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Abstract

Support to Election Management Bodies (EMBs) in developing democracies is generally provided by the donor community in two forms, namely the provision of experts and financial support primarily for the procurement of assets that are directly required for the conduct of one major electoral event. Although there is evidence that this method of support is not necessarily successful no alternatives are ever considered.

This research aims to investigate an alternative by assessing the value for EMBs in Eastern and Southern Africa outsourcing some or all of their Information, Communication Technology (ICT). The research also examined the effectiveness of the current method of assistance to EMBs in the area of ICT and ascertained the feasibility of changing the way support is provided for the specific purpose of enhancing the long-term capabilities of EMBs in the area of ICT beyond one electoral event. This research also aims to bring to the forefront the suggestion that outsourcing is a tool that can and should be considered for the future.

As current research into support to EMBs in developing democracies does not consider the question of outsourcing, the methodology used in this research is to focus on two key players, the EMBs themselves and the Election Management Experts (EMEs) who are often the ones who provide recommendations as to the type of support to be provided by the donor community. This research used non-probability sampling based on 4 methods; quota, judgement, snowball and convenience. Given the sizes of the two groups being surveyed the results can only be said to represent the EMBs and EMEs who actually completed the questionnaires. However, the results can be seen as typical of what one would expect to find in a larger survey.

The key findings of this research were that outsourcing some of the EMBs’ ICT services can add value and that support should be extended to the EMBs’ day-to-day operations and not just focus on one electoral event. In conclusion there is general agreement amongst EMBs and EMEs that there is value in outsourcing ICT services and that the current method of support is not optimum. There is also agreement that support needs to be extended to day-to-day operations. However, there remains disagreement amongst both groups surveyed over the question of whether the provision of experts/advisers is outsourcing. Further research is needed in this area to establish how experts/advisers actually perform their roles.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Support to Election Management Bodies (EMBs) in developing democracies is generally provided by the donor community in two forms, namely the provision of experts for a specific period of time and financial support which has been primarily geared towards the procurement of assets that are directly required for the conduct of a major electoral event such as voter registration and/or the conduct of elections (Lopez-Pintor, 2005).

There is a wide body of material that supports this approach. However, one area of support that tends to always be mentioned with caution and concern is that of the procurement of technology and its sustainability. The vast majority of papers, documents and research raise concerns regarding the level of state-of-the-art technology that is being procured by EMBs mentioning specifically the high cost and concerns about sustainability and skill levels within EMBs to manage and maintain the technology after the electoral event (Evrensel et al., 2010 and Ellis et al., 2006). However, no alternatives are ever offered that may reduce or eliminate the concerns (Yard et al., 2010).

EMBs do not readily accept innovation and change due to fear of the unknown and not wanting to be the first amongst the developing democracies to try something new. Major donor agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) seem to be content with the current approach of supporting EMBs by procuring assets and appear to adhere to the notion ‘bigger is better’. This notion is understandably also espoused by the private sector that sells high-end Information and Communication Technology (ICT) hardware and software to EMBs.

The ‘UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide’ (UNDP, 2007) goes into great detail as to how to provide assistance, including the procurement of state-of-the-art technology. Varma (2003), in a paper titled ‘E. F. Schumacher: Changing the Paradigm of Bigger Is Better’ discusses the paradigm ‘bigger is better’ and how Schumacher challenged this modern belief and replaced it with ‘small is beautiful’, something that is not seen in ICT technology solutions being offered to and procured by EMBs. Mathieson (2011), in a report he delivered
at the 6th annual Electoral Institute for Southern Africa (EISA) symposium also stated concern about the growing cost of ICT solutions and the dangers of expensive yet unsuitable technologies which may not be sustainable. The question of affordable and sustainable elections is also raised in reports such as the United Nations’ office, the Economic Commission for Africa, titled ‘Improving Electoral Quality in Southern Africa’ (2007) and the European Commission’s ‘Methodological Guide on Electoral Assistance’ (2006). Likewise, the Electoral Knowledge Network project, known as ACE, under the heading ‘Sustainability Considerations’ also raises the issue of sustainability and acknowledges the low levels of expertise within EMBs.

In spite of all these concerns no discussions are ever held to see if there are alternatives to procuring expensive and often unsustainable ICT solutions. As a result, changing the way Election Experts (EMEs) and EMBs consider options in the way ICT services and functions are implemented is limited and does not include the day-to-day ICT requirements of EMBs.

### 1.2 Research Question & Aims

This research is specifically looking at the question of whether EMBs in African developing democracies should consider outsourcing some or all of their ICT services. Due to the limited time available for this dissertation the research will focus on Eastern and Southern Africa.

In posing this question this research aims to examine the effectiveness of the current method of assistance to EMBs in the area of ICT and to ascertain the value of changing the way support is provided for the specific purpose of enhancing the long-term capabilities of EMBs in the area of ICT beyond major electoral events. This research also aims to bring to the forefront the idea that outsourcing is a tool that can and should be considered for the future.

It is also intended that this research will create criteria for establishing comprehensive ICT solutions for EMBs and not just for major electoral events. By doing so EMBs will reap the benefit of donor investments beyond that of one election and will allow EMBs to incorporate their non-election related ICT needs into donor support for an election.

The objectives of this research are twofold:
1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the current method of assistance in the area of ICT within EMBs in Eastern and Southern Africa
2. Ascertain the value of changing the way support is provided for the specific purpose of enhancing the long-term capabilities of EMBs in the area of ICT

1.3 Justification for the Research

The vast majority of studies have focused on procedural, legal and political perspectives and have not focused on possible alternative approaches to donor support.

EMBs in Eastern and Southern African like most EMBs in the developing world almost always rely on additional donor funding to enable them to meet the international standards expected of them when delivering voters’ registers and credible elections (‘UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide’ 2007 and Blanc et al., 2007).

Ownership of assets is very high on the agenda of EMBs which includes computer hardware and software. This is due to the culture within developing countries that sees ownership of assets as a status symbol and the only way to deliver results. This belief seems to be supported by organisations such as UNDP (‘UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide’, 2007 and Blanc et al., 2007).

Many EMEs including those that are ICT experts have not considered outsourcing when examining ICT options. Yard et al. (2007) discuss the many options of ICT implementation but do not consider outsourcing. Contrary to this Neufeld (1994) considered a form of outsourcing when he suggested that EMBs could partner with other government institutions to allow “strategic alliances”. He also mentions outsourcing “their technology management aspects to a systems integration firm” and suggests that there are successful models. However, his paper does not provide examples. Also, there has not been any substantial effort made to use outsourcing as an alternative.

The suggestion by Neufeld (1994) that EMBs could partner with other government institutions does not go far enough. EMBs could also look to other EMBs to outsource services. An example of this is the Antigua and Barbuda Electoral Commission where the overall registra-
tion process was managed by the Electoral Office of Jamaica because it had the expertise and technology which it had used in a similar exercise in Jamaica (Bailur, 2003).

It is therefore imperative to bring to the forefront the idea of changing the way ICT support is provided to include the possibility of outsourcing and the inclusion of non-election related ICT requirements.

1.4 Outline Methodology

The research will target EMBs and EMEs in the target area of Eastern and Southern Africa. The selection of Eastern and Southern Africa also provides two distinct geographic regions with similar political and economic conditions. As neighbouring regions they work in close collaboration and refer to each other when change is contemplated. By selecting the two regions the research will provide an opportunity to compare two distinct yet similar sets of EMBs which will reduce any natural bias that may occur if only one region was used for the research.

This will provide a good sampling and should provide a good response rate. Many of the EMEs who have worked in the target area will also have worked in other parts of Africa and the world which will add to the overall accuracy of the data collected (Bouma and Atkinson, 1995).

The data collection method is in the form of questionnaires, one for EMBs and another for EMEs which will be emailed to each respondent. Due to the nature and disbursement of the target groups emailing questionnaires is the most viable and efficient method which should also assist with the return rate. Follow up can readily be made via email which will enhance both the return rate and completeness of the questionnaires (Oppenheim, 1992).

The questions will target to two key issues, firstly, the effectiveness of the current system of providing short to medium term assistance to EMBs and the procurement of technology, secondly, that of outsourcing.

1.5 Outline of the Rest of the Thesis
The literature review will attempt to identify existing research on this subject and will review literature that supports the contention that outsourcing is not generally considered for EMBs in developing countries. It will also attempt to identify existing research on outsourcing in general and where possible outsourcing by EMBs in developed democracies.

The methodology of this research is based on the need to introduce change in the way donor support is currently being provided to EMBs in developing democracies. Generally speaking outsourcing has not been seriously considered for EMBs in developing democracies for no apparent reason other than the belief or assumption that outsourcing brings with it the possibility of manipulation and loss of credibility while at the same time ignoring the manipulation that occurs even when technology is fully owned by EMBs.

