**Supporting Digital Literacy
Analysis of Good Practice Initiatives**

Topic Report 1

Annexes

Disclaimer
The views expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

Copyright

Authors:
Knud Erik Hilding-Hamann
Morten Meyerhoff Nielsen
Kristian Pedersen

Danish Technological Institute
Centre for Policy and Business Analysis

Annexes

Annex 1 – List of Initial 91 Potential Initiatives for Good Practice Selection

Below are listed the 91 initiatives that were selected for deeper analysis following the initial mapping of initiatives which identified 464 initiatives across the 32 countries (note that four of the initiatives, namely the three European projects and the Spanish Cibervoluntarios initiative, were appended after the completion of the country surveys). The 91 initiatives have subsequently been reduced to 30 initiatives that have been selected as good practice cases to be featured in the Topic Report 3.

Austria

FluEqual Work iT - a Network for Refugees.
- *Target group:* Refugees from various countries
- *Years:* 2005 - 2007
- *Content:* Tailored training via the development of a homepage for refugees. Self-organised learning and relevance through the production of the homepage emphasising the process of using ICT as a tool to achieve a tangible outcome.
- *Method/innovation:* Project team and external coaches, graphic programmes, programming languages, open source tools and social software. Participants as multipliers training other refugees.
- *Stakeholders:* Local and national public partners (City of Salzburg, Caritas Salzburg, Evangelischer Flüchtlingsdienst).
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation, documentation of the project can be downloaded from the webpage
- *Results:* The webpage www.fluequal.at is viewed as the outcome of the project.

LEARN FOREVER – Lifelong Learning in the Age of the Information Society – New Opportunities for Women
- *Target group:* Women
- *Years:* 2005 - 2006
- *Content:* Training with and evaluation of learning software, workshops.
- *Method/innovation:* Organised workshops, e-learning, evaluation of learning software by the target group.
- *Stakeholders:* 14 organisations including public partners.
- *Evaluation:* An evaluation report has been made.
- *Results:* The project is considered as an example of good practise. The magnitude of the project is unknown

LERNBAR – für MigrantInnen der Stadt Wien
- *Target group:* People with migration background in Vienna, especially women and young people
- *Years:* 2002 - 2008
- *Content:* ICT-courses tailored for immigrants
- *Method/innovation:* Specially developed learning platform. Certificates attainable at intercultural educational centres.
- *Stakeholders:* The project is funded by local public organisations and an organisation at the European level (ESF). Educational institutions.
- *Evaluation:* Internal project follow-up. Otherwise no specific documentation.
- *Results:* Not specified – however the long duration and the inclusion aspects for immigrants indicate potential.

Belgium

Aangename Kennismaking met de Computer
- *Target group:* Jobseekers and low skilled persons.
- *Years:* From March 2001 - ongoing
- *Content:* Teaching of basic ICT skills. It is intended to make it easier for people to deal with the increasing use of ICT in society and on the work floor.
- *Method/innovation:* Basic ICT and internet software, CD with computer simulation, power point presentation to support practical work, digital exercises, project homepage. Trainers are workers in various professions with the requisite ICT skills.
- *Stakeholders:* The Flemish Public Employment Service.
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation or assessment appears to have been done. Based on a series of sectoral pilot projects.
- *Results:* Not specified – but integrating ICT training with job seeking via an employment service appears to be an effective way of providing basic ICT training to those who most need it.

Easy-e-Space
- *Target group:* Elderly, disabled and socially disadvantaged groups.
- *Years:* Unspecified
- *Content:* Computer lessons for elderly, disabled and socially disadvantaged groups and training to people teaching and helping the participants.
- *Method/innovation:* Basic ICT, establishment of Easy-e-Spaces (PIAPs) in eight locations, education of own teachers.
- *Stakeholders:* The Flemish Public Employment Service.
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation or assessment has been carried out. No annual reports are available.
- *Results:* Not specified – but it is a promising initiative because it is available all over Belgium, in both Flemish and French and targets all socially disadvantaged groups.

Bulgaria

T-Centre
- *Target group:* The overall population, in particular people who demand more advanced information services.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Establishment of a broad-based network of public telecentres providing services to small or economically underdeveloped communities.
- *Method/innovation:* PIAPs, on- and off-line business services, training in iCentres, eLearning, certificates.
- *Stakeholders:* The government of Bulgaria and the UNDP. Several other stakeholders in both the private and public sector have been involved.
- *Evaluation:* Not specified.

- *Results:* An immense project, which has had a great impact. About 100,000 people have used the eLearning system.

Bulgarian-German Centres for Vocational Training

- *Target group:* Young people (men) with low or no skills.
- *Years:* Ongoing
- *Content:* The training of unemployed youth is accomplishing through an educational program (EP) based on contemporary achievements in the field of ICT.
- *Method/innovation:* Basic computer equipment and internet access.
- *Stakeholders:* Unspecified.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* In 2006, training of 1,000 youths and employment for 161 persons is planned.

Canada

BRAND – Broadband for Rural and Northern Development

- *Target group:* Rural areas, areas with lower than average ICT access and abilities.
- *Years:* 2001 - 2004
- *Content:* The digitalisation of native-American communities
- *Method/innovation:* ICT-infrastructure was provided and digital literacy competence development measures were addressed.
- *Stakeholders:* Mainly public organisations (Industry Canada and National Selection Committee), but to some extent also industrial organisations and non-governmental organisations.
- *Evaluation:* A full report on the results of the project has been made.
- *Results:* Indication of areas of improvement. Also, the project has lead to a new initiative.

OLT – Office of Learning Technologies

- *Target group:* A wide variety of population groups. Socio-economical marginalised and people with poor education, i.e. rural/remote, youth, women, people with disabilities, aboriginals, seniors, visible minorities.
- *Years:* From 1996 - ongoing
- *Content:* Computer-based learning, specialised methods for people with disabilities.
- *Method/innovation:* Computer-based training, internet, websites, specialised software, multimedia, video-conferencing.
- *Stakeholders:* National public organisations, academic institutions, workplaces and community organisations.
- *Evaluation:* Annual reviews and multiple reports have been made
- *Results:* Not specified – but it is believed that the project has strong potential for informing future policy making concerning certain disadvantaged groups.

Smart Communities

- *Target group:* Underserved and disadvantaged areas (Rural, northern and aboriginal groups).
- *Years:* 2000 - 2003
- *Content:* Providing access to computers and ICT, sharing experiences, on-line and in-person training, education and business development tools.
- *Method/innovation:* Internet access, ICT training, business development tools.
- *Stakeholders:* Public organisations (Smart Communities, Industry Canada)
- *Evaluation:* A mid-term evaluation has been made. No final report was completed
- *Results:* Not specified – twelve projects were chosen, budget of $5,000,000.

Cyprus

Multifunctional Youth Centre in Nicosia

- *Target group:* Young persons with disabilities
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* The establishment of a youth centre in which young people and people with disabilities can receive training in the use of ICT during their spare time.
- *Method/innovation:* PCs, software. Strong focus on increasing participation in public issues.
- *Stakeholders:* Local and national public organisations (The Youth Board of Cyprus, the Municipality of Nicosia)
- *Evaluation:* No specific evaluation – attendance has continuously increased.
- *Results:* Not specified – however two more youth centres are being constructed after the model.

Czech Republic

NPCL – National Programme for Computer Literacy

- *Target group:* The general public, special emphasis on older people, also courses for disabled people.
- *Years:* 2003 - 2006
- *Content:* Three two-hour courses, e-Learning,
- *Method/innovation:* PCs, software, open source, certificates (NPCL, ECDL)
- *Stakeholders:* Public organisations, private companies and NGOs.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified, however the programme was chosen as a finalist of the European eGovernment Awards and the programme has been 'exported' to several African countries.
- *Results:* More than 100,000 participants and 16,454 registered users of the e-Learning courses.

PCs Against Barriers

- *Target group:* Physically or mentally disabled citizens.
- *Years:* 1996 - 2007
- *Content:* Education and re-training of disabled persons.
- *Method/innovation:* IT courses and personal assistance for participants, financial support for compensating aids, setting up of protected workplaces.
- *Stakeholders:* NGOs and the private sector.
- *Evaluation:* General positive attitude, but no formal evaluation
- *Results:* Continuously *g*rowth in the number of people participating in the courses, 111 persons have obtained employment thanks to the project.

Seniors Communicate

- *Target group:* Seniors
- *Years:* 2006 - 2007
- *Content:* Tailored courses which seek to teach seniors to use PCs, cell phones and payment cards.
- *Method/innovation:* Day-time courses, one computer free for usage in every centre.
- *Stakeholders:* Private companies (T-mobile and Ceska Sporitelna)
- *Evaluation:* No approach to document yet. However, according to personal interviews, seniors seem to be very satisfied.
- *Results:* Over 1,000 seniors have participated in the courses. The programme has been 'exported' to The Netherlands and Belgium.

Kindergarten for Seniors

- *Target group:* Senior citizens.
- *Years:* From 2003 - ongoing
- *Content:* Basic PC course consisting of ten lectures
- *Method/innovation:* Addresses PC components, Internet use, work with texts, tables, presentations, graphs, certificates, the creation of web pages and programme installation. Use of trained college students to teach participants.
- *Stakeholders:* The non-profit association ELPIDA with the financial support of GlaxoSmithKline and other private contributors. Support from the Czech Ministry of Informatics
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* Unspecified.

Denmark

Ældremobiliseringen – Datastuer (The Danish Association of Senior Citizens – Data Rooms)

- *Target group:* Elders
- *Years:* From 2006 - ongoing

- *Content:* Tailored courses which seek to teach seniors to use PCs online and at PIAPs made specifically for seniors.
- *Method/innovation:* Courses, e-Learning, accessibility through PIAPs.
- *Stakeholders:* A private company and a NGO (Microsoft and Ældremobiliseringen)
- *Evaluation:* A final evaluation is available online.
- *Results:* There are now 134 data rooms nationwide and 5,000 annual course participants.

Estonia

Look@World Foundation

- *Target group:* Population at large – anyone with an interest in learning basic ICT skills.
- *Years:* 2002 - 2004
- *Content:* Provision of training courses in Estonian and Russian concerning use of computers, the Internet, and electronic services.
- *Method/innovation:* Building computer class rooms around the country, payment of teachers to instruct participants, advertisement campaigns, award of diplomas
- *Stakeholders:* The Look@World Foundation instituted by ten Estonian companies, public organisations and private training companies.
- *Evaluation:* Both immediate user evaluation of initiative and subsequent impact evaluation trough phone survey of continued use.
- *Results:* 102,697 participants of which 34.5% were over 51 years old.

Finland

Computer Training for Seniors and Peer Tutoring

- *Target group:* Aimed at elderly citizens
- *Years:* 2006 - 2008
- *Content:* Tailored PC training and Training in the use of the mobile telephone
- *Method/innovation:* Peer to peer learning
- *Stakeholders:* Run by a strong association at regional level with several public and a private partner
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with Association/users
- *Results:* Not specified – but indication that the project is sustainable/ongoing

Netti-Nysse: the Tampere City Library Internet Bus

- *Target group:* Population at large – however more and more elderly
- *Years:* 2000 - unknown
- *Content:* Tailored training, online learning materials,
- *Method/innovation:* A bus with 12 PCs at local level. Personal PC instruction, informal learning, spirit of encouragement and empowerment.

- *Stakeholders:* Public organisation, schools, businesses and local communities
- *Evaluation:* Evaluations have taken place and the initiative has won prices and is recognised internationally.
- *Results:* 1,000s of people are trained annually in Tampere and the majority indicates that they will continue to use/practice the skills developed.

Nettiä Nääs, Tietoa Tuville – Information to the Cabins

- *Target group:* People with intoxicant problems
- *Years:* Unspecified
- *Content:* Courses on ICT-skills
- *Method/innovation:* Basic computers and software.
- *Stakeholders:* Public organisation and a NGO
- *Evaluation:* No formal evaluation. The target group was very hard to reach and influence.
- *Results:* Limited information available on the actual impact and results.

Internet Corner

- *Target group:* Citizens without basic facilities and training to join the Information Society
- *Years:* Unspecified
- *Content:* Training and the offering of basic computer facilities in cosy environments.
- *Method/innovation:* Basic computers and software. Free child care at facility.
- *Stakeholders:* Neighbourhood organisation.
- *Evaluation:* Only internal project follow-ups have been made. No formal evaluation.
- *Results:* Unspecified.

France

Cyber-Base-Spaces

- *Target group:* Young people and secondary jobless people.
- *Years:* From 2000 - ongoing
- *Content:* Increasing the accessibility of ICT through PIAPs.
- *Method/innovation:* PIAPs, PCs, software, educational multimedia content.
- *Stakeholders:* Several public partners within employment, economic development, education and public services.
- *Evaluation:* The CDC carries out some survey to measure the degree of satisfaction of users of Cyber-base-spaces, but no formal assessments of the participants' achievements are required.
- *Results:* The magnitude of the project is huge and ought, solely based on its size, to have been of great importance.

ICOM' Handicap International
- *Target group:* People with disabilities and instructors and the heads of specialised establishments.
- *Years:* From1996 - ongoing
- *Content:* Tailored teaching on ICT, research on innovative solutions for people with disabilities.
- *Method/innovation:* National research, local teaching, training of teachers, promoting networks.
- *Stakeholders:* Local, regional and national public organisations.
- *Evaluation:* Individual assessments are made of each participant. It is unknown whether or not there has been a formal evaluation of the project.
- *Results:* The mechanism implemented at national level to share knowledge and the other local resource centres constitute an exemplary initiative.

