

---

# EXTERNAL EVALUATION OPEN GOVERNANCE

---

Final report  
Brussels, 14 September 2016

**ODS**

**GREATER IMPACT**

[www.odsupport.eu](http://www.odsupport.eu) | [info@odsupport.eu](mailto:info@odsupport.eu)

+32 2 22 72 71 4

4, Rue de la Presse – 1000 Brussels, Belgium

## INHALT

<b>Executive summary</b> .....	3
<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b> .....	4
1.1 Transparency International .....	4
1.2 The Open Governance Project .....	5
1.3 The Evaluation.....	6
<b>Chapter 2 – Standards &amp; Scorecards</b> .....	8
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2 Answering the research questions .....	9
2.3 Lessons Learned.....	11
<b>Chapter 3 – Advocacy and Campaigning</b> .....	12
3.1 Introduction .....	12
3.2 Answering the research questions .....	13
3.3 Lessons Learned.....	16
<b>Chapter 4 – Citizen Engagement</b> .....	17
4.1 Introduction .....	17
4.2 Answering the research questions .....	17
4.3 Lessons Learned.....	20
<b>Chapter 5 – CSO Networks</b> .....	20
5.1 Introduction .....	20
5.2 Answering the research questions .....	21
5.3 Lessons Learned.....	23
<b>Chapter 6 – Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b> .....	24
6.1 Specific Programme Recommendations .....	24
6.2 Specific Operational Conclusions & Recommendations.....	26
6.3 Strategic conclusions & recommendations .....	27

Abbreviations	
ODS	The evaluators
Open Governance	OG
Open Governance Project	OG Project
Open Government Partnership	OGP
Project Leadership Team	PLT
Transparency International	TI
Transparency International National Chapter	TI Chapter
Transparency International Secretariat	TI-S

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As measured against the project's deliverables and objectives, the aims of the projects have only partially been achieved. Open Governance, the OGP and the project itself have not gained noteworthy traction as concepts within other CSOs, project countries or globally. The reasons for this lack of uptake are threefold. Firstly, the project was not built on a strong, shared understanding of the problem which it tried to address, beyond a generic aim of promoting OG. Secondly, there was a lack of a clear understanding within TI of the relationship between the project, the OGP and Open Government Standards. Thirdly, the criteria for the selection of project participants and the decision on the management structure of the project were not communicated clearly. This resulted in the impression among Chapters that the project was very flexible but also that deliverables and objectives were malleable.

Through the process, TI built its own understanding and expertise on Open Governance. This has been achieved through the long-term process of working on these issues rather than by any specific activity or tool. In this sense, the project design has proven beneficial as it has left room for the implementing TI Chapters to design their own approaches regarding three objectives (Advocacy and Campaigning, Citizen Engagement, NGO Networks), with the exception of Standards and Scorecard. In designing similar projects, TI could institutionalise elements of this approach: the planning should foster positive elements – flexibility, adaptation to local circumstances, incubator approach – while reducing negative outcomes experienced by the OG Project – confused project implementation, lack of focus and insufficient human resources.

Individually, the project's activities and outputs were well chosen and relevant for at least part of the objectives of the project. The standards and scorecard could have good advocacy potential if updated, the capacity of TI and the Chapters to advocate on OG has increased, and citizens were engaged in all project countries. Taken together however, these very different project objectives have put a significant strain on the implementing countries, the coordinator at TI-S and even on some support units within TI-S. This could have been prevented by formally splitting the project into two, where the standards and scorecard would have been driven by TI-S, but the other elements left to the Chapters themselves.

Each of the four objectives, could in fact justify a full project of its own. If the current project is seen as a pilot, the conclusion should be that developing a scorecard, advocating for OG, engaging citizens and forming CSO coalitions, can each take up the full attention of a TI Chapter. Going forward, the scope of a possible new project should be reduced. One way to do this would be to combine two or three objectives into one project.

In terms of future impact, only the groundwork has been laid. This is to be expected however, in a multifaceted project with a running period of three years. This assessment is supported by the interviews, but also based on the experience of evaluators in evaluating multi country projects. More baseline data (which is now available), and more rigorous M&E practice during implementation, would have contributed to the efficient use of resources and a better understanding of the impact.

Below, we have summarised in a heat map the project’s success in achieving its objectives.

		Relevance	Outcomes & Impacts	Effective-ness	Efficiency	Sustain-ability
Standards & Scorecards	National	●	●	●	●	●
	Regional	●	●	●	●	●
	International	●	●	●	●	●
Advocacy & Campaigning	National	●	●	●	●	●
	Regional	●	●	●	●	●
	International	●	●	●	●	●
Citizen Engagement	National	●	●	●	●	●
	Regional	●	●	●	●	●
	International	●	●	●	●	●
CSO Networks	National	●	●	●	●	●
	Regional	●	●	●	●	●
	International	●	●	●	●	●

● Poor result/non-existent/not relevant/etc. ● Decent result/somewhat achieved/some relevance/etc.  
● Good result/achieved/very relevant/etc.

## CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The present document is the end-of-project evaluation report of the Open Governance Project at Transparency International, performed by consultants from ODS, a Brussels firm working with NGOs.

### 1.1 Transparency International

Transparency International is a Berlin-based association under German law. The Berlin office functions as the Secretariat for a global movement of organisations (‘Chapters’) working on transparency and anti-corruption. Each of these organisations is a separate legal entity allowed to carry the Transparency International brand in accordance with a bilateral licensing agreement. The overarching goal of Transparency International (which includes the Secretariat and the Chapters) is “to give a voice to the victims and witnesses of corruption; to work together with governments, businesses and citizens to stop the abuse of power, bribery and secret deals; a world free of corruption”.

Under its ‘Public Sector Integrity Programme’, TI aims to combat corruption in the public sector and “strengthen integrity, transparency and anti-corruption advocacy at the local, national and global level”. Projects under this programme revolve around the strengthening of local integrity, corruption in public procurement and the principles of Open Governance, which is the subject of this evaluation.

## 1.2 The Open Governance Project

### *Open Government and Open Governance*

Open government has in recent years become a priority of governments, institutions and CSOs at national and international level. This has resulted in an Open Government Partnership (OGP) of countries who are committing to enacting Open Government standards. To become a member of OGP, participating countries must endorse a high-level Open Government Declaration, deliver a country action plan developed with public consultation, and commit to independent reporting on their progress.<sup>1</sup> While the OGP does not set binding standards, European civil society organisations have been cooperating to create the Open Government Standards (OGS). These standards are legal and institutional conditions that need to be met by the signatories and designed to foster openness along three dimensions: transparency, accountability and participation.<sup>2</sup> From Open Government, the broader concept of Open Governance emerged, encompassing not only the function and definitions of governments, but also the combined interactions, processes and relations of public institutions and citizens, including CSOs, in a holistic approach. TI has designed the Open Governance Project to capture the existing standards in a framework and use that framework in advocacy and citizen engagement.