The findings will produce an indication as to whether outsourcing is something that should be seriously considered by EMBs, EMEs and in particular the donor community.

Data analysis and conclusion will provide academic researchers with data on outsourcing information technology services of EMBs for the first time.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

An initial review of potential literature has identified numerous papers, articles and research that while do not specifically address the subject of this research they do provide a good resource of information that can be used in relation to this research.

It must be stressed that there is very little academic literature on information systems outsourcing for public administration (Marco-Simo et al., 2007) and even less for EMBs generally and in particular in developing democracies. It has therefore been difficult to provide academic references specific to this research.

2.2 Value

The oxforddictionaries.com website defines value as “the regard that something is held to deserve; the importance, worth, or usefulness of something” and “the material or monetary worth of something” or “the worth of something compared to the price paid or asked for it”.

The concept of value may refer to worth, quantity, theory, ethics, personal or cultural beliefs just to name some. With regards to the research question it will often be read and/or understood as assessing the ‘economic’ value rather than other intangible values such as ‘worth’ or ‘quality’ to the EMBs (Clark, 1915).

While acknowledging and taking into account that economic value will inevitably play a role in this research it should not be the driving force that determines if there is value other than economic value in outsourcing some or all of the ICT services of an EMB.

The pre-occupation with ownership and the monetary value of software and hardware will undoubtedly create a barrier to thinking beyond what is commonly accepted as ‘the way to do things’ as will perceptions of loss of independence and control. That said, the purpose of this research is to enquire into the true value of outsourcing that may produce quality and worth beyond that of purely economical benefits or immediate one off results.

2.3 Literature
The 7th Global Forum on ‘Reinventing Government: Building Trust in Government’ held in Austria in 2007 published a report titled ‘Public Administration and Democratic Governance: Governments Serving Citizens’ under the auspices of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations (UN). The report looked at a wide range of topics for improving governance and public administration including outsourcing of services. While the report does not endorse outsourcing without caution it does place the possibility on the table. That said, UNDP the UN’s primary agency in developing democracies has to-date not seen fit to consider outsourcing in the area of technology seemingly favouring procurement (‘Public Administration and Democratic Governance’, 2007).

Lopez-Pintor (2005) stressed that up until his publication the international community did little regarding sustainability and only focused on delivering a specific election. Ellis et al. (2006) also raised the same concerns. Likewise Lopez-Pintor and Fischer (2005) in a joint publication by the International Foundations for Electoral Systems (IFES) and UNDP did not deal with alternatives to outright procurement of technologies for EMBs. Again, Yard et al. (2007) comprehensively addressed the application of technology to election administration but did not consider alternatives to the outright procurement of technologies.

Donors also see this as the normal approach to ensuring that EMBs meet international standards, as can be seen by the many papers, reports and articles on the subject of procuring ICT solutions such as:

- ACE Project ‘Elections and Technology’

Many EMEs and in particular those with ICT expertise have simply not considered outsourcing when examining ICT options. Yard et al. (2007) discuss the many options of ICT implementation but do not consider outsourcing. Contrary to this Neufeld (1994) considered a form of outsourcing when he suggested that EMBs could partner with other government institutions to allow “strategic alliances”. He also mentions outsourcing “their technology man-
agement aspects to a systems integration firm” and suggests that there are successful models. However, his paper does not provide examples. Like Neufeld, outsourcing is often touched upon but is never actively pursued with the view of formally introducing it.

Studies on the need for EMBs to use ICT solutions are vast and often acknowledge the enormous financial outlay, pitfalls and often specifically state concerns regarding the high cost of implementing state-of-the-art technology which may not be sustainable leading to ultimate failure (Evrensel et al., 2010).

The UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-Moon in his 2009 statement to the UN General Assembly also stated his concern that some of the poorest countries in the world have chosen some of the most expensive electoral processes and technology (‘Procuring and Using Technology in Electoral Management: solutions and risks’, undated). Time and time again concerns are raised about EMBs selecting high tech solutions that are often too costly for government to fund requiring donor financial support to procure and yet there is never any suggestion as to alternatives to outright procurement of these solutions.

In the past, donor support including the coordinated support from UNDP, has focused on one election, which in almost all circumstances actually covered two major electoral events, that of voter registration and the conduct of the election itself. It was, to some extent, understandable that the support provided was focused on the short-term as the focus was to ensure successful elections ‘on this occasion’. Over the last ten years, short-term support has moved from as little as three months to the provision of support for up to two years leading to an election. However, the focus remained on providing a solution to achieve results for one election. This is evident in the way that the support programme is closed down soon after the election is completed.

In 2009 UNDP launched its first ever global support programme. This is the first time that UNDP has formally recognised the need for longer-term support to EMBs and has implemented a programme to provide support that goes beyond one election (‘Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund Annual Report’, 2010). With this in mind it should be evident that a change is also required in the way ICT solutions are implemented as the high cost of procuring ICT solutions is simply often not sustainable.
The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) suggested an electoral cycle in a publication titled ‘Electoral Management Design: The International IDEA Handbook’. The authors (Wall et al., 2006) introduced the concept of an electoral cycle which suggests that certain activities are repeated throughout the entire electoral cycle.

UNDP also published an electoral cycle in 2007 (see figure 1 below) and although not identical they are very similar. In 2010 UNDP also changed its approach towards its short-term support programmes and is now focusing on long-term support to EMBs as stated in a report titled ‘Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund Annual Report’, (2010) yet ICT support has continued to focus on procuring hardware and software for a specific electoral event in the hope that it will be sustainable and used in subsequent events. This needs to change.

This research aims to introduce innovative thinking in the way EMEs assess the needs of EMBs and attempt to have them re-focus on the entire electoral cycle when it comes to ICT. Likewise, it aims to get EMBs to also take up UNDP’s changed approach and to seek ICT support for the entire electoral cycle. By doing so it is believed that the question of outsourc-
ing can be introduced as a possible alternative to procurement which can be managed throughout UNDP's long-term support programmes.

Considering that outsourcing ICT services has become standard business practice in both the private and public sectors around the world (Hancox & Hackney, 1999 and Alaranta & Jarvenpaa, 2010), it is surprising that this is not the case with EMBs in developing democracies.

While within developed democracies outsourcing of ICT services has been successfully implemented for many years by some EMBs this has not been encouraged within developing democracies. An Australian Electoral Commission paper presented at the Conference of Commonwealth Chief Elections Officers, Queens’ College, Cambridge, in 1998 states that it has outsourced some of its ICT services successfully and acknowledged the need for international cooperation between EMBs in this regard. However, once again not much has been done regarding this.

Another intriguing aspect of how technology support is being provided to EMBs in developing democracies is the way technology is only being provided for specific electoral events while ignoring the general state of technology within EMBs. It is difficult to imagine EMBs that do not have computers and official email addresses and Internet access for all of their employees yet have high-end technology systems for their voters’ register and election management. However, this is the case in many of the EMBs within Eastern and Southern Africa.

2.4 ICT Hardware and Software

Another factor that seems to have been overlooked by donors and EMEs alike is the fact that computer hardware and software becomes outdated and often unserviceable within a few years (Yard et al., 2010).

A diagram showing the substantial changes that have occurred in technology over a period of less than 20 years, which is only 4 election cycles, demonstrates the heavy demands that are placed on EMBs in keeping pace with technology once it is procured. See figure 2 below.
When looking at just the most common area of technology procurement for EMBs, that of voter registration systems, the list of hardware and software procured is large but not limited to:

- Digital Cameras for field voter registration
- Printers for printing photos for field voter registration
- Power supply systems such as solar panels and batteries for field voter registration
- OMR (Optical Mark Reader) Image Scanners
- High Speed Laser Printers for printing of the voters’ registers
- Application Server
- Database Server
- Fax Server
- Work Stations (Desktop Computers)
- Desktop Laser Printers
- Networking (Local Area & Wide Area)
- Scanner Interfacing Software
- Image Processing and Management Software
• OMR Software
• Database Integration
• Data Validation
• Exception Handling Module
• Reporting Module
• System Production Management Module
• Deletion Processing Module
• Delimitation Module
• Voter Register Publishing Module
• Search Module
• System Administration Module
• Automatic Fingerprint Verification Module

Many of the above equipment such as digital cameras and printers with all the associated paraphernalia are often procured in large quantities to support a new voter registration process to have the majority of the equipment stored afterwards and often not used again. Likewise the large numbers of high-end scanners required for the first influx of huge numbers of registration forms will often lay idle after the new voter register is complete requiring only one or two scanners to maintain registration thereafter.

In recent years support has extended to election results, compilation and transmission management, candidate registration management and other areas of election management all of which require extensive software development and maintenance and in some instances additional hardware procurement.

One must therefore question why the donor community would want to procure high-end hardware and software that may require expensive maintenance or replacement before the next election.