Clique sur ta Ville
- *Target group:* Underprivileged families, the unemployed, senior citizens and unemployed youth. It is open to everyone.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* A training programme for instructors in local organisations that are equipped with PIAPs. Instructors will receive training in educational methods, technical issues and in how to conduct practical workshops
- *Method/innovation:* By educating the instructors the general utility of the PIAPs ought to rise.
- *Stakeholders:* A public-private partnership including Microsoft, municipalities, public institutions, companies and five associations.
- *Evaluation:* An assessment of the initiative in the city of St. Etienne is planned (perhaps it has been conducted).
- *Results:* Unspecified.

ICT Initiation Workshops
- *Target group:* Mainly senior citizens. Junior high school seniors and people with slight disability have also received training.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Classroom ICT-courses held by volunteering students.
- *Method/innovation:* The concept is original and all stakeholders are in a win-win situation: students, school, city hall, and those attending the courses.
- *Stakeholders:* A student association, support from an academic institution and the city.
- *Evaluation:* The results of this initiative are documented only for the year 2005 and early 2006
- *Results:* It is believed, that this initiative is likely to further develop in other places across France.

Sites-Gone

- *Target group:* Mainly immigrants but also disadvantaged people.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* ICT-courses by volunteers in order to integrate immigrants into the community
- *Method/innovation:* Informal learning, PC, printer, fax, scanner, Internet access and Office software
- *Stakeholders:* A volunteering association, the city of Lyon
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified
- *Results:* Unspecified

Internet de Rue

- *Target group:* Very poor people or isolated people.
- *Years:* 2005 - 2007.
- *Content:* The objective was to develop and validate a concrete approach of ICT awareness actions and use by parents and young adults living in extreme situations of poverty.
- *Method/innovation:* Initiation to Internet use, support to job and housing search, support to attend the PIAPs
- *Stakeholders:* Private sector foundations, private companies, the cities in which the project took place.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* Information on people ICT-needs was produced. General impact unknown.

Germany

Start und Klick!

- *Target group:* Computer non-users, the project also reached specific target groups like the elderly, women and youth.
- *Years:* 2001 - 2005
- *Content:* Courses in basic computer and internet use.
- *Method/innovation:* Basic computers and software.
- *Stakeholders:* Public foundation, private management company and educational institutions.
- *Evaluation:* A comprehensive evaluation of the project can be found at their webpage.
- *Results:* 32,888 courses have been held. No direct measurement of ICT-skills, but a phone survey regarding people's opinions about the impact of the courses.

Senioren-Migranten

- *Target group:* Children, adolescents, senior citizens and socially disadvantaged groups. More specific focus was on immigrants – in particular Turkish women.
- *Years:* 2003 - 2007

- *Content:* Enhancement of digital literacy through PC-courses, media-courses and production of intercultural TV. In addition to this there is also an intercultural networking aspect.
- *Method/innovation:* Multilingual online platform, internet courses, equipment for video/audio production.
- *Stakeholders:* Migrant and senior citizens associations, national and local public institutions.
- *Evaluation:* There appears to be no evaluation.
- *Results:* The project is well documented on the multilingual webpage, where general information and short articles on special activities can be found.

Sternstrasse

- *Target group:* Former drug-addicts.
- *Years:* From 2001 - ongoing
- *Content:* Multi-media courses, including topics like programming languages, communication theory and multimedia applications.
- *Method/innovation:* PCs, laptops, Internet. Volunteering teachers.
- *Stakeholders:* A professional management team, sponsoring enterprises and volunteering teachers.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* No systematic approach to measurement and documentation has been utilised.

Volkswagen Level 5 Internet Offensive

- *Target group:* All employees regardless of age, ability, and function within Volkswagen. Specially designed courses for disabled workers and foreign language workers.
- *Years:* From 2000 - ongoing
- *Content:* Customised training intended to improve the ICT-skills of the workers and improve the company's competitiveness.
- *Method/innovation:* Training provided solely by the employers, a combination of on-line and traditional learning methods and tools, ECDL-certificate, eLearning, the multi-channel approach,
- *Stakeholders:* Volkswagen, Volkswagen Coaching GmbH.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified, however since the initiative has been integrated into the organisational practices an internal evaluation *ought* to have occurred.
- *Results:* All employees have taken the course. See 'evaluation'.

Senior Internet Helpers

- *Target group:* Senior citizens (50+) in rural regions (particularly elderly women and persons with physical impairments, volunteers in associations, representatives of senior councils, persons who care for family members, senior citizens in residential homes.
- *Years:* 2004 - 2007 (but continued as independent entity)

- *Content:* Tailored activities improving/updating ICT knowledge.
- *Method/innovation:* Imparting voluntary senior-Internet-helpers with skills in different fields of ICT (technical tools, information, communication, and social applications) in order for them to teach other senior citizens how use and be comfortable with ICT. Development of e-Learning platforms, creation of network for exchange of good practices. Awareness campaign in cooperation with local radio show.
- *Stakeholders:* ZAWiW (Centre for General Scientific Continuing Education) of Ulm University in cooperation with partner institutions, volunteers.
- *Evaluation:* Several reports in different journals have been accomplished.
- *Results:* 456 senior-Internet-helpers were trained to work in 54 senior-Internet-initiatives especially in the rural regions of Baden-Wuerttemberg. On average, each helper works 10 hours per month on a voluntary basis resulting in a total of 55,000 working hours per year.

Greece

Skills Upgrading
- *Target group:* The workforce of the country.
- *Years:* 2000 - 2008
- *Content:* Upgrading of the competences of the workforce through training programmes in basic and advanced ICT-skills.
- *Method/innovation:* Certificates, separate programmes for employed and unemployed, flexible form of training for employees in SMEs, programmes for the acquisition of work experience in the ICT sector, PCs, internet, basic and advanced software applications.
- *Stakeholders:* Ministries, intermediate management agencies and a non-profit corporation.
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation – too early in the process.
- *Results:* 41,870 have participated in ICT-courses, 2,686 in advanced ICT-courses and 33,558 have been certified in PC usage. The general impact of the project has not been evaluated.

Training in Basic ICTs of Persons with Vision Problems
- *Target group:* People with vision problems.
- *Years:* Started in 2007 (ongoing)
- *Content:* Training in and certification of ICT-skills for people with vision problems through special teaching and technology.
- *Method/innovation:* Certificates, software for screen reading, training of instructors, basic training in ICT-skills, adaptation of the examinational system of the Certification Agencies to the needs of people with vision problems.
- *Stakeholders:* NGOs.
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation yet due to its recent implementation.
- *Results:* So far 750 people have participated in the courses. The project is assessed to be of interest by the report.

Information Technology Youth Clubs

- *Target group:* Low- and/or under-qualified young people.
- *Years:* 2002 - 2005
- *Content:* Familiarisation with PCs and basic IT-skills acquisition with the purpose of increasing employability in combination with counselling.
- *Method/innovation:* Street-work, peer-education, youth clubs with specially configured rooms. Parts of the youth clubs gradually transformed into social/ self-managed enterprises (eCafés).
- *Stakeholders:* Local municipalities, municipal development agencies and vocational training institutions.
- *Evaluation:* Formal evaluation has been made within the relevant procedures of the Community Initiative Equal Operational Programme.
- *Results:* No approaches for documentation of the results have been made. 195 youngsters have received training.

Hungary

Click, Granny!

- *Target group:* Elder persons.
- *Years:* From 2002 - ongoing
- *Content:* Tailored training for elders.
- *Method/innovation:* ICT-courses for elders held in community centres, creation of self-teaching groups and clubs for current and former participants and other citizens. Also has instigated a grandchildren-grandparents IT contest.
- *Stakeholders:* Public institutions and a private company (UPC).
- *Evaluation:* The project has been presented as 'best practice' in a Hungarian e-Inclusion report.
- *Results:* Unspecified.

Association of Hungarian NetWomen

- *Target group:* Women of all ages.
- *Years:* Not specified.
- *Content:* Promotion of ICT usage among women and providing information of women issues and history.
- *Method/innovation:* ICT-courses, networking with national and international women's organisations, digitalising documents of women history and research activities on ICT and the information society. Establishment of chat forums concerning information relevant to the modern woman.
- *Stakeholders:* Not specified (Presumably NGOs).
- *Evaluation:* Not specified
- *Results:* Not specified.

India

Akshaya Project

- *Target group:* Rural areas, special focus on deprived communities, women and socially backward communities in Kerala.
- *Years:* From 2002 - ongoing
- *Content:* Increasing the ICT accessibility through the development of ICT access points   (e-centres/PIAPs), eLiteracy training.
- *Method/innovation:* PIAPs, 15hour-courses, internet services (eBusiness, ePayment etc.), creation of content on the web which is relevant to the local people.
- *Stakeholders:* State government, IT companies, women self-help groups, village-level entrepreneurs.
- *Evaluation:* The project is perceived to be of great importance to the area. Several prizes have been won. The state documents the results of the project regularly.
- *Results:* Not specified – but indications that the project is sustainable and rewarding.

Schoolnet Project by IL & FS

- *Target group:* Educational system, rural development
- *Years:* Unspecified.
- *Content:* Developing and deploying learning modules for imparting IT literacy to schools, businesses and rural areas.
- *Method/innovation:* Public Private Partnership model.
- *Stakeholders:* Government and administrations, public institutions, private enterprises.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified,
- *Results:* The project has received remarkable success and has been replicated in other parts of the world.

Project SARI – Sustainable Access in Rural Areas

- *Target group:* Rural development.
- *Years:* Unspecified
- *Content:* Providing both telephone and internet access in every village.
- *Method/innovation:* 'Wireless in Local Loop' technologies (WLL).
- *Stakeholders:* Government and administrations, private enterprises.
- *Evaluation:* The project has been viewed as 'best practice' by the World Bank, UNDP and Harvard University. The project has to a great extent been thoroughly studied.
- *Results:* Unspecified – but recommendations for replication throughout the world indicates sustainability.

Ireland

FIT – Fasttrack to IT

- *Target group:* Long-term unemployed adults (secondarily women, youth, people in the danger of redundancy and refugees have also been targeted).
- *Years:* From 1998 - ongoing
- *Content:* An employment training programme which seeks to give people the skills which the industry needs. Specific initiatives for refugees, women, and redundant workers.
- *Method/innovation:* tailored training program, an assessment centre.
- *Stakeholders:* Employers, state training providers, Local Employment Service Networks and Area Partnership Companies.
- *Evaluation:* Most recent annual report was published in 2001.
- *Results:* Unspecified.

SWICN Computer Clubhouse

- *Target group:* Youth from disadvantaged backgrounds.
- *Years:* Unspecified
- *Content:* Learning through multi-media production. The 'learning by doing' approach both teaches them to use new media tools and helps the general learning.
- *Method/innovation:* Works on a drop-in basis, project based, group work, peer to peer learning, volunteer mentor buddies, PCs, animation station, Film and Music production facilities.
- *Stakeholders:* Local organisations, an NGO and a corporation fund.
- *Evaluation:* The project is a part of the annual Computer Clubhouse Network Evaluation.
- *Results:* Documentation on the basis of the CDYSB (City of Dublin Youth Services Board) methodology. Improvements in the members have been observed.

Digital Communities Programme

- *Target group:* Young people at risk of marginalisation, People with no or poor digital literacy, Unemployed people, People living in poverty and/or precarity, disadvantaged/deprived communities.
- *Years:* March 2003 and ongoing
- *Content:* Standard and tailored learning programmes intended to help break bad social inheritance.
- *Method/innovation:* A part of the wider Community Links programme, which involves schools, ICT and after school programmes, third level access programmes, music and community arts programmes.
- *Stakeholders:* Dublin Institute of Technology at the University and Hewlett Packard along with government and private sector partners.
- *Evaluation:* It appears that evaluation has taken place.
- *Results:* Evaluation results show positive outcomes at individual level, e.g. participation in learning as well as at community level, e.g. enhancing social capital.

ASC – Access, Skills and Content

- *Target group:* The primary targets are elders and people with disabilities, Furthermore women with home duties; tradesmen/skilled workers; workers in agriculture, forestry or fishing; and the unemployed are targeted.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* The ASC funds voluntary projects concerning digital literacy. Most of the funding goes to training in basic IT-skills. The rest supports the purchase of hardware/software and the construction of websites/community blogs.
- *Method/innovation:* See 'content'.
- *Stakeholders:* Local organisations, an NGO and a corporation fund.
- *Evaluation:* The project is a part of the annual Computer Clubhouse Network Evaluation.
- *Results:* Documentation on the basis of the CDYSB (City of Dublin Youth Services Board) methodology. Improvements in the members have been observed.

Italy

Non é M@i Troppo Tardi – RAI Literacy

- *Target group:* Senior citizens and housewives.
- *Years:* February 2004 - November 2004
- *Content:* Teaching of very basic e-skills to people outside the labour market through television programmes.
- *Method/innovation:* TV-programmes, PCs, online sites where the programmes can be seen.
- *Stakeholders:* Ministries and an inter-ministerial commission.
- *Evaluation:* No specific evaluation or documentation.
- *Results:* No documentation of the results, but Italy has a long experience with educational TV-programmes and the initiative has been continued in a new series of programmes specifically targeting Southern Italy.