### *Theory of Change & project objectives*

According to the original Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) documents, “This project aims at maximizing citizens’ effective use of open governance to advocate for and impact change through TI’s 1) direct engagement with communities 2) coordination with civil society promoting coherent, OG standards and monitoring systems 3) fostering stronger government commitment to implement critical Open Governance reforms”. In line with the above, the stated project objectives of the project are:

1. Empowering people to develop and use their rights to information, participation and accountability in governance to improve their lives
2. Simplifying, aggregated and coherent Open Governance standards identified, adapted, accepted and monitored at the national and international level
3. Encouraging those with power and influence, to take responsibility to implement open governance, and realise the benefits for people

These objectives translate into the focal areas evaluated in this report: **Advocacy and Campaigning, Citizen Engagement** and **CSO Networks**, plus the development of a **Standards & Scorecard** tool which in some project documents is formulated as an objective but in fact is an output of the project.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/>

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.opengovstandards.org/>

### **Operations**

- › Project budget: \$1.500.000
- › Funder: Hewlett Foundation
- › The original project period: March 2013 until March 2016
  - › A no-cost extension of the grant until September 2016 was requested by TI and granted by the Hewlett Foundation.
- › Project countries & lead organisations:
  - › Ghana: Ghana Integrity Initiative (GII, TI Chapter)
  - › Indonesia: TI Indonesia
  - › Peru: Proetica (TI Chapter)
  - › Ukraine: TI Ukraine
- › Within TI, the project has been assigned to the Public Sector Integrity Programme
- › The Project Leadership Team is made up of
  - › A project manager at TI-S
  - › One representative of each Chapter in the relevant project countries
- › The PLT sets the strategic direction of the project and drives its implementation, and is responsible for collecting reporting
- › Resources have been redistributed from salaries toward core activities such as the implementation of local initiatives supporting local communities

## **1.3 The Evaluation**

### **Methodology & Approach**

In June 2016, ODS – a Brussels based consultancy working with CSOs – was selected to perform an end of project evaluation of the OG Project between June and September 2016. Based on the Terms of Reference and ODS<sup>3</sup> work offer, a project plan was developed for the evaluation in which a number of approaches and activities were outlined to collect evidence, and analyse the information. These include:

<i>Information gathering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Briefing meetings with TI staff</li> <li>› Desk research</li> <li>› Briefing calls with responsible project leads in the Chapters</li> <li>› Interviews with TI-S staff</li> <li>› Interviews with global and national stakeholders, incl. media, other CSOs/INGOs, public sector representatives, researchers</li> </ul>
------------------------------	--

<sup>3</sup> Attached in the annexes

<i>Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Outputs &amp; Outcomes mapping</li> <li>› Brief case studies</li> <li>› A timeline</li> <li>› An organisational Scan</li> </ul>
<i>Reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Draft conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>› A presentation of the conclusions and discussion</li> <li>› A workshop presentation with PLT and other TI-S staff</li> <li>› The final report</li> </ul>

### ***Limitations***

As in any evaluation, there are limitations which prevent a programme under review to be fully studied, and the OG Project is no different in this regard. These limitations stem from the nature of the project, the available data, inherent limitations of methodologies to evaluate projects (especially in advocacy and of global coalitions) and time and budget constraints. More specifically, data on outcomes and outputs is collected by the national coalitions but while there is some though incomplete data on some types of outputs (e.g. participants in meetings), the information captured by national Chapters does not provide a full overview of the outcomes or impact of the project. In addition, annual reporting does not include a cross-check on activities carried out against those listed in the previous year’s work plan, making the mapping of outcomes and outputs challenging. Therefore, additional information on activities, impact, successes and challenges was collected through interviews. While the number of interviews was substantial for an evaluation of this scope (around 50 in total), the process was insufficient in constituting a truly representative sample of the relevant stakeholder population.

Furthermore, evaluating advocacy and campaigning initiatives is always challenging. Political and social change is complex and multifaceted. Causal relationships are difficult to determine, and the effects of specific projects are hard to isolate. In addition, the notion of success is highly malleable as absolute success is rarely possible, and achievements are often the result of compromise. Broad change, if it occurs, only becomes visible in the long term, especially in an area as intricate and interconnected as good governance. The road from advocacy to changes in policy, to changes in practices, is long. Finally, the scope of the review, the available budget and the timeframe did not allow for an in-depth evaluation of each organisation and the impact of campaigns in each project country.

### ***Research questions***

Based on the project documentation, briefing meetings, the ToR and ODS’ work offer, a matrix was developed with the core research questions. Interview questions and the structure of this report were derived from this matrix. The most important research questions were:

- › **Logframe: relevance**
  - › Were activities executed as planned and were the deliverables met?
  - › Were activities relevant to the problem to be solved?
- › **Impact/Outcomes: effectiveness & sustainability**
  - › Was the project effective in achieving the desired outcomes?
  - › What was the impact of the project, including on gender?
  - › Are the impacts, outcomes and outputs sustainable?
- › **Operation/organisation: efficiency**
  - › How was the project organised at global level, including M&E, management, reporting?
  - › Have there been any comparable projects, also in terms of cost efficiency?
- › **General research questions**
  - › Has capacity of the national Chapters improved through this project?
  - › Has a network emerged among the project countries?
  - › How is this project related to Chapters' regular work at the national level?
  - › What has been the added value of the project?

These questions were applied on a global, regional and national level, and to the work areas corresponding to the overarching goals of the project – Standards & Scorecard, Advocacy & Campaigning, Citizen Engagement and Expanding network of organizations working on OG.

## CHAPTER 2 – STANDARDS & SCORECARDS

### 2.1 Introduction

During the first year of the project, a set of 35 Open Governance Standards were identified in three areas: transparency, accountability and participation. To assess whether basic conditions for Open Governance were met in each of the project countries, a set of legal indicators was subsequently added based on these OG Standards. These indicators would allow Chapters to assess adherence to the open governance principles in their countries, by pulling together research in a useful 'scorecard' format and using that scorecard for advocacy.

In the second year of the project, each of the four participating Chapters plus the United Kingdom (TI UK) published the in-law assessments of their country in which they reviewed their country's legal framework. After this pilot, sub-indicators were added in to include information on the adherence to OG Standards in practice. This brought the total number of indicators at 457 (127 in-law, 330 in-practice).<sup>4</sup>

At the time of writing this report, draft scorecards are currently being revised before publication in Indonesia, Ghana and Peru, and final scorecards have already been published in Ukraine and UK.

---

<sup>4</sup> The UK Chapter's participation in the project was limited to the Scorecards objective.

