Programme Innovation Case Studies: Social Accountability

Prepared for World Vision UK by Ethicore

Programme Innovation Case Studies: Social Accountability

As part of World Vision UK's DFID Programme Partnership Arrangement (PPA) in 2016, we commissioned Ethicore (www.ethicore.com) to carry out a six month research project mapping innovative programming learning and potential opportunities in our priority thematic areas of Health, Child Protection and Social Accountability. An important component of the project was identifying, summarising and analysing 12 case studies across all 3 themes from within World Vision and other agencies.

Studies were selected with a particular focus on programming for the most vulnerable children (MVC) and in fragile contexts, using the selection criteria listed on the next page. All non WV case studies used material from published reports. This document covers 5 case studies covering social accountability and civic engagement, with two other documents covering Child Protection and Health respectively. Please note that the analysis and insights below are those of the consultant and do not necessarily reflect those of World Vision.

Cover photo: A young woman rates health services against government standards in Kailali, Nepal as part of World Vision's Citizen Voice and Action social accountability process.

Contents and Index of case studies

World Vision.

EVERY CHILD FREE FROM FEAR

CRITERIA FOR CASE STUDY SELECTION (Original)

Title of project	Insert project name / ref here			
Criteria	Description	Essential or optional?	Weighting	Score
Quality	Sufficient evidence (quantitative & / or qualitative data) documented for a case study	Essential		
Sectoral	Applies (or has potential to apply) to a need, or opportunity in 1 or more of the 3 priority programme areas	Essential		
Innovative & Impactful	Evidences a NEW solution able to deliver sustained impact for vulnerable children & their communities	essential		
New model or Transforming?	Innovation is either a new development model OR a transformative 'step change' approach.	1 or other; Optional –	scores 2	
New business or partnering model	Innovation is either a new business model OR partnering approach.	1 or other; Optional –	scores 1	
Most Vulnerable	Innovation that has particular relevance for the most vulnerable children & their house-holds and communities	Optional –	scores 3	
Replicable	The innovation can be adapted to different contexts and cultures	Optional –	scores 2	
Scalability	The innovation has potential to be applied at a large scale e.g. across entire countries and large populations	Optional –	scores 2	
Cost effective	The innovation is impactful at relatively low cost or achieves significant cost savings	Optional –	scores 2	
Fragile or post emergency contexts	The innovation has been applied, or has high potential to be applied in fragile or post emergency contexts	Optional –	scores 3	
Alignment	The innovation is well aligned to a particular WV strength or opportunity (e.g. community base, faith)	Optional –	scores 2	
Organisational	The case study demonstrates increased organisational capability for innovation or agility	Optional –	scores 2	
Marginal urban or rural	The innovation responds to a particular opportunity in a neglected / niche programme area	Optional –	scores 1	

Insights from case studies

1.FOCUS ON THE PROBLEM AS RECOGNISED AND DEFINED BY TARGET AUDIENCES

- Start from the needs of children and their families and communities
- Be adaptive, flex programme development in line with the needs of the community
- Aim to meet participant expectations – not provider expectations

2.INNOVATE WITH PARTICIPATORY PROGRAMME DESIGN

- Put communities at the heart of the design process
- Focus on community to define demand and solve problems
- NGOs as facilitators to convene, facilitate and build capacity

3.EXPERIENCE PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

- Design solutions based on observation and experience
- Understand problems through proximity not just analysis
- Focus on solutions created – not what needs you aim to satisfy

4.CREATE DEMAND FOR THE OUTCOME NOT DEMAND FOR INPUTS

- Focus on endgame e.g. village which is child marriage free
- Provide an excellent service to drive demand
- Provide proof and build trust through tangible experiences

Insights from case studies (CONT.)

