1. Introduction
Twaweza (www.twaweza.org) meaning “we can make it happen” in Swahili, is a citizen-centred initiative that aims to trigger large scale social change in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. Twaweza believes that lasting change requires bottom-up action. By expanding access to information and the flows of information for at least ten million people, Twaweza seeks to enable citizens to enhance their agency i.e. their ability to make change happen in basic service delivery and other areas of importance to them.

The Twaweza initiative has a ten-year time frame, with three goals (i) enhance access to and flow of information among citizens (ii) enhance ‘citizen agency’ and (iii) enable citizens to use (i) and (ii) to improve their access to basic education, primary health care, and clean water, as well as other issues of importance to them. Enhanced citizen agency is instrumental to achieving the third objective, but is also an end in itself.

Twaweza has completed its start up phase and is seeking to appoint an independent evaluator to consider its work over the next four years (2010/11 – 2013/14). The evaluation comprises qualitative and quantitative components, which may be integrated and implemented by one entity (preferred) or separately by different entities (but in close collaboration with each other). The completion of a baseline survey by the end of 2010, for which a draft questionnaire has already been developed, is an urgent requirement.

2. Background to Twaweza
Twaweza seeks to enable at least ten million people across East Africa to:

- **Better access and generate information** through five nationwide channels and networks: mobile telephony, mass media, teachers, religious organizations and consumer goods networks.
- **Increase agency** through information access and flows which foster people’s imagination and enhance their ability to monitor, to express themselves, and initiate and co-ordinate actions. This in turn helps to:
  - **Improve access to basic services** following enhanced scrutiny of public actors and actions by citizens themselves.

Twaweza views each of these as complex social processes which are closely related to context and institutional responses. The steps in this conceptual framework for change are not necessarily linear, nor
are the links between them necessarily causal. They are iterative, synergistic and dependent on frequent feedback loops at small (local) and at large (regional/provincial and national) scales.

Twaweza focuses its efforts on three sectors: water, primary health and basic education because these areas were found to be important to people and where increased citizen agency could make a difference. To increase access to and flows of information related to these sectors, Twaweza’s strategy is to work with (‘piggyback’ on) the five key nationwide networks synergistically such that citizens can receive, search for and find information using different social networks, technologies and modes of communication: for example, from their imam, through a message in a laundry detergent box, and through SMS or radio; while at the same time use mobile phone to send data, call in to the radio about this issue, or organize among teachers to co-ordinate a response. To achieve this synergistic effect Twaweza engages with anchor partners that develop ‘trigger’ initiatives. As these take shape Twaweza then brokers and supports wider partnerships amongst diverse groups and actors in the three sectors. The density of information flows via the five channels and the ‘buzz’ created as this spreads across the three sectors is expected to create an ‘ecosystem effect’ in which change can be brought about by citizens themselves, in ways that are not linear and predictable, and which will vary from context to context. This ecosystem effect takes place in wider media/information ecologies. Annex 1 provides further detail on the approach.

Twaweza has a dedicated unit responsible for monitoring and learning, and managing the external evaluation. The external evaluation is expected to contribute to global knowledge about the relation between information, agency and change, as well as to internal learning and program development at Twaweza. In terms of the well-known formulation around ‘triple loop learning’ (Argyris and Schon, 1996), the external evaluation contributes to the second and third loops. The first loop involves Twaweza’s own internal monitoring, which will track implementation and check outputs. The second loop involves checking our work against our research questions, hypotheses and assumptions, to enable adaptive management and course adjustments. Doing this will require interaction between the internal unit and the external evaluators. The third loop involves synthesizing the multiple lines of evidence in order to assess impact and review the appropriateness of Twaweza’s conceptual framework for change. This falls within the external evaluator’s brief. Communication of evaluation design and findings, through academic and popular publications, presentations and multimedia is strongly emphasized.

Twaweza’s first five year program has a budget of US$68 million, which is jointly funded by DFID (UK), Sida (Sweden), The Hewlett Foundation (USA), SNV and Hivos (Netherlands). The initiative is housed by and legally operates under Hivos, a Dutch international development agency with 40 years experience in promoting human rights, freedom of expression and enhanced quality of life. Full documents and further detail can be found on www.twaweza.org.

