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INTRODUCTION

In late 2003 APC gathered in Colombia to define our strategic priorities for the following five years. It was the largest meeting in our history at the time. For Danilo it was his first APC strategic planning session and he recalls how intense and enriching the exercise was: to be forced to understand the network better, to overcome regional points of view and to identify global lines of action that were still rooted in issues that every region was confronting.

Like most good APC meetings, the Cartagena event mixed politics with capacity building. We were joined by numerous partners in bilingual policy and advocacy training and a workshop on mapping activism on the web. The policy workshop often erupted into fiery debate on, for example, the wrongs and rights of different approaches to intellectual property. The network mapping workshop did hands-on research to answer the question of whether APC was an issue network or a social one. We can remember thinking that the answer was so obviously “APC is both” that we couldn’t understand why such a research question was being asked!

Yet both workshops were invaluable and the inclusion of partners, experts, researchers and trainers gave us the sense of APC as a convener and a catalyst and a network that generates networking and open, learning-oriented ways of working among all those that we come into contact with.

And there were celebrations: the tenth anniversaries of the APC women’s programme and our Colombian host member, who did an amazing job at hosting 70 people in beautiful Cartagena for two weeks.

In other words, APC’s 2004-2008 strategic action plan – the results of which you will read in this report – emerged from learning, debate, introspection, music, dancing and quite a bit of drinking Colombian aguardiente.

It was followed by five years of what has felt like very, very hard work with many challenges: financial resource mobilisation being the greatest, but also challenges emerging from the extremely high standards that we set ourselves; the very broad and constantly evolving nature of the internet; and challenges related to members’ involvement in all aspects of APC’s work, to maintaining trust, collaboration and also a sense of a community of people and organisations who are in solidarity with one another personally, politically and socially.

Looking back over this period in earnest is quite intimidating. This is what we try to do in this report. We hope that it gives you some idea of those challenges and gives us an opportunity to recognise why APC is what it is and does what we do – making the world a better place by helping people gain the access, the skills, and the rights they need to work together online.

Anriette Esterhuysen, executive director
Danilo Lujambio, chair
ABOUT APC

THE APC VISION
All people have easy and affordable access to a free and open internet to improve their lives and create a more just world.

THE APC MISSION
APC’s mission is to empower and support organisations, social movements and individuals in and through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to build strategic communities and initiatives for the purpose of making meaningful contributions to equitable human development, social justice, participatory political processes and environmental sustainability.

APC’s strength lies in the fact that we don’t get excited about the internet for the internet’s sake. We are committed activists who want to use it to make the world a better place.

We help people get access to the internet where there is none or it is unaffordable, we help grassroots groups use the technology to develop their communities and further their rights, and we work to make sure that government policies related to information and communication serve the best interests of the general population, especially people living in developing countries.

APC is both a network and an organisation. APC members are groups working in their own countries to advance the same mission as APC. In December 2008, APC had 52 members in 37 countries, the majority from developing countries. The membership define APC’s strategic priorities every five years. APC has a small staff, each living in different countries and communicating day-to-day over the internet (we have no central headquarters). APC’s value and uniqueness come from the local perspectives and contact with grassroots organisations that we gain from our members and the fact that we operate as a truly virtual, international organisation.

---

1 Technology and tools that people use to share, distribute and gather information and to communicate with one another, one on one or in groups. APC primarily focuses on computer and internet technologies.
We organise our work in three programme areas:

- communications and information policy
- women’s networking support
- strategic use of technology and capacity building

Our strongest activities are often those taking place at the local or national level where the real impact can be felt, and from which the network can learn and replicate regionally or internationally. We work best when we can really work as a network – i.e., programmes and members work together to conceptualise projects and campaigns and then implement them together.

APC values working with other people beyond our own network. We are aware of our own limitations as well as the power of networking. Where we lack knowledge or expertise and need to learn in order to better engage challenges, we are eager to form partnerships.2 In all of APC’s work we encourage people to network as a means of making other activities more sustainable. If people share their experiences and skills they have greater value over a longer period and often create a ripple effect.

APC was founded in 1990. We are incorporated as a non-profit under section 501(c)(3), Public Charity Status 170 (b)(1)(A)(vi) State of California, USA.

---

2 “APC is highly respected. This respect comes from a range of different players and extends over technical, advocacy, and political aspects of its work. The evaluation has shown evidence of the varied partnerships that APC uses in its work. This is reflected not only in the number of partners named for the evaluation, but also in the way it has co-organised many of the events described in this evaluation. The ability to engage in such partnerships is itself an indirect reflection of the esteem that others have for the organisation and its work.” Debbie Budlender in an independent evaluation of APC’s policy programme (2007)
2004-2008 HIGHLIGHTS

APC'S STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR THE PERIOD 2004 TO 2008 WERE:

1. Strengthening the role and engagement of APC and CSOs in ICT policy processes
   To achieve this priority, APC conducted research and capacity building and engaged in advocacy and network building to achieve rights-based, people-centred ICT policies at regional, national and global levels. We focused on affordable internet access and making political processes more open and inclusive, particularly so that civil society organisations can participate in a more meaningful way.

2. Promoting and facilitating strategic use of ICTs by CSOs
   APC prioritised exploring and building resources and skills to help communities to gain access to and use the internet. We focused on one particular user community – the women's movement – and one particular technical community – people who could set up cheap, wireless internet connections in Latin America and Africa.

3. Growing and strengthening the network of CSOs promoting the use of ICTs for social justice and development
   Strengthening networks is both a goal as well as a modus operandi for APC and as a consequence, network building and strengthening is a thread throughout this entire report.

The priorities were cross-cut by two additional themes: sustainable development and gender equality and women's empowerment.

NO SOCIAL INTERVENTION CAN BE ATTRIBUTED EXCLUSIVELY TO THE ACTIONS OF ONE ORGANISATION. HOWEVER WE HAVE OBSERVED THAT FROM 2004 TO 2008 APC CONTRIBUTED TO THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- ICT policy makers internationally, regionally and nationally have stopped regarding ICT and internet policy as merely pertaining to technical and infrastructure issues. Increasingly they see ICT policy as essential to development, and in some cases, a rights issue.

- We have contributed to putting internet access and “affordable or equitable access for all” as a key rights issue firmly onto the table in global policy dialogue spaces, regionally in East Africa and Latin America and in national spaces like Ecuador.

- We have also contributed to the development of an approach to policy advocacy which engages all stakeholders in a consultative rather than an adversarial manner, which saw significant success in making policy change in at least three countries: Kenya, Pakistan and Ecuador.

- APC played a significant role in the creation of an international forum to promote constructive dialogue and outcomes between adversarial opponents regarding the governance and future of the internet.
There has been an increase in the quality of civil society participation in global, regional and national policy arenas. It is not enough to occupy a space but at the very least, to contribute to ICT policy dialogue, and at best, to help influence the way other stakeholders think about what is at stake with the aim of reminding those in power that social justice with respect to internet rights is important for everyone.

As a consequence of our capacity-building work with hundreds of organisations and people from the women’s movement, we believe that we have helped to transform how the women’s movement thinks about technology and the internet, and that their confidence has been built to use technology more and more creatively to further women’s rights.

Representatives from almost 700 social change organisations have had their capacity built in ICT policy and the strategic use of technology. Hundreds of people living in Latin America and Africa are able to set up cheap, wireless internet connections to the internet thanks to training facilitated by APC and use materials freely available online in four languages.
PRODUCING RIGHTS-BASED PEOPLE-CENTRED ICT POLICY

Between 2004 and 2008 APC worked simultaneously in three ICT policy spaces – global, regional and national – to strengthen the role and engagement of civil society. This three-tier involvement was partly fortuitous in that the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) process was happening during the initial stages of the implementation of our strategic plan regarding global policy spaces and also stimulated activity in regional spaces, particularly in Africa and Latin America. At the national level, the fact that we were working in Africa, Europe, Latin America and South Asia, establishing a dozen national policy portals, producing some key rights-focused resources like the Internet Rights Charter and the annual Global Information Society Watch watchdog reports, also enabled APC to gain some real experience grappling with national ICT policy advocacy campaigns.

These experiences in different policy spaces positioned APC as a very visible and vocal representative of an emerging global civil society presence in international communication and information policy. Together with partners, we brought a perspective focusing on rights, access and the collaborative value of ICTs and the internet that would otherwise not be heard. And that civil society voice was progressively more articulate and effective.

Contributing to this was the success of a multi-stakeholder approach within WSIS that enabled the private sector and civil society to become more active participants within the UN Internet Governance Forum (IGF) and to play a role in shaping the space, rather than simply being invited into it on a limited basis by governments.

That APC had core funding1 during this period was a hugely important component in being able to operate across so many spaces. It gave a certain amount of flexibility to the process of engaging these spaces as well as enabling a multiplier effect in the use of the funds to financially support a broad range of initiatives within these spaces that included research, capacity building, information dissemination and awareness building, participation in events, networking and advocacy.

How did APC become so informed and so influential?

When APC first started working in the area of policy advocacy in the late 1990s until around 2004, the challenge was really just about civil society being heard. Often when civil society was given access to policy spaces it was at a token level. Governments involved in WSIS knew they had to be seen to be meeting their “multi-stakeholder” obligations, and they did it mainly to enhance their own legitimacy.

---

1 This crucial core support between 2004 and 2008 came from DGIS and SDC. We also had programmatic support from the UK DFID as part of the Building Communication Opportunities (BCO) Alliance. The Ford Foundation also supported APC’s global advocacy work.
“APC’s network of affiliated organisations involves and incorporates actors from nearly all communication-information policy issues, and its network contains an unusual degree of technical knowledge about the internet and telecommunication. APC have put particular emphasis on broadening access to ICTs in the developing world. But they were never just an ICT4D group; they also promoted free expression rights, privacy rights and gender equality as well. [...] When the WSIS debates shifted toward internet governance APC alone was well prepared to handle it. That flexibility and scope, coupled with the facilitation and organising skills of APC’s professional staff, accounts for its centrality and influence.” Conclusion of Milton Mueller et al. in a case study on the role of advocacy groups in international communication and information policy, Syracuse University, USA, 2006 2

But this started changing around 2005 towards the end of WSIS. Civil society started making an impact and was listened to, not because of who we were, but because of what we were talking about and how we were saying it.

At a national level the results of this can be seen, for example, in Kenya, where through KICTANet, ICT policy has been approached in a more holistic way that represents the interests of the media, small businesses and NGOs. In Ecuador, where the politics are very different, the results can be seen in “communication rights” being enshrined in the 2008 constitution. In India this can be seen through, for example, the informal consultation between Indian government officials and civil society entities which APC was asked to convene during the Hyderabad IGF in December 2008.

APC as an organisation and as a network has worked to make ourselves and our partners more coherent, influential and informed in the ICT policy space at global, national and in some cases regional levels. We have done this through hard work, on-the-ground experience, and not being afraid to take risks and make constructive policy proposals.

Getting there has been slow and arduous. It has involved plunging in at the deep end, having to participate in quite high-level spaces and come up with concrete policy inputs working all hours at international meetings. It has involved capacity building through formal workshops, through experience and exposure to policy makers, experts and other civil society actors, and through having to produce our own content and resources where no others exist (for example, the ICT policy handbook for beginners or translating the Internet Rights Charter into twenty languages). We have had to find the discipline to focus and home in on specific policy issues, for instance, by focusing quite deeply on “access” to influence the course of the IGF.

