during the first field visit and adjusted as necessary to ensure that they produce relevant and accurate findings. Further, the project team will review key programme documents and work in consultation with UNICEF to identify appropriate stakeholders to engage during the Review.
- **Triangulation:** The project team will work to ensure that the most appropriate sources of evidence for undertaking the Review are used in a technically appropriate manner. The project team will collect and analyse data from different available sources and maintain an ongoing consultation process with UNICEF staff throughout the Review in order to triangulate information – checking and corroborating findings from multiple sources to ensure that they are consistent and accurate. By using a number of data collection tools (document/data review, KII, FGDs), the project team can validate its analysis and findings.
- **Contribution:** While the project team will engage stakeholders using a semi-structured interview format, team members will conduct KIIs and FGDs in a manner that will solicit feedback on any unexpected or unintended results, outcomes, etc. in order to obtain a comprehensive picture and a thorough assessment of the impact of the program. Our approach focuses on the causal relationships and linkages between resources/inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, long term goals, the context of project implementation and/or other influencing factors (e.g. operational, political, technical capacity) that serve to support or limit successful outcomes and results. Data relevant to these factors will be collected during application of the KIIs, FGDs and other data collection tools. The analytical process links proposed programme outcomes and results to

actual achievements documented by UNICEF (or other stakeholders) and is reinforced by the understanding, perceptions and attitudes of stakeholders in respect of changes attributable to the project interventions. This will ensure the project team can accurately determine and attribute UNICEF's contribution

- **Transparency:** In order to ensure transparency, ISG will work with UNICEF and the reference group to finalise data collection tools and stakeholders to engage during the Review. Further, the project team will conduct a debriefing session at the end of each field visit with Country Office Staff. This will create a platform for our project team and UNICEF Country Office Staff to discuss initial findings, gather initial feedback, and identify any errors in fact or misinterpretations. Additionally, where permission is granted, ISG may record KIIs and FGDs for later content analysis and to provide clarification in the event of data discrepancies. Finally, at the discretion of participants and UNICEF, we will include a list of stakeholders engaged with over the course of the assignment in the final report. Further, the project team will submit all notes and recordings to UNICEF upon completion of the Review, subject to UNEG guidelines.

Annex A: Detailed Work Plan

An updated work plan, created in consultation with UNICEF, is provided below and reflects the new timeline for the assignment along with associated key milestones and deliverables.

Phase	Task/Deliverable	Associated Personnel	Expected Dates
Inception	Contract signature and sharing of documents.	ISG; UNICEF	24 October
	Inception meeting: Discuss concept for Inception Report. Output: agree broadly on timeframe and work plan.	UNICEF ISG/DG	22 October
	Initial inception/kick-off telephone calls with key UNICEF stakeholders	UNICEF COs, RO, GIC, FRG	27-30 October
	Deliverable: Submission of draft workplan	ISG/DG	28 October
	Deliverable: Submission of draft Inception Report.	ISG/DG	30 October
	Convene Reference Group to discuss Inception Report at formal Inception Meeting - Nairobi Output: Feedback on Inception Report to project team.	UNICEF RG ISG/DG	2-4 November
	Incorporation of CRG feedback by project team. Deliverable: Submission of final Inception Report.	ISG/DG	10 November
	Sharing of Final Inception Report with country offices.	UNICEF	12 November
Data Collection	Initial desk review of initiative documentation and data	ISG	25 Oct-15 November
	Field Visits to four countries	ISG project team member, UNICEF CO staff	15 November – 15 December
	Malawi Field Visit	ISG project team member, UNICEF CO staff	Nov 15 – 25
	Rwanda Field Visit	ISG project team member, UNICEF CO staff	Dec 7 - 11
	Uganda Field Visit	ISG project team member, UNICEF CO staff	Nov 30 – Dec 9
	Zambia Field Visit	ISG project team member, UNICEF CO staff	Dec 5 - 10
	Further document review, virtual interviews with relevant stakeholders Output: Review and initial analysis of data	ISG	25 November – 31 January 2016
Analysis/Reporting	Analysis and Report Writing: Analysis of collected data and preparation of individual country case study reports	ISG	15 Dec 2015 – 29 January 2016
	Deliverable: Submission of draft 4 country case studies & key findings brief	ISG	29 January