5.OUR GOALS, NOT MY GOALS
- Set clear goals for programmes, as expressed by beneficiaries
- Have an intentional aim and evaluate against it
- Put those experiencing a problem in place to evaluate it

6.DESIGN FOR THE MOST VULNERABLE AND MARGINALISED
- Engage most vulnerable and marginalised children in programme analysis and design
- Avoid reinforcing structures that exclude, e.g. focus groups which favour the literate
- Extend approaches to other vulnerable groups, e.g. disabled and illiterate
- Enlist children as advocates and ambassadors

7.WORK WITH 'UNUSUAL PARTNERS' TO REACH BENEFICIARIES.
- Identify new targets reach audiences, e.g. domestic violence -work with perpetrators, not just victims.
- Work with current actors (men's groups) and potential actors (boys), defenders (women's groups) and enablers (e.g. police force).

8.LAYER UP LEVELS OF ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND RELATIONSHIPS.
- Work with different levels, e.g. national government, local government, community groups, families.
- Consider inter and intra-family relationships, e.g. multi-generation, familial, community, peer-to-peer.
- Integrate new partners to imagine new models, e.g. design firms, government bodies, private sector.

INSIGHTS FROM CASE STUDIES (CONT.)

9.REFRAME AND REPURPOSE APPROACHES FOR CULTURAL RELEVANCE.
- Identify core values of key audiences and influencers, e.g. generational respect.
- Identify new activities which align with their values, e.g. storytelling .
- Reinforce cultural practices to build solutions, e.g. grandmothers as advisers.
- Contextualise for local culture, e.g. drumming in rural Uganda.

10.EXTREME INNOVATION IN CRISIS SITUATIONS.
- Invest in capabilities to enable extreme innovation, e.g. partner with agile tech innovators.
- Focus on access to information for continuity and accountability, e.g. records aggregation and demand identification through mobiles.
- Access through free mobile applications to build participation.
- Innovate with 'anonymous' technology for citizen accountability in fragile states.

11.INNOVATE WITH NEW ECONOMIC MODELS.
- Delivering a service for customers not beneficiaries.
- Develop business/funder/government alliances. Create solution focused programmes for funders and governments. Requires ideological shift and reengineering of NGO model.
- Leverage NGO credibility/access, private sector technical ability/resources, government authority/capability.

12.NEW MODELS AND PROCESSES ENABLE GREATER IMPACT AND ADAPTATION.
- Large scale impact through disruptive innovation: visioning new structures and models, e.g. Living Goods.
- Strong brand creation for scale: Use on and offline networks: community advocacy, media and social media, e.g. I Care About Her.
- Modular approach: building different 'blocks' of innovation to allow iterative development, e.g. LMMS.

Social Accountability

Internal Case studies

Case Study 1:
Greenfield

World Vision and partners

Greenfield
from World Vision

INNOVATION/ APPROACH	Approach
FOCUS OF INNOVATION	Community driven development for improved services
TYPE OF INNOVATION	Incremental

OVERVIEW

The Greenfield Concept is a modern, community-driven development approach that seeks to empower communities with skills, rather than donor hand-outs and freebies. More emphasis is placed on communities taking charge of their own developmental destiny. This is in direct contrast with previous initiatives, when non-governmental organisations were at the forefront of development projects, particularly in rural areas.

As part of a Greenfield project, communities draft an Integrated Community Development Plan to guide their own development for the next five years, using a simplified plant growth analogy tool to identify and design projects. The plans identify major challenges and then rate them in their order of priority.

The community identified several major projects after the assessment process, which involved other stakeholders such as representatives of various government departments, traditional leaders and council officials. The projects identified were food, nutrition, security and livelihoods, water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), advocacy, sponsorship and project management.

The Greenfields concept was designed to strengthen the current development approach in World Vision (DPA), and to drive greater social accountability in World Vision programmes. In essence, both the DPA and the GF models are concerned with effective and sustainable community development. The vision of the GF model however is to involve the community from the outset of operations, helping draw out their contextual knowledge and build their capacities to be involved further in programme implementation. In the GF model, there were a number of aspects that also differed to DPA approach:
- GF staff were one grade higher in the pay scale – this was done to see how this impacted on staff longevity and therefore delivery of the programmes.
- Local communities were targeted as individuals, rather than simply through existing community groups which may marginalise certain groups or have a hierarchy that prevents true two way communication.

FEATURES

Community ownership
Central to the Greenfield approach is it's commitment to drive a greater sense of community ownership. A key part of this is community led development planning where communities lay out their own development needs and solutions.

