



## **Note on the 2005 Independent Evaluation of the Development Gateway Foundation**

The attached two documents are intended to be read together:

- Attachment #1: Development Gateway Foundation: Independent Evaluation, May 16, 2005, authored by Dr. D.P. Muth and Dr. F.H. Gerlach
- Attachment #2: Plan to Implement the Recommendations Contained in the 2005 Report of the Independent Evaluation, May 18, 2005, authored by the Development Gateway management

### About the Independent Evaluation

The attached report is a summary version of a longer evaluation report commissioned by the Development Gateway as part of its application for financial support from the World Bank's Development Grant Facility. The evaluators – Dr. H.P. Muth and Dr. F. H. Gerlach – are independent consultants who have not been involved in the work of the Development Gateway in any way.

The Independent Evaluation covers the period from 2001, when the Foundation was established, until April 2005, when the full report was delivered by the evaluators. This summary report was created by the evaluators at the request of the Development Gateway. The recommendations that were made in the longer report are repeated in this summary.

June, 2005

# **Development Gateway Foundation**

## **Independent Evaluation**

16 May 2005

Hanns Peter Muth

Frederick H. Gerlach

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b><u>Part I: Evaluation of the Development Gateway Foundation</u></b>	1
<u>SUMMARY</u>	1
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
<u>BACKGROUND</u>	2
<u>PROGRAMS</u>	2
<u>EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT</u>	4
<u>THE DEVELOPMENT GATEWAY FOUNDATION AS AN ORGANIZATION</u>	5
<u>FINANCIAL EVALUATION</u>	5
<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	6
<b><u>Part II: Recommendations</u></b>	7
<u>Programs</u>	7
<u>Governance, Organization and Management</u>	26

## Part I: Evaluation of the Development Gateway Foundation

The evaluation of the Development Gateway Foundation **concludes** that:

- The Development Gateway portal and the programs supported by the Development Gateway Foundation are fully compatible with the Foundation's mission and objectives.
- Continued donor support of the Foundation's programs is necessary and justified, for three main reasons:
  - Some of the Foundation's programs are unique in scope or concept, and some – based on current, primarily anecdotal, evidence – promise growing and eventually major impact in terms of its mission.
  - Some of the current weaknesses of the Foundation are due to the fact that it 'lost' two years of institutional development due to a problematic transition from World Bank incubation to operational independence;
  - After achieving operational independence, Management of the Foundation has demonstrated its will and ability to overcome these weaknesses and to make the Development Gateway into a powerful player in the ITC4D field.

The key **recommendations** of this evaluation are that:

- ◆ The Foundation make impact measurement a matter of high priority – donors are unlikely to be persuaded forever by anecdotal evidence of impact.
- ◆ The Foundation continually reassess the relative merits – in terms of development and poverty-reduction impact – of its menu of programs to ensure that scarce resources are applied to the development and improvement of those programs that generate the most 'value for money'.
- ◆ The Foundation 'stretch' its resources through an even more collaborative approach to program development and implementation. The increased emphasis on partnerships may mean that, in some cases, the Foundation plays 'second fiddle' to competitors while, in others, it plays the lead role because of the strength of its own programs.
- ◆ Management develop a comprehensive fund-raising strategy, based on two premises: 1) continued public-sector and multilateral donor support is **essential** as evidence of recognition of the impact of the Foundation's programs, and 2) private-sector support is **welcome** and can give the Foundation the financial freedom to 'experiment' with new programs. Future approaches to new public-sector and multilateral donors must be prepared with solid research on individual donors' missions, objectives, and programs and on the synergies and impact the DG's own programs can offer.
- ◆ The organization of the Foundation be strengthened in four important respects:
  - › The 'development dimension' – which is missing from the career histories of the CEO and CFO – should be a selection criterion for all future additions to the Foundation's senior staff.
  - › The planning, marketing, fund-raising and impact-measurement functions need to be given their due place in the organization and assigned to individuals with strong relevant experience.
  - › Cross-departmental working groups must ensure that the entire organization 'thinks marketing, impact measurement and fund raising' and participates in the planning process.
  - › The governance structure and processes must be made more effective.

## INTRODUCTION

This evaluation, covering the period from 2001 to the present, was commissioned by the Development Gateway Foundation (“the Foundation” or “the DG”) and is a highly condensed version of a detailed report submitted recently to the DG. The Foundation had commissioned the evaluation to comply with a requirement of the World Bank, one of the DG’s principal funding agencies, that multi-year programs supported by it be evaluated periodically and independently. Part I is the report summary; Part II presents the Recommendations essentially as they appeared in the detailed report.

We – the evaluators, Dr. H. P. Muth and Dr. F. H. Gerlach – are independent consultants who have worked for more than 15 years on joint assignments in developing countries but who were not involved in the genesis or implementation of the DG in any way. The time available for the evaluation having been very limited, our work consisted of some 80 interviews with Foundation staff and representatives of a broad range of stakeholders, as well as of desk research, using the Internet and extensive written materials provided by the Foundation staff.

## BACKGROUND

Some knowledge of the unusual historical genesis of the DG is essential for an understanding of the Foundation of today. Created within the World Bank in 1999 at the urging of the Bank’s President, James Wolfensohn, the DG was a part of the Bank’s external-knowledge-sharing strategy aimed at promoting sustainable development and poverty reduction through the use of information and communications technology (ICT). In 2001, an independent entity – the Foundation – was established to take ownership of the DG while the Bank continued program work under a series of service agreements with the Foundation. In ‘spinning off’ the DG in this way, the Bank intended to limit its liabilities and encourage other donors to share in the costs of the DG programs.

While continuation of the extraordinarily close relationship with the World Bank assured that the DG programs would be completely developed and successfully launched, it created problems for the Foundation that were perhaps not foreseen at the time. Senior officials of the Bank, including Mr. Wolfensohn (Bank president), held positions on – and one even chaired – the Foundation’s Board. Bank officials also dominated the Foundation’s powerful Executive Committee, which, de facto, made most of the key decisions.

There was thus ambiguity in the minds of some observers regarding whether the Foundation was going to be ‘legally separate but operationally subject to World Bank control’ or ‘legally separate and operating independently’. No one argued that, in the field of ICT for development (ICT4D), the World Bank’s and the Foundation’s objectives were anything but fully compatible, but the ambiguity of the situation made life very difficult for the CEO, temporarily stunted the Foundation’s organizational growth and, as word got around, undermined the very quest for donor funds that had been a principal reason for the spin-off in the first place. It is to the great credit of the Foundation’s Management that the DG has survived this ‘transition damage’ and can now look forward to a successful future with good prospects for operational sustainability.