	Provision of UNICEF feedback on all four country case studies	UNICEF	10 Feb
	Finalisation of country case studies	ISG	11-19 February
	Deliverable: Final country case study reports x4	ISG	19 February
	Deliverable: Submission of first draft Synthesis Report	ISG	26 February
	UNICEF HQ, COs, RG, etc. review first draft and provide feedback	UNICEF	26 Feb – 4 March
	UNICEF HQ compiles all feedback	UNICEF	4 March
	Output: Consolidated draft final report Feedback		
	Deliverable: Submission of final version of final report	ISG	15 March

*Travel dates are provisional, pending availability of UNICEF staff, stakeholders and the project team.

Annex B: Data Collection Tools

Interview protocol for KIIs and Focus Group Discussions

This Interview Protocol sets out 1) A list of key stakeholders who will participate in the data collection process; 2) A brief Introduction to the Review and procedures; 3) Questions to guide semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with stakeholders.

1. List of Key Stakeholders and Informants

- UNICEF HQ Staff
- UNICEF Country Office Staff
- Other donors and UN agencies-to be discussed with UNICEF
- National government (Line Ministries) and other related government departments (at national, regional, and local levels, as appropriate) and partners
- NGOs, CSOs grantees
- Private sector partners, including technology providers/developers

2. Introduction to the Review and Procedures

Introduction of the project team and ISG

International Solutions Group (ISG) is a consulting firm specializing in Monitoring and Review that has been contracted by UNICEF Headquarters in New York to undertake a review of UNICEF's work on ICT4D solutions.

The overall purpose of the review, with the Theory of Change as a reference point, is to serve as an evidence-based document for country office programme sections when deciding whether ICT4D solutions will add value to achieving programme results.

The main objectives of the Review are:

1. To assess the cost-effectiveness, impact and sustainability of select ICT4D solutions;
2. To identify conditions and drivers for effective adoption and scale-up of ICT4D solutions;
3. To propose recommendations for the adoption, scale-up and sustaining of ICT4D solutions.

Introduction to the field visits for the review

There will be a series of discussions and interviews taking place as part of the overall review methodology which will examine UNICEF's work on ICT4D solutions in the East and Southern Africa region. The ISG Team will collect, analyse, and assess relevant quantitative and qualitative data, drawing on external and UNICEF internal documentation and key informants.

It includes visits to four UNICEF countries: Malawi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia

The project field visit (and the related document review) involves a number of interviews and consultations with stakeholders in the country. These visits will provide the project team opportunities to assess project progress and practice, draw comparisons with progress reported to UNICEF assessed from the document review, lessons learned, and explore opportunities and constraints that programme stakeholders face and make recommendations for the way forward.

In the process of data collection, the ISG team would like to reassure all stakeholders, interviewees and participants that the team will maintain full confidentiality in recorded notes and reports of all the interviews and discussions. The ISG team thanks all informants for their participation

3. Questions to guide semi-structured KIIs and FGDs

Individual guides can be accessed on the following pages:

ANNEX B(I): KII/DISCUSSION GUIDE: UNICEF STAFF	22
ANNEX B(II): KII/DISCUSSION THEMES AND QUESTIONS: NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND RELATED GOVERNMENT PARTNERS	25
ANNEX B(III): KII/DISCUSSION THEMES AND QUESTIONS: NGOS, PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS AND TECHNICAL EXPERTS (NON-UNICEF).....	27