## 2.2 Answering the research questions

Standards & Scorecard		Relevance	Outcomes & Impact	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability
Positive	Chapters	Engaging governments	National successes	Scorecards produced in all countries	Built capacity to work on OG	Tool in toolbox
			Started working on OG		Researched in-house	Better capacity to work on OG
	TI-S/ Global	Engagement with the OGP	Global standing on OG	Fostered TI's OG expertise	Management of research process: heavy involvement from TI-S	Template and inclusive process for scorecard
Negative	Chapters	Difficult to leverage without advocacy	No grassroots level involvement in the production	Tilted towards research as opposed to advocacy		Unlikely to be taken up by additional Chapters absent new funds
						TI-S/ Global

### Relevance

The scorecard yields easy-to-use tool information on whether basic conditions are met, not met or partially met in the respective thematic areas. This summary language is clear and helps streamline the production of the scorecard since it allows for a relatively easy scoring process. However, it limits the amount of information available for the interpretation of the scores. Adding qualitative assessments would increase the ways in which the research data could be used for advocacy.

The idea of a tool combining information on OG Standards is relevant as it has advocacy potential. However, its relevance at the present moment is limited by several factors. Chapters find that the amount of indicators makes the production of the scorecard too lengthy and burdensome, which drains resources from advocacy. They also found that the information contained in the scorecard is too granular for a purportedly lean and practical advocacy tool, which ultimately limits its usefulness. The Chapters would benefit from a production phase which is less burdensome, and a final result which is more easy to present to policy makers, while also allowing for more qualitative analysis.

### Outcomes & Impacts

The outcomes and impact of the scorecard link closely with the advocacy activities that had been planned, and (partially) realised in the project. Nationally, the tool was seen by interviewees as comprehensive, useful and serious enough to present to policy makers. The most

important outcome was that the scorecard has resulted in a national baseline in the project countries, which can serve to track progress of the national situation over time. As such, the tool is a good addition for national Chapters to use, especially to inform policy discussions on specific topics covered in the scorecard. For advocating for the national implementation of the OGP, the scorecard not specifically used.

The above results were almost exclusively achieved at the national level, as the impact at the global level has been minimal in the review period. This difference is due to the prominence of the OGP and the unclear distinction for many between the OGP and Open Governance, but also due to the difficulty comparing countries in the scorecard. Finally, national scorecards have not been disseminated among stakeholders at the grassroots level, nor have they contributed to its design. As a result, there has been limited uptake of the scorecards among grassroots CSOs, leading to missed opportunities for advocacy impact at the national and subnational levels.

### ***Effectiveness***

A set of standards and a first (at least partial) scorecard in four project countries, have been achieved, despite some delays in all of the project countries ranging from 12 to 24 months compared to the original May 2014 delivery target. Therefore, this 'objective' has been achieved. The actual rationale for the scorecard was another of course, namely to function as a research project and to produce an advocacy tool. The standards and scorecard has been more successful in achieving the planned results on the research side than as an advocacy tool. This is due to the focus of the project, in addition to the original nature of TI as a research organisation. For future research on OG, the project has created a sound data baseline. It has also brought together knowledge that would otherwise have remained scattered. Since the scorecard as a whole is rather overwhelming, with no clear external communication output added for interested stakeholders, the results may be used in advocacy, but not in the most effective way. Of course this is not only a function of the scorecard design, but rather a lack of capacity by the Chapters to turn the scorecard into relevant communications.

### ***Efficiency***

Our interviewees characterised the project as one that involved good collaboration between the Chapters and TI-S in terms of management and project organisation. We found that this collaboration relied heavily on the involvement of the country coordinators and especially the TI-S project coordinator. Their involvement went beyond the originally planned distribution of tasks and responsibilities as the methodology was planned mostly by TI-S with the help of an external consultant. The Chapters were involved in the design of the scorecard, but only at certain intervals and mostly to provide input in existing processes rather than to co-create. This centralised approach to the scorecard has contributed to a more efficient delivery than would have been the case otherwise. However, it did compromise the original vision for the project, which had foreseen more responsibilities in the Chapters in all aspects. Some Chapters, especially Ghana and Peru, encountered unexpected challenges in securing sufficient research capacity for completing the scorecards, thus resulting in delays, and fewer resources for advocacy. According to our interviews, the capacity to produce the index was not properly assessed at the inception of the scorecard resulting in such difficulties.

The M&E plan did not contribute to improving the efficiency of the scorecard process and the use of the product. This was due to its limited scope and lack of sufficient baseline data, as it was drafted after the project design rather than in concert with it.

### Sustainability

In theory, the process of producing the scorecard could potentially represent the starting point for many TI Chapters to begin developing their own scorecards, and possibly offer interesting content to the OGP members, working together on the promotion of OG standards. In that sense the OG Project might represent a pilot, where some attention to implementation was also included. Similarly, working on this project has primed TI-S to work on OG, understand the challenges and design new projects with this experience in mind. For this longer term benefit to materialise however, TI as a whole needs to take a conscious decision on what happens next: will the experience with OG result in a strategic choice to pursue OG further, or has it added little value to justify continued investments?

As a research and advocacy tool, continued use seems less likely. In its current form, the scorecard does not allow for a comparison of national scores nor for composing a global ranking. It is also unlikely that in its current form, the TI Chapters or others will repeat the research without additional funds or other strong incentives. This means that while the current scorecard will have some shelf life for advocacy purposes, as a comparative tool it will not serve its purpose without substantial changes.

### 2.3 Lessons Learned

Lesson	Drawn from	Applicable to	Risk / opportunity
Research capacity to produce a scorecard with complex and extensive indicators, was not assessed prior to starting work and proved not to be available in each Chapter	Chapters as well as TI-S	Centrally led research projects	Limited Chapter resilience; inefficiencies; Research can drain advocacy resources
Limited ownership by Chapters in the development of scorecards, led to diminished buy-in, enthusiasm to do the research, and acceptance of the final product.	Chapters	Centrally led research projects where methodology is managed by TI-S	Delayed production process; limited use of the scorecard afterwards
The needs and the chances of integration of the tool with existing national activities, should be assessed beforehand	Chapters, Externals	Advocacy tools being developed	Limited uptake
Unclear branding and project design leads to confusion between OG Project indicators and OGP (partnership), both in terms of language and in terms of M&E	Externals	Projects which are closely connected to existing initiatives	Possible synergies but also overlaps

***Case study: Ukraine***

If advocacy is about being ready when an opportunity presents itself, the 2014 revolution ('Maidan revolution' or 'Revolution of dignity') in Ukraine was a prime example. TI rose to the challenge by civil society during the first period of the project, even as the Chapter kept functioning as the connector between the OGP and the local level, and had a key role in formulating and drafting the action plans for Ukraine. The design of the OG Project was flexible enough for TI Ukraine to allow it to convene a 48-strong CSO coalition named "Reanimation Packa using their ongoing projects in a variety of ways. The OG Project was used to organise cycle of Reforms" which developed indicators of open governance and from which some CSOs engaged directly with the new government. This coalition has – in the meantime – grown strong enough to be independent from TI Ukraine's leadership, which is a success for the Movement in building strong civil society for the longer term. Similarly, The implementation of the ProZoro public procurement transparency system, was done with the support of the project funds. With it, many more local actors were trained on public procurement practices and the use of the platform, than otherwise would have been the case. TI played a key role in developing, hosting and making the use of the platform compulsory for public procurement.

**CHAPTER 3 – ADVOCACY AND CAMPAIGNING****3.1 Introduction**

In the first iteration of the project, advocacy and campaigning were seen as relevant on two levels: national and regional.<sup>5</sup> The idea was to advocate for the OG principles towards national policy makers and to introduce these principles to national CSOs in several regions, in order to create a broader base of organisations and people working on open governance. In the final project design, a global advocacy component was added with the intention to influence the process at the OGP. This had the purpose of making TI as organisation visible in the OGP, and making the country-level reality more visible in the OGP by feeding back the information gathered at the national and regional levels. Finally, even though advocacy in relation to the OGP was not included in the original framework, project resources were used to move the OGP action plans forward in several countries.

***Case study: Ghana***

Ghana has struggled with producing the scorecard as they lacked research capacity. This together with some internal changes, prevented them from making full use of the opportunities of the project, especially in advocacy. However, when the OGP process stalled in Ghana due to internal changes in the government and diminishing available resources as a result of that, GII was able to bring together CSOs and the government using their own funds, to further

---

<sup>5</sup> In this report, we use 'regional' in the supranational sense (i.e. geographical regions of multiple countries), not in the subnational sense (i.e. geographical units making up a country). To designate the latter we use 'local'.

the development of the OGP Action Plan. Under the GII’s newly appointed Programme Manager, the existing Social Auditing Clubs also started using OG in their sub-national advocacy activities bringing together citizens, civil society and local governments. This indicates that through the OG Project, TI priorities and OG principles have trickled down, even though it was not achieved in the way the project had originally envisioned. The OG Project has provided the evidence, the funds and the impetus to influence institutions and stakeholders in Ghana.

### 3.2 Answering the research questions

Advocacy & Campaigning		Relevance	Outcomes & Impact	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability
Positive	Chapters	Important to nudge national & regional CSOs to advocate on OG	Coalitions working on OG	Laying the groundwork for effective advocacy	Low-cost approach	Stronger coalitions
			Better OG messages			Increased OG knowledge
			Supported other advocacy	Useful tool if an opportunity arises	Existing structures & resources used for OG	Durable CSO advocacy coalitions in all countries
		Also informed OGP processes	Nudged OGP in right direction in Ghana & Peru	The project provided the means		
TI-S/ Global	Information from field into OGP	Better capacity TI to work on OG		–	TI continues to work on OG	
Negative	Chapters	How the project leads to impact not specified	No concrete legislative results (non expected)	Advocacy strategies lacking	No monitoring of advocacy impact	Lasting policy changes uncertain
	TI-S/ Global	No evidence yet	No actual global advocacy done			

#### Relevance

To achieve the inclusion of open governance principles in public sector policies and practices, this project aimed to produce useful tools, to bring together a strong representation of national civil society, and to offer capacity building to empower people and organisations to advocate for OG at various levels. Direct lobbying was not part of the project’s objectives. This is a relevant approach in principle, but little time has been spent discussing whether the theory of change behind the approach was indeed valid in all national contexts.

In the planning phase, TI envisioned the emergence of regional coalitions of CSOs. These would advocate towards regional bodies using information collected at national level, and would bring to light patterns or similarities in the way OG is (not) put into practice in a specific region. It was also assumed that national stories could travel upwards to the global level (OGP) and influence the process. These assumptions on the relevance of regional and global advocacy have not yet been validated in the implementation period. In the interviews with regional OGP coordinators however, the evaluators have been made aware of movements towards forming a regional OGP hub in South America, and of the existence of more informal regional networks in which Indonesia and Ukraine play a leading role.

### ***Outcomes & Impacts***

In the project documents the long-term planned impact of the project was described in terms of policy change. The immediate outcomes revolved around capacity building, forming coalitions and informing policy makers rather than on lobbying. Therefore, it is logical that no legislative changes directly attributable to this project were found. However, this makes the development of a scorecard (as opposed to standards), less fitting for the advocacy objectives of the project. Delays in producing the scorecard further limited its use for advocacy. However, the project had an impact on the capacity of TI and its network to work on OG, and has resulted in the formation of coalitions in which the TI Chapters are active in all countries. Some of these coalitions were newly formed, as in the case of Ukraine. In other cases, existing collaborations started working on Open Governance. The evaluation produced strong evidence that the project also enhanced the quality of advocacy activities and messaging of the national Chapters and the coalitions they were a part of, both on the OG and on the underlying principles.

During the lifetime of the project, the OGP became the project's principal global advocacy audience. Unfortunately, the priorities of the OGP (membership and monitoring as opposed to holding members to binding standards) make it an imperfect match for the scorecard, limiting its impact in that forum. No direct advocacy was done towards international bodies during the project period.

### ***Effectiveness***

The theory of change of the project recognises that Open Governance needs systemic (policy) change. To date, the OG Project has not contributed directly as the main driver of national or international policy change. However, by undertaking a number of advocacy activities (stakeholder meetings, workshops, seminars, public debates, campaign activities, trainings, press conferences, interviews etc.) the OG and the OGP (or the principles underpinning these) have been put or kept on the agenda. Without this project, this may not have happened. The project has also laid the groundwork for future advocacy on OG by producing advocacy messages, informing CSOs, governments and other stakeholders, and also by bringing together stakeholders at local and national level. This may lead to more concrete impact on policy processes in the medium to long-term. In one instance (Ukraine) where a large political

shift took place, the project was used effectively to inform a much broader legislative change process. Here, TI Ukraine contributed their expertise on Open Governance and OGP, as well as their convening power.

### ***Efficiency***

The resources of the project were used to organise meetings with advocacy potential, involving policy makers, other CSOs and stakeholders. In doing so, they used existing structures and networks as well as staff time and resources of the individual Chapters. Furthermore, in several interviews the impression was relayed that this project was not inexpensive, but it did deliver value for money. Our review of the budgets confirmed that resources were distributed efficiently on advocacy activities, and spending on circumstantial budget lines was minimal. Managing the advocacy activities was mostly left to the Chapters with ad hoc support from TI-S. The project Chapters each had their own advocacy approaches, but there were no specific advocacy strategies in place connecting actions with the desired outcomes of the project and the Theory of Change. Advocacy was included in general terms in the MEL plan, but subsequently advocacy impact was not monitored consistently.