## PROGRAMS

The Foundation’s programs consist of four **core** programs, two **joint** programs, and the Development Gateway **Forum** and **Award**. (For a description of each program, click on the program title in each case.) Despite the limited time available for the evaluation, we have observations to make on all of them and recommendations for all but one. The narrative below includes a summary of the key recommendations for each program (with links – PR 1, PR 2, etc. – to the detailed recommendations); see ‘[Part II: Recommendations](#)’ for the full list of recommendations and for the rationale in each case.

**Core Programs – [Topic Pages](#).** While the Foundation’s 27 web-based Topic Pages have the potential to enhance the DG ‘brand’ at relatively modest cost, the concept – essentially a web site devoted to a development-related topic – is anything but unique in practice. The DG’s challenge is to convince users, and ultimately potential donors, that its Topic Pages offer more value than competing ones. We recommend that the DG reassess and revamp its Topic Page program so as to add depth at the expense of breadth, i.e., to concentrate on topics where it arguably has (or is close to having) a lead, provides value for money and meets a market need (see [PR 1](#), [PR 2](#) and [PR 3](#)). The Board-nominated [Editorial Committee](#) should be involved in this process ([PR 4](#)). For other recommendations, see [PR 5](#), [PR 6](#), and [PR 7](#).

**Core Programs – [Country Gateways](#) (CGs).** As Internet portals and independently-owned partners of the Foundation in various countries around the world, CGs (now totaling over 50) are an impressive concept. They are at their best when they synergistically use other DG programs for local purposes. However, with important countries missing and some CGs a disappointment, the existing network is far from ideal. Fully aware of the situation, but in charge of the program only since October 2004, the Foundation is taking steps to tighten performance requirements and change CG partner recruitment procedures. We recommend that the Foundation expand its search for donors ([PR 8](#)), emphasize a partnership-based approach to identifying potential new CGs ([PR 9](#)), invest in more staff travel ([PR 10](#)), tailor grant disbursement schedules to CG needs ([PR 11](#)), and continue to encourage CG lateral networking through global and regional meetings ([PR 12](#)).

**Core Programs – [dgMarket](#).** We found no Foundation program more widely acclaimed than dgMarket, a web-based, worldwide data base for tenders and procurement opportunities. This acclaim stems in part from dgMarket’s demonstrated capacity to earn revenues, which now cover nearly half of program costs. The program faces problems, however: the lack of a standard product classification system, the barriers of multiple languages, the absence of contract award monitoring (and therefore of a means of measuring impact), the shortage of staff, and, above all, the unwillingness of many governments to adopt the system (perhaps because they feel threatened by transparency and competition). We recommend that the Foundation review its dgMarket staffing needs ([PR 13](#)), seek ways of monitoring contract awards ([PR 14](#)), and, in partnership with donors and organizations battling corruption, launch a worldwide marketing and PR campaign to increase the availability of, and demand for, dgMarket’s services ([PR 15](#)).

**Core Programs – [Development Effectiveness Group](#) (DE Group).** An impressive collaborative effort involving major actors in the development field, the DE Group consists of **AiDA** (Accessible Information on Development Activities), the largest online global directory of development projects; **LPD** (Local Projects Database), an open source application to help organizations coordinate development projects and activities; and **AMP** (Aid Management Platform), a system for promoting information sharing on proposed aid activities from conceptualization to funding. While the latter two are still in the pilot stage, their promise is clear. We make no recommendations here, but we would point out that the DE Group has shown by example how the Foundation can effectively leverage its modest resources.

**Joint Programs.** Two Foundation programs were born collaboratively. With the Italian government, [e-Government Grants](#) aims at helping developing countries fulfill national e-government strategies through small projects that can be scaled up by bigger donors. Mozambique and Nigeria have received grants for two projects each; additional countries are expected to become grantees soon. We regard this program as an excellent vehicle in support of the Foundation’s mission, and we recommend ([PR 16](#)) that additional donors be recruited to join it. [Research and Training Centers](#) resulted from an effort to bring developing countries (so far, Korea, India, China and Rwanda) into the DG as largely in-kind and/or local-currency donors. While the centers clearly build capacity to use ICT4D, the program has been criticized as not relevant to the Foundation’s overall mission. We concurred initially but changed our minds when

we noted the synergies the centers engender with other Foundation programs. We recommend ([PR 17](#)) placing these two joint programs under a single manager and promoting them actively as part of the donor recruitment process (see 'Effectiveness and Impact' below).

[Development Gateway Award](#) and [Development Gateway Forum](#). We regard the Award as a well-conceived, and relatively inexpensive, way of enhancing the Foundation's stature in the ICT4D world. As for the Forums, the two held so far (2003 and 2004, in Bonn) have proven useful in bringing key ICT leaders together and in raising the Foundation's profile, but the events compete with other programs for scarce staff time. The Forum this year, focused on Asia and the Pacific and being organized by China, will demonstrate whether the Foundation can leverage its own limited resources and depend on others to do most of the work. We recommend ([PR 18](#)) that the Foundation consider holding its DG Forum biennially, or even triennially, and in the intervening years co-sponsor regionally-oriented forums similar to the one this year in Beijing. We further recommend ([PR 19](#)) that the Foundation explore holding joint conferences with other organizations, thus reducing costs and broadening the appeal of the events for the cooperating partners.

**Shared Goals of the Programs.** Our review of the Foundation's programs suggests the need for common goals and for altering – even eliminating – programs with unrealistic goals. Each program should 1) add value and carve out a distinct niche of its own; 2) promote partnerships; 3) achieve in-house synergies, 4) develop methodologies and data for measuring impact; and 5) stress marketing and the raising of DG's profile. Now that the Foundation is fully independent, its staff must view the programs dispassionately and search constantly for synergies, 'buyers' of the DG's fine 'products' and ways to raise the Foundation's profile within the development community.

## EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

Donors consider 'value for money' a key criterion for allocating scarce resources among competing applications, and thus impact measurement has become critical for funding applicants. In the ICT4D sector, impact measurement is still relatively new. Numbers of subscribers, visitors, pages per visit, etc., are demand indicators, not evidence of impact.