2.5 Political Manipulation

An area that is also overlooked completely if not deliberately ignored is that of the potential for and actual political manipulation of in-house ICT systems. I have not been able to find any research on the subject while having witnessed both failed and successful manipulation
of ICT systems personally. However, there are many examples of manipulation or rigging, as it is commonly referred to, of voters’ registers, voting and result tabulations by EMBs with full ownership and control of their systems.

Nigeria is one of many examples where the rigging of an election is seen as synonymous with Nigerian Elections (Ibrahim, 2007). According to UNDP’s Human Development Report titled ‘Deepening democracy in a fragmented world’ (2002) some 73 countries still do not hold free and fair elections. As well as Nigeria the publication mentions Haiti, Chad, Zimbabwe and Madagascar elections as having been marred by fraud.

Possible electoral manipulation and the question of credibility is only raised as a negative or concern whenever the question of outsourcing is raised. However, these same concerns are not raised regarding accusations of manipulation when ICT solutions are procured by EMBs. An example of this as far back as 1973 is in Zambia when donor funded procurement went wrong and the Electoral Commission of Zambia was accused of manipulating the voters’ register (Times of Zambia, 2011).

Likewise there does not seem to be much written about the failures that occur as these tend to be ignored and never spoken about again. Acknowledging failure after millions of dollars have been spent is simply not something that the donor community and EMBs like to do, hence the lack of literature and documentation on the subject of failed support.

2.6 ICT Procurement is De-facto Outsourcing

What EMBs, EMEs and the donor community have not acknowledged is that there is in fact outsourcing taking place. Tenders are placed and awarded to private companies to not only provide hardware and software for the delivery of a voters’ register and perhaps aspects of election management but to provide services leading up to the election. Even the tender process itself is often performed by another form of outsourcing where UNDP as the donor coordinator of funds takes control of the tender process rather than allowing the EMB to control the tender process themselves.

Once the tender is issued it is generally a requirement for the private company to deliver, install, commission and operate the hardware and software leading up to and through to the end
of the electoral event which is in fact outsourcing the process with the only difference being that at the end, the software and equipment is owned by the EMB. While this process is meant to provide technology transfer to EMBs that will allow the EMB to repeat “......the process itself without external assistance” or “......repeating the process without (too much) external assistance” this is often not the case (‘Procurement Aspects of Introducing ICTs in Electoral Processes: The Specific case of Voter Registration’, 2010).

It is therefore questionable for EMEs and the donor community to state their concerns over outsourcing when in fact it is occurring. One may also question why when UNDP provides a service it is an acceptable practice and not considered outsourcing while it is not acceptable or is considered as outsourcing when suggesting the use of a private company?

2.7 ICT Outsourcing

A good deal of attention is given to ICT outsourcing these days. However, ICT outsourcing has been around for many years and can be dated back to the 1960s. Johansson (undated) discusses knowledge sharing in ICT outsourcing relationships and the options available for outsourcing. He states that outsourcing can be classified as “selective”, “transitional” or “total” outsourcing. Selective outsourcing can be used to successfully outsource a specific function or activity that may be limited in time or ongoing. Transitional outsourcing on the other hand is a method that can be used by organisations to temporarily outsource a function or functions for a period of time while using the time to build capacity and competence to handle the function itself in the long term (Johansson, undated).

Using transitional and selective outsourcing can bring benefits to an EMB especially one that does not have a strong ICT capacity in the first instance. Knowledge sharing between the contractor and EMB can be used as a tool to enhance the knowledge of IT personnel within the EMB which will provide longer term sustainability.

There are numerous motivations to consider outsourcing such as financial motivations, unresponsive ICT departments, strategic motivations, improved business performance and facilitating strategic change (Johansson, undated). It is not uncommon to find unresponsive ICT departments within EMBs for reasons such as lack of funding and capacity, both of which may be corrected using selective and transitional outsourcing during major electoral events.
where the donor community is present and often has the financial capacity to fund such outsourcing.

2.8 Summary

A large amount has been written, researched and discussed about the need for ICT solutions and the substantial cost associated with such advancement in elections, yet very little is written about changing the culture and approach to ICT solutions. The dangers are spoken about and warnings are made with concerns stated that EMBs are opting for the most expensive of technologies yet at no time have we seen any serious attempts to assess the value of alternatives such as outsourcing.

The two aspects, manipulation of ICT systems that are owned by EMBs and the failures of the current method of support must be examined further to bring to the forefront the shortcomings of what has been accepted as the norm for so many years. These realities must be considered when concerns are raised at the suggestion of outsourcing and weighed to provide an unemotional discussion about what might be considered in the future.

This research attempts to address this shortcoming by bringing to the forefront the idea of outsourcing and investigating the potential and degree of outsourcing that may be possible and acceptable.
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

A substantial amount of research has been conducted on election operations and management by numerous organisations such as, the UN, UNDP, IFES, IDEA, Electoral Reform International Services (ERIS) and Electoral Institute for Southern Africa (EISA). However, the research has not adequately considered the benefits of ICT outsourcing (Procurement Aspects of Introducing ICTs in Electoral Processes: The Specific case of Voter Registration, 2010 and Gramatikov, 2002). Unfortunately the research has not delved into what outsourcing may have taken place seemingly preferring to ignore areas where outsourcing has occurred.

3.2 Primary Targets

EMBs in developing democracies throughout the world are the primary beneficiaries of the donor community electoral support programmes and are often ‘persuaded’ or rather ‘forced’ to accept support as determined by the donor community. The donor community usually determines the support as result of recommendations by EMEs. It is for this reason that EMBs and EMEs have been selected for this research (Bouma and Atkinson, 1995).

EMEs are central to the type of support being provided. The donor community, most commonly through UNDP in Africa, rely almost entirely on assessments and recommendations made by EMEs before any support is contemplated. EMEs have the potential to convince the donor community of the level and type of support that should be provided. They are therefore the optimum group to obtain views on the value of ICT outsourcing.

Likewise, as EMBs are the recipients of the support, they are often in a position to influence the EMEs as to the level and kind of support they require although they often do not take advantage of this position. They are therefore also an optimum group to survey.

Due to the very large numbers of EMBs in developing democracies and the unknown number of EMEs that provide advice and support to these EMBs it would be extremely difficult, time consuming and costly to include all of them. It would also be difficult due to time constraints to narrow the research to the whole of Africa. It has therefore been decided for the purpose of
this research to reduce the target area to Eastern and Southern Africa (Bouma and Atkinson, 1995).

3.2 Research Design

This research aims to investigate the value of alternative approaches for the provision of assistance to EMBs with the view to introducing new thinking towards the way the current method of support is provided and how best EMBs can provide ICT solutions for their entire staff. This research will attempt to bring together the need for major ICT solutions such as voter registration, election results management and election operations with the EMB's day-to-day ICT needs.

The research will look at all aspects of election administration and operations with the view to changing the way EMBs determine the optimum ICT solutions for its entire office over the entire electoral cycle, not just that of voter registration and elections.

The research will aim to answer the following questions:

- Is there value in outsourcing ICT services generally?
- Can ICT solutions for voter registration and elections successfully incorporate general administrative requirements?
- What level of outsourcing should be considered – Services, equipment, software?

Two questionnaires have been developed to capture the views of EMBs and EMEs.

3.2.1 Sampling

There are many methods and options for sampling. The selection of a target group or groups and/or population is required in order to conduct a survey.

A survey can be conducted in many different ways using different types and techniques of observation. However, for this research questionnaires will be used to gather data and measure the attitudes of people and organisations (StatPac Inc., 2012).

Survey samples are generally classified into two categories namely, probability and non-probability samples. This research will use non-probability sampling.
Surveys that are based on non-probability sampling have no way of measuring their bias or sampling error. Likewise, non-probability samples are not externally valid. They can only be said to be representative of the people that have actually completed the survey.

For this research the sampling has been designed based on 4 methods of selection:

- **Quota**: The equivalent of stratified sampling this research has identified two groups namely all EMBs within the target area and EMEs with work experience in the target area.

- **Judgement**: A total of 25 EMBs and a minimum of 100 EMEs have been selected reflecting the total number of EMBs in the target area and a proportionate number of EMEs with developing democracy expertise in the target area.

- **Snowball**: As the number of EMEs who have worked in the target area is unknown and it would be impossible to identify all of them the initial group of EMEs have been asked to forward the questionnaire to suitably qualified EMEs that they believe are qualified to respond and further requests have been placed on the ACE website and on the LinkedIn website.

- **Convenience**: The total number of EMBs and EMEs are accessed through a list of EMBs and another of EMEs prepared by myself with the assistance of colleagues.

As this is a non-probability sample the relationship between the target population and the survey sample is immeasurable and the potential bias is not known (Bouma & Atkinson, 1995).

### 3.2.2 Design of Questionnaires

The questionnaires have been designed with the view of ease of completion and allow the respondents to complete the questionnaire without the need to be online. After completion the respondents will simply return the completed questionnaire via email.