3. Evaluation Design
3.1 Evaluation Goals and Questions
In addition to drawing on the evaluation findings as it proceeds, Twaweza looks to the evaluation to assess impact of the first five years of its work and to inform the development of its second phase (2014 – 2018). Specifically, the evaluation needs to:

- Assess impacts (effects) in the areas of information, citizen agency and service delivery;
- Explain the links between information, agency and service delivery;
- Relate these impacts and links to the extent possible to Twaweza’s strategies and activities.
Annex 2 provides a metric of our goals and possible types of indicators for evaluating impact. We envisage that a set of ‘mixed method’ quantitative and qualitative studies will be needed to address the key evaluation questions, which are:

- To what extent are citizens able to better access and communicate information in Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya via the five channels?
- To what extent do expanded access to and flows of information lead to enhanced citizen agency? How does this dynamic work or be constrained?
- To what extent and in what ways do expanded access to information and communication and enhanced citizen agency contribute to improved citizen access to basic service delivery (either because citizens take more actions themselves, or because they hold public service providers to account)?

See Annex 3 for more detailed questions on areas of research interest. In addition the evaluation is expected to provide insight into:

- The contexts in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda (including institutional culture, structure, and capacity) and how these enable and constrain citizen agency, and
- The institutional responses in each country to increased citizen agency and action.

### 3.2 Hypotheses

Hypotheses will be identified by the evaluators in consultation with Twaweza management. The following are illustrative examples of hypotheses that indicate the types of variables that need testing, and that will help contribute to ‘second loop learning’.

1. **Action / uptake of information by citizens depends on the form and frequency with which information is provided. Action/uptake is more likely when information is provided at high frequency and as comparisons (over time, in relation to others) or as stories of change, than when it is provided in the form of facts, policies or rights.**

   With such a hypothesis the differential impact of two different forms of information provision is explored. At the same time, it aims to provide insight into issues such as whether the channel (or the number of channels) matters.

2. **Action/uptake of information depends on ‘exposure’. Action/uptake responds in a positive and exponential manner to the number and density of key channels available to citizens.**

   This hypothesis would test the notion of non-linearity of information uptake (due to feedback loops in the ecosystem, the presence of tipping points, shifts in ‘mindset’, etc) against the alternative that uptake is linearly dependent in the number of channels, is decreasing in the number of channels, that there is no relation between the number of channels and uptake.
3. **Sense of agency increases if citizens process or actively generate information.** Agency increases if citizens are ‘active’ with information and not when they only are passive recipients of information.

This hypothesis would test whether an active use of information allows citizens to ‘own it’ which in turn enhances agency, something that would not happen if information is received passively. A challenge with this hypothesis is that processing information is already an expression of agency. Hence everything else being equal, active processing of information always leads to more agency than passive processing of agency. As there is no clear scale on which agency is measured, it is unclear how the increase in agency as a result of actively using information could be separated from the already heightened level of agency due to information processing.

4. **Acquisition of a sense of agency is developmental.** Citizens who have been able to take successful action in the private (or more proximate/local) sphere will be more willing to act in a more public (less proximate/private) sphere. Action is more likely to occur when citizens can draw on horizontal linkages in existing social networks than vertical linkages involving local government officials or agents.

This hypothesis would test the scales and domains in which agency can be identified and the role of proximity vs distance in the exercise of agency. It will need to examine the kinds of communicative resources needed for less proximal agency to be exercised.

5. **Action is more likely if citizens perceive other/peers taking action (the ‘nudge effect’).**

This hypothesis tests types of information, as well as the influence of social relations and perspectives on individual action. Twaweza is interested in the relation between individual and collective forms of action.

### 3.3 Evaluation approach

Hypotheses suggest research methods which provide answers to “what works?” types of questions. Twaweza also needs to answer questions about “why/how/under what conditions” do its interventions work (or not work). The evaluation design needs to deal with both kinds of questions and should comprise innovative qualitative and quantitative research, as well as combinations/linkages between the two.