The DG does its *counting* well, employing sophisticated instruments for the *user market* of its products and services. Our experience with small not-for-profit organizations is not extensive, but we have not encountered an organization of similar size that devotes as much time and effort to getting to know the 'where, who and what' of the markets for its products and services, and to market-testing its programs. We have also found the Foundation's Management alert to the issue and problems of impact *measurement*. Still, as pointed out in several of our recommendations, even more can – and should – be done.

We have found far fewer signs of research by the DG of its '*donor market*' – i.e., detailed analyses of the development/ICT4D strategies, priorities, programs and associated needs of individual donors – as inputs for an individual-donor-targeted fund-raising strategy. Even a cursory surfing of the Internet shows many services that arguably compete with those offered by the DG. We believe that, to be effective, a donor-focused fund-raising strategy in a competitive environment must have two key elements: research about each donor's priorities relative to one's own programs and evidence that these programs achieve measurable impact – ideally, greater impact than those of competitors.

We note Management's confidence that they will be able both to secure Second-Round funding and to raise an endowment of \$50 million from private-sector donors. We certainly hope they succeed, but, even if they do, we believe that the Foundation should review, reorganize and strengthen its approach to fund raising as well as to impact measurement. We make a number of specific recommendations ([EffRec](#)) in this regard. The DG will validate its existence via the

superiority and impact – continually measured and confirmed by the market – of its programs and services. A systematic, targeted global approach to bilateral and multilateral donors must complement a global effort at raising an endowment for the DG from the private sector. Continuing donor support, more than the size of an endowment funded by wealthy private donors, is evidence of acknowledged impact.

## **THE DEVELOPMENT GATEWAY FOUNDATION AS AN ORGANIZATION**

The Foundation's operational independence does not – and certainly should not – mean a rupture of relations with the World Bank. It *does* mean that the inherited management, governance structure and 'organizational culture' should be reviewed and, in our view, altered in important ways. With respect to Management, we have proposed changes that would incorporate our ideas for a greater emphasis on planning, impact-measurement and fund-raising. We recommend ([OrgRec1](#)) recruitment of a Chief Programs Officer and two senior executives for the 'Planning and Funding Strategy' and the 'Marketing, Communications and Forums' functions. These persons should have strong development experience as well as excellent managerial qualities ([OrgRec2](#)). We also recommend ([OrgRec1](#)) the establishment of cross-departmental committees or working groups for planning, funding strategy and impact measurement.

As a result of the Foundation's unusual background, governance has been a problem from the beginning. The [Board of Directors](#) has been described as more of a "donors club", with limited continuity, than a cohesive and an effective organ of governance. We recommend ([GovRec1](#)) either a radical re-shaping of the Board by including representatives of all important stakeholder groups, or a partial re-shaping that would see some stakeholder groups represented on the Board of Directors, others on the [Advisory Board](#). We also recommend measures to strengthen the [Executive Committee](#) ([GovRec2](#)), the Nominating Committee ([GovRec4](#)), and the Advisory Board ([GovRec3](#)). Importantly, all members of the Executive Committee and the full Board should be appointed for their personal commitment to the mission and objectives of the DG, not merely to occupy a chair reserved for a donor. We note the desirability of holding Board of Directors meetings twice per year, of alternating these meetings between Washington DC and locations on other continents, and of having one of those meetings each year jointly with the Advisory Board.

Finally, good governance also requires that attention be paid to the DG's 'organizational culture'. To rephrase and stress the point made above, the DG should seek a better balance between management skills and experience on one hand, and the 'development dimension' on the other. While the Foundation's senior management has the former in abundance, it is short on the latter. Remedying this weakness – we recommend ([OrgRec1](#)) the appointment of a Chief Programs Officer with senior management experience in a development-oriented organization – will help in implementing the other recommendations we have made.

## **FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

For various reasons the DG never became the financially powerful ICT4D engine envisioned by its founders. The total funds raised in the first three years amounted to about \$72 million, some \$39 million of which consisted of cash donations; the rest was donated in kind. This result contrasted sharply with projected donations of \$90 million to \$150 million. Exaggerated expectations have given way to the realistic awareness that the marketplace will decide whether the DG will survive. The Foundation deserves a chance to expose its programs to that test.

The financial accounts as of 30 June 2004 (audited) and 31 December 2004 (unaudited) show that the Foundation has been going through a difficult period. Management is now confident that sufficient firm commitments will be obtained in a 'second round' of funding to allow operations to continue at approximately current levels and with the present menu of programs. As noted above, even if the endowment-raising campaign succeeds and a sizable capital fund is established, there is good reason to continue putting the Foundation and its programs to the test of traditional donor support (see [FinRec](#)).

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The Development Gateway portal and the programs supported by the Development Gateway Foundation are fully compatible with the Foundation's mission and objectives.

Continued donor support of the Foundation's programs is necessary and justified, for three main reasons:

- Some of the Foundation's programs are unique in scope or concept, and some – based on current, primarily anecdotal, evidence – promise growing and eventually major impact in terms of its mission.
- Some of the current weaknesses of the Foundation are due to the fact that it 'lost' two years of institutional development due to a problematic transition from World Bank incubation to operational independence;
- After achieving operational independence, Management of the Foundation has demonstrated its will and ability to overcome these weaknesses and to make the Development Gateway into a powerful player in the ITC4D field.

## Part II: Recommendations

### Programs

#### Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 1

- ¶ The DG should regularly survey the users of each Topic Page to determine how it might be improved and whether it has the potential to lead in its field.

##### *Rationale*

- Like any commercial business, the DG must be aware of its competition. Surveying the users of each Topic Page will help to a) identify the competitors, b) determine the 'rank' of the DG page vis-à-vis competing web pages, c), when the rank is high, decide what improvements in the page are needed in order to achieve/maintain leadership, maximize 'value added' and demonstrate impact, and d), when the rank is low, discuss appropriate action – which might include termination or consolidation – with sponsors of competing web sites.

##### *Implementation Milestones for each Topic Page*

- Periodic surveys (to be continuously refined)
- Inventorying and monitoring of competitors
- Development of individual page strategies

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 2

¶ Armed with the page strategies (see Program Recommendation 1), the DG should systematically reach out to competitors, treating them as potential partners and seeking cooperative ways of reducing duplication. In some cases, Topic Pages might be re-branded to give the competitors equal billing; in other cases, the DG might give up its own Topic Pages, directing visitors to the web sites of competitors (in return for cross-links to the DG's own strong pages).