*Note: The interviews are semi-structured. **The following are guides, not questionnaires.** It is expected to be more of a discussion than an 'interview'. Some interviewees will know much more about the sector and about the programme than others. As noted, some interviewees will be non-participants in the program, and may wish to offer more general comments. Some interviewees will have more useful insights than others. The interview will be led by an international ISG project team Member and the respective national consultant. Each interview will last approximately one hour, though focus groups may require a little more time. **The interview/discussion questions may be prioritized or adjusted to the specific respondents to be interviewed.***

Annex B(i): KII/discussion guide: UNICEF Staff

For each KII or focus group discussion the project team member will begin with introductions and provide a brief explanation of the purpose of the meeting/discussion, its emphasis on a participatory and learning oriented approach, and express appreciation for the respondent's participation in the interview/discussion

Introductory

Name of respondent

Job title

Donor Agency/Department

Date and time of Interview

Name of Interviewer: ISG Reviewer (give names)

1. Opening questions

- 1.1. Please describe briefly your current position and key responsibilities in with respect to UNICEF's ICT4D initiatives?
- 1.2. What are the ICT4D initiatives that you are currently rolling out or have rolled out over the last 4-5 years?
- 1.3. What are the most successful ICT4D initiatives? Why?
- 1.4. And the least successful? Why?

2. Context of UNICEF's ICT4D Initiatives

- 2.1. What are the contextual factors (political, social, legal, economic) at national and global level influencing the design, development and implementation of ICT4D solutions in your office?
- 2.2. What have been the key developments in ICT4D solutions within UNICEF over the past 5 years?
- 2.3. To what extent are external stakeholders in this country (e.g. governments, donors, private sector organisations and CSOs/NGOs) familiar with the concepts and development/rollout of ICT4D solutions?

3. Relevance

- 3.1. To what extent are the ICT4D solutions implemented by your office relevant to UNICEF's mandate?
- 3.2. To what extent have individual ICT4D design and implementation strategies been relevant to this country's political, legal, economic, cultural and technological context, in particular its capacity to adopt ICT4D solutions in developmental settings?
- 3.3. Do you have a *Theory/ies of Change* for ICT4D solutions? How valid/accurate is it/are they?
- 3.4. What in your perspective are the ICT4D goals for UNICEF in this country? How were these identified?
- 3.5. How relevant are ICT4D solutions in addressing UNICEF's developmental priorities/issues in this country, particularly at community and grassroots level and for those most disadvantaged?
- 3.6. In what way were you involved in strategy and/or individual ICT4D design?

3.7. To what extent do/have national and local stakeholders (including women) participated in ICT4D design?

4. Effectiveness

- 4.1. What would you say are the major achievements of your ICT4D solutions? Please give examples.
- 4.2. To what extent have individual ICT4D solutions made progress against planned outcomes and outputs?
- 4.3. Which results/outcomes have not been achieved and why?
- 4.4. How has knowledge and capacity building and information sharing among partners helped achieve program outcomes?
- 4.5. Have the ICT4D solutions been supported by an enabling environment? If so, how? Please give examples. If not, why not?
- 4.6. What have been the key factors (contextual, management, strategies, operational) that have hindered or supported ICT4D solution effectiveness and progress?
- 4.7. How do/did ICT4D solutions measure the effect they are/were having on intended beneficiaries?
- 4.8. What are the main changes in knowledge and capacity development of national government stakeholders and civil society in relation to ICT4D solutions?
- 4.9. Who are the other main partners of your ICT4D solutions?
- 4.10. What were the criteria for choosing these partners?
- 4.11. How effectively have partners supported the ICT4D solutions?
- 4.12. Is there a role for other partners e.g. in the private sector? Why? If not, why not?
- 4.13. Are there other organizations working on similar ICT4D solutions? Are you familiar with what they do? Do you ever consult with each other?