On the quantitative side it is expected that baseline (2010) and follow-up (2014) household, community and facility surveys will be undertaken. Draft surveys have been developed. In addition, in one of Twaweza’s programs called the ‘wananchi survey’, households covered in the baseline survey (2,500 hhs/country) will each be provided with a mobile phone, which will be used to ask weekly additional questions through a mobile survey. The objective of this mobile survey is monitoring of service delivery and opinion-polling, yet it provides the evaluator with an opportunity to gather real-time, high frequency information on areas of interest to the evaluation. The mobile phones can possibly also be used for in-depth interviews using voice.

Further quantitative research could involve randomized trials or quasi-experiments.
On the qualitative side, it is expected that research studies will aim at explaining the links in the theory of change i.e. the relation between information access and flow and increased agency, and the relation between increased agency and improved service delivery. If they are to answer questions about why/how/under what conditions change occurs (or does not), they will need to address issues of power and culture. It is expected that there will be a range of types of studies, and where possible, synergies between these and the surveys and other quantitative studies. A rationale for the choice of studies, including specification of the units of analysis and the scales at which these can be studied, as well as sampling and synergies with data from the baseline study, will be developed in conjunction with Twaweza management.

Some qualitative studies can address specific aspects of the hypotheses. But in order to understand the relation between information access/flows and agency the following focus areas have been suggested: existing communicative ecologies at different scales; communicative practices and resources at local levels; forms of uptake of information; and necessity of information for an increased sense of agency and action. Descriptions of existing conditions in these focus areas could then facilitate holistic and contextualized studies which map change and assess Twaweza’s contributions over its first five years. Some studies may therefore need to be site-based and involve ethnographies of communicative practices in villages or urban communities; others may be group-based and focus on how the affordances of particular modes of communication where Twaweza anticipates significant change (users of Facebook) enable or constrain the uptake of information and the exercise of agency; still others could include content and discourse analysis of existing forms of documentation (minutes of village water committees). In many of these cases, longitudinal or comparative studies would be useful. A different type of approach could involve event tracking, in order to map the uptake of information and the social relations in sequences of actions undertaken by citizens (both everyday, mundane actions like cleaning up a street, as well as unusual or spectacular actions like forcing the President’s motorcade to stop and force him to hear community concerns). Each of these could be considered in relation to social network analyses. Twaweza has also been interested in the use of software such as ‘Sensemaker’ as a way of aggregating large qualitative data sets and enabling research subjects to undertake their own coding (http://www.sensemaker-suite.com/).

Feedback processes and events for all types of studies will be required by Twaweza to ensure learning on an ongoing basis. In addition, and at a more summative level, synthesizing the qualitative and quantitative studies will be necessary, and it is expected that evaluators will propose ways of doing this.

A preliminary literature review has been commissioned and should be available by September 2010. The evaluator may need to enhance this review. Secondary data analysis still needs to be undertaken as part of the baseline study.

While the preference is for the evaluation to be undertaken by one entity/consortium, the qualitative and quantitative approaches may be led by different researchers, together with an overall evaluation expert, provided that the evaluating entities are prepared to collaborate closely so as to ensure synergies and mutual overlap. Twaweza also expects the researchers to make opportunistic use of emergent opportunities and to be able to respond quickly through ad hoc studies or otherwise.

3.4 Challenges
Certain features of Twaweza’s theory of change and its program of work pose challenges for evaluation.
First, our approach and our program cannot necessarily be adapted or modified in order to facilitate ease of evaluation. Much of our work is designed for seamless integration into the logic of everyday life, the ongoing quotidian events and practices of those already working within and reached by the five networks and channels (religion; journalists, broadcasters and programmers in radio, TV and print media; commercial goods distributors; teachers; mobile phone vendors/marketers), and according to logics, timeframes and scales that make sense to them. Because ‘our’ success is so dependent on partners viewing the interventions as their own, ‘interventions’ cannot be designed in a manner that constrains partner priorities and rhythms.