### *Rationale*

➤ Unlike commercial businesses, the DG faces no anti-trust action for cooperating with competitors. Since all of them are pursuing similar objectives, facing similar fiscal pressures, and seeking funds from similar sources, cooperation aimed at eliminating wasteful duplication makes sense – for the competitors as well as the donors. (There is no guarantee, of course, that all of the competitors will meet the DG half way, but the effort will be worth while nonetheless and may lead the DG to revise its page strategy.)

### *Implementation Milestones for each Topic Page*

- Preparation of a page-strategy-based plan for reaching out to competitors
- Initiation of efforts at cooperation
- Monitoring and assessment of results, feed-back and appropriate action

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 3

- ¶ The DG should remain alert for opportunities to bring its Topic Page program to bear on subjects not currently covered but of great interest to donors. For example, an ‘impact measurement’ page might not only put the DG, as coordinator, at the forefront of a highly topical field but also help the DG with those of its own programs that need more convincing impact data in order to attract greater donor support.

### *Rationale*

- ICT4D being a dynamic field, the DG should continuously look for pages to add as well as to eliminate. The critical factors are demand and competition: If the demand is there and the DG can realistically ‘lead the pack’, it may well make sense to create a new page. There is no standard way of finding opportunities, but a key requirement is communication with interested parties, notably donors. The new ‘Open Educational Resources’ Topic Page, funded with a grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, is an excellent example of DG alertness to a market opportunity.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Periodic brainstorming to consider new Topic Pages
- Appointment of a project manager for each potential new Topic Page
- Plan for reaching out to potential sponsors and competitors
- Implementation plan for approved new pages
- Provision of resources for the effort

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 4

- ¶ The DG should involve the Editorial Committee in the process of reviewing Topic Pages, expanding partnerships, and considering new subjects (see Program Recommendations 1 to 3).

### *Rationale*

- Given the complexity of the ICT4D marketplace, the DG's 'founding fathers' were wise to foresee the need for an Editorial Committee. Dedicated and well-connected members can assist enormously in the reaching-out process we recommend. They can also add an objective and constructive dimension to the various tasks facing the DG Topic Page guides and content coordinators.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Steps are taken to rejuvenate the Executive Committee
- Meetings, both real and virtual, are held on an agenda-driven basis

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 5

- ¶ The DG should continue to move gradually toward elimination of the guide stipends and instead use those funds to bring guides together at least once annually (perhaps on the fringes of the Development Gateway Forum) and to maintain more systematic contacts with actual or potential partner organizations.

### *Rationale*

- The DG correctly seeks to concentrate on providing the portal, technical support, and coordination without which the Topic Pages could not exist. Most of the non-DG guides, advisors and partner organizations responsible for content devote their time and resources to the effort for reasons related to their respective missions rather than for the modest stipend that many of them are still receiving. All parties in the Topic Pages program would benefit from lateral contact with each other as well as from travel aimed at the recommended 'reaching out' process. The money now expended for guide stipends should be diverted to these other urgent needs.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Consultations with guides (or the organization employing them) to advise them of the intention to terminate the stipends
- Plans for periodic 'summit' meetings of the guides of all Topic Pages
- Summit agendas

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 6

- ¶ The DG should enhance the 'Third World' dimension of its Topic Pages by more actively seeking partnerships in the developing countries.

### *Rationale*

- Much of the criticism one hears about the DG's Topic Pages is that they reflect the 'Washington consensus' rather than a more balanced view of the world and that the views of developing countries are not adequately incorporated into the various topics. There are two excellent vehicles available to the DG for correcting this imbalance through the recruitment of new 'Third World' Topic Page partner organizations: 1) the DG's own Country Gateways (CGs), which are intimately familiar with their respective local scenes, and 2) the Global Development Network (GDN) – another newly independent World Bank initiative – which promotes development-related research through a number of independent and well-established Regional Network Partners.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- CGs are informed of the specific partnership needs through appropriate channels
- Active contact with the GDN regarding this and other subjects for possible cooperation

## Topic Pages – Program Recommendation 7

- ¶ The DG should review its relationship with the CGs in the content area and technically facilitate the exchange of resources between the Topic Pages and CG portals.

### *Rationale*

- While much of the content of individual CGs may be too parochial to be of global interest, the reverse is clearly not true (although globally posted resources may not always be deemed relevant in some countries). In any case, guides should be able to copy resources to the CGs, and from the CGs' portals to Topic Pages, with minimal effort.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Polling of guides regarding their relationship with CGs with a view to determining what technical problems might be hindering the sharing of content
- Elimination of technical constraints to content sharing with CGs
- Implementation of one or two pilot projects with CGs

## Country Gateways – Program Recommendation 8

¶ In an effort to stretch available funds for the Country Gateway (CG) program further, the Foundation should systematically approach a) donors that have funded similar enterprises but not the Foundation and b) the in-country missions of USAID and other donors in countries that the DG would particularly like to bring into the CG network (see also Program Recommendation 9).

### *Rationale*

➤ At the funding rates currently foreseen by the DG, expansion of the CG network will be slow, even in the absence of any setbacks. We believe, however, that there are potential donors for the program that, for various reasons, do not wish (or are not authorized) to fund the DG centrally but that would favorably consider funding new CGs if a formula for cooperation could be found. (Some donors might agree to have a percentage of their funds used to cover the Foundation's CG-related overhead. The Global Development Network employs this method in channeling donor assistance to its Regional Network Partners – see Topic Pages, Program Recommendation 6).

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Prioritized list of target countries where CGs do not yet exist (or new partners are needed for existing CGs)
- Contacts with donor missions in those countries regarding the funding of planning and implementation grants for prospective CGs
- For all prospective donors, individual plans for joint funding of CG's on appropriate terms

## Country Gateways – Program Recommendation 9

- ¶ As part of its pro-active process of seeking promising potential CG partners and expanding potential funding sources for them, the Foundation should contact NGOs and other organizations (examples: Bellanet, Global Development Network, Global Development Learning Network) with a presence (or an interest in establishing a presence) in the target countries. (See also Program Recommendation 8.)