5. Efficiency

- 5.1. What are the strengths and weakness of UNICEF's management structure and processes (e.g. staffing; planning; monitoring; resource management; communications and interactions between national, regional and global level) in implementation of ICT4D solutions?
- 5.2. To what extent do UNICEF Headquarters, UNICEF Regional Offices and the GIC provide guidance, support and tools for project implementation? Please give examples.
- 5.3. In terms of management of ICT4D solutions, what has worked well, what has not and why? What do you think needs to be improved?
- 5.4. To what extent were risk factors and risk mitigation strategies identified and applied during implementation of individual ICT4D solutions?
- 5.5. How strategically and efficiently were human and financial resources, and technical support, used in ICT4D solutions? Please give examples.
- 5.6. How do you assess the adequacy of resources provided to meet the planned results? Do you undertake a business case analysis for any of your ICT4D solutions? Please explain.

6. Sustainability

- 6.1. Which of your ICT4D solutions have continued beyond their pilot phase?
- 6.2. What determines whether an ICT4D solution continues and/or goes to scale?
- 6.3. What, if any, sustainability elements were built into these ICT4D solutions from the initial stages?
- 6.4. How successfully were the risks identified in the program design stage addressed during implementation? (E.g. changing macro-economic environment, political instability, weak capacity of partners/government for tech innovations, etc.)
- 6.5. To what extent has commitment and ownership been demonstrated by government and national institutions to ensure sustainability? What about other stakeholders?
- 6.6. What plans and strategies have you developed to ensure sustainability of ICT4D solutions?

8. Impact

- 8.1. What in your view has been the overall impact of your ICT4D solutions and in which specific areas and issues?
- 8.2. What is the evidence that ICT4D solutions have had impact at the grassroots level? Please give examples.
- 8.3. Are ICT4D solutions receiving any more money now than before? What do you think drives this?
- 8.4. Which ICT4D solutions have been adopted by other countries? Other regions?

9. Lessons learned, future directions and recommendations

- 9.1. In your perspective, what are the main lessons learned and good practices that can inform future ICT4D solution programming in this country? What could be replicated elsewhere? What could be scaled up?
- 9.2. What are key lessons learned for future collaboration between government partners, private sector partners, civil society organisations and UNICEF?
- 9.3. What are key lessons in regard to the overall management approach to ICT4D solutions?

10. **Other:** Please feel free to add or share any other comments and observations.

Thank you for your kind participation.

Annex B(ii): KII/discussion themes and questions: National government, government departments and related government partners

For each KII or focus group discussion the project team member will begin with introductions and provide a brief explanation of the purpose of the meeting/discussion, its emphasis on a participatory and learning oriented approach, and express appreciation for the respondent's participation in the interview/ discussion

Introductory

Name of respondent

Job title

Organisation/Department

Date and time of Interview

Name of Interviewer: ISG Reviewer (give names)

1. Opening questions

1.1. Please describe briefly your current position and key responsibilities

2. Context of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions

2.1. Are you familiar with the UNICEF's ICT4D solutions, and are these an area of collaboration between your organisation and UNICEF? Please explain.

2.2. What are the contextual factors (political, social, legal, economic) at national and global level influencing ICT4D solutions as they relate to UNICEF's development goals?

3. Relevance

3.1. To what extent is such technology-based development a priority for the government and your Ministry?

3.2. To what extent are technology-based approaches being integrated in the development policy frameworks and in aid effectiveness and aid management systems in your government?

3.3. What has been the involvement of the Ministry in design or implementation of any of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions?

4. Effectiveness

4.1. How do you assess the quality of your cooperation and partnership with UNICEF? What is the support and guidance you have received from UNICEF?

4.2. In your view what have been the most significant achievements and results related to UNICEF's ICT4D programming to date?

4.3. To what extent have the ICT4D solutions made progress against their objectives and results at the community level?

4.4. What are the results that have not been achieved? Why?

4.5. What have been the key factors (contextual, management, strategies, operational) that have supported or hindered progress?