Second, a key criterion for Twaweza is to work with multiple partners on multiple aspects at scale at the same time, so as to create synergistic effects and density of information flows, often by piggybacking onto broad reach that they already have (e.g. improving news content on national radio, engaging the church’s parishes in all districts of the country). Therefore there are no ‘intervention’ sites or comparison sites as such, other than the variability in the depth of reach or possibly the timing of activities of the different partners. This provides challenges in identifying counterfactuals.

Third, the identification strategy is hampered by issues of endogeneity as the direction of causality between the three steps in the theory of change from information access → citizen action/agency → improved service delivery can easily be reversed, for instance when the (expectation) of successful action leading to improved service delivery leads to information access.

Fourth, it may well be that the impact of the information strategy and the eco-system idea is non-linear and exponential to the extent that it may be hard to discern any impact till a certain ‘tipping point’ has been reached.

Fifth, randomized experiments are encouraged provided they naturally fit into planned Twaweza activities and/or make use of natural experiments. This also helps ensure that the experiment reflects a real (scalable) situation and not an artificially created environment i.e. put bluntly, the intervention logic or scale will not be modified to fit the needs of the randomized experiment; the randomized experiment would need to fit the logic of the intervention.

Furthermore, there are two ‘nodes’ in our intervention logic that require theoretical precision. These are: first, the concept of ‘uptake’ of information and its relation with the concept of agency. Second, the concept of agency and whether this is viewed as an internal psychological state, or whether it is only evidenced in observable actions. Precision on these concepts will need to be developed as part of an enhanced literature review.

For more on Twaweza’s idea of change see excerpt in Annex 1

4. Timeline for Baseline
Twaweza has a degree of flexibility in formulating deliverables and activities. However, there is particular urgency in completing the baselines in 2010, particularly for Tanzania. Baselines in Kenya and Uganda can take place in early 2011. For this reason we have put out an RFP for the Tanzania baseline and will move ahead with this immediately. Significant work has been done on the baseline and draft household, facility and community questionnaires are currently being finalized. The evaluators will be given the opportunity to comment on the survey instruments where possible and every effort will be made to take comments into account.
5. **Budget**
Twaweza has available up to US $2.6 million for the entire evaluation over the next four years (that includes the baseline and follow-up surveys).

6. **Expectations and Outputs**
Twaweza is looking for seasoned academics with experience in empirical analysis and qualitative approaches in developing countries, with intellectual curiosity in the relation between access to information, citizen agency and improved service delivery. Twaweza is open to different modes of working, but one considered at present is where one (or two) lead academics identify multiple PhD students or those doing post-doctoral research, who commit to work on the impact evaluation over the next 4 years. Having a substantive manager resident in Dar es Salaam who can coordinate the process and serve as a communication point for Twaweza and other interested parties is strongly encouraged.

Twaweza places equal emphasis on the quality and creativity of communication as it does on research. Evaluators are expected to integrate in their work flow and make time available to communicate with Twaweza, other researchers, evaluators and development practitioners, as well as the general public, and to be responsive to requests for information and clarification by email and other means. Outputs will be negotiated but as a guide Twaweza expects:
- Baseline reports for quantitative and qualitative studies conducted during 2010
- Reports on small scale, targeted studies and longitudinal studies conducted throughout
- Presentation and debate around findings at annual learning events organized by Twaweza
- Academic publications in peer reviewed journals
- Popular briefings on key findings
- Presentations at conferences/key meetings
- Communication through updated websites and new social media as appropriate
- Final summative reports

Twaweza would aim to bring together an edited collection from the different studies conducted.

7. **Reporting**
The independent evaluators will work in conjunction with the learning and communication unit inside Twaweza which fosters learning, reflection, documentation and communication.

8. **Next steps**
If you are interested in undertaking the evaluation, please email ckell@twaweza.org and rrajani@post.harvard.edu the following:
- 2-3 page note describing your interest, approach and strengths
- 2 papers/publications on research/evaluation undertaken by one or more of the principals

Please indicate your interest as soon as possible, but no later than the 16th August 2010.