Partnerships
Partnerships were key to delivery of the Greenfields approach. This was not just the creation of partnerships, but the creation of the right partnerships – ones that would create channels of communication between individuals in the community from all backgrounds, and not ones that would reinforce existing social structures and cultural attitudes that prevent clear two way communication between community members and community leaders.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

In an attempt to evaluate the value add of the GreenField Concept compared to the DPA, a comparative evaluation was carried out between a Greenfield (GF) pilot and the existing Development Programming Approach (DPA). The evaluation was carried out in four different development areas, across two countries in Southern Africa.

Evaluation teams visited each development area and looked at cost effectiveness and progress made towards three key aims:
- Local ownership
- Effective partnerships
- Transformed partnerships

Two of the areas were utilising GF and two DPA. A purposive sampling method was used to gather opinions from 705 respondents (607 participants in 62 FGD groups and 98 KIIs). In addition, the evaluation team also distributed questionnaires and conducted interviews with 26 key internal stakeholders who had unique insights into GFs, visited 12 project activity sites and read 19 key project documents across the four programmes. Data analysis involved a tabulation of evidence captured in site visit notes and video recordings for each project to produce a simple scoring system in order to highlight different levels of programme activity quality in those projects.

As this evaluation is conducted at the early stage of the programmes (2nd year of implementation) it is early to measure outcome level changes, and such comparison is beyond the scope of the evaluation. The evaluation aimed to document learning and good practices from the GF experience to help scale up to other programmes.

INSIGHTS

Memorandums of understanding or codes or practice are central to successful partnerships

When working with partners who have existing relationships with a community, they will have their own views on how this must be done. It's important all parties outline their requirements and agree on a common code of practice. Without this, partnerships can become strained when one party does not fulfill expectations of the other, for example how cancellations of public forums are dealt with.

It's important to be transparent about aims if you are to achieve them

When asked about changes they had seen, the communities focused on material gains that had been delivered such as books and tools. They did not recognise the systemic changes or social accountability changes. This may be a reflection of the historic 'beneficiary' role, or it may represent a lack of communication over the more intrinsic changes being targeted – the community's ability to communicate with high level stakeholders, the ability to drive change or to shape projects. There needs to be an intentional aim to improve skills across the community, building communications channels and promoting different types of leadership that are more inclusive.

Community outreach must be inclusive

It was noted that due to the inability for many to actively get involved in workshops, there was a lack of communications through the community. This could create divides between those attending and the wider community.

There needs to be a shift from aid to service provision

Historically, the position of World Vision (and other NGOs) as providers of aid, and therefore the active party, made the community a passive recipient. As such, they had little feeling of being able to expect delivery or challenge practices. As social accountability increases, there will be an increased sense of communities wanting to have clear deliverables with clear dates, and an expectation that these should be met. For Greenfield to work, project staff will need to reposition themselves and communicate with 'beneficiaries', as they would funders, with regularity and fixed deadlines that are adhered to. Without this, the communities will lose faith in the process.

INSIGHTS

Lack of independent evidence

The evaluation carried out to date was designed and delivered by World Vision employees. This meant both a potential bias and a reduced scope during delivery, due to work pressures elsewhere.

The CBOs involved in the evaluation were selected by World Vision staff; this makes it likely that those, where the best relationships existed, were selected. The ability to engage with a community and shape a programme around this is therefore significantly affected by the level of existing relationship already held. This certainly does not negate the findings, but it should perhaps lead to a consideration of the 'context' in which positive GF results are to be found. For example, the m-health work in Indonesia set out a base level of requirements, which included an existing relationship with WV. A similar approach could be utilised for the roll out of GF.

GF approach needs to be followed through all programme activities

The GF projects demonstrated an improved sense of community ownership. However, whilst communities were involved in initial consultation and decision making to identify priorities and how thy would be tackled, they were not brought in when decisions around funding had to be made at later stages, or during any discussions around re-prioritisation. This could significantly impact the relationship with these communities, as they may feel that the initial consultation was a token effort.

Understanding of needs hierarchy for the community

The involvement of the communities from the beginning meant that World Vision could identify base needs that would also help to deliver on other needs once met – for example, the need to generate income would also lead to an improvement in child nutrition.