Interviewees repeatedly flagged that due to limited involvement of the TI-S communications department, external communications, including the project website, did not add substantial value. The fact that the communications team was not involved in the design of the project, and aside from a budget line for developing the website, their support was not included in the budgets, meant that it could only offer very limited support in achieving the advocacy objectives. It also meant that the information emanating from the project was not used in other venues within TI or by other Chapters. In general, the role of the communications department in projects involving national Chapters is poorly defined which leads to frustration on the TI-S side and among Chapters.

### ***Sustainability***

The advocacy tool, messages, collected knowledge and increased capacity to work on OG, will most likely remain relevant for some time. The TI movement, national coalitions working and local structures will continue to work on OG, or at least on many of the ideas underpinning open governance. In that sense the project will have a lasting impact. However, since no policy changes were foreseen, direct advocacy impact is not visible making the question of sustainability moot. To understand whether the work done under the project, to prepare the ground for policy changes, will lead to such changes, a follow-up project or study would be required.

### 3.3 Lessons Learned

Lesson	Drawn from	Applicable to	Risk / opportunity	*
A comprehensive Standards and scorecard may be labor intensive but can be useful for national advocacy as it provides Chapters with a credible advocacy tool.	Three out of four project countries	New type of advocacy campaigns where audiences are not fully aware of the concepts	Building a new tool for each project rather than using the tools available	3
The comprehensive scorecard proved unhelpful for comparative analysis between countries	Global researchers, advocates <sup>6</sup>	Detailed scoring tools used in wildly differing national situations	A reworked version may prove useful	
Process is as important as the project: this project allowed for national flexibility in finding ways to use the project to the benefit of the national Chapter's advocacy	Our assessment of the evidence	All multi-country projects	Mixing a Chapters day-to-day work with OG, makes MEL challenging	9
Lack of involvement of operational units in TI-S (especially comms) when designing a project, leads to missed opportunities to promote, use or strengthen the project.	TI-S, the project, ODS' review of the GTNI	All TI projects and projects	Better integration of TI-S operational units with research and advocacy	
				* Relevant recommendation

#### Case study: Indonesia

The most important success for TI Indonesia has been the implementation of the Linida project in which they have collaborated with another organisation to teach villagers how to hold their local public authorities to account. This has been made possible by the flexible approach to this project – designed by TI and allowed by the funder – in which Chapters were able to combine the project implementation with other ongoing work. In Indonesia this synergy has not only led to success in citizen engagement, but has also diverted attention away from OG advocacy, especially after the director's attention was taken up by important political crises. Under the OG Project no clear outcomes or deliverables were formulated on how to use the resources allocated to advocacy in the most effective way. With a clearer strategy and MEL framework, more advocacy impact could have been demonstrated and it may have been easier to allocate sufficient time and resources from relevant staff despite other urgent issues.

<sup>6</sup> Similar issues occur in other ranking tools such as Oxfam's Fair Finance Guide International

## CHAPTER 4 – CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT

### 4.1 Introduction

The notion that citizens should be engaged by governments and other actors in the public sphere, is a core principle governments commit to in the OGP, and a crucial element in Open Governance. It is an indispensable counterpart of openness in government that citizens are engaged to receive and assess the available information. In addition to this, informed citizens are better able to pressure policy makers, businesses and others, to comply with the principles of open governance. In the OG Project, engaging citizens, informing them about OG but also supporting them to take an interest in relevant processes, is a crucial element. This was true from the design phase and in the Theory of Change, but has been given even more precedence by the Chapters. For all of them – except Ukraine, where circumstances elevated the importance of advocacy – citizen engagement became the core objective.

### 4.2 Answering the research questions

Citizen Engagement		Relevance	Outcomes & Impact	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability
Positive	Chapters	Citizens need to use their right to information	Discussions at local level	Laid the groundwork for engaged citizenry	TI Chapters used their experience, expertise and networks	Projects & groups continue in all countries
		Citizens should participate in public consultations	Actions towards authorities			
		Better citizens' understanding of OG supports OG advocacy	Reached multipliers like journalists and teachers	Effective use of local groups	Many activities on a modest budget	
	TI-S/ Global	The information gathered could be fed back into OGP	Presentations local initiatives at the OGP	No evidence		
Negative	Chapters	Access to information is still very (too?) broad as a topic	Limited citizen understanding of OG as such		Initiatives suffered from circumstance/organisational problems	Without continued attention, citizens will forget OG
			Limited actual action taken by citizens, even as they did become better informed			
	TI-S/ Global	No evidence yet of OGP taking local perspective into account				

### ***Relevance***

All project countries lack a system for effective public consultation between governments and citizens. This is due to a lack in government facilitation but also – as the Linida project in Indonesia makes clear – caused by a lack of capacity or understanding among the public to participate. Something similar is true for access to information: citizens need to understand the importance of the information, and therefore want access.. Under the OG Project, citizens were engaged to learn about the OG principles as such, but also to engage in discussions on specific topics such as access to information or participation. Both of these types of engagement are relevant and allow citizens to use their rights and to become advocates for these rights or even OG itself. Focusing on a specific issue such as access to information or citizen participation, allowed Chapters to make tangible the abstract concepts of OG and transparency.

CSOs and grassroots organisations are fundamental in reaching local populations with messages derived from OG. Unfortunately, the range of issues under OG is too broad for one project to cover all of them. This means that though important, the initiatives have only limited relevance to implementing OG as a set of standards or principles.

### ***Outcomes & Impacts***

When it comes to accessing information or citizen participation in the public sector, it is crucial that citizens are active in claiming their rights and understand the value of these rights. The OG Project achieved the first step by informing them, which happened in all countries. In some (Indonesia) the project involved actually working with citizens to claim their rights at the local level. In others (Peru) citizens were part of the research on OG in their communities, which is a more active form of engagement. Ukraine used the resources from the project to facilitate, provide expertise and information as part of public consultations, and build citizens' capacity. This gave others (and TI in other projects), the tools to influence the new and evolving legal framework. In Ghana citizens participated in discussions in over 30 social auditing clubs, with the purpose of getting local authorities to commit to certain principles related to OG.

The impact of the project however is limited, as most activities focused on individuals or small groups rather than the population as a whole. There were initiatives to inform journalists, other CSOs or university professors, which have the potential to widen the reach of the project. However, due to a lack of adequate M&E practices in the project countries, no evidence was collected on whether participants of the engagement activities changed their level of awareness, or used the newly learned notions of OG or OGP. Therefore, the impact of the activities remains unclear.

### ***Effectiveness***

The OG Project has succeeded in bringing together groups of citizens through the work of the TI Chapters, other CSOs and grassroots organisations. In these groups, discussions were

held and in some instances actions were prepared related to OG. However, due a of lack of resources (both human and financial) within TI Chapters and local organisations, the reach of these activities was limited. So while the work of CSOs and grassroots organisations has proven effective to deliver the activities planned under the project, reaching the planned outcomes and fostering broader participation would require a scaled approach and better impact monitoring.