9. **References**
ANNEX 1: Elements in Twaweza’s conceptual framework for change

Twaweza’s perspective on information
Twaweza has at least four ways of viewing access to and availability of information. Each is premised on ideas about what language is best used; what genres and media are most appropriate; what communicative mode is most appropriate (verbal, written, visual, embodied, audio and so on); what technologies are best used for communication; and so on. Twaweza will work to ensure that the following (at minimum) start to circulate widely within the ecosystem through the work of our partners and in our partnerships.

- **Practical information about rights, laws, entitlements**: This basic information is not yet made available to people in accessible, popular forms across East Africa. Often when it is, it is static, inert and authoritarian. It does not capture imagination and does not lend itself to ‘uptake’.

- **Comparisons**: Information presented in ways that allows people to compare their situations with others’ can enable people to transcend the local. In societies with highly developed information ecologies people are constantly exposed to comparative information, often in visual forms. In Tanzania, for example, being able to compare a change in exam pass rates in your village with a change in pass rates in the neighboring village can act as a spur for action.

- **Stories of ordinary people taking initiative**, making a difference: We know that people are doing things to improve their lives, individually and collectively. But these stories are not well documented and re-presented back to people. We know that people in poor and remote areas tell stories and have their own modes of representation. It is important to understand these, but in a globalizing world driven by knowledge and information, a wide range of forms of representation need to circulate through the information ecology. We believe it is important to enable people to identify and to re-present inspiring stories, and to establish channels whereby people can circulate their own stories.

- **Choices and pathways**: ‘When people are informed, when they can compare their situation with others’, when they hear inspiring stories, they may feel that more options are open to them. But they need examples of these options, if imagination is to be triggered. The above three approaches can all help with envisioning choices and fostering aspirations.

Threaded through all of these is the notion that Twaweza draws from people and their everyday experiences, and that is the basis for Twaweza’s existence: the idea that “we can make it happen”, that “it’s us” (ni sisi). We expect this idea to take root in the public imagination, triggering debates from citizens’ perspectives about change, from which further, new, information will be generated.

But we also need to take into account the way in which information is conceptualized. The concept of access to information can equate with the vaccination idea in modernization theories, which prescribes injections of information for the ‘information-poor’. People are not blank slates on which information can write its purposes and cause ‘behavior change’. Information needs to be brokered into people’s existing social practices in the different spheres and domains of their lives. Social practices are shaped by the capabilities and assets to which they have access, and the structural constraints they experience. We need to understand these and, where possible, make them the starting point.
It is important therefore that information is not conceptualised as a one-way flow from those that have it to those that don’t. A top-down, one-way flow of information does not sit easily with the ecosystem concept. For this reason we don’t just talk about access to information, we also talk about generating and brokering information, creating new circuits for information, redundancy and feedback loops. The advent of digital technologies, the mobile phone in particular, enables ‘many to many’ forms of communication and enables ordinary citizens to generate their own information. Digital information is no longer sole-authored and involves (particularly amongst youth) creative remixing using language, sound, image, music. Its makers are often mobile themselves and the information they generate is itself mobile, as it is re-contextualized across space and time. We need to harness these new ways of making meaning.

**Twaweza’s perspective on agency**

Twaweza sees agency as having four aspects. Each of these is about making meaning in informed ways through different communicative and interpretive resources and each is related to the idea of ‘uptake’ of information.

**Coming to know/understand:** Here we are concerned with the way in which information turns into knowledge for meaning making. If information is to become knowledge, people must do the work: they must be able to compare, contrast, connect and converse if this transformation is to take place (Davenport and Prusak, 1998). Clearly this work is context-specific, domain-specific and contingent. One way to manage this specificity is to try to ensure that people have the ability to get the information they need in an affordable, reliable manner, where/when they want it. This is where our five networks and channels need to come in. Rather than providing information in repositories, we broker information through these networks and channels, linking content makers and vehicles with wide and differentiated access, piggybacking on elements that are already part of and valued by people’s existing social practices, rather than something separate to be deployed later.

- **Being able to monitor:** There are four aspects to being able to monitor. First, monitoring is important in relation to policies, budgets, laws and entitlements. Second, it is important to monitor one’s situation in relation to others’. Third, monitoring can help people to compare the present with the past. Fourth, monitoring can enable perspectives to be shared and compared. Monitoring in the world of development has become reified, turned into events that are mediated through scorecards and other techniques, something that happens on that right hand side of the page. When we talk about citizen monitoring, we are talking about a simpler, day to day form of monitoring, initially based on noticing differences, on keeping track in one’s mind, and on sharing this process of keeping track. It’s about finding whatever means are available to compare and contrast.

- **Expressing/voicing/communicating:** The concept of voice needs unpacking, as it lies at the heart of much of Twaweza’s work. Voice can be defined as the ability to participate in decision-influencing or making, through having the communicative and discursive resources to make oneself understood. Communicative resources include access to channels for communicating and being able to use modes of communication (like verbal and written language, visual and gestural forms of communication) appropriately. Discursive resources include knowing about the subject matter, including cultural codes and norms, as well as information.

- **Taking action, making a difference:** Monitoring and expressing are obviously actions. By
'making a difference’, we mean more than monitoring and expressing. We mean an effort to co-ordinate a sequence of actions using various tools and resources (even at the smallest scale) across time and space to achieve a particular purpose, which involves a change from the current situation. We think about this at both the individual and the collective level, in private and public domains. Much of what we hope to trigger are in domains most citizens can or already control, in the everyday aspects of their lives. These may include dealing with absent teachers or health workers, exerting pressure on those who divert medicines or water or other resources in a manner that hurts the community, organizing cleaning up the street of trash or stagnant pools that cause malaria and so forth. At times, solving a problem will require more directly holding (local) government to account.

While we are cognizant of the fact that many problems are related to larger structural issues, and that others require concerted collective action, focusing only on structural issues and on groups rather than individuals can be paralyzing, and exert enormous transaction costs (e.g. mobilizing for meetings and sustaining can be extremely time consuming). Often larger problems are often made up of smaller components, many of which can be addressed at lower levels. Success in solving these matters may also generate the experience and confidence that can enable citizens to address larger or more structural concerns.

Twaweza therefore sees agency as about people’s ability to bring about change themselves, through individual and collective action. We will explore whether proximal forms of exercising agency affect more distant forms, or whether it is domain-specific. Our view of agency is that it can be intrinsic as well as instrumental. By intrinsic, we mean that it can be understood at the level of an internal psychological state, or sense of well-being, which may not be reflected in actions. We therefore see agency as important in itself, as an outcome in and of itself, not only as a means to improving service delivery. While we recognize them as important, we do not see ourselves as working directly to foster reform processes or institutional change. There are many actors working on these issues. Rather we see our niche or core work as triggering the public pressure that can help animate ongoing institutional reforms, by creating greater awareness, public debate and citizen engagement about the purpose and value of public sector for people, and in so doing help citizens reclaim the public sector as belonging to them rather than an alien government ‘out there’.

**Twaweza’s perspective on improving basic services**

Twaweza has chosen to work with the relation between information and agency, because these matter in themselves, and because we believe that they will enable citizens to make a difference in the domains that are of importance to them. In our situation analysis, the situation of access to and quality of water, health and education emerged as key concerns. We will use these as our ‘testing grounds’ over the next ten years to assess our framework for change, at the same time as needing to be alert to other domains that citizens choose to make change happen, such as access to markets or issues of family gender dynamics.

Within each of the basic social services, we have particular areas of concern, neglected need as well as the aspects of the services that are the most important and covering aspects that matter the most. In water we are concerned about access to clean water, of adequate quantity, within reasonable distance and cost, and reducing overall water insecurity and vulnerability to water-borne illness. A particular concern here is the functionality of installed water facilities. In health our concern is access to medicines and health care, including the availability of trained and motivated health workers. We will also pay attention to basic immunization access so essential to public health. In education, in light of recent
dramatic expansion of enrolments, our concern is with money reaching schools, teachers showing-up and teaching, and children learning, starting with basic competencies in literacy and numeracy. These squarely focus the gaze on aspects that are of value or meaningfulness to people, and where they have a direct stake.

Our approach is to trigger agency, and we do not have targets for what we trigger. This means that citizens will take up actions in ways that they feel will work for them, rather than ones that we try to anticipate. As these actions feed into the ecosystem in water, health and education they trigger other actions, contributing to the broader ecosystem of change. Over time, this should have effects in the areas of water, health and education.

Our role is therefore that of catalyst. We cannot take the ordered approach (Snowden) that has characterized so much work in development, which sees targeted inputs as leading to pre-specified outputs and larger outcomes, in linear and somewhat mechanical fashion, which can be tested as single variables, controlled for difference, and where the magnitude of the input is correlated with the size of the change. Instead, our stance draws on complexity theory. We have seen that a large push to the system may not move it at all. We therefore aim to identify ‘attractors’ as we are working, and build on them, study what happens, notice the feedback and adapt. Attracors can be examples of activities that people have undertaken to make a difference, that are working and that others want to emulate.

In summary
We aim for these three social processes to take shape within emergent citizen agency and at times direct health, water and education partnerships which, through communication, action, feedback and adaptation, will give shape to an ecosystem of change. As we work to foster the ecosystem, it, itself starts to mediate in between the actions of individuals and small groups and the realization of broad changes in society. This is a key piece in how we see change happening. Our partners can be seen as initial ‘nodes’ in the ecosystem. Their work feeds the points at which communication can have an impact at the level of small day to day actions in the areas of water, health and education. Since we only work with partners that reach at least one million people, our energies are always focused at the level of the ecosystem, and not at the level of ‘place-bound’ initiatives and ‘projects’. Our work in constructing wider partnerships contributes towards the pathways and threads linking nodes. We envisage these taking on a ‘life of their own’, generating new initiatives and triggering further actions over which we have no control and which we might not even know about. As the partnerships create a ferment in the ecosystem, a ‘buzz’ about citizen agency and public action, the ideas of ‘twaweza’ and ‘ni sisi’ themselves should take root in the public imagination.

The ‘ecosystem of change’ exists in a wider information/media ecology. Ecosystems and ecology are metaphors for the dynamic interconnectedness of people, resources, structures and institutions, and the networks, niches, flows and pathways of information and communication. At present these represent the interests of particular groups and elites. We believe that they can potentially be shifted, and we see this happening in large parts of the world where people are engaging through digital technologies in new forms of monitoring, co-ordination and social action. In East Africa we believe that such a shift may involve “altering the terms of recognition” (Appadurai, 2004), or the terms under which “the poor negotiate with the very norms that frame their social lives” (p66).

Shifting the information ecology means working through five key networks and channels that we have identified. These are a) religious organizations, b) consumer goods networks, c) teachers and their trade unions, d) TV, radio and other media, and e) mobile phones. There are others, but these five are
particularly powerful because they are present in virtually every urban and rural setting and have enormous potential for scale and reach. Our work aims to build partnerships, which we conceptualize as playing key roles in a wider ecosystem of change. We test these ideas in the areas of water, health and education, because these are areas which are meaningful to people and where change is needed.

Fostering imagination, citizen agency and public action in each of these areas, we believe, will create triggers and tipping points for a wider ecosystem of change, and a shifting of the information/media ecology in each country.