### *Rationale*

- The partners selected for CGs so far have not always been the best available, in part because the process of partner identification was arguably too open: The best prospects often did not bother to apply. NGOs and other organizations, with their own reasons for being (or wanting to be) in specific countries, might be interested in – and excellent candidates for cooperation with – the DG in a pro-active CG candidate identification process. These same organizations might also have access to funds not available to the DG.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- List of appropriate organizations for potential cooperation in targeted countries
- Systematic approach to target organizations to explore cooperation in the CG candidate identification process

## Country Gateways – Program Recommendation 10

- ¶ The Foundation should budget for carefully prepared travel, by mid-level as well as senior staff, in support of efforts to implement Program Recommendations 8 and 9 as well as to enhance the CG-DG dialogue.

### *Rationale*

- Even for an ICT4D-oriented organization familiar with ‘virtual’ contacts travel is not a luxury. Nothing can trump person-to-person contact for sensitive activities such as selecting partners for new CGs or solving problems with existing ones. Travel is expensive, however. Traveling senior DG managers should make themselves available for program-related tasks, but travel should be a regular part of the work of CG (and other program) staff as well. All staff-level travel should be carefully prepared so as to maximize the number of countries visited and useful meetings.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Provision in the DG budget for regular travel by CG (and other) program staff
- Travel policy making **all** staff-level travel subject to approval by the proposed Chief Programs Officer (see Organization – Recommendation 1)
- Procedures to assure that traveling senior managers keep CG (and other) program objectives in mind as they plan their itineraries and activities

## Country Gateways – Program Recommendation 11

- ¶ The DG should phase in a CG grant system that varies a) grant amounts in accordance with local conditions and country priorities and b) disbursement schedules in accordance with CGs' needs of achieving sustainability.

### *Rationale*

- In the past grant amounts and disbursement schedules were essentially the same for all new CGs. It makes sense, however, to introduce greater flexibility, since no two countries are alike in terms of cost structure and CG revenue potential and since a flexible grant system would likely result in better-managed CGs and fewer cases of failure.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Revised grant procedures to allow flexibility regarding grant amounts and disbursement schedules in response to local needs
- Extension of revised procedures to existing CGs with not fully-disbursed grant awards

## Country Gateways – Program Recommendation 12

- ¶ The DG should continue to organize periodic meetings of the CGs as a means of promoting the exchange of information and the establishment of fruitful lateral relationships. To minimize its costs in organizing such meetings, the DG should work toward requiring the CGs to pay their own expenses but assist them in finding ways of doing so.

### *Rationale*

- From the beginning it has been the DG's goal to build a network of CGs in which CG-CG lateral relationships are at least as important, if not more so, than DG-CG relationships. As with other desirable DG goals, the building of lateral relationships requires actual as well as virtual contact – physical meetings, not just email exchanges or telephone conversations. The DG should do everything it can – not least by committing to the attendance of one or more DG staff persons – to encourage global and regional meetings of the CGs. In the long run, however, 'encouragement' should not include financing of the CGs' costs of attendance. The CGs, with at least as much interest in these meetings as the DG, need to start including the cost of them as line items in their respective budgets. The DG can and should assist in any way possible short of financing.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Formulation of DG policy to encourage and facilitate attendance by CGs (at their own expense) at global and regional meetings
- Identification of steps and measures (excluding funding) designed to facilitate CG participation in meetings
- Budgeting of funds for DG's CG program staff to attend both DG-organized global meetings and regional meetings convened by the CGs

## dgMarket – Program Recommendation 13

¶ In the context of its review of overall program priorities and staffing levels, the Foundation should assure that the popular dgMarket service is staffed to meet current market demands and to support a major marketing and PR effort.

### *Rationale*

➤ Among the DG's programs, dgMarket alone appears to have the potential of becoming self-sustainable. It is also the DG's most widely acclaimed program, with candidates waiting to join it – this despite the fact that virtually no promotional effort has yet been undertaken. For these reasons, every effort must be made to assure that the program is well staffed.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Study of staffing required for the current workload but also for the workload anticipated in conjunction with the proposed worldwide advertising and PR campaign (see Program Recommendation 15)
- Appropriate staffing changes and additions

## dgMarket – Program Recommendation 14

- ¶ The Foundation should give priority to measuring the impact of dgMarket services as a means of broadening its scope and increasing donor support.

### *Rationale*

- In the dgMarket program, thousands of procurement projects are added to the data base from various multilateral and bilateral sources every month, but the DG has no systematic way of ascertaining, either in single cases or collectively, whether bidders using its service are successful, i.e., are awarded contracts. The lack of relevant data also means that there is no way of even estimating how much impact the program is having in making the government procurement process more transparent and therefore potentially in reducing corruption around the world. Appropriate impact data may induce donors to support the DG generally and dgMarket in particular. (See also Recommendation on Effectiveness and Impact.)

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Definition of impact, to be continuously updated and refined
- Appropriate changes in the data requested of applicants for tender information
- Appropriate measures (aimed at countries, donors and data users, respectively) to encourage feedback from recipients of tender information
- Design and continuous refinement of monitoring tools and procedures in close collaboration with governments and donors
- Continuous measurement of impact

## dgMarket – Program Recommendation 15

¶ As a priority area of work for its planned new marketing and public relations position (see Organization – Recommendation 1), the Foundation should launch a worldwide campaign to increase the demand for dgMarket’s services. To leverage the effort, it should explore cooperation with governments and NGOs like Transparency International that share the DG’s interest in battling corruption.

### *Rationale*

➤ While dgMarket has won widespread admiration, it has barely scratched the surface of its potential impact. With annual developing country government procurement totaling about \$1 trillion, the potential cost savings from increased transparency are estimated at \$50 billion (5% of \$1 trillion). Economic growth will also benefit, since contract awards based on the bribery by, rather than competence of, bidders leads to a misallocation of resources. Endemic corruption can be reduced with a major PR campaign coordinated with cooperating governments and NGOs and offering an appropriate vehicle – dgMarket – to bring transparency to the procurement process.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- DG cooperation with Transparency International and other like-minded organizations in planning a worldwide anti-corruption campaign
- Procurement of financing for the campaign from a wide range of donors (including, for example, industrial associations representing members that would benefit from reduced corruption in government procurement)

## eGovernment (eG) Grants – Program Recommendation 16

- ¶ The Foundation should build on its cooperation with the Government of Italy by offering to other donors the option of channeling eG-earmarked funds through the Foundation.