Nonni su Internet

- *Target group:* The Roman population over the age of 60.
- *Years:* 2006 - 2007
- *Content:* Basic ICT-training for elders at local schools.
- *Method/innovation:* Certificates, PCs, internet.
- *Stakeholders:* Local organisations, an NGO and a corporation fund.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* The initiative is in its sixth reinstallment, which is an indicator of the success of the initiative.

E-learning Liguria

- *Target group:* The population over the age of 60.

- *Years:* From 2003 - ongoing
- *Content:* Creation of a network of Information Centres for Socialisation. Basic ICT-training for elders. After the courses, a training period based on e-learning methods may be attended.
- *Method/innovation:* Certificates, PCs, internet, eLearning.
- *Stakeholders:* The Region of Liguria and private companies.
- *Evaluation:* Unspecified.
- *Results:* The initiative was considered a success and was replicated for other groups.

418-Geron-Access

- *Target group:* Disabled and aged people.
- *Years:* From 2004 - ongoing
- *Content:* Strongly tailored teaching in basic ITC-skills.
- *Method/innovation:* Courses based on in-depth analysis of the needs of the target group. Person to person training.
- *Stakeholders:* The Marche Region, an academic institute and an association for disabled and aged people.
- *Evaluation:* Every action included in the project was assessed. For the digital literacy initiative, at the end of the initiative a questionnaire was addressed to the participants.
- *Results:* Important as to the methodology, not the magnitude. Future project could perhaps benefit from this.

Latvia

Latvia@World

- *Target group:* Unemployed, pensioners, disabled persons, employees of municipalities, health care and culture institutions, employees of SMEs.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Increasing accessibility of ICT and through e-services improving IT skills and competences.
- *Method/innovation:* Not elaborated in the report.
- *Stakeholders:* NGO.
- *Evaluation:* Other than internal follow-up, no specific information is available.
- *Results:* More than 15,000 people have been trained.

Open Door

- *Target group:* Adult population with a focus on people with disabilities.
- *Years:* From 2006 - ongoing
- *Content:* Tailored training and increased accessibility of ICT for disabled people.

- *Method/innovation:* Handicap-friendly PIAPs, mobile computer classroom, certificates, training of instructors, research on accessibility features for disabled IT-users.
- *Stakeholders:* NGO, corporation funding, academic institutional funding.
- *Evaluation:* Student evaluation forms, measurement of attendance, pilot project conducted, selected participants are interviewed at the end of the project year. Not specified whether or not a full evaluation report has been made.
- *Results:* Indications that the project is sustainable / ongoing.

Malta

My Web
- *Target group:* General public (housewives, blue-collar workers, unemployed and senior citizens in particular)
- *Years:* From 2002 - ongoing
- *Content:* Seeks to increase digital literacy as well as participants' use of Internet and e-mail.
- *Method/innovation:* Periodic training courses
- *Stakeholders:* The Ministry for IT and Investment of Malta
- *Evaluation:* Evaluation would have to be obtained from the stakeholder
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

HelloIT Community Training and Learning Centres
- *Target group:* Disadvantaged people, people with special needs, housewives, parents and children
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Aim to enhance digital skills and computer usage
- *Method/innovation:* Relevant courses as well as provision of computer/Internet access.
- *Stakeholders:* The Ministry for IT and Investment of Malta, local NGOs
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the responsible government officers.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Netherlands

Digitale Trapveldjes
- *Target group:* Inhabitants of urban problem areas
- *Years:* 2000 - 2004
- *Content:* Providing Internet access and teaching basic ICT skills
- *Method/innovation:* Creation of PIAPs in major cities across the country
- *Stakeholders:* The Ministry of Home Affairs as well as a number of private enterprises.

- *Evaluation:* Annual monitoring reports indicate the success of each individual project.
- *Results:* An estimated 1 million people has visited the 34 PIAPs set up creating enthusiasm among the local residents.

Seniorweb.nl

- *Target group:* Aimed primarily at senior citizens (55+)
- *Years:* From 1996 - ongoing
- *Content:* Use of Internet and computer in general.
- *Method/innovation:* Traditional courses and workshops aimed at/tailored to specific target group, website providing help set up.
- *Stakeholders:* Volunteers, public libraries, Rabobank
- *Evaluation:* Annual report available at http://www.seniorweb.nl/uploadedFiles/Over_SeniorWeb/Organisatie/jaarverslag_ 2006_pdf.pdf
- *Results:* Approximately 750,000 hits/month on website, 90,000 subscribers to newsletter, and 69,000 members in 2006 (steady increase since project start).

Web in de Wijk

- *Target group:* Almost all disadvantaged groups are targeted in this initiative (seniors (60+), disabled people, young people at risk of marginalisation, people with no or poor digital literacy, unemployed people, people living in poverty and/or precarity, disadvantaged/deprived communities, SMEs, associations and intermediaries, women, others)
- *Years:* From 2002 - ongoing
- *Content:* Computer and Internet usage as well as creation of a 'digital social network'
- *Method/innovation:* Locally developed courses tailored to specific area needs. Development of social networks, peer-to-peer training, and a digital platform to accommodate user's wants and needs.
- *Stakeholders:* WiN (Web in de Wijk) is a national association
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with all/some of the local implementers.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Norway

55pluss Data for Alle

- *Target group:* Senior citizens (55+)
- *Years:* From 2001 - ongoing
- *Content:* Creation of a useful website for senior citizens along with ICT-training
- *Method/innovation:* Internet based ICT courses, course material developed along the way, thus tailored to specific user requests and needs. Also classroom based courses.

- *Stakeholders:* The Høykult + partners
- *Evaluation:* Available online: http://www.55pluss.no/nyttig/rapporter.htm
- *Results:* More than 500 people participating in online ICT training courses thus far.

D@mes and D@ta - a St@ke for the Future

- *Target group:* Aimed at ethnic minority women
- *Years:* 2007 - 2008
- *Content:* Development of digital literacy skills (plus a more ambitious, holistic attempt to empower these women at large, building self-esteem and strengthening personal networks)
- *Method/innovation:* Basic ICT training as well as a program for 'empowering women'. Information and awareness building in the general public to help change general perceptions leading to racism and exclusion of the target group. Encouraging participation in civil- and minority women organisations.
- *Stakeholders:* Municipality of Oslo, Ministry of Administration and Public Reform + others
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the responsible municipal officers.
- *Results:* Still in implementation phase.

Poland

Unlimited Potential – Social Programme of Technological Skills for Poland

- *Target group:* Communities of villages and small towns, unemployed people, disabled people.
- *Years:* From 2003 - ongoing
- *Content:* Creating PIAPs and offering general ICT training
- *Method/innovation:* Free access to, and training in the use of, computers and Internet
- *Stakeholders:* Microsoft + local community centres
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the responsible Microsoft department.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

WebRepublic of Poland

- *Target group:* Rural areas (economically challenged)
- *Years:* From 2006 - ongoing
- *Content:* Providing access to, and training in use of, computer. Encourages citizen involvement and 'Information Society building'
- *Method/innovation:* Provision of PIAPs and computer training
- *Stakeholders:* TP Polish Telecom, local communities
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the responsible TP Polish Telecom department.

- *Results:* Not specified.

Let's Do IT Together

- *Target group:* Senior citizens
- *Years:* Not specified
- *Content:* Writing a computer literacy manual for senior citizens.
- *Method/innovation:* Creating and testing a manual by working together with the elders who are the target group of the eventual end product.
- *Stakeholders:* Partially subsidized by the EU
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the organisation.
- *Results:* Not specified

I Can Know More - the Open Computer Room for Middle-Aged and Elderly Women

- *Target group:* Middle-aged and elderly women
- *Years:* From 2004 - ongoing
- *Content:* Development of ICT skills of the target group
- *Method/innovation:* Establishment of PIAPs and provision of an instructor providing help and advice to develop ICT skills in target group.
- *Stakeholders:* OSKa (Information Centre for Women's Environments)
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with OSKa
- *Results:* Not specified

Portugal

Rede de Espaços Internet

- *Target group:* Disadvantaged, remote communities
- *Years:* From 1999 - ongoing
- *Content:* Providing Internet access to increase digital economic inclusion. Hardware and software to handle specific user needs. Informal learning environment.
- *Method/innovation:* Establishment of PIAPs and provision of instructors/mediators to assist users.
- *Stakeholders:* The national Knowledge Society Agency (UMIC) + local private partners.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with UMIC.
- *Results:* Approximately 3,000 PIAPs established

Romania

The Knowledge Economy Project

- *Target group:* Local communities in disadvantaged areas
- *Years:* 2005 - 2011

- *Content:* The establishment of approximately 200 multi-purpose local community e-networks and support of local human resource development to ensure understanding and acceptance of services provided.
- *Method/innovation:* Communities will obtain access to knowledge through a number of services and technologies including computers, the Internet, and communication services. Local networks will have multiple nodes such as schools, public administrations, libraries, and independent PIAPs.
- *Stakeholders:* The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, the World Bank
- *Evaluation:* Not specified.
- *Results:* Not specified.

equalSkills

- *Target group:* Specifically designed for those with no experience whatsoever of computers, but open to everyone.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Tailored computer training for the specific target group.
- *Method/innovation:* ECDL certificates awarded.
- *Stakeholders:* Public and private sector, along with educational institutions, social partners and several NGOs.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the responsible association.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Slovakia

Academy without Barriers

- *Target group:* Aurally disabled persons (deaf people)
- *Years:* From 2004 - ongoing
- *Content:* Tailored training to accommodate specific needs of the target group.
- *Method/innovation:* e-Learning as well as regular courses. Certificates awarded.
- *Stakeholders:* EKS (Evropská Kulturná Spoločnost) + public and private organisations, NGOs, international partners.
- *Evaluation:* Evaluation as far as testing participants' progress has taken place.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing.

Digital Stur's Movement in the Schools

- *Target group:* Overall population but with specific focus on those with little or no prior ICT skills (primarily women, senior citizens, unemployed persons and minorities according to this report)
- *Years:* 2005 - 2006
- *Content:* ICT training tailored to each individual school participating, but perhaps not tailored as much to the individual user.

- *Method/innovation:* Traditional ECDL courses, but also online teaching materials and user specific courses developed. Award of certificates.
- *Stakeholders:* The Ministry of Transport, Post and Telecommunication of the Slovak Republic.
- *Evaluation:* Each school participating has been evaluating their own project and these are available at: www.telecom.gov.sk/index.php?ids=13971 (English version available at the top)
- *Results:* More than 65,000 users have participated thus far spread over 829 schools meaning the initiative has reached quite far considering the size of Slovakia (5.5 million citizens)

Slovenia

Unlimited Potential

- *Target group:* Aimed at unemployed, underprivileged youth, seniors and to a lesser extent people with disabilities.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* ICT courses following the Microsoft DL Curriculum.
- *Method/innovation:* Free suite of DL courses developed by Microsoft and implemented by a national organisation in collaboration with local youth action programmes in areas of high unemployment.
- *Stakeholders:* Microsoft is the founder, various CTCs (Community Technology Centres) are the implementers.
- *Evaluation:* Project is evaluated only through the number of people trained and the number of people who have otherwise benefited from it. For any formal evaluation a primary research will be required in terms of interviews with the responsible department officials of Microsoft.
- *Results:* Over 1,100 people had passed the training course by August 2007, while more than 3,000 people have benefited from the CTCs.

MOBILATORIJ

- *Target group:* General public however aims to bridge the digital divide indicating it is first and foremost meant for the digitally illiterate.
- *Years:* From 2001 - ongoing
- *Content:* Mobile PIAP sparking computer, and Internet, interest in all areas of Slovenia.
- *Method/innovation:* Mobile unit going from town to town teaching residents about the use of Internet and computer in general through assistance as well as regular classroom-like teaching.
- *Stakeholders:* Mobilatorij, funded by the private company Mobitel.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with Mobilatorij/Mobitel.
- *Results:* Relatively large number of participants and the project is ongoing although only scheduled to last one year, thereby indicating sustainable results.

Kiberpipa

- *Target group:* Open to everyone but specifically aimed at young people, including students.
- *Years:* From 2000 - ongoing
- *Content:* Development of information society, and provision of access to and knowledge about the use of computers. Developing media literacy and online cooperation. Open lectures on open source tools and innovative business management. Digital art gallery, computer museum, video production lab.
- *Method/innovation:* All users of the PIAP are given the opportunity to create new content to the Internet platform, or develop new software. Traditional lectures given, all of which are also available in video format online.
- *Stakeholders:* Broad spectre of involved stakeholders ranging from public over private to NGOs. The main stakeholder is Kiberpipa (Cyberpipe).
- *Evaluation:* Indication that the project has received recognition of some sort but not specified any further.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Spain

See You in the Virtual Square

- *Target group:* Immigrants
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Aims to create dialogue across cultures in order to enhance understanding.
- *Method/innovation:* Creation of blogs for the immigrants to maintain. Workshops to teach them how to do that.
- *Stakeholders:* Public, private, educational, NGOs
- *Evaluation:* No evaluation has taken place however a guide on how to implement the initiative elsewhere has been published (ISBN-10:84-690-0868-4).
- *Results:* Not specified.