But many ICT policy makers internationally, regionally and nationally have stopped regarding the internet and ICT policy as merely technical and infrastructure issues and have started to see ICT policy development as an issue of rights and access. We are not the only actor that has contributed to these changes, but the general climate in ICT policy making has changed.

And APC did make a unique contribution by working in national, regional and
global spaces, and working with real people who through their long-term exposure
to this kind of work have built their capacity and confidence.

**Policy advocacy: Creating the resources when there are none**

“We first developed our policy advocacy methodology around the time of the first
version of the APC Internet Rights Charter, which was written collectively between
2001 and 2002,” says APC’s executive director, Anriette Esterhuysen. “First we develop
resources to demystify the issue – be it the whole theme of ‘ICT policy’ at first – and
then later specific issues like content regulation.3 We involve civil society in the de-
velopment of the resources to build their capacity. Then we use these resources for
broader capacity development: training, building knowledge of the issues, making
information available in the public domain. Simultaneously we facilitate participation
in policy processes, thereby building knowledge, confidence and capacity at the same
time as giving people an opportunity to use and test the resources in real policy pro-
cesses. The other element of this method, which is what makes it produce sustainable
results, is that we link people at the national level, thereby supporting the emergence
of networks that tend to continue on their own.”

The APC Internet Rights Charter was redrafted around 2006. When there was a small
amount of cash available to fund the translation and printing of the charter into other
languages, fifteen members jumped at the chance and the charter started circulating in
twenty languages. It is now being taken as the starting point for the development of a
new internet governance “charter of rights and principles” as the most complete work
available on the subject. APC’s policy monitor websites for Africa and Latin America and
for integrating gender into policy, which were set up between 2001 and 2003, were also
a unique contribution to international, regional and national advocacy.4

---

3 Policy issues new to APC are typically first approached by the commissioning of a paper on the subject. See:
www.apc.org/en/pubs/issue

4 The Latin America policy monitor lac.derechos.apc.org is in Spanish. GenderIT.org is multilingual. The Africa moni-
tor was closed down in 2009 as the service was no longer required. All these resources have aided and put the
spotlight on regional and national advocacy, which includes the integration of gender perspectives in the analysis
of issues. The LAC monitor was initially supported by Hivos, the Africa monitor by IDRC, and GenderIT.org by SDC
as part of their commitment to gender and ICT policy advocacy.
The fundamentals: APC’s Internet Rights Charter in Australia

From APC’s Australian member apc.au’s perspective, perhaps the most significant aspect of APC’s work from 2004 to 2008 has been the publication of resource materials, often produced collaboratively within the APC network, that can be used in their own work from their Melbourne base. “Since our beginning in 1997, we have worked towards the goals of equality, freedom and empowerment in the online world. The fundamental concepts expressed in the Internet Rights Charter are a framework that neatly encapsulates the foundations of our work. Access to knowledge and sharing what we learn are key aspects of the projects we take on and the content we produce. We are frequently recognised as leading the way in the promotion and application of open and flexible content licences such as Creative Commons and free and open source software. We work within our sector to leverage ICTs to empower people online. All of this is driven by our adherence to the concepts so succinctly captured in the Internet Rights Charter. The APC Internet Rights Charter provides us with a tangible product that expresses our core, fundamental beliefs, our organisational DNA. This allows external groups to understand our motivations and provides us with a measure we can assess our activities against.” – Grant McHerron and Andrew Garton, apc.au

Internet Rights Charter in Pakistan

In 2007, when APC members and staff got together to translate and print the APC Internet Rights Charter into twenty languages, Bytes For All took up the challenge with APC’s support to translate it into Urdu, Pakistan’s national language spoken by around 265 million people all over the world.

“It was an extremely important initiative due to various reasons. Information about information and communications technology is usually only available in English and it was an established fact that the government does not provide even basic ICT policy information in Urdu. For civil rights advocacy purposes it was important to get the Internet Rights Charter translated, so its outreach could be enhanced manifold. This also helped amazingly to push our civil society rights agenda into the ICT policy arena. Up until now, particularly in government circles, IT had been seen without the ‘C’ of communication and only from a business angle. We can rightfully claim that the founding of the Pakistan ICT policy monitor network and the dissemination of the Internet Rights Charter in Urdu seeded a national debate around rights issues and technology. Now we have a basis on which we are building our campaign around internet rights issues. The government has just started the process to come up with a new policy and we are an active, inseparable part of this process.” – Shahzad Ahmad, Bytes For All Pakistan
Annual “state-of-the-digital-divide” report: Global Information Society Watch

Global Information Society Watch (GISWatch)\(^5\) is an annual report co-produced by APC which looks at the progress being made in creating an inclusive information society worldwide (particularly in implementing WSIS goals), encourages critical debate and strengthens networking and advocacy for a just, inclusive information society.

The country reports are easy to read and offer a quick insight into a country situation. Contributors are primarily from civil society organisations active in ICT issues in their countries, and for many when the publication was first launched in 2007, it was the first time they had put their analysis of the state of ICT in their countries on paper. Since 2007, GISWatch has covered citizen participation in ICT policy processes, access to ICT infrastructure and access to information and knowledge. That the same authors are writing about these issues from a country perspective suggests that their understanding of a broad ICT policy environment should grow over time as they grapple with what, for some, may be new topics. And as their understanding grows, so will their confidence and ability to engage in related policy and advocacy processes. For APC, this is the real capacity-building value of GISWatch.

“The fact that GISWatch is being used in universities is encouraging, as universities are highly influential places when it comes to ICT policy. For contributors to have a voice in this space is important,” commented GISWatch editor Alan Finlay.

\[^5\] www.giswatch.org. GISWatch is a partnership project, produced by APC and the Third World Institute (ITeM) in 2007, by APC, ITeM and Hivos in 2008, and by APC and Hivos from 2009. GISWatch 2007 was funded primarily by the Ford Foundation with additional resources from DGIS and DFID. Hivos, Bread For All, the Ford Foundation and Sida provided support for GISWatch 2008.

“More and more investment in broadband infrastructure is being made in developing countries. GISWatch 2008 comes at no better time.” – Lishan Adam PhD, ICT in development researcher and consultant, associate and adjunct professor, Ethiopia
National ICT policy

APC ran our first ICT policy training workshops in South Africa in late 2002. This was followed by a milestone event, when more than 100 representatives from civil society organisations throughout Africa trained in Addis Ababa in 2002 in preparation for their participation in WSIS. Further trainings took place in India and Africa. The first pilot of a standardised curriculum called “ICT policy training for civil society” in Colombia at the end of 2003, attended by almost all APC members as well as Latin American civil society organisations, proved to be very important for the APC network as we prepared the 2004-2008 strategic plan. Almost all APC members at the workshops felt that they were real novices and many were quite intimidated by the idea of getting involved in policy processes. Five and six years on, many of those original workshop participants are making interventions in their own countries and have become established as experts on rights-based ICT policy.

Seed funding through an APC initiative to set up their own national “ICT policy monitor” websites from 2004 to 2006 gave a dozen APC members a chance to get their feet wet and find out what ICT policy was all about. A policy travel fund within APC got people to key policy events so that they could learn, network and build visibility for their own areas of interest.

The APC network gains confidence and experience

The national ICT policy monitor initiative began in 2004 with eleven APC members on board. Each member built an ICT policy monitoring portal for increasing awareness amongst local civil society activists about local issues, strategies for influencing public policy debates and monitoring the WSIS process. Often the portals were the first websites to collect information on ICT policy in their countries. By 2006, another seven organisations had joined the network. The project supported members through improved networking amongst the various national processes (learning from what the others were doing) and support for their engagement in global processes (including funding to travel to events). By the end of 2006, members reported new engagements with national civil society and governmental processes, including announcements from eight members that they were planning national-level public consultations during 2007. A number of the members report on the importance of their advocacy during this four-year period:

---

6 rights.apc.org/training. The curriculum eventually included a substantial module on advocacy and was translated into French and Spanish and shared online. APC also produced an ICT policy handbook “for beginners” to accompany the curriculum. The curriculum and handbook were funded by the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO) as part of DFID’s Building Digital Opportunities (BDO) programme. The pilot workshop was supported by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

7 Supported by Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V. (EED).

8 Possible thanks to the fact that APC’s policy programme had core funding from the Ford Foundation and Hivos.

9 Colnodo (Colombia), BlueLink (Bulgaria), LaNeta (Mexico), apc.au (then c2o) (Australia), Pangea (Spain), FMA (Philippines), Nodo TAU (Argentina), GreenNet (UK), Unimondo (Italy), ITeM (Uruguay), and Alternatives (Canada/Democratic Republic of Congo).

10 Bytes For All (Bangladesh), Bytes For All (Pakistan), ArabDev (Egypt), Open Institute (Cambodia), StrawberryNet (Romania), ZaMirNET (Croatia), and RITS (Brazil).
Pakistan

“It all started back in 2005, when APC provided travel support to one of the representatives from Bytes For All Pakistan to participate in the Tunis phase of WSIS. It was such a great learning experience, providing us with the opportunity to meet and network with the APC staff and its members gathered in Tunis from all around the world. This interaction also helped build mutual trust between APC and Bytes For All Pakistan for long-term partnership. In 2006, it was a small but extremely important initiative conceived and seeded by APC’s policy programme when the Pakistan ICT policy monitor network was established.

“This was first time ever in the history of the country that civil rights organisations got themselves connected to the ICT policy space in the country. This network not only helped CSOs but all other stakeholders to raise their voice on ICT policy issues, the usual practice being policy making in isolation without any inclusive or participatory approaches. At that time, Pakistan already had a dormant policy document and unimplemented IT Action Plan. This state of affairs helped the network a great deal to build its advocacy campaigns and engage with the policy makers at the highest level with a collective voice on issues of concern. Since 2006, the network has covered a lot of ground and currently enjoys the reputation of being the most inclusive ICT policy space in Pakistan. The discussion group has 252 members representing all different stakeholders throughout the country.

“We can claim with pride that this small initiative helped a great deal to mainstream a civil society perspective into ICT policy debate in the country. In addition, it also helped attract additional grants for projects including a review of Pakistan ICT policy and in the areas of internet censorship and privacy, surveillance and mainstreaming gender into ICT policy processes. It was because of this network that the .pk ccTLD [country code top-level domain] included a civil society representative on its advisory board.” – Shahzad Ahmad, Bytes For All Pakistan

Cambodia

“For us here in Cambodia, the major change that APC brought about was that we (members and the network as a whole) were able to influence the language of international ICT policy documents to make sure that policy serves the best interests of the general population and promotes sustainable development and social justice. The other change is the awareness raising within the APC network of how important it is to have a good policy for ICT.