### *Rationale*

- In working through the DG, the Italian Government hopes to leverage its eG funding by attracting other governments to the program. Other governments, in turn, have shown a great deal of interest in the potential of eG as a tool of development. The DG therefore has an excellent chance of attracting new donors to the program. Whether they will be willing to follow the Italian example and match eG funds dollar-for-dollar with unrestricted funds for the DG is another matter, however. The Foundation could offer a formula whereby a percentage of donor funds would be used to cover Foundation expenses deemed to be overhead for the eG program. (This would be analogous to Program Recommendation 8.)

### *Implementation Milestones*

- DG offer of participation in the eG program to other donors, on terms sufficiently flexible to appeal to a range of donors
- Development of tools and collection of data to measure the impact of eG programs

## Research and Training (R&T) Centers – Program Recommendation 17

- ¶ The Foundation should place management of the eG and R&T programs under a single Joint Programs manager and use the R&T option as a vehicle for attracting targeted developing countries into the DG system and for establishing cooperation with potential partners such as the Global Development Learning Network.

### *Rationale*

- The record of the R&T centers in building synergies with other DG programs is impressive. The R&T program has also demonstrated an imaginative method of making developing countries – four so far – donors, albeit largely on an in-kind basis. We believe that the program may well be attractive to a number of key countries – such as Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa and Egypt – that are not currently in the DG system. To extend its reach, the R&T program needs to have a clearly defined base within the DG. Logically, it should be linked under a single manager to the other 'joint' program, eG, that involves a close relationship with one or more donor governments.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Responsibility for the R&T centers is given to a single Joint Programs manager
- Offer of extending the program to key countries not now cooperating with the DG in any way (with the examples of Korea, India, China and Rwanda being used to demonstrate that program participation implies no particular country size or political orientation)

## Development Gateway Forum – Program Recommendation 18

- ¶ The Foundation should consider holding its Development Gateway Forum biennially, or even triennially, and in the alternate years co-sponsor a regional forum similar to the one in 2005 in Beijing.

### *Rationale*

- The two annual global forums held so far, both in Bonn, have been valuable for building the DG's image and for bringing people – notably CG managers – together. Well-organized forums, however, cost a tremendous amount staff time – time that is not then available for program activities. Regional forums, in which regional CGs would play the major organizing role, would relieve the DG of some of this time-consuming work and give the CGs an opportunity to introduce their regional interests and concerns and to elevate their profile within the CG network. There would still be a global dimension in such regional forums, however, as a result of the DG's world-wide advertising on their behalf and of the broad attendance encouraged by peripheral meetings of DG stakeholders such as the Board of Directors, Advisory Board, CGs, Topic Page guides, and steering committees.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Use of meeting(s) on the periphery of the DG Forum in Beijing in 2005 to discuss with CGs the idea of regional forums as substitutes for global forums
- With a willing partner, test the concept by setting a tentative date and agenda for a regional forum as a substitute for an annual forum

## Development Gateway Forum – Program Recommendation 19

- ¶ The Foundation should explore, with the Global Development Network or perhaps other kindred organizations that hold annual conferences, the feasibility of holding joint conferences, thus reducing costs and broadening the appeal of the events for the cooperating partners.

### *Rationale*

- Most organizations strain financially and are hard pressed to find staff resources to organize these ambitious events. In some cases, notably the GDN, compatibility of objectives suggest the feasibility of a joint event in terms of attracting desirable speakers and attendance. In the case of a joint event, the cooperating partners could share the cost of a full-time staff person to handle the organizational details.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Inventory of the annual global conferences/meetings of various organizations and identification of events with similar/compatible objectives and agendas
- Exploration with appropriate organizations of the feasibility of holding joint conferences
- Plan for a joint conference on a trial basis

## Governance, Organization and Management

### Effectiveness and Impact – Recommendations

- ¶ The DG should aim to become an acknowledged leader in measuring the impact of ICT4D projects, starting with its own programs.
  - To achieve this, the DG should convince and encourage governments, partner organizations, donors and subscribers to participate in the development of appropriate tools and to provide relevant data to the Foundation.
  - The DG should strengthen its organizational capacity to measure impact.
- ¶ The DG should consider launching a Topic Page on “Impact Measurement in ICT4D” and aim to become a leader in this field.

#### *Rationale*

- Donors increasingly demand ‘value for money’. In development, impact is value, and **measured** impact is more convincing than assumed or anecdotally reported impact. As the DG demonstrates that it achieves value for money, it will gain additional arrows in its quiver that it can aim at skeptical donors.
  - Donors increasingly emphasize the importance of evidence of impact, and of measured evidence over assumed or anecdotal evidence.
  - Many donors acknowledge the lack of appropriate measurement tools and consider the development of a toolkit a matter of importance.
- Potential donors are more likely to become actual supporters of the DG if they are convinced that funds channeled through the Foundation tend to have greater development impact than funds channeled through other institutions.
- Continued market testing is necessary because, in the absence of accurate tools for measuring impact, consumer behavior is often the best available surrogate measure of effectiveness.

#### *Implementation Milestones*

- Decision to make impact measurement a core focus of DG programs
- Assembly of a network of collaborators and supporting institutions, agreement on priorities
- Approved collaborative work program, assignment of responsibility and appropriate staffing decisions
- Launch of a Topic Page on Impact Measurement as the leading forum for this effort

## Organization – Recommendations 1

- ¶ The organization of the Foundation should be strengthened by:
- Recruiting a Chief Programs Officer and two senior executives for the newly established functions: Planning and Funding Strategy; and Marketing, Communications and Forums;
  - Establishing an Impact Measurement function (see Recommendations on Effectiveness and Impact);
  - Establishing cross-departmental committees or working groups for planning, funding strategy and impact measurement.