The questionnaires primarily use a modified Likert scale which provides two or three options rather than the standard five to collect the views of both EMBs and EMEs. The neutral or middle ground(s) response has not been provided as it is considered unnecessary for this re-
search as both EMBs and EMEs will have or should have an opinion. The Likert method provides clear distinct answers to the questions posed and allows for direct comparisons and compilation of answers which will provide clear overall views from both EMBs and EMEs. An opportunity to elaborate on each answer is given so as to allow respondents to qualify their responses if they feel the need to. This will also provide an opportunity to capture any views that do not fit into the predesigned answers.

The rationale for the design of the questions is to encourage both EMBs and EMEs to think about alternative options to simply procuring ICT solutions for major electoral events such as voter registration and elections and to consider the overall and long term needs of EMBs with particular focus on their day-to-day ICT requirements.

The questionnaires are structured and consist of two sections for EMEs and three sections for EMBs, as stated above, seeking the views of the target groups with a combination of methods of data collection:

- **Likert Scale**: To measure the satisfaction/dissatisfaction regarding a specific area of interest.
- **Multiple Choice**: To collect specific areas of expertise and views.
- **Open questions**: Give liberty to the respondent to give their opinion or elaboration.

The other section collects personal information from EMEs. Information relating to EMBs and their current ICT usage are also collected in two sections.

### 3.2.3 EMBs’ Questionnaire

The EMBs’ questionnaire contains three sections, one to collect the EMBs’ details, a second to collect their current level of ICT usage and finally, their views on ICT generally.

The first section collects details of the EMB and of the person completing the questionnaire on behalf of the EMB. These are:

- Name of EMB
- Country
- Head Quarter's Physical Address
• Head Quarter’s Postal Address
• Telephone Number
• Fax Number
• Name of Person Completing this Form
• Position of Person Completing this Form
• Email Address of Person Completing this Form
• Year the EMB was established
• Number of Eligible Voters in Thousands
• Total Number of Permanent Staff
• Total Number of Permanent Staff at HQ
• Number of Permanent Offices
• Number of Permanent Warehouses
• Total Number of Elections conducted since EMB’s establishment
• Please indicate the nature of your EMB
• Additional Comments

This list of questions establishes the authenticity of the EMB and that it is one from within the target area and collects contact information in case there is a need to communicate directly with the EMB. Details of the authorised person are also collected to verify the person’s qualifications to complete the questionnaire on behalf of the EMB.

Taking up from Yard et al. (2010), Evrensel et al. (2010) and Ellis et al. (2006) a number of technical questions have been prepared to collect the EMBs’ current ICT status and competencies. This section also seeks relevant information associated with electoral cycle management (UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide, 2007) on topics of technology plan and stakeholders.

• Does the EMB have a Technology Plan?
• Please indicate the Communication methods currently used
  • Within Head Quarters
  • Between Permanent Offices
  • With other Stakeholders
• Does the EMB have a website?
• Do all permanent employees have a computer at their workstation?
• If all employees do not, how many do not have a computer?
• Do all employees with a computer have an email address?
• Is there a Local Area Network throughout the EMB?
• Is there a Shared File Server?
• Is there an Email Server?
• Is there an Internet Server?
• Please provide any additional comments

A sub-section is also provided to collect the computer competency level of the EMB’s permanent staff by category such as Commissioners/Director of Elections, Department Heads and the various department personnel.

This section allows for the establishment of the level of ICT maturity within each EMB that responds.

A third and final section will blend the concepts of value, (Clark, 1915) outsourcing (Johansson, undated) and the electoral cycle (UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide, 2007) in an effort to understand the degree of interest EMB’s may have in expanding the current method of support by seeking their views. This will also show the possible need to educate the incumbents on the current trends of outsourcing ICT and how it may work with elections. The questions delve into the following areas:

• Does your EMB think that there may be value in outsourcing its ICT services?
• In your EMB’s experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing its ICT services?
• Please select the areas of election operations where you believe ICT outsourced services could be used.
• Does your EMB consider providing ICT experts/advisers to EMBs as outsourcing?
• Does your EMB think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters’ registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?
• Does your EMB think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations?
• Does your EMB think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?
• Does your EMB think that outsourcing some of its ICT services feasible?
• Would your EMB consider outsourcing its ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?
• What benefits would your EMB expect to see from outsourcing to consider it?

An opportunity is provided for EMBs to elaborate on each of the questions.

A statement has also been included defining outsourcing in relation to this research. EMBs are asked to state if they agree with the statement and if not what they would change. The statement reads:

“Outsourcing is the use of external resources which would normally be handled and/or procured internally by the organisation and/or its own staff. Resources include but are not limited to: the provision of expert personnel, consulting, application development, application maintenance and enhancement, computer operations, data communication network operations, voice communication, network hosting and the supply of equipment.”

The questions have been designed in an attempt to capture the views relating to the areas of this research on ICT outsourcing for public administrations (Marco-Simo et al., 2007). The aim of the questions is to collect the views of EMBs in relation to what they need, want or prefer rather than what is currently being offered (‘Public Administration and Democratic Governance’, 2007).

The questions being asked have not been asked of EMBs before although the idea of expanding support to:

....a holistic approach that links electoral assistance to the inclusive development of political frameworks and democratic culture is required, and that the building of a strong and stable electoral administration capacity is a better long-term investment than ad hoc contributions to electoral events (Ellis et al., 2006:6).

A copy of the questionnaire is at Annex 2.
3.2.4 EMEs’ Questionnaire

The EMEs questionnaire contains two sections, the first to collect the EMEs’ personal details and a second to collect their views on ICT generally.

A set of questions was included to clearly identify the EME and ensure credibility of the responses by requesting each EME to provide basic information to demonstrate their level of expertise as follows:

- Expert’s Name
- E-mail Address
- Contact Telephone Number
- Qualifications, positions held and publications
- Education Level
- Number of years of election experience
- Number of elections participated in
- List of countries EME has worked in
- Areas of election expertise

The UNDP Electoral Cycle (UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide, 2007) defined a number of areas where EMEs have developed their knowledge and expertise and have grouped them to facilitate their delivery. Two blocks are provided for EMEs to make multiple choices from, the first being “Areas of Experience” containing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Management</th>
<th>Expertise in the management of political party registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>Expertise in all aspects of voter registration, options available etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Registration</td>
<td>Expertise in receipt and processing of candidate nominations etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Expertise in all aspects of voting including ordinary and absentee voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Expertise in various forms of counting, benefits and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Reporting</td>
<td>Expertise in results reporting and tabulation including various options for the transmission of same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>Expertise in methods of auditing election results and other election processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Expertise in providing options and methods in dispute resolution to ensure quick and appropriate resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Education</td>
<td>Expertise in methods and options of timely and appropriate voter education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Education</td>
<td>Expertise in working with political parties to provide them with knowledge and advice as to how best to perform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Logistics</td>
<td>Expertise in all aspects of logistical planning and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Expertise in providing options and methods in dispute resolution to ensure quick and appropriate resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Education</td>
<td>Expertise in methods and options of timely and appropriate voter education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Security</td>
<td>Expertise in all aspects of security, including assessment and the provision of options to ensure security during an election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Law</td>
<td>Expertise in election law including interpretation and amendments as well as regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Management</td>
<td>Expertise in overall management of elections, finance, administration, logistics etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Technology Planning</td>
<td>Expertise in assessing IT needs with the view to preparing IT plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Technology Implementation</td>
<td>Expertise in the implementation of IT solutions, hardware and software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Technology Operation and Support</td>
<td>Expertise in the management, envisioning, planning, design, implementation, construction, deployment, distribution, verification, installation, instantiation, execution and maintenance of IT services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Expertise in financial management planning, organising, directing and controlling the financial activities such as procurement and utilization of funds including the application of general management principles to financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Management</td>
<td>Expertise in contract management including negotiating the terms and conditions in contracts and ensuring compliance, as well as documenting and agreeing on any changes or amendments that may arise during the implementation or execution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific electoral functions and roles have also been identified by UNDP in its electoral cycle (UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide, 2007) which is used in order to determine if EMEs that respond have sufficient areas of expertise. A second multiple choice block titled ‘Election Roles Performed’ covering roles such as, Election Administrator, Polling Station Staff, Party Agent, Registration Officer, Election Officer, Counting Officer, Support Staff, IT Technology Management, Educator, Consultant, Mediator and Other has been included.

Because the research is focused on Eastern and Southern Africa it is essential that the personal data is collected to ensure that only experts with the relevant work experience are included. Views collected without this information cannot be used and as such this data needs to be collected in the first instance.