“Working in ICT policy is very challenging and time consuming. In Cambodia, the development of a national ICT policy began in 2005 and we still do not have an approved policy. ICT policy processes tend to be slow and depend on how much interest there is on the part of the government to move things along. There is also a real challenge related to how much our comments can really influence or change the legislation. Once the period for public comments is closed, it is out of our hands to really know what the final policy document will include.
“We cannot say that we have been able to achieve what we wanted: an ICT national policy that truly serves to benefit Cambodians, a policy that can lead the country towards more development and then advancement. At this point, all we can hope for is that our comments concerning gender, the Khmer language, free and open source software, standardisation and others will make it through the working versions of policy and into the final document. If they are still there in the final version, it will be our achievement in providing inputs that contributed to a policy that serves the best interests of Cambodia.” – Kong Sidaroth, Open Institute, Cambodia

Bulgaria

“BlueLink has worked with other members to accelerate APC’s activities related to the sustainable development theme which was conceptualised at APC’s council meeting hosted by BlueLink in 2005 and developed at the WSIS in Tunis. A special workshop was hosted by APC and BlueLink at the first IGF in Athens (2006) which outlined the broad range of internet policy and governance priorities which could have an essential impact on the empowering of communities and citizens in their struggle for environmental information and rights. In addition, lessons learned from the Aarhus Convention – a key multinational agreement on access to information – have been used as the basis for a voluntary code of practice for good internet governance proposed by APC, the United Economic Commission for Europe and the Council of Europe at the second IGF.” – Pavel Antonov, BlueLink, Bulgaria

11 www.apc.org/en/pubs/briefs/world/discussion-paper-code-good-practice-participation-
Philippines

“APC’s efforts at engaging ICT and internet policy spaces have allowed FMA to participate in general governance spaces such as WSIS and the IGF. This engagement has allowed us, and APC in general, to be updated on the current state of play in terms of the content and agencies of internet governance – the issues, actors and spaces – and has allowed us to position ourselves and our advocacies in both international and local contexts. It also allowed us to network with communities of practice and advocacy in specific areas of work (privacy/security, A2K, access, etc.). This has also helped sharpen FMA’s positions on key policy issues that we engage nationally (and to a lesser extent regionally). This is related not only to APC’s facilitating member participation in the aforementioned spaces, but also in providing frameworks of content for our advocacies such as APC’s Internet Rights Charter – which has provided an overarching agenda for information and communications advocacy. The charter provides invaluable content to our advocacy, and allows us to advance a social justice, rights-based agenda in ICT, internet and telecoms policy. APC has enabled us to engage in regional and national campaigns via policy research, public forums and capacity-building activities. APC helps members like us to be a relevant civil society actor in many of the content areas which the charter tackles.” – Alan Alegre, FMA, Philippines

Ecuador

“The new Ecuadorian Constitution signed into law on 28 September 2008 states that all people are entitled to ‘universal access to information and communication technologies’ and protects ‘the creation of social media, equal access to radio spectrum for managing public, private and community radio and television stations, and free bands for the operation of wireless networks’ (for internet access).
“Civil society groups in Ecuador working in the communication sectors felt the constitutional reform was a unique opportunity to propose a new communication rights framework that included access to the internet for all citizens. The Ecuadorian struggle for these rights is complex – those who control the traditional media vehemently opposed the changes, and internet access, mobile phones and other ICT services have typically been delivered within a regulatory context favouring the interests of a small number of wealthy business owners and multinationals. We communication rights advocates tried to spread a message adapted from the World Social Forum that ‘Another communication is possible’. As an APC representative, to me, when applied to the internet that meant that the internet should be seen as a global public good: open, affordable and accessible to all.

“We formulated proposals for the Constituent Assembly in charge of drafting the new constitution. We stimulated public debate, convened multi-stakeholder forums and researched key communication trends in Latin America and the world. APC was directly in charge of preparing proposals, developing the rationale and lobbying members of the Assembly. We were overjoyed when two key communications rights became established in the new constitution. The challenge today centres around the mechanisms needed to enforce the rights in a way that is coherent with national development policies.” – Valeria Betancourt, APC’s Latin American policy coordinator, Ecuador

The network expands

The Catalysing Access to ICTs in Africa (CATIA) programme was a multi-component approach to addressing access issues such as trying to streamline the use of VSATs, boost community radio, provide support for regulators and assist civil society actors to engage in ICT policy debate. APC coordinated the component on ICT policy advocacy.

It gave us the opportunity to focus on very specific nationally driven policy advocacy work for the first time in five African countries. We were able to select and pay part-time “network animators” to stimulate national ICT policy dialogue that ideally would involve government, the private sector, civil society and the media. Some worked better than others, but in all of the five countries, the ICT landscape changed for the better.

Positive policy and regulatory reform really took off in Kenya from as early as 2005. KICTANet, as a multi-stakeholder advocacy network, organised a range of inclusive policy debates and consultations, both face to face and online, with the government, private sector, media and consumers. The coalition collaborated closely with the government in the formulation of the ICT policy which was approved by the cabinet in January 2006.

KICTANet also played a direct role in the liberalisation of VoIP by the regulator. Interestingly, KICTANet’s experience indicated that here was a replicable model of a multi-stakeholder advocacy network and we documented the experience. KICTANet later joined APC as

12 APC was contracted to run Component 1c on policy advocacy as part of Catalysing Access to ICTs in Africa (CATIA), a major initiative funded by the UK DFID.
a member and since 2008 has been coordinating the Eastern African network of CATIA’s successor, Communication for Influence in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA).

In Senegal, greater awareness of the value of ICTs was raised with the media in order to promote better coverage of ICT policy issues. Television programmes and websites dedicated to ICT policy issues appeared for the first time, some still primary references on ICTs in Senegal today.

A multi-sectoral network, DMTIC, came together in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) as part of CATIA to engage policy makers and carry out research to inform advocacy on a national backbone network. DRC still had no country-wide infrastructure in 2008 but DMTIC had put the issue on the government’s radar by linking ICTs with development. A backbone is planned for 2010.

CATIA in fact was so successful that APC secured funding to carry out similar initiatives, starting in 2008, to build the CICEWA network in Africa15 and an Andean network in Latin America16 to promote affordable broadband.

Democratic Republic of Congo

THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS, THE MEDIA, CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE ACADEMIC SECTOR COME TOGETHER FOR INFORMATION AND DIALOGUE ON ICT IN DMTIC. PHOTO: ALTERNATIVES

“Between 2004 and 2008, the most significant impact that APC had on APC member Alternatives was to support the creation of a multi-stakeholder coalition which went on to engage policy makers and use research to campaign for a national internet backbone. In 2008, DRC, Africa’s third largest country and the most populous French-speaking country in the world, still had no fibre-optic connection to the international internet.

15 CICEWA www.apc.org/en/projects/communication-influence-central-east-and-west-afri is supported by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).
16 Communication for Influence in Latin America (CILAC – Andean Region) www.apc.org/en/projects/communication-influence-latin-america-cilac-andean is also supported by the IDRC.
“The coalition known as the DMTIC came to life as part of CATIA in 2005. APC supported the first round-table which set up the DMTIC in January 2005 and the organisation of a Pan-African Forum (with representatives from five countries: DRC, Morocco, Niger, Benin and Cameroon) to build capacity in ICT policy advocacy a month later.

“Since then, the DMTIC has been the space where the various players involved in ICT – the public and private sectors, the media, civil society, the academic sector – come together for information and dialogue and the players have focused on the advent of a national ICT development policy in DRC.

“Thanks to the initial support from APC, we received additional funding to work on advocacy and for a second project to work on the establishment of an ICT policy for DRC. APC’s support was also significant in negotiating an agreement with IDRC to fund our research on the feasibility of an internet infrastructure in DRC, the results of which were published in August 2007.17

“The government has taken this initiative seriously, and Alternatives and the DMTIC were asked to coordinate a special civil society commission on ICT policy set up by the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications. Alternatives and the DMTIC have developed an action plan in response to an appeal made by both Alternatives and APC at WSIS that governments which had not developed global cyberstrategies as an integral part of their development plans and poverty control strategies should do so by 2010.

“The creation of the DMTIC, the multi-sectoral dialogue and information exchange, the completion of the feasibility study on the internet, etc., led to discussion within the government and a change in perception with regard to ICT. It is no longer being seen solely as infrastructure, but also as a tool for development.

“An institutional and legal ICT framework for DRC (a working document) and a draft national ICT policy have been sketched out, although they have still not been adopted at the time of writing. However, the government recently concluded agreements with a Chinese company for implementation of an internet backbone and several regions in the country should have suitable infrastructure by 2010-2011! Inshallah!

“Today, Alternatives and the DMTIC have become ICT points of reference in DRC; in fact, several DMTIC members have been seconded by the government to act as resource people for implementation of the national policy.” – Michel Lambert, Alternatives, Canada/DRC

Senegal

“In 2006, I was the facilitator in Senegal for CATIA, led by APC, and this really opened the way for us to initiate changes in the use of ICTs by civil society and especially by the media in Senegal. As part of CATIA, we built the capacity of journalists by training them on the political issues surrounding ICTs as well as showing them how to use ICT tools to improve their work (e.g., creating blogs, downloading radio programmes). To my big surprise, some journalists ended up creating new shows for the net and one of

17 www.rdc-tic.cd/q=node/75
the journalists created an online journal18 that several years on is widely read and highly respected here in Senegal. It is a really great source of information for anyone who is online in Senegal to get the information they need about the internet, and its existence should be a source of pride for APC. Another example is the television show DEBATIC, which came into being thanks to CATIA and which talked about ICT policy. It was the first of its kind here in Senegal. It set off a dynamic that provoked changes in ICT policy elaboration in that people began to realise that ICT policies need to consider the needs of the population and integrate civil society in an in-depth reflection on ICTs for sustainable development. Everyone was talking about it and now even the authorities and regulators are aware of the issue.” – Coura Fall, CATIA coordinator, Senegal (Coura is the current coordinator of the Central and West African network of CICEWA, GOREeTIC.)

Cameroon

“Working as part of APC has allowed us to expand our vision in relation to ICT policy making in Cameroon and at a regional African level. We wrote the Cameroon country report on access to ICTs for the 2008 edition of GISWatch and we have been closely involved in the establishment of the GOREeTIC network for improved synergy in West Africa with relation to government consultations on the implementation of laws and regulatory texts governing ICT access for all. In Cameroon, PROTEGE QV has highlighted the use of universal access funds by conducting a study that identifies the fund’s main components and focuses on the use of these funds, and what has been achieved so far.” – Avis Momeni and Sylvie Siyam, PROTEGE QV, Cameroon

18 www.pressafrik.com
Regional ICT policy

In Africa, APC’s main focus was on access to infrastructure. APC ran a series of workshops and consultations on existing and proposed submarine cables and on other forms of local access. We launched the campaign website FibreForAfrica.net, reached out to national and regional media to publicise the debate, and published major research on the missed opportunities that have been part of the monopoly-held West African submarine cable.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, APC pursued an arduous campaign to have civil society participation in the regional post-WSIS ICT action plan recognised. The campaign was ultimately successful and APC was chosen by our peers to represent civil society. The gain may seem slight but it goes to the heart of ensuring that plural communities can participate in governance, and to demonstrating the value of participatory governance to the quality of the policy and regulatory outcomes that are achieved.

Open access in Africa

Africa has to pay for some of the most expensive bandwidth in the world. The money it pays in hard currency leaves the continent and the high costs are affecting Africa’s development both socially and economically. On the west side of Africa, until 2007, the one international fibre-optic cable (SAT-3) was run by a monopoly, keeping prices artificially inflated. In 2008, the eastern seaboard of Africa still did not even have one fibre-optic cable, so all internet access was via satellite and very expensive.

