



**Evaluation of Transparency International's  
Programme Partnership Arrangement (PPA) with the  
UK Department for International Development (DFID)**

**Management Response**

**Introduction**

Transparency International (TI) is pleased that comprehensive evaluations of its work are encouraged by DFID and commends DFID for its commitment to evaluation and learning.

This evaluation of the TI secretariat's (TI-S) performance over the period 1 April 2008 – Autumn 2010 was timely. During this period we have seen considerable growth as a secretariat; we had to respond to new challenges and opportunities; and as a movement we developed a new strategy, *TI Strategy 2015*, which will guide our work in the coming five years. This PPA evaluation was an opportunity to reflect on how we work as a secretariat, how we work as a movement, and how the external environment influences our thinking and our interventions.

We are encouraged by the findings of the evaluation and, where areas of improvement are identified, we have already started addressing them, while agreeing that concrete outcomes of these changes may be difficult to identify at this stage. For example, *TI Strategy 2015* responds to changes within and outside of the movement and enables us to give more focus and be more strategic in our work. Implementation of the strategy will however commence in 2011 and it is hence too early to assess its outcomes.

**Feedback on 'progress against the PPA objectives'**

Transparency International is pleased with the generally positive assessment of our progress against the PPA objectives. We agree with the evaluation team that we have made particular progress in terms of the performance indicators under strategic objective 1 (TI's global and national research and advocacy drives the agenda) and 2 (TI's support and advice to citizens and CSOs on corruption is developed and increased). We also agree that the indicators under objective 3 (Increased commitment of private sector to tackling corruption) were not entirely achieved, and that the indicators under objective 4 (Increased quality and reach of TI's work at national level) were possibly too ambitious.

We however feel the evaluation could have done more to assess our performance against the objectives beyond the indicators only. We consider indicators to be part of the evidence which would inform an analysis on progress, but think it cannot be the entire picture. We would have welcomed more evidence being presented on how we performed against our strategic objectives more broadly.

On the purpose of the PPA, TI is in agreement that we have done and achieved a lot to keep the fight against corruption on the world's agenda. We think many examples of this are provided in our annual self-assessment reports to DFID and also in the evaluation report. We agree that it is more difficult to establish whether our work has led to reduced corruption. We believe that our work promoting integrity, transparency and accountability in the public and private sector have contributed to reducing corruption, but the exact evidence of reduced corruption, and whether

TI was responsible for this reduction, is difficult to establish. Related to this, it is worth noting that due to the changing nature of corruption our achievements are sometimes short-lived and our strategies must constantly be reassessed to remain relevant. Our influence is challenged by vested interests and our approaches to fighting corruption require ongoing adaptations.

### **Feedback on 'the impact of the PPA on TI-S'**

The evaluation emphasises the critical value of unrestricted and strategic funding to enable and maintain growth and quality and it highlights the strategic value of the PPA for the relationship between TI and DFID. TI is pleased the evaluation recognises that many change processes at TI-S would not have taken place, or would have taken longer to complete, without the PPA support, for example in terms of the development of our new strategy, and the strengthening of a range of departments and functions at the TI secretariat

As recognised in the evaluation report, we consider that the PPA has enabled us to keep the partnership at a strategic level and that through PPA support TI is able to add value to DFID. The PPA funding has allowed us to maintain our historically strong partnership with DFID and to interact at the policy level on issues such as asset recovery, the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and aid transparency.

### **Feedback on 'value for money'**

We are encouraged that the evaluation report recognises that despite our relatively small budget "TI is a global player and a well-established brand in fighting corruption". The note that "TI-S has invested the PPA funds appropriately for an organisation at its stage of growth" resonates with us too. We acknowledge that we are currently in a crucial stage of our development in which a strong growth and changing internal and external relationships require new approaches and management models. We are pleased the report highlights that our support costs have considerably decreased over recent years and we are committed to continue improving our efficiency and effectiveness in the future.

Whilst many instances of TI providing value for money are provided in the report, some examples are not highlighted, such as that by working in coalitions and with partners we are able to reach a wider audience and ensure our messages are heard more widely than when working on our own. The very nature of the issue we work on- reducing corruption- is in itself increasing value for money, for DFID's own interventions and beyond. For example, TI's work to promote transparency and integrity in public contracting ensures resources are not abused for private gain but instead benefit the population at large.

### **Feedback on 'issues to be addressed'**

Many of the findings in the report are in line with our own observations which particularly came to the fore during the development of our new strategy. We are therefore confident we will be able to act on those areas which require improvement, and further strengthen those areas where we are already performing well.

The report notes TI should be more strategic in having an impact on peoples' lives. Through our Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres and the Development Pacts we consider we have already made considerable progress in reaching out to citizens. The importance of working with people is recognised further as a key focus area in *TI Strategy 2015*. As the strategy states, "Our aim is to inspire and work with greater numbers of people, to enable societies to reject corruption as a major social, economic and political ill that infringes upon people's basic human rights". Responding to the new strategy we recognise that TI-S will need to set up the necessary structures and acquire the necessarily skills to build on our earlier successes and further increase our work with people.

Improving our monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is indeed important. As the report recognises, TI-S has made considerable efforts on this in recent years, but we do recognise more work needs to be done and that these improvements might take a while to bear fruit and be visible to external stakeholders, and to ourselves. While improving on our M&E we will emphasise the importance of learning and we will also aim to respond to the complexities in measuring progress and attribution in our line of work.

In terms of our resource base, we recognise the need to further diversify our donors. We have made considerable efforts in this regard in recent years, successfully starting partnerships with some of the bigger US Foundations, but at the same time the global economic downturn has meant our corporate resource base has come under substantial pressure. As a result we are still heavily reliant on governmental donors. This is something we seek to remedy, through the implementation of the new TI strategy which calls for new and alternative funding models for the TI movement.

The report implies that for TI to be more effective in fighting corruption it could consider other models for the movement, giving the TI Secretariat a more central role. We believe that our decentralised structure is in fact very strategic in that our National Chapters are locally established and fully independent national organisations strongly rooted in their own country. While contributing to the general mission and objectives of the TI movement, this gives them the local knowledge and credibility necessary to effectively tackle corruption at the national level. A more centralised structure would likely give less credibility to our chapters and would decrease their convening power. Local ownership, knowledge and credibility are fundamental for our work.

The evaluators describe the need for TI to be more strategic in its geographical prioritisation. *TI Strategy 2015* notes on this that we will aim to “have strong Chapters able to influence the national and international priorities of their governments and societies in all established and emerging global and regional power centres”

The evaluation notes that TI-S will have to better ensure the sustainability of its tools, such as the Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres, and that it will have to decide on its priorities. The new strategy is entirely intended to bring focus to our work, while still recognising the diversity of the movement which we consider one of our strengths. In particular, the upcoming five-year implementation plan for *TI Strategy 2015* will determine our priority interventions and ways forward.

The report notes TI-S could consider having more regional representation. We welcome this analysis and hope to build on the successful start of our Brussels office, focusing on EU institutions, which we opened in 2008.

### **Final remarks**

TI gratefully acknowledges the support of DFID as a key partner in our work and we look forward to continuing to work together in our quest to fight corruption and promote accountability, integrity and transparency around the world. We also look forward to engaging with DFID as we act on the conclusions of this report.

*Transparency International, 30 November 2010*