As with EMBs a further set of questions will blend the concepts of value, (Clark, 1915) outsourcing (Johansson, undated) and the electoral cycle (UNDP Electoral Assistance Implementation Guide, 2007) in an effort to understand the degree of interest EMEs may have in expanding the current method of support by seeking their views on whether ICT services should be kept in-house or outsourced have been formulated to provide an opportunity for the respondents to grade the level of acceptance or otherwise of the question that outsourcing may be a better alternative. These are:

- Do you think that there is value in outsourcing ICT services?
- In your experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing ICT services?
- Please select the areas of election operation where you believe ICT outsourced services could be used.
- Do you consider providing ICT experts/advisers to EMBs as outsourcing?
- Do you think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters’ registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?
• Do you think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations of EMBs?
• Do you think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?
• Do you think that outsourcing some of an EMB's ICT services feasible?
• Would you consider outsourcing EMB's ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?
• What benefits would you expect to see from outsourcing to recommend it?

An opportunity is provided for EMEs to elaborate on each of the questions.

A statement has also been included defining outsourcing in relation to this research. EMEs are asked to state if they agree with the statement and if not what they would change. The statement reads:

“Outsourcing is the use of external resources which would normally be handled and/or procured internally by the organisation and/or its own staff. Resources include but are not limited to: the provision of expert personnel, consulting, application development, application maintenance and enhancement, computer operations, data communication network operations, voice communication, network hosting and the supply of equipment.”

While the questions being asked have so far not been asked of EMBs they have also not been addressed by EMEs and the donor community with any degree of seriousness although the idea of expanding support to:

....a holistic approach that links electoral assistance to the inclusive development of political frameworks and democratic culture is required, and that the building of a strong and stable electoral administration capacity is a better long-term investment than ad hoc contributions to electoral events (Ellis et al., 2006:6)

has been discussed.

A copy of the questionnaire is at Annex 3.

3.3 Administration

To ascertain the value of EMBs in African developing democracies outsourcing their ICT services the views of key players have been sought. While there are numerous categories of
people and organisations that can contribute to this research it is impossible to seek the views of all of them within the timeframe allocated for this study. Therefore for the purpose of this research it is sufficient to seek the views of EMBs within the target area and of a number of EMEs who have worked in the target area.

The questions posed provide an opportunity for the respondents to consider alternative approaches to the current thinking which allowed the data collected to be analysed in broader terms to that what has become the “norm”.

An initial email was sent to EMEs seeking their agreement to participate in the research which contained a brief background to the research that provided sufficient interest to encourage replies. A similar email was sent to EMBs seeking their cooperation. The questionnaires were ultimately emailed to all EMEs that responded to the initial email and to all EMBs within the target area with a personal message seeking their cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaires. Follow up emails were also sent where necessary.

The data was collected using Adobe forms. The questionnaires were developed in Adobe ‘LifeCycle’ Designer ES2. These forms can be completed offline and then returned as an attachment to an email.

Once the questionnaires were completed they were tested for accuracy and readiness to collect the required data.

An analysis was made of each EMB’s response to the section of the questionnaire relating to ICTs currently in use to determine the ICT maturity of each EMB and the effect it might have with their responses on their views. Likewise, a similar analysis was made on the EME’s responses.

The combined responses provide the general overall outcome of this dissertation.

### 3.4 Research Ethics

This research is purely to determine the feasibility of introducing an alternative approach to the provision of donor support in the area of ICT solutions to EMBs in Eastern and Southern
Africa. The data collection from individuals and EMBs in the target area will not impinge or harm either target group in any way.

The data will be carefully managed and at no stage will the data be modified to alter or skew the results.

Anonymity is provided to individuals and EMBs by way of the usual undertakings and assurances. No direct quotes are made. The individuals and organisations that respond will do so freely.

The result of this research will either confirm that the current donor support mechanisms are the most effective and should continue or will suggest that alternatives should be considered, therefore there are no ethical implications.
Chapter 4 Findings

4.1 Survey Results for EMBs

4.1.1 EMBs’ Questionnaire
The purpose of the questionnaire is to record the EMBs’ details, determine their level of ICT capacity/expertise and to record their views. The questionnaire is therefore made up of three sections to cover each of the areas mentioned which will assist to validate answers given regarding the views of the EMBs.

EMBs
An attempt to contact a total of 26 EMBs within the target area of Eastern and Southern Africa was made. A list of the EMBs with a breakdown of the results of attempted contacts made is at Annex 4.

Initial responses were received from 13 EMBs indicating an interest in completing the questionnaire. However, 5 ultimately did not respond while 8 returned the completed questionnaire. Follow up emails were sent to others in an attempt to obtain further responses without success. Of the 26 EMBs initial contact attempts 1 EMB was not functioning while 2 EMBs’ email addresses failed to deliver. The other 10 EMBs did not respond in spite of repeated attempts to contact them. There are numerous reasons why an EMB did not respond e.g. Lesotho was at that time heavily involved in election preparations.

Although the number of responses is not large (30%) they do provide a very good sampling in areas of location, language, ICT capacity and size, from both Eastern and Southern Africa.

EMBs’ Details
The 8 EMBs that responded have been in existence from twenty years to as little as four. Namibia and Zanzibar have been in operation the longest since 1992 closely followed by Seychelles since 1993, although Seychelles became a Commission for the first time in 2011, while the newest being Swaziland having been created in 2008. See figure 3 below.
EMBs’ ICT Capacity

All the EMBs claim sufficient capacity in communications within their respective headquarter staff, field staff where applicable and with other stakeholders. All EMBs have websites with all except Malawi and Zanzibar stating that all their employees have computers at their workstations. Zanzibar has an exceptionally high number of staff without computers (25 out of 71 staff) while Malawi did not state the number of employees without a computer, yet all EMBs have claimed that all the staff have email addresses. However, it should be noted that in some instances private web-based email addresses are used rather than official EMB email addresses.

All EMBs report that they have a local area network (LAN) while shared file, email and internet servers are present in all EMBs except for Swaziland and Zanzibar. Seychelles reported that they also use sms and mms services for “voter identification on the voter roll” while South Africa reported that they use “mobile and sms based technologies”.

All EMBs reported computer literacy levels as good to moderate except for Seychelles who reported excellent literacy levels among their entire staff.

4.1.2 EMBs’ Views

When asking EMBs if they believe there is value in outsourcing ICT services all except one believe there is. The one that does not cited sensitivity, security and safety of information as the reason. Three believe that there is definitely value in outsourcing while the other four be-
lieve that there possibly is. All see benefits in outsourcing specific areas such as automated fingerprint identification and candidate management as well as infrastructure, systems and data centres. See figure 4 below.

![Figure 4](image)

While all EMBs agree with the definition of outsourcing as outlined in the statement three of them do not agree that the provision of experts/advisers is outsourcing part of their ICT services. One EMB believes that experts/advisers work only in an advisory role while the other two gave reasons such as “work with equipment/infrastructure within the EMB” and “are there to fill the gaps” See figure 5 below.

![Figure 5](image)

A substantial majority of EMBs (6 or 75%) think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations with one additional EMB accepting the possibility. The single EMB that
does not think it should be stated the limiting of flexibility as the reason but did not give any explanation or example of what it meant by limiting flexibility. See figure 6 below.

![Figure 6](image)

All EMBs either believe that ICT support can be provided in a better way or possibly can. None believe that it is currently being provided in the best way. They all believe that the current support is not sufficient. One EMB that believes that support can be provided in a better way stated that currently the support is disjointed and focuses on Voters’ Registers. See figure 7 below.

![Figure 7](image)

The EMBs’ views for all 9 questions can be found at Annex 6

4.2 **Survey Results for EMEs**
4.2.1 EMEs’ Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire is to record the respondents’ views and to verify their qualifications to answer the questionnaire and establish the level of their expertise. Hence the questionnaire is made up of two sections each required to validate the other.

4.2.2 EMEs

A total of 178 EMEs were originally approached to check email addresses and to see if they were interested in taking part in the survey. A request was also placed on two websites namely, ACE and LinkedIn seeking EMEs who have worked in the target area of Eastern and Southern Africa to volunteer to take part in the survey.

Of the 178 EMEs originally approached, 5 emails failed to deliver and 54 did not respond. The 119 remaining replied saying they would be happy to participate in the survey. An additional 3 questionnaires were received as a result of the ACE website request and another 3 questionnaires were also received as a result of the LinkedIn website request, making a total of 125 questionnaires emailed out.

Of the 125 EMEs, 6 replied stating that due to their current pressing personal and/or work commitments they were unable to complete the questionnaire. A further 5 replied stating that after viewing the questionnaire they did not believe they were qualified to participate in the survey. This left a potential reply from 114 EMEs.

A total of 89 completed questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 71% based on the 125 respondents who agreed to participate or 78% based on the 114 potential replies after deducting the 11 who for reasons advised that they would not participate.

A list of EMEs that completed the questionnaire is at Annex 5

4.2.3 Respondents

Respondents Education Level

The vast majority of respondents’ have a Masters degree or higher while only 6 out of the 89 respondents do not have a degree although they are equally qualified to complete the questionnaire. The respondents’ education qualifications profile is at figure 8 below.
**Respondents Experience**

The respondents have an average of 18 years experience each. The average may be seen by some as high and this can be attributed to 8 of the EMEs having between 31 and 40 years each.

The respondents’ election years of experience profile is at figure 9 below.

![Education Level of Respondents](image)

**Figure 8**

**Years of Experience of Respondents**

![Years of Experience of Respondents](image)

**Figure 9**

4.2.4 **EME’s Views**

While there was overall agreement that there is value in outsourcing ICT services with the majority stating this as a possibility (59%) rather than an outright definite (35%) only 6% said no. Concerns were limited to “vendor lock” and “vendor dependency” with some “own-
ership issues” and the question of “independence”. It must be noted that these concerns were raised by only four EMEs. The rest were positive towards outsourcing even if some were very specific as to the extent and scope of the outsourcing. See figure 10 below.

While the majority (52%) considered the provision of experts/advisers as outsourcing with 42% saying that they did not, it is clear that up to 57% would consider it outsourcing as the 7% that did not answer the question all stated that it depended on what the advisers/experts did. Their elaborations tended to focus on who paid for the EMEs and whether they were long or short term rather than what they actually did. Capacity building was used as elaborations for agreeing and disagreeing with the idea that experts/advisers were outsourcing. It is very clear that there is no common understanding as to what outsourcing means in relation to the provision of experts/advisors. See figure 11 below.
While only 35% of EMEs do not believe that procuring ICT solutions for specific functions is the optimum way the majority (53%) believe it may possibly be the optimum with just 12% believing it optimum. Only four comments were made by EMEs who believed that procurement of ICT solutions were optimum and these were inconsistent and reflected personal views ranging from “easier to control”, “establishment of voter register...once” “optimal to use the most technical, high skill functions” and “only in the most egregious situation”. While the majority of those that felt it was possibly the optimum were cautious and suggested a varying number of conditions such as “the provision of controls”. Many also suggested that it depended on the status of the EMB with regards to capacity, finance and urgency. See figure 12 below.

Overall the results favour extending ICT support to day-to-day operations with the larger percentage (52%) thinking that it is possible while a further 30% think it definitely. Of the six comments provided by those that do not favour outsourcing day-to-day operations one stated that is was favourable “only when necessary for more efficiency”, others stated security and credibility concerns and others the view that in-house solutions should be the preferred method. Those that agreed to the possibility had varying opinions from the benefits of the provision of ICT expertise to assist EMBs to perform better to concerns with dependency and outside interference. See figure 13 below.
A clear majority of EMEs (56%) agree that consideration to outsourcing should be given if additional benefits can be derived. Only two comments were received from those that did not favour outsourcing regardless of benefits, one stated that EMBs must remain in full control and the other suggested that sustaining ICT provides skills transfer for permanent staff. Benefits suggested from the majority were vast, ranging from “more transparent elections” to “efficiency and value for money”. See figure 14 below.

The EMEs’ views for all 9 questions can be found at Annex 7

4.3 Summary

The 8 EMBs that responded cannot necessarily be considered as the average within the target area as it is not known to what extent their overall good to very good ICT competency can be
seen as being the norm within the target area. However, it can be taken as a good view of those EMBs that also have “good” to “very good” ICT competencies. On the other hand the EMEs that responded can clearly be taken as being representative of EMEs generally that have worked within the target area.

All in all the findings suggest that the current support being provided is not necessarily the optimum and that including day-to-day operations is desired especially by the EMBs. Outsourcing is an option that should be considered especially if benefits can be derived from it. Concerns of loss of independence and credibility are not seen as critical and perhaps more of a perception rather than a reality.
Chapter 5 Analysis & Conclusions

5.1 Analysis

5.1.1 Introduction
While there could have been different approaches to this research it is felt that the outcome would have been very similar if not the same. As has been stated from the outset the approach was to attempt to invoke a re-think as to how to best to provide ICT services and to change the way in which support is provided. Whether this was an appropriate approach is not clear. However, change is required and whilst much of the literature available raises concerns around the current methods of support they do not question the methods being used (Lopez-Pintor, 2005; Lopez-Pintor & Fischer, 2005 and Yard et al., 2007). Innovative thinking is required to enable the introduction of change in the way support is being provided. This research has attempted to do this while collecting the views of key players.

The set of questions could have been developed further so as to try and eliminate the doubts and/or confusion that remained with regards to the definition of outsourcing and in particular the question relating to the provision of ICT experts/advisors as outsourcing that brought about a non-response from a very small number of EMEs (Johansson, Undated).

5.1.2 EMBs
All 8 EMBs that responded have “good to excellent” ICT competencies, most of which fall into the category of very good. This suggests that their responses are well considered and may be taken as typical of EMBs within the Eastern and Southern Africa that have very good ICT competencies. However, it is not known if there are any EMBs with poor ICT competencies within the target area.

Generally speaking all EMBs see benefits and value in outsourcing their ICT services to varying degrees. Some have noted that they do in fact outsource aspects of their ICT services with the EMB whose status is a government department acknowledging that many if not most of its ICT services are linked to other government institutions (‘Public Administration and Democratic Governance’, 2007). The perception of loss of independence was only cited by one EMB which is surprising in that this is often a major reason given by EMEs and the donor community for favouring outright procurement of ICT solutions. While all EMBs agreed
with the outsourcing statement there still remains some confusion as to how experts/advisers supplied by the donor community should be regarded.

Likewise the current method of procuring specific ICT solutions is seen differently by the EMBs with only half believing that it is the optimum option (Lopez-Pintor, 2005). Considering that this has been the main way assistance is generally offered it provides an insight into the feelings of EMBs in that they may well be accepting assistance in this manner because it is the only way it is being offered and they feel obliged to accept it or perhaps as they do not have sufficient finances through their normal funding are compelled to take what is being offered (Yard et al., 2007). This insight has also been alluded to by some EMEs.

Another area that supports this is the EMBs’ overwhelming belief that ICT support should be extended to cover day-to-day operations, something that does not generally occur but could be introduced through longer-term support programmes such as provided by UNDP (‘Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund annual Report’, 2010). A pattern has emerged with all EMBs believing that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way.

Finally, the vast majority of EMBs agree that they would consider outsourcing ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it citing cost effectiveness, efficiency and professionalism as some of the benefits.

5.1.3 EMEs

The EMEs’ education level is on average extremely high and there are many publications attributed to a considerable number of them adding authority to their views. Their areas of expertise, years of experience and the number of elections worked in again shows a level of authority that cannot be disputed.

The profile of any number of these EMEs show them to be clearly suitable to reference as a panel of experts whose members have more than adequate qualifications and practical election experience to be able to voice a qualified opinion on the topic of this research. Collectively they make up a panel of experts with outstanding if not exemplary qualifications.
In general the majority of EMEs see value in outsourcing and acknowledge benefits with some qualifications or reservations over the EMBs’ possible perceived loss of integrity, independence and capacity (Evrensel et al., 2010).

There is a clear disagreement amongst the EMEs as to what constitutes outsourcing and if experts/advisers should be regarded as such. While the vast majority of EMEs agree with the outsourcing statement the elaborations from those that were not in agreement tend to question the roles of the experts/advisers or better still they state what their roles should ideally be rather than the realities of experts/advisers who often perform specific functions rather than only provide advice (Johansson, Undated).

Interestingly only 12% of EMEs believe that procuring ICT solutions for specific functions is the optimum although 52% believe that it is possibly the optimum while 35% do not believe it is the best way to go. There is clearly uncertainty amongst the EMEs if the current method of assistance is the best option especially when you take into account the question of extending support to day-to-day activities where only 18% believe that ICT support should not be extended to day-to-day operations.

Again, only 4% of EMEs believe that ICT support cannot be provided in a better way with 52% saying it is possible while 44% say it definitely can. This tends to demonstrate an uncertainty with what is best for EMBs. On the other hand one area that seems to be overwhelmingly agreed upon is that outsourcing of an EMB’s ICT services is feasible with 55% saying definitely and only 9% saying it is not. Again an overwhelming majority of EMEs (56%) agree that outsourcing should be considered if additional benefits could be derived from it.

5.1.4 Comparing EME and EMB results
There was overall agreement by both EMBs and EMEs that there is value in outsourcing ICT services with EMEs focusing on concerns over the perception of loss of independence while EMBs did not regard this as a concern.

What is interesting is that there seems to be a greater degree of agreement amongst EMBs that the provision of experts/advisers is a form of outsourcing than amongst EMEs although overall there is a clear tendency to agree that it is or could be a form of outsourcing.
Another area where both EMBs and EMEs agree is that of extending ICT support to day-to-day operations of EMBs although EMBs see this as more advantageous than EMEs. Likewise both groups would consider outsourcing if additional benefits could be derived from it with EMEs considering this slightly more than EMBs.

Both groups have acknowledged that some form of outsourcing has or is taking place yet both groups remain reluctant to embrace the general concept of outsourcing. What is interesting is that while 50% of the EMBs believe that the current method of procuring specific ICT solutions as being the best option with 25% saying it is not, only 12% of EMEs believe that it is the best option while 35% do not (Procurement Aspects of Introducing ICTs in electoral Processes: the Specific case of Voter Registration, 2010).

### 5.2 Conclusions

There is general agreement that there is value for EMBs in African developing democracies to outsource their information & communication technology services even if only in specific areas while there remains disagreement amongst both groups surveyed over the question of whether the provision of experts/advisers is in fact outsourcing (‘Public Administration and Democratic Governance’, 2007). Another key aspect of the findings is that of the potential benefits of including day-to-day operations in the support provided by the donor community with a clear statement that the current method of support is not the optimum (Evrensel et al., 2010).

It appears that although there is a general view that the current method of support may not necessarily be the best option there does not seem to be any or sufficient leadership for change to take place for reasons beyond this research’s scope. This will require further research to determine why changes to the overall approach seem so difficult to introduce let alone achieve.

Change can occur although it may take time and then only with further education and/or enlightenment of both EMBs and EMEs into what outsourcing benefits are currently being enjoyed by both the private and public sectors, including EMBs in developed democracies.

### 5.3 Limitations
This is a qualitative research study undertaken within a very limited timeframe and is conducted with no actual documented references of ICT outsourcing projects within electoral management bodies in Eastern and Southern Africa. There is also no control over the number of respondents. Many of the findings and conclusions in this paper can only be viewed as generalisations within the target area. Further research will need to be conducted in order for the lessons that emerge to be applicable across a wider business perspective. The lack of literature on the subject also has impacted on the ability to do a comparative study of the outcomes.

5.4 Opportunities for further research

A clear and definitive definition of what outsourcing means in relation to the support provided to EMBs by the donor community must be developed and understood by the donor community itself, EMEs and EMBs (Johansson, undated).

In light of the key findings of this study, the need to introduce support for day-to-day operations and the general view that the current method of procuring ICT solutions is not necessarily the optimum method, there is an opportunity to research these two areas further. Changes in the attitude and policies of the donor community in limiting their support to major electoral events which is predominately for voter registration and the conduct of a specific election must occur to allow for the introduction of support for day-to-day operations and to allow for the ‘innovation’ of at least introducing the possible use of outsourcing (Ellis et al., 2006).

With the above in mind I am aware that UNDP is undertaking a significant Thematic Evaluation of its contribution to electoral assistance. The evaluation I understand includes 13 country case studies and a number of cross-cutting themes, including that of ICT support. The ICT thematic case study is designed to look at UNDP policy on ICT support for electoral assistance, at the factors that drive the introduction of sophisticated technologies in countries where UNDP has electoral assistance projects, at the effectiveness, timeliness and sustainability of UNDP’s support for the use of ICT’s in elections processes as well as UNDP’s partnerships in this regard. It would have been extremely helpful had this study been completed and made public as perhaps it may have provided support to this research.
Another area that needs further research is that of the role played by experts/advisors in supporting EMBs. It is evident in this study that there is a major variation in how EMEs and EMBs view the role of experts/advisors and that their views may impact on their recommendations. It is clear that what role is intended is not necessarily what is happening in reality. This has simply not been addressed at all.

5.5 Reflections

5.5.1 Donors & EMEs

The driving force behind support to EMBs in developing democracies generally is the desire to ensure that democracy takes hold and is sustainable. However, donor community focus has always been on a single election which is often coupled with voter registration (Ellis et al., 2006). Until very recently long term support has not been considered. Even now that it has, the donor community has not embraced the very real need to provide sustainable support for the entire electoral cycle which includes day-to-day operation and administrative needs (Ellis et al., 2006). This research has primarily focused on UNDP because UNDP has been the main provider of support to EMBs in the target area and in many parts of the world. UNDP is without doubt the key to the way support is provided and will be the catalyst for change. Having said this UNDP relies almost entirely on EMEs for its support delivery. Likewise it relies heavily on EMEs, both administrative and ICT, for its policy development.

This research demonstrates the lack of consistency in attitude and approach by the EMEs when it comes to how best to provide support and in particular the reluctance to change the way support is provided (Ellis et al., 2006). Because EMEs are mostly independent individuals on contract there is no coordinated approach as to what is best and therefore policy is maintained “as is” simply because no one or no group of experts have managed to recommend or lead change. Seeing that the current method of recruiting individual EMEs as and when needed is likely to remain in place for the foreseeable future it will be very difficult to introduce change.

Further research is needed to study the effect of the current methods of recruitment of EMEs and the general provision of support with the view to changing donor policy. Ellis et al. (2006) suggest that consideration could also be given to exchange EMB staff by way on international secondment which would provide capacity building within regions. There is no
single institute that provides guidance and support to all EMEs. Likewise there is no organisation that knows who all the EMEs are let alone how many. Regardless of how professional and dedicated the EMEs are around the world they are made up of a loose consortium of individuals with no single direction.

5.5.2 Personally
As stated in my acknowledgments the road to this dissertation has been a long and arduous task for me especially considering that this has been my first real experience with tertiary education and certainly my first with online education. That said this entire learning experience has been an extremely rewarding one for me for many reasons. Having worked in my chosen profession of election management for the better part of my life and certainly for almost all of my working life and having worked for organisations such as the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme at senior level where degrees, both Bachelors and Masters, have been a requirement it has been an incredible journey for me to put my knowledge through a formal process and have it measured and graded academically. The exposure to formal academia has been for me, filled with frustration as well as enlightenment and confirmation of what I know. It has enabled me to look at what I do from a slightly different perspective and to have a more critical view of what I do. It has also enabled me to reflect on my profession with a more critical eye. It has enabled me to come to a realisation that there is so much more that can be achieved in supporting EMBs in developing democracies.

As a group of specialists we need to engage with each other more and develop our own understanding of what we do and to innovate and lead change as a group of experts not just as individuals. This is something that this MALIC course has taught me; leadership is more than being contracted to advise and/or get an EMB through a tough election, leadership is looking to how best to improve and sustain that improvement not just focus on one electoral event.

We owe it to ourselves and to the EMBs we work with to engage with each other and develop policy recommendations that will benefit all EMBs that are being provided with support through UNDP and the donor communities.

Innovation and change is not easily accepted within EMBs in developing democracies for numerous reasons that I have stated in the modules in this course and in chapter one of this dissertation. To attempt leading such innovation and change on one’s own is extremely diffi-
cult if not impossible. However, as a group it is achievable. Before “we” as individuals can hope to achieve change “we” as a group must first learn to change our own approach and work collectively so as to add credibility to what we do best. What I have learnt during this study is that there is very little literature on this subject. There is even less critical analysis of the failures of how things have been done to-date. This must change if we are to provide true support to EMBs in the developing democracies all over the world not just Eastern and Southern Africa (Ellis et al., 2006).
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Annex 1 - List of Abbreviations

ACE  ACE: The Electoral Knowledge Network
EMB  Election Management Body
EME  Election Management Expert
ERIS Electoral Reform International Services
EISA Electoral Institute for Southern Africa
IDEA International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
IFES International Foundation for Electoral Systems
LinkedIn A business-oriented social networking site
NGO Non Government Organisation
UN United Nations
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
Annex 2 - Election Management Bodies Questionnaire

Dissertation Questionnaire for Election Management Bodies

This questionnaire is used to collect data for a dissertation by Frank Vassallo on ascertaining the value to Electoral Management Bodies in African developing democracies outsourcing their ICT services. Please note all information supplied will be treated with the strictest of confidence and only used for academic purposes.

Frank can be contacted at frankvassallo@gmail.com

Section A: Election Management Body’s Details

This section records details with respect to the EMB and the person completing the questionnaire.

Name of EMB (including acronym):

Country:

Head Quarter's Physical Address:

Head Quarter’s Postal Address:

HQ’s Telephone Number:

HQ’s Fax Number:

Name of Person Completing this Form:

Position of Person Completing this Form:

Email Address of Person Completing this Form:

Year the EMB was established: ____________ Number of Eligible Voters in Thousands: ____________

Total Number of Permanent Staff employed by the EMB: ____________ Total Number of Permanent Staff at the EMB’s Head Office: ____________

Total Number of Permanent IT Management Staff employed: ____________ Total Number of Permanent IT Support Staff employed: ____________

Number of Permanent Offices: ____________ Number of Permanent Warehouses: ____________

Total Number of Elections conducted since EMB's establishment: ____________

Please indicate the nature of your EMB:

Additional Comments:
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**Section B: Current ICT Applications in use by EMB**

This section records details of ICT Applications currently in use by EMB.

