**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) womenb)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) PWDsproduced 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  |  |