### ***Efficiency***

In order to engage citizens in several project countries, staff needs to be knowledgeable and involved, as well as understand the target communities. In the OG Project, this has been acknowledged by maintaining a decentralised approach even as the development of the standards and scorecard was centralised. In doing so, all Chapters used their existing experience, network and knowledge to further the project, while at the same time using the project to expand their capacities. This has created efficiencies that contributed to the success of the project implementation, and achieved the project objective of increasing Chapter capacity. Unfortunately, in absence of Chapters' M&E frameworks for the projects, it is difficult to assess just how much value this project has added to Chapters' regular work or which projects would otherwise have not taken place.

Furthermore, the risk of any decentralised process is that it increases vulnerability to changes in the implementing organisation or in local circumstances. This has indeed posed a problem in some cases. In Indonesia and Ukraine political externalities implicated the capacity of the Chapter to work on citizen engagement whereas staff turnover in Ghana resulted in delivery delays.<sup>7</sup> The role of TI-S was limited to building operational capacity, which it has done, but there has not been any training on citizen engagement per se.

### ***Sustainability***

The work of the grassroots organisations and groups in Ghana, Indonesia and Peru, will continue after the end of the programme. A concern does remain on how these coalitions will raise funds to continue engaging citizens as the project comes to a close. This would be unfortunate, as without additional scale and continued attention to OG, the experience will be wasted and the issue will fade from memory. As the impact of these activities was not tracked, it is difficult to say to what extent the results of the work of the Chapters will be sustainable. Where it was assessed – in Peru and Indonesia – it was clear that potential for durable impact was there, provided the projects would increase their reach.

---

<sup>7</sup> This issues is not exclusive to citizen engagement but as Chapters were most involved in implementing this part of the project, we include it here. See the country reports in the annexes for more details.

### 4.3 Lessons Learned

Lesson	Drawn from	Applicable to	Risk/opportunity
When existing activities or infrastructures at national level were used in combination with the tools developed under the project, with the pressure of agreed advocacy deliverables under the project, citizens were reached in interesting and innovative ways.	Local contexts in all four project countries	Projects that build on existing efforts in similar areas, especially at the local level.	Insufficient distinction between project and regular work can lead to lack of focus Insufficient distinction between project and regular work can lead to lack of focus
Without sufficient scope, reaching citizens can have a very limited effect. For change there needs to be a momentum or a project needs to aim for a tipping point.	Activity reports	Projects with a focus on in-person meetings	Only direct contact results in impact, severely limiting the potential

#### *Case study: Peru*

In 2014, Proetica started to implement a project in cooperation with Contraloría General de la República (the agency controlling public expenditure). The objective of the project was to collect information on Open Governance and evaluate the feasibility of civic involvement. Several training workshops were conducted with journalists, who were the main target group of the interventions. After one year however, due to some organisational issues, both parties decided to discontinue the project. The project was replaced by “Brigada anti corrupción”, which was designed to have a more grassroots approach. The new project aims to empower citizens to audit public procurement procedures. It also promotes the engagement of the public sector in holding it accountable towards citizens. The initiative was widely covered by media and resulted in a partnership between Proetica and Defensoria del Pueblo (Autonomous body, which supervises respect of constitutional and human rights, similar to an Ombudsperson), to continue work on public procurement. In this case therefore, the grassroots collaboration proved a better approach than engaging with the government directly.

## CHAPTER 5 – CSO NETWORKS

### 5.1 Introduction

Based on the original Theory of Change of the OG Project as well as the project implementation documents, CSOs were envisioned to potentially form networks working on OG on four levels:

- I. At a global level, one of the purposes of engaging TI Chapters was that they would form a network within TI working on OG.
- II. Regionally, these same Chapters could then leadW a network of TI Chapters in other countries working on common issues regarding OG.
- III. Nationally, the project envisioned CSO coalitions coming together to advocate for OG towards their national governments and develop the standards and scorecard.
- IV. At the local level, CSOs, interest groups and initiatives could be brought in to discuss OG principles, engage citizens and advocate towards local authorities.

Of these four, the first and second were an explicit project objective whereas the third and fourth were mainly conditions for the implementation of the project.

### 5.2 Answering the research questions

CSO Networks		Relevance	Outcomes & Impact	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability
Positive	Chapters	To work on OG, CSO coalitions or networks are crucial: locally, nationally, regionally, and globally	Regional and National groups included OG in their work	Strong incentive for national coalitions	Building on existing structures	Many of the regional groups will continue
			Ad hoc coalitions on specific issues	Needs based coalition building	Decentralised approach worked	Nationally fora and common languages have emerged
	TI-S/ Global		TI movement works on OG	This project has mobilised TI & Chapters	No resources were wasted on global level	TI movement will keep working on OG
Negative	Chapters	Coalitions did not work exclusively on OG	Coalitions were not necessarily strengthened	Limited depth and frequency of the collaborations	Insufficient resources to support local CSOs	Remaining coalitions not OG focused perse
	TI-S/ Global	Internal TI motives (creating Chapter leadership/ 'Hubs') are less relevant	No new regional or global coalitions working on OG			

#### Relevance

The need to work in coalitions of CSOs on OGP and OG, is widely recognised. There are two main reasons for CSO involvement. Firstly, it is often up to civil society organisations (as well as media, educational institutions and companies in open governance) to hold governments

(and other organisations active in the public domain) accountable using the available information. Aside from being stakeholders in that sense, CSOs also have the convening power to advocacy, and campaign to inform citizens or move them to action. Building CSO Networks at various levels is therefore a logical and relevant part of this project. At global and regional level OG needs to be promoted with international organisations, corporations and INGOs, at national level CSO coalitions are instrumental in advocating national governments, and locally smaller groups and grassroots initiatives can come together (with the help of larger NGOs) to engage citizens directly as well as advocate locally.

An internal objective of TI was also to provide participating Chapters with the opportunity to lead a coalition of TI Chapters in their regions. To the overarching goal of promoting and monitoring OG, this is less relevant other than leading to more organisations working on the topic.

### ***Outcomes & Impacts***

At sub-national or local level, as well as nationally, networks or fora for discussion already existed in many of the project countries (such as in Ghana) or were set up for other purposes than the OG Project alone (Indonesia). In Peru, new local collaborations were initiated, at first with some difficulty but later with more success. In Ukraine, the coalition building was not driven by the project but rather by the political situation. However, OG did provide those coalitions with valuable information used in the development of the new legislative framework. In all these cases, the groups did not work exclusively on OG, but thanks to the project they were involved with OG and the OGP in ways they would otherwise have not. While it is clear that OG was discussed because of the project, it is not clear that synergies were achieved or whether sustainable long-term partnerships have been created with the purpose of working on OG. Partnerships had an ad-hoc and functional character. For example, such partnerships were created to organise OGP meetings in Ghana when the government lagged. These may be reactivated or may even prove to become structural with time.