In 2006, APC co-organised consultations and workshops to bring together key stakeholders to discuss actions to ensure open access to the proposed East African Submarine Cable System (EASSy) so as to lower the cost of international bandwidth on the east coast of Africa. Participants later took their concerns to the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Such meetings received extensive coverage in African and international media, and APC launched the Fibre for Africa website to provide information on access to infrastructure in Africa. In November

---

19 The specific work outlined to open up access to infrastructure in Africa was made possible thanks to DGIS, DFID, infoDev, the Open Society Institute and UNDP.
20 For example, South Africa’s Mail & Guardian: www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=267024&area=/insight/insight__economy__business
21 For example, BBC Online: news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/4787422.stm
22 www.fibreforafrica.net
2006, APC together with UNDP convened a workshop on dialogue and exchange on promising options and critical issues for national policy and advocacy on “open access”. The pressure of such workshops and the signing of a NEPAD protocol on the proposed EASSy submarine cable indirectly caused a downward trend on prices on SAT-3 as the operating consortium tried to pre-empt regulatory intervention to lower prices.

As well as getting together key stakeholders to apply pressure, in 2006 APC carried out a large-scale research project – SAT-3/WASC Post-Implementation Audit: Country Case Studies\(^{23}\) – to document the effect the monopolised cable had on communications on the African continent, as well as the opportunities that have been missed and the reasons behind these.

The research gave infrastructure-oriented campaigns better insight into the pitfalls of “closed” decision making, complemented by the presentation of facts and real-life examples. APC also published a case study on Mauritius, where there were positive initiatives despite the SAT-3 situation. The studies were circulated in English, French and Portuguese at key regional and international policy events.

Civil society participation in Latin America and the Caribbean\(^{24}\)

Many governments opposed allowing civil society access to the proceedings and activities of the Latin American and Caribbean follow-up process to WSIS (known as eLAC),\(^{25}\) despite the fact that they were signatories to the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, which specified that all national, regional and global information society processes should be conducted with the participation of the private sector and civil society. However, by the end of 2007, in the face of strategic advocacy by APC and partners, the governments conceded and the way was open for civil society participation with a proposal that a nominated CSO serve as a link between the governments and civil society. Latin American CSOs nominated APC to take on this role.

In order to evaluate the existing state of involvement and impact of civil society and how best to improve it in future, APC commissioned a survey\(^{26}\) of actors in the region with a knowledge of the eLAC process.

Survey participants identified 162 actors with some degree of relevance in the ICT policy processes in the region. Each one of the survey participants identified up to ten actors in decreasing order of importance. In cases where a person indicated the same actor more than once, only the first position appearing was considered (see Table 1).

As part of the exercise, survey participants were asked to identify, in decreasing order of importance, up to five actors with which their institution had relations of collaboration in the area of ICT policies (e.g., political organisation, technical collabo-

\(^{23}\) www.apc.org/en/projects/open-access-africa-eassy-sat-3-wasc-research
\(^{24}\) APC’s advocacy work around eLAC was only possible thanks to the core funding APC’s policy programme received from Hivos.
\(^{25}\) www.eclac.org/socinfo/elac
\(^{26}\) www.apc.org/en/pubs/research/policy/elac/advocacy-and-civil-participation-elac-process-anal. The table and graph are adapted from this study.
ration, financing, participation in the same networks). Based on these responses, an index of collaboration was calculated for each of the 162 actors previously identified as relevant in the regional context of ICT policies by those surveyed.

Ten organisations obtained the highest index of collaboration, including more than four mentions in each case (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
<th>MENTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ECLAC</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National govern</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ICA/IDRC</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LACNIC</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>eLAC</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IADB</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Government of Brazil</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1: ACTORS IDENTIFIED AS MOST RELEVANT TO ICT POLICY PROCESSES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

There is a significant degree of concordance between the values obtained for relevance and collaboration. Well-thought-of actors in the area of ICT for development are clearly distinguished, consistent with their degree of activity in the region, expressed through the collaboration links they establish with different institutions.
The evaluators concluded: “It is not surprising to obtain as a result of the survey a high number of mentions of APC, as a network of civil society organisations with a high penetration in the region, of ECLAC, as a body which facilitates processes of ICT policies in general and of eLAC, in particular, and of IDRC as a funding organisation for a great number of projects on information society and ICT policies in the region.”

International ICT policy

Ensuring the internet is run with rights at the fore: The Internet Governance Forum

One of the most significant changes in the international ICT policy landscape and from APC’s perspective, a very valuable one, was the creation of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF). The IGF was an outcome of the WSIS. It is an annual international meeting, open to anyone who is interested in the governance of the internet, and provides a space for discussion and debate on public policy issues for all stakeholders in an environment that is, at least in theory, equal to all. It provides a kind of “pressure relief valve” for some of the most controversial internet governance issues, allowing actors with quite radically different and often opposing views to come together in an environment that is in the main respectful and constructive.

Although APC cannot claim a major role in its creation, we can claim a significant one relative to our capacity and resources. The IGF’s origins lie in deadlocked debates between governments on internet governance issues, which dominated the latter
stages of the WSIS process. This led to a recommendation by governments to form a working group which would make proposals for how the international community could best address this complex area of public policy. APC was nominated by our peers to be a member of this group – which eventually comprised 40 or so individuals from government, business and civil society – and along with other civil society actors was instrumental in formulating one of the final recommendations, that a forum be established.

Work did not end with the recommendation itself; it was then left to governments to discuss the proposal during the Tunis Summit in 2005, with many governments and private sector and technical community actors being opposed to the forum’s formation. APC was very active in lobbying – along with civil society – for the forum’s creation. In the four years of the forum’s existence, APC has been a constant in the IGF process, actively involved in everything from nomination, formation, participation and renewal of the IGF’s multi-stakeholder advisory group; participating in every consultation (which take place February, May and September every year) and annual forum; bringing a substantial team of members, partners and staff to the annual forum; collaborating with all stakeholders to organise workshops, contribute to main session planning, support national and regional interim processes, and so on.

Multi-stakeholder processes are probably the most challenging aspect of the IGF. Learning to listen to traditional adversaries, understanding different perspectives and seeking common solutions to complex problems, without losing sight of closely held values and principles, have not always come easily to an international rights-based NGO with a broad activist membership base like APC.

The IGF is probably best known for, or characterised by, its multi-stakeholder nature. Multi-stakeholder processes are probably the most challenging aspect of the IGF. Learning to listen to traditional adversaries, understanding different perspectives and seeking common solutions to complex problems, without losing sight of closely held values and principles, have not always come easily to an international rights-based NGO with a broad activist membership base like APC. Yet the solution to many of the challenges APC deals with in relation to ICT policy issues relies on the active involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. APC has largely supported the multi-stakeholder approach in the IGF, and in general we feel that the relationships we have forged with business, government, the technical community and so on have contributed to achieving APC’s goals in the IGF process in relation to the relatively “safe” issues of access to infrastructure in particular and capacity building.

However, the same degree of comfort cannot be said to exist in relation to more emotive and politically sensitive issues such as human rights, privacy protection, censorship of content and so on. Here actors still tend to fall back into their respective camps (though this is not necessarily a bad thing, it is very early in the process).
Developing a shared vision on the universal application of human rights to the internet is a monumental undertaking. Momentum has been building around the IGF incorporating human rights more centrally in its work agenda, but we imagine that it will still be some time in coming.

There are many small stories within this large story. The IGF has provided a useful entrée to the world stage for our members in Pakistan, the Philippines, Kenya and Bangladesh, to name a few. It has provided a similar entrée for the APC women’s programme, who until the IGF had tended to stay within women’s movement spaces.

One of the most memorable moments in the 2008 IGF was hearing APC’s Jac sm Kee explaining from the main plenary podium that women are often prevented from accessing important content on health and reproductive and sexual rights because of the content regulation policies being promoted. She left several panellists who were espousing paternalist views on protecting women and children from harmful content without a strong argument. Jac’s input was hugely significant. From the podium she changed the orientation of the IGF process regarding online security and privacy from one which was pushing aggressively for a global protection initiative that would have had enormous implications for freedom of expression, to one which finally took a more balanced and less hysterical approach to the issue.

The IGF provides a space where this type of dialogue, between adversarial opponents, can really move towards deepening understanding and ultimately influencing decision makers to make better internet policy for a more just world. APC has been a key actor in making this possible.

“In a country where abortion is illegal, the internet becomes a critical space to find out more about […] what kind of decisions you can make about your own body.” – Jac sm Kee (pictured), whose intervention changed the orientation of the “harmful content” debate at the IGF.

PHOTO: EZRENA MARWAN

---

28 The APC women’s programme’s involvement in policy advocacy was made possible with a grant from SDC.
THE STRATEGIC USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE: THE CASE OF THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT

When the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) screened some of the Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX) digital stories in the AWID Forum plenaries in November 2008, APC Women’s Networking Support Programme (WNSP) manager Chat Garcia Ramilo remembers how thrilled the WNSP team felt. “And I remember how nervous and excited the FTX participants were too, as their personal story was about to be shown before 2,000-plus women.” The plenary was packed, and the second the narration of the digital story started there was a complete hush. When it finished, the buzz from the audience was intense. The video immediately sparked identification, the realisation that “I could do that! I want to do that… about the women miners in my community, about abortion prohibitions sacrificing women’s lives in Nicaragua, about my organisation’s work.” The interest was confirmed by a flood of visitors to the FTX Hub later. For Chat, at that moment the point of APC’s ant-like work over the previous four years had finally clicked into place, “and I remember sitting in the auditorium marvelling at the long way we had come.”

How did the APC WNSP get the women’s movement to take ICTs seriously?

“The FTX1 highlighted the intersections between communication rights, women’s rights and movement building. And it has begun to make the case for why these issues matter to women’s rights work to over 2,000 women who, as a movement, have tended to be slow to take up ICTs or understand communication and technology as feminist political issues of relevance to the advancement of women’s rights,” said Anna Turley, AWID’s strategic initiatives manager.

The AWID Forum is the largest recurring event of its kind in the women’s movement, bringing together women’s rights leaders and activists from around the world every three years to strategise and learn. APC WNSP had been invited to organise a pre-forum three-day FTX in South Africa in 2008 which was attended by one out of twenty of all the AWID Forum participants. The FTX’s visibility was dramatically different from APC’s first participation at the 2002 AWID Forum, where we ran an internet café in the basement of the conference venue.

The change began around 2005, when the APC women’s programme set out to focus our work in policy advocacy and capacity building on one interconnected theme: ICT and violence against women. It was a strategic move to both engage the wider women’s movement in the politics of ICT – as violence against women was one of the most well-established issues in women’s rights – and for the APC WNSP to deepen our own understanding of how ICT policy impacts on women’s rights agendas.

---

1 Abigail E. Disney matched funding provided by AWID to make the FTX possible. The FTX was an initiative of APC WNSP, AWID and APC member Women’sNet.
APC WNSP had been training women's rights activists long before the FTX, combining learning new technology skills in a collaborative and safe space with a focus on women’s perspectives. But from 2005 onward, we particularly focused on building capacity to combat violence against women. We chose new and appropriate technologies, looking at their benefits but also how they are being used against women, and forged a lot of our practical work around a campaign – Take Back the Tech! – and a very powerful methodology, digital storytelling (see the section on Building the network of people promoting technology for social change).