So, as this happens (or splutters as the case may be) we will observe and reflect and evaluate keenly. How does agency get triggered or constrained, and manifest itself? How can we document manifestations of voice and how these actions and initiatives are represented, both through the work we do with the existing media and in the new channels and circuits of communication that will start to form in the wider ecosystem of change? What do we learn about the links between information access, imagination, agency and access to better services? What does it take to cause a shift in the wider information/media ecology across the region? For as long as we cultivate a fierce commitment and curiosity to learn, document and share insights and lessons, both the ‘successes’ and ‘failures’ of our work can be of value, in both helping us make necessary course corrections and contribute to global knowledge.
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### ANNEX 2: Metrics Framework 2010 – 2018

While Twaweza is fully committed to the extent and reach of impact suggested in the indicators below, many of these are seen as placeholders, which will need to be fully developed through the literature review, secondary data analyses and baseline studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Impact measures</th>
<th>Possible indicators (measurable and can be disaggregated in terms of youth, men and women)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONE: Enhance access to and generating of information</strong></td>
<td>Citizens have increased access to information via five channels</td>
<td>40% of young people, men and women in 75% of districts have increased access to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved quality/content of information</td>
<td>Indicators to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened independence, plurality, quality and reach of mass media (print, TV and radio)</td>
<td>Indicators to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased options for citizens to generate and interpret data and information</td>
<td>Indicators to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO: Enhance citizen agency (capability and action) (by 2013 and continuing)</strong></td>
<td>Citizens exercising voice</td>
<td>20% of young people, men and women in 75% of districts have increased opportunities to express views in a public sphere to a public body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens monitoring services and government</td>
<td>10% of young people, men and women in 50% of districts have increased opportunities to express views in a public sphere to a public body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens making change happen</td>
<td>At least 10% of young people, men and women have an increased sense of being able to make change happen, and can cite an example of having done so in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THREE: Improve service delivery (by 2018, tracking progress in the meantime)</strong></td>
<td>Improvements in basic education outcomes</td>
<td>85% of teachers show up and teach 90% of disbursed funds for schools reach them 80% of children able to read and write at their level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in basic health outcomes</td>
<td>85% of health workers show up and deliver health care 90% of basic medicines available at clinics 85% DPTb3 immunization coverage X% experience better health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in access to and affordability of water</td>
<td>90% urban and 70% rural have access to piped or covered water within 30 minutes fetch time X% reduction in water insecurity Y% reduction in water borne illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other changes (made by citizens’ self-determined priorities)</td>
<td>Methods to be developed to capture areas chosen by citizens themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3: Areas of research interest to the evaluation

A. **Contexts**
How does the political, economic, social and environmental context (factors and institutions) enable and constrain citizen agency?
- How do citizens perceive their own well-being, capacity and opportunities to exercise agency?
- What are the key political, economic, social and environmental factors and institutions that shape citizen agency and how do these factors enable or constrain citizen agency?
- What characterises the interactions between citizens and these institutions?

B. **Citizens’ access to and generating of information:**
What constitutes engaging information for citizens? Under what conditions/circumstances is there uptake of information by citizens?
- What information (in general and on water, health and education) reaches people, which people, where and when?
- To what extent is information uptake a function of trust, sharedness, ease of access, relevance, timeliness, repetition, expected impact?
- To what extent do media, language, genre, message, mode of communication and domain within which information is received/shared determine information uptake?
- What is the relation between information uptake and the exercise of agency?

C. **Citizen agency.**
What constitutes citizen agency, how can it be measured and how does it change?
- In what circumstances/under what conditions (including economic opportunities), does individual citizen agency occur (generating information, monitoring, voicing, acting)? What is the role of transaction costs, coordination failures, uncertainty and discounting of future benefits?
- In what circumstances/under what conditions, does citizen agency express itself as coordinated action (generating information, monitoring, voicing, acting)?
- What role does information play in enhancing citizen agency?
- Action is more likely to occur where citizens can take action as individuals quickly and relatively easily (there are low co-ordination/transaction costs)
- Does exercising agency in the private domain increase exercising agency in the public domain? Is there learning?

D. **Institutional response to increased citizen agency**
What are the institutional responses to increased citizen action?
- Under what circumstances do service delivery providers respond positively or negatively to citizen action for improving service delivery? Why?

E. **Improved service delivery**
What evidence is there that public services (water, health, and education) extend their reach and improve in quality as a result of increased citizen agency?
- If there is increased citizen agency does it have effects with regard to service delivery in water, health and education? In what other areas or issues do citizens’ exercise agency?