**Does the EMB have a Technology Plan?**

**Please indicate the Communication methods currently used**
(Use the Ctrl Key to select multiple items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Head Quarters:</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Between Permanent Officers:</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>With Other Stakeholders:</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Does your EMB have a website?**

**Do all permanent staff have a computer at their workstation?**

**If all staff do not, how many do not have a computer?**

**Do all staff with a computer have an email address?**

**Is there a Local Area Network throughout the EMB?**

**Is there a Shared File Server?**

**Is there an Email Server?**

**Is there an Internet Server?**

**Additional Comments:**

Please provide the computer literacy level of the EMB's permanent staff by category

- Commissioners/Director of Elections:
- Department Heads:
- Legal:
- Administrative:
- Finance:
- Election Operations:

**Submission Date:** 18/05/2012
Section C: EMB’s Opinion and View

This section records the views and opinions of the EMB in regard to ICT outsourcing by Electoral Management Bodies.

Does your EMB think that there is value in outsourcing ICT services?

Please Elaborate on your answer

In your EMB’s experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing ICT services?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Please select the areas of election operations where your EMB believes ICT outsourced services could be used (Use the Ctrl Key to select multiple items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Function</th>
<th>Operational Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Registration</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Registration</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Education</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Reporting</td>
<td>Election application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Outsourcing should not be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Elaborate on your answer

Statement: Outsourcing is the use of external resources which would normally be handled and/or procured internally by the organisation and/or its own staff. Resources include but are not limited to: the provision of expert personnel, consulting, application development, application maintenance and enhancement, computer operations, data communication network operations, voice communication, network hosting and the supply of equipment.

Does your EMB agree with the statement above?

Submission Date 18/05/2012
If your EMB does not agree with the statement how would you alter it?

Does your EMB consider the provision of ICT experts/advisers to EMBs as outsourcing?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Does your EMB think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters' registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Does your EMB think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Does your EMB think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Does your EMB think that outsourcing some of an EMB's ICT services feasible?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Would your EMB consider outsourcing its ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?

What benefits would your EMB expect to see from outsourcing to recommend it?

I would like to thank you for the time and trouble you have gone to in completing this questionnaire.

Please verify your answers and submit the completed form.

Statement of Confidentiality

Please note all information supplied will be treated with the strictest of confidence and only used for academic purposes. Information/data provided will only be disclosed in the context of a published dissertation.
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Annex 3 - Election Management Experts Questionnaire

Dissertation Questionnaire for Election Experts

This questionnaire is used to collect data for a dissertation by Frank Vassallo on ascertaining the value to Election Management Bodies in African developing democracies outsourcing their ICT services. Please note all information supplied will be treated with the strictest of confidence and only used for academic purposes.

Frank can be contacted at frankvassallo@gmail.com

Section A: Election Management Expert’s Details

This section records details with respect to the experts credentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert’s Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-mail Address:</th>
<th>Contact Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications (Please provide full name of degree(s), title of position(s) held and a list of publications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your years of election experience. Please indicate the number of elections you have participated in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of election experience</th>
<th>Number of elections participated in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list all of the countries you have worked in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries worked in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the areas of election expertise you have.

Areas of Experience
- Planning
- Party Management
- Voter Registration
- Candidate Registration
- Voting
- Counting
- Result Reporting
- Auditing
- Dispute Resolution
- Voter Education
- Party Education
- Election Logistics
- Election Security
- Election Law
- Election Management
- IT Technology Planning
- IT Technology Implementation
- IT Technology Operation and Support
- Financial Management
- Contract Management
- Resource Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Roles Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Station Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Technology Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section B: Experts Opinion and View

This section records the views and opinions of the expert in regards to ICT outsourcing by Electoral Management Bodies.

Do you think that there is value in outsourcing ICT services?

Please Elaborate on your answer

In your experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing ICT services?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Please select the areas of election operation where you believe ICT outsourced services could be used.
(Use the Ctrl Key to select multiple items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Function</th>
<th>Operational Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Registration</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Registration</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Education</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Reporting</td>
<td>Election application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Outsourcing should not be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Elaborate on your answer

**Statement:** Outsourcing is the use of external resources which would normally be handled and/or procured internally by the organisation and/or its own staff. Resources include but are not limited to: the provision of expert personnel, consulting, application development, application maintenance and enhancement, computer operations, data communication network operations, voice communication, network hosting and the supply of equipment.

Do you agree with the statement above?

If you do not agree with the statement how would you alter it?

Do you consider providing ICT experts/advisers to EMBs as outsourcing?

Please Elaborate on your answer
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Do you think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters' registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Do you think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations of EMBs?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Do you think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Do you think that outsourcing some of an EMB's ICT services feasible?

Please Elaborate on your answer

Would you consider outsourcing EMB's ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?

What benefits would you expect to see from outsourcing to recommend it?

I would like to thank you for the time and trouble you have gone to in completing this questionnaire.

Please verify your answers and submit the completed form.

Statement of Confidentiality

Please note all information supplied will be treated with the strictest of confidence and only used for academic purposes. Information/data provided will only be disclosed in the context of a published dissertation.
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## Annex 4 - List of EMBs in the Target Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>National Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Interest Shown No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>National Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Not functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior and Decentralization</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Eritrea Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>National Electoral Board</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Interim Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>National Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Malawi Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Mauritius Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Interest Shown No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Interest Shown No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Namibia Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Contact Email Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>Seychelles Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Somalia Electoral Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Contact Email Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Elections and Boundaries Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Interest Shown No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Uganda Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Electoral Commission of Zambia</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanzibar</td>
<td>Zanzibar Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Electoral Commission</td>
<td>Interest Shown No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5 - List of EMEs who Completed Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian MacDonald</td>
<td>Lee Kironget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Ochama</td>
<td>Leti Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksandra Tomić</td>
<td>Linda Maguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Carpenter</td>
<td>Marco Hasselaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Ellis</td>
<td>Margie Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Campbell</td>
<td>Mary Lou Schramm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrid Evrensel</td>
<td>Max Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayman Ayoub</td>
<td>Melanie Du Plessis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Dundas</td>
<td>Michael Baldassaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Benjamin Nsimbi</td>
<td>Michael Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lasham</td>
<td>Michael Maley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ched Flego</td>
<td>Mike Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinga Chaguluka</td>
<td>Morten Jødal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Kyriakides</td>
<td>Noor Mohammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Shields</td>
<td>Ole Holtveld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Thakur</td>
<td>Oskar Lehner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Avery</td>
<td>Paul Guerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mathieson</td>
<td>Per Nilsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Kadima</td>
<td>Peter Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Campbell</td>
<td>Phil Whelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cote</td>
<td>Phillip Mwangobole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Happel</td>
<td>Rasul Wahidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fida Nasrallah</td>
<td>Ray Russon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald Jean</td>
<td>Richard Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Key</td>
<td>Rod Medew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Sinclair</td>
<td>Rolf Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Bekko</td>
<td>Ronan McDermott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunder Soderback</td>
<td>Rosemarie McBean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Neufeld</td>
<td>Rudi Elbling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Modisane</td>
<td>Serge Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko Miyamura</td>
<td>Shalva Kipshidze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert Akunjiah</td>
<td>Shaun Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Smith</td>
<td>Simon Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Tip</td>
<td>Staffan Darnolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Hays</td>
<td>Stephen Beale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Jaisi</td>
<td>Steve Canham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maphethe</td>
<td>Steve Telford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joceelyn Lucas</td>
<td>Steven Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Thompson</td>
<td>Sue Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jørgen Eikløit</td>
<td>Thomas Otieno Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kare Vollan</td>
<td>Tim Meisburger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Birsel</td>
<td>Vic Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Ryan</td>
<td>William Clive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaz Kuroda</td>
<td>William Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwame Domoah-Agyemang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 6 - EMB’s Views from Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Does your EMB think that there is value in outsourcing ICT services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>In your EMB’s experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing ICT services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Does your EMB agree with the statement above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Does your EMB agree with the statement above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Does your EMB think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters’ registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Does your EMB think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Does your EMB think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Does your EMB think that outsourcing some of an EMB’s ICT services feasible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9

Would your EMB consider outsourcing its ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?
Annex 7 - EME's Views from Questionnaire

Question 1
Do you think that there is value in outsourcing ICT services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2
In your experience what is the extent of the value of outsourcing ICT services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3
Do you agree with the statement above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4
Do you consider providing ICT experts/advisors to EMBs as outsourcing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5
Do you think that procuring ICT solutions only for specific functions such as voters' registers, election or finance management is the optimum option?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6
Do you think that ICT support should be extended to day-to-day operations of EMBs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7
Do you think that support in the area of ICT can be provided in a better way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8
Do you think that outsourcing some of an EMB's ICT services feasible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9
Would you consider outsourcing EMB's ICT services if additional benefits could be derived from it?

[Bar chart showing responses to Question 9]
- Yellow bar: Definitely
- Blue bar: Possibly
- Purple bar: No

Responses:
- Definitely: 50
- Possibly: 32
- No: 2
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