**DGD II Monitoring Matrix 2014 – 2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Description** | **Output Indicators** | **Data Collection and Verification** | | |
| **How**  **(from whom, what tools)** | **When**  **(one time or recurring)** | **By whom**  **(you, associates, contract monitors)** |
| **Component 1. Promoting credible, transparent and sustainable electoral processes** | | | | |
| **Output 1.1**  Strategic planning, policy and operational capacities of INEC strengthened | 1. Proportion of INEC performance benchmarks achieved within set timelines |  |  |  |
| 1. Status of the Electoral Road Map/Calendar - 2015 |  |  |  |
| 1. Level, nature and outcome of inter-departmental liaison within INEC |  |  |  |
| 1. Level of stakeholder satisfaction with INEC External Relations and information sharing |  |  |  |
| 1. Timeliness of electoral procedures and guidelines |  |  |  |
| 1. Existence and implementation of the INEC Gender Policy |  |  |  |
| **Output 1.2**  Electoral systems (voter registration) and processes (tallying and transmission) improved through ICT | 1. Percentage of eligible women and youths registered to vote and issued with Permanent Voters’ Cards (compared with demographic projection) | ???? Collecting statistics for 2 states |  |  |
| 1. Number of voters registered (disaggregated by sex, age and social grouping) and issued with Permanent Voters’ Cards | Analysis of INEC Report | Later 2014 |  |
| 1. Percentage of political candidates who view the 2015 voter register as better than in the 2011 elections. | Post-election polls and analysis  (Cross section with component 2) | Every 6 months |  |
| 1. Percentage of political parties who view 2015 voter register as better than in the 2011 elections. | Same as above |  |  |
| 1. Percentage of registered voters who view the 2015 voter register as better than in the 2011 elections. | Built into Political Landscape Analysis | Towards the 2015 general elections |  |
| **Output 1.3**  Legal and policy framework for election improved | 1. Extent to which constitutional and electoral reforms reflect changes desired by INEC and other CSOs | Cross section with components 2 and 4 |  |  |
| 1. Degree of acceptance of the electoral law, rules and procedures by political candidates | Cross section with component 2 |  |  |
| 1. Proportion of election complaints filed and adjudicated through the electoral Alternative Dispute Resolution (EADR) mechanism and concluded within timelines set by Electoral law | Collect info from electoral officers | Every 6 months:  1.  2.  3. |  |
| 1. Proportion of EADR decisions accepted by complainants | Same as above | Same as above |  |
| **Output 1.4** Professional capacity and collaboration between INEC and SIECs enhanced | 1. Extent, nature and outcome of liaison between INEC and SIECs | Collect information about local elections | When local elections take place;  Peer learning in June and August of 2014 |  |
| 1. Percentage of trained INEC and SIEC staff who after training, report they applied new knowledge and skills at work | -pre- and post-survey  -Reflection on last training when attending new training (questionnaire, group discussion) | Every 6 months;  Report after new training |  |
| 1. Public approval and confidence in INEC/SIECs | Media, press, radio |  |  |
| **Component 2: Improving the Democratic Quality of Political Engagement** | | | | |
| **Output 2.1**  Capacity of political parties strengthened | 1. Level of, and modalities for political party participation in democratic processes | [With whom, issues, results]  PP activity reports; follow up discussion | -event based  -6 month review |  |
| 1. Degree to which competing political parties articulate distinct programmatic agendas that provide clear choices for the electorate | [issue based campaigns]  Through INEC and CSOs’ monitoring of parties  party manifesto presentations, party campaigns and debates | -event based  - 6 month review |  |
| 1. Proportion of registered political parties with written bylaws that promote internal party governance and are adhered to by party leaders | [internal party democracy, pol inclusiveness]  Through analyzing bylaws and observation of leaders’ behavior;  INEC reports | -party primaries or conventions |  |
| 1. Level of political participation youths in party leadership, voting, decision making, and other activities | From INEC and PPs | -party primaries or conventions |  |
| **Output 2.2**  Improved effectiveness of targeted National Assembly (NASS) committees and processes | 1. Level of civic engagement in reviewing implementation of the legislative agenda | CSO monitor reports | Every year |  |
| 1. Number of CSOs invited and participated in NASS public hearings on constitution and electoral reform | CSO reports, NASS Committee’s reports | 6 months |  |
| 1. Number of memoranda submitted by CSOs to the NASS on constitution and electoral reforms | CSO reports, NASS Committee’s reports | 6 months |  |
| 1. Extent to which targeted NASS committees achieve their legislative, oversight and representational agenda | NASS reports, Feedback from specific committees by interview; | 6 months |  |
| 1. Establishment of structure of using research in the work of the NASS. | From Parliamentary information center’s publications | 6 months |  |
| 1. Revised rules and regulations on ethics, accountability and procedures for the NASS | From ethics and privilege committee | 6 months |  |
| **Component 3: Enhancing Participation by Women, Youth and other marginalized groups** | | | | |
| **Output 3.1**  Legal reforms and women’s empowerment initiatives to promote affirmative and women’s empowerment in politics and elections undertaken | 1. Proportion of CSO recommendations on women’s empowerment reflected in final constitutional and legislative reforms | -submission of memorandum  -#accepted by 2 adhoc committees  -#accepted in the harmonized bill  -#accepted by NASS | Context based |  |