Red Conecta/Conecta Joven

- *Target group:* Young people, women, unemployed, immigrants, and ethnic minorities.
- *Years:* Ongoing
- *Content:* Facilitating access to the Internet, increasing social participation, and developing teaching material tailored to user needs.
- *Method/innovation:* Not specified
- *Stakeholders:* Fundación Esplai + host of NGOs
- *Evaluation:* Not specified
- *Results:* More than 30,000 people have attained computer skills in the telecommunications centres involved in this project.

Nuevos Centros del Conocimiento/New Knowledge Centres

- *Target group:* People at age 16+ in Extremadura, with special attention paid to groups at high risk of being excluded from the Information Society
- *Years:* 1999 and ongoing
- *Content:* All content is individually prepared and tailored to the group and the individual-
- *Method/innovation:* Use of open source software and specially developed motivation and learning model-including personalisation to the user needs.
- *Stakeholders:* co-financed by the ESF and the Extremenian Regional Ministry of Economy, Innovation and Commerce. The management of this initiative is taken care of by the Popular Universities Association of Extremadura
- *Evaluation:* Yes
- *Results:* Since 1999, the number of visits to the NKC is 1,551,945. The number of formal users of NKC is 130,178

XenoCLIPSe

- *Target group:* The primary target group is migrants and ethnic minorities. Other target groups are: People with no or poor digital literacy, disadvantaged/deprived communities, SMEs, associations and intermediaries.
- *Years:* 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Creation of media (videos) by minorities to undermine the prejudices in the general public towards minorities.
- *Method/innovation:* Face-to-face and on-line training for target group, development of an address book
- *Stakeholders:* NGO XenoMedia, several European universities (Barcelona, Köln, Stavanger, Gent)
- *Evaluation:* Questionnaires have been filled out from the participants in the project. Constant follow-up by the xenoclipse.net network.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Cibervoluntarios

- *Target group:* Individuals and communities at risk of exclusion from the information society due to age, gender, professional and social environment, lack of time, motivation, and/or economic resources, knowledge or skills including: Elderly, women, disabled, people with poor education and training background, rural inhabitants and small townships, volunteers at other NGOs.
- *Years:* From 2001 - ongoing
- *Content:* Free training courses in Internet use aimed at making technology simple and useful for daily life; pre-consultations in order to remove any lingering doubts and fears while increasing the awareness about the importance of ICT skills and competences and about how technology may affect the quality of life; follow-up workshops.
- *Method/innovation:* Reliance on volunteers, start as social movement (now registered non-profit organisation) and strong social conscience, comprehensive system of continued learning.

- *Stakeholders:* The Cyber Foundation, volunteers, VIT@LIS (founding partner) and the Club of Rome
- *Evaluation:* Not specified
- *Results:* Not specified – but project is ongoing.

Sweden

SeniorNet Sweden
- *Target group:* Senior citizens
- *Years:* From 1998 - ongoing
- *Content:* Bridging the digital divide via tailored, and self-made, courses.
- *Method/innovation:* Digital literacy competence development measures, motivation strengthening and/or awareness raising, user-creation of website as a key tool.
- *Stakeholders:* Community groups, NGOs, private enterprises.
- *Evaluation:* Not specified
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

BASTA Work Cooperative
- *Target group:* Marginalised groups, especially long term unemployed with personal or social problems.
- *Years:* From 1997 - ongoing
- *Content:* Increasing digital literacy and employability by 'hiring' marginalised people to work in BASTA.
- *Method/innovation:* Treating participants as colleagues rather than clients.
- *Stakeholders:* BASTA + a number of NGOs and public sector organisations
- *Evaluation:* Indication of plans to evaluate but has not been carried out as of yet.
- *Results:* Many hundreds have been employed at BASTA, project has expanded to other areas of Sweden.

United Kingdom

UK Online Centres
- *Target group:* 95% of the online centres serve the general public. The remaining 5% focus on: disabled people, older people in residential homes, adults with learning disabilities, mentally ill people, unemployed, carers/care staff, seniors (50+) and homeless people.
- *Years:* From 2000 - ongoing
- *Content:* Access to Internet, 95% also offer one-to-one support.
- *Method/innovation:* Establishments of PIAPs in public libraries and community centres.
- *Stakeholders:* Learning and Skills Council, New Opportunities Fund + others (both public and private)

- *Evaluation:* Several follow-up surveys and research documents are at hand (for a list please refer to the 'Approaches to document the results of the initiative' in the UK Annex, case 1).
- *Results:* Over 105,000 computer terminals established.

ESF Pathways Project in Prisons and Probation

- *Target group:* Offenders in last two years of prison sentence or on probation. A significant share of the participants had some form of disability and/or was from ethnic minorities.
- *Years:* 2005 - 2006
- *Content:* Level 2 qualification in skills for life (literacy and numeracy), ECDL and CLAIT, online learning resources.
- *Method/innovation:* E-learning, onsite training and telephone support. Prison staff acted as tutors; special system developed to accommodate security requirements.
- *Stakeholders:* Project managed by Shropshire County Council, funded by European Regional Development Fund and Advantage West Midlands.
- *Evaluation:* Evaluation has taken place focusing on barriers; 28% of participants gained qualifications; 43% employment rate.
- *Results:* Over 2800 offenders at 20 prisons took part in the courses.

IT for the Terrified

- *Target group:* General public, but elders in particular.
- *Years:* 1998 - 2004
- *Content:* Provision of PIAPs and tailored training for senior citizens.
- *Method/innovation:* Run as a community venture, develops introductory and ongoing training.
- *Stakeholders:* IT for the Terrified (charity), schools, Sedgemoor District Council.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with participants and/or the main stakeholder.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Internet Rangers

- *Target group:* Older members of family who are 'shy' of computers.
- *Years:* From 2005 - ongoing
- *Content:* Encouragement and awards to young people in order to get them to start/continue to help older people in their families learn ICT-skills.
- *Method/innovation:* Peer-to-peer learning, young people in family teaching older people in family in the use of computers. Awards given to recognize the efforts of the youth.
- *Stakeholders:* BT (British Telecommunications PLC)
- *Evaluation:* Not available, but there are indications that an evaluation is under way.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Shropshire Broadplaces

- *Target group:* Open to general public, but applies especially to ICT-illiterates, and students with no access to broadband at home.
- *Years:* 2003 - 2007
- *Content:* Aims to improve the confidence with and use of ICT.
- *Method/innovation:* Drop in sessions makes the nature of the courses rather informal.
- *Stakeholders:* Project managed by Shropshire County Council, funded by European Regional Development Fund and Advantage West Midlands.
- *Evaluation:* External evaluations including user feedback have been prepared every year.
- *Results:* Over 30,000 people had visited the centres by June 2007.

Innovations in ICT and Literacies Programme

- *Target group:* People with limited education, particularly young adults. Unemployed and workers facing redundancy, people with English as a second language, people living in disadvantaged areas, workers in low skilled jobs, people with low incomes, people with health problems and disabilities.
- *Years:* 2004 - 2007
- *Content:* User-driven training programs (tailored to their specific needs)
- *Method/innovation:* Central fund making resources available to individual projects aiming to develop ICT skills in some way. Aims at developing practical skills for personal achievement.
- *Stakeholders:* Public and educational sector as well as NGOs
- *Evaluation:* Independent evaluation carried out available at: http://www.aloscotland.com/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/ALO_EXECUTIVESUMMARY_EVALUATION.pdf. It is comparable with Welsh initiative Wales Co-operative Central.
- *Results:* Not specified

USA

North Carolina's e-NC Authority

- *Target group:* General public but rural and distressed urban areas in particular.
- *Years:* From 2000 - ongoing
- *Content:* Aims to bridge the digital divide by providing Internet access to everybody.
- *Method/innovation:* Establish PIAPs and provide training in how to use the Internet.
- *Stakeholders:* e-NC (grassroot initiative, publicly funded)
- *Evaluation:* Annual reports as well as user surveys available on the project's homepage: www.e-nc.org
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is (probably) ongoing

Street-Level Youth Media
- *Target group:* Youth (age 8-22)
- *Years:* From 1993 - ongoing
- *Content:* Using all sorts of media youth get the chance to address community issues and socialize across 'gang-affiliations'.
- *Method/innovation:* Media production workshops with social-personal agenda.
- *Stakeholders:* Started out as a project of two artists and a teacher, now is funded by a host of public and private organisations.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the Street-Level organisation.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

ZeroDivide (previously Community Technology Foundation)
- *Target group:* Low-income, urban, disadvantaged youth, minorities, disabled, people with learning disabilities, policy-makers.
- *Years:* From 1998 - ongoing
- *Content:* Aims to create, capture and distribute content which influences public debate.
- *Method/innovation:* Web portal developments for target groups, Internet access and training (developed with the users to make it apply to their individual needs).
- *Stakeholders:* Pacific Bell, SBS Communications + 134 community organisations, charitable organisations, etc.
- *Evaluation:* Each individual project has been required to make a final report on the results and these should be available via the project homepage.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Osiris Organisation
- *Target group:* Youth at risk
- *Years:* From1996 - ongoing
- *Content:* After-school computer training programs
- *Method/innovation:* Traditional computer training, integrated with entrepreneurial and life skills.
- *Stakeholders:* Osiris Organisation (main), public institutions, private companies.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of interviews with the Osiris Organisation and with the participants in the project.
- *Results:* Not specified – but the project is ongoing

Alliance for Technology Access
- *Target group:* Disabled people
- *Years:* From1988 - ongoing
- *Content:* Possibility to explore the world of computers in different resource centres.

- *Method/innovation:* Face-to-face technical support and assistance is provided at the resource centres.
- *Stakeholders:* Local grassroots resource centres, public and private contributors.
- *Evaluation:* Will require primary research in terms of research of individual centres and initiatives.
- *Results:* 62,000 people with disabilities served every year. Apart from this not specified – but the project is ongoing

Net Literacy

- *Target group:* Poor and underserved areas, elderly
- *Years:* From 2003 - ongoing
- *Content:* Provision of refurbished PC and Internet facilities and teaching computer and Internet use as well as Internet safety skills.
- *Method/innovation:* Promotes senior citizen computer and Internet literacy by building public computer labs, teaching senior citizens (and especially those who are mobility impaired or lack reliable transportation) computer and Internet skills, and increasing public awareness to this critical issue. Person to person training working patiently with the individual course participants.
- *Stakeholders:* Non-profit voluntary organisation established and run by students (400 volunteers) in collaboration with local governments and private companies in four states in the US.
- *Evaluation:* Evaluation has taken place focusing on achievements in terms of number of participants. User feedback also available. See further, www.netliteracy.org.
- *Results:* 60,000 people have gained access to computers and the Internet and many of these people have gained good ICT skills facilitated by the personal tuition.

European Projects

The PIC project

- *Target group:* Public Internet centres throughout Europe
- *Years:* October 2005 and ended in September 2007
- *Content:* Studies, good practice analysis and guidelines
- *Method/innovation:* Models for undiscriminatory public internet centres
- *Stakeholders:* Co financed through European Commission programme. Six partners including University and operators of networks of PICs
- *Evaluation:* Yes
- *Results:* Published guidelines, online database of good practices, a book, three study reports.

e-Migra – for Migrants' Digital Culture in Europe

- *Target group:* Organisations interested in digital literacy initiatives aimed at immigrants
- *Years:* 2005 - 2006
- *Content:* Guidelines, studies and evaluations

- *Method/innovation:* It has made a large scale research and collection of material, analysis, and production of new knowledge (criteria and examples of best practices and guidelines) in relation migrants and digital culture
- *Stakeholders:* Several organisations involved in digital literacy initiatives aimed at immigrants
- *Evaluation:* Yes
- *Results:* A database with more than 130 best practice cases; a guide for migrants' digital culture in Europe; a study report

Grandparents and Grandchildren

- *Target group:* Young people and especially their elderly relations
- *Years:* From 2006 - ongoing
- *Content:* Generalised learning model and standard content in several languages
- *Method/innovation:* Innovative model where young people recruit and train their grandparents
- *Stakeholders:* Scienter and 9 national representatives in different countries each responsible for national dissemination
- *Evaluation:* Yes
- *Results:* More than 700 participants (young and old) to date.

Annex 2 – Relevant Data Tables

The tables below are based on the assessment of each of the 464 initiatives identified during the initial mapping of digital literacy (DL) initiatives across 32 countries.