The decision to focus on a thematic area provided a hook on which to examine a whole host of internet rights (the rights to privacy, freedom of expression, information, citizenship, assembly, mobility, safety) and a whole range of civil and political rights from a clearly feminist and gender-equal perspective. It also gave a point of engagement with the wider communications rights movement, particularly on content regulation, and regarding the women’s movement it was timely politically. Issues like cyberstalking and violence against women in video games were just beginning to gain visibility. There was a dearth of information and analysis on the interconnection between communications rights, technology and violence against women, and in 2005 the APC WNSP produced two issue papers on violence against women and technology: *Digital Dangers: ICTs and trafficking in women* and *Cultivating violence through technology? Exploring the connections between ICTs and violence against women.*

The two issue papers were accompanied by further investigation exploring the different policy facets of online violence against women, and we focused our policy advocacy activities more sharply and deeply on discussing the issues of openness, privacy and security at a number of important ICT policy and women’s forums. A third issue paper, *The World Wide Web of Desire*, took an increasingly nuanced look at content regulation on the internet and the debate on “harmful content”.

“We do not have to convince feminists about the relevance of ICT in their lives any more,” says Chat Garcia Ramilo. “A session at AWID asked ‘Is the internet feminist?’ and for the first time women’s rights defenders from all walks of life debated the issue and were clear about their stake in shaping a feminist internet. But perhaps the most significant change of our work can be best summed up by so many individual women trained in workshops over the last four years, who came out buzzed on their new skills and vision and have gone on to be the ICT mentors in their communities and organisations, the bloggers and podcasters, or to just be themselves, feeling strong.”

---

4 Namita Malhotra, 2007 www.apc.org/en/system/files/webOFdesire_EN_0.pdf. This paper, presented at the second Internet Governance Forum in 2007, took an increasingly nuanced look at content regulation on the internet, culminating in the women’s programme’s direct intervention at the third IGF in India on content regulation (see the section on international ICT policy) and changing the course of the international internet governance debate on “harmful content”.

5 The APC WNSP provided training for members of 214 women’s rights organisations from 2005 to early 2009. A number of organisations have participated in more than one training.
Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX):Uniting feminist techies and the women’s movement

Ekaete Judith Umoh of Nigeria is a typical FTX participant. She is eager to use the internet and other technology to make a difference in her effectiveness. And she wants to understand how rights to information and communication connect with her specific advocacy area, equality for women and girls living with disabilities.

The FTX trains women’s rights advocates, particularly those like Ekaete who live in developing countries, in essential internet, audio and other technical skills and crucially, the FTX also looks at the politics and impact of technology on women’s lives.

“IT is very strategic to devise a workshop centred on the issues regarding women and the feminist practice of technology. Often the tools training takes up all the space available at technical workshops and there is no opportunity for people to actually discuss the underlying policy issues or the impact on your context,” commented Margarita Salas, the thematic dialogue coordinator for the FTX and a member of Sulá Batsú, an APC member organisation in Costa Rica.

Trainers agree that it is rare for them to meet other “feminist techies” who are also advocates for both feminism and women’s rights and technology.

The first-ever FTX trained over 100 women’s rights advocates who were also attending the AWID Forum in South Africa in November 2008. It generated a demand for regional FTXs with the first starting in Latin America.
Take Back the Tech! New tools and an old problem

Every 25 November since 2006, the sixteen-day Take Back the Tech! campaign has encouraged individual women’s rights activists and everyday technology users to explore ICT tools, and especially Web 2.0 tools, from a feminist point of view. Campaigners use or are introduced to the latest technology – blogs, social networking tools, SMS campaigns, digital storytelling – to understand and be smart about the risks that online and mobile technology can represent, and to learn about other women’s realities, how we use ICT to confront violence, and how to take action.

For each of the sixteen days, the campaign site features a different action. For example, one day campaigners make and send anti-violence digital postcards; another day, they update pages in Wikipedia to include feminist perspectives. The campaign also provides tips for online safety.

“The campaign was a good incentive to start blogging and it got me thinking about the difference between blogging under one’s real name or under a nickname,” comments a campaigner in Brazil, where partner G2G translated material into Portuguese and encouraged local women’s organisations to participate in every facet of the campaign.

“Take Back the Tech! rejects a discourse of victimisation,” says Jac sm Kee, the coordinator of the campaign. “It is about looking at digital spaces as politically relevant, and setting aside sixteen days in taking simple, yet creative and concrete actions to address violence against women. In the process, we learn, we get comfortable with new technology and we change attitudes about women’s relationship with technology.”

Take Back The Tech! is increasingly being championed and localised by organisations and networks in different parts of the world from Cambodia to Mexico to the Republic of Congo. The campaign is helping to broaden the women’s movement as many of the campaigners are content creators, ad hoc collectives, organisations new to the area of ICT advocacy and women’s rights, and men.
g2g and Mediatatica (Brazil) created an autonomous Portuguese Retome a Tecnologia campaign site, after researching FOSS solutions and learning more about server administration to do so. They translated daily actions, “redecorated” streets with posters and made TBTT a central part of the first Brazilian Eclectic Tech Carnival.

Women’sNet (South Africa) and WOUGNET (Uganda) partnered to initiate an SMS campaign, “Stand Out, Speak Out”, where 170 participants from thirteen countries on five continents subscribed and submitted SMS messages against violence against women.

Open Institute (Cambodia) translated the campaign’s daily actions and icons into Khmer, networked with local women’s groups to monitor news reports on violence against women, initiated a white ribbon campaign, wrote editorials about violence against women and blogged.

AZUR Développement (Republic of Congo) organised a workshop on violence against women and ICT for local women’s rights groups, created digital postcards, and wrote analytical articles on the current status of legal protection against domestic violence.

LaNeta (Mexico) travelled to different states in Mexico with the campaign, giving workshops on using Web 2.0 for activism, creating postcards and a video on the action, as well as using these actions to initiate discussions on violence against women and ICT.

Réapproprie-toi la technologie! (Canada) emerged from a loose collective of activists who created a French-language TBTT website and collected resources on how to communicate safely online.
BUILDING THE NETWORK OF PEOPLE PROMOTING TECHNOLOGY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

“WeWith the Web 2.0 craze it seemed like there were technology evangelists who felt that
the internet was all you needed to cure what ails you, completely ignoring people’s
realities. APC helped keep technology training sessions rooted and well-rounded,
stressing secure online communications or explaining broader policy ramifications
of ICTs beyond a particular internet platform, chock full of examples from across the
world or right next door. With APC, trainings can never be about tools in isolation.”
– Erika Smith, APC women’s programme, based in Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of organisations trained by APC in 2004-2008</th>
<th>680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organisations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2004 to 2008, APC built or strengthened a number of different networks. A
number of them in the areas of policy and women’s issues have been mentioned al-
dready. Some of our most significant impact has been in the building of other networks,
specifically in building wireless technology expertise in Africa and Latin America and
the development of networks of gender and ICT evaluators and digital storytellers
using technology and narrative to heal and change.

Community wireless techies in Africa and Latin America

Between 2004 and 2008, APC hosted two community wireless internet connectivity
capacity-building projects – the first in Africa in 2005-2006 and the second in Latin
America and the Caribbean in 2007-2008.¹ The APC wireless projects were based on
the idea that if technically inclined community members have good information on
how they can build wireless networks and overcome the infrastructural shortages
that they face, then they can build networks themselves with inexpensive equipment.

Telecentre operators, local ICT trainers and community leaders with strong technical
skills participated in six-day training workshops where they learned the basic principles

¹ APC strategically chose to invite a Latin American participant to the Africa workshops who then returned home
to network with other Latin American APC technicians regarding the experience. TRICALCAR emerged as a
result, and then “gave back” to Africa by updating and adding to the training materials. We had to convince
our funding partner to agree to this but we knew from experience that this kind of cross-regional fertilisation
can be very fruitful.
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of wireless physics and networking. They made antennas from recycled materials and together built functioning wireless links connecting the communities hosting the workshops to the internet. The rigorous selection process, hands-on training and comprehensive training materials provided a strong basis to encourage these new wireless techies to set up wireless networks once they return home.

The African project\(^2\) included four linked components: materials development; pilot face-to-face workshops; the development and maintenance of a distributed knowledge base on wireless for development; and the building of partnerships and knowledge networks. The primary target audience were potential “champions” – people such as technical implementers, managers and trainers who would be able to apply and share the skills and knowledge acquired during the training.

Materials development was carried out in three languages (English, French and Arabic) for four regional workshops in Southern and Eastern Africa, Francophone West Africa and Arabic North Africa. All training units were then made available for download on the ItrainOnline repository of training resources.\(^3\)

A final evaluation\(^4\) carried out among participants in all of the workshops showed that over half had gone on to train others in using wireless technology, and a similar number had gone on to build networks themselves.

\(^2\) www.apc.org/en/projects/wireless/africa/wireless-africa. Project partners included wire.less.dk (Denmark), Ecole Supérieure Multinationale des Télécommunications - ESMT (Senegal), IT +46 (Sweden) and Community Wireless Solutions - CUWiN (USA). The Africa wireless initiative was supported by OSI and IDRC.

\(^3\) www.itrainonline.org/itrainonline/mmtk/wireless.shtml

APC concluded the first phase of the project with a strategy meeting in December 2006 of more than 40 members and partners actively involved in wireless networking in Africa. As well as strengthening the network built up over the previous two years, this final meeting concluded with specific recommendations for a second phase of the project.

“In 2006 while completing some research with APC, I found myself in a very remote part of Tanzania with Joseph Sekiku. I wanted to find a project that I had not been directly involved in to study and contrast with my findings from projects that I had worked on. When I arrived I found that Joseph, with remote tutelage, time at an APC workshop and a manual (Wireless Networking for the Developing World), had built his network himself and had connected a school, a government office and a business to the internet via his small telecentre in the middle of the jungle.

“Though the story of Joseph’s network is incredible, the greatest feat accomplished by APC’s work in wireless was not the wireless networks built, or the computers connected to the internet, but rather the human networks that were created. Those human networks live on and have led to many more initiatives. This result is hard to measure and regrettably is not a measure that corresponds to traditional development ‘deliverables’.

“APC was able to bring together a group of passionate people who shared an idea and donors like OSI, IDRC and Network the World who then further funded initiatives spawned by these human networks. Work like the aforementioned book was a result of this. What was started was another approach to development that is people-network focused. This has been the greatest result of this work and it is vastly under appreciated. Keep up the great work APC!”

1 www.apc.org/en/node/7237
TRICALCAR5 applied those recommendations to reconfigure the Latin America project. As a result, more emphasis was put on constructing permanent usable networks that would be left to communities who host workshops, as well as on developing a strong network of local experts and community network administrators. The training materials written for the African training were translated into Spanish, updated and adapted, focusing not only on the technical side but tackling the community and gender issues that can arise when running community networking initiatives.

Venezuelan APC member ESLARED had hosted major technical workshops in Latin America since 1992 and was chosen as project coordinator by its peers. They saw the learning from the African experience as the incentive to put together a “more ambitious” project for Latin America. “TRICALCAR was undoubtedly one of the factors that led the Internet Society to award ESLARED the Jonathan B. Postel Award in November 2008 for its contribution to the development of ICTs in Latin America and the Caribbean,” said Ermanno Pietrosemoli of ESLARED. By the end of 2008, TRICALCAR had built a lively network of wireless technicians and trainers from eighteen countries.
TRICALCAR PARTICIPANTS REPORT ON IMPACTS AFTER RETURNING HOME

Juan Cadillo, Peru: Juan reports that his organisation, the Peruvian Alliance for Knowledge Management (Alianza Peruana para la Gestión del Conocimiento), has installed wireless networks in two district municipalities in Ancash (a northern department on the Pacific coast), improving the use of existing VSAT satellite links and providing internet access to nearby schools. Two universities have incorporated TRICALCAR materials into their courses, so that students can now choose wireless network implementation as a final project for degree programmes.