| 1. Percentage of women, youths, and PWDs in election administration workforce, including voter registration workers, polling staff, election observers, and the Electoral Commissions (INEC & SIECs) | Feedback from partner, e.g. Gender Desk, EMB (INEC) and SIECs | Every 6 months |  |
| 1. Degree to which voter registration and polling sites are accessible to   a) women  b)PWDs | Observers reports | Aug and Oct, 2014 state elections, as well as 2015 general election |  |
| 1. Number and type of civic/voter education materials specifically geared toward inclusion of:   a) women,  b) youths,  c) PWDs  produced and disseminated by INEC, SIECs and CSOs | From INEC and CSOs | Every 6 months |  |
| **Output 3.2**  Pool of women aspirants for elective offices at various levels enlarged | 1. Proportion of political candidates who are women at Federal, State, and Local Government levels | Baseline 2011 Election results | One month after 2015 general election |  |
| **Output 3.3**  CSO’s capacity to advocate affirmative action enhanced | 1. Proportion of political candidates who are women at Federal, State, and Local Government levels | From various committees of NASS, political parties, Women and Politics Forum | Every 6 months |  |
| 1. Proportion of political candidates who are women at Federal, State, and Local Government levels | Women and Politics Forum, youth-based CSOs | Every 3 months |  |
| **Output 3.4**  Capacity of women holding elected office enhanced | 1. Percentage of elected women leaders who after training, report and provide evidence that they have used their new knowledge and skills to advance their legislative, oversight and representational agenda | Pre- and post-training survey,  Follow up calls or focus group | Every 6 months follow up |  |
| 1. Number of legislative proposals and bills emanating from elected women representatives at Federal, State and Local Government levels | Meetings with representatives of elected women | Every 6 months |  |
| **Component 4: Strengthening Channels of Civic Engagement**  Sub-comp 4.1: Civil society capacity development | | | | |
| **Output 4.1.1**  Zonal networks and individual CSOs strengthened | 1. Degree to which CSO platforms, networks and coalitions improve their engagement with democratic governance | [Direct training for CSOs;  Experience sharing and peer learning on specific subject; Implementing]  Pre- and post-on training of Modules  Follow up questionnaires, surveys with CSOs and those interacting with them | Event-based and 6-month follow up |  |
| **Output 4.1.2**  Civil society engagement in democratic reforms and monitoring supported | 1. Level of, and modalities for organized CSO participation in democratic reforms & monitoring | [meetings and experience sharing, e.g con review]  Number of meetings and issues, participants level, no of step down through DGD staff follow up and CSO reports | 6 months |  |
| **Output 4.1.3**  Civil society capacity to carry out election observation enhanced | 1. Number and geographical spread of CSOs engaged in election observation | [General & states  Lead CSO’s local network]  From lead CSO and direct observation | -training  -election day |  |
| 1. Degree to which reports from state-level CSO election observers are shared with national bodies | [INEC, police, pp, CSOs]  Press conference;  Report of CSOs sharing | One month after local or general elections |  |
| **Output 4.1.4**  Civil society capacity to carry out civic education enhanced | 1. Number, type, and geographical spread of CSOs implementing civic education | [General & states  Lead CSO’s local network]  From lead CSO reports and direct observation | Quarterly |  |
| **Output 4.1.5**  Public awareness and implementation of Freedom of Information Act (FoI) strengthened. | 1. Level of public awareness and knowledge on FoI | Through: FOI coalition/network of CSOs, mentoring group | Survey in Dec |  |
| 1. ~~Extent to which Ministry of Justice coordinates with CSOs on FOI~~ |  |  |  |
| 1. Level of CSO satisfaction with access to information from targeted Ministries, Departments and Agencies | Through: FOI coalition and mentoring group | Bi-monthly report from CSOs |  |
| **Component 4:** **Strengthening Channels of Civic Engagement**  Sub-comp 4.2: Strengthening capacity and voice of the media | | | | |
| **Output 4.2.1**  Capacity of the media to monitor and report on democracy and election related issues strengthened | 1. Existence of a professional code of media conduct in elections |  | Expect final product in Oct 2014 |  |
| 1. Proportion of media organizations which after training, focus on:   a) fair and balanced coverage of elections,  b) also conflict sensitive reporting | Analysis of media comprehensive monitoring projects;  Questionnaire to training participants | 6 month follow-up |  |
| 1. Degree to which ICT and new media is deployed to cover democracy and election matters |  | Bi-monthly report of on-line media monitoring |  |
| **Output 4.2.2**  Capacity for media monitoring strengthened | 1. Extent of equitable access to news platforms by competing political parties and candidates | Media monitoring,  Interviews with PP | 3 or 6 months |  |
| 1. Level of access to media by women candidates | Media monitoring on gender responsiveness | 6 months |  |
| 1. Degree of compliance with the professional code of media conduct in elections/code of ethics, by media practioners. | Post-election reports analysis | 2 months after election |  |
| 1. Category and frequency of media abuse cases identified through media monitoring over the electoral cycle | Media monitoring | Bi-monthly basis |  |
| 1. Number of media organizations, editors and journalists sanctioned for contravening the professional code of media conduct | Through regulatory bodies, such as Nigeria Press Council, Nigeria Union of Journalists | Every 3 months |  |