### *Rationale*

- The remarkable talent and creativity of the Foundation's employees have hitherto been applied primarily to the development of the DG's own products. Now those same strengths should be harnessed in the broader effort to ensure survival of the Foundation.
- The Foundation is a business operating in a competitive market, albeit not for profit. The CEO and the CFO had successful private-sector careers in large organizations. The management team should be complemented by adding a marketing executive and a fund-raising specialist experienced in targeting public-sector donors.
- Greater emphasis on, and growing success in, impact measurement will allow better targeting of donors, and it will facilitate the setting of measurable business plan targets that go beyond mere recording of upward-trending user statistics.
- The Foundation's three top managers – CEO, CFO and CPO – are key to its long-term survival and must provide important guidance for the marketing and fund-raising functions.
- Cross-departmental working groups will ensure that product developers will 'think impact' and that realistic, measurable plan targets will improve the usefulness of future business plans for orienting and monitoring the Foundation's business, which will make it easier to 'sell' the Foundation to donors.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Board approval of organizational changes
- Appropriate international recruitment activities (subject to US immigration constraints)
- Internal meeting(s) to explain the changes

## Organization – Recommendation 2

¶ The ‘organizational culture’ of the Foundation should be oriented more strongly toward, and shaped by, the ‘development dimension’ of the DG’s mission by ensuring that future employees, especially at management level, have relevant past experience in development-oriented work and organizations.

### *Rationale*

- The DG Foundation is managed by a strong team with extensive experience at senior management level in successful commercial organizations.
- The Foundation’s staff has excellent technical skills and experience.
- With a few exceptions, the Foundation’s staff and management are short of relevant experience in the development field. That may explain, for example, the current emphasis on counting web-site traffic rather than measuring impact, as well as shortcomings in the organization’s funding strategy and activities.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Recognition of the ‘problem’
- Emphasis in recruitment and desirable candidate profiles on development experience

## Governance – Recommendations 1

- ¶ The Board should adopt measures designed to strengthen its effectiveness as the Foundation’s supreme organ of governance by, e.g.:
- Creating new categories of Directors to represent a broader range of stakeholders, such as Current Donors, Potential Donors, Country Gateways, NGOs and Civil Society, organizations with similar missions, and Development Practitioners.
  - Seeking personal commitments from Board members to support and advance the mission of the Development Gateway.
  - Meeting twice annually, with one meeting to be held on a different continent each year, whenever possible in conjunction with a Development Gateway Forum or its equivalent.
- ¶ Alternatively, the Board could represent only current and potential donors, DG business partners and individuals with relevant business experience, with other stakeholders being represented on the Advisory Board (see Governance – Recommendation 3). The Board and the Advisory Board should meet jointly once every year. Whenever possible, the meeting would take place in conjunction with a Development Gateway Forum or its equivalent.

### *Rationale*

- The Board in its current composition has been described as a “donors’ club”. While this does injustice to a few Directors, it is essentially correct. The Board should represent the entire development community, and it should do so with commitment and dedication.
- Alternatively, a Board with a narrower range of representation would have ‘institutionalized’ annual meetings with other members of the development community who are members of the Advisory Board and share the Board members’ commitment to the success of the Development Gateway.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Board decision on broader representation (on the Board itself or partially on the Board and on the Advisory Board)
- Nomination of candidates by the Nominating Committee (see Governance – Recommendation 4)
- Appointment of new members (possibly phased to allow for scheduled retirements of existing members)

## Governance – Recommendations 2

- ¶ Membership of the Executive Committee should reflect the operational needs of the Foundation rather than mirror the broadened membership of the Board (see Governance – Recommendation 1).
- ¶ The Executive Committee should hold meetings when required and at places convenient to the members.
- ¶ The Executive Committee should meet with Management and use such meetings to deepen its familiarity with the current operations of and problems facing the Foundation.

### *Rationale*

- The current mix of donor representation and private-sector expertise qualifies the Executive Committee to monitor and guide Management in accordance with the intentions of those that fund the Gateway.
- There is no need to hold regular Executive Committee meetings in other countries as a matter of policy.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Review of the composition and modus operandi of the Executive Committee and identification of appropriate changes
- Implementation of changes

### **Governance – Recommendation 3**

¶ The Executive Committee should consider whether the current composition of the Advisory Board is sufficiently broad, enthusiastic and agile and make appropriate recommendations for change.

- The recommendations should take into account any changes approved in the composition of the Board of Directors (see Governance – Recommendation 1).

#### *Rationale*

- The Advisory Board does not have the formal governance obligations of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee.
- Its greatest utility is as a panel of dedicated experts on a broad range of ICT4D matters, available individually or collectively to advise Management as needed.
- If the composition of the Board of Directors remains essentially as it is today, there would be considerable merit in a joint annual meeting of the two Boards (see Governance – Recommendation 1).

#### *Implementation Milestones*

- Review of the composition and modus operandi of the Advisory board and identification of appropriate changes
- Implementation of changes

## Governance – Recommendation 4

- ¶ Membership of the Nominating Committee should be such that the members' business contacts cover the entire spectrum of Board and Advisory Board membership.

### *Rationale*

- If membership of the Board of Directors is broadened as we recommend (see Governance – Recommendation 1), the members of the Nominating Committee should be able to nominate Board and Advisory Board members from the deepest-possible pool of suitable candidates.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Review of the composition of the Nominating Committee and identification of appropriate changes
- Implementation of changes

## Financial Evaluation – Recommendation

¶ Following the completion of the second-round fund-raising campaign, the Foundation should assign high priority to development of a long-term, coherent, well-researched and well-targeted public-sector fund-raising strategy as a complement to its strategy of raising a capital fund from social investors.

### *Rationale*

- Continuing support from public-sector donors will validate the success of the Foundation's programs in the pursuit of its mission.
- The Foundation has ambitious fund-raising goals. A strategy that identifies and targets donors individually is bound to be more effective than the current, somewhat haphazard approach.
- If the DG succeeds in raising from social investors a capital fund of \$50 million in addition to the successful completion of the second round of funding from existing donors, the Foundation's will have no near-term financial worries and can devote time and resources to the development of a long-term funding strategy.

### *Implementation Milestones*

- Appointment of the Manager, Planning and Fund Raising (see Organization – Recommendation 1)
- Preparation of a fund-raising strategy for Board approval.
- Donor research and targeting.
- Continuous monitoring of results, dissemination of feed-back throughout the organization
- Periodic review (and revision) of the strategy.



**Plan to Implement the Recommendations Contained in the  
2005 Report of the Independent Evaluation of the Development Gateway  
May 18, 2005**

**I. Take a Fresh Look at Current Programs**

**A. Topic Pages**

**Recommendation 1.** Survey users of each Topic Page to learn if it can be the leader in its field.

**Implementation:** We plan to conduct a series of scripted interviews with Topic Page guides, advisors, competitors, and cooperating organizations. Also, we are working on conducting a site-wide survey in June, plus topic- or cluster-specific surveys as needed by September 2005. The results of these surveys will be analyzed and an action plan will be produced by year-end.

**Recommendation 2.** Reach out to competitors to seek ways of reducing costly duplication through partnerships.

**Implementation:** We do this in the normal course of business. We currently collaborate with over 200 different organizations and in the past six months have reduced the number of Topic Pages from 35 to 27.

**Recommendation 3.** Know the market and be alert for opportunities; consider doing an "Impact Measurement" page.

**Implementation:** We will continue to work with partners and our marketing department to track opportunities – particularly those with funding, such as the Hewlett Foundation funded Topic Page: the "Open Educational Resources Topic Page." The "ICT Monitoring and Evaluation Topic Page" is already under development (including funding options) and is to be on-site within the month. We will work with partners on the "MDG Capacity Building Topic Page," "Aid Effectiveness Topic Page," and others to develop broader coverage of impact.

**Recommendation 4.** Get the Editorial Committee involved in evaluating the usefulness of pages; establishing partnerships, including with competitors; considering new subjects.

**Implementation:** The Editorial Committee deals with broad editorial issues. The management team deals with these operational issues in the normal course of business. We do intend, however, to inform the Editorial Committee of all of the recommendations dealing with the Topic Pages.

**Recommendation 5.** Eliminate guide stipends and reallocate those funds to expand/enhance partnerships.

**Implementation:** This is in process.

**Recommendation 6.** Enhance developing world views within Topic Pages through partners in developing countries.

**Implementation:** We are gradually increasing our interaction with Country Gateways and others to expand this dimension.

**Recommendation 7.** Review Development Gateway's relationship with Country Gateways to facilitate the sharing of content.

**Implementation:** We have begun sharing content on Special Reports and have recently implemented a new software feature that can post live content feeds from our site to the Country Gateways' sites.

## **B. Country Gateways**

**Recommendation 8.** Seek funds earmarked for Country Gateways (even when targeted to specific countries).

**Implementation:** In progress. Funds from Luxembourg and Pakistan include portions earmarked for Country Gateways in specific countries.

**Recommendation 9.** Partner with NGOs and others in identifying potential Country Gateways.

**Implementation:** We already collaborate in this regard with a number of organizations, including NGOs, the United Nations, and the World Bank. Our focus now is on improving the effectiveness of the collaboration.

**Recommendation 10.** Provide for more travel for Development Gateway program staff.

**Implementation:** We intend to do so when our financial situation permits. In the meantime we communicate regularly using various electronic means, which is quite cost-effective.

**Recommendation 11.** Tailor Country Gateway grant amounts and disbursement schedules to local needs.

**Implementation:** We are already doing so. In the past month, we have implemented a new grant review and approval methodology which incorporates this approach.

**Recommendation 12.** Promote both global and regional meetings of Country Gateways.

**Implementation:** We held the first global Country Gateway meeting in June 2004. We plan to continue to promote Country Gateway gatherings and collaboration.

## **C. dgMarket**

**Recommendation 13.** Enhance dgMarket program staff.

**Implementation:** We will, as demand requires us to do so and when our financial situation permits.

**Recommendation 14.** Seek ways of monitoring contract awards as a way to measure impact.

**Implementation:** We continue to study this but have not found a good way of doing so. This requires the full collaboration of the host country and we will strive to find ways to obtain such collaboration, probably with the help of other organizations.

**Recommendation 15.** In cooperation with governments and appropriate NGOs (e.g. Transparency International), launch a worldwide campaign in favor of dgMarket.

**Implementation:** We plan to do so during 2005.

#### **D. e-Government Grants Facility**

**Recommendation 16.** Actively seek other donors for the program.

**Implementation:** We are doing so in collaboration with the Italian government.

#### **E. Research and Training Centers**

**Recommendation 17.** Offer the Research and Training options to key countries missing from the Development Gateway/Country Gateway network.

**Implementation:** We are not eager to follow this recommendation because we are afraid of losing focus. We will, however, consider each opportunity on a case-by-case basis.

#### **F. Forum**

**Recommendation 18.** Consider holding global forums biannually or even triennially, and in intervening years have regional forums organized by Country Gateways.

**Implementation:** We have started on this path already. The next three Forums have a regional focus and are being organized in conjunction with the government of China.

**Recommendation 19.** Explore with the Global Development Network and/or other organizations the possibility of holding joint conferences.

**Implementation:** We have started to do so, and will continue, particularly with organizations that have complementary roles to ours. Our next Forum is co-sponsored with the government of China (Advisory Committee for the State Informatization, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Information Industry, and State Council Informatization Office), and the World Bank.

## **II. Governance, Organization and Management**

### **A. Become a Leader in Impact Measurement**

**Recommendations.** Develop and Disseminate Tools. Apply these tools to our own program.

**Implementation:** Discussions are taking place with the Global Development Network and the World Bank to collaborate in this endeavor. A plan of action will be prepared within the next three months.

### **B. Strengthen the Organization**

**Recommendation 1.** Hire both a fundraising and a marketing professional; strengthen business planning, impact measurement and fundraising via the establishment of appropriate management committees.

**Implementation:** The fundraising position is now filled and marketing should be staffed by June 2005. Appropriate management committees that address this recommendation have been established. Although some of these committees pre-date this recommendation, they are all recently formed and still evolving.

**Recommendation 2.** Strengthen the organization by changing its structure and hiring new people with experience in development.

**Implementation:** Although we intend to periodically consider changing our organizational structure to increase effectiveness, we do not think that now is the time to do so. The Development Gateway's current organizational structure has been in place for about six months and seems to be working. Experience in development is an attribute that we look for when we recruit new employees.

### **C. Strengthen Governance**

**Recommendations 1-4** pertain to more effective governance.

**Implementation:** The Executive Committee is carefully considering all recommendations and will submit a proposal to strengthen governance to the full Board within six months.

### **III. Funding Strategy**

**Recommendation:** Assign high priority to a long-term fundraising strategy.

**Implementation:** A funding plan has been prepared and discussed with the Audit and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee during the past three months. This plan was presented to the Board of Directors during the meeting of Tuesday, April 19, 2005.