Juan Pablo Neira, Colombia: Juan Pablo is assisting the FundeWilches Foundation, which promotes development in a community of oil palm growers, to install four networks which will provide access to 48 remote locations, including 21 educational centres, one senior citizens’ home, eighteen organisations, five businesses and three hospitals.

Freddy Bohorquez, Bolivia: Freddy works for the Centre for Research and Advancement of Campesinos (Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado). The centre has improved the inter-institutional network in San Ignacio de Moxos (capital of one of the country’s largest provinces) which currently interconnects fourteen institutions and eight private connection points via a satellite connection shared through the centre’s wireless network.1 One month after the workshop, they helped the Santa Rosa del Sara municipality in Santa Cruz set up its municipal wireless network. The installation of a community educational network in the municipality of Aymara de Viacha provided access to the municipal telephone exchange (through VoIP), access to the internet, and access to local educational portals in the municipality of Viacha for the Aymara indigenous communities.

Paco Olaza, Ecuador: Upon returning from the workshop, Paco worked on the installation of a wireless network for a financial institution in the coastal province of Machala (financed by the IADB) in order to optimise micro-credit in the region. It established links between agencies in three provinces over a 52-km link with 50-metre and 35-metre towers. This is a banana-growing region, with very tall, dense vegetation. Paco also received a scholarship for more training in Italy.

Juan de Urraza, Paraguay: Juan reported that participation in the Rosario workshop was useful for checking the topology of the Oportunet project’s network,2 evaluating other devices and protocols, as well as experimenting with VoIP and possible applications not currently permitted in Paraguay. Thanks to the new skills acquired at the workshop, the Oportunet project successfully applied for a CISCO Foundation grant for equipment valued at USD 24,376 to establish point-to-point connections and re-transmit the Oportunet signal to areas beyond the original one hundred points.


Taken from the APC Annual Report 2007
ICT evaluators and practitioners for women’s equality (GEM)

GEM\(^6\) is an evaluation methodology that integrates a gender analysis into evaluations of initiatives that use ICTs for social change. It is an evaluation tool for determining whether ICTs are really improving or worsening women’s lives and gender relations, as well as for promoting positive change at the individual, institutional, community and broader social levels.

GEM has been developed from the ground up, and has involved the collaboration of hundreds of community-based organisations and individuals since its first design in 2002. The network that has developed includes people who developed GEM, who train in how to use GEM, who are adapting GEM (to increase its applicability to rural ICT4D projects, telecentres, software localisation and ICT policy advocacy), and who are now offering GEM evaluations on a consultancy basis.

What the network says about GEM

Reports confirm that GEM produces a real change in the mindset of evaluators and users themselves and this consciousness remains with them.

John Dada is a farmer, nurse and part-time coordinator at the Fantsuam Foundation. John attended a GEM workshop for telecentre and rural ICT projects in 2007. Later he reported: “I am suddenly seeing GEM everywhere, in everything I do. I suppose that is what you mean by being gender-sensitive, that you don’t take things for granted any more. You begin to appreciate why sometimes the women that are part of our community resist the empowerment process and want to do things as they have always done. I used to be annoyed and think, ‘Can’t you see that you are oppressed? Can’t you see that you are being cheated?’ Now I understand that this is the product of years of conditioning and it will take some effort to reverse the trend. With GEM, you pull away all of the cultural cover-ups, social constructs and biases and you see the situation for what it truly is. And it is only when you appreciate the truth of a situation, that you can actually effect any change. Otherwise you just scratch the surface. GEM helps you see the situation for what it is, so you can optimise your resources where you can make the maximum impact in creating change.”

\(^6\) GEM has been strongly supported by the IDRC from its inception – when the women’s programme realised how critical it was to evaluate how technology projects were having different effects on the lives of women compared to men. GEM consultancies generate income for the women’s programme with the aim that they will eventually be a significant revenue-earner.
NATASHA PRIMO facilitated a GEM workshop convened by the IDRC for its African grantees running ICT-related projects. She recounts her experience when she realised the impact that GEM could have on the mindset of ICT project coordinators: “The workshop participants had very different takes on how their projects were already gender-aware. Some flatly argued that gender was irrelevant to their projects. We wanted to create a common understanding that their research should be aimed at making the world a better place for citizens or communities or children and that where they did not acknowledge gender and the impact gender would have on their research subjects’ lived experience, they could well be entrenching inequality.

“As participants grappled with their research questions they began to have a sense of how they could integrate – or could have in some cases – a gender lens. There was one participant who seemed really disengaged from the workshop process, but when he reworked his research questions to be gender-aware, he was the one most struck by how a re-orientation of the project approach to accommodate more participatory local government and especially participatory budgeting processes would have had a profound impact on the ability of women citizens to engage with their local government.

“For the participant, his project morphed from a computer and software-enabled information management project into a (lost) opportunity to pilot a project that deepened women’s role in local budget discussions with the potential to impact on decision making.”

7 The fact that IDRC has taken up the challenge of building existing partners’ capacity to integrate gender into their ICT projects and the dynamic of the workshop described is indicative of a growing understanding of the centrality of a gender-aware approach to bringing about meaningful social change, as well as its importance for building women’s capabilities and deepening women’s empowerment opportunities and processes.
Who is using GEM?

By 2004 a total of 103 women and nineteen men from 36 countries had been trained in how to apply GEM. In the following four years sixteen organisations requested GEM training and over 300 people were trained through these workshops. In addition, since 2007, twelve organisations have been adapting GEM in the four thematic areas, for application to rural ICT4D projects, telecentres, software localisation and ICT policy advocacy.

Those organisations include CEPES, an APC member from Peru working with rural communities west of Lima. Colnodo, an APC member from Colombia, works with hundreds of municipalities helping them ensure their transparency by getting their financial information online and is implementing GEM in a number of government telecentres. Telecentre networks in the Philippines, Mali, Colombia and Uganda are learning about how their projects can change gender roles and relations in their communities. A long-standing GEM partner has produced a guidebook on gender and technology in Bangladesh. An academic in Chhattisgarh, India has made GEM part of the coursework at the university where she works and joined the APC delegation to the IGF in India, leading our intervention during an informal consultation with Indian government officials.

On Lake Victoria, the Buwama Telecentre was mainly used by journalists from the local radio station and teenagers. Following GEM training, journalists have begun to create programming that includes women’s perspectives and caters better to the needs and interests of local women. The telecentre administrators have also begun to offer equal opportunity ICT training and encourage the participation of women over 30. PHOTO: APC VNSP
There was also a demand for GEM consultancies. The GEM team completed eight major consultancies during 2004-2008, ranging from training gender national machineries under the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW) in Africa to integrating gender into research and ICT4D projects run by the Ministry of Commerce in Cambodia.

**INTERNATIONAL BODIES APPLY GEM**

- **Canadian International Development Agency, E-Governance for Efficiency and Effectiveness Program**: GEM experts from APC produced an analysis of gender equality issues relating to ICTs in the Philippines and various government institutions identified as stakeholders (2002)
- **The World Bank, Strategies for the Development of Rural Information Systems in Indonesia**: GEM study on leveraging resources, institutional strengthening, and improving livelihoods of rural women, including policy and regulatory aspects of gender in ICT for development (2004-2005)
- **International Development Research Centre, Community-Driven Universal Access Policy in Cambodia**: GEM review and revision to integrate a gender perspective into the project document (2005)
- **Ministry of Commerce, Cambodia, Informatics for Rural Empowerment and Cambodian Healthy Communities**: GEM was used to provide advice and training on integrating gender-related issues into research design and project implementation (2006)

“In the last five years, we have worked with many people and organisations. Some we trained only in one workshop, others we guided through evaluations. Some we have not heard from again. Many others we are still in touch with and we continue to support,” says women’s programme coordinator Chat Garcia Ramilo. “What we have discovered is that this overall process of capacity building takes a long time, but if we persist long enough, we find out what changes it brings about.”

**Digital storytellers from Africa to the Balkans**

“If I had to say what was the most significant impact that APC has had on my organisation in the last four years, I would have to choose digital storytelling,” said Valentina Pellizzer, director of OWPSEE, a Sarajevo-based communications NGO and member of APC.

Digital stories – short videos using images and sound to tell a personal story – hold tremendous power for bringing about change. A digital story can be used for both
advocacy and documentation and takes advantage of the impact of images and the spoken word and music to convey a story or message.

The digital storytelling methodology has several steps including planning the story to be told and features a story circle to share and receive feedback on the story idea. When stories are traumatic, the circle-sharing is a privileged moment. "Sharing personal stories about experiences of violence requires courage," explains South African trainer Janine Moolman. "Listening to stories about experiences of violence requires humility, sensitivity and compassion. The story circle provides a supportive and confidential space for participants to share painful, powerful and poignant stories. For some people, it can be the first time they have spoken about their experience. The act of sharing stories, and the act of listening to them, hold the power to transform."

APC has trained women to create digital stories especially for the telling of stories to fight violence against women and has run training tracks for women's organisations above all in Africa. Digital stories have been featured as a key advocacy and awareness-raising tool in the Take Back the Tech! campaign and inspired 2,000 people at a women and development conference to use technology for social change (see the section on Strategic use of technology for social change).

Thanks to a fund APC makes available for member exchange visits and training, digital storytelling spread within the APC network from South Africa to the Balkans. Trainers from Women'sNet, an APC member in South Africa, travelled to Sarajevo to train OWPSEE staff members and partners from Bosnia and Serbia and two other APC members from the Balkans, ZaMirNET from Croatia and Metamorphosis from Macedonia. "It gave us a real sense of the power of the network," said Valentina.

"Thanks to APC we brought a methodology from South Africa to South East Europe and now we are training other organisations in the region. The power of creating your own digital story is immense in terms of communicating a message."

---

8 The APC-Africa-Women network was supported by Hivos. AAW has run a number of digital storytelling workshops for women who document violence against women in collaboration with Women'sNet. Because of their sensitive nature, digital stories are often unavailable to the public and so we do not include web addresses.

9 The APC Member Exchange Fund disburses around USD 30,000 each year which comes from APC member fees. www.apc.org/en/projects/member-exchange-fund-mef
Basic facts and figures

In the period 2004-2008, APC’s average yearly income was USD 2.9 million and in 2008 we had twenty full-time staff and 52 members.

Compared with 2000, our tenth anniversary, these figures represent significant growth. In 2000 APC had a budget of less than USD 700,000, just three staff members and a membership of less than twenty.

Income during 2004-2008 was primarily sourced from project grants, commissioned projects, some core and programme funding which came to an end in 2008, and some consulting income (see Figure 2). The grants and commissions were awarded by as many as twenty different agencies including government development agencies, parastatals, foundations and private companies. Our biggest supporters during this period were government agencies from the Netherlands and the United Kingdom and a Canadian Crown corporation.
Membership dues account for only 1% of our income. Over 6% of total expenditure from 2004 to 2008 was disbursed to members as payment for work on APC projects as well as small grants through the member travel fund used for participation in key policy arenas and the member exchange fund¹ which provides members with small grants to be able to carry out collaborative work and build the network.

With the increase in workload thanks to projects awarded in 2004, our staff had increased eight-fold from 2000, the majority working part-time. However, as the team consolidated, our goal was to have fewer staff working more hours, which is more efficient and cost effective and contributes to building a strong and sustainable team.

![Figure 3: Staffing 2000-2008 (Individuals and “Full Time Equivalents”)](#)

**Financial systems and procedures**

During the period under review we began to address the challenges of managing finance and administration in a largely virtual office environment in which staff are located in different countries, our bank account is located in a different country from the finance staff, and we need to pay for services in multiple countries.

A grant from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), a Canadian Crown corporation, greatly assisted us in developing a web-based online payment request system that we have linked to APC’s accounting software. The payment system enables staff to immediately allocate payments, together with supporting documentation, to the correct budgets, so that the payment approvers are able to quickly authorise payments provided they have access to the internet. The new system also facilitates quick financial reporting and compliance with auditing requirements.

We have also streamlined our internal charging system and developed rates for staff members’ time to help us accurately track and charge for work done by staff across programmes and projects. We regularly update our financial and administrative policies and procedures in the context of the virtual office environment but also to ensure that controls are in place for sound financial management.

During this five-year period, APC was awarded grants by 30 different groups including government agencies, development organisations and foundations from North America and Europe as well as international organisations.

We are particularly grateful to the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the Directorate-General for International Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS), the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (Hivos) and the Ford Foundation for their generous support of our work.

The IDRC of Canada has been one of our earliest and most visionary supporters. They encouraged us to develop the Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM) which is already a revenue generator as well as a remarkable evaluation tool to promote women’s equality. They also supported our two transcontinental community wireless initiatives at a time when wireless internet connectivity was less widely known. IDRC understood the importance of ICT for development well before many others, and we value our peer-to-peer relationship with them immensely.

The DGIS supported APC for the first time with a core grant for 2004-2008. This funding was hugely important in our policy work and our work with women’s movements to encourage the adoption of ICTs as a means of promoting women’s equality.

DFID invited APC to become part of a key group of civil society and donor partners known as the Building Communication Opportunities (BCO) Alliance and provided core funding from 2005 to 2007. They also contracted us to run part of the Catalysing Access to ICTs in Africa (CATIA) project in 2004-2006. This innovative project has seen key results in ICT policy advocacy in several African nations, and sparked follow-up advocacy networks in East and West Africa and the Andean region of South America respectively.

Hivos has been a long-time supporter of APC’s flagship policy initiatives and APC’s women’s programme’s work in Africa. We are particularly grateful for their core support of our policy work. Since 2008 we have been working together as peers as co-authors of the Global Information Society Watch report.

The Ford Foundation first supported APC back in 1997. In this period, they made it possible for us to play a prominent and influential role in global ICT policy advocacy and to strategically leverage our network of members and partners through the launching of Global Information Society Watch in 2007.

The fact that APC had core funding during the 2004-2008 period was a crucial component in the impact and visibility of APC’s work in both ICT policy and the women’s movement. It provided us with flexibility to engage where we could have a significant impact, as well as enabling a multiplier effect in the use of funds to financially support a broad range of initiatives that included research, capacity building, information dissemination and awareness building, participation in events, networking and advocacy.
Core funding from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) came to an end in 2007, and the significant contribution from the DGIS to APC core costs ended in December 2008. APC’s primary challenge going into our next planning period will be to secure sources of general support to ensure that we can maintain the institutional and human capacity we managed to develop from 2004 to 2008.

**New partners**

During the 2004-2008 period over half of our funding came from just three sources, and we are actively working to diversify our financial support base for the future. As a result, during the same period almost a third of the groups that collaborated with APC did so for the first time. These new partners include European development agencies, a church development group, and for the first time ever an academic partnership, an agricultural centre and a philanthropist.

---

**Core funders in 2004-2008**

1. DGIS
2. Hivos
3. SDC

**Primary programme supporters**

**Policy programme**

1. DFID
2. DGIS
3. IDRC
4. Hivos

**Strategic use programme**

1. DFID
2. IDRC
3. OSI
4. FAO

**Women’s programme**

1. IDRC
2. DGIS
3. Hivos
4. DFID
Organisations who supported APC during 2004-2008

We would like to thank the following agencies, organisations and individuals for their financial support of our work:

- Abigail E. Disney
- Article 19
- Atos KPMG Consulting Ltd.
- Bread for All
- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
- Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO)
- Directorate-General for International Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS)
- Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V. (EED)
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)
- Ford Foundation
- Global Fund for Women
- Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP)
- Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (Hivos)
- infoDev
- Institute for Connectivity in the Americas (ICA)
- International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
- International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD)
- International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
- Open Society Institute (OSI) Zug Foundation, OSISA & OSIWA
- Oxfam-Novib
- Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA)
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
- Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA)
- United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)
- World Association for Christian Communication (WACC)
APC MEMBERS IN 2008

Argentina - Nodo TAU  www.tau.org.ar
- Wamani  www.wamani.apc.org

Australia - apc.au apc.org.au

Bangladesh - Bangladesh Friendship Education Society (BFES)  www bfes.net
- Voices for Interactive Choice and Empowerment (VOICE)  www voicebd.org

Bosnia and Herzegovina - OneWorld Platform for Southeast Europe Foundation (OWPSEE)  www.oneworldsee.org

Brazil - Rede de Informações para o Terceiro Setor (RITS)  www rits.org.br

Bulgaria - BlueLink Information Network  www.bluelink.net

Cambodia - Open Forum of Cambodia  www.forum.org.kh
- Open Institute  www.open.org.kh

Cameroon - PROTEGE QV  www.protegeqv.org

Canada - Alternatives  www.alternatives.ca
- Web Networks  www.web.net

Colombia - Colnodo  www.colnodo.apc.org

Congo, Republic of - AZUR Développement  www.azurdev.org

Costa Rica - Sulá Batsú  www.sulabatsu.com

Croatia - ZaMirNET  www.zamirnet.hr

Czech Republic - Econnect  www.ecn.cz

Dominican Republic - Networks & Development Foundation (FUNREDES)  www.funredes.org

Egypt - ArabDev  www.arabdev.org

Germany - ComLink  www.comlink.org

Hungary - Green Spider  www.zpok.hu

Italy - Cooperativa Kiné  www.kine.coop

Japan - Japan Computer Access for Empowerment (JCAFE)  www.jcafe.net
- JCA-NET  www.jca.apc.org

Kenya - African Regional Centre for Computing (ARCC)  www.arcc.or.ke
- Arid Lands Information Network-East Africa (ALIN-EA)  www.alin.or.ke
- Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet)  www.kictanet.or.ke

Macedonia - Metamorphosis Foundation  www.metamorphosis.org.mk
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Mexico - LaNeta www.laneta.apc.org
Nigeria - Fantsuam Foundation www.fantsuam.org
Peru - Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales (CEPES) www.cepes.org.pe
Philippines - Foundation for Media Alternatives (FMA) www.fma.ph
- Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD) (until December) www.ipd.ph
- WomensHub www.womenshub.net
Romania - StrawberryNet www.sbnet.ro
Senegal - ENDA-Tiers Monde www.enda.sn
South Africa - Community Education Computer Society (CECS) www.cecs.org.za
- Southern African NGO Network (SANGONeT) www.sangonet.org.za
- Ungana-Afrika www.ungana-afrika.org
- Women’sNet www.womensnet.org.za
South Asia - Bytes For All www.bytesforall.org
South Korea - Korean Progressive Network Jinbonet www.jinbo.net
Spain - Pangea www.pangea.org
Uganda - Collaboration on International ICT Policy for East and Southern Africa (CIPESA) www.cipesa.org
- Women of Uganda Network (WOUGNET) www.wougnet.org
UK - Computer Aid International www.computeraid.org
- GreenNet www.gn.apc.org
USA - Institute for Global Communications (IGC) www.igc.org
- LaborNet www.labornet.org
Uruguay - Third World Institute (ITeM) www.item.org.uy
Venezuela - Fundación Escuela Latinoamericana de Redes (ESLARED) www.eslared.org.ve
BOARD AND COUNCIL

BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN 2008
(November 2007-November 2010)

Danilo Lujambio, Argentina (chair)  Anriette Esterhuysen, South Africa (executive director)
Janine Moolman, South Africa (vice chair)  Michel Lambert, Canada
Andrew Garton, Australia (secretary)  James Nguo, Kenya
Magela Sigillito, Uruguay (treasurer)  Valentina Pellizzer, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Alan Alegre, Philippines

COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES IN 2008

AFRICA

ALIN-EA, Kenya  PROTEGE QV, Cameroon
James Nguo  Sylvie Siyam, Avis Momeni
ArabDev, Egypt  SANGONet, South Africa
Leila Hassanin  David Barnard, Janine Moolman (from May)
ARCC, Kenya  Ungana-Afrika, South Africa
Alfred Orimbo, Steven Yogo  Toni Eliasz, Tshepo Thlaku
AZUR Développement, Republic of Congo  Women’sNet, South Africa
Victorine Diaboungana (until April), Blanche Zissi (from May), Roméo Mbengou (from May)
Georges Mbowala (until April)
CECS, South Africa  WOUGNET, Uganda
Arnold Pietersen  Goretti Zavuga Amuriat, Milton Aineruhanga
CIPESA, Uganda  
Vincent Bagire, Lillian Nalwoga
ENDA-TM, Senegal  
Laye Kante, Masse Lo
Fant suas Foundation, Nigeria  
John Dada, Kazanka Comfort (until July), Kelechi Micheals (from July)
KICTANet, Kenya  
Alice Wanjira, Muriuki Mureithi

ASIA-PACIFIC

apc.au, Australia  
Andrew Garton, Grant McHerron
BFES, Bangladesh  
Reza Salim, Rashiduzzaman Ahmed
Bytes For All, South Asia  
Partha Pratim Sarker, Frederick Noronha
FMA, Philippines  
Alan Alegre
IPD, Philippines  
No representative in 2008

JCAFÉ, Japan  
Onoda Mitoye, Okabe Kazuaki

JCA-NET, Japan  
Fujino Satoshi, Hamada Tadahisa

JINBONET, South Korea  
Oh Byoung-il, PatchA (until June), Jisung Kim (from July)

Open Forum, Cambodia  
Im Sokthy

Open Institute, Cambodia  
Chim Manavy, Kong Sidaroth

VOICE, Bangladesh  
Ahmed Swapan Mahmud, Farjana Akter

Women's Hub, Philippines  
Pi Villanueva

-----------------------------------------------

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN
-----------------------------------------------

CEPES, Peru  
Maicu Alvarado, Jaime Torres (until July), Roberto Bustamante (from July)

Colnodo, Colombia  
Julián Casasbuenas, Ariel Barbosa

E Bellegho, Venezuela  
Edmundo Vitale, Lourdes Pietrosemoli

FUNREDEx, Dominican Republic  
Daniel Pimienta

IteM, Uruguay  
Pablo Accuesto, Magela Sigillito (until October)

LaNeta, Mexico  
Olinca Marino, Erika Smith

Nodo TAU, Argentina  
Danilo Lujambio, Eduardo Rodriguez

RITS, Brazil  
Paulo Lima (until April), Carlos Afonso (from May), Graciela Selaimen

SUlA Batts, Costa Rica  
Margarita Salas, Francia Alfaro

Wamani, Argentina  
Carlos Alvarez, Rodolfo Rapetti

-----------------------------------------------

NORTH AMERICA  
(not including Mexico)
-----------------------------------------------

Alternatives, Canada  
Michael Lambert, Caroline Tagny

IGC, USA  
Mark Graham, Mitra

LaborNet, USA  
Steve Zeltzer, Erika Zweig

Web Networks, Canada  
Oliver Zielke, Ramya Ramanathan (from May)
STAFF TEAM IN 2008

Management systems staff

Executive director: Anriette Esterhuysen, South Africa
Assistant to the executive director: Katherine Walraven, Canada
Network development manager: Karen Banks, UK
Network development assistant: Vanessa Purper, Brazil (until October)
Logistics coordinator: Mylene Soto, Philippines
Finance manager: Maya Sooka, South Africa
Finance and human resources assistant: Fatima Bhyat, South Africa
Accounting and financial consultant: Misty McWilliams, South Africa*
Communications, media and promotions manager: Karen Higgs, Uruguay
Information coordinator: Frédéric Dubois, Canada (until September)
Specialist editor: Analía Lavin, Uruguay
Technical information coordinator: Adolfo Dunayevich, Mexico (until October)
Technical information coordinator: Sarah Tomas, Philippines (from November)
BCO coordinator: Lauren Fok, South Africa* (until October)
Communications associates: Kelly Loverock, Uruguay/Canada** (until March) and Lisa Cyr, Uruguay/Canada** (from September)

Programme teams

APC Women’s Networking Support Programme (APC WNSP)

Women’s Networking Support Programme manager: Chat Garcia Ramilo, Philippines
APC-Africa-Women coordinator: Jennifer Radloff, South Africa
APC-Africa-Women co-coordinator: Sylvie Niombo, Rep. Congo
GEM Practitioners Network coordinator: Lenka Simerska, Czech Republic
LAC regional coordinator: Dafne Plou, Argentina
GEM research coordinator: Angela Marianne Kuga Thas, Malaysia
GenderIT.org coordinator: Katerina Fialova, Czech Republic
Communications coordinator: Erika Smith, Mexico
Women’s Rights and ICT project coordinator: Jac sm Kee, Malaysia
Technical & systems administrator: Sarah Tomas, Philippines* (until October)
GenderIT.org website editor: Flavia Fascendeni, Brazil*
Communications and Information Policy Programme (CIPP)

Communications and Information Policy Programme manager: Willie Currie, USA  
National ICT Policy Advocacy (NIPA) coordinator: Natasha Primo  
NIPA intern: Natalie Brown, South Africa/Canada** (until February)  
Africa ICT Policy Advocacy coordinator: Coura Fall, Senegal  
Africa ICT Policy Monitor and Chakula editor: Alan Finlay, South Africa*  
Latin America policy programme (CIPP-LA) coordinator: Valeria Betancourt, Ecuador  
Communications advisor to CIPP-LA: Analía Lavin, Uruguay  
CIPP-LA intern: Felisa Ponce Tamayo, Ecuador/Canada** (from September)  
CIPP-LA website editor: Florencia Flores, Uruguay*

Strategic Use Programme (SUP)

Strategic Use Programme manager (acting): Karel Novotný (until July)  
Strategic Use Programme manager (acting): Karen Banks (from August)  
Knowledge-sharing coordinator: Karel Novotný, Czech Republic  
Project worker: Cheekay Cinco, Philippines

* Consultants and/or temporary staff who worked with APC during 2008
** The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) provided APC with four outstanding interns during 2008.
FINANCIAL SUPPORTERS IN 2008

APC would like to thank the following donor agencies and organisations for their support of APC’s work1 in 2008:

Abigail E. Disney
Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX)

Bread for All
Global Information Society Watch

Directorate-General for International Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS)
Core support to APC

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)
Web 2.0 and Social Networking for Development (IMARK module)

Ford Foundation
EroTICs, Global ICT Policy Advocacy for Information and Communications for Social Justice and Sustainable Development, core support to the policy programme

Global Fund for Women
Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX)

Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (Hivos)
Core support: Engaging Policy and Practice, Global Information Society Watch, GenARDIS

Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA)-Institute of International Education (IIE)
Decreasing the cost of broadband in South Africa

Institute of International Education (IIE)-Ford consultancy
Workshop on Open, Universal Internet Access

International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
Communication for Influence in Latin America (CILAC), Towards Détente in Media Piracy, Communication for Influence in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA), Capacity Building and Institutional Support for APC (INSIRO), Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM) II, Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX), GenARDIS

International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD)
GenARDIS

International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
IGF travel grants

Oxfam-Novib
Feminist Tech Exchange (FTX)

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
Global Information Society Watch, Study of Effects and Possibilities of ICT for Enhancement of Democracy

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
Building Communication Opportunities (BCO) Alliance

Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA)
GenARDIS

United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
Building Communication Opportunities (BCO) Alliance

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Pro-Poor ICT Access Resource Kit

---

1 For more information about the initiatives they supported please visit the “Projects” section of the APC website. Past projects are also archived at www.apc.org/en/projects/past
### ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR 2008

#### BALANCE SHEET AT 31 DECEMBER 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 (USD)</th>
<th>2007 (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td>2,057,774</td>
<td>1,165,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>65,388</td>
<td>21,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income - consulting</td>
<td>30,807</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income - grants</td>
<td>705,218</td>
<td>297,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>1,256,361</td>
<td>845,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>2,057,776</td>
<td>1,165,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES AND LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>2,057,776</td>
<td>1,166,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves and sustainability funds</td>
<td>638,403</td>
<td>460,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability funds</td>
<td>604,384</td>
<td>460,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained income</td>
<td>34,019</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>1,419,373</td>
<td>705,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>92,116</td>
<td>94,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income from project implementation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income from grants</td>
<td>1,327,258</td>
<td>607,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESERVES AND LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>2,057,776</td>
<td>1,166,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 (USD)</th>
<th>2007 (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant and contract income</td>
<td>2,847,243</td>
<td>2,083,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income</td>
<td>142,417</td>
<td>101,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting revenue</td>
<td>76,492</td>
<td>63,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>28,377</td>
<td>29,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>14,399</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and sundry</td>
<td>23,149</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>2,812,150</td>
<td>2,367,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors’ remuneration</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings (staff, executive board and council)</td>
<td>56,978</td>
<td>260,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational expenses</td>
<td>64,345</td>
<td>75,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>378,769</td>
<td>425,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project expenses</td>
<td>2,261,235</td>
<td>1,532,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and fax</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>3,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>15,610</td>
<td>8,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, accommodation and per diems</td>
<td>11,905</td>
<td>37,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (includes re-design)</td>
<td>12,893</td>
<td>24,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) FOR THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>177,510</td>
<td>(183,172)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detailed information is available in the audited financial statements for 2008.
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ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ALIN-EA Arid Lands Information Network-East Africa, Kenya*
APC Association for Progressive Communications
ARCC African Regional Centre for Computing, Kenya*
AWID Association for Women’s Rights in Development
BCO Building Communication Opportunities Alliance
BDO Building Digital Opportunities Programme
BFES Bangladesh Friendship Education Society, Bangladesh*
CATIA Catalysing Access to ICTs in Africa
CECS Community Education Computer Society, South Africa*
CEPES Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales (Peruvian Social Studies Centre), Peru*
CICEWA Communication for Influence in Central, East and West Africa
CIDA Canadian International Development Agency
CILAC Communication for Influence in Latin America
CIPESA Collaboration on International ICT Policy for East and Southern Africa, Uganda*
CSOs civil society organisations
CTA Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
CTO Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation
DFID UK Department for International Development
DGIS Directorate-General for International Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
EASSy Eastern Africa Submarine Cable System
ECLAC Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EED Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (Church Development Service), Germany
eLAC a regional ICT policy strategy developed by governments for Latin America and the Caribbean
ENDA-TM ENDA-Tiers Monde (Environment and Development Action in the Third World), Senegal*
ESLARED Fundación Escuela Latinoamericana de Redes (Latin American Networking School Foundation), Venezuela*
FAO Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FMA Foundation for Media Alternatives (Philippines)*
FTX Feminist Tech Exchange
FUNREDES Fundación Redes y Desarrollo (Networks and Development Foundation), Dominican Republic*
GEM Gender Evaluation Methodology
GenARDIS Gender, Agriculture and Rural Development in the Information Society
GKP Global Knowledge Partnership
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| **Hivos** | Humanistisch Instituut voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking (Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries), Netherlands |
| **ICA** | Institute for Connectivity in the Americas |
| **ICTs** | information and communications technologies |
| **IDRC** | International Development Research Centre |
| **IGC** | Institute for Global Communications, USA* |
| **IGF** | Internet Governance Forum |
| **IIED** | International Institute for Communication and Development |
| **IIE** | Institute of International Education |
| **IMARK** | Information Management Resource Kit |
| **IPD** | Institute for Popular Democracy, Philippines* |
| **IteM** | Instituto del Tercer Mundo (Third World Institute), Uruguay* |
| **ITU** | International Telecommunication Union |
| **JCAFE** | Japan Computer Access for Empowerment, Japan* |
| **JCA-NET** | Japan Computer Access Network, Japan* |
| **LAC** | Latin America and the Caribbean |
| **NEPAD** | New Partnership for Africa's Development |
| **NGOs** | non-governmental organisations |
| **OSI** | Open Society Institute |
| **OWPSEE** | OneWorld Platform for Southeast Europe Foundation, Bosnia and Herzegovina* |
| **PHEA** | Partnership for Higher Education in Africa |
| **PROTEGE QV** | Promotion des Technologies Garantes de l’Environnement et de la Qualité de Vie (Promotion of Technologies that Guarantee the Environment and Quality of Life), Cameroon* |
| **RITS** | Rede de Informações para o Terceiro Setor (Information Network for the Third Sector), Brazil* |
| **SANGONeT** | Southern African NGO Network, South Africa* |
| **SAT-3** | South Atlantic 3 submarine cable |
| **SDC** | Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation |
| **Sida** | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency |
| **TBTT** | Take Back the Tech! campaign |
| **TRICALCAR** | Tejiendo Redes Inalámbricas Comunitarias en América Latina y el Caribe (Weaving Community Wireless Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean) |
| **UNDP** | United Nations Development Programme |
| **UNESCO** | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation |
| **VOICE** | Voices for Interactive Choice and Empowerment, Bangladesh* |
| **WACC** | World Association for Christian Communication |
| **WNSP** | APC Women’s Networking Support Programme |
| **WOUGNET** | Women of Uganda Network, Uganda* |
| **WSIS** | World Summit on the Information Society |

* APC member organisations
What are APC’s priorities for 2009-2012?

APC’s enduring vision is that all people have easy and affordable access to a free and open internet to improve their lives and create a more just world.

We will:

- Advocate for affordable internet access for all
- Secure and defend internet rights
- Build the “information commons”
- Use emerging technologies for social change
- Make technology work to sustain the environment
- Improve governance, especially internet governance

You can find out more details in our strategic action plan.¹ If you would like to support APC’s work, please write to Anriette Esterhuysen, APC executive director, anriette@apc.org.

For regular updates about the APC network and other news stories on technology for social justice and sustainable development, subscribe to APCNews,² our twice-monthly newsletter, in English, French or Spanish.

For general information about APC, write to info@apc.org.

² You can subscribe to APCNews at www.apc.org
Association for Progressive Communications
Asociación para el Progreso de las Comunicaciones
Association pour le progrès des communications
Executive director's office
Oficina de la directora ejecutiva
Bureau de la directrice exécutive
PO Box 29755, Melville 2109, South Africa
Telefax: +27 11 726 1692
Mail: info@apc.org
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