Learning from Nyaki's visionary approach

The success in the Nyaki's GF has been attributed to the vast effort by volunteers from the local community. They are inspired by the vision for change in their community and as a result the project has a huge swell of social capital to draw on.

As this group did not meet the features outlined as integral to the success of GF, but scored the highest, it is worth exploring the drivers behind this social capital. Who has created this vision and how has it been circulated amongst the community?

INSIGHTS

Questioning enabling features

The GF guidelines outline a number of enabling features that make up a conducive environment for successful GF implementation. These include strong involvement of traditional leaders and a lack of political tensions.

However, the evaluations show that Nkayi GF was actually the most successful, although it does not have the features outlined for a favourable operating environment for GF. This raises questions as to whether these guidelines are backed up by evidence or assumptions based on the existing development model.

GF has the distinctive feature of being community driven, as such features that may be optimum for more traditional models may not apply here. For example, the presence of existing structures such as Rural Development Groups. The project evaluation shows that these pre existing relationships and the connection to them, may have hindered progress. The rural development groups often held strong and very useful relationships with traditional leadership and high level stakeholders. However, they also marginalise certain groups, and community interest groups are often not very involved. In addition, the more traditional leadership groups, such as the church, often work on a hierarchical basis, from the top down. This is contrary to the GF model, and may explain the correlation between increased engagement with traditional leadership and very low engagement levels with the community members.

The evaluation of partnerships for each approach is not comparable

The evaluation looked at the strength of partnerships, judging their maturity. This only evidences partnership practice, rather than evaluating the value of the different partnerships. This is touched upon, with a recognition that partnerships in the GF areas were more community based, and those in DPA were higher level or traditional leadership partnerships. As the types of partnership are very likely to affect end community relationships, this evaluation metric does not feel as appropriate for testing GF value adds and could encourage the strengthening of existing relationships – likely to be high level stakeholders or traditional leadership groups – over the creation of new relationships that would take longer to reach maturity.

WHAT'S UNIQUE ABOUT THE INNOVATION?

Innovation of an existing approach
The innovation brings together a newer social accountability approach with an existing programme development approach. It is not focused on a single project or deliverable, but rather a way to develop World Vision's approach to programme development to improve social accountability.

Freedom to innovate
GF sites were given additional flexibility with organisational policies and this emerged as an enabler for good development practice. Greenfield Team Leaders (GFTLs), both in the evaluation sites and in expert opinion interviews, referenced the increased "space" for innovation, piloting, and community engagement. This took the form of more time to submit a programme design and the ability to pitch special projects. Interestingly, there are a couple of isolated comments in the expert opinion interviews about staff approaching DPA implementation from a perspective of organisational compliance, or as a mechanical process. So perhaps the additional flexibility of GFs staff can be counted as a positive addition by the GFs model.

More accessible contact points
In the GDA model, when communities are involved, they tend to be invited to participate in higher level activity with government or traditional leadership groups. As such, they often have to travel and pay to get involved.

The GF approach takes the workshops and discussion sessions to the community, hosting them in households and enabling more people to attend. The approach not only makes it more inclusive, but shifts the costs of delivery onto the households, as they manage any refreshments or requirements when they host the meetings. This creates the sense of ownership and reinforces their ability to continue this even if WV and other leading parties removed the structures at a higher level.

WHAT MAKES IT INNOVATIVE?

Reaching beyond the normal community groups
It has been noted that relationships with traditional leadership groups and government bodies can actually reinforce the exclusion of certain groups and lead to failure with regards to engagement across the whole community. GF looks to develop relationships at individual community member level.

Creating a new model for change
The process aims to showcase the value add from taking a GF approach. If this can be evidenced over time this can be used to challenge the expectations around timeline that have been set for funders (both private and public) through more traditional models.

The GF approach challenges process
There are a number of policies and processes within World Vision that have to be adhered to. One such example is the procurement of services, where a preferred supplier list exists. The GF approach highlights the significant constraints posed by these rigid rules, and presents a clear list of areas where innovation is needed.