Rationale vs. Target group

	i. Population/Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Educational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Improve employability	34	3	9	18	40	21	0	12	16	17	11	4	16	6	1	99
ii. Improve quality of life	11	1	2	5	6	30	1	10	7	5	3	1	5	2	1	54
iii. Improve DL overall	113	68	20	24	45	57	1	62	27	38	28	9	35	8	3	322
iv. Condition-specific improvements	9	24	6	5	5	23	2	5	2	3	4	2	4	0	1	61
v. Citizenship development	14	3	1	3	1	4	1	7	5	5	3	1	3	0	0	33
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	48	16	9	15	25	50	2	38	21	22	20	9	22	6	2	170
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	46	28	4	11	8	12	1	11	9	5	23	8	10	0	2	105
viii. Other rationale	5	7	1	2	1	1	2	5	2	3	3	0	4	0	0	21
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Improve employability	34 %	3 %	9 %	18 %	40 %	21 %	0 %	12 %	16 %	17 %	11 %	4 %	16 %	6 %	1 %	100 %
ii. Improve quality of life	20 %	2 %	4 %	9 %	11 %	56 %	2 %	19 %	13 %	9 %	6 %	2 %	9 %	4 %	2 %	100 %
iii. Improve DL overall	35 %	21 %	6 %	7 %	14 %	18 %	0 %	19 %	8 %	12 %	9 %	3 %	11 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
iv. Condition-specific improvements	15 %	39 %	10 %	8 %	8 %	38 %	3 %	8 %	3 %	5 %	7 %	3 %	7 %	0 %	2 %	100 %
v. Citizenship development	42 %	9 %	3 %	9 %	3 %	12 %	3 %	21 %	15 %	15 %	9 %	3 %	9 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	28 %	9 %	5 %	9 %	15 %	29 %	1 %	22 %	12 %	13 %	12 %	5 %	13 %	4 %	1 %	100 %
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	44 %	27%	4 %	10 %	8 %	11 %	1 %	10 %	9 %	5 %	22 %	8 %	10 %	0 %	2 %	100 %
viii. Other rationale	24 %	33 %	5 %	10 %	5 %	5 %	10 %	24 %	10 %	14 %	14 %	0 %	19 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Improve employability	24 %	3 %	38 %	55 %	70 %	22 %	0 %	15 %	44 %	37 %	31 %	29 %	36 %	55 %	33 %	21 %
ii. Improve quality of life	8 %	1%	8 %	15 %	11 %	32 %	17 %	12 %	19 %	11 %	8 %	7 %	11 %	18 %	33 %	12 %
iii. Improve DL overall	80 %	76 %	83 %	73 %	79 %	60 %	17 %	76 %	75 %	83 %	78 %	64 %	78 %	73 %	100 %	69 %
iv. Condition-specific improvements	6 %	27 %	25 %	15 %	9 %	24 %	33 %	6 %	6 %	7 %	11 %	14 %	9 %	0 %	33 %	13 %
v. Citizenship development	10 %	3 %	4 %	9 %	2 %	4 %	17 %	9 %	14 %	11 %	8 %	7 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	7 %
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	34 %	18 %	38 %	45 %	44 %	53 %	33 %	46 %	58 %	48 %	56 %	64 %	49 %	55 %	67 %	37 %
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	32 %	31 %	17 %	33 %	14 %	13 %	17 %	13 %	25 %	11 %	64 %	57 %	22 %	0 %	67 %	23 %
viii. Other rationale	4 %	8 %	4 %	6 %	2 %	1 %	33 %	6 %	6 %	7 %	8 %	0 %	9 %	0 %	0 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Target group

	i. Population/ Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Educa-tional system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Large	39	35	12	13	9	10	0	14	7	7	11	5	10	0	1	102
ii. Medium	20	14	3	5	16	10	1	14	8	8	14	3	6	3	1	67
iii. Small	27	14	4	6	16	25	3	23	10	15	3	3	12	5	1	108
iv. Not known	56	27	5	9	16	50	2	31	11	16	8	3	17	3	0	187
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Large	38 %	34 %	12 %	13 %	9 %	10 %	0 %	14 %	7 %	7 %	11 %	5 %	10 %	0 %	1 %	100 %
ii. Medium	30 %	21 %	4 %	7 %	24 %	15 %	1 %	21 %	12 %	12 %	21 %	4 %	9 %	4 %	1 %	100 %
iii. Small	25 %	13 %	4 %	6 %	15 %	23 %	3 %	21 %	9 %	14 %	3 %	3 %	11 %	5 %	1 %	100 %
iv. Not known	30 %	14 %	3 %	5 %	9 %	27 %	1 %	17 %	6 %	9 %	4 %	2 %	9 %	2 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Large	27 %	39 %	50 %	39 %	16 %	11 %	0 %	17 %	19 %	15 %	31 %	36 %	22 %	0 %	33 %	22 %
ii. Medium	14 %	16 %	13 %	15 %	28 %	11 %	17 %	17 %	22 %	17 %	39 %	21 %	13 %	27 %	33 %	14 %
iii. Small	19 %	16 %	17 %	18 %	28 %	26 %	50 %	28 %	28 %	33 %	8 %	21 %	27 %	45 %	33 %	23 %
iv. Not known	39 %	30 %	21 %	27 %	28 %	53 %	33 %	38 %	31 %	35 %	22 %	21 %	38 %	27 %	0 %	40 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Large	19	7	81	17	10	40	49	8	102
ii. Medium	23	7	53	7	2	31	21	2	67
iii. Small	26	15	78	14	12	46	8	4	108
iv. Not known	31	25	110	22	9	52	27	7	187
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Large	19 %	7 %	79 %	17 %	10 %	39 %	48 %	8 %	100 %
ii. Medium	34 %	10 %	79 %	10 %	3 %	46 %	31 %	3 %	100 %
iii. Small	24 %	14 %	72 %	13 %	11 %	43 %	7 %	4 %	100 %
iv. Not known	17 %	13 %	59 %	12 %	5 %	28 %	14 %	4 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Large	19 %	13 %	25 %	28 %	30 %	24 %	47 %	38 %	22 %
ii. Medium	23 %	13 %	16 %	11 %	6 %	18 %	20 %	10 %	14 %
iii. Small	26 %	28 %	24 %	23 %	36 %	27 %	8 %	19 %	23 %
iv. Not known	31 %	46 %	34 %	36 %	27 %	31 %	26 %	33 %	40 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Level vs. Target group

	i. Population/Disadvantaged groups at large	ii. Educational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Unemployed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural development	xii. Urban development	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. National	89	67	17	21	29	52	4	44	13	21	22	5	21	6	1	268
ii. Regional	31	12	7	9	11	22	1	18	7	14	8	3	11	0	0	88
iii. Local	20	10	0	3	16	16	1	19	16	11	5	6	13	5	2	86
iv. Not known	2	1	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	22
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. National	33 %	25 %	6 %	8 %	11 %	19 %	1 %	16 %	5 %	8 %	8 %	2 %	8 %	2 %	0 %	100 %
ii. Regional	35 %	14 %	8 %	10 %	13 %	25 %	1 %	20 %	8 %	16 %	9 %	3 %	13 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
iii. Local	23 %	12 %	0 %	3 %	19 %	19 %	1 %	22 %	19 %	13 %	6 %	7 %	15 %	6 %	2 %	100 %
iv. Not known	9 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	5 %	23 %	0 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. National	63 %	74 %	71 %	64 %	51 %	55 %	67 %	54 %	36 %	46 %	61 %	36 %	47 %	55 %	33 %	58 %
ii. Regional	22 %	13 %	29 %	27 %	19 %	23 %	17 %	22 %	19 %	30 %	22 %	21 %	24 %	0 %	0 %	19 %
iii. Local	14 %	11 %	0 %	9 %	28 %	17 %	17 %	23 %	44 %	24 %	14 %	43 %	29 %	45 %	67 %	19 %
iv. Not known	1 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	5 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Level vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. National	54	41	188	41	20	94	68	12	268
ii. Regional	22	4	68	6	5	34	22	5	88
iii. Local	23	7	62	11	8	39	13	4	86
iv. Not known	0	2	4	3	0	3	2	0	22
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. National	20 %	15 %	70 %	15 %	7 %	35 %	25 %	4 %	100 %
ii. Regional	25 %	5 %	77 %	7 %	6 %	39 %	25 %	6 %	100 %
iii. Local	27 %	8 %	72 %	13 %	9 %	45 %	15 %	5 %	100 %
iv. Not known	0 %	9 %	18 %	14 %	0 %	14 %	9 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. National	55 %	76 %	58 %	67 %	61 %	55 %	65 %	57 %	58 %
ii. Regional	22 %	7 %	21 %	10 %	15 %	20 %	21 %	24 %	19 %
iii. Local	23 %	13 %	19 %	18 %	24 %	23 %	12 %	19 %	19 %
iv. Not known	0 %	4 %	1 %	5 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Rationale

	i. Large	ii. Medium	iii. Small	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. National	84	49	34	101	268
ii. Regional	15	8	25	39	88
iii. Local	3	9	49	25	86
iv. Not known	0	1	0	7	22
All initiatives	102	67	108	187	464
i. National	31 %	18 %	13 %	38 %	100 %
ii. Regional	17 %	9 %	28 %	44 %	100 %
iii. Local	3 %	10 %	57 %	29 %	100 %
iv. Not known	0 %	5 %	0 %	32 %	100 %
All initiatives	22 %	14 %	23 %	40 %	100 %
i. National	82 %	73 %	31 %	54 %	58 %
ii. Regional	15 %	12 %	23 %	21 %	19 %
iii. Local	3 %	13 %	45 %	13 %	19 %
iv. Not known	0 %	1 %	0 %	4 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Accessibility vs. Target groups

	i. Population/Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Educational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initia-tives
i. Exclusively	13	11	1	4	1	6	1	3	3	1	10	3	4	0	1	41
ii. Significantly	22	10	3	4	6	15	3	9	4	3	12	2	5	1	0	58
iii. Partly	26	10	1	7	10	31	0	19	8	10	6	6	5	3	2	88
iv. Not at all	80	58	19	16	39	43	2	51	20	31	7	3	31	7	0	258
v. Not known	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	19
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Exclusively	32 %	27 %	2 %	10 %	2 %	15 %	2 %	7 %	7 %	2 %	24 %	7 %	10 %	0 %	2 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	38 %	17 %	5 %	7 %	10 %	26 %	5 %	16 %	7 %	5 %	21 %	3 %	9 %	2 %	0 %	100 %
iii. Partly	30 %	11 %	1 %	8 %	11 %	35 %	0 %	22 %	9 %	11 %	7 %	7 %	6 %	3 %	2 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	31 %	22 %	7 %	6 %	15 %	17 %	1 %	20 %	8 %	12 %	3 %	1 %	12 %	3 %	0 %	100 %
v. Not known	5 %	5 %	0 %	11 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	5 %	5 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	9 %	12 %	4 %	12 %	2 %	6 %	17 %	4 %	8 %	2 %	28 %	21 %	9 %	0 %	33 %	9 %
ii. Significantly	15 %	11 %	13 %	12 %	11 %	16 %	50 %	11 %	11 %	7 %	33 %	14 %	11 %	9 %	0 %	13 %
iii. Partly	18 %	11 %	4 %	21 %	18 %	33 %	0 %	23 %	22 %	22 %	17 %	43 %	11 %	27 %	67 %	19 %
iv. Not at all	56 %	64 %	79 %	48 %	68 %	45 %	33 %	62 %	56 %	67 %	19 %	21 %	69 %	64 %	0 %	56 %
v. Not known	1 %	1 %	0 %	6 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	3 %	2 %	3 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	4 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Accessibility vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	4	5	22	3	1	19	36	0	41
ii. Significantly	13	8	40	11	7	27	41	4	58
iii. Partly	16	17	65	9	5	37	23	1	88
iv. Not at all	64	23	194	38	20	86	5	16	258
v. Not known	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	19
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Exclusively	10 %	12 %	54 %	7 %	2 %	46 %	88 %	0 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	22 %	14 %	69 %	19 %	12 %	47 %	71 %	7 %	100 %
iii. Partly	18 %	19 %	74 %	10 %	6 %	42 %	26 %	1 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	25 %	9 %	75 %	15 %	8 %	33 %	2 %	6 %	100 %
v. Not known	11 %	5 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	4 %	9 %	7 %	5 %	3 %	11 %	34 %	0 %	9 %
ii. Significantly	13 %	15 %	12 %	18 %	21 %	16 %	39 %	19 %	13 %
iii. Partly	16 %	31 %	20 %	15 %	15 %	22 %	22 %	5 %	19 %
iv. Not at all	65 %	43 %	60 %	62 %	61 %	51 %	5 %	76 %	56 %
v. Not known	2 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	4 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Usability vs. Target group

	i. Population/ Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu-cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	0	1	1	0	0	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
ii. Significantly	19	26	6	6	12	44	4	18	6	12	6	4	12	1	2	117
iii. Partly	41	25	5	7	13	21	2	34	15	16	8	4	12	5	0	127
iv. Not at all	79	37	12	17	31	17	0	28	13	16	18	5	21	5	1	160
v. Not known	3	1	0	3	1	2	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	45
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Exclusively	0 %	7 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	73 %	0 %	13 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	16 %	22 %	5 %	5 %	10 %	38 %	3 %	15 %	5 %	10 %	5 %	3 %	10 %	1 %	2 %	100 %
iii. Partly	32 %	20 %	4 %	6 %	10 %	17 %	2 %	27 %	12 %	13 %	6 %	3 %	9 %	4 %	0 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	49 %	23 %	8 %	11 %	19 %	11 %	0 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	11 %	3 %	13 %	3 %	1 %	100 %
v. Not known	7 %	2 %	0 %	7 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	0 %	4 %	4 %	9 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	0 %	1 %	4 %	0 %	0 %	12 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	3 %
ii. Significantly	13 %	29 %	25 %	18 %	21 %	46 %	67 %	22 %	17 %	26 %	17 %	29 %	27 %	9 %	67 %	25 %
iii. Partly	29 %	28 %	21 %	21 %	23 %	22 %	33 %	41 %	42 %	35 %	22 %	29 %	27 %	45 %	0 %	27 %
iv. Not at all	56 %	41 %	50 %	52 %	54 %	18 %	0 %	34 %	36 %	35 %	50 %	36 %	47 %	45 %	33 %	34 %
v. Not known	2 %	1 %	0 %	9 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	6 %	4 %	11 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	10 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Usability vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	1	8	6	4	0	5	0	1	15
ii. Significantly	24	22	77	32	7	48	18	5	117
iii. Partly	28	10	89	20	17	46	27	6	127
iv. Not at all	43	12	147	5	8	67	58	9	160
v. Not known	3	2	3	0	1	4	2	0	45
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Exclusively	7 %	53 %	40 %	27 %	0 %	33 %	0 %	7 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	21 %	19 %	66 %	27 %	6 %	41 %	15 %	4 %	100 %
iii. Partly	22 %	8 %	70 %	16 %	13 %	36 %	21 %	5 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	27 %	8 %	92 %	3 %	5 %	42 %	36 %	6 %	100 %
v. Not known	7 %	4 %	7 %	0 %	2 %	9 %	4 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	1 %	15 %	2 %	7 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	5 %	3 %
ii. Significantly	24 %	41 %	24 %	52 %	21 %	28 %	17 %	24 %	25 %
iii. Partly	28 %	19 %	28 %	33 %	52 %	27 %	26 %	29 %	27 %
iv. Not at all	43 %	22 %	46 %	8 %	24 %	39 %	55 %	43 %	34 %
v. Not known	3 %	4 %	1 %	0 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	10 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Usability vs. Target group