4.6. How relevant are these ICT4D solutions in addressing the priorities/concerns particularly of the most disadvantaged at community and local level?

4.7. What have been the key achievements in terms of strengthening national government capacity in ICT4D solutions for domestic development?

4.8. What results have been achieved in integrating ICT4D solutions into local government?

4.9. In what way have other organisations, such as private companies or NGOs been partners with your Ministry on ICT4D solutions? How effective have these partnerships been? How can they be improved?

5. Efficiency

5.1. How well has UNICEF monitored the performance and results of its ICT4D solutions?

5.2. What has worked well in management and rollout of these initiatives, what has not and why? What do you think needs to be improved?

5.3. To what extent have human and financial resources and technical support been strategically and efficiently used in these initiatives? How can they be improved?

6. Sustainability

6.1. What is the level of government political commitment, ownership and capacity to sustain results of, or replicate/scale up ICT4D solutions?

6.2. Which results are likely to be sustained after ICT4D solutions end? Which are less likely, and why?

6.3. Does the Ministry have a sustainability plan for ensuring results are sustained, replicated or scaled up beyond the initiative period? Please explain.

7. Impact

7.1. What changes have you observed as a result of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions and on which specific areas and issues?

7.2. To what extent have the initiatives made a difference and impacted communities at grassroots level? Please give specific examples.

8. Lessons learned, future directions and recommendations

8.1. In your perspective, what are the main lessons learned and good practices that could inform future ICT4D programming in this country?

8.2. What are key lessons learned for future collaboration on such initiatives between government partners, donors, civil society, the private sector and UNICEF?

9. **Other:** Please feel free to add or share any other comments and observations.

Thank you for your kind participation.

Annex B(III): KII/discussion themes and questions: NGOs, private sector organisations and technical experts (non-UNICEF)

For each KII or focus group discussion the project team member will begin with introductions and provide a brief explanation of the purpose of the meeting/discussion, its emphasis on a participatory and learning oriented approach, and express appreciation for the respondent's participation in the interview/ discussions.

Introductory

Name of respondent

Job title

Civil Society Organisation

Date and time of Interview

Name of Interviewer: ISG Reviewer (give name)

1. Context questions

1. Please describe briefly your current position and key responsibilities in your organisation?
2. To what extent are you familiar with the objectives and strategies of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions?

2. Relevance

1. To what extent is ICT4D a priority for your organisation?
2. To what extent is your organization trying to use technology and/or innovative approaches to improve your programmes?
3. What have been the key developments in this area over the past years? What are your organisation's plans in the area of ICT4D?
4. What has been the involvement of your organisation in design or implementation of any of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions?

3. Effectiveness

1. How do you assess the quality of your cooperation and partnership with UNICEF? What is the support and guidance you have received from UNICEF?
2. In your view what have been the most significant achievements and results related to UNICEF's ICT4D programming to date?
3. What are the results that have not been achieved? Why?
4. What have been the key factors (contextual, management, strategies, operational) that have supported or hindered progress?
5. Have these initiatives addressed the priorities/concerns particularly of the most disadvantaged at community and local level?
6. What level of support or engagement on ICT4D is there from government? How can this be improved?
7. In what way have other organisations, such as private companies or NGOs been partners with your organisation on ICT4D solutions? How effective have these partnerships been? How can they be improved?

4. Efficiency

1. How do you decide to engage with a particular ICT4D solution? What, if any, are the criteria you use?
2. How do you monitor the performance and results of the ICT4D solutions in which you are involved? Does UNICEF play a role in this?
3. What has worked well in management and rollout of these initiatives, what has not and why? What do you think needs to be improved?
4. To what extent have human and financial resources and technical support been strategically and efficiently used in these initiatives? How can they be improved?

5. Sustainability

1. Which results are likely to be sustained after an initiative ends? Which are less likely, and why?
2. Does your organisation have a plan to ensure results are sustained, replicated or scaled up beyond the initiative period? Please explain.