Testing the progression of volunteers
In the GF approach, volunteers have actual project responsibilities. They are held accountable and trained to support their activities. This approach is significantly different to the traditional development model where volunteers are often additional resources, and it frees up the GF staff to capacity build. It does highlight the need to innovate how to maintain volunteers and prevent volunteer exhaustion.

Social Accountability

External Case studies

Case Study 1: Youth Livelihoods and Development (YLEP)	Restless Development
Case Study 2: Liberation Technology	Ushahidi

Youth Livelihoods and Development (YLEP), Sierre Leone
From Restless Development

OVERVIEW

Youth led development agency, Restless Development, is at the forefront of change in development in Sierra Leone. They focus on three key areas:

Civic participation; young people included in development process and policy setting.
Livelihoods and employment; young people are able to acquire skills to pursue employment.
Sexual and reproductive health; young people have access to services and the knowledge and personal skills to act on informed decisions.

They deliver on these goals through a mix of programmes and activities, including direct delivery to young people, efforts to build a strong youth sector, and sharing and learning. Their activities are delivered in a progressive series, each building on the other, culminating in an 'alumni' of past students and participants that they then try to keep mobilised in civic duties and development.

The alumni have been brought together under a programme called Youth Livelihoods and Development (YLEP) and Restless Development have undertaken significant evaluation of YLEP.

INNOVATION/ APPROACH	Approach
FOCUS OF INNOVATION	Training and empowerment to encourage civic participation
TYPE OF INNOVATION	Transformational

FEATURES

Progressive activities all interlinked
Restless Development is an agency that employs a number of different strategies for driving change, however they bring these together with a network of programmes that are all interlinked or progressive.

An alumni of participants
A unique aspect of this case study is the creation of a volunteer alumni. This group is made up of past participants on RD programmes, and aims to maintain a connection with them over the long term, as well as support connections between them.

Mass mobilisation of young people into civic participation
An overarching aim of Restless Development is to increase civic participation. As such, every programme works to develop skills and confidence needed to do this, and presents opportunities to create connections that will support this in the future i.e. internships, links to local community groups, voluntary opportunities.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

An evaluation has been carried out to look at the success of YLEP, as well as other interlinked activities from Restless Development (RD).

The core KPIs are as follows:

% of young people participating in the development, implementation and monitoring of national and local policies
% of young people possessing essential life skills to make informed decisions
% of young people in higher studies or productive jobs within 3 years of a RD activity
% of alumni networks self financed through alumni contributions
% of young people employed or setting up businesses to contribute to household

A randomised sampling method was used to select respondents to the survey. An online sample size calculator with a 5% confidence level was used to identify that 270 respondents would be representative. The sample was actually brought down to 210 due to time available. The respondents were split across three different strategy districts to ensure their context was slightly different, and a range of data collection methods were used including: questionnaire, focus groups, key informant interviews and case studies.

An additional layer of evaluation looks at how the alumni feels personally, from confidence levels, to skills they believe they possess and their commitment to volunteerism.

INSIGHTS

General confidence boosting activities support civic participation

It is evident from the evaluation that activities which help to boost confidence lead to an increased sense of empowerment and result in greater civic participation. These confidence boosting activities need not be formalised programs with extensive objectives beyond simply giving people the chance to interact and grow more comfortable with speaking to each other and others in authority.

Creating an alumni network of volunteers can increase their commitment and optimise the investment made in individuals.

Restless Development creates an alumni of people who have participated in any of their activities. It then mobilises this alumni through further programmes. This model of training and then retaining presents a possible approach for adoption by WV to strengthen the quality and reliability of volunteers across programming, whilst ensuring there are possible impacts for the volunteers.

Benefits can be seen that are not in the evaluation plan

Evaluation plans need to take into account unplanned benefits, as often these can exceed those originally targeted and have far reaching consequences. One such example is the beneficial changes to gender relationships. This was not an intentional aim, but does have significant impacts, including more girls going into further education and respondents being more appreciative of the rights of the opposite sex after their involvement with Restless Development.

INSIGHTS

Looking at statistics in isolation can give an unfair evaluation

The survey shows a high % of unemployed, but more youth report being actively involved in decision making at local and government level. These two indicators are both measures of success, but have contrasting outcomes.

There needs to be an alignment between expectations and aims

A common failure point in programmes is when expectations of those involved are not aligned with the aims of the project. This can be because of a lack of communication or a lack of intentionality around aims. This is evident in the Restless Development work around employability skills. The aim of RD is to develop skills that enable employment, but not to directly offer end employment roles. The participants were therefore a little unsure of the 'purpose' for the alumni, as many expected there to be a clear route to jobs, and when this did not occur they were unsure of the alumni's role. There needs to be greater clarity around the role of RD versus the role of the individual alumni members. The notion is that alumni create their own personal employment experiences, utilising the skills and connections RD provides. There could be a need for RD to facilitate job creation through shared value partnerships with other organisations or businesses.

WHAT'S UNIQUE ABOUT THE INNOVATION?

Restless Development creates a learning process similar to the zone of proximal development
The zone of proximal development is described as the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers. RD creates this zone by having layers of peers, each at different stages of development, as well as supportive facilitators and trainers at each level. The model aims to utilise the layer above to bring those below upwards.

The model is based on self motivation
The RD model is based around young people having motivation to improve their own lives, and the lives of their communities. It does not provide certain 'steps' in the process, such as providing job roles for those completing courses. Instead it relies on giving them the skills and ability to identify and follow up opportunities that are presented to them. This is more representative of everyday life and is likely to support a sense of self determination.

WHAT MAKES IT INNOVATIVE?

Closing the loop between skills development and civic participation opportunities
63% of those involved with RD went on to participate with civic development activities and nearly 80% volunteered for unpaid civic duties. By joining up skills and confidence activities, with opportunities to engage with local community organisations, RD creates connections that make it easier for young people to get actively involved in decision-making.

Understanding trends and working within them
RD started innovating from a good understanding of the context in which they were working and the factors that drove positive trends. For example, they identified that those with a greater level of education were generally held in more esteem in the communities of Sierra Leone, and found it easier to find work, even if this was unskilled. Rather than trying to change the trend, they worked within it.

Creating progressive layers of activity to optimise investment in an individual
RD did not deliver on all objectives through one programme. Instead they have a progressive series of activities, each building a different set of skills, whilst complimenting each other. Ultimately they end up with layers of increasingly trained and confident young people who are working towards the top layer – the next generation of leaders.

Liberation technology
from Ushahidi

INNOVATION/ APPROACH	Innovation
FOCUS OF INNOVATION	Social accountability through geomapping and citizen reporting
TYPE OF INNOVATION	Transformational Product performance
THEMATIC AREA	Social accountability

OVERVIEW

Ushahidi, which translates to 'testimony' in Swahili, is a crowdsourcing tool which collects information from several mobile and social media sources and helps to categorize it, geo-locate it, and publish it on a map. It has been described as a 'liberation and accountability technology' which allows accurate documentation of incidences in crisis situations, providing the ability to create and 'edit' in real time a map of an event or situation, supported by video and photographic evidence.

First launched by bloggers in Kenya to highlight and document post-election violence in 2008, it helped catalogue human-rights violations undocumented by the mainstream media. Witnesses texted in their reports using SMS. Bloggers then shared blogs to publicise the platform and crowdsource crisis information.

Ushahidi Inc was created a few months later to develop the mapping platform and make it free and open-source. The platform can now be integrated with SMS, Twitter, email, Facebook, Flickr and You-Tube and is complemented by smartphone apps which are freely available to use.

Ushahidi has been used to create more than 10 000 live maps in more than 140 countries by humanitarian and human-rights organisastions, media companies, civil society groups and activists. Uses span from election observation, human-rights monitoring, disaster response (a Haiti Crisis Map tracked crisis response), civil resistance and environmental impact reporting,

The technology was notably employed during Egypt's parliamentary elections in 2010 to monitor corruption. Most recently it has been used to catalogue violence in Syria.

FEATURES

Democratic access
Unlike other forms of media which are open to abuse and control, crowdsourcing of information is open to any one with access to a mobile. Although there are issues of accuracy, with volume, a 'truth' emerges.'