	i. Exclusively	ii. Significantly	iii. Partly	iv. Not at all	v. Not known	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	0	1	10	29	1	41
ii. Significantly	1	19	15	23	0	58
iii. Partly	3	33	19	28	5	88
iv. Not at all	11	64	83	100	0	258
v. Not known	0	0	0	0	5	19
All initiatives	15	117	127	160	45	464
i. Exclusively	0 %	2 %	24 %	71 %	2 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	2 %	33 %	26 %	40 %	0 %	100 %
iii. Partly	3 %	38 %	22 %	32 %	6 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	4 %	25 %	32 %	39 %	0 %	100 %
v. Not known	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	26 %	100 %
All initiatives	3 %	25 %	27 %	34 %	10 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	0 %	1 %	8 %	18 %	2 %	9 %
ii. Significantly	7 %	16 %	12 %	14 %	0 %	13 %
iii. Partly	20 %	28 %	15 %	18 %	11 %	19 %
iv. Not at all	73 %	55 %	65 %	63 %	0 %	56 %
v. Not known	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	11 %	4 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Target group

	i. Population/Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Educational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Public	52	45	4	10	10	19	1	14	9	7	6	3	11	5	0	151
ii. Public-NGO	35	16	11	14	25	31	2	29	12	19	12	4	22	2	0	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	32	13	1	4	10	10	1	12	6	8	11	2	3	2	2	69
iv. Public-Private	10	13	2	0	4	4	0	6	3	4	2	1	4	2	0	35
v. NGO	8	1	4	2	3	21	2	6	2	7	1	2	3	0	0	43
vi. NGO-Private	4	0	1	3	4	8	0	12	3	1	3	1	2	0	1	23
vii. Private	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	8
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Public	34 %	30 %	3 %	7 %	7 %	13 %	1 %	9 %	6 %	5 %	4 %	2 %	7 %	3 %	0 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	29 %	13 %	9 %	12 %	21 %	26 %	2 %	24 %	10 %	16 %	10 %	3 %	18 %	2 %	0 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	46 %	19 %	1 %	6 %	14 %	14 %	1 %	17 %	9 %	12 %	16 %	3 %	4 %	3 %	3 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	29 %	37 %	6 %	0 %	11 %	11 %	0 %	17 %	9 %	11 %	6 %	3 %	11 %	6 %	0 %	100 %
v. NGO	19 %	2 %	9 %	5 %	7 %	49 %	5 %	14 %	5 %	16 %	2 %	5 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	17 %	0 %	4 %	13 %	17 %	35 %	0 %	52 %	13 %	4 %	13 %	4 %	9 %	0 %	4 %	100 %
vii. Private	13 %	25 %	13 %	0 %	13 %	25 %	0 %	38 %	13 %	0 %	13 %	13 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Public	37 %	50 %	17 %	30 %	18 %	20 %	17 %	17 %	25 %	15 %	17 %	21 %	24 %	45 %	0 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	25 %	18 %	46 %	42 %	44 %	33 %	33 %	35 %	33 %	41 %	33 %	29 %	49 %	18 %	0 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	23 %	14 %	4 %	12 %	18 %	11 %	17 %	15 %	17 %	17 %	31 %	14 %	7 %	18 %	67 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	7 %	14 %	8 %	0 %	7 %	4 %	0 %	7 %	8 %	9 %	6 %	7 %	9 %	18 %	0 %	8 %
v. NGO	6 %	1 %	17 %	6 %	5 %	22 %	33 %	7 %	6 %	15 %	3 %	14 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	3 %	0 %	4 %	9 %	7 %	8 %	0 %	15 %	8 %	2 %	8 %	7 %	4 %	0 %	33 %	5 %
vii. Private	1 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	4 %	3 %	0 %	3 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Public	26	12	107	22	11	49	45	6	151
ii. Public-NGO	38	11	95	15	6	57	22	7	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	17	6	60	4	8	28	18	6	69
iv. Public-Private	5	1	21	9	1	9	12	1	35
v. NGO	6	19	20	9	5	12	3	1	43
vi. NGO-Private	5	4	15	2	1	9	4	0	23
vii. Private	2	1	4	0	1	6	1	0	8
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Public	17 %	8 %	71 %	15 %	7 %	32 %	30 %	4 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	31 %	9 %	79 %	12 %	5 %	47 %	18 %	6 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	25 %	9 %	87 %	6 %	12 %	41 %	26 %	9 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	14 %	3 %	60 %	26 %	3 %	26 %	34 %	3 %	100 %
v. NGO	14 %	44 %	47 %	21 %	12 %	28 %	7 %	2 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	22 %	17 %	65 %	9 %	4 %	39 %	17 %	0 %	100 %
vii. Private	25 %	13 %	50 %	0 %	13 %	75 %	13 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Public	26 %	22 %	33 %	36 %	33 %	29 %	43 %	29 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	38 %	20 %	30 %	25 %	18 %	34 %	21 %	33 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	17 %	11 %	19 %	7 %	24 %	16 %	17 %	29 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	5 %	2 %	7 %	15 %	3 %	5 %	11 %	5 %	8 %
v. NGO	6 %	35 %	6 %	15 %	15 %	7 %	3 %	5 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	5 %	7 %	5 %	3 %	3 %	5 %	4 %	0 %	5 %
vii. Private	2 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	3 %	4 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Evaluation vs. Target group

	i. Population/Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu-cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	25	21	5	11	10	12	2	16	9	9	14	7	15	0	2	82
ii. Irregular	26	17	6	4	9	10	0	12	4	5	5	1	7	4	0	67
iii. No evaluation	50	31	10	9	25	44	3	30	15	22	6	4	12	7	1	184
iv. Not known	41	21	3	9	13	29	1	24	8	10	11	2	11	0	0	131
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	30 %	26 %	6 %	13 %	12 %	15 %	2 %	20 %	11 %	11 %	17 %	9 %	18 %	0 %	2 %	100 %
ii. Irregular	39 %	25 %	9 %	6 %	13 %	15 %	0 %	18 %	6 %	7 %	7 %	1 %	10 %	6 %	0 %	100 %
iii. No evaluation	27 %	17 %	5 %	5 %	14 %	24 %	2 %	16 %	8 %	12 %	3 %	2 %	7 %	4 %	1 %	100 %
iv. Not known	31 %	16 %	2 %	7 %	10 %	22 %	1 %	18 %	6 %	8 %	8 %	2 %	8 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	18 %	23 %	21 %	33 %	18 %	13 %	33 %	20 %	25 %	20 %	39 %	50 %	33 %	0 %	67 %	18 %
ii. Irregular	18 %	19 %	25 %	12 %	16 %	11 %	0 %	15 %	11 %	11 %	14 %	7 %	16 %	36 %	0 %	14 %
iii. No evaluation	35 %	34 %	42 %	27 %	44 %	46 %	50 %	37 %	42 %	48 %	17 %	29 %	27 %	64 %	33 %	40 %
iv. Not known	29 %	23 %	13 %	27 %	23 %	31 %	17 %	29 %	22 %	22 %	31 %	14 %	24 %	0 %	0 %	28 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Usability vs. Target group

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	18	7	66	13	5	33	32	5	82
ii. Irregular	16	9	50	6	6	25	18	4	67
iii. No evaluation	41	27	129	23	13	79	32	9	184
iv. Not known	24	11	77	19	9	33	23	3	131
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	22 %	9 %	80 %	16 %	6 %	40 %	39 %	6 %	100 %
ii. Irregular	24 %	13 %	75 %	9 %	9 %	37 %	27 %	6 %	100 %
iii. No evaluation	22 %	15 %	70 %	13 %	7 %	43 %	17 %	5 %	100 %
iv. Not known	18 %	8 %	59 %	15 %	7 %	25 %	18 %	2 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	18 %	13 %	20 %	21 %	15 %	19 %	30 %	24 %	18 %
ii. Irregular	16 %	17 %	16 %	10 %	18 %	15 %	17 %	19 %	14 %
iii. No evaluation	41 %	50 %	40 %	38 %	39 %	46 %	30 %	43 %	40 %
iv. Not known	24 %	20 %	24 %	31 %	27 %	19 %	22 %	14 %	28 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Delivery form vs. Target group

	i. Population/ Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu-cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Informal	25	22	2	9	7	15	2	19	11	8	13	4	15	1	2	103
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	116	71	23	26	51	83	4	64	27	39	25	10	32	10	1	361
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Informal	24 %	21 %	2 %	9%	7%	15%	2%	18%	11%	8%	13%	4%	15%	1%	2%	100%
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	33 %	20 %	7 %	7%	14%	24%	1%	18%	8%	11%	7%	3%	9%	3%	0%	100%
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7%	12%	20%	1%	18%	8%	10%	8%	3%	10%	2%	1%	100%
i. Informal	18 %	24 %	8 %	27 %	12 %	16 %	33 %	23 %	31 %	17 %	36 %	29 %	33 %	9 %	67 %	22 %
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	82 %	79 %	96 %	79 %	89 %	87 %	67 %	78 %	75 %	85 %	69 %	71 %	71 %	91 %	33 %	76 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Delivery form vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Informal	15	8	78	11	12	35	25	7	103
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	85	46	250	54	22	137	81	15	361
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Informal	15 %	8 %	76 %	11 %	12 %	34 %	24 %	7 %	100 %
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	24 %	13 %	71 %	15 %	6 %	39 %	23 %	4 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Informal	15 %	15 %	24 %	18 %	36 %	21 %	24 %	33 %	22 %
ii. Formal or Indeterminate	86 %	85 %	78 %	89 %	67 %	81 %	77 %	71 %	76 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

User payment vs. Target group

	i. Population/Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu-cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Free of charge	81	57	12	24	37	50	3	47	24	28	20	7	33	11	2	272
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	26	3	7	6	8	13	1	19	5	10	9	2	9	1	1	52
iii. Full payment	5	8	3	1	4	2	0	7	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	20
iv. Not known	41	22	4	7	15	34	2	19	6	8	9	5	4	0	0	120
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Free of charge	30 %	21 %	4 %	9 %	14 %	18 %	1 %	17 %	9 %	10 %	7 %	3 %	12 %	4 %	1 %	100 %
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	50 %	6 %	13 %	12 %	15 %	25 %	2 %	37 %	10 %	19 %	17 %	4 %	17 %	2 %	2 %	100 %
iii. Full payment	25 %	40 %	15 %	5 %	20 %	10 %	0 %	35 %	15 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
iv. Not known	34 %	18 %	3 %	6 %	13 %	28 %	2 %	16 %	5 %	7 %	8 %	4 %	3 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Free of charge	57 %	63 %	50 %	73 %	65 %	53 %	50 %	57 %	67 %	61 %	56 %	50 %	73 %	100 %	67 %	59 %
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	18 %	3 %	29 %	18 %	14 %	14 %	17 %	23 %	14 %	22 %	25 %	14 %	20 %	9 %	33 %	11 %
iii. Full payment	4 %	9 %	13 %	3 %	7 %	2 %	0 %	9 %	8 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	4 %
iv. Not known	29 %	24 %	17 %	21 %	26 %	36 %	33 %	23 %	17 %	17 %	25 %	36 %	9 %	0 %	0 %	26 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