6. Impact

1. What changes have you observed as a result of UNICEF's ICT4D solutions and on which specific areas and issues?
2. To what extent have the initiatives made a difference and impacted communities at grassroots level? Please give specific examples.

7. Lessons learned, future directions and recommendations

1. In your perspective, what are the main lessons learned and good practices that could inform future ICT4D programming in this country?
2. What are key lessons learned for future collaboration on such initiatives between government, donors, civil society, the private sector and UNICEF?

- 8. Other:** Please feel free to add or share any other comments and observations.

Thank you for your kind participation.

Annex C: Table of Contents for Reports

Country Case Studies

- 1) Field Visit Overview
 - i) Timing, locations, etc.
 - ii) Innovations / ICT4D solutions reviewed
- 2) Innovation #1 (***create a similar section for each innovation reviewed***)
 - i) The enabling environment / stakeholder map
 - (1) UNICEF Programme Section
 - (2) Government counterparts
 - (3) Other partners involved in solution
 - ii) Specific problem(s)/opportunities identified to be addressed by innovation/ICT4D solution
 - (1) Programme level
 - (2) Theory of change
 - (3) Connection with larger CO programme and National Strategy
 - (4) Business case
 - iii) Description of evolution of innovation/ICT4D solution
 - (1) Timeline of: Design, Development, Piloting, Full roll out, Scale
 - (2) How were partners involved across timeline
 - (3) How has the solution changed from inception to current implementation
 - iv) Day to day use of the innovation/ICT4D solution
 - (1) Data flows
 - (2) Management decisions taken
 - (3) Who operates / maintains the solution(s)
 - (4) Connections with other programme sections
 - v) Funding sources
 - (1) How has the innovation/ICT4D solution been funded over its timeline?
 - vi) Costs associated with innovation/ICT4D solution (Cost/Benefit analysis)
 - (1) Specific to the ICT4D solution (Design, Development, Piloting, Full roll out, Scale)
 - (2) Ongoing management / maintenance
 - (3) Other programme costs (Marketing, Training, Other)
 - vii) Benefits realized by programme
 - (1) Efficiencies (time, costs, HR, etc.)
 - (2) Scale / Reach / Impact
 - (3) New opportunities (UNICEF's changing relationship with gov't and beneficiaries)
 - (4) Other
 - viii) Challenges experienced by program (Lessons to learn)
 - (1) Design, development and roll out of innovation/ICT4D solution
 - (2) Day to day Management
 - (3) Unintended outcomes (positive and negative)
 - (4) Changes in the local context (political, etc.)
 - (5) Other
 - ix) The future
 - (1) Conditions necessary for sustainability (funding, HR, enabling environment)
 - (2) Capacity building for transfer of solution
 - (3) Immediate next steps
 - (4) 2-5 year horizon
- 3) Annexes
 - a) Documents Reviewed
 - b) Interviews conducted
 - c) Other as identified

Final Synthesis Report

1. Executive Summary
2. Assignment Description
 - 2.1. Review Purpose and Primary Objectives
 - 2.2. Methodology
3. Findings
 - 3.1. Summary of Country Level Findings
 - 3.1.1. Malawi
 - 3.1.2. Rwanda
 - 3.1.3. Uganda
 - 3.1.4. Zambia
 - 3.2. Impact of ICT4D solutions on UNICEF ESARO programming
 - 3.2.1. What differences have the ICT4D solutions made towards achieving programme results?
 - 3.2.2. Have programmes with an ICT4D component repositioned the relationship of beneficiaries from passive recipients to active change agents, or is there a difference in the level of engagement?
 - 3.3. Effectiveness of ICT4D solutions on UNICEF ESARO programming
 - 3.3.1. What is the effectiveness and impact realized by the ICT4D solutions?
 - 3.3.2. What is the business case for adopting ICT4D solutions in programmes?
 - 3.3.3. In what ways has access to real-time information or the engagement of citizens improved programme performance? - What are the improved efficiencies of the ICT4D solutions?
 - 3.4. Efficiencies Created by ICT4D Solutions on UNICEF ESARO programming
 - 3.4.1. How do these costs compare to the cost of doing “business as usual” for the programmes?
 - 3.4.2. What are the opportunity costs of implementing ICT4D solutions?
 - 3.4.3. How are ICT4D solutions financed?
 - 3.4.4. Across the life of the ICT4D solution (design, development, implementation, scale-up, transfer), what is the cost-benefit and value for money of each of the ICT4D solutions and overall for the Country Office?
 - 3.4.5. Over time, are the ICT4D solutions the most cost-effective and best value for money for UNICEF, government counterparts, and partners?
 - 3.4.6. What would be the cost of not implementing the ICT4D solutions for beneficiaries and UNICEF?
 - 3.4.7. In what ways has access to real-time information or the engagement of citizens.... reduced monitoring and implementation costs?
 - 3.5. Relevance of ICT4D solutions on UNICEF ESARO programming
 - 3.5.1. How are stakeholders (especially rights holders) being engaged in new or different ways by programmes that have implemented ICT4D solutions?
 - 3.5.2. What has been government engagement and ownership of ICT4D solutions?
 - 3.5.3. What is the theory of change underpinning the expected impact of the ICT4D solutions on programme results?
 - 3.6. Sustainability of ICT4D solutions implemented by UNICEF ESARO programming
 - 3.6.1. What are the conditions for an effective enabling environment to adopt, implement and scale ICT4D solutions?

- 3.6.2. What are the country-level governance structures that enhance ownership?
- 3.6.3. How have countries used district level structures to implement ICT4D solutions at village levels?
- 3.6.4. What is the understanding of Total Cost of Ownership?
- 3.6.5. Are the ICT4D solutions institutionally and financially sustainable?
- 3.6.6. What factors enable country-level mobilisation of funds towards modelling and scaling up of ICT4D solutions?

- 4. Lessons Learned
- 5. Recommendations
- 6. Annexes
 - 6.1. Documents Reviewed
 - 6.2. Interviews conducted
 - 6.3. Data collection tools/analysis approach
 - 6.4. Terms of Reference

Annex D: Unresolved Issues of Project Scope

At the time of the acceptance of this Inception report, the following project-scope related issues remained unresolved and will continue to be monitored during the assignment by ISG and UNICEF:

1. **Evidence Base:** ISG anticipates that the majority of data used for this review will come from Key informant interviews. All attempts will be made to secure other forms of data (e.g. usage statistics, verified programme results, etc.) that may provide insights into how the selected ICT4D solutions have effected the service delivery of the programmes for which they were created.
2. **Focus of Analysis:** The proposed focus of the review and analysis of data is on the day to day operations of programming at UNICEF COs in the four countries and how ICT4D solutions have effected the service delivery of the programmes for which they were created. There will likely be requests for additional depth and breadth of the analysis from many of the broad selection of stakeholders (from GIC to in-country partners) that may simply not be possible given constraints of time and level of effort for the assignment.
3. **Financial Analysis:** ISG has proposed to perform a cost/benefit analysis regarding the selected ICT4D solutions. However, this analysis is contingent upon the availability of sufficient and complete financial data relative to the ICT4D solutions.
4. **Impact Analysis:** The depth and breadth of analysis will be heavily dependent upon what data is available (see above). While ISG will provide as detailed analysis of all data as possible, we may find that, from the data available, measuring any type of impact will be difficult or impossible. The impact of how the solutions ultimately effected programmes and, subsequently, the lives of women and children those programmes are intended to help is outside of the scope of this work.
5. **Sustainability Analysis:** ISG proposes to analyse sustainability by looking at the will, focus and commitment from those who "own" the process (and budget) of the selected ICT4D solutions.