No structured cooperation emerged at the supranational level. There have been occasions where the project organisations were included in conferences, or regional meetings were held, but this has not led to a stable global or regional coalition working on OG. In Ukraine, a truly regional website was built and an effort was made to transcend the national debate but even there, TI Ukraine is the only active organisation behind the website. One could argue that TI itself is a 'coalition' and that this project has been successful in moving TI as a whole and TI-S in particular, to become a lead organisation in working on Open Governance and the OGP. This is more of an internal result, but in an area where the involvement of civil society is seen as crucial, becoming the leading global anti-corruption INGO on board is important. This has also been confirmed by external stakeholders involved in the OGP, including a representative of the project's funder.

### ***Effectiveness***

While the project did not actively create coalitions to work on OG, it provided the space and resources for these to emerge spontaneously. Where a more centralised approach would have been needed – regionally under the leadership of a national coalition and globally under the leadership of the PLT – the Chapters formed no such coalition. Limited resources affected the intensity of the collaborations, and as in the citizen engagement work, limited the reach of the project as well. Several interviewees indicated that the project could have resulted in even more cooperation locally if there would have been more budget to provide to other (grassroots) organisations.

**Efficiency**

TI Chapters leveraged their pre-existing coalitions and collaborative relationships in the implementation of the OG Project. Collaboration under this project had the added value of broadening the issues on which these networks could work together. This was efficient in promoting OG within the national context and in some cases supported the advocacy and citizen engagement activities. Focusing on pre-existing networks meant that few new synergies were found, which means that the project was ineffective in broadening these networks. In terms of management, the responsibility for coalition building rested with each Chapter. This division of responsibilities was efficient for the national campaigns as local Chapters were able to better judge the more suitable approach for their national context. However, it led to inefficiencies and lack of progress in building regional or international networks.

**Sustainability**

Some organisations who were working together before the start of the OG Project are continuing to collaborate and implement joint activities, only now with more attention to OG. In addition, the project has created a common forum and language at national level to discuss OG, which will remain helpful to discuss other issues around open governance, anti corruption and access to information. We do not expect these coalitions to survive as ‘OG Networks’, with the exception of Ghana where the work of CSO coalition on the OGP plans, seems to have forged a more sustainable collaboration. In Latin America, the regional OGP coordinator suggested that she would try to establish a coalition of national CSOs led by Proetica, to work OGP. TI’s own work on OG and within the OGP will continue as well, which means that the relationships built under this project may prove useful again in the near future.

**5.3 Lessons Learned**

Lesson	Drawn from	Applicable to	Risk/opportunity
Coalitions only work if there is an actual need and/or resources to create an incentive to work together on a certain topic	Success of coalitions at different levels	All projects in which NGO networking is a goal	Forced coalitions or networks do not work.

Nationally, coalitions were effective and efficient but their scope was limited due to budget Constraints and the many other elements of the project that needed attention.	Project documents, Interviews with project leads	Project design phases involving Multiple objectives	More focus would help but would also reduce The incubator function
---	--	---	--

## CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Specific Programme Recommendations

#### *Standards & Scorecard*

Developing the standards and realising the scorecards can be seen as remarkable accomplishments both for the comprehensiveness of the research and the quality of the analysis. However, the initial aim of the standards and scorecards was to arrive at a uniform framework across all project countries. In implementing the project, it became clear that while the standards were one and the same, the interpretation of those standards and the indicators varied significantly depending on the national context. In principle, this could be positive as it allows the standards to be used in different contexts. For comparing across borders however, these differences pose a serious problem. In the interviews it was recognised that in its current form the standards and scorecard are not useful to arrive at a multi-country comparison or a global ranking of countries on adherence to OG Standards. The scorecards did prove to be effective in other ways. The tool provided some countries with a comprehensive baseline assessment that did not exist before, which has the potential of being used to monitor a country’s progress on all or some of the indicators. All Chapters also used the tool for advocacy at the national level and the scorecard provided them with more bargaining power.

1. The scorecards should consider more sophisticated scoring beyond the three-tiered method currently applied. This would add further advocacy potential for national Chapters. Provided the amount of indicators is drastically reduced, the cost of production would not increase.
2. Before becoming involved in complex multi-year projects, each Chapter would benefit from an impartial assessment of their research capacity and resources in order to ensure their ability to deliver on their commitments.

#### *Advocacy & Campaigning*

While the Standards and scorecards had promise as advocacy tools for the concepts of Open Government and Governance, we have discussed above that no concrete success was envisioned or achieved in that regard. The work on these issues did build up the expertise of TI and indirectly supported their other advocacy campaigns, and led to more actions to promote OGP and OG.

3. The Standards and scorecard could be more useful for advocacy (and its impact more sustainable) if it were split into two parts:
  - a. A limited set of global indicators, comparable across national contexts, which allow for a ranking or at least a relative assessment of the progress towards open governance;
  - b. A full list of optional indicators, from which the national Chapters could choose a minimum number of themes relevant to their national context.
4. The Chapter could then research and complete the two-part scorecard every two or three years, using it to track progress nationally while allowing TI to compare scores internationally.
  - a. In the design phase of any advocacy project, more attention needs to be given to designing a strategy and ways to monitor progress. This includes an assessment of the national government's position, the likelihood of advocacy success and (political) risks/opportunities.

### ***Citizen Engagement***

The project was successful in pursuing the activities related to citizen engagement, with all interviewees judging them positively. Most of these were grassroots initiatives creating synergies with the core work of the national Chapters. They had more limited connections to the specific objectives of the project. The initiatives all remained relatively small-scale and localised, and no information was collected on their impact and how they will be aligned with the future work of the Chapters. Therefore, scaling and sustainability of these initiatives are the most important priorities.

5. Scaling the citizen engagement activities should be top priority. One way to achieve this would be to add resources and organise more meetings with citizens. These should be supported by a broader campaign, more focus on schools or universities, or other multipliers. A thorough citizen engagement strategy, based on an analysis of what is effective in the respective countries and supported by concrete KPIs (number of people reached) would be necessary.
6. National Chapters have paid little attention to the impact of the activities. It would be important for Chapters to think about what would determine success for citizen engagement (changes in behaviour, awareness, etc.), and how TI can know whether resources are spent efficiently.

### ***CSO Networks***

National Chapters managed to deepen collaboration with their pre-existing networks through the OG project and at a subnational level, fruitful collaborations were found in all project countries. Few truly new connections were formed as a result of this project, and no significant activity took place at the supranational (regional or international) scale. In Peru and possibly in Ghana, regional networks may still emerge after the project has ended, working on OGP implementation.

7. Networks require specific incentives to function autonomously and successfully. The two most important possible incentives are usefulness and money. Therefore, any NGO network or coalition that is proposed, should either have a strong value proposition for its members, be well funded with benefits for all members, or both.
8. The top-down approach to coalition building or creating of hubs led by chapters, is not working. It might be better for TI-S to play a more facilitating role, identifying existing or emerging collaborations and leveraging those by offering support, resources and making connections.
9. Best practices in community mobilisation, should be shared horizontally between CSOs. This is true nationally but lessons can also be learned from different countries. It would be useful for the different Chapters working on this pilot project to share ideas and create a platform (or use existing infrastructure) which can include though and insights from different angles.

## 6.2 Specific Operational Conclusions & Recommendations

The project found an interesting balance between the centralised development of the Standards & scorecard, and the decentralised implementation of the advocacy and citizen engagement elements of the project. This resulted in delivering on the production of the standards and scorecards even though the scope of the scorecard was seen as too ambitious.

It is impossible to draw hard conclusions on the efficiency of the project without a control project to compare it with. We do conclude that a large amount of activities and outputs were achieved with the available sources, pointing to a reliable management of the country-level activities, in 3 out of the 4 countries.<sup>8</sup> Chapters have allocated their own resources and existing infrastructure to the project which enhanced its reach. This was especially true for citizen engagement, as in several countries existing local networks and groups were mobilised to reach target audiences. This together with the lack of a solid MEL framework, makes it difficult to identify the unique contribution of this project.

The project was managed by a prominently involved coordinator from TI-S. The coordinator was assisted by the regional coordinators on an ad-hoc basis in addressing problems in the Chapters. The project and regional coordinators put significant effort into following up with Chapters, solving problems on the ground, and working with the Chapters on site. This was energy intensive for TI-S, and not always welcomed by the Chapters, although it ensured that most deliverables were realised.

Aside from the coordinator, there was no real ownership over this project at TI-S leadership level. This may have been caused by the donor requesting the addition of a scorecard with a strict timeline, or perhaps it may have been the result of the project being moved to another department. However, as this lack of ownership has occurred in other TI initiatives as well, it may point to the more structural problems of initiatives being moved around too much, or initiators losing interest. In addition to complicating the project itself, it also led to the proliferation of projects without paying sufficient attention to potential synergies or overlaps.

---

<sup>8</sup> In Ghana, the project implementation was closed before the end of the extension period due to management issues.

The project had periodic reporting and a detailed MEL plan, but these were designed after the beginning of the project. During implementation, Chapters used an informal reporting structure, and made limited use of the MEL framework and tools. This resulted in a lack of documentation and an oversight of the impact of the project activities.

10. To insure a holistic project approach, M&E frameworks should be developed in concert with the Risk Management framework and the project proposal. A reporting framework developed together or by the Chapters would be used more than once coming from TI-S.
11. Informal reporting is sufficient if the coordinator and Chapter project managers are aware of shared minimum requirements. Reporting in this case was driven by the donor, rather than by a strategic interest from TI-S. The latter approach is more conducive to good reporting.
12. Even though they were frequently invited to contribute, Chapters felt limited ownership of the scorecard. In future programmes developing similar tools, a collaborative process should be designed to foster co-creation rather than just validation or participation, by taking into account the (perceived) power variances between the Chapters and TI-S.
13. Operational units in TI-S, namely the Communications department, should be involved in the project design. Their resources should be budgeted in each project, allowing them to support the project and horizontally use its outputs and successes in the future.

### 6.3 Strategic conclusions & recommendations

#### *Designing programmes & projects*

Producing a tool such as the Standards & Scorecard is in principle, a good investment in support of evidence based advocacy, if a clear added value is to be expected. In this case, the investment in the Standards & Scorecard will have been worthwhile if there is sufficient follow-up and/or the tool is taken up by others. In building TI's capacity to work on OG, the project was successful but not efficient.

Going forward, should a tool like this be deemed useful, the research project should still be managed from TI-S. The question is whether TI-S should only manage it in terms of funding, logistics and setting the ToR, or whether the research should be done in-house as well. In an ever more specialised and expanding field, closer collaborations with (national) research institutes, seems inevitable. But working on the research also has significant benefits for TI in determining their advocacy strategies. A mix of internal and external research would therefore be most beneficial,

In advocacy projects, TI-S should play a facilitating role. This includes building capacity, providing research and other types of information, logistical support, fundraising, external communications, etc. In some cases, if requested by the Chapters, coordination could also be provided. . Only with regard to global advocacy and campaigning, would TI-S take the lead

building on the work done nationally and regionally. The same is true for citizen engagement projects, but without a global role for TI-S.

The OG Project is actually a good example of how such a platform could work, but to apply it as a model for other projects, a checklist is needed on the conditions to be met and actions to be taken when designing a successful multi-country project.

14. This process template should include, but is not limited to:
  - › A careful assessment of the capacity (research, organisation, campaigning, etc.) of a Chapter or TI-S to implement all the elements of the project.
  - › A careful assessment of existing tools and approaches, with the purpose of finding synergies where possible.
  - › Collaboratively, the implementing entities should formulate the project Theory of Change, MEL Framework and reporting practices, and a Risk Framework, according to a TI MEL manual.
  - › TI-S should support each Chapter to formulate its own project MEL framework for the national or regional implementation. The content, priorities and approaches should be determined by the Chapters, especially in advocacy or citizen engagement.
  - › A clear agreement needs to be made in advance regarding the support of TI-S, and this needs to be budgeted for. For Chapter led projects, TI-S should function as a service provide.
  - › The role of the Comms department needs to be clarified and brought in line with a more supporting role for TI-S. Brand consistency and research quality should move to another department and comms should provide support. However, in order to be effective, they should be involved in the design of every project, and sufficient resources should be allocated.

### ***Future OGP and Open Governance work***

In line with the general recommendation to split research and advocacy/citizen engagement projects, there are two possible futures to work on OG and OGP which we could recommend.

15. First, the existing projects engaging citizens could scale in order to reach more people, better strategise and monitor outcomes in terms of changes in awareness or behaviour, and better utilise the information collected. This would involve allocating a larger budget to these projects, but also involve delivering more support in building project M&E frameworks, in external communications, and in the general collecting of data from the activities with citizens.
16. Secondly, the Standards & Scorecard could be turned into a more useful tool by TI-S' research department, in the way described above. National Chapters – both those who participated in this project and others – could then use the tool with much less effort, adapting it to their own needs. TI-S could support the research, collect data to improve the scorecard and find ways to use the aggregated data for global advocacy.

An alternative would be to combine the OG Standards and Scorecard tool with other, similar tools in TI. It is outside of the scope of this evaluation to judge which other initiative, if any, would be suitable.