User payment vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Free of charge	63	29	208	29	18	102	67	17	272
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	12	8	38	4	7	26	14	1	52
iii. Full payment	5	3	16	3	2	4	1	0	20
iv. Not known	26	15	71	26	8	44	23	3	120
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Free of charge	23 %	11 %	76 %	11 %	7 %	38 %	25 %	6 %	100 %
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	23 %	15 %	73 %	8 %	13 %	50 %	27 %	2 %	100 %
iii. Full payment	25 %	15 %	80 %	15 %	10 %	20 %	5 %	0 %	100 %
iv. Not known	22 %	13 %	59 %	22 %	7 %	37 %	19 %	3 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Free of charge	64 %	54 %	65 %	48 %	55 %	60 %	64 %	81 %	59 %
ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	12 %	15 %	12 %	7 %	21 %	15 %	13 %	5 %	11 %
iii. Full payment	5 %	6 %	5 %	5 %	6 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	4 %
iv. Not known	26 %	28 %	22 %	43 %	24 %	26 %	22 %	14 %	26 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Evaluation

	i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	ii. Irregular	iii. No evaluation	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Public	23	29	57	42	151
ii. Public-NGO	27	12	55	27	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	15	12	22	20	69
iv. Public-Private	10	4	13	8	35
v. NGO	2	5	24	12	43
vi. NGO-Private	4	3	10	6	23
vii. Private	1	2	3	2	8
All initiatives	82	67	184	131	464
i. Public	15 %	19 %	38 %	28 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	22 %	10 %	45 %	22 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	22 %	17 %	32 %	29 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	29 %	11 %	37 %	23 %	100 %
v. NGO	5 %	12 %	56 %	28 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	17 %	13 %	43 %	26 %	100 %
vii. Private	13 %	25 %	38 %	25 %	100 %
All initiatives	18 %	14 %	40 %	28 %	100 %
i. Public	28 %	43 %	31 %	32 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	33 %	18 %	30 %	21 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	18 %	18 %	12 %	15 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	12 %	6 %	7 %	6 %	8 %
v. NGO	2 %	7 %	13 %	9 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	5 %	4 %	5 %	5 %	5 %
vii. Private	1 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Delivery form

	i. Informal	ii. Formal or indeterminate	All initiatives
i. Public	28	123	151
ii. Public-NGO	28	96	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	14	55	69
iv. Public-Private	10	27	35
v. NGO	13	30	43
vi. NGO-Private	7	17	23
vii. Private	3	5	8
All initiatives	103	361	464
i. Public	19 %	81 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	23 %	79 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	20 %	80 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	29 %	77 %	100 %
v. NGO	30 %	70 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	30 %	74 %	100 %
vii. Private	38 %	63 %	100 %
All initiatives	22 %	78 %	100 %
i. Public	27 %	34 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	27 %	27 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	14 %	15 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	10 %	7 %	8 %
v. NGO	13 %	8 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	7 %	5 %	5 %
vii. Private	3 %	1 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. User payment

	i. Free of charge	ii. Reduced (subsidised) payment	iii. Full payment	iv. Payment not known	All initiatives
i. Public	94	15	4	39	151
ii. Public-NGO	77	13	7	30	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	38	11	2	21	69
iv. Public-Private	21	5	4	5	35
v. NGO	21	3	1	18	43
vi. NGO-Private	15	3	1	6	23
vii. Private	6	2	1	1	8
All initiatives	272	52	20	120	464
i. Public	62 %	10 %	3 %	26 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	64 %	11 %	6 %	25 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	55 %	16 %	3 %	30 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	60 %	14 %	11 %	14 %	100 %
v. NGO	49 %	7 %	2 %	42 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	65 %	13 %	4 %	26 %	100 %
vii. Private	75 %	25 %	13 %	13 %	100 %
All initiatives	59 %	11 %	4 %	26 %	100 %
i. Public	35 %	29 %	20 %	33 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	28 %	25 %	35 %	25 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	14 %	21 %	10 %	18 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	8 %	10 %	20 %	4 %	8 %
v. NGO	8 %	6 %	5 %	15 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	6 %	6 %	5 %	5 %	5 %
vii. Private	2 %	4 %	5 %	1 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Evaluation

	i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	ii. Irregular	iii. No evaluation	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Large	33	24	29	16	102
ii. Medium	21	11	21	14	67
iii. Small	17	11	55	25	108
iv. Not known	11	21	79	76	187
All initiatives	82	67	184	131	464
i. Large	32 %	24 %	28 %	16 %	100 %
ii. Medium	31 %	16 %	31 %	21 %	100 %
iii. Small	16 %	10 %	51 %	23 %	100 %
iv. Not known	6 %	11 %	42 %	41 %	100 %
All initiatives	18 %	14 %	40 %	28 %	100 %
i. Large	40 %	36 %	16 %	12 %	22 %
ii. Medium	26 %	16 %	11 %	11 %	14 %
iii. Small	21 %	16 %	30 %	19 %	23 %
iv. Not known	13 %	31 %	43 %	58 %	40 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Platform vs. Target group

	i. Population/ Dis- advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu- cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un- employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop- ment	xii. Urban develop- ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. PCs	135	80	23	31	57	91	6	81	36	46	32	14	41	11	2	423
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	2	6	1	1	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	18
iii. Mobile phones	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
iv. PIAPs	21	0	2	3	4	4	1	10	4	4	11	5	2	0	1	38
v. Open source tools	6	2	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	11
vi. Learning platform	11	17	2	3	0	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	36
vii. Network/ infrastructure	40	23	4	8	8	14	3	13	9	3	21	8	10	0	2	104
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. PCs	32 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	13 %	22 %	1 %	19 %	9 %	11 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	3 %	0 %	100 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	11 %	33 %	6 %	6 %	17 %	22 %	11 %	17 %	6 %	6 %	6 %	6 %	6 %	0 %	6 %	100 %
iii. Mobile phones	50 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	33 %	0 %	17 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
iv. PIAPs	55 %	0 %	5 %	8 %	11 %	11 %	3 %	26 %	11 %	11 %	29 %	13 %	5 %	0 %	3 %	100 %
v. Open source tools	55 %	18 %	0 %	0 %	9 %	27 %	0 %	18 %	0 %	9 %	0 %	9 %	9 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
vi. Learning platform	31 %	47 %	6 %	8 %	0 %	11 %	0 %	11 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	0 %	8 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	38 %	22 %	4 %	8 %	8 %	13 %	3 %	13 %	9 %	3 %	20 %	8 %	10 %	0 %	2 %	100 %
i. PCs	95 %	89 %	96 %	94 %	100 %	96 %	100 %	99 %	100 %	100 %	89 %	100 %	91 %	100 %	67 %	91 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	1 %	7 %	4 %	3 %	5 %	4 %	33 %	4 %	3 %	2 %	3 %	7 %	2 %	0 %	33 %	4 %
iii. Mobile phones	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
iv. PIAPs	15 %	0 %	8 %	9 %	7 %	4 %	17 %	12 %	11 %	9 %	31 %	36 %	4 %	0 %	33 %	8 %
v. Open source tools	4 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	3 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	7 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	2 %
vi. Learning platform	8 %	19 %	8 %	9 %	0 %	4 %	0 %	5 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	8 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	28 %	26 %	17 %	24 %	14 %	15 %	50 %	16 %	25 %	7 %	58 %	57 %	22 %	0 %	67 %	22 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Platform vs. Rationale

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. PCs	96	53	307	60	31	158	93	20	423
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	5	3	12	3	0	6	6	0	18
iii. Mobile phones	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	6
iv. PIAPs	9	5	29	3	4	22	28	1	38
v. Open source tools	1	0	8	5	1	4	2	0	11
vi. Learning platform	4	3	31	4	1	8	8	3	36
vii. Network/ infrastructure	18	9	73	12	7	54	90	5	104
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. PCs	23 %	13 %	73 %	14 %	7 %	37 %	22 %	5 %	100 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	28 %	17 %	67 %	17 %	0 %	33 %	33 %	0 %	100 %
iii. Mobile phones	0 %	17 %	33 %	17 %	0 %	33 %	17 %	17 %	100 %
iv. PIAPs	24 %	13 %	76 %	8 %	11 %	58 %	74 %	3 %	100 %
v. Open source tools	9 %	0 %	73 %	45 %	9 %	36 %	18 %	0 %	100 %
vi. Learning platform	11 %	8 %	86 %	11 %	3 %	22 %	22 %	8 %	100 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	17 %	9 %	70 %	12 %	7 %	52 %	87 %	5 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. PCs	97 %	98 %	95 %	98 %	94 %	93 %	89 %	95 %	91 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	5 %	6 %	4 %	5 %	0 %	4 %	6 %	0 %	4 %
iii. Mobile phones	0 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	5 %	1 %
iv. PIAPs	9 %	9 %	9 %	5 %	12 %	13 %	27 %	5 %	8 %
v. Open source tools	1 %	0 %	2 %	8 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
vi. Learning platform	4 %	6 %	10 %	7 %	3 %	5 %	8 %	14 %	8 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	18 %	17 %	23 %	20 %	21 %	32 %	86 %	24 %	22 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Content vs. Target group

Content vs. Target group	i. Population/ Dis-advantaged groups at large	ii. Edu-cational system	iii. Work related	iv. Poor education and training	v. Un-employed	vi. Disabled	vii. Health	viii. Elderly	ix. Young people at risk	x. Women	xi. Rural develop-ment	xii. Urban develop-ment	xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	xv. Other groups	All initiatives
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	98	33	18	18	42	43	1	60	21	30	21	8	27	8	1	246
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	27	37	9	9	13	58	4	23	9	15	6	4	13	4	3	150
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	20	20	2	5	8	11	2	10	8	3	5	2	8	1	0	68
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	29	22	8	6	9	9	1	10	3	2	5	0	9	2	1	77
v. Community and innovation driven content	23	10	1	4	3	6	1	10	5	5	9	4	5	0	0	59
All initiatives	142	90	24	33	57	95	6	82	36	46	36	14	45	11	3	464
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	40 %	13 %	7 %	7 %	17 %	17 %	0 %	24 %	9 %	12 %	9 %	3 %	11 %	3 %	0 %	100 %
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	18 %	25 %	6 %	6 %	9 %	39 %	3 %	15 %	6 %	10 %	4 %	3 %	9 %	3 %	2 %	100 %
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	29 %	29 %	3 %	7 %	12 %	16 %	3 %	15 %	12 %	4 %	7 %	3 %	12 %	1 %	0 %	100 %
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	38 %	29 %	10 %	8 %	12 %	12 %	1 %	13 %	4 %	3 %	6 %	0 %	12 %	3 %	1 %	100 %
v. Community and innovation driven content	39 %	17 %	2 %	7 %	5 %	10 %	2 %	17 %	8 %	8 %	15 %	7 %	8 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	31 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	12 %	20 %	1 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	10 %	2 %	1 %	100 %
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	69 %	37 %	75 %	55 %	74 %	45 %	17 %	73 %	58 %	65 %	58 %	57 %	60 %	73 %	33 %	53 %
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	19 %	41 %	38 %	27 %	23 %	61 %	67 %	28 %	25 %	33 %	17 %	29 %	29 %	36 %	100 %	32 %
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	14 %	22 %	8 %	15 %	14 %	12 %	33 %	12 %	22 %	7 %	14 %	14 %	18 %	9 %	0 %	15 %
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	20 %	24 %	33 %	18 %	16 %	9 %	17 %	12 %	8 %	4 %	14 %	0 %	20 %	18 %	33 %	17 %
v. Community and innovation driven content	16 %	11 %	4 %	12 %	5 %	6 %	17 %	12 %	14 %	11 %	25 %	29 %	11 %	0 %	0 %	13 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

	i. Improve employability	ii. Improve quality of life	iii. Improve DL overall	iv. Condition-specific improvements	v. Citizenship development	vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	viii. Other rationale	All initiatives
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	70	23	202	21	18	100	65	3	246
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	29	28	93	41	9	65	22	7	150
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	7	4	54	9	6	22	17	11	68
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	20	9	64	8	5	23	18	3	77
v. Community and innovation driven content	4	7	32	8	12	20	20	4	59
All initiatives	99	54	322	61	33	170	105	21	464
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	28 %	9 %	82 %	9 %	7 %	41 %	26 %	1 %	100 %
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	19 %	19 %	62 %	27 %	6 %	43 %	15 %	5 %	100 %
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	10 %	6 %	79 %	13 %	9 %	32 %	25 %	16 %	100 %
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	26 %	12 %	83 %	10 %	6 %	30 %	23 %	4 %	100 %
v. Community and innovation driven content	7 %	12 %	54 %	14 %	20 %	34 %	34 %	7 %	100 %
All initiatives	21 %	12 %	69 %	13 %	7 %	37 %	23 %	5 %	100 %
i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	71 %	43 %	63 %	34 %	55 %	59 %	62 %	14 %	53 %
ii. Courses tailored to user needs	29 %	52 %	29 %	67 %	27 %	38 %	21 %	33 %	32 %
iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	7 %	7 %	17 %	15 %	18 %	13 %	16 %	52 %	15 %
iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	20 %	17 %	20 %	13 %	15 %	14 %	17 %	14 %	17 %
v. Community and innovation driven content	4 %	13 %	10 %	13 %	36 %	12 %	19 %	19 %	13 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Accessibility vs. Platform

	i. PCs	ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	iii. Mobile phones	iv. PIAPs	v. Open source tools	vi. Learning platform	vii. Network/ infrastructure	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	32	5	1	7	0	0	38	41
ii. Significantly	54	1	1	16	1	2	44	58
iii. Partly	85	6	0	13	4	7	21	88
iv. Not at all	247	6	4	2	6	27	1	258
v. Not known	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
All initiatives	423	18	6	38	11	36	104	464
i. Exclusively	78 %	12 %	2 %	17 %	0 %	0 %	93 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	93 %	2 %	2 %	28 %	2 %	3 %	76 %	100 %
iii. Partly	97 %	7 %	0 %	15 %	5 %	8 %	24 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	96 %	2 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	10 %	0 %	100 %
v. Not known	26 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
All initiatives	91 %	4 %	1 %	8 %	2 %	8 %	22 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	8 %	28 %	17 %	18 %	0 %	0 %	37 %	9 %
ii. Significantly	13 %	6 %	17 %	42 %	9 %	6 %	42 %	13 %
iii. Partly	20 %	33 %	0 %	34 %	36 %	19 %	20 %	19 %
iv. Not at all	58 %	33 %	67 %	5 %	55 %	75 %	1 %	56 %
v. Not known	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	4 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Usability vs. Content