Empowering information
Testimony direct from the individual provides an account based on local knowledge. In the Haitian earthquake, engaging the local population overcame traditional response systems, with a lack of contextual knowledge.

Extreme accuracy
Ushahidi provides a platform which can catalogue abuses of individuals, recording civilian deaths in Syria, naming individuals and providing evidence for future prosecution.

Safeguarding anonymity
To ensure the protection of contributors, the platform works with encryption applications. This allows for usage in crisis situations where contributors could face reprisals from governments.

Vetting of evidence
To ensure that evidence collated is robust, bloggers in Kenya monitored reports against other available sources and recontacted reporters.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Evaluations of the programme are not widespread but quantitative and qualitative data was collected in the Egyptian elections*

Egyptian activists' objectives were focused on raising awareness on electoral processes, citizens' rights and the importance of electoral participation, to remedy violations and facilitate advocacy for fair elections.

1) The electoral laws and Egyptian constitution and up-to-date news on the electoral campaign were widely shared: 40 000 hits, significant international and national media coverage, 2 700 reports mapped, 90% of which were verified

2) 1 500 cases of reported elected violations were submitted to the Egyptian courts (but are un-attributable to the Ushahidi platform)

3) Some issues with inclusivity were identified with certain sectors in society not engaged. Technical and political barriers were cited as issues

Assessment of the platform indicates that the project had some impact on the political discourse in Egypt, but required greater scale

The book, SMS Uprising**, documents that in the Kenyan election the platform 'was instrumental in bringing hundreds of perpetrators in front of the international criminal court in the Hague charged with crimes against humanity.'

Overall, the platform has enjoyed 90 thousand deployments, 6.5m testimonies and has reached 20m people.

*http://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/meier_ushahidi_as_a_liberation_technology.pdf
**SMS Uprising: Mobile Activism in Africa, Sokari Ekine

INSIGHTS

Enabling accountability in crisis situations
Because of the ubiquity of smart phones, the barriers to traditional reporting in fragile and crisis situations are diminished for crowdsourcing. The platform has enabled the employment of social accountability and citizen reporting in extreme and sensitive situations .

Ease and simplicity to encourage use
The platform was designed to make reporting as easy and accessible as possible.
With freely available smart phone apps and open source technology, barriers to use are minimal.

Giving voice to individuals
Direct cataloguing without a 'middleman', (e.g. emergency response agency, journalist, civil activist), enables local knowledge and contextualisation of a situation or issue for a more accurate interpretation of events and needs.

INSIGHTS

Creating a sustainable business model
By creating a non profit business model, Ushahidi Inc has enabled investment in its product portfolio and technical evolutions.

.

Innovating for crises
Ushahidi has extended its portfolio of products to accelerate tools for social activism. including Crowdmap, a collaborative map-making tool, CirisiNet, a platform which can 'consume and interpret' crowdsourced data coming from social media, and Ping a 'group check-in tool' that allows automatic check in via text in case of emergencies with a nominated list of loved ones. Many of its new applications were born out of specific incidences and are responsive to emerging crises e.g. Ping was created in response to the Nairobi mall massacre.

WHAT'S UNIQUE ABOUT THE INNOVATION?

Technological innovation to democratise information
Because of the technological explosion and ubiquity of mobiles in Africa and other continents, Ushahidi is democratising the ability to spread information. Evaluation indicates that more can be done to ensure that the most vulnerable groups (e.g. children), are able to document and share instances of abuse.

Precision and depth of data capture
The mash up of geomapping and social media enables a unique blend of extreme accuracy in terms of reporting and cataloguing situations, with expressions of individual experiences and citizen accounts which provide real insight.

Direct voices
The platform aligns well with World Vision's unique approach to social accountability , providing a voice to citizens, but removing the intermediary to allow individual citizens to speak directly about their experiences and needs.

WHAT MAKES IT INNOVATIVE?

Adaptation of technology to crisis situations
Ushahidi is an example of how technology can liberate and promote social accountability even in the most hostile and fragile contexts. Adaptations to protect anonymity and to verify evidence demonstrate how technology can adapt to protect citizens in crisis situations.