	i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	ii. Courses tailored to user needs	iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	v. Community and innovation driven content	All initiatives
i. Exclusively	2	14	0	0	1	15
ii. Significantly	39	73	20	23	14	117
iii. Partly	66	44	25	20	22	127
iv. Not at all	133	19	23	33	18	160
v. Not known	6	0	0	1	4	45
All initiatives	246	150	68	77	59	464
i. Exclusively	13 %	93 %	0 %	0 %	7 %	100 %
ii. Significantly	33 %	62 %	17 %	20 %	12 %	100 %
iii. Partly	52 %	35 %	20 %	16 %	17 %	100 %
iv. Not at all	83 %	12 %	14 %	21 %	11 %	100 %
v. Not known	13 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	9 %	100 %
All initiatives	53 %	32 %	15 %	17 %	13 %	100 %
i. Exclusively	1 %	9 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	3 %
ii. Significantly	16 %	49 %	29 %	30 %	24 %	25 %
iii. Partly	27 %	29 %	37 %	26 %	37 %	27 %
iv. Not at all	54 %	13 %	34 %	43 %	31 %	34 %
v. Not known	2 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	7 %	10 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Platform vs. Content

	i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	ii. Courses tailored to user needs	iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	v. Community and innovation driven content	All initiatives
i. PCs	241	139	64	72	51	423
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	9	7	3	5	1	18
iii. Mobile phones	2	2	0	2	0	6
iv. PIAPs	31	6	3	5	7	38
v. Open source tools	5	4	3	1	3	11
vi. Learning platform	10	9	7	23	2	36
vii. Network/ infrastructure	64	24	18	14	18	104
All initiatives	246	150	68	77	59	464
i. PCs	57 %	33 %	15 %	17 %	12 %	100 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	50 %	39 %	17 %	28 %	6 %	100 %
iii. Mobile phones	33 %	33 %	0 %	33 %	0 %	100 %
iv. PIAPs	82 %	16 %	8 %	13 %	18 %	100 %
v. Open source tools	45 %	36 %	27 %	9 %	27 %	100 %
vi. Learning platform	28 %	25 %	19 %	64 %	6 %	100 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	62 %	23 %	17 %	13 %	17 %	100 %
All initiatives	53 %	32 %	15 %	17 %	13 %	100 %
i. PCs	98 %	93 %	94 %	94 %	86 %	91 %
ii. PDAs/ Notebooks	4 %	5 %	4 %	6 %	2 %	4 %
iii. Mobile phones	1 %	1 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	1 %
iv. PIAPs	13 %	4 %	4 %	6 %	12 %	8 %
v. Open source tools	2 %	3 %	4 %	1 %	5 %	2 %
vi. Learning platform	4 %	6 %	10 %	30 %	3 %	8 %
vii. Network/ infrastructure	26 %	16 %	26 %	18 %	31 %	22 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Content

Size vs. Content	i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	ii. Courses tailored to user needs	iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	v. Community and innovation driven content	All initiatives
i. Large	58	28	15	31	21	102
ii. Medium	39	19	12	10	5	67
iii. Small	56	40	22	12	13	108
iv. Not known	93	62	19	24	20	187
All initiatives	246	150	68	77	59	464
i. Large	57 %	27 %	15 %	30 %	21 %	100 %
ii. Medium	58 %	28 %	18 %	15 %	7 %	100 %
iii. Small	52 %	37 %	20 %	11 %	12 %	100 %
iv. Not known	50 %	33 %	10 %	13 %	11 %	100 %
All initiatives	53 %	32 %	15 %	17 %	13 %	100 %
i. Large	24 %	19 %	22 %	40 %	36 %	22 %
ii. Medium	16 %	13 %	18 %	13 %	8 %	14 %
iii. Small	23 %	27 %	32 %	16 %	22 %	23 %
iv. Not known	38 %	41 %	28 %	31 %	34 %	40 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Content

	i. Standard computer courses (ECDL, MSoffice, etc.)	ii. Courses tailored to user needs	iii. Courses aimed at producing new content (websites, blogs, etc.)	iv. Online courses (e-Learning)	v. Community and innovation driven content	All initiatives
i. Public	86	44	22	28	15	151
ii. Public-NGO	66	39	26	19	15	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	35	28	11	13	13	69
iv. Public-Private	24	9	3	8	5	35
v. NGO	16	21	4	5	5	43
vi. NGO-Private	13	7	2	3	4	23
vii. Private	6	2	0	1	2	8
All initiatives	246	150	68	77	59	464
i. Public	57 %	29 %	15 %	19 %	10 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	55 %	32 %	21 %	16 %	12 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	51 %	41 %	16 %	19 %	19 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	69 %	26 %	9 %	23 %	14 %	100 %
v. NGO	37 %	49 %	9 %	12 %	12 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	57 %	30 %	9 %	13 %	17 %	100 %
vii. Private	75 %	25 %	0 %	13 %	25 %	100 %
All initiatives	53 %	32 %	15 %	17 %	13 %	100 %
i. Public	35 %	29 %	32 %	36 %	25 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	27 %	26 %	38 %	25 %	25 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	14 %	19 %	16 %	17 %	22 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	10 %	6 %	4 %	10 %	8 %	8 %
v. NGO	7 %	14 %	6 %	6 %	8 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	5 %	5 %	3 %	4 %	7 %	5 %
vii. Private	2 %	1 %	0 %	1 %	3 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Target group vs. Status

	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Population/ Disadvantaged groups at large	59	7	28	50	142	42 %	5 %	20 %	35 %	100 %	32 %	35 %	28 %	31 %	31 %
ii. Educational system	37	5	24	25	90	41 %	6 %	27 %	28 %	100 %	20 %	25 %	24 %	15 %	19 %
iii. Work related	13	1	6	4	24	54 %	4 %	25 %	17 %	100 %	7 %	5 %	6 %	2 %	5 %
iv. Poor education and training	16	4	7	6	33	48 %	12 %	21 %	18 %	100 %	9 %	20 %	7 %	4 %	7 %
v. Unemployed	26	3	9	19	57	46 %	5 %	16 %	33 %	100 %	14 %	15 %	9 %	12 %	12 %
vi. Disabled	43	4	16	32	95	45 %	4 %	17 %	34 %	100 %	24 %	20 %	16 %	20 %	20 %
vii. Health	2	0	2	2	6	33 %	0 %	33 %	33 %	100 %	1 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	1 %
viii. Elderly	34	7	15	27	82	41 %	9 %	18 %	33 %	100 %	19 %	35 %	15 %	17 %	18 %
ix. Young people at risk	15	1	7	13	36	42 %	3 %	19 %	36 %	100 %	8 %	5 %	7 %	8 %	8 %
x. Women	17	2	11	16	46	37 %	4 %	24 %	35 %	100 %	9 %	10 %	11 %	10 %	10 %
xi. Rural development	19	2	3	12	36	53 %	6 %	8 %	33 %	100 %	10 %	10 %	3 %	7 %	8 %
xii. Urban development	5	0	3	6	14	36 %	0 %	21 %	43 %	100 %	3 %	0 %	3 %	4 %	3 %
xiii. Ethnic, cultural and language minorities	15	3	12	15	45	33 %	7 %	27 %	33 %	100 %	8 %	15 %	12 %	9 %	10 %
xiv. Criminal and other illegal behaviour	3	0	3	5	11	27 %	0 %	27 %	45 %	100 %	2 %	0 %	3 %	3 %	2 %
xv. Other groups	2	0	1	0	3	67 %	0 %	33 %	0 %	100 %	1 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Rationale vs. Status

	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Improve employability	41	2	31	25	99
ii. Improve quality of life	26	2	7	19	54
iii. Improve digital literacy overall	129	16	79	100	322
iv. Condition-specific improvements	25	3	15	18	61
v. Citizenship development	14	1	7	11	33
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	67	10	40	54	170
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	40	6	28	32	105
viii. Other rationale	9	2	4	6	21
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464
i. Improve employability	41 %	2 %	31 %	25 %	100 %
ii. Improve quality of life	48 %	4 %	13 %	35 %	100 %
iii. Improve digital literacy overall	40 %	5 %	25 %	31 %	100 %
iv. Condition-specific improvements	41 %	5 %	25 %	30 %	100 %
v. Citizenship development	42 %	3 %	21 %	33 %	100 %
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	39 %	6 %	24 %	32 %	100 %
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	38 %	6 %	27 %	30 %	100 %
viii. Other rationale	43 %	10 %	19 %	29 %	100 %
All initiatives	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %
i. Improve employability	23 %	10 %	31 %	15 %	21 %
ii. Improve quality of life	14 %	10 %	7 %	12 %	12 %
iii. Improve digital literacy overall	71 %	80 %	79 %	62 %	69 %
iv. Condition-specific improvements	14 %	15 %	15 %	11 %	13 %
v. Citizenship development	8 %	5 %	7 %	7 %	7 %
vi. Bridge digital divide and social inclusion	37 %	50 %	40 %	33 %	37 %
vii. Improve ICT infrastructure	22 %	30 %	28 %	20 %	23 %
viii. Other rationale	5 %	10 %	4 %	4 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Size vs. Status

Size vs. Status	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Large	40	9	33	20	102
ii. Medium	25	5	17	22	67
iii. Small	45	5	28	31	108
iv. Not known	72	0	22	78	187
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464
i. Large	39 %	9 %	32 %	20 %	100 %
ii. Medium	37 %	7 %	25 %	33 %	100 %
iii. Small	42 %	5 %	26 %	29 %	100 %
iv. Not known	39 %	0 %	12 %	42 %	100 %
All initiatives	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %
i. Large	22 %	45 %	33 %	12 %	22 %
ii. Medium	14 %	25 %	17 %	14 %	14 %
iii. Small	25 %	25 %	28 %	19 %	23 %
iv. Not known	40 %	0 %	22 %	48 %	40 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Level vs. Status

	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. National	117	13	53	86	268
ii. Regional	32	4	23	31	88
iii. Local	32	3	20	31	86
iv. Not known	1	0	4	3	22
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464
i. National	44 %	5 %	20 %	32 %	100 %
ii. Regional	36 %	5 %	26 %	35 %	100 %
iii. Local	37 %	3 %	23 %	36 %	100 %
iv. Not known	5 %	0 %	18 %	14 %	100 %
All initiatives	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %
i. National	64 %	65 %	53 %	53 %	58 %
ii. Regional	18 %	20 %	23 %	19 %	19 %
iii. Local	18 %	15 %	20 %	19 %	19 %
iv. Not known	1 %	0 %	4 %	2 %	5 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Stakeholders vs. Status

	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Public	46	7	46	54	151
ii. Public-NGO	51	6	26	38	121
iii. Public-NGO-Private	34	3	11	21	69
iv. Public-Private	17	1	5	13	35
v. NGO	18	2	6	17	43
vi. NGO-Private	11	1	4	7	23
vii. Private	5	0	2	1	8
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464
i. Public	30 %	5 %	30 %	36 %	100 %
ii. Public-NGO	42 %	5 %	21 %	31 %	100 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	49 %	4 %	16 %	30 %	100 %
iv. Public-Private	49 %	3 %	14 %	37 %	100 %
v. NGO	42 %	5 %	14 %	40 %	100 %
vi. NGO-Private	48 %	4 %	17 %	30 %	100 %
vii. Private	63 %	0 %	25 %	13 %	100 %
All initiatives	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %
i. Public	25 %	35 %	46 %	33 %	33 %
ii. Public-NGO	28 %	30 %	26 %	23 %	26 %
iii. Public-NGO-Private	19 %	15 %	11 %	13 %	15 %
iv. Public-Private	9 %	5 %	5 %	8 %	8 %
v. NGO	10 %	10 %	6 %	10 %	9 %
vi. NGO-Private	6 %	5 %	4 %	4 %	5 %
vii. Private	3 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	2 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Evaluation vs. Status

	i. Continued or ongoing project	ii. Transferred/ expanded to new project	iii. Not ongoing	iv. Not known	All initiatives
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	32	5	26	21	82
ii. Irregular	25	5	20	17	67
iii. No evaluation	79	6	43	56	184
iv. Not known	46	4	11	57	131
All initiatives	182	20	100	162	464
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	39 %	6 %	32 %	26 %	100 %
ii. Irregular	37 %	7 %	30 %	25 %	100 %
iii. No evaluation	43 %	3 %	23 %	30 %	100 %
iv. Not known	35 %	3 %	8 %	44 %	100 %
All initiatives	39 %	4 %	22 %	35 %	100 %
i. Systematic and integrated in wider assessment	18 %	25 %	26 %	13 %	18 %
ii. Irregular	14 %	25 %	20 %	10 %	14 %
iii. No evaluation	43 %	30 %	43 %	35 %	40 %
iv. Not known	25 %	20 %	11 %	35 %	28 %
All initiatives	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %