

**METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF CROSSCUTTING THEMES IN THE CZECH DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION**

GOOD GOVERNANCE INDICATORS

FICHES



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTPUT INDICATORS..... | 7 |
| GGO1: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CONSULTATION MECHANISMS ESTABLISHED | 7 |
| GGO2: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ADVOCACY/OUTREACH PRODUCTS CREATED WITH PROJECT SUPPORT | 8 |
| GGO3: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ADVOCACY COALITIONS ESTABLISHED | 9 |
| GGO4: NUMBER AND FORMAT OF CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT BY PROJECT RECIPIENT WITH OTHER PROJECT KEY STAKEHOLDERS..... | 10 |
| GGO5: EVIDENCE OF PROVISION OF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO PROJECT PARTNERS, BENEFICIARIES AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THEIR MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT-AFFECTED AREA..... | 11 |
| GGO6: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STAFF OR FEMALE COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND CONSULTATIONS | 12 |
| GGO7: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF MARGINALIZED GROUPS IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND CONSULTATIONS | 13 |
| GGO8: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF GROUPS IN CONFLICT IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES..... | 14 |
| GGO9: NUMBER OF EVENTS TO STRENGTHEN LOCAL GROUP'S PARTICIPATION | 15 |
| GGO10: PARTICIPATION MECHANISMS INTRODUCED BY LOCAL/NATIONAL GOVERNMENT..... | 16 |
| GGO20: TARGET GROUPS ARE EQUIPPED WITH NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE TO ACT TRANSPARENTLY AND ACCOUNTABLY | 17 |
| GGO21: NUMBER OF CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS FORMED AND/OR STRENGTHENED TO DEMAND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM THEIR GOVERNMENT | 18 |
| GGO22: NUMBER OF TECHNICAL RESOURCES/MECHANISMS DEVELOPED WITH PROJECT ASSISTANCE TO STRENGTHEN TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY..... | 19 |
| GGO23: NUMBER OF RESOURCES DEVELOPED THAT SUPPORT EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY DECISIONS..... | 20 |
| GGO24: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MECHANISMS TO IMPROVE OPERATIONS IN THE CONCERNED SECTOR | 21 |
| GGO25: COMPLETENESS AND QUALITY OF LOCAL PARTNER/GOVERNMENT RECORDS IN THEIR OPERATIONS..... | 22 |
| GGO26: EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INFORMATION CAMPAIGN (INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL) RELATED TO A PROJECT OR ITS THEMATIC FOCUS INITIATED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT OR OTHER LOCAL PLAYERS | 23 |
| GGO27: NUMBER OF PUBLIC FORUMS FOR DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION, INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS, AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION | 24 |
| GGO28: NUMBER OF JOURNALISTS TRAINED ON REPORTING RELATED TO TRANSPARENCY OR ACCOUNTABILITY | 25 |
| GGO29: PROPORTION OF TARGET POPULATION THAT HAS GAINED REGULAR ACCESS TO THE INTERNET | 26 |
| GGO30: NUMBER OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs) ESTABLISHED OR REVISED | 27 |
| GGO31: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MECHANISMS OF COMPLAINT ESTABLISHED..... | 28 |
| GGO32: NUMBER AND TYPE OF OPEN DATA POLICIES, PROGRAMMES AND INITIATIVES..... | 29 |
| GGO33: NUMBER AND TYPE OF POLICY DIALOGUES ESTABLISHED AT A NATIONAL OR LOCAL LEVEL | 30 |
| GGO40: PROJECT HAS EQUIPPED RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS PUBLIC SERVANTS, NGO WORKERS AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS/STAKEHOLDERS WITH NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE TO ACT IN ACCORD WITH RULE OF LAW PRINCIPLES..... | 31 |
| GGO41: NUMBER AND TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CHECKS ON GOVERNMENT POWER BY THE LEGISLATURE, THE JUDICIARY, AND INDEPENDENT AUDITING INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED..... | 32 |
| GGO42: NUMBER AND TYPE OF WHISTLE BLOWING PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED | 33 |
| GGO43: INFORMATION REQUESTS FILED BY PROJECT BENEFICIARIES OR PARTNERS | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| GGO44: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OF MECHANISMS INTRODUCED TO STRENGTHEN LAWFUL TRANSITIONS OF POWER IN REGION / COUNTRY | 35 |
| GGO50: NUMBER OF REGULATORS TRAINED | 36 |
| GGO51: NUMBER OF CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS TRAINED TO ADVOCATE FOR GOOD REGULATIONS | 37 |
| GGO52: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING TRAININGS, COURSES AND INFORMAL SESSIONS IN REGULATORY PROCESSES | 38 |
| GGO53: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OR MECHANISMS INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS AND TIMELINESS OF COUNTRY'S REGULATORY PROCESSES..... | 39 |
| GGO60: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING TRAININGS, COURSES AND INFORMAL SESSIONS DELIVERED TO JUSTICE SYSTEM STAKEHOLDERS | 40 |
| GGO61: NUMBER OF JUSTICE SYSTEM STAKEHOLDERS EDUCATED ON FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, JUDICIAL BEST PRACTICES, TREATMENT OF VULNERABLE GROUPS AND OTHER PERTINENT TOPICS | 41 |
| GGO62: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OR MECHANISMS INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED TO STREAMLINE JUDICIAL PROCESSES | 42 |
| GGO63: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS TRAINED AT JUSTICE SYSTEM OVERSIGHT | 43 |
| GGO64: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ADRs ESTABLISHED OR IMPROVED | 44 |

2. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTCOME INDICATORS – B.1 (QUAL.)45

| | |
|--|----|
| GGRL1: EVIDENCE OF CITIZEN AND OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS' ABILITY TO PRESENT THEIR OPINION | 45 |
| GGRL2: EVIDENCE OF INTEGRATION OF TARGET GROUPS' CONCERNS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS TO THE FINAL VERSION OF POLICY PRODUCTS..... | 46 |
| GGRL3: EVIDENCE OF INTEREST/FOLLOW-UP FROM PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS ON PROJECT RESULTS AND THEIR SUSTAINABILITY | 47 |
| GGRL4: EVIDENCE OF CONTINUOUS COOPERATION OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN ACTIVITIES AND DIALOGUES | 48 |
| GGRL5: EVIDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES' INCREASED ACTIVITY IN CONSULTATION PROCESSES | 49 |
| GGRL6: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED POLITICAL TOLERANCE TO OPPOSING VIEWS EXPRESSED BY CIVIL SOCIETY OR OPPOSITION GROUPS | 50 |
| GGRL7: EVIDENCE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY SUPPORTED GROUPS..... | 51 |
| GGRL8: EVIDENCE OF CHANGES ACHIEVED AS A CONSEQUENCE OF ADVOCACY/OUTREACH ACTIVITIES BY SUPPORTED GROUPS | 52 |
| GGRL9: EVIDENCE OF TARGET GROUPS' INFLUENCE ON DECISION MAKING | 53 |
| GGRL10: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED CAPACITY (EFFECTIVENESS) OF CSOs TO ENGAGE IN POLICY DIALOGUES | 54 |
| GGRL11: OCCASIONS OF CONSENSUS OR CONCERTED EFFORTS IN VILLAGE(S) | 55 |
| GGRL20: EVIDENCE OF IMPROVED INFORMATION CONTENT ON OFFICIAL WEBSITES OR IN KEY DOCUMENTS OF PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES | 56 |
| GGRL21: EVIDENCE OF CONTINUOUS PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON PROJECT THEMATIC AREA(S) BY TARGET GROUPS TO RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS, INCL. CITIZENS | 57 |
| GGRL22: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED FREEDOM OF MEDIA..... | 58 |
| GGRL23: EVIDENCE OF A GREATER RESPONSIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT TO CITIZEN REQUESTS..... | 59 |
| GGRL24: GOVERNMENT ENTITIES AND/OR OTHER PLAYERS CONTINUE TO ACTIVELY SEEK FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS ON POLICIES OR PREVIOUSLY AGREED COMMITMENTS | 60 |
| GGRL25: BUDGETING PRACTICE IN A TARGET SECTOR UTILIZES EVIDENCE | 61 |
| GGRL26: DRAFT BUDGETS IN TARGET SECTORS ARE PUBLISHED FOR STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS (OPEN BUDGET) | 62 |

| | |
|---|----|
| GGRL27: EVIDENCE OF LEGISLATIVE CHANGES AIMING AT STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS TAKING PLACE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF A PROJECT | 63 |
| GGRL28: EVIDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES HOLDING REGULAR PUBLIC MEETINGS | 64 |
| GGRL29: EVIDENCE OF MORE EFFICIENT OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES PARTICIPATING IN A PROJECT | 65 |
| GGRL30: PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY OF ALL MAJOR AUDITS, EVALUATIONS AND OTHER PERFORMANCE REVIEWS HAS IMPROVED | 66 |
| GGRL31: THE GOVERNMENT HAS RELEASED A DIGITAL GOVERNMENT STRATEGY | 67 |
| GGRL32: THE GOVERNMENT HAS ADOPTED STEPS TO INCREASE SECURE PUBLIC DATA SHARING AND ACCESS | 68 |
| GGRL33: INCREASED ACCESS AND USE OF OPEN GOVERNMENT DATA | 69 |
| GGRL34: POLICY DIALOGUES ESTABLISHED WITH PROJECT SUPPORT CONTRIBUTE TO EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMMING AND POLICY-MAKING | 70 |
| GGRL35: INCREASED ACTIVITY OF INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISTS | 71 |
| GGRL40: EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENTION FACILITATING FREE PUBLIC ACCESS TO APPLICABLE LAWS | 72 |
| GGRL41: EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT RECIPIENT CONTINUES TO PROVIDE PUBLIC INFORMATION-RELATED SERVICES AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS | 73 |
| GGRL42: PERCEIVED QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS AND TIMELINESS OF ON-REQUEST PROVISION OF PUBLIC RECORDS / INFORMATION..... | 74 |
| GGRL43: EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT RECIPIENT CONTINUES TO ADHERE TO GOOD PRACTICES IN FOSTERING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS | 75 |
| GGRL44: DEGREE OF OBSERVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL LAWS AND ACCEPTED STANDARDS BY NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS | 76 |
| GGRL45: PERCEIVED DEGREE OF FAVOURITISM AND DOMINATION OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR BY POWER GROUPS | 77 |
| GGRL46: CHANGE IN REPORTED TRUST IN GOVERNMENT / JUDICIARY / POLICE BY CITIZENS | 78 |
| GGRL50: EVIDENCE OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPING / ENACTING REGULATIONS THAT COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONALLY ACCEPTED STANDARDS | 79 |
| GGRL51: EVIDENCE OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO GREATER INDEPENDENCE OF REGULATORY PROCESS(ES)..... | 80 |
| GGRL52: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF REGULATORS..... | 81 |
| GGRL53: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO OVERSEE/ADVOCATE FOR GOOD REGULATORY PROCESSES..... | 82 |
| GGRL54: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO EXPOSE CASES OF INSUFFICIENT OR BAD REGULATIONS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT AND HOLD REGULATORS ACCOUNTABLE | 83 |
| GGRL60: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED AND EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR ALL POPULATION GROUPS | 84 |
| GGRL61: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY OF JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS..... | 85 |
| GGRL62: EVIDENCE OF GREATER INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM..... | 86 |
| GGRL63: EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENTION CONTRIBUTING TO PASSING A JUDICIAL REFORM(S) TO STREAMLINE JUDICIAL PROCESSES AND INVESTIGATIONS..... | 87 |
| GGRL64: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS AND A DUE PROCESSING OF THE ACCUSED | 88 |
| GGRL65: CHANGE IN LIVING CONDITIONS OF PRISONERS AND CONVICTED PERSONS IN PSYCHIATRIC FACILITIES..... | 89 |

3. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTCOME INDICATORS – B.2 (QUAN.)90

| | |
|--|----|
| GGRN1: PERCENTAGE AND TYPE OF CIVIL SOCIETY RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS ACCEPTED IN DECISION MAKING ... | 90 |
| GGRN2: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CONSULTATION MECHANISMS THAT ARE FUNCTIONING AFTER THE END OF THE INTERVENTION | 91 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| GGRN3: NUMBER AND TYPE OF STAKEHOLDER COALITIONS THAT ARE FUNCTIONING AFTER THE END OF THE INTERVENTION | 92 |
| GGRN4: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MEDIA PRODUCTS COVERING CAUSES PURSUED BY SUPPORTED STAKEHOLDER GROUPS... | 93 |
| GGRN5: NUMBER OF (JOINT) PETITIONS AND/OR VOICED CONCERNS PRESENTED BY SUPPORTED GROUPS..... | 94 |
| GGRN6: NUMBER OF PUBLIC BODIES OR MECHANISMS THAT REGULARLY INVITE INPUT FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL STAKEHOLDERS..... | 95 |
| GGRN20: NUMBER AND TYPE OF PUBLIC FORUMS OR POLICY DIALOGUES THAT ARE REGULARLY CONVENED BY PROJECT PARTICIPANTS | 96 |
| GGRN21: NUMBER OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND/OR PUBLIC SERVANT DIRECTORIES RELEASED PUBLICLY | 98 |
| GGRN22: PERCENTAGE OF INFORMATION REQUESTS RESPONDED BY GOVERNMENT ENTITIES..... | 99 |
| GGRN23: NUMBER OF PROJECT-ASSISTED CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS THAT ENGAGE IN ADVOCACY AND WATCHDOG FUNCTIONS..... | 100 |
| GGRN24: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ISSUES AND SUGGESTIONS RAISED BY CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS TO GOVERNMENT ENTITIES | 101 |
| GGRN25: PROPORTION AND TYPE OF GOVERNMENT TRANSACTION SERVICES THAT MAY BE MADE ONLINE | 102 |
| GGRN26: PERCENT OF REGIONAL/DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS THAT MAKE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE THEIR ANNUAL BUDGET EACH YEAR..... | 103 |
| GGRN27: NUMBER OF POLICIES OR AMENDMENTS INSTITUTIONALIZED AS A RESULT OF PROJECT SUPPORT..... | 104 |
| GGRN28: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CITIZEN GRIEVANCES AND COMPLAINTS RESOLVED THROUGH NEWLY ESTABLISHED MECHANISMS OF COMPLAINT | 105 |
| GGRN29: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE ON KPIS DEVELOPED..... | 106 |
| GGRN30: NUMBER OF REPORTS, AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT/COMMISSIONED BY GOVERNMENT-OVERSIGHT BODIES AFTER PROJECT END..... | 107 |
| GGRN31: NUMBER, TYPE AND FREQUENCY OF REPORTS PUBLISHED BY GOVERNMENT ENTITIES ON THEIR OWN ACTIVITIES | 108 |
| GGRN32: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CASES WHERE GOVERNMENT ENTITIES WERE CALLED TO ACCOUNTABILITY BY CIVIL SOCIETY SUPPORTED FROM A PROJECT | 109 |
| GGRN33: CHANGE IN INCIDENCES OF CORRUPTING DECISION-MAKERS AND CIVIL SERVANTS | 110 |
| GGRN34: NUMBER AND TYPE GOVERNMENT OPEN DATA SOURCES | 111 |
| GGRN35: MEDIA COVERAGE OF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS | 112 |
| GGRN40: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – OPEN GOVERNMENT AND CORRUPTION | 113 |
| GGRN41: DEMONSTRABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN TIMELINESS AND QUALITY OF (OPEN) GOVERNMENT SERVICES..... | 114 |
| GGRN42: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SANCTIONED FOR MISCONDUCT | 115 |
| GGRN43: NUMBER OF FORMAL INFORMATION REQUESTS/COMPLAINTS FILED BY CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS AFTER RECEIVING SUPPORT FROM THE INTERVENTION | 116 |
| GGRN44: NUMBER OF CASES OF LAWFUL TRANSITIONS OF POWER AT REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL WITHIN FIVE YEARS.. | 117 |
| GGRN45: NUMBER OF REPORTED FRAUDULENT ELECTIONS AT REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS | 118 |
| GGRN46: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – OPEN GOVERNMENT AND CORRUPTION | 119 |
| GGRN50: NUMBER AND TYPE OF REGULATIONS PRESENTED AND/OR ADOPTED | 120 |
| GGRN51: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – REGULATORY PROCESSES..... | 121 |

GGRN60: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW - JUSTICE 122

GGRN61: CHANGE IN COURT CASE PROCESSING TIMES 123

GGRN62: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF REPORTED CASES OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BY THE JUSTICE SYSTEM ACTORS 124

GGRN63: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF REPORTED CASES OF BRIBE REQUESTS MADE BY JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS' STAFF 125

GGRN64: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CASES PROCESSED BY JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS 126

GGRN65: CHANGE IN PROPORTION OF PERSONS HELD IN CUSTODY/PRISONS WITHOUT DUE JUDICIAL PROCESSING OF THEIR CASE 127

GGRN66: CHANGE IN CRIME RATES (BY TYPE OF CRIME) 128

1. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTPUT INDICATORS

GGO1: Number and type of consultation mechanisms established

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO1: Number and type of consultation mechanisms established</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Consultation is an input to policy development and analysis: a tool for the collection of ideas and reactions to ideas before key decisions are made. Consultation mechanisms are regular, open channels through which stakeholders may submit inputs, comments, feedback, information and suggestions. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of consultation mechanisms established with project support. While there may be different consultation mechanisms for different policy outputs or audiences, in many situations, the type of consultation mechanism and its users/participants will be a more meaningful piece of information for the evaluation than a mere quantification. |
| Data sources | Project documentation, meeting minutes, consultation participants, consultation conveners, consultation outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Stakeholders surveys and interviews Content analysis of consultation outputs |
| Definition of key terms | Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc. |
| Further resources | European Commission. (2014). <i>Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines. Public Consultation Document.</i> (link) African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations.</i> (link) Australian Government. (2016). <i>Best Practice Consultation.</i> Guidance Note. (link) or a summary by Broadribb, K. (n.d.). <i>Implementing a successful stakeholder consultation.</i> [PowerPoint Presentation]. (link) |

GGO2: Number and type of advocacy/outreach products created with project support

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO2 Number and type of advocacy/outreach products created with project support.</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks the number of advocacy/outreach products created with project support with the objective to influence policy making, course of action in a certain area, public opinion, change of behaviour etc. Besides mere quantity, the indicator also analyzes the type of the products, i.e. the content and to whom they have been destined. Depending on the purpose and intended audience, these products may have the form of media campaigns (incl. icon hashtags), manifestos, visual campaigns, forming coalitions and a number of others. The authors of these products will most commonly be supported civil society organizations or also government organizations trying to influence the opinion or behaviour of citizens. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of advocacy and/or outreach products produced with project financial or other (e.g., technical, skill-transfer) support. While the primary measurement outcome is a number, the type and/or purpose of advocacy/outreach products should also be considered in the evaluation. Attention should also be paid to audiences for whom these products were prepared. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders, media, policy documents, public opinion polls |
| Methods of data collection | Stakeholder surveys or interviews Case studies Focus groups Media tracking Media content or media tracking analysis Policy tracking Public polling |
| Definition of key terms | Advocacy/outreach products may mean letters or official complaints addressed to public officials, informative videos, photos, posters, media campaigns, ads, demonstrations against or in favour of a clearly defined cause, formation of a coalition or a new membership in a coalition of like-minded organizations and other forms of behaviour or expressions with the purpose to advocate for a cause, reach out to important audiences etc. |
| Further resources | Chapman, J. (2002). Monitoring and evaluating advocacy. <i>PLA Notes</i> , 43, 48-52. (link) Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy</i> . Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. UNICEF. (2010). <i>Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy. Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit</i> . New York: UNICEF. (link) - includes case studies. |

GGO3: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ADVOCACY COALITIONS ESTABLISHED

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO3 Number and type of advocacy coalitions established</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks the number of advocacy coalitions created or operating with project support with the objective to support a cause, a proposal or policy that has been neglected or is otherwise disputed. Advocacy coalitions frequently act on behalf of those who are not able to advocate for themselves, i.e. the most vulnerable groups of the society such as children, people with disabilities, groups excluded from the society based on ethnic, social-class or other attributes. Project support may be financial or skill-based (technical). |
| What the indicator measures | Number of advocacy coalitions created or operating with project financial or other support. Type of advocacy coalitions such as membership, thematic focus, activities and means in which they engage/pursue. |
| Data sources | Project records, advocacy products, coalition statements, coalition members and partners, other stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Stakeholder interviews or surveys Case studies Media content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Advocacy is the act or process of supporting a cause or proposal. It seeks to ensure that people, particularly those who are most vulnerable in society, are able to have their voice heard on issues that are important to them, defend and safeguard their rights and have their views and wishes genuinely considered when decisions are being made about their lives. In other words, advocacy is a tool for real participation by citizens in decision-making by government and other powerful bodies.</p> <p>Coalition. A coalition is a temporary alliance for combined action. It may contain people and organizations from a variety of positions (elected and agency officials, interest group leaders, researchers, NGOs), yet it often gathers a number of civil society organizations/NGOs that work towards a similar cause and through a coalition joint their effort and increase their voice. Members of an alliance share a particular belief system and show a non-trivial degree of coordinated activity over time.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>O’Neil, G. et al. (2015). <i>Oxfam’s Global Leaders Empowered to Alleviate Poverty (LEAP). Evaluation - Final Report.</i> (link).</p> <p>Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy.</i> Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies.</p> <p>UN Women. (2012). <i>How is Advocacy Defined?</i> (link) – includes a case study</p> <p>Washington Office on Latin America. (2001). <i>Manual para la facilitación de procesos de incidencia política.</i> (link) – available only in Spanish</p> |

GGO4: Number and format of consultations carried out by project recipient with other project key stakeholders

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO4: Number and format of consultations carried out by project recipient with other project key stakeholders</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks quantitative (number) and qualitative (format) evidence of consultations organized with project support with the objective to genuinely inform, engage and gather feedback from target groups on the processes of decision-making, formulation of strategies, policies, directives, projects or programs that affect the target group or fall within their scope of expertise. These consultations may be organized by national or local government organizations or other relevant stakeholders (e.g., international organization with presence in the area, a large NGO, semi-autonomous public agencies etc.). |
| What the indicator measures | Number of consultations organized with project support. These may be organized by project recipient/partner organizations with financial or other support from project or by other stakeholders in relation to project planning or implementation. While the primary measurement outcome is a number, the type and/or purpose of consultations should also be considered in the evaluation. Attention should also be paid to the representativeness of consulted stakeholders . |
| Data sources | Project records, attendance sheets, consultation minutes Project recipients, stakeholders consulted, stakeholders left out of consultations |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc. |
| Further resources | European Commission. (2014). <i>Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines. Public Consultation Document</i> . (link) African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations</i> . (link) Australian Government. (2016). <i>Best Practice Consultation</i> . Guidance Note. (link) or a summary by Broadribb, K. (n.d.). <i>Implementing a successful stakeholder consultation</i> . [PowerPoint Presentation]. (link) |

GGO5: EVIDENCE OF PROVISION OF SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO PROJECT PARTNERS, BENEFICIARIES AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THEIR MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT-AFFECTED AREA

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO5: Evidence of provision of sufficient information to project partners, beneficiaries and other key stakeholders in order to facilitate their meaningful participation in project-affected area</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator ascertains expressions (evidence) of project partners, beneficiaries and other groups being adequately informed about the nature, objectives and activities of the project to make an informed decision about their participation in the project and to be able to engage meaningfully in activities in the project-affected area. Evidence in this case may mean reports collected from stakeholders, information ascertained from project records or other related documents, information deduced from stakeholder actions and the level of their engagement in project-related activities etc. |
| What the indicator measures | The amount and adequacy of information provided to project stakeholders, including project partners and beneficiaries judged by stakeholders' subjective perceptions and/or documented information transfers and whether the information enabled their meaningful participation judged by stakeholder's activities or products of their activities in project-related area. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders, project records, stakeholders' activities or products in project-affected area |
| Methods of data collection | Stakeholder interviews or surveys Desk research Case studies Observations |
| Definition of key terms | Meaningful participation (MP). People are empowered to take an active role in decision-making at various levels in an organisation or community and within different stages of a program. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to MP; each context and each group requires different strategies. Simple presence does not result in MP, people must have a certain level of responsibility and decision-making power. MP should be open, fair, truthful, broad-based, deliberative, responsive and competent. Project partners. Organizations that collaborate on implementation or co-implement project. Project beneficiaries. Individuals or groups who benefit from project, may be directly involved in project activities or be recipients of benefits derived from project implementation, i.e., be directly supported by a project or benefit indirectly. |
| Further resources | Gifford, G.L. (1999). <i>Meaningful Participation. An activist's guide to collaborative policy-making.</i> (link) Save the Children. (2013). <i>Review of Children's Participation in Humanitarian Programming.</i> (link) Save the Children. (2014). <i>A Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluating Children's Participation. Booklet 4 - A 10-step guide to monitoring and evaluating children's participation.</i> (link) UNEP. <i>Ensuring Meaningful Participation. Evaluation Checklist.</i> (link) |

GGO6: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STAFF OR FEMALE COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO6: Evidence of meaningful participation of female staff or female community members in project activities and consultations</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Projects greatly benefit from meaningful participation of all relevant population (target) groups, which can enrich perspectives, information, strategies and tools with which the project operates. In some cultures, religions, socioeconomic groups or professional settings the voices and opinions of women may be silenced by traditionally dominant male members. It is, therefore, necessary for the project to ensure that women have meaningfully engaged and shared their perspectives. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any kind of evidence of meaningful participation of female members of the target group(s) in all the phases of the intervention where such participation was desirable/relevant. |
| Data sources | Female staff of relevant organizations Female members of the community/target groups Project documentation, consultation outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Focus groups, group discussions Surveys, interviews Desk research Storytelling |
| Definition of key terms | Meaningful participation (MP). People are empowered to take an active role in decision-making at various levels in an organisation or community and within different stages of a program. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to MP; each context and each group requires different strategies. Simple presence does not result in MP, people must have a certain level of responsibility and decision-making power. MP should be open, fair, truthful, broad-based, deliberative, responsive and competent. |
| Further resources | Gifford, G.L. (1999). <i>Meaningful Participation. An activist's guide to collaborative policy-making.</i> (link) |

GGO7: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF MARGINALIZED GROUPS IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO7: Evidence of meaningful participation of marginalized groups in project activities and consultations</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Projects greatly benefit from meaningful participation of all relevant population (target) groups, which can enrich perspectives, information, strategies and tools with which the project operates. In a number of settings, there will be groups whose voices are traditionally silenced. Those groups may be marginalized for numerous reasons and the project implementation should ensure that the causes and consequences of the marginalization are considered and, where necessary, removed, to ensure a meaningful participation of these groups in the intervention. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any kind of evidence of meaningful participation of members of the marginalized group(s) in all the phases of the intervention where such participation was desirable/relevant. |
| Data sources | Members of marginalized groups pertaining to project target groups / community Project documentation, consultation outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Focus groups, group discussions Surveys, interviews Desk research Storytelling |
| Definition of key terms | Meaningful participation (MP). People are empowered to take an active role in decision-making at various levels in an organisation or community and within different stages of a program. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to MP; each context and each group requires different strategies. Simple presence does not result in MP, people must have a certain level of responsibility and decision-making power. MP should be open, fair, truthful, broad-based, deliberative, responsive and competent. |
| Further resources | Gifford, G.L. (1999). <i>Meaningful Participation. An activist's guide to collaborative policy-making.</i> (link) |

GGO8: EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF GROUPS IN CONFLICT IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO8: Evidence of meaningful participation of all groups in conflict in project activities</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Projects greatly benefit from meaningful participation of all relevant population (target) groups, which can enrich perspectives, information, strategies and tools with which the project operates. In some settings, there will be groups that experience strong rivalry or antagonism based on previous experience of conflict, membership in clans/ethnic groups etc. Perceived stronger participation of one of these groups in the intervention may increase existing tensions or result in boycott or sabotage of the intervention by the other group(s). |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any kind of evidence of meaningful participation of members of all rival groups in all the phases of the intervention where such participation was desirable/relevant. |
| Data sources | Members of rival groups pertaining to project target groups / community Project documentation, consultation outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Focus groups Surveys, interviews Desk research Storytelling |
| Definition of key terms | Meaningful participation (MP). People are empowered to take an active role in decision-making at various levels in an organisation or community and within different stages of a program. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to MP; each context and each group requires different strategies. Simple presence does not result in MP, people must have a certain level of responsibility and decision-making power. MP should be open, fair, truthful, broad-based, deliberative, responsive and competent. |
| Further resources | Gifford, G.L. (1999). <i>Meaningful Participation. An activist's guide to collaborative policy-making.</i> (link) |

GGO9: NUMBER OF EVENTS TO STRENGTHEN LOCAL GROUP'S PARTICIPATION

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.2 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO9: Number of events organized with project support to strengthen local groups' participation in community-based decision making</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks the number of events organized with project support to engage local participants and strengthen community organizations and their involvement in decision making and actions for a given ultimate purpose determined by the intervention (e.g., health, school enrollment, human rights education, water treatment and sanitation, climate-resilient agricultural production etc.). These may include meetings or public outreach events, dialogue sessions, workshops, etc. to discuss budgeting or resource allocation, policy development or reform, or local service delivery performance. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of events organized with project support. Also events organized with different purpose, which engaged local participants and strengthened community organizations as per the definition above. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Community-based decision making: Community-based decision making refers to a participatory process where beneficiaries or clients are involved in setting priorities, contributing to planning, and establishing shared expectations.</p> <p>Local: Local refers to events at the subnational level.</p> <p>Participation: Participation refers to a process that facilitates open dialogue between an inclusive set of local groups and officials from a given purpose field (see above). Participation entails a give-and-take between the local groups and these officials.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government of the Republic of Ireland. (2014). <i>Working Group Report on Citizen Engagement with Local Government</i>. (link)</p> <p>Mansuri, G. and Rao, V. (2013). <i>Localizing Development. Does Participation Work?</i> The World Bank: Washington, D.C. (link)</p> <p>UNHCR. (2008). <i>A Community-based Approach in UNHCR Operations</i>. (link)</p> |

GGO10: PARTICIPATION MECHANISMS INTRODUCED BY LOCAL/NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO10: Participation mechanisms introduced by local/national government</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | The participation of citizens in decision-making processes is a key element of democracy. It increases the transparency and makes government officials more accountable for their decisions. It is an ongoing process that covers the period between two elections, where dissemination of information about policies and decisions occurs in both directions: citizens express concerns towards government and government informs citizens on the implementation of the policies. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should capture available information and facts on participation mechanisms introduced by local or national government with project support. While they may be quantitative as to the number of mechanisms introduced, qualitative description of the type/nature of the mechanism will likely be more informative. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders who participate or should participate in the mechanism Documents related to participation mechanism and its output (agendas, invitations, summaries etc.) Government representatives Project documentation |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, surveys Desk research Focus groups |
| Definition of key terms | Participation: Participation refers to a process that facilitates open dialogue between an inclusive set of local groups and officials from a given purpose field (see above). Participation entails a give-and-take between the local groups and these officials. Participation mechanisms (also voice mechanisms) are regular channels, “windows” or “dedicated bodies” through which citizens can access governments. |
| Further resources | OSCE. (n.d.). <i>Implementing Citizen’s Participation in Decision Making at Local Level.</i> (link) |

GGO20: TARGET GROUPS ARE EQUIPPED WITH NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE TO ACT TRANSPARENTLY AND ACCOUNTABLY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO20: Target groups are equipped with necessary knowledge to act transparently and accountably</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | While the concept of transparency and accountability may be well spread and understood in some settings (or countries), it may not necessarily be included in the practices of others. In order to increase transparency and accountability, target groups may need to be provided with the necessary knowledge to act in transparent and accountable manner. |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of the target groups being informed or educated on what common transparency and accountability behaviour and procedures entail and how to ensure one's behaviour and their organizations' behaviour is transparent and accountable. |
| Data sources | Representatives of target groups (e.g., government officials) Knowledge tests |
| Methods of data collection | Surveys, interviews Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability. Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations. |
| Further resources | Hallak, J. and Poisson, M. (Eds.) (2006). <i>Governance in education: transparency and accountability</i> . (link) |

GGO21: NUMBER OF CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS FORMED AND/OR STRENGTHENED TO DEMAND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM THEIR GOVERNMENT

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO21: Number of civil society groups formed and/or strengthened through project assistance to engage in demanding accountability from their government</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the efforts of the project to create, assemble, convene and strengthen new or existing civil society groups to engage in governance in relevant field. Civil society organizations provide channels for citizen voice and can help citizens hold government accountable. This is important for: improved government responsiveness to the relevant needs of citizens; for helping to inform government policy decisions; and for assessing the performance of relevant sector policies and service delivery. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of civil society groups that have been formed or strengthened. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Civil society organization: Civil society organizations are broadly understood as the diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations.</p> <p>Relevant sector governance: Governance in the relevant sector refers to a wide range of steering and rule-making related functions carried out by governments/decisions makers, including: maintaining the strategic direction of policy development and implementation; articulating the case for the subject of interest, and for corresponding resource allocation; regulating the behavior of a wide range of actors - from financiers to providers; and establishing transparent and effective accountability mechanisms.</p> <p>Project assistance: may be defined by the project and can include training, mentoring, provision of technical resources and tools, networking support, information sharing, etc.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Fourie, D. J. and Kakumba, U. (2011). <i>Assessing the Role and Capacity of Civil Society Organisations in Holding Local Government Accountable in Uganda</i>. (link)</p> <p>Sharma, B. (2008). <i>Voice, Accountability and Civic Engagement. A Conceptual Overview</i>. (link)</p> <p>UNDP. (2010). <i>Fostering Social Accountability: From Principle to Practice. Guidance Note</i>. (link)</p> <p>World Bank. (2007). <i>Civil Society's Role in the Governance Agenda in Ecuador: Assessing Opportunities and Constraints</i>. (link)</p> |

GGO22: NUMBER OF TECHNICAL RESOURCES/MECHANISMS DEVELOPED WITH PROJECT ASSISTANCE TO STRENGTHEN TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO22: Number of technical resources developed with project assistance to strengthen transparency and accountability</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Measures the amount of support provided by the project to add data and technical depth to debates on regulatory issues. |
| What the indicator measures | The number of deliverables provided to partner country governments on regulatory issues. If a number is not available from project documentation, subjective perceptions of institution's management, project management staff and institution's partners may be used, though it must be explicitly stated that no objective data exist. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Technical resources: Technical resources are defined broadly as tools, models, methodologies, guidance, approaches, and strategies. They may include but are not limited to assessments, manuscripts, published articles, reports, training courses, learning modules, software, strategic plans, operational plans, etc. These resources include direct project outputs that may be tracked by the project's records or M&E system.</p> <p>Mechanisms: An established process by which something takes place or is brought about; a recognized system, method, or medium for achieving an output or outcome. Mechanisms may include, but are not limited to, systems for internal controls, audit protocols, citizen scorecards, an organizational website with relevant and regularly updated information, publicly available reports, standard operating procedures, manuals, guidelines, process maps, etc.</p> <p>Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability.</p> <p>Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations.</p> <p>Relevant sector regulation: Includes both broad umbrella policies for the sector and the more detailed governing requirements underneath that broader policy. The specific issues covered (e.g. financing, procurement, asset management, human resources, data management) should be defined at the project level in line with project scopes of work.</p> <p>Project support: Technical assistance, training, and other support specific to the given context.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Bester, A. (2016). <i>National mutual accountability and transparency in development cooperation: Study on the findings of the Fourth DCF Survey</i>. (link)</p> <p>Development Initiatives. (n.d.). <i>Transparency and Accountability</i>. (link)</p> <p>Pekkonen, A. and Malena, C. (n.d.). <i>Budget Transparency</i>. Civicus. (link)</p> <p>Transparency International. (2011). <i>Mapping transparency, accountability and integrity in primary education in South Africa</i>. (link)</p> |

GGO23: NUMBER OF RESOURCES DEVELOPED THAT SUPPORT EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY DECISIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO23: Number of resources developed with project support that support evidence-based policy decisions</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator assesses the outcome of project efforts supporting the development of new resources that help policy makers make evidence-based decisions. The indicator tracks the project's contribution to the use of information to support policy decisions, as well as to strengthening feedback loops across the health system. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of information products, monitoring reports, or studies linked to project support. |
| Data sources | Project or government records, follow-up with end users, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Evidence-based: An evidence-based policy decision is informed by relevant information that can include data on health systems indicators (including trends over time), the results from evaluations and research studies (that could be from other countries), cost-benefit or any other analyses.</p> <p>Resources: Resources may include information products, monitoring reports, studies or other research outputs.</p> <p>Support: The resources that are developed can be said to support evidence-based decisions if they directly relate to current policy discussions, debate and decision-making, and are provided to and considered by relevant sector stakeholders.</p> |
| Further resources | EU-Luxembourg-WHO Universal Health Coverage Partnership. (2015). <i>Policy dialogue: What it is and how it can contribute to evidence-informed decision-making</i> . Briefing Note. (link) |

GGO24: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MECHANISMS TO IMPROVE OPERATIONS IN THE CONCERNED SECTOR

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO24: Number and type of mechanisms to improve operations in the concerned sector</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks the number of mechanisms developed and implemented with project support to help improve management and operations of the relevant sector. Such mechanisms are essential for efficient and effective sector functionality and improving performance of the relevant services delivery. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of mechanisms developed and implemented with project support. If a number is not available, subjective perceptions of organization's management, project management staff and organization's partners may be used, though it must be explicitly stated that no objective data exist. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Mechanisms: Mechanisms are understood as tools, methods, or processes and can include standard operating procedures, manuals, systems, guidelines, and process maps for the sector managers. |
| Further resources | <p>Curristine, T., Lonti, Z. and Joumard, I. (2007). Improving Public Sector Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities. <i>OECD Journal on Budgeting</i> 7(1). (link)</p> <p>McKinsey & Company. (2011). <i>Better for less. Improving public sector performance on a tight budget.</i> (link)</p> |

GGO25: COMPLETENESS AND QUALITY OF LOCAL PARTNER/GOVERNMENT RECORDS IN THEIR OPERATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO25: Completeness and quality of local partner/government records in their operations</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Completeness of public records is a function of the transparency and accessibility of a given government (or partner organization). Additionally, good information governance may contribute to organization's accountability as information is one of the most vital strategic assets as it can be used to develop products and services, make critical strategic decisions, protect property rights, propel marketing, manage projects, process transactions, serve customers, and generate revenues. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator captures the completeness (i.e., absence of missing data) and quality (i.e., level of detail, degree of error, meaningfulness of captured information) of records the partner organization (government or other) maintains on its operations. While an evaluator will most likely gain access predominantly to records related to the intervention, whenever possible, a broader records maintenance of the organization should be considered, specifically if the intervention may have helped to a greater transparency in the area. |
| Data sources | Organization's records Stakeholders representing these organizations |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Information governance is an accountability framework that "includes the processes, roles, standards, and metrics that ensure the effective and efficient use of information in enabling an organization to achieve its goals. |
| Further resources | Arma International. (2013). <i>Generally Accepted Record Keeping Principles</i> . (link) |

GGO26: EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INFORMATION CAMPAIGN (INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL) RELATED TO A PROJECT OR ITS THEMATIC FOCUS INITIATED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT OR OTHER LOCAL PLAYERS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO26: Existence and characteristics of an information campaign (internal and external) related to a project or its thematic focus initiated by local government or other local players</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Information campaigns are used to disclose and disseminate project or sector related information such as project and program objectives, components, benefits, costs, timeline, financial management and procurement, progress reports, grievance mechanisms, and contacts. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator ascertains evidence of information campaigns created and the key characteristics of these such as the content, purpose, target groups, communication strategies used etc. |
| Data sources | Information campaign's materials Media outlets used for dissemination Authors of information campaign(s) Campaign target groups |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Media analysis Interviews, survey |
| Definition of key terms | Information campaigns inform and create citizen awareness about development plans, laws, activities, services, and rights of beneficiaries. |
| Further resources | Read, L. and Manuelyan Atinc, T. (2017). <i>Information for Accountability: Transparency and Citizen Engagement for Improved Service Delivery in Education Systems</i> . (link) World Bank. (2017). <i>Social Accountability E-Guide. A Step-by-Step Approach to Integrating Social Accountability into Projects. Information Campaigns</i> . (link) World Bank. (2016). <i>Making Politics Work for Development. Harnessing Transparency and Citizen Engagement</i> . (link) |

GGO27: NUMBER OF PUBLIC FORUMS FOR DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION, INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS, AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO28: Number of public forums for dissemination of information, increased public awareness, and public discussion established</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the number of public forums held at the national, regional, or district level to increase public awareness and transparency by disseminating public information and encouraging open discussion of health-sector issues. These forums will support greater interaction between the government, private sector, the relevant sector (health, education, agriculture etc.) decision-makers, and the public. This interaction may lead to the more effective incorporation of public needs in the health sector and may lead to more transparent and accountable policies, regulations, and decisions. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of public forums; location. |
| Data sources | Project records, government records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Public Forum: A place, meeting, or medium that is advertised in advance, open to the public and where ideas, views, and information on a particular issue can be exchanged. May include town hall meetings, community meetings, public hearings, public working group sessions, outreach and information sessions, online blogs, etc.</p> <p>Dissemination of Information: The act of spreading information widely. The mass circulation and public availability of information relating to health sector issues.</p> <p>Public awareness: The public's level of understanding of the relevant information, the importance, and the implications pertaining to a health sector related topic. The knowledge or perception that a community has about an issue or situation.</p> <p>Public discussion: Discourse that allows the public and stakeholders from all sides of the issue—including both opponents and proponents—to share their ideas, opinions, and positions; a conversation that allows people to exchange views and examine relevant issues openly.</p> <p>Project support: Technical assistance, training, and other support specific to the given context.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Read, L. and Manuelyan Atinc, T. (2017). <i>Information for Accountability: Transparency and Citizen Engagement for Improved Service Delivery in Education Systems</i>. (link)</p> <p>World Bank. (2016). <i>Making Politics Work for Development. Harnessing Transparency and Citizen Engagement</i>. (link)</p> |

GGO28: NUMBER OF JOURNALISTS TRAINED ON REPORTING RELATED TO TRANSPARENCY OR ACCOUNTABILITY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO28: Number of journalists trained with project support on reporting related to transparency or accountability (investigative journalism).</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator counts the number of persons working in the media field in communications or journalism to whom knowledge or skills have been imparted as a result of training or interaction with project staff or counterparts. Training will include topics on improving transparency and accountability within the health sector. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of in-person or virtual/online methods and can be delivered by the project or its implementing partners. Training will enhance the human capacity of communications specialists and journalists to ensure that relevant information in the health sector is shared openly and can lead to increased transparency and accountability. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of participants trained; training topic. |
| Data sources | Project records, implementing partners, trained journalists |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Journalist: A person that reports and disseminates information to the public through newspapers, magazines, radio, television, or online media; may be employed by a news agency or other media outlet that publishes information for public consumption. Some projects may choose to distinguish between journalists from state-run and non-state media outlets.</p> <p>Training: Training can include classroom learning, workshops, established mentoring and internship programs, and on-the-job training.</p> <p>Project support: Technical assistance, training, and other support specific to the given context.</p> <p>Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability.</p> <p>Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public health institutions' responsibility for delivery of health services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations.</p> <p>Investigative journalism is reporting that relies on the journalist's own enterprise and initiative, which commonly results in uncovering wrongdoing by individuals and institutions. It entails the use of multiple sources – both human and documentary – that together paint a picture of wrongdoing or abuse. It requires the verification and corroboration of every piece of information, even if these come from sources that are considered reliable or authoritative.</p> |
| Further resources | Coronel, S. S. (2009). <i>Digging Deeper: A guide for investigative journalists in the Balkans</i> . Balkan Investigative Reporting Regional Network: Sarajevo, BiH. (link) |

GGO29: PROPORTION OF TARGET POPULATION THAT HAS GAINED REGULAR ACCESS TO THE INTERNET

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO29: Proportion of target population that has gained regular access to the internet</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Transparency and the right to access government information are now internationally regarded as essential to democratic participation, trust in government, prevention of corruption and informed decision-making. In recent years, many governments have worked to increase openness and transparency in their actions. The Internet has greatly reduced the cost of collecting, distributing, and accessing government information and gave way to a boom of e-government services for greater access to information and for promotion of transparency, accountability, and anti-corruption goals. Yet, underserved populations with no or limited access to internet remain and do not benefit from these recent trends. |
| What the indicator measures | Percentage of total target population that has gained regular access to the internet as a direct or indirect contribution of the intervention. |
| Data sources | Target population |
| Methods of data collection | Survey |
| Definition of key terms | E-government is the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to provide public services to citizens and other persons in a country or region. |
| Further resources | <p>Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T. and Grimes, J. M. (2010). <i>Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies.</i> (link)</p> <p>Welch, E. W., Hinnant, C. C. and Moon M. J. (2004). Linking Citizen Satisfaction with E-Government and Trust in Government. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 15, 371–391. (link)</p> |

GGO30: NUMBER OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs) ESTABLISHED OR REVISED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO31: Number of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) established or revised</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Measuring the number of KPIs evaluates whether or the responsible government body evaluates its own performance in terms of results and efficiency. KPIs should be established complete with baseline data, and then measured periodically to assess marginal improvement or deterioration in performance. These periodic evaluations help to prioritize spending and budget planning in subsequent years. KPIs are closely associated with modern approaches to public budgeting such as Program Budgeting and Results-Oriented Budgeting. A higher number of KPIs does not necessarily indicate a better system. On the contrary, a set of a smaller number of high quality indicators is often a more effective management tool. |
| What the indicator measures | Count of the number of KPIs measured by the responsible government body that it uses to evaluate its own performance. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Key Performance Indicator (KPI): A measurement that encapsulates a critical element of a person’s or institution’s effectiveness. KPIs for a government body such as ministry often include high-level indicators such as maternal and child mortality, rate of tertiary educated citizens, proportion of agricultural land under certain environmental measures etc., as such outcomes are indicative of a wide range of lower-level outcomes. |
| Further resources | Auditor General of British Columbia. (2010). <i>Guide for Developing Relevant Key Performance Indicators for Public Sector Reporting.</i> (link) PriceWaterhouseCoopers. (n.d.). <i>Guide to key performance indicators. Communicating the measures that matter.</i> (link) |

GGO31: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MECHANISMS OF COMPLAINT ESTABLISHED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO32: Number and type of mechanisms of complaint established</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Effective complaint mechanisms are a key tool to identify and prevent corruption and other malpractice. Enabling stakeholders to seek and receive response for grievances and alleged harm is a critical aspect of accountability. This is the mechanism through which stakeholders can hold an organisation to account by querying a decision, action or policy and receiving an adequate response to their grievance. Therefore, credible and functioning complaint mechanisms constitute a key tool for public institutions, companies and not-for-profit organisations to manage corruption risk and potential reputational damage. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of mechanisms of complaint established with project support and the type (description) of such mechanism (by type of government entity, sector, form of submission etc.). |
| Data sources | Mechanisms of complaint and related documentation |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, analysis of complaints |
| Definition of key terms | Complaint mechanisms are mechanisms through which an organisation enables stakeholders to address complaints against its decisions and actions, and through which it ensures that these complaints are properly reviewed and acted upon. |
| Further resources | Blagescu, M., de las Casas, L. and Lloyd, R. (2005). <i>Pathways to Accountability A short guide to the GAP Framework</i> . (link) Transparency International. (2016). <i>Complaint Mechanisms. Reference Guide for Good Practice</i> . (link) |

GGO32: NUMBER AND TYPE OF OPEN DATA POLICIES, PROGRAMMES AND INITIATIVES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO33: Number of open data policies, programmes and initiatives</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | There is a strong intersection between open data and transparency. However, the paradox of open data is that the high-value data needed is quite often held by, and must be released by, the same institutions that should be held to account. In order to achieve the establishing of open data polices, the intervention has to work with political will, incentives and strategic engagement of those who hold the data. Opening data usually involves making it machine-readable, publishing it online and providing a clear statement that gives anyone permission to reuse it. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of open data policies, programmes or initiatives launched with project support and their characteristics (description). These may concern government entities, as well as private and non-profit organizations. |
| Data sources | Open data policies, programmes or other initiatives Data shared via newly established open data initiatives |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, data analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Open data involves the release of data so that anyone can access, use and share it. It should be usable for any legal purpose and accessible to all, and that restrictions on its reuse should be clearly justified. |
| Further resources | Carolan, L. (2016). <i>Open data, transparency and accountability: Topic guide</i> . Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham. (link) |

GGO33: NUMBER AND TYPE OF POLICY DIALOGUES ESTABLISHED AT A NATIONAL OR LOCAL LEVEL

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO34: Number and type of policy dialogues established at a national or local level</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Policy dialogues (PD) convene different stakeholder and expert groups around a policy issue(s) in order to provide a check on the quality and contents of the policy brief, clarify judgments that are made in the policy brief, introduce relevant evidence, help to ensure that the contents of the policy brief are understandable and understood, help to ensure that the policy brief is taken into account and used in the development of a policy. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of policy dialogues established at the level of national and/or local government and the type of policy dialogues by issue, parties convened/regularly participating in the dialogue mechanism. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Agendas, meeting minutes, policy briefs and other PD outcomes |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Policy dialogue is an open and inclusive dialogue on development policies. It forms part of policy and decision-making processes, where it is intended to contribute to developing or implementing a policy change following a round of evidence-based discussions/workshops/consultations on a particular subject. Policy dialogue take place around a policy question on which key documents and experts are brought together to present recent evidence on the issue. |
| Further resources | EU-Luxembourg-WHO Universal Health Coverage Partnership. (2015). <i>Policy dialogue: What it is and how it can contribute to evidence-informed decision-making</i> . Briefing Note. (link) Lortkipanidze, S. and Patariaia, T. (2014). <i>Mapping Study of Civil Society Organisations' Engagement in Policy Dialogue in Georgia</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Bangladesh Country Report</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Uganda Country Report</i> . (link) Court, J., Mendizabal, E., Osborne, D. and Young, J. (2006). <i>Policy Engagement. How Civil Society Can be More Effective</i> . Overseas Development Institute. (link) |

GGO40: PROJECT HAS EQUIPPED RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS PUBLIC SERVANTS, NGO WORKERS AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS/STAKEHOLDERS WITH NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE TO ACT IN ACCORD WITH RULE OF LAW PRINCIPLES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO40: Project has equipped relevant stakeholders with necessary knowledge to act in accord with rule of law principles</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Rule of law has been a prominent theme in development and it has long been recognized that weak institutions undermine sustainable development. The importance of Rule of Law and regulatory stability form the substance of the Sustainable Development Goal 16 - Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of increased knowledge among relevant stakeholders (public servants, NGO workers and other participants/stakeholders) on the principles of rule of law and how to apply them in their specific practice. |
| Data sources | Involved stakeholders Teaching / training materials |
| Methods of data collection | Case studies Interviews, survey Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Rule of Law refers to the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence. Rule of Law principles include separation of powers, stable legal framework under which all actors are equally accountable, accessible, fair, and efficient process of law enactment and enforcement and timely delivery of justice by competent ethical, and independent representatives. |
| Further resources | Domingo, P. (2016). <i>Rule of law, politics and development. The politics of rule of law reform</i> . Overseas Development Institute. (link) United Nations. (2015). <i>Sustainable Development Goal 16</i> . (link) World Bank. (n.d.). <i>Rule of Law</i> . (link) World Justice Project. (n.d.). <i>What is the Rule of Law?</i> (link) |

GGO41: NUMBER AND TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CHECKS ON GOVERNMENT POWER BY THE LEGISLATURE, THE JUDICIARY, AND INDEPENDENT AUDITING INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO41: Number and type of institutional checks on government power by the legislature, the judiciary, and independent auditing introduced or strengthened</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | While separation of powers is the cornerstone of democracy, it in itself does not prevent the misuse of power. This requires procedures known as checks and balances empower the separate actors to prevent actions by other actors, for example through vetoes, judicial review, or regulatory oversight, with the aim of ensuring policy moderation and preventing misuse of political power. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of checks (constraints) introduced with project support and characteristics (description) of these checks that limit the powers of each separate branch of government. |
| Data sources | Institutional documents, laws, policies |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Constraints (checks) on governments powers refer to the extent to which those who govern are bound by law. It comprises the means, both constitutional and institutional, by which the powers of the government and its officials and agents are limited and held accountable under the law. It also includes non-governmental checks on the government's power, such as a free and independent press. |
| Further resources | Alt, J. E. and Lassen, D. D. (2008). <i>Political and judicial checks on corruption: Evidence from American State Governments</i> . (link) World Justice Project. (n.d.). <i>Constraints on Government Powers (Factor 1)</i> . (link) |

GGO42: NUMBER AND TYPE OF WHISTLE BLOWING PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO42: Number and type of whistle blowing procedures established</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | In effort to fight corruption, international (e.g., the UN and EU legislation) and in, some cases, national legislation nowadays require establishing whistleblower procedures and to ensure protection of whistleblowers. While the legal instruments may be more narrowly focused on private companies, whistleblowing represent a crucial mechanism also for the public sector. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and characteristics (description) of whistleblowing procedures that were established with project support. Consideration should be given also to the easiness of access/use and protection (anonymity) of those who decide to use it. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders Written documentation (if such exists) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews Survey of stakeholders (e.g., if destined to use by staff of an organization) Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Whistleblowing procedures are channels or tools through which public officials, private sector employees (or certain categories of such employees) and sometimes every citizen to report (suspicions of) criminal acts to the police or prosecution bodies. Most frequently, it is an anonymous hotline (or helpline), other forms include email, suggestion box, mail or in-person reporting. |
| Further resources | Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2017). <i>Developing an Integrated Anti-Fraud, Compliance, and Ethics Program. Implementing a Whistleblower Helpline.</i> (link) Deloitte. (n.d.). <i>Setting up a whistleblowing program. 10 Frequently Asked Questions.</i> (link) OECD. (2012). <i>Whistleblower protection: encouraging reporting.</i> (link) Speckbacher, C. (2009). <i>The protection of whistleblowers in the light of GRECO's work.</i> (link) |

GGO43: INFORMATION REQUESTS FILED BY PROJECT BENEFICIARIES OR PARTNERS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO43: Information requests filed by project beneficiaries or partners</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | One key feature of open government and a cornerstone of government transparency is access to information granted to citizens, civil society organizations and whomever may be interested. Not only there needs to be adequate legislation and political will in place, potential users of the information need to be informed it is available and know how to request it. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of information requests filed by groups directly and indirectly supported from the intervention, the type of information and its use. |
| Data sources | Beneficiaries and partner organizations/groups |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, group discussions |
| Definition of key terms | Open Data. Data are considered to be “open” if anyone can freely use, re-use and redistribute them, for any purpose, without restrictions. While a large amount of data is published on government websites, the majority of published data is intended only to be read as stand-alone documents, not re-used for other purposes. To be considered “open,” the data must be re-usable, meaning they can be downloaded in open formats and read by software, and users have a legal right to re-use it. |
| Further resources | World bank. (2012). <i>Open Government Data Toolkit</i> . (link) |

GGO44: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OF MECHANISMS INTRODUCED TO STRENGTHEN LAWFUL TRANSITIONS OF POWER IN REGION / COUNTRY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO44: Number and type of tools of mechanisms introduced to strengthen lawful transitions of power in region / country</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Lawful and peaceful transition of power between political parties and/or between high-ranking elected officials such as presidents is a hallmark of democracy. However, in some situations, these officials or parties refuse to step down and hang over their office/mandate. An appropriate legal framework, mechanisms and institutions guaranteeing democratic elections and strong opposition parties can help avoid such situations. Commitment to democracy secured by neighbouring countries or regional alliances represents another mean when internal mechanisms fail (as was the case in Gambia in 2017). Furthermore, coups d'état represent another form of anti-democratic transfer of power. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and characteristics of tools and/or mechanisms introduced or strengthened with direct or indirect intervention support that contribute (or have the potential to contribute) to peaceful and lawful transition of power, i.e. strengthen democratic institutions related to free elections and checks on power. |
| Data sources | Documentation, legislative changes Stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Lawful transfer/transition of power is the act of handing over power to an official elected in free, democratic elections according to the laws of the country or territory. Peaceful transfer of power refers to transition of power which proceeds without any conflict (political, armed). |
| Further resources | Chesterman, S. (2007). Ownership in Theory and in Practice: Transfer of Authority in UN Statebuilding Operations. <i>Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding</i> 1(1) (link). Varol, O. O. (2012). The Democratic Coup d'état. <i>Harvard International Law Journal</i> 53(2), 292-356. (link) |

GGO50: NUMBER OF REGULATORS TRAINED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO50: Number of regulators trained</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Building effective regulations is essential to protect public safety and health of citizens while effective economic governance is a key condition for economic growth and development. Good regulations are thus essential for the development and wellbeing of a country or district. The capacity of local regulators to design good, modern regulations may be strengthened via technical cooperation through the means of additional training, knowledge-transfer sessions and others. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of regulators trained in designing good regulations and the type of training/capacity building. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Regulators Trainers, experts |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Good Regulation serves the public interest through supporting ongoing confidence in processes, such as the market process, in which the public participates and in activities, such as auditing, on which the public relies. Criteria for good regulation comprise: whether the action or regime is supported by legislative authority; whether there is an appropriate scheme of accountability; whether procedures are fair, accessible, and open; whether the regulator is acting with sufficient expertise; and whether the action or regime is efficient. After explaining each of these criteria, the chapter turns to their role in assessing regulation. |
| Further resources | Baldwin, R., Cave, M. and Lodge, M. (2011). <i>Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice</i> . Oxford Scholarship Online, April 2015. (link) Kirkpatrick, C. (2014). Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Reform in Developing countries. <i>Public Administration and Development</i> 34, 162-168. (link) Thomadakis, S. B. (2007). <i>What Makes Good Regulation?</i> (link) World Bank. (2015). <i>Building Regulation for Resilience. Managing Risks for Safer Cities</i> . (link) |

GGO51: NUMBER OF CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS TRAINED TO ADVOCATE FOR GOOD REGULATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO51: Number of civil society actors trained to advocate for good regulations</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | With a shift from government to a broader concept of governance, civil society organizations (CSOs) have been increasingly incorporated into regulatory decision-making processes often very directly and formally, in an attempt to democratise participation in regulatory decisions. CSOs try to influence both governmental and corporate agenda-settings to include and promote regulatory objectives. Nevertheless, the capacity of CSOs to influence regulatory processes varies greatly across countries. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of civil society actors (measured as number of organizations and their type/focus or number of representatives from what type of organizations) who have been trained in advocating for and influencing regulatory processes at local, national or international level. Training may include technical capacity building, information sessions, building alliances and partnerships, knowledge and experience-sharing sessions etc. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders from civil society Training materials Trainers, coaches, experts |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organizations (CSOs) encompass a broad array of actors such as non-governmental organizations, charities, trusts, foundations, advocacy groups, national and international non-state associations |
| Further resources | Ghaus-Pasha, A. (2004). <i>Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance</i> . (link) Hutter, B. M. and O'Mahony, J. (2004). <i>The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Regulating Business</i> . Discussion Paper No. 26, London School of Economics. (link) |

GGO52: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING TRAININGS, COURSES AND INFORMAL SESSIONS IN REGULATORY PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO52: Number and type of capacity-building trainings, courses and informal sessions in regulatory processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | The task of good regulatory processes is to produce sound regulations such as legislative framework, procurement processes, system of sanctions and their enforcement etc. Each field of practice carries its own specifics which need to be considered in designing effective regulations. These processes shall be supported by good international practice and experience sharing, knowledge building and sharing and other forms of capacity building to regulators and in some cases to other stakeholders such as civil society organizations. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (characteristics, description) of capacity-building activities focused on regulatory processes delivered to stakeholders of the intervention. Information on the type of stakeholders and the type of institution(s) they represent should also be collected. |
| Data sources | Capacity-building materials Project documentation, attendance lists Stakeholders who participated in the activities |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews, Focus groups |
| Definition of key terms | Capacity: Ability to effectively design, plan, carry out, and monitor and evaluate the organization's core functions and scope of work. Good Regulation serves the public interest through supporting ongoing confidence in processes, such as the market process, in which the public participates and in activities, such as auditing, on which the public relies. Criteria for good regulation comprise: whether the action or regime is supported by legislative authority; whether there is an appropriate scheme of accountability; whether procedures are fair, accessible, and open; whether the regulator is acting with sufficient expertise; and whether the action or regime is efficient. After explaining each of these criteria, the chapter turns to their role in assessing regulation. |
| Further resources | Baldwin, R., Cave, M. and Lodge, M. (2011). <i>Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice</i> . Oxford Scholarship Online, April 2015. (link) Ghaus-Pasha, A. (2004). <i>Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance</i> . (link) Hutter, B. M. and O'Mahony, J. (2004). <i>The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Regulating Business</i> . Discussion Paper No. 26, London School of Economics. (link) Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. <i>Capacity-building</i> . (link) WHO. (2017). <i>Regulatory Strengthening and Capacity Building</i> . (link) |

GGO53: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OR MECHANISMS INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS AND TIMELINESS OF COUNTRY'S REGULATORY PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO53: Number and type of tools or mechanisms introduced or strengthened to improve effectiveness and timeliness of country's regulatory processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Effective regulations are essential to protect public safety and health of citizens and to generate sustainable economic growth and development. However, regulations may easily become out of date and create unnecessary burdens on citizens and businesses. They are also often associated with unnecessary administrative burden (red tape). Development may thus be enhanced by improving the effectiveness of regulations and timeliness of the regulatory process. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and key characteristics of tools or mechanisms that have been introduced or strengthened with project support with the intention (or indirect effect) to improve country's or region's administrative processes. |
| Data sources | Tools and mechanisms introduced Regulations that were modified Norms and procedures accompanying the regulatory processes Stakeholders of the regulatory process |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Content analysis Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Tools and mechanisms to improve regulations include regulatory impact assessment (RIA), administrative simplifications (cutting the red tape), performance monitoring, risk governance frameworks, and considering alternatives to regulations, among others. |
| Further resources | Moreira de Castro, C. (2013). Public hearings as a tool to improve participation in regulatory policies: case study of the National Agency of Electric Energy. <i>Revista de Administração Pública</i> 47(5). (link) OECD. (2017). <i>Policy Tools for Regulatory Quality Assurance</i> . (link) OECD. (2012). <i>Regulatory policy: improving governance</i> . (link) OECD. (2009). <i>Improving the Quality of Regulations. Policy Brief</i> . (link) |

GGO60: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING TRAININGS, COURSES AND INFORMAL SESSIONS DELIVERED TO JUSTICE SYSTEM STAKEHOLDERS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO60: Number and type of capacity-building trainings, courses and informal sessions delivered justice system stakeholders</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Efficient, equitable and accessible justice systems are the lifeblood of the rule of law. Technical assistance is provided to assist partner countries in developing or improving their criminal justice systems by strengthening their capacities and performance. It may take the form of specialized trainings to judges and prosecutors and on promoting the rule of law, support to assist states in adapting their legislation and procedures to enhance the capacity of their criminal justice practitioners to respond to the growing need to establish institutional and ongoing international cooperation in criminal matters with neighbouring states. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (description) of capacity-building activities focused on transfer of knowledge, best practices and/or training of stakeholders in the justice system of a given country, region or territory. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Materials, attendance lists, evaluations used in capacity-building Stakeholders who participated in capacity-building Instructors |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Capacity: Ability to effectively design, plan, carry out, and monitor and evaluate the organization's core functions and scope of work. Justice system refers to the series of organizations and processes established by governments involved in apprehending, prosecuting, defending, sentencing, and jailing those involved in crimes - including law enforcement, attorneys, judges, courts of law, prisons. |
| Further resources | International Development Law Organization. (2015). <i>Building Judicial Capacity</i> . (link) The Commonwealth. (n.d.). <i>Strengthening the capacity of the justice system of Swaziland</i> . (link) UNDP & Government of South Africa. (2003). <i>Capacity building in the area of Child Justice. (The Child Justice Project)</i> . SAF/97/034. (link) |

GGO61: NUMBER OF JUSTICE SYSTEM STAKEHOLDERS EDUCATED ON FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, JUDICIAL BEST PRACTICES, TREATMENT OF VULNERABLE GROUPS AND OTHER PERTINENT TOPICS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO61: Number of justice system stakeholders educated on fundamental rights, judicial best practices, treatment of vulnerable groups and other pertinent topics</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Efficient, equitable and accessible justice systems are the lifeblood of the rule of law. Building judicial capacity is thus considered one of the most important objectives in order to support the development and fortification of good governance. Additionally, efforts should be made to enhanced inclusion within the justice system by building capacity of stakeholders who represent different population groups. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of justice system stakeholder disaggregated by sex, ethnic/religious group membership, age and other characteristics as appropriate in a given context who were educated on effective justice system processes and other pertinent topics including fundamental rights, just treatment of vulnerable groups etc. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Training materials, attendance lists, evaluations Stakeholders trained Project manager, training staff, lecturers etc. |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews, focus groups Survey |
| Definition of key terms | Justice system refers to the series of organizations and processes established by governments involved in apprehending, prosecuting, defending, sentencing, and jailing those involved in crimes - including law enforcement, attorneys, judges, courts of law, prisons. |
| Further resources | International Development Law Organization. (2015). <i>Building Judicial Capacity</i> . (link) UNDP & Government of South Africa. (2003). <i>Capacity building in the area of Child Justice. (The Child Justice Project)</i> . SAF/97/034. (link) |

GGO62: NUMBER AND TYPE OF TOOLS OR MECHANISMS INTRODUCED OR STRENGTHENED TO STREAMLINE JUDICIAL PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO62: Number and type of tools or mechanisms introduced or strengthened to streamline judicial processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Efficient, equitable and accessible justice systems are the lifeblood of the rule of law. Streamlining judicial processes also sends positive signals to business and potential investors. Assistance to partner countries may take the form of clearing of substantial case backlogs and improving the quality and timeliness of court practice and administration, among many others. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (characteristics, description) of tools or mechanisms that were introduced or strengthened with project support with the objective to streamline judicial processes. |
| Data sources | Tools or mechanisms introduced Justice system stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Streamlining judicial processes includes reforming court procedures to improve judicial efficiency, decongest court dockets and reduce court delay. It also means removing improper filing practices, instating case timelines and strengthening contract enforceability in order to achieve judicial accountability and efficiency. |
| Further resources | The Commonwealth. (n.d.). <i>Strengthening the capacity of the justice system of Swaziland</i> . (link) Fordham, M., Chamberlain, M., Steele, I. & Al-Rikabi, Z. (2014). <i>Streamlining Judicial Review in a Manner Consistent with the Rule of Law</i> . (Bingham Centre Report 2014/01). (link) USAID. (2017). <i>Justice Strengthening to Improve Court Effectiveness (JUSTICE) Project</i> . (link) |

GGO63: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS TRAINED AT JUSTICE SYSTEM OVERSIGHT

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO63: Number and type of civil society actors trained at justice system oversight</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Civil society oversight of the justice system sector, including oversight of judicial reforms, involves the active participation of CSOs in defining justice policies and overseeing the structures and practices of justice system actors. The objective is to ensure the incorporation of community-level and grassroots interests and perspectives in the provision of justice, and to support local ownership and sustainability. In addition, civil society oversight ideally supports internationally accepted democratic norms on transparency and accountability. Civil society oversight can occur at local, national, regional and international levels, and can include CSO participation in both formal and informal oversight mechanisms. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (characteristics, type of civil society actor and presence/stakes in the justice system) of civil society actors who were trained at justice system oversight activities/functions with the support of the project. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Training materials, registration forms, attendance lists, evaluations Trained stakeholders Training staff, project management and staff |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews Survey |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society: Civil society is a domain parallel to, but separate from the state and the market, comprising diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations such as community-based organisations, religious bodies, professional associations, trade unions, student groups, cultural societies, media etc. that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations. |
| Further resources | Barnes, K. and Albrecht, P. (2008). "Civil Society Oversight of the Security Sector and Gender." In Bastick, M. and Valasek, K. (Eds.), <i>Gender and Security Sector Reform Toolkit</i> . Geneva: DCAF, OSCE/ODIHR, UN-INSTRAW. (link) |

GGO64: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ADRs ESTABLISHED OR IMPROVED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGO64: Number and type of alternative dispute resolutions (ADRs) established or improved</i> |
| Indicator level | Output |
| Purpose of indicator | Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) includes any process for resolving a dispute other than adjudication by a judge in a statutory court. While ADRs have been growing in importance worldwide, they are not a substitute for formal judicial system. ADR programs are instruments for the application of equity, rather than the rule of law, and as such cannot be expected to establish legal precedent or implement changes in legal and social norms. However, ADR programs can complement and support judicial reforms. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (qualitative description) of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms established or improved with project support. |
| Data sources | Project documentation Project staff and management ADR stakeholders ADRs established or improved and related documentation |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews, focus groups Community discussions |
| Definition of key terms | Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) describes a wide variety of dispute resolution mechanisms that are short of, or alternative to, full-scale court processes. The term can refer to everything from facilitated settlement negotiations in which disputants are encouraged to negotiate directly with each other prior to some other legal process, to arbitration systems or minitrials that look and feel very much like a courtroom process. Processes designed to manage community tension or facilitate community development issues can also be included within the rubric of ADR. ADR systems may be generally categorized as negotiation, conciliation/mediation, or arbitration systems. Key principles of ADR include its voluntary nature, the need for confidentiality, its efficiency and the transparency and quality of the process. |
| Further resources | Law Reform Commission of Ireland. (2008). <i>Alternative Dispute Resolution. Consultation Paper.</i> (link) Lucas, B. (2014). <i>Alternative dispute resolution for businesses in developing countries.</i> (link) Michel, J. (2011). <i>Alternative Dispute Resolution and the Rule of Law in International Development Cooperation.</i> Justice & Development Working Paper Series, The World Bank. (link) Santosa, M.A. (2003). <i>Development of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Indonesia.</i> (link) USAID. (1998). <i>Alternative Dispute Resolution Practitioner's Guide.</i> Center for Democracy and Governance. (link) |

2. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTCOME INDICATORS – B.1 (QUAL.)

Note: Unless specifically stated otherwise, all outcome indicators are assessed as *compared to baseline* (the state/condition before intervention).

GGRL1: EVIDENCE OF CITIZEN AND OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS' ABILITY TO PRESENT THEIR OPINION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL1: Evidence of citizen and other stakeholder groups' ability to present their opinion</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Citizens' capacity to express and exercise their views effectively has the potential to influence government priorities and processes, including a stronger demand for responsiveness, transparency and accountability. Governments that can be held accountable for their actions, for their part, are more likely to respond to the needs and demands articulated by their population. In order for stakeholders to express their opinions and demand it be taken into account, they need to be well informed on channels and appropriate forms to express their views and on mechanisms to influence decision-making. However, capacity-building in itself may be necessary but not sufficient condition for stakeholders and citizen to voice their concerns. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any type of evidence that the project enhanced citizens' or other stakeholder groups' ability to present their opinion and do it in the most appropriate/impactful manner. |
| Data sources | Citizens/stakeholder groups as appropriate Community/stakeholder groups leaders Written or recorded evidence of opinions/inputs presented |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Citizen voice indicates the ability to express opinions, interests, preferences, and views, and at the same time to exercise that ability, usually in an attempt to influence governmental priorities or public administration processes. |
| Further resources | MacDonald, L., Fishkin, B. and Witzel, D. (2014). <i>Citizen Voice in a Globalized World</i> . (link) Overseas Development Institute. (2011). <i>Promoting citizens' voice and accountability: understanding what may work in different settings and lessons from experience</i> . (link) Tembo, F. (2012). <i>Citizen voice and state accountability. Towards theories of change that embrace contextual dynamics</i> . (link) Munzara, A. and Benn, N. (2014). <i>Guidance on Citizen Voice and Action for Resilience and Livelihoods Programming</i> . (link) |

GGRL2: EVIDENCE OF INTEGRATION OF TARGET GROUPS' CONCERNS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS TO THE FINAL VERSION OF POLICY PRODUCTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL2: Evidence of integration of target groups' concerns and/or suggestions to the final version of policy products</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | While countries frequently receive significant policy assistance, policy recommendations often do not translate into policy change or modified development programmes. Similarly, while different stakeholder groups may be provided with tools to advocate for good policies and influence policy-making, these capacity-building activities may not translate in effective policy advocacy work. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the target groups supported from the intervention influencing the final policy products adopted within a given sector. |
| Data sources | Target stakeholder groups Policy proposals submitted Final policy products Policy makers Policy experts in a given sector |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews, focus groups Expert panel |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Target group is the particular group of people that an intervention is intended to reach or is focusing on.</p> <p>Meaningful participation (MP). People are empowered to take an active role in decision-making at various levels in an organisation or community and within different stages of a program. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to MP; each context and each group requires different strategies. Simple presence does not result in MP, people must have a certain level of responsibility and decision-making power. MP should be open, fair, truthful, broad-based, deliberative, responsive and competent.</p> <p>Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations</i>. (link)</p> <p>Gifford, G.L. (1999). <i>Meaningful Participation. An activist's guide to collaborative policy-making</i>. (link)</p> <p>Maetz, M. and Balié, J. (2008). <i>Influencing policy processes. Lessons from experience</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRL3: EVIDENCE OF INTEREST/FOLLOW-UP FROM PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS ON PROJECT RESULTS AND THEIR SUSTAINABILITY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL3: Evidence of interest/follow-up from project stakeholders on project results and their sustainability</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | There is a growing importance of the role of citizen groups and other civil society organizations in monitoring development initiatives, from small-scale community one to the global Agenda 2030. Citizens, whether as individuals or through their various organized fora in civil society, are often knowledge brokers at the point of delivery, providing critical information about the results of development delivery. The rise of innovations in technology has provided citizens with new and unprecedented opportunities and tools to follow-up and engage with intervention results (or the lack of it) and those responsible for the results. Stakeholders will be the more interested and engaged, the more they have developed ownership or feel their stake in the intervention and its sustainability. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the stakeholders of the intervention engaging in follow-up activities, monitoring and ensuring or demanding sustainability of the intervention results. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders engaged in follow-up activities Records of follow-up activities (demands, petitions, open calls etc.) Authorities responsible for sustaining results |
| Methods of data collection | Most significant change, story telling Focus groups Interviews, surveys Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Citizen-based monitoring and engagement promotes mutual learning and sharing based on citizen's experiential knowledge, complements other official data gathering efforts, strengthens accountability relationships between state and citizens and increases trust between state and citizens, helps to refocus development cooperation on results of development and promotes efficiency and effectiveness in development delivery. |
| Further resources | ECOSOC. (2015). <i>Citizen-based Monitoring of Development Cooperation to Support Implementation of the 2030 Agenda</i> . 2016 Development Cooperation Forum Policy Briefs. (link) Gigler, S. (2016). <i>10 lessons on citizen engagement</i> . (link) Kindornay, S. and Twigg, S. (2015). <i>Establishing a workable follow-up and review process for the Sustainable Development Goals</i> . (link) |

GGRL4: EVIDENCE OF CONTINUOUS COOPERATION OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN ACTIVITIES AND DIALOGUES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL4: Evidence of continuous cooperation of key stakeholders with project recipient after project end</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Some development interventions may bring together distinct actors that cooperate based on the common purpose of the intervention or because the funder requested them to do so (e.g., the requirement of participation of civil society). However, the intervention is set for a more durable effect, if these actors maintain cooperation in the domain even after the project end. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of ongoing cooperation of key stakeholders of the intervention with the recipient (or key stakeholders among themselves). The purpose of this ongoing cooperation and the degree of the contribution of the intervention should also be examined. |
| Data sources | Key stakeholders, project recipient Documented outcomes of the ongoing cooperation |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews Survey Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Key stakeholders area subgroup of stakeholders whose support or engagement is crucial to the success of the intervention and its sustainability. |
| Further resources | UN Habitat. (2012). <i>CAMEROON IMPACT STORY: Fostering political will to create a platform for cooperation between all key stakeholders.</i> (link) WWF. (2000). <i>Stakeholder Collaboration. Building Bridges for Conservation.</i> (link) |

GGRL5: EVIDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES' INCREASED ACTIVITY IN CONSULTATION PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL5: Evidence of government entities' increased activity in consultation processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Government entities as recipients of development cooperation funds earmarked for specific purposes may be required to carry out consultations with appropriate stakeholders such as civil society organizations, groups from the private sector and others. When these consultation mechanisms established for a specific purpose continue to function after the intervention end, they may contribute to a more democratic and better focused development. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the supported government entities (or where applicable, other type of recipients) increased activity in consultation processes with civil society or other stakeholders. Increased activity may be measured as increased frequency of consultations, larger number of consulted groups/organizations, increased number of policy outputs on which the government have sought inputs etc. |
| Data sources | Consulted stakeholders and/or those who should have been consulted Representatives of corresponding recipients (government entities) Consultation inputs and outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc. |
| Further resources | European Commission. (2014). <i>Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines. Public Consultation Document.</i> (link) African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations.</i> (link) Australian Government. (2016). <i>Best Practice Consultation.</i> Guidance Note. (link) or a summary by Broadribb, K. (n.d.). <i>Implementing a successful stakeholder consultation.</i> [PowerPoint Presentation]. (link) |

GGRL6: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED POLITICAL TOLERANCE TO OPPOSING VIEWS EXPRESSED BY CIVIL SOCIETY OR OPPOSITION GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL6: Evidence of increased political tolerance to opposing views expressed by civil society or opposition groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Lack of political tolerance is a problem everywhere. It manifests itself when political leaders refuse to give space to opposition parties and politics, when political parties do not tolerate dissent from their membership and, more generally, through a rejection of different views. Increased political tolerance to opposing views and demands placed on government entities by civil society or other opposition groups is a sign of a greater democratization of authorities. Expressions of tolerance may range from decrease or elimination of repression against opposition groups to inviting them to a negotiating table and/or consultative mechanisms. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any type of evidence of increased government tolerance towards opposing views expressed by civil society groups or other opposition groups as appropriate in the given context. |
| Data sources | Civil society groups, opposition groups Documented evidence of acceptance of proposals by the government Independent media coverage of civil society/government interface |
| Methods of data collection | Focus groups, interviews Media analysis, desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Political tolerance means accepting and respecting the basic rights and civil liberties of persons and groups whose viewpoints differ from one's own. |
| Further resources | Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2009). <i>International Day of Democracy 2009. Democracy and political tolerance.</i> (link) |

GGRL7: EVIDENCE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY SUPPORTED GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL7: Evidence of advocacy and outreach activities undertaken by supported groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The purpose of the indicator is to verify whether groups that were supported in developing advocacy skills and capacity and/or specific advocacy products continue to use these skills and advocacy activities after project end, i.e. the sustainability of such support. |
| What the indicator measures | The indicator should ascertain any evidence of advocacy and outreach activities carried out by supported groups after the support end. The type of activity, purpose/objective and targeted audiences should also be analyzed. |
| Data sources | Records of advocacy activities (media files, letters, documentation from events organized etc.) Supported groups Target audiences |
| Methods of data collection | Media tracking, media content analysis Desk research Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Advocacy/outreach activities may mean sending letters or official complaints addressed to public officials, creating informative videos, photos, posters, media campaigns, ads, organizing demonstrations against or in favour of a clearly defined cause, formation of a coalition or a new membership in a coalition of like-minded organizations and other forms of behaviour or expressions with the purpose to advocate for a cause, reach out to important audiences etc. |
| Further resources | Chapman, J. (2002). Monitoring and evaluating advocacy. <i>PLA Notes</i> , 43, 48-52. (link) O’Neil, G. et al. (2015). <i>Oxfam’s Global Leaders Empowered to Alleviate Poverty (LEAP). Evaluation - Final Report</i> . (link). Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy</i> . Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. Transtec. (2014). <i>Strengthening Advocacy Capacity of Civil Society in The Gambia</i> . (link) UNICEF. (2010). <i>Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy. Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit</i> . New York: UNICEF. (link) - includes case studies |

**GGRL8: EVIDENCE OF CHANGES ACHIEVED AS A CONSEQUENCE OF ADVOCACY/OUTREACH
ACTIVITIES BY SUPPORTED GROUPS**

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL8: Evidence of changes achieved as a consequence of advocacy/outreach activities by supported groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | While indicator GGRL7 assesses the continued use of newly acquired advocacy skills and/or continued work in the advocacy arena by supported groups after the end of the intervention (support), this indicator focuses on actual impacts achieved by these advocacy activities, i.e. the effectiveness of the advocacy activities carried out. Those effects may be a result of advocacy activities undertaken during or after the intervention. |
| What the indicator measures | The indicator should ascertain any evidence of changes or other effects generated by/resulting from advocacy activities that supported groups |
| Data sources | Stakeholders, media, policy documents, public opinion polls |
| Methods of data collection | Stakeholder surveys or interviews Case studies Focus groups Media tracking Media content or media tracking analysis Policy tracking Public polling |
| Definition of key terms | Advocacy/outreach activities may mean sending letters or official complaints addressed to public officials, creating informative videos, photos, posters, media campaigns, ads, organizing demonstrations against or in favour of a clearly defined cause, formation of a coalition or a new membership in a coalition of like-minded organizations and other forms of behaviour or expressions with the purpose to advocate for a cause, reach out to important audiences etc. |
| Further resources | Chapman, J. (2002). Monitoring and evaluating advocacy. <i>PLA Notes</i> , 43, 48-52. (link) O'Neil, G. et al. (2015). <i>Oxfam's Global Leaders Empowered to Alleviate Poverty (LEAP). Evaluation - Final Report</i> . (link). Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy</i> . Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. Transtec. (2014). <i>Strengthening Advocacy Capacity of Civil Society in The Gambia</i> . (link) UNICEF. (2010). <i>Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy. Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit</i> . New York: UNICEF. (link) - includes case studies |

GGRL9: EVIDENCE OF TARGET GROUPS' INFLUENCE ON DECISION MAKING

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL9: Evidence of target groups' influence on decision making</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | <p>Civil society plays key roles in pushing for new laws, programmes, policies or strategies, in holding governments to account on their commitments; in identifying the lack of joined-up government responses; and in ensuring that national policy making does not forget the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p>Target groups such as civil society organizations (CSOs) may receive support to acquire a broad range of skills, participate in events, establish or fortify alliances and coalitions, enhance knowledge on civic rights, democracy and good governance principles and many others. This indicator looks for evidence that these were able to capitalize on the support and turn it into actual influence on public decision making. (In some cases, they may also want to influence decision making of the private sector).</p> |
| What the indicator measures | The indicator should ascertain any evidence of the supported groups influencing decision making of relevant authorities or other powerful organizations/groups. Key characteristics of the process through which decision making was influenced should also be the subject of analysis. |
| Data sources | <p>Policy outputs, multi-stakeholder and international agreements</p> <p>Abandoned/reverted decisions and policies seen as controversial</p> <p>Court decisions</p> |
| Methods of data collection | <p>Policy tracking</p> <p>Content analysis of policy outputs and agreements</p> |
| Definition of key terms | Influencing decision making includes raising awareness at local and national levels and helping governments, donors and international organizations plan for addressing key challenges, adopting policies for inclusive and sustainable growth, with specific emphasis on those who are most vulnerable, opening governing processes to non-state actors, strengthening democracy, transparency and accountability. |
| Further resources | <p>Džatková, V. (2016). <i>The Role of Civil Society in Public Governance</i>. Rocznik Administracji Publicznej 2. (link)</p> <p>Perret, V. (2006). <i>Civil society in international relations: a typology of roles and political functions</i>. XXth World Congress of the International Political Science Association, At Fukuoka, Japan. (link)</p> <p>Reid, H., Ampomah, G., Olazábal Prera, M.I., Rabbani, G. and Zvigadza, S. (2012). <i>Southern voices on climate policy choices. Analysis of and lessons learned from civil society advocacy on climate change</i>. International Institute for Environment and Development. London. (link)</p> |

GGRL10: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED CAPACITY (EFFECTIVENESS) OF CSOs TO ENGAGE IN POLICY DIALOGUES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 1. Participation |
| Subdimension | 1.1 Stakeholder engagement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL10: Evidence of increased capacity (effectiveness) of CSOs to engage in policy dialogues</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | While the involvement of civil society in policy dialogue has a long history particularly in relation to social movements, this role is being increasingly encouraged by development partners (partner countries). A strong civil society actively engaging with the state is now regarded as an end in itself and a public good, leading to better democratic practice and outcomes. This position is further endorsed in The Accra Agenda for Action in 2008. As such, significant efforts have been invested in developing the capacity of CSOs to effectively engage in policy dialogues. |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of increased capacity of CSOs supported from the intervention to engage in policy dialogue and do so in effective manner, i.e. achieving objectives related to priority topics, influencing the agenda, policy outputs etc. |
| Data sources | CSOs, CSOs' inputs into policy dialogues Policy processes and outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Workshops Observation of CSOs engagement in action Case studies Interviews, focus groups Policy reviews, desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Policy dialogue is an open and inclusive dialogue on development policies. It forms part of policy and decision-making processes, where it is intended to contribute to developing or implementing a policy change following a round of evidence-based discussions/workshops/consultations on a particular subject. Policy dialogue take place around a policy question on which key documents and experts are brought together to present recent evidence on the issue. |
| Further resources | Court, J., Mendizabal, E., Osborne, D. and Young, J. (2006). <i>Policy Engagement. How Civil Society Can be More Effective</i> . Overseas Development Institute. (link) Lortkipanidze, S. and Patariaia, T. (2014). <i>Mapping Study of Civil Society Organisations' Engagement in Policy Dialogue in Georgia</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Bangladesh Country Report</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Uganda Country Report</i> . (link) OECD. (2013). <i>Support to Civil Society. Emerging Evaluation Lessons</i> . (link) |

GGRL11: OCCASIONS OF CONSENSUS OR CONCERTED EFFORTS IN VILLAGE(S)

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRNL11: Occasions of consensus or concerted efforts in village(s)</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Consensus of local people is crucial to any kind of initiative or intervention. When local people come to a consensus, they provide their support, wisdom and in some cases also labour and money to the intervention. Initiatives based on consensus face less opposition, achieve a greater level of local ownership and tend to be overall more effective in their desired effect. Community/village consensus is a key part to local self-organization and can greatly contribute to functional local governance. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of the intervention contributing to consensus or concerted efforts reached at the level of a village or community where intervention was taking place. |
| Data sources | Villagers, members of the community Community (village) leaders |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Community walk, observation |
| Definition of key terms | Consensus building (also called collaborative problem solving or collaboration) is essentially mediation of a conflict which involves many parties. Usually, the conflict also involves multiple, complex issues. |
| Further resources | Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado, USA. (1998). <i>Consensus Building</i> . (link) The United Republic of Tanzania. (1998). <i>Guidelines for Participatory Village Land Use Management in Tanzania</i> . (link) |

GGRL20: EVIDENCE OF IMPROVED INFORMATION CONTENT ON OFFICIAL WEBSITES OR IN KEY DOCUMENTS OF PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL20: Evidence of improved information content on official websites or in key documents of participating government entities</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The abundance of data and the number of different ways to share it create new service-delivery possibilities for government through use of data that government agencies themselves collect and generate. Open sharing of data and information has been deemed one of the most important ways of improving transparency and the relationship between the public and the government. Besides transparency, the benefits of Open Data include public service improvement, innovation and economic value and efficiencies within government. |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of improved information content (quantity, quality, accuracy) on official government sites and/or official documents of government entities that participated or have been otherwise affected by the intervention. |
| Data sources | Official websites of concerned government entities Reports and other key documents Stakeholders using/requesting the information |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, website and report content analysis Interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Open data involves the release of data so that anyone can access, use and share it. It should be usable for any legal purpose and accessible to all, and that restrictions on its reuse should be clearly justified. |
| Further resources | Canares, M. and Shakhar, S. (2015). <i>Open Data and Sub-national Governments: Lessons from Developing Countries</i> . (link) Kossow, N. (2015). <i>The Role of Open Data for Sustainable Development. A Brief from Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i> . Prepared for UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. (link) Open Data for Development Network. (2015). <i>Open Data for Development. Building an Inclusive Data Revolution</i> . (link) Open Data Research Network. (n.d.). <i>Exploring the emerging impacts of open data in developing countries</i> . (link) |

**GGRL21: EVIDENCE OF CONTINUOUS PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON PROJECT THEMATIC AREA(S)
BY TARGET GROUPS TO RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS, INCL. CITIZENS**

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL21: Evidence of continuous provision of information on project thematic area(s) by target groups to relevant stakeholders, incl. citizens</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Provision of information to the public or specific stakeholder groups is the basic attribute of transparency. This indicator focuses on the sustainability of transparency and accountability gains achieved throughout the project, specifically on whether the responsible authorities (recipients) continue voluntarily and proactively providing adequate information to their stakeholders/citizens. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator ascertains any evidence of continuous provision of information on the intervention thematic area by responsible authorities or other subjects to their stakeholders/citizens. The degree of relevance of the information to the stakeholders as well as adequacy of format should also be analyzed. |
| Data sources | Responsible authorities / project recipients Stakeholders, citizens Public surveys |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys Case studies Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability. Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations. |
| Further resources | Hallak, J. and Poisson, M. (Eds.) (2006). <i>Governance in education: transparency and accountability</i> . (link) |

GGRL22: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED FREEDOM OF MEDIA

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL22: Evidence of increased freedom of media</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Freedom of expression is a fundamental human right while media freedom and access to information feed into the wider development objective of empowering people. Freedom of expression and access to information play a crucial role in good governance, transparency, and accountability and free and independent media are a cornerstone of democratic societies. The criteria used to assess freedom of the press include: everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers. Freedom of the press is dependent on the legal environment, the political environment, and the economic environment. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator ascertains any evidence of increased (or on the contrary decreased) freedom of the press in the concerned region/location compared to baseline (the situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Perceptions of stakeholders Reports of threats and aggressions against journalists Reports of political repression or economic influencing of the media/journalists International freedom of the press indices NGOs working in the area of transparency/freedom of expression Country's / region's legal framework relating to freedom of expression |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Desk research, content analysis of reports Media analysis Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Free press is such that is independent and pluralistic: independent of governmental, political or economic control or of control of materials essential for its production and dissemination, and pluralistic through the absence of media monopolies and the existence of the greatest possible number of newspapers, magazines and periodicals reflecting the widest possible range of opinion within the community. |
| Further resources | Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2015). <i>Freedom of opinion and the media in German development policy</i> . (link) Freedom House. (2017). <i>Freedom of the Press 2017</i> . (link) Guseva, M. et al. (2008). <i>Press Freedom and Development. An analysis of correlations between freedom of the press and the different dimensions of development, poverty, governance and peace</i> . Prepared for UNESCO. (link) Reporters Without Borders. (2017). <i>2017 World Press Freedom Index</i> . (link) |

GRRL23: EVIDENCE OF A GREATER RESPONSIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT TO CITIZEN REQUESTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GRRL23: Evidence of a greater responsiveness of government to citizen requests</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Trust in government can depend on citizens' experiences when receiving public services. The interaction between citizens and the state is a crucial factor of trust in government. With the technological revolution, government today have an array of options of communicating with citizens, providing information, accepting and responding to requests. Particularly, mobile technology offers a broad coverage even in low income countries where access to broadband remains limited. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of government greater responsiveness to citizens' request compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). This can be manifested by opening new channels of receiving and responding to these requests, a higher rate of responding through traditional channels etc. |
| Data sources | Channels established (ICT, mobile technology and others) Citizen initiatives, representative CSOs |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Environmental scan, desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Government responsiveness is the degree to which government listens to what people want and acts on it, and to which public policies and institutions respond to the needs of citizens and uphold their rights. |
| Further resources | Good Governance Learning Network. (2015). <i>In Pursuit of Responsible and Responsive Local Governance</i> . (link) OECD. (2011). <i>Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society</i> . OECD Public Governance Reviews. (link) OECD/International Telecommunication Union. (2011). <i>M-Government: Mobile Technologies for Responsive Governments and Connected Societies</i> . OECD Publishing. (link) |

GGRL24: GOVERNMENT ENTITIES AND/OR OTHER PLAYERS CONTINUE TO ACTIVELY SEEK FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS ON POLICIES OR PREVIOUSLY AGREED COMMITMENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL24: Government entities and/or other players continue to actively seek feedback from stakeholders on policies or previously agreed commitments</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator seeks to establish whether gains in increased consultations and established consultation processes continue to hold also after the end of the intervention or whether responsible entities carry on with commitments previously agreed in consultations/policy dialogues. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the government entities directly or indirectly supported from the intervention (or otherwise involved) continuing to seek feedback and consulting on proposed policy documents or changes to these. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders involved in consultations (or those omitted) Government representatives Consultation/feedback documents, final policy outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Desk research, content analysis Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc. |
| Further resources | European Commission. (2014). <i>Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines. Public Consultation Document.</i> (link) African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations.</i> (link) Australian Government. (2016). <i>Best Practice Consultation. Guidance Note.</i> (link) or a summary by Broadribb, K. (n.d.). <i>Implementing a successful stakeholder consultation.</i> [PowerPoint Presentation]. (link) |

GGRL25: BUDGETING PRACTICE IN A TARGET SECTOR UTILIZES EVIDENCE

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL25: Budgeting practice in a target sector utilizes evidence.</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the level of evidence being used by actors in the relevant system (health, education etc.) when creating budgets. This can be evaluated by examining the number of budget line items and determining (1) which line items were formulated using evidence-based budgeting, and (2) to what extent evidence-based budgeting was utilized. Evaluations of the budget can be done by the private sector, or by non-governmental organizations or civil society groups. Evidence-based budgeting is critical to ensuring that funding streams are used to support programs or items that have been shown to produce results and meet public needs, as well as to reform or eliminate failures. By using evidence-based budgeting, systems can also help to restore public trust in government by demonstrating that budgets and disbursements are made properly and are able to achieve the intended outcomes. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of budget line items determined in full or in part by evidence linked to previous evidence-based decision-making support. |
| Data sources | Government records; NGO and/or CSO assessments; project records |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Budgeting practice: The process of creating a budget; developing an estimate of incomes and expenditures over a given period of time.</p> <p>Evidence: Facts, information, or data that are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a program or budget item. Can include data on health systems indicators (including trends over time), the results from evaluations and research studies (that could be from other countries), and cost-benefit or any other analyses. Evidence can be produced by government or from think tanks, international organizations, and civil society organizations.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative. (2014). <i>Evidence-Based Policymaking. A guide for effective government.</i> (link)</p> <p>Sutcliffe, S. and Court, J. (2005). <i>Evidence-Based Policymaking: What is it? How does it work? What relevance for developing countries?</i> (link)</p> |

GGRL26: DRAFT BUDGETS IN TARGET SECTORS ARE PUBLISHED FOR STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS (OPEN BUDGET)

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL26: Draft budgets in target sectors are published for stakeholder consultations</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The budget is the single most important policy document governments publish. It sets out priorities and should enable citizens to see where and how public resources are spent. Budget transparency is at the heart of transparent and accountable financing for development and the effective governance of public resources. When citizens do not have sufficient information about how their government prioritizes and spends public resources, they cannot help to set those priorities or hold their governments accountable for the effective use of public resources. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain evidence of open budget practices in supported sectors, i.e. of draft budgets or other public financial data being published and open for consultations and comments by relevant groups of stakeholders. The degree of budget transparency should be compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Open budget data (public financial data) Consultation mechanisms and consultation outcomes (e.g. summary of comments) Final budget versions Stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis of the degree of reflection of comments in the final version of budgets Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Open budget data are datasets of financial management in the public sector which are made available by the state and public administration to be freely used, redistributed and re-used without restrictions. |
| Further resources | De Renzio, P and Mastruzzi, M. (2016). <i>How Does Civil Society Use Budget Information? Mapping Fiscal Transparency Gaps and Needs in Developing Countries</i> . International Budget Partnership. (link) Gray, J. (2015). <i>Open Budget Data. Mapping the Landscape</i> . (link) International Budget Partnership. (2015). <i>Open Budget Survey 2015</i> . (link) ONE. (2013). <i>Budget Transparency</i> . (link) |

GGRL27: EVIDENCE OF LEGISLATIVE CHANGES AIMING AT STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS TAKING PLACE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF A PROJECT

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL27: Evidence of legislative changes aiming at strengthening accountability mechanisms taking place as a consequence of a project</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Legislatures are the institution where citizen interests and preferences are expressed and transformed into policy, and the point at which, at least potentially, people most closely engage their national government. As such, legislatures are key to achieving the democratic potential embodied in free and fair elections. Effective, representative legislatures bring benefits to the large majority of citizens. However, legislatures may also function ineffectively, succumb to political influences and traditions, fail to hear voices of majority citizens and in consequence, make the society suffer. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of project contribution to legislative changes aimed at enhancing accountability and strengthening democratic principles. |
| Data sources | Legislature representatives Project recipient, interested beneficiaries and other stakeholders Legislation adopted/amended |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Desk research, legislative analysis, RIA |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations.</p> <p>Legislature is one of the branches of the government and is the one who most closely represents citizens and their interests. It fulfills a number of important functions in a democracy including representing people and groups, reflecting and bringing their needs, aspirations, problems, concerns, and priorities to the policymaking and policy-amending process; making laws, the rules that govern a nation; and practicing oversight, assuring that laws and programs are carried out legally, effectively, and according to legislative intent.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Center for Democracy and Governance. (2000). <i>USAID Handbook on Legislative Strengthening</i>. (link)</p> <p>Hallak, J. and Poisson, M. (Eds.) (2006). <i>Governance in education: transparency and accountability</i>. (link)</p> <p>SIDA. (2006). <i>Parliamentary Strengthening. Position Paper – Revision 060529</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRL28: EVIDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES HOLDING REGULAR PUBLIC MEETINGS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL28: Evidence of government entities holding regular public meetings</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Public meetings bring diverse groups of stakeholders together for a specific purpose. Public meetings are held to engage a wide audience in information sharing and discussion. They can be used to increase awareness of an issue or proposal, and can be a starting point for, or an ongoing means of engaging, further public involvement. When done well, they help build a feeling of community. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of supported (or otherwise influenced by the intervention) government entities holding regular public meetings to inform, discuss and consult citizens on issues of public interest. It only makes sense to follow this indicator if there were no public meetings held prior to the intervention (or were very irregular/ineffective) A clear link of contribution of the intervention to the new practice needs to be established. |
| Data sources | Public meeting announcements and invitations Minutes from public meetings, media records of meetings (photo, video, direct streaming online) Media coverage of meetings Stakeholders organizing and participating in meetings |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Media analysis Interviews Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Public meetings are familiar, established ways for people to come together to express their opinions, hear a public speaker or proposed plan, engage in shared learning about a topic, or work together to develop solutions. |
| Further resources | United States Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). <i>International Cooperation. Public Participation Guide: Public Meetings.</i> (link) |

GGRL29: EVIDENCE OF MORE EFFICIENT OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES PARTICIPATING IN A PROJECT

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL29: Evidence of more efficient operations of government entities participating in a project</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Efficiency is about doing more for less. Efficiency is an increasingly core component of government reform. However, reviews of government production costs and productivity in OECD countries indicate that governments may be getting less efficient over time. Governments can enhance their efficiency through the introduction of new practices in various areas of public service. In order to achieve an adequate degree of efficiency, government should pursue innovative practices linked to efficiency; scale the use of efficient practices; improve the use of established measurement and analytical tools to generate actionable insights; and strengthening management incentives to become more efficient. |
| What the indicator follows | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the intervention contribution to a greater efficiency in operations of participating/supported government entities. |
| Data sources | Documentation of newly established operations and processes Government representatives Affected stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Case studies Desk research, content analysis Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Efficiency is about doing more for less. It involves maximizing outputs such as the volume of services provided, minimizing inputs such as the amount of resources or capital required to produce those services and maintaining or improving quality. Efficiency can be measured by how much it costs to deliver a program compared to previous years or compared to peers, or the relative outcomes that governments obtain from a certain level of expenditure. |
| Further resources | Curristine, T., Lonti, Z. and Joumard, I. (2007). <i>Improving Public Sector Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities</i> . (link) United Arab Emirates and Deloitte. (2013). <i>Government Efficiency. Innovate. Scale. Measure. Incent. The Government Summit Thought Leadership Series</i> . (link) |

GGRL30: PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY OF ALL MAJOR AUDITS, EVALUATIONS AND OTHER PERFORMANCE REVIEWS HAS IMPROVED

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL30: Public accessibility of all major audits, evaluations and other performance reviews has improved</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Openness, accountability, and honesty define government transparency. Increasing access to information has the potential to enhance the ownership of processes by the public and provides means to follow through and demand accountability from public officials and institutions. Accessibility of information also allows making informed decisions, improve products and services and increase their efficiency. |
| What the indicator measures | The improvement of accessibility of audits, evaluations and other performance reviews of public programs, government entities operations etc. compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). The improvement may mean that more audits/evaluations are being conducted or that a higher proportion of them is being publicized. |
| Data sources | Audits, evaluations and other performance reviews Government transparency watchdogs / NGOs |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability. Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations. |
| Further resources | Cheng, X., J. and Moses, K. (2016). <i>Promoting transparency through information: A global review of school report cards</i> . UNESCO: Paris, France. (link) Hallak, J. and Poisson, M. (Eds.) (2006). <i>Governance in education: transparency and accountability</i> . (link) Xh.Ymeri, M. (2016). <i>Increasing Transparency through promotion of Internal Audit role in the Accountability chain</i> . Instituti KAF: Kosovo. (link) |

GGRL31: THE GOVERNMENT HAS RELEASED A DIGITAL GOVERNMENT STRATEGY

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL31: The government has released a digital government strategy</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The potential for digitization as a tool for development is a result of its ability to affect every area of a country's life, such as poverty alleviation, the quality of education, health services, government service delivery, economic activities, and citizens' everyday lives. It is therefore essential to devise a strategy that will make technological developments available to everyone. Digitization contributes to economic growth and creates jobs as a result of improvements in firms' productivity and new industry creation. ICTs provide a strong impetus for the adoption of new, more efficient means of production. Moreover, digitization is closely linked to innovation and also encourages the more intelligent and ecological use of human, natural and economic resources. |
| What the indicator measures | Whether a digital strategy for a country or sector was released by government entities supported from the intervention. Whenever possible, characteristics (extensiveness, coverage, based on good practices, tools to be used etc.) of the strategy should also be examined. |
| Data sources | Digital strategy |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Digitization is defined as the ability of a country and its people to use digital technologies to generate, process and share information.</p> <p>E-Government refers to the use by the governments of information and communication technologies (ICTs), and particularly the Internet, as a tool to achieve better government.</p> <p>Digital Government refers to the use of digital technologies, as an integrated part of governments' modernisation strategies, to create public value.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Gobierno de Los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. (2013). <i>National Digital Strategy</i>. (link)</p> <p>OECD Council. (2014). <i>Recommendation of the Council on Digital Government Strategies</i>. (link)</p> <p>OECD. (2017). <i>OECD Digital Government Toolkit</i>. (link)</p> <p>OECD. (2016). <i>Digital Government Strategies for Transforming Public Services in the Welfare Areas</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRL32: THE GOVERNMENT HAS ADOPTED STEPS TO INCREASE SECURE PUBLIC DATA SHARING AND ACCESS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL32: The government has adopted steps to increase secure public data sharing and access</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Provision of citizen services often requires sharing citizen data among many different collaborating government agencies, and these data may contain sensitive information of citizens. In this environment, the security and privacy issues become a paramount priority to build a trust-worthy and sustainable smart government. |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of steps taken by responsible government entities to increase access, use and sharing of public data while ensuring security of such data based on current best practices. |
| Data sources | Digital strategy Initiatives and tools of open government Government unit responsible for digitization Stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis IT security analysis Interviews Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Secure data sharing involves preventing illegal modification, edits, or transfers of sensitive data to third parties for unintended purposes. |
| Further resources | Choi, J., Chun, S. A., Kim D. H., Keromytis, A. (2013). <i>SecureGov: Secure Data Sharing for Government Services</i> . (link) |

GGRL33: INCREASED ACCESS AND USE OF OPEN GOVERNMENT DATA

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL33: Increased access and use of open government data</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Open data is central to enabling widespread economic value, fostering greater civic engagement and enhancing government transparency and accountability to citizens. It is one of the vehicles to achieve the sustainable development goals agenda. Across settings, the primary driver of openness at the national and sub-national level is the presence of national or legal framework promoting the same although the absence of such does not necessarily represent a hindrance in making data open to the public. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of government facilitating access to data it gathers and of stakeholders accessing this data and using it for the benefit of holding their government accountable or other purpose in line with sustainable development. |
| Data sources | Open data initiatives and products Representatives of government entities opening their data Stakeholders using (or requesting) open data Initiatives or products (e.g. campaigns, projects/programs, reports) that used open data |
| Methods of data collection | Comparison before and after Interviews, surveys Case studies Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Open data involves the release of data so that anyone can access, use and share it. It should be usable for any legal purpose and accessible to all, and that restrictions on its reuse should be clearly justified. |
| Further resources | Canares, M. and Shakhar, S. (2015). <i>Open Data and Sub-national Governments: Lessons from Developing Countries.</i> (link) Kossow, N. (2015). <i>The Role of Open Data for Sustainable Development. A Brief from Eastern Europe and Central Asia.</i> Prepared for UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. (link) Open Data for Development Network. (2015). <i>Open Data for Development. Building an Inclusive Data Revolution.</i> (link) Open Data Research Network. (n.d.). <i>Exploring the emerging impacts of open data in developing countries.</i> (link) |

GGRL34: POLICY DIALOGUES ESTABLISHED WITH PROJECT SUPPORT CONTRIBUTE TO EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMMING AND POLICY-MAKING

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL34: Policy dialogues established with project support contribute to evidence-based programming and policy-making</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | A strong civil society actively engaging with the state is now regarded as an end in itself and a public good, leading to better democratic practice and outcomes. This position is further endorsed in The Accra Agenda for Action in 2008. As such, significant efforts have been invested in developing the capacity of CSOs to effectively engage in policy dialogues. Those should be focused not only on gathering opinions of different segments of the society/stakeholders but also to collect and exchange sound data and relevant information including scientific evidence to inform policies. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of policy dialogues and the participation of supported CSOs in those contributing or resulting in programming or policies based on sound evidence. |
| Data sources | Meeting minutes from policy dialogues convened Stakeholders participating in policy dialogues Policies or programming discussed in policy dialogues |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Evidence-based: An evidence-based policy decision or programming is informed by relevant information, data and research that can include data on sector indicators (including trends over time), the results from evaluations and research studies (that could be from other countries), cost-benefit or any other analyses. Policy dialogue is an open and inclusive dialogue on policies. It forms part of policy and decision-making processes, where it is intended to contribute to developing or implementing a policy change following a round of evidence-based discussions/workshops/consultations on a particular subject. Policy dialogue take place around a policy question on which key documents and experts are brought together to present recent evidence on the issue. |
| Further resources | Lortkipanidze, S. and Patariaia, T. (2014). <i>Mapping Study of Civil Society Organisations' Engagement in Policy Dialogue in Georgia</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Bangladesh Country Report</i> . (link) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). <i>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Uganda Country Report</i> . (link) OECD. (2013). <i>Support to Civil Society. Emerging Evaluation Lessons</i> . (link) |

GGRL35: INCREASED ACTIVITY OF INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL35: Increased activity of investigative journalists</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Investigative reporting is watchdog journalism aims to check the abuses of those who have wealth and power. It exposes wrongdoing so it can be corrected. As such, it forms an important part of open, democratic society. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain evidence of increased activity of investigative journalists as direct or indirect consequence of intervention support compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Investigative journalists Cases investigated and published |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews Case studies Desk research Media content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Investigative journalism is reporting that relies on the journalist's own enterprise and initiative, which commonly results in uncovering wrongdoing by individuals and institutions. It entails the use of multiple sources – both human and documentary – that together paint a picture of wrongdoing or abuse. It requires the verification and corroboration of every piece of information, even if these come from sources that are considered reliable or authoritative. |
| Further resources | Coronel, S. S. (2009). <i>Digging Deeper: A guide for investigative journalists in the Balkans</i> . Balkan Investigative Reporting Regional Network: Sarajevo, BiH. (link) |

GGRL40: EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENTION FACILITATING FREE PUBLIC ACCESS TO APPLICABLE LAWS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL40: Evidence of the intervention facilitating free public access to applicable laws</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The possibility of immediately knowing applicable laws constitutes one of the basic tenets of a state governed by the rule of law and is an essential element of legal security. The free dissemination of legal information contributes to the rule of law and the overall ideals of democracy in many ways, including the possibility of knowledge of the applicable rule of law; the State's compliance to its law; the creation of conditions necessary to the equality and fairness of a legal system; and, the improvement of the functioning of democratic institutions. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator should ascertain any evidence of the intervention facilitating free public access to legal information / applicable laws. This may include publishing legal information and texts on sites easily accessible to the public, or promotion of this information already available to potential users (awareness-raising) or improving access of target populations to ICT tools in order to access legal information. |
| Data sources | Legal information published (compared to baseline) Stakeholders (the public, right defenders and others) |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Free public access means available to all without any charge. |
| Further resources | Poulin, D. (2004). Open Access to Law in Developing Countries. <i>First Mondays</i> 9(12). (link) |

GGRL41: EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT RECIPIENT CONTINUES TO PROVIDE PUBLIC INFORMATION-RELATED SERVICES AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL41: Extent to which project recipient continues to provide public information-related services after the intervention ends</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Information-based strategies to promote open government offer many opportunities to generate social and economic value through public use of government information. Access to government information is a public right that must not be restricted by administrative barriers, geography, ability to pay, or format. The information should be disseminated in a manner that promotes its usefulness to the public. When development interventions aid responsible entities to collate, store and disseminate information to the public, there should also be efforts to secure the continuation of such public data services after the intervention ends. |
| What the indicator measures | The indicator serves to verify to what extent the project recipient (or beneficiary if appropriate) maintains the standard achieved in provision of public information and related services to the public after the end of the intervention. |
| Data sources | Government representatives Stakeholders Government websites and other channels of communication Reports, press releases, newsletters, databases and other information made public |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Interviews Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Public information resources are defined as the data, information content, systems, and information services that emanate from the day-to-day administration of government programs. |
| Further resources | Albalte, D. (2012). <i>The Institutional, Economic and Social Determinants of Local Government Transparency</i> . (link) American Library Association. (2017). <i>Key Principles of Government Information</i> . (link) Dawes, S. S. and Helbig, N. (2014). <i>Information Strategies for Open Government: Challenges and Prospects for Deriving Public Value from Government Transparency</i> . (link) Relly, J. E. and Sabharwal, M. (2009). Perceptions of transparency of government policymaking: A cross-national study. <i>Government Information Quarterly</i> 26, 148-157. (link) |

GGRL42: PERCEIVED QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS AND TIMELINESS OF ON-REQUEST PROVISION OF PUBLIC RECORDS / INFORMATION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL42: Perceived quality, effectiveness and timeliness of on-request provision of public records / information</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | It is a fundamental right of citizens in a well-functioning democracy to know what their public officials are doing. What policies public offices are pursuing, what laws and regulations they are preparing, what programmes they are running, how they are raising and spending money and what international agreements they are negotiating. Such information helps to curtail arbitrary use of government power, increases accountability of public officials, assists the private sector in economic decision making, and aids citizens in formulating opinions on public policy issues. |
| What the indicator measures | Stakeholders' perceptions of change in quality, effectiveness and/or timeliness of government response to their information requests or requests to consult public records compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Stakeholders Client satisfaction questioners |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, survey Desk research, basic statistics |
| Definition of key terms | Public information resources are defined as the data, information content, systems, and information services that emanate from the day-to-day administration of government programs. |
| Further resources | Dawes, S. S. and Helbig, N. (2014). <i>Information Strategies for Open Government: Challenges and Prospects for Deriving Public Value from Government Transparency</i> . (link) Édes, B. W. (2000). <i>The Role of Public Administration in Providing Information. Information Offices & Citizens Information Services</i> . (link) |

GGRL43: EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT RECIPIENT CONTINUES TO ADHERE TO GOOD PRACTICES IN FOSTERING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL43: Extent to which project recipient continues to adhere to good practices in fostering citizen participation after the intervention ends</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Developing countries often face formidable challenges in their efforts to build citizen engagement and democratic governance processes, among them the absence of democratic culture and civil society, profound poverty, time pressures and demands for immediate results, and the lack of an institutional infrastructure. In order to achieve an optimal level of citizen engagement, developing democracies not only face the daunting task of unraveling and rebuilding obsolete political institutions, but they also must address the cultural habits and artifacts that have been embedded in its social fabric for decades, and in many instances, centuries. |
| What the indicator measures | The indicator focuses on the continuation / level of maintenance of good practices achieved during the intervention or as its immediate consequence. It should study the level and modes of citizen engagement practiced by relevant government / public administration entities compared to those established and practiced with the intervention support. |
| Data sources | Citizens, specific stakeholder groups Government representatives Citizen engagement outputs and tools (communication, events, reports etc.) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys Case studies Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Citizen engagement emphasizes the sharing of power, information, and a mutual respect between government and citizens. It implies the involvement of citizens in decision-making process of the State – through measures and/or institutional arrangements - so as to increase their influence on public policies and programmes ensuring a more positive impact on their social and economic lives. Citizen engagement includes public communication (one-way), public consultation (one-way) and public participation (two-way). |
| Further resources | Armstrong, E. (2013). <i>The Role of Active Participation and Citizen Engagement in Good Governance</i> . (link) Denhardt, J., Terry, L., Ramirez Delacruz, E., Andonoska, L. (2009). Barriers to Citizen Engagement in Developing Countries. <i>Intl Journal of Public Administration</i> , 32, 1268–1288. (link) Sheedy, A. (2008). <i>Handbook on Citizen Engagement: Beyond Consultation</i> . Canadian Policy Research Network. (link) |

GGRL44: DEGREE OF OBSERVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL LAWS AND ACCEPTED STANDARDS BY NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS AFTER THE INTERVENTION ENDS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL44: Degree of observance of international laws and accepted standards by national stakeholders after the intervention ends</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | International law is formulated by international agreements, which create rules binding up on the signatories, and customary rules, which are basically state practices recognised by the community at large as laying down patterns of conduct that have to be complied with. States are naturally interdependent in many ways and international law facilitates international co-operation (e.g., preventing pollution of the sea, international trade). Observance of regulations of international laws by governments has been linked to stronger economic development of their nations. |
| What the indicator measures | The extent to which good practice in observance of international law achieved with the intervention has been maintained after the end of the intervention. |
| Data sources | Legislation related to economic and social development, trade, environment protection, etc. and records of its enforcement Complaints by citizens, business etc. Advocacy groups National and international NGO reports International rankings and indices International courts and tribunals' decisions |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis Comparison of applicable national and international legislation, comparison of legislation and practice, comparison in time Case studies Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Observance of international law means respecting obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law. |
| Further resources | Akbari, B. (2016). The Role of International Law and Observance of Its Regulations on Countries Economic Development. <i>Journal of Politics and Law</i> 9(7). (link) |

GGRL45: PERCEIVED DEGREE OF FAVOURITISM AND DOMINATION OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR BY POWER GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL45: Perceived degree of favouritism and domination of the public sector by power groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Widespread favouritism is one of the main obstacles to good governance and economic development in some countries or regions in the world. For instance, the leadership in many African countries is characterised by ethnic bias and favouritism, and citizens are thus treated unequally in many respects, particularly when it comes to national resource allocation and political representation. |
| What the indicator measures | Perceived degree of favouritism and domination of the public sector by power groups / rich families compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Citizens Relevant stakeholders (e.g., business people, NGO staff etc.) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Favouritism can be defined as the tendency to provide preferential treatment to friends and relatives. |
| Further resources | Ilorah, R. (2009). Ethnic bias, favouritism and development in Africa, <i>Development Southern Africa</i> , 26(5), 695-707. (link) Loewe, M., Blume, J., Schönleber, V., Seibert, S., Speer, J. and Voss, C. (2007). <i>The impact of favouritism on the business climate. A study on wasta in Jordan</i> . German Development Institute. (link) Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (Ed.) (2015). <i>Government Favouritism in Europe. The Anticorruption Report 3</i> . (link) |

GGRL46: CHANGE IN REPORTED TRUST IN GOVERNMENT / JUDICIARY / POLICE BY CITIZENS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL46: Change in reported trust in government / judiciary / police by citizens</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Interpersonal trust along with civic involvement have been identified as a determinant of economic development, political participation, and effective democratic institutions. However, trust may also be seen as the product rather than the cause of institutional performance and may be negatively influenced by perceived or actual poor government performance record, corruption environment etc. Trust in government is important for the success of a wide range of public policies that depend on behavioural responses from the public or on cooperation and compliance of citizens. It also increases the confidence of investors and consumers. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in trust citizens in the intervention area report to have towards representative or administrative institutions such as the central or local government, the judiciary, police, army etc. compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention unless other baseline point seems more appropriate). |
| Data sources | Citizens Value polls |
| Methods of data collection | Polls analysis, desk research Interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Trust attitudes are self-reported indications of the level of trust respondents feel toward institutions or individuals in question. |
| Further resources | Morris, S. D. and Klesner, J. L. (2010). Corruption and Trust: Theoretical Considerations and Evidence From Mexico. <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 43(10), 1258–1285. (link) OECD. (2017). <i>Trust in Government</i> . (link) |

GGRL50: EVIDENCE OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPING / ENACTING REGULATIONS THAT COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONALLY ACCEPTED STANDARDS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL50: Evidence of project contribution to developing / enacting regulations that comply with internationally accepted standards</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | International standards are globally agreed procedures or practices and represent readily-adoptable efficient and cost-effective tools. When used in public sector, international standards enable greater transparency and competition, e.g. in public procurement, while they also provide essential requirements for industry (via reference in regulations and laws). |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of the intervention contributing to the development or enactment of national regulations that follow or are in accord with international standards in the area. |
| Data sources | Regulations adopted or enacted in the area of the intervention International standards relating to the area of the intervention Experts |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis and comparison Expert panel |
| Definition of key terms | International standards represent global consensus on a solution to a particular issue, embody universally agreed procedure or practice and provide requirements, specifications, guidelines or characteristics to consistently ensure that materials, products, processes and services are fit for their purpose. |
| Further resources | Fliess, B., Gonzales, F., Kim, J., and Schonfeld, R. (2010). <i>The Use of International Standards in Technical Regulation</i> . (link) ISO. (n.d.). <i>Using and referencing ISO and IEC standards to support public policy</i> . (link) |

GGRL51: EVIDENCE OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO GREATER INDEPENDENCE OF REGULATORY PROCESS(ES)

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL51: Evidence of project contribution to greater independence of regulatory process(es)</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Market liberalisations have led to the emergence of independent regulatory authorities. The primary reason for this separation is to ensure that regulatory judgements can be made, and enforcement actions taken, without pressure from interests that may conflict with safety or public interests. Furthermore, the credibility of the regulatory body in the eyes of the general public depends in large part upon whether the regulatory body is regarded as being independent from the organizations it regulates, as well as independent from government agencies or industry groups that promote nuclear technologies. |
| What the indicator measures | Any evidence of the intervention contributing to a greater independence of regulatory processes. |
| Data sources | Stakeholders Regulatory processes that have taken place since the intervention end Regulatory bodies (management & staff) Experts |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys Desk research Case studies Expert panel |
| Definition of key terms | Independent regulatory processes abstain from favouring political or private interests of specific groups, businesses etc., specifically those pertaining to the regulated industry. They are based on best practices, evidence, documented need etc. |
| Further resources | Gilardi, F. & Maggetti, M. (2010). <i>The independence of regulatory authorities</i> . (link) International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.). <i>Regulatory Body. Regulatory Independence</i> . (link) Sander Johannsen, K. (2003). <i>Regulatory Independence in Theory and Practice – a Survey of Independent Energy Regulators in Eight European Countries</i> . (link) |

GGRL52: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF REGULATORS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL52: Reported increased capacity of regulators</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Building effective regulations is essential to protect public safety and health of citizens while effective economic governance is a key condition for economic growth and development. Good regulations are thus essential for the development and wellbeing of a country or district. The capacity of local regulators to design good, modern regulations may be strengthened via technical cooperation through the means of additional training, knowledge-transfer sessions and others. |
| What the indicator measures | Reported/perceived increased capacity of regulators to design and promote good and effective regulations compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Regulators who received support from the intervention Stakeholders with stakes in good regulations (industry, CSOs) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Good Regulation serves the public interest through supporting ongoing confidence in processes, such as the market process, in which the public participates and in activities, such as auditing, on which the public relies. Criteria for good regulation comprise: whether the action or regime is supported by legislative authority; whether there is an appropriate scheme of accountability; whether procedures are fair, accessible, and open; whether the regulator is acting with sufficient expertise; and whether the action or regime is efficient. After explaining each of these criteria, the chapter turns to their role in assessing regulation. |
| Further resources | Baldwin, R., Cave, M. and Lodge, M. (2011). <i>Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice</i> . Oxford Scholarship Online, April 2015. (link) Kirkpatrick, C. (2014). Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Reform in Developing countries. <i>Public Administration and Development</i> 34, 162-168. (link) Thomadakis, S. B. (2007). <i>What Makes Good Regulation?</i> (link) World Bank. (2015). <i>Building Regulation for Resilience. Managing Risks for Safer Cities</i> . (link) |

GGRL53: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO OVERSEE/ADVOCATE FOR GOOD REGULATORY PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL53: Reported increased capacity of civil society to oversee/advocate for good regulatory processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | With a shift from government to a broader concept of governance, civil society organizations (CSOs) have been increasingly incorporated into regulatory decision-making processes often very directly and formally, in an attempt to democratise participation in regulatory decisions. CSOs try to influence both governmental and corporate agenda-settings to include and promote regulatory objectives. Nevertheless, the capacity of CSOs to influence regulatory processes varies greatly across countries. |
| What the indicator measures | Reported/perceived increased capacity of civil society actors who received support from the intervention to oversee and/or advocate for good regulations compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Civil society stakeholders Representatives of regulatory bodies |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organizations (CSOs) encompass a broad array of actors such as non-governmental organizations, charities, trusts, foundations, advocacy groups, national and international non-state associations |
| Further resources | Ghaus-Pasha, A. (2004). <i>Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance</i> . (link) Hutter, B. M. and O'Mahony, J. (2004). <i>The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Regulating Business</i> . Discussion Paper No. 26, London School of Economics. (link) |

GGRL54: REPORTED INCREASED CAPACITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO EXPOSE CASES OF INSUFFICIENT OR BAD REGULATIONS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT AND HOLD REGULATORS ACCOUNTABLE

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL54: Reported increased capacity of civil society to expose cases of insufficient or bad regulation and their enforcement and hold regulators accountable</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | With a shift from government to a broader concept of governance, civil society organizations (CSOs) have been increasingly incorporated into regulatory decision-making processes often very directly and formally, in an attempt to democratise participation in regulatory decisions. CSOs try to influence both governmental and corporate agenda-settings to include and promote regulatory objectives. Nevertheless, the capacity of CSOs to influence regulatory processes varies greatly across countries. |
| What the indicator measures | Reported/perceived increased capacity of civil society actors who received support from the intervention to identify, investigate and/or expose cases of insufficient or bad regulations, their insufficient enforcement or other regulatory failures. Their capacity to demand reparation/accountability from responsible regulators should also be analyzed as part of the indicator. |
| Data sources | Civil society stakeholders Documentation of exposure (complaints, letters, campaigns, demonstrations etc.) Documentation of actions taken by responsible regulators |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews, focus groups Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organizations (CSOs) encompass a broad array of actors such as non-governmental organizations, charities, trusts, foundations, advocacy groups, national and international non-state associations |
| Further resources | Ghaus-Pasha, A. (2004). <i>Role of Civil Society Organizations in Governance</i> . (link) Hutter, B. M. and O'Mahony, J. (2004). <i>The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Regulating Business</i> . Discussion Paper No. 26, London School of Economics. (link) |

GGRL60: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED AND EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR ALL POPULATION GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL60: Evidence of increased and equal access to justice for all population groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Equal access to justice is a right that is based on human rights obligations. It is a guarantee against exclusion and inequality faced by many persons living in poverty or discrimination. The strengthening of access to justice is relevant in all societies, not only in fragile contexts, yet in developing countries the barriers of access to justice are most tangible and are related to factors such as costs and long distances but also importantly to discrimination, inequality, lack of legal awareness, and corruption in the justice system. Research shows that these barriers have the biggest impact on the poorest people, women and indigenous people. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of the contribution of the intervention to increased access and/or increasingly equal access of most vulnerable population groups such as the poor, minors, women, indigenous people, the elderly, people with disabilities, members of minority groups to justice in the intervention area compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Stakeholders from targeted population groups Human rights advocates, ombudsman offices Cases processed by the justice system Cases of abuses and rights violations registered |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Participatory techniques (most significant change, storytelling etc.) Case studies Desk research Comparison in time |
| Definition of key terms | Access to justice means very concretely that people are capable of claiming their rights – to protect their livelihoods, income and assets or see a remedy against exploitation. |
| Further resources | Karat Coalition (2012). <i>Women's Access to Justice in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i> . (link) Sepúlveda Carmona, M. a Donald, K. (2014). <i>Access to justice for persons living in poverty: a human rights approach</i> . (link) Sieder, T. and Sierra, M. T. (2010). <i>Indigenous Women-s Access to Justice in Latin America</i> . (link) UNDP. (2004). <i>Access to Justice. Practice Note</i> . (link) UNICEF. (2015). <i>Children's Equitable Access to Justice: Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i> . (link) United States Department of State. Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs. (2016). <i>INL Guide to Gender in the criminal Justice System</i> . (link) |

GGRL61: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY OF JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL61: Evidence of increased administrative capacity of justice system organizations</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Effective legal and judicial projects are often hampered by resource constraint problem; improving the capacity and quality of a judicial system requires material and human resources that are in short supply in developing economies. A lack of administrative capacity of judicial organizations results in a serious backlog in processing cases, prolonged detentions of persons without being granted timely hearings and other human rights violations. The effectiveness and streamlining of case processing in some cases may also be achieved by training, increasing salaries of judicial and administrative staff and implementing measures to increase discipline within justice system organizations. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence (qualitative and/or quantitative) of the intervention contributing to increased administrative capacity of justice system organizations within the intervention area and scope. Increased capacity should be demonstrated mainly through a faster and higher volume of cases duly processed through the justice system. |
| Data sources | Representatives (management & ordinary staff) of justice system organizations Justice system stakeholders, court users Citizens |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Household surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Justice system refers to the series of organizations and processes established by governments involved in apprehending, prosecuting, defending, sentencing, and jailing those involved in crimes - including law enforcement, attorneys, judges, courts of law, prisons. It is commonly divided into three groups – the police, judiciary and prisons. |
| Further resources | Stephenson, M.C. (2007). <i>Judicial Reform in Developing Economies: Constraints and Opportunities</i> . (link) UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools</i> . (link) |

GGRL62: EVIDENCE OF GREATER INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL62: Evidence of greater integrity and independence of the justice system</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Integrity and independence represent a central feature of a functioning judiciary system. Perceived independence of the justice system from other government branches as well as organizations within the justice system from each other impacts the degree of confidence of regular citizens in the justice system and their own access to justice. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of the intervention directly or indirectly contributed to increased integrity and independence of the justice system or specific justice system organization within the intervention area. Subjective perceptions of justice system stakeholders may be taken as evidence as long as they are triangulated across different groups. |
| Data sources | Justice system stakeholders, court users Citizens Representatives (management & ordinary staff) of justice system organizations |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Household surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Justice system refers to the series of organizations and processes established by governments involved in apprehending, prosecuting, defending, sentencing, and jailing those involved in crimes - including law enforcement, attorneys, judges, courts of law, prisons. It is commonly divided into three groups – the police, judiciary and prisons. Integrity and independence of justice system means that courts, police and prisons respect human rights, avoid abusing their power and are free from undue influence of political and private interests. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) UNDP. (2013). <i>Judicial Strengthening Project Implemented by Supreme Court of Bangladesh and UNDP. Summary Report on Court Services Situation Analysis.</i> (link) |

GGRL63: EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENTION CONTRIBUTING TO PASSING A JUDICIAL REFORM(S) TO STREAMLINE JUDICIAL PROCESSES AND INVESTIGATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL63: Evidence of the intervention contributing to passing a judicial reform(s) to streamline judicial processes and investigations</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The judiciary plays in an important role in economic development of a country. Its primary function is to provide reliable and efficient dispute resolution. Courts enforce contract and property rights, which in turn fosters a favourable investment climate. Courts may also improve economic performance by correcting various market failures (e.g. liability) while judicial enforcement may grant more credibility to government commitments. However, the judiciary system in many developing economies and efforts to reform them suffer from various setbacks, the major one being resource constraints, incentive incompatibility (or a lack of willingness of affected parties) and a lack of comprehensive approach to a judicial reform. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of a direct or indirect contribution of the intervention to passing and/or implementing a judicial reform in the intervention area. To the extent possible, the effects of the reform, i.e. if it actually led to the streamlining of judicial processes and criminal investigation, should also be analyzed. |
| Data sources | Legal documents and legislation promulgating/surrounding judicial reform Representatives of the judiciary Justice system stakeholders Citizens |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Desk research Household survey |
| Definition of key terms | Legal and judicial reform projects that range from modest efforts to improve court administration to ambitious attempts to eliminate judicial corruption, promote judicial independence, and craft better, more equitable, and more market-friendly legal systems. |
| Further resources | International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (2002). <i>Initiatives in Legal and Judicial Reform</i> . (link) Stephenson, M.C. (2007). <i>Judicial Reform in Developing Economies: Constraints and Opportunities</i> . (link) UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools</i> . (link) |

GGRL64: EVIDENCE OF INCREASED RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS AND A DUE PROCESSING OF THE ACCUSED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL64: Evidence of increased respect for the rights and a due processing of the accused</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | All individuals, regardless of nationality, statelessness, or other status, must have effective access to justice, which includes a fair trial and a due process. In this context, criminal charges, or a person's rights and obligations in a suit at law, must be determined by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The right to a fair trial involves the right to a public hearing and the right to a trial without delay or within a reasonable time. Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of the intervention contributing directly or indirectly to increased respect for the rights of persons, specifically those accused of a crime, exercised by justice system authorities and improved situation in granting due processing to the accused. |
| Data sources | Justice system stakeholders, court users, the accused Human right advocates, ombudsman Citizens Independent third party reports (CSOs, think tanks, international rankings) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Desk research Survey |
| Definition of key terms | Due process means that laws must be applied fairly and equally to all people, especially to a citizen accused of a crime. All persons are, according to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, entitled to a fair and public hearing, and at trial stage, to be informed promptly and in a language in which he / she understands the nature of the charge. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2015). <i>Basic Human Rights Reference Guide: Right to a Fair Trial and Due Process in the Context of Countering Terrorism.</i> (link) |

GGRL65: CHANGE IN LIVING CONDITIONS OF PRISONERS AND CONVICTED PERSONS IN PSYCHIATRIC FACILITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRL65: Change in living conditions of prisoners and convicted persons in psychiatric facilities</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Prisons (and psychiatric facilities) should ensure the safety and security of inmates (patients) and corrections officers (medical staff). Facilities should also meet health and welfare needs in terms of nutritional standards, access to clean water and adequate sanitation, access to health services as well as allowing contact with family members, avoiding overcrowding, separating different groups of prisoners by gender, age, severity of crime etc. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of the intervention contributing to change (improvement) in living conditions of inmates in prisons or people convicted of criminal offenses detained in psychiatric facilities compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Inmates, patients NGOs working with inmates, human right advocates active in the criminal justice sphere Representatives of prison / psychiatric facilities (management and staff) |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Surveys |
| Definition of key terms | Living conditions concern both basic needs such as water, nutrition, space and sanitation as well as psychological and/or social deprivations such as denying contact with family members, unnecessary solitary confinement etc. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) |

3. GOOD GOVERNANCE OUTCOME INDICATORS – B.2 (QUAN.)

Note: Unless specifically stated otherwise, all outcome indicators are assessed as *compared to baseline* (the state/condition before intervention).

GGRN1: PERCENTAGE AND TYPE OF CIVIL SOCIETY RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS ACCEPTED IN DECISION MAKING

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN1: Percentage and type of civil society recommendations and reports accepted in decision making</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the impact of civil society involvement in public decision-making such as priority-setting and/or budgeting exercises. It is a proxy for measuring the effectiveness of advocacy training and support and/or other capacity-building provided for civil society groups. |
| What the indicator measures | Percentage of civil society data reports and recommendations that are considered for decisions on resource prioritization and budget in a given purpose field determined by the project. If a percentage is not available, subjective perceptions of civil society organizations' management, project management staff and organization's partners, as well as representatives of relevant government entities accompanied by specific examples of influence may be used as evidence, though it must be explicitly stated that no objectively verifiable data exist. |
| Data sources | Project records, meeting minutes, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Civil society: Civil society is broadly understood as the diverse set of groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations.</p> <p>Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between public officials and civil society representatives where civil society organizations are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies or service performance. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, and service delivery governance institutions.</p> <p>Influencing decision making: Influencing decision making includes the incorporation of specific data and/or recommendations into draft policies or regulations; response to advocacy to improve service delivery quality/access; inclusion of budget allocation priorities in budget requests or final budgets; etc.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>Cutter, A., Fenn, I. and Seath, F. (n.d.). <i>Advocacy Toolkit. Influencing the post-2015 Development Agenda.</i> (link)</p> <p>Thomas, D. (n.d.). <i>Engaging with the Media. A Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit for Influencing the Post-2015 Development Agenda.</i> (link)</p> |

GGRN2: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CONSULTATION MECHANISMS THAT ARE FUNCTIONING AFTER THE END OF THE INTERVENTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN2: Number and type of consultation mechanisms that are functioning after the end of the intervention.</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Consultation is an input to policy development and analysis: a tool for the collection of ideas and reactions to ideas before key decisions are made. Consultation mechanisms are regular, open channels through which stakeholders may submit inputs, comments, feedback, information and suggestions. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of consultation mechanisms that were established with intervention's direct or indirect support and that continue to serve their purpose (are still functioning) after the intervention has been completed. |
| Data sources | Project documentation, meeting minutes, consultation participants, consultation conveners, consultation outputs |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Stakeholders surveys and interviews Content analysis of consultation outputs Case studies |
| Definition of key terms | Consultation: Consultation requires a give-and-take between those who convene them (most frequently public officials) and those who are convened (civil society representatives, affected citizens, enterprises operating in a given area etc.) where those convened are asked to provide information, feedback or perceptions of policies, strategies, proposed programs, service performance etc. These may include town hall meetings, participatory budget exercises, public hearings, visits of public officials to communities with the objective to gather information from citizens etc. |
| Further resources | European Commission. (2014). <i>Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines. Public Consultation Document.</i> (link) African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations.</i> (link) Australian Government. (2016). <i>Best Practice Consultation.</i> Guidance Note. (link) or a summary by Broadribb, K. (n.d.). <i>Implementing a successful stakeholder consultation.</i> [PowerPoint Presentation]. (link) |

GGRN3: NUMBER AND TYPE OF STAKEHOLDER COALITIONS THAT ARE FUNCTIONING AFTER THE END OF THE INTERVENTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN3: Number and type of stakeholder coalitions that are functioning after the end of the intervention</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator tracks the number of stakeholder coalitions created or operating with project support with the objective to support a cause, a proposal or policy. Stakeholder coalitions represent and advocate for interest their individual members represent or act on behalf of those who are not able to advocate for themselves, i.e. the most vulnerable groups of the society such as children, people with disabilities, groups excluded from the society based on ethnic, social-class or other attributes. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of advocacy coalitions created or operating with project financial or other support. Type of advocacy coalitions such as membership, thematic focus, activities and means in which they engage/pursue. |
| Data sources | Project records, advocacy products, coalition statements, coalition members and partners, other stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Stakeholder interviews or surveys Case studies Media content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Coalition. A coalition is a temporary alliance for combined action. It may contain people and organizations from a variety of positions (elected and agency officials, interest group leaders, researchers, NGOs), yet it often gathers a number of civil society organizations/NGOs that work towards a similar cause and through a coalition joint their effort and increase their voice. Members of an alliance share a particular belief system and show a non-trivial degree of coordinated activity over time Advocacy is the act or process of supporting a cause or proposal. It seeks to ensure that people, particularly those who are most vulnerable in society, are able to have their voice heard on issues that are important to them, defend and safeguard their rights and have their views and wishes genuinely considered when decisions are being made about their lives. In other words, advocacy is a tool for real participation by citizens in decision-making by government and other powerful bodies. |
| Further resources | O'Neil, G. et al. (2015). <i>Oxfam's Global Leaders Empowered to Alleviate Poverty (LEAP). Evaluation - Final Report.</i> (link). Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy.</i> Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. UN Women. (2012). <i>How is Advocacy Defined?</i> (link) – includes a case study Washington Office on Latin America. (2001). <i>Manual para la facilitación de procesos de incidencia política.</i> (link) – available only in Spanish |

GGRN4: NUMBER AND TYPE OF MEDIA PRODUCTS COVERING CAUSES PURSUED BY SUPPORTED STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN4: Number and type of media products covering causes pursued by supported stakeholder groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator serves as a proxy of the effectiveness of increased/newly gained advocacy capacity of supported stakeholders. Visibility in media and medialization of certain cases or causes may go long way in drawing attention and support (locally, nationally and internationally), keeping responsible authorities or businesses in check and achieving advocacy goals. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of media products (newspaper articles, video, reportages etc.) covering causes pursued by stakeholders supported from the intervention that have been published or otherwise circulated – where applicable, circulation through social media should also be analyzed. The connection to the supported groups should be clearly established, i.e. if the media outputs are not the result of the advocacy work, they are in no way linked or do not mention the supported groups and/or their efforts, albeit covering the same or a similar cause, such outputs should not be counted. |
| Data sources | Media |
| Methods of data collection | Media tracking Media content or media tracking analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Advocacy/outreach products may mean letters or official complaints addressed to public officials, informative videos, photos, posters, media campaigns, ads, demonstrations against or in favour of a clearly defined cause, formation of a coalition or a new membership in a coalition of like-minded organizations and other forms of behaviour or expressions with the purpose to advocate for a cause, reach out to important audiences etc. |
| Further resources | Chapman, J. (2002). Monitoring and evaluating advocacy. <i>PLA Notes</i> , 43, 48-52. (link) Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy</i> . Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. UNICEF. (2010). <i>Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy. Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit</i> . New York: UNICEF. (link) - includes case studies. |

GGRN5: NUMBER OF (JOINT) PETITIONS AND/OR VOICED CONCERNS PRESENTED BY SUPPORTED GROUPS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN5: Number of (joint) petitions and/or voiced concerns presented by supported groups</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | A petition is a simple yet effective tool in advocacy. With just a little bit of effort, an organization or an individual can generate attention and momentum around an issue, grow a list of advocates, and pressure lawmakers to act. Plus, a petition helps organizations raise their visibility and gain new members or supporters. Alternatively, concerns may be voiced, for example, through an open letter to policy-makers or other entity at which advocacy efforts are targeted. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of petitions or other forms of voicing concerns and/or raising demands presented by supported groups. Petitions presented jointly by different groups of stakeholders should be taken as evidence of advocacy, as well as evidence of creating or strengthening alliances and coalitions for effective advocacy work. |
| Data sources | Supported groups Petitions and other voiced concerns |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Petition is a request for action. Petitions give voice to community concerns on a particular issue, and put forward specific requests to influence government decision-making. |
| Further resources | Chapman, J. (2002). Monitoring and evaluating advocacy. <i>PLA Notes</i> , 43, 48-52. (link) Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (2014). <i>Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy</i> . Working paper 395. (link) - includes case studies. UNICEF. (2010). <i>Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy. Companion to the Advocacy Toolkit</i> . New York: UNICEF. (link) - includes case studies. |

GGRN6: NUMBER OF PUBLIC BODIES OR MECHANISMS THAT REGULARLY INVITE INPUT FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL STAKEHOLDERS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Participation |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN6: Number of public bodies or mechanisms that regularly invite input from non-governmental stakeholders</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Soliciting input from stakeholders and providing space for participation have been shown to enhance project quality, ownership and sustainability; to empower targeted beneficiaries (in particular, women and poor people) and to contribute to long-term capacity-building and self-sufficiency. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of public bodies or mechanisms (e.g. committees, taskforces, etc.) established or supported from the intervention that regularly invite (and work with) input from non-governmental stakeholders such as NGOs, businesses, academia, or media. |
| Data sources | Mechanisms through which input is invited/solicited and related documentation Representatives of responsible public entities Stakeholders who participate in those mechanisms / provide input |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Survey Case studies Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Participation is a process through which people with an interest (stakeholders) influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources that affect them. |
| Further resources | African Development Bank. (2001). <i>Handbook on Stakeholder Consultation and Participation in ADB Operations</i> . (link) Western and Pacific Child Welfare Implementation Center. (n.d.). <i>Stakeholder Engagement Tools for Action</i> . (link) |

GGRN20: NUMBER AND TYPE OF PUBLIC FORUMS OR POLICY DIALOGUES THAT ARE REGULARLY CONVENED BY PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN20: Number of public forums for dissemination of information, increased awareness, and public discussion that are regularly convened</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Although forums may be established, they may not hold public meetings on a regular basis to satisfy the public's needs. This indicator assesses the level of activity of the forum and level of participation by members of the public. Public forums can lead to increased transparency and accountability only if they host regular activities, are utilized by the public, and share information or reports resulting from forum meetings. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of forum meetings; number of public participants; number of reports or meeting minutes. |
| Data sources | Project records; government records; forum publications; news articles; NGO and/or CSO assessments, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Public Forum: A place, meeting, or medium that is advertised in advance, open to the public and where ideas, views, and information on a particular issue can be exchanged. May include town hall meetings, community meetings, public hearings, public working group sessions, outreach and information sessions, online blogs, etc.</p> <p>Policy dialogue is an open and inclusive dialogue on development policies. It forms part of policy and decision-making processes, where it is intended to contribute to developing or implementing a policy change following a round of evidence-based discussions/workshops/consultations on a particular subject. Policy dialogue take place around a policy question on which key documents and experts are brought together to present recent evidence on the issue.</p> <p>Dissemination of Information: The act of spreading information widely. The mass circulation and public availability of information relating to relevant sector issues.</p> <p>Public awareness: The public's level of understanding of the relevant information, the importance, and the implications pertaining to a relevant sector related topic. The knowledge or perception that a community has about an issue or situation.</p> <p>Public discussion: Discourse that allows the public and stakeholders from all sides of the issue—including both opponents and proponents—to share their ideas, opinions, and positions; a conversation that allows people to exchange views and examine relevant issues openly.</p> <p>Regularly convened: Regularly convened meetings occur at predictable intervals with advance notice, at least once annually and generally more often than that. Ad hoc or one-off events are not considered regularly convened.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>EU-Luxembourg-WHO Universal Health Coverage Partnership. (2015). <i>Policy dialogue: What it is and how it can contribute to evidence-informed decision-making</i>. Briefing Note. (link)</p> <p>Lortkipanidze, S. and Pataraiia, T. (2014). <i>Mapping Study of Civil Society Organisations' Engagement in Policy Dialogue in Georgia</i>. (link)</p> |

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). *Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Bangladesh Country Report.* ([link](#))

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2012). *Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue. Uganda Country Report.* ([link](#))

GGRN21: NUMBER OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND/OR PUBLIC SERVANT DIRECTORIES RELEASED PUBLICLY

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN21: Number of public service and/or public servant directories released publicly</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Citizens should have access to information on what public services are available to them and how to access them, they should also be able to contact a public official (an elected representative) or a public servant responsible for the service in question. Public service and/or public servant directories contribute to a greater transparency and accessibility of government. They should be available in all local languages and made accessible through the most convenient channels of communication. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of public service and/or public servant directories compiled and released publicly with intervention support. Their accessibility by the general public should also be analyzed. |
| Data sources | Public directories released |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | A directory is a book or a web page listing individuals or organizations alphabetically or thematically with details such as names, addresses, and telephone numbers. |
| Further resources | United Nations. (2015). <i>World Public Sector Report 2015. Responsive and Accountable Public Governance</i> . (link) |

GGRN22: PERCENTAGE OF INFORMATION REQUESTS RESPONDED BY GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN22: Percentage of information requests responded by government entities</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Trust in government can depend on citizens' experiences when receiving public services. The interaction between citizens and the state is a crucial factor of trust in government. With the technological revolution, government today have an array of options of communicating with citizens, providing information, accepting and responding to request. Particularly, mobile technology offers a broad coverage even in low income countries where access to broadband remains limited. |
| What the indicator measures | Percentage of all information requests received that were responded by responsible government entities and within what time frame. Where possible, requests should be broken down by communication channels through which they were submitted/responded. |
| Data sources | Administrative data |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, admin data analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Government responsiveness is the degree to which government listens to what people want and acts on it, and to which public policies and institutions respond to the needs of citizens and uphold their rights. |
| Further resources | <p>Good Governance Learning Network. (2015). <i>In Pursuit of Responsible and Responsive Local Governance</i>. (link)</p> <p>OECD. (2011). <i>Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society</i>. OECD Public Governance Reviews. (link)</p> <p>OECD/International Telecommunication Union. (2011). <i>M-Government: Mobile Technologies for Responsive Governments and Connected Societies</i>. OECD Publishing. (link)</p> |

GGRN23: NUMBER OF PROJECT-ASSISTED CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS THAT ENGAGE IN ADVOCACY AND WATCHDOG FUNCTIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN23: Number of project-assisted civil society organizations that engage in advocacy and watchdog functions</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures projects efforts to engage with civil society organizations and support their efforts to engage in advocacy and watchdog functions at different levels of government within the country. Advocacy initiatives by civil society reflect the ability of citizens and civil society to demand responsiveness of the relevant sector system and improve government responsiveness to community needs. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of civil society groups participating in advocacy activities, watchdog functions (participation on community sector-relevant panels, writing articles, etc.). Their participation must be linked to some previous project support. |
| Data sources | Project records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Civil society organization: Civil society organizations are broadly understood as the diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations.</p> <p>Advocacy: Can include campaigns, workshops, roundtables, media campaigns, public outreach intended to influence decision makers, including policy makers and service delivery agents.</p> <p>Watchdog functions: Watchdog functions refer to monitoring of health facilities, service delivery and use of public resources. Watchdog functions may include use of social accountability tools such as community score cards, report cards, social audits, public expenditure tracking surveys, health facility exit surveys, etc.</p> |
| Further resources | Equal Rights for All Coalition. (2016). <i>Human Rights Strategy for Kosovo 2016-2022: A Way Forward</i> . (link) |

GGRN24: NUMBER AND TYPE OF ISSUES AND SUGGESTIONS RAISED BY CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS TO GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN24: Number and type of issues and suggestions raised by civil society groups to government entities</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Civil society organizations (CSOs) provide channels for citizen voice and can help citizens hold government accountable. This is important for: improved government responsiveness to the relevant needs of citizens; for helping to inform government policy decisions; and for assessing the performance of relevant sector policies and service delivery. This indicator also serves as a proxy to measure the effectiveness of support provided to CSOs to engage in advocacy, democratic governance etc. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of issues and/or suggestions raised by supported civil society groups to responsible government entities since they receive support (e.g., since a training on advocacy skills). |
| Data sources | Documented evidence of issues/suggestions raised Civil society groups |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Cases studies Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organization: Civil society organizations are broadly understood as the diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations. |
| Further resources | Fourie, D. J. and Kakumba, U. (2011). <i>Assessing the Role and Capacity of Civil Society Organisations in Holding Local Government Accountable in Uganda</i> . (link) Sharma, B. (2008). <i>Voice, Accountability and Civic Engagement. A Conceptual Overview</i> . (link) UNDP. (2010). <i>Fostering Social Accountability: From Principle to Practice. Guidance Note</i> . (link) World Bank. (2007). <i>Civil Society's Role in the Governance Agenda in Ecuador: Assessing Opportunities and Constraints</i> . (link) |

GGRN25: PROPORTION AND TYPE OF GOVERNMENT TRANSACTION SERVICES THAT MAY BE MADE ONLINE

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN25: Proportion and type of government transaction services that may be made online</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Customer transaction services are a substantial area of interaction between citizens and the public sector, covering activities such as the payment of taxes and bills, applying for government benefits, drivers' licences and the registration of names. They are very important for the daily lives of members of the public and represent a significant draw on public resources. |
| What the indicator measures | Proportion and type of government transaction services that are fully digitalized (available to citizens online) compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). The analysis may be focused only on a certain sector of government transaction services as appropriate. When proportion cannot be established, change in the provision of online services (quantitatively and qualitatively) can be measured and commented. |
| Data sources | Administrative data Websites, online platforms and applications providing digitalized services Government stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Analysis of available services Case studies Interviews Survey |
| Definition of key terms | Government transaction services are services involving an exchange of money, goods, services, permissions, licences or information between the government and a service user, resulting in a change to a government system. |
| Further resources | Deloitte. (2015). <i>Digital government transformation</i> . (link) Pwc. (2012). <i>Transforming the citizen experience. One Stop Shop for public services</i> . (link) |

GGRN26: PERCENT OF REGIONAL/DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS THAT MAKE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE THEIR ANNUAL BUDGET EACH YEAR

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN26: Percent of regional/district organizations that make publicly available their annual budget each year.</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the percentage of regional or district organizations (health, education, etc.) that make their annual budgets available to the public. By sharing budget information regularly, organizations allow the public to examine the efficiency, equity, and sustainability of services. For example, using the annual budget, civil society can analyze expenditure patterns and actual spending against what is in the budget to determine whether a service is sustainable or funds are properly managed. |
| What the indicator measures | Numerator: Number of organizations (within the relevant sector) that make publicly available their annual budgets Denominator: Total number of health management teams within a country or within project work plan |
| Data sources | Government records; subnational government organizations/their management team reports; NGO and/or CSO assessments; project or public records |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Regional/District organization: A sub-national level body (regional, district, or other local-level) that oversees a defined district/area and is able to make decisions regarding health services and the allocated resources within their territory. Annual budget: A budget that covers a 12-month period and outlines both the income and expenditures that are expected to be received and paid over the coming year. |
| Further resources | De Renzio, P and Mastruzzi, M. (2016). <i>How Does Civil Society Use Budget Information? Mapping Fiscal Transparency Gaps and Needs in Developing Countries</i> . International Budget Partnership. (link) Gray, J. (2015). <i>Open Budget Data. Mapping the Landscape</i> . (link) International Budget Partnership. (2015). <i>Open Budget Survey 2015</i> . (link) ONE. (2013). <i>Budget Transparency</i> . (link) |

GGRN27: NUMBER OF POLICIES OR AMENDMENTS INSTITUTIONALIZED AS A RESULT OF PROJECT SUPPORT

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance & Human Rights |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN27: Number of policies or amendments institutionalized as a result of project support</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator measures the number of policies or amendments that were drafted, approved, and where clear steps have been taken to implement them, and one of these steps was as a result of project support to develop and implement the policies. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of policies or amendments to policies institutionalized with project support. |
| Data sources | Project records, government records, stakeholders |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, interviews, surveys |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Policy: Policy is a set of rules and procedures that ensure legal representation of the interests of citizens through representative democracy. It lays out the vision, goals, and objectives for leadership and governance. Policies may include decisions, guidelines, legislations, and regulations. The main policy actors are political parties and politicians, elected members of the Parliament and local government.</p> <p>Institutionalized: The project should define “institutionalize” according to the given context. Generally, it will mean a decision by the authorities (e.g. national government) to implement the policy, followed by the designation of the responsible implementing entity and the implementation of the policy that is supported by adequate resources, including human and financial.</p> |
| Further resources | OECD. (2016). <i>Better Policies for Sustainable Development 2016: A New Framework for Policy Coherence</i> . OECD Publishing, Paris. (link) |

GGRN28: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CITIZEN GRIEVANCES AND COMPLAINTS RESOLVED THROUGH NEWLY ESTABLISHED MECHANISMS OF COMPLAINT

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN28: Number and type of citizen grievances and complaints resolved through newly established mechanisms of complaint</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Grievance mechanisms form part of good governance and specifically contribute to the concept of responsive, accountable and inclusive government. By providing mechanisms to resolve grievances or dispute, government also acknowledges the rights of all parties involved. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of citizen grievances and complaints resolved through mechanisms of complaint established with the support of the intervention. |
| Data sources | Administrative data Stakeholders submitting/involved in grievances and complaints |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews, focus groups Survey |
| Definition of key terms | A grievance mechanism is a formal, legal or non-legal (or 'judicial/non-judicial') complaint process that can be used by individuals, workers, communities and/or civil society organisations that are being negatively affected by certain business activities and operations. Grievance mechanisms are also called 'dispute', 'complaints' and 'accountability' mechanisms. |
| Further resources | Human Rights and Grievance Mechanisms. (n.d.). <i>What is a grievance mechanism?</i> (link) UNDP. (2014). <i>Management of Local Grievances and Complaints in the Afghan Public Sector. Afghanistan Sub-National Governance Study Paper No. 4.</i> (link) |

GGRN29: IMPROVED PERFORMANCE ON KPIS DEVELOPED

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN29: Improved performance on KPIS developed</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Measuring the number of KPIS evaluates whether the responsible government entity evaluates its own performance in terms of results and efficiency. KPIS should be established complete with baseline data, and then measured periodically to assess marginal improvement or deterioration in performance. These periodic evaluations help to prioritize spending and budget planning in subsequent years. KPIS are closely associated with modern approaches to public budgeting such as Program Budgeting and Results-Oriented Budgeting. A higher number of KPIS does not necessarily indicate a better system. On the contrary, a set of a smaller number of high quality indicators is often a more effective management tool. |
| What the indicator measures | This indicator collects evidence of improved performance on KPI established with the support of the intervention. The improvements may be qualitative or quantitative depending on the nature of the KPI. Whenever possible, evidence should be triangulated across sources. |
| Data sources | Evaluations using KPI Administrative data, service data |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Basic statistics |
| Definition of key terms | Key Performance Indicator (KPI): A measurement that encapsulates a critical element of a person's or institution's effectiveness. KPIS for a government body such as ministry often include high-level indicators such as maternal and child mortality, rate of tertiary educated citizens, proportion of agricultural land under certain environmental measures etc., as such outcomes are indicative of a wide range of lower-level outcomes. |
| Further resources | Auditor General of British Columbia. (2010). <i>Guide for Developing Relevant Key Performance Indicators for Public Sector Reporting</i> . (link) PriceWaterhouseCoopers. (n.d.). <i>Guide to key performance indicators. Communicating the measures that matter</i> . (link) |

GGRN30: NUMBER OF REPORTS, AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT/COMMISSIONED BY GOVERNMENT-OVERSIGHT BODIES AFTER PROJECT END

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN30: Number of reports, audits and inspections carried out/commissioned by government-oversight bodies after project end</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Public sector auditing plays a key role in promoting the accountability, effectiveness and transparency of the public administration and in strengthening trust in government. Public sector auditing can not only help managers of public funds, but also all those charged with public sector governance, citizens and other stakeholders, by providing them with information to effectively hold their government accountable for results. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of reports, audits and inspections that were either directly carried out by government oversight bodies supported from the intervention or commissioned to other independent auditors, evaluators etc. While the indicator is formulated quantitatively, the quality (and meaningfulness) of such products should also be considered. |
| Data sources | Audit and evaluation outputs (reports, inspection records, summary of findings, briefs etc.) |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Supreme audit institutions (SAIs) are the lead public sector audit organisation in a country. Their principle task is to examine whether public funds are spent economically, efficiently and effectively in compliance with existing rules and regulations and in line with national priorities. |
| Further resources | Effective Institutions Platform. (2014). <i>Supreme Audit Institutions and Stakeholder Engagement Practices. A Stocktaking Report.</i> (link) The Institute of Internal Auditors. (2012). <i>Supplemental Guidance: The Role of Auditing in Public Sector Governance.</i> (link) OECD. (2016). <i>Good Practices in Supporting Supreme Audit Institutions.</i> (link) |

GGRN31: NUMBER, TYPE AND FREQUENCY OF REPORTS PUBLISHED BY GOVERNMENT ENTITIES ON THEIR OWN ACTIVITIES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN31: Number, type and frequency of reports published by government entities on their own activities</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Openness, accountability, and honesty define government transparency. Increasing access to information has the potential to enhance the ownership of processes by the public and provides means to follow through and demand accountability from public officials and institutions. Accessibility of information also allows making informed decisions, improve products and services and increase their efficiency. |
| What the indicator measures | Number, type and frequency of reports published by supported government entities on their own activities. |
| Data sources | Annual reports issued by concerned government entities Official websites Reports to the parliament made public |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | Transparency: Open to public scrutiny; demonstrating openness, communication, and accountability. Accountability: Accountability refers to the acceptance and recognition of an organization's responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies. In the context of activities to advocate for increased accountability, this may refer to civil society or other stakeholders seeking to monitor or strengthen public institutions' responsibility for delivery of services, effectiveness of use of public resources, or quality of policies and regulations. |
| Further resources | Cheng, X., J. and Moses, K. (2016). <i>Promoting transparency through information: A global review of school report cards</i> . UNESCO: Paris, France. (link) Hallak, J. and Poisson, M. (Eds.) (2006). <i>Governance in education: transparency and accountability</i> . (link) Xh.Ymeri, M. (2016). <i>Increasing Transparency through promotion of Internal Audit role in the Accountability chain</i> . Instituti KAF: Kosovo. (link) |

GGRN32: NUMBER AND TYPE OF CASES WHERE GOVERNMENT ENTITIES WERE CALLED TO ACCOUNTABILITY BY CIVIL SOCIETY SUPPORTED FROM A PROJECT

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN32: Number and type of cases where government entities were called to accountability by civil society supported from a project</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Civil society organizations provide channels for citizen voice and can help citizens hold government accountable. This is important for: improved government responsiveness to the relevant needs of citizens; for helping to inform government policy decisions; and for assessing the performance of relevant sector policies and service delivery. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of cases where government entities were called to accountability by civil society supported from the intervention. |
| Data sources | Open letters, campaigns and other CSOs activities aimed at government CSO representatives Government stakeholders who engaged with CSOs on issues presented |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Case studies Surveys Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organization: Civil society organizations are broadly understood as the diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations. |
| Further resources | Fourie, D. J. and Kakumba, U. (2011). <i>Assessing the Role and Capacity of Civil Society Organisations in Holding Local Government Accountable in Uganda</i> . (link) Sharma, B. (2008). <i>Voice, Accountability and Civic Engagement. A Conceptual Overview</i> . (link) UNDP. (2010). <i>Fostering Social Accountability: From Principle to Practice. Guidance Note</i> . (link) World Bank. (2007). <i>Civil Society's Role in the Governance Agenda in Ecuador: Assessing Opportunities and Constraints</i> . (link) |

GGRN33: CHANGE IN INCIDENCES OF CORRUPTING DECISION-MAKERS AND CIVIL SERVANTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN33: Change in incidences (%) of corrupting public officials</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Corruption represents one of the most antique and widespread forms of behaviour which is inimical to the administration of public affairs. Due to its nature, the scale of corruption is impossible to measure with complete accuracy. Most scales and indices relate on reported behaviours or perceptions of citizens and business representatives. This indicator focuses on the change in reported incidences of being asked for bribes/favours and paying those. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in percentage of people who report having been asked or having paid a bribe or other kind of favours to public officials within an established period compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Citizens Businesses Watchdog organizations and their reports |
| Methods of data collection | Surveys and household survey Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Corruption is defined as private individuals or enterprises who misuse public resources for private power and/or political gains. They do so through abusing public officials whose behavior deviates from the formal government rules of conduct. Codes of conduct (or code of ethics) are generally value-based guides on how public officials should behave, and outline what they should – and should not – do on the job. Codes are written documents and generally are divided into three key parts: a statement of principles, rules, and a regulatory framework. |
| Further resources | Lindgreen, A. (2004). Corruption and Unethical Behavior: Report on a Set of Danish Guidelines. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> 51(1), 31-39. Transparency International. (2012). <i>Calling out Public Official on Corruption: Codes of Contact</i> . (link) Transparency International UK. (n.d.). <i>Measuring Corruption</i> . (link) |

GGRN34: NUMBER AND TYPE GOVERNMENT OPEN DATA SOURCES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN34: Number and type of government open data sources</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Open data is central to enabling widespread economic value, fostering greater civic engagement and enhancing government transparency and accountability to citizens. It is one of the vehicles to achieve the sustainable development goals agenda. Open data contributes to a holistic understanding of the context and the general environment around development topics; timely or real-time tracking and measuring of goals, hence improving chances for targeted responses of decision-makers; and tapping into the knowledge, tools and capacities of citizen groups in tracking progress towards development goals, through citizen-generated data, or in analyzing the existing data. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type (description) of open data sources made accessible by government entities compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Open data sources |
| Methods of data collection | Review of open data sources Comparison before and after |
| Definition of key terms | Open data involves the release of data so that anyone can access, use and share it. It should be usable for any legal purpose and accessible to all, and that restrictions on its reuse should be clearly justified. Government open data sources include registries of businesses, population census data, repository of information for specific situations (e.g. permits necessary to open/operate a business in a certain field), data on water flow, waste management statistics, air quality statistics, farming statistics etc. |
| Further resources | Canares, M. and Shakhar, S. (2015). <i>Open Data and Sub-national Governments: Lessons from Developing Countries</i> . (link) Kossow, N. (2015). <i>The Role of Open Data for Sustainable Development. A Brief from Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i> . Prepared for UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. (link) Open Data for Development Network. (2015). <i>Open Data for Development. Building an Inclusive Data Revolution</i> . (link) Open Data Research Network. (n.d.). <i>Exploring the emerging impacts of open data in developing countries</i> . (link) |

GGRN35: MEDIA COVERAGE OF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 2. Transparency & Accountability |
| Subdimension | 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN35: Media coverage of government actions</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | The mass media are often referred to as the fourth branch of government because of the power they wield and the oversight function they exercise. The media can promote democracy by among other things, educating voters, protecting human rights, promoting tolerance among various social groups, and ensuring that governments are transparent and accountable. The media, however, can play antidemocratic roles as well. They can sow fear, division and violence. Instead of promoting democracy, they can contribute to democratic decay. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in media coverage of government actions compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention/receiving training). Media coverage may be measured as the number of articles, reportages and other media outputs. The tone of these outputs should also be analyzed. |
| Data sources | Media outputs covering government actions |
| Methods of data collection | Media content analysis |
| Definition of key terms | The term media most commonly refer to newspapers, news agencies, television, radio, internet and graphic publications. |
| Further resources | Coronel, S. S. (2001). <i>The Role of the Media in Deepening Democracy</i> . (link) Coronel, S. S. (2009). <i>Digging Deeper: A guide for investigative journalists in the Balkans</i> . Balkan Investigative Reporting Regional Network: Sarajevo, BiH. (link) |

GGRN40: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – OPEN GOVERNMENT AND CORRUPTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN40: Shift in country ranking on internationally recognized measures/indices of rule of law – open government and corruption</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | <p>There are currently two recognized international rule of law / good governance ranking systems - the World Justice Project (WJP) and the World Governance Indicators (WGI). They both issue their rankings of countries on several dimensions of rule of law / good governance annually. In terms of regulatory processes, the following dimensions are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WJP: Constraints on government powers; Absence of corruption; Open government • WGI: Control of Corruption |
| What the indicator measures | Change (improvement) or deterioration of country's ranking on the WJP Absence of corruption, Constraints on government powers and Open government rankings and the WGI Regulatory quality ranking between the year considered baseline for the intervention and the last year for which data is available in the year of the evaluation. |
| Data sources | <p>WJP Rule of Law Index Reports (link) or interactive data for the last year available (link)</p> <p>WGI interactive data (link)</p> |
| Methods of data collection | <p>Desk research</p> <p>Comparison in time</p> |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Absence of corruption (WJP) includes the dimensions: Government official in the executive branch; the legislative branch; the judiciary; and the police and the military do not use public office for private gain.</p> <p>Constraints on government powers (WJP) includes dimensions of: Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature; the judiciary; by independent auditing and review; government officials are sanctioned for misconduct, government powers are subject to non-governmental checks; transition of power is subject to the law.</p> <p>Open Government (WJP) includes the following dimensions: Publicized laws and government data; Right to information; Civic participation; Complaint Mechanism.</p> <p>Control of corruption (WGI) captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as "capture" of the state by elites and private interests.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>WJP. (various years). <i>Rule of Law Index Reports</i> (link)</p> <p>WJP. (2016). <i>Methodology</i> (link)</p> <p>WGI. (n.d.). <i>Methodology</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRN41: DEMONSTRABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN TIMELINESS AND QUALITY OF (OPEN) GOVERNMENT SERVICES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN41: Demonstrable improvements in timeliness and quality of (open) government services</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | This indicator is a proxy for regulatory efficiency and increased openness of the government. Besides providing information to the public, resolving complaints and misconduct, it also comprises a business freedom component, which measures the extent to which the regulatory and infrastructure environments constrain the efficient operation of businesses. As such, operations and transactions such as issuing licences and permits, responding to inquiries, connecting basic services (electricity, water etc.) where applicable and their costs form part of the indicator. |
| What the indicator measures | Evidence of improvements in timeliness and/or quality of open government services or government services generally in case they have not been digitalized yet compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Users of government services Administrative data |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, survey Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Open government is such that shares information, empowers people with tools to hold the government accountable, and fosters citizen participation in public policy deliberations. |
| Further resources | Miller, T. and Kim, A. B. (2017). <i>2017 Index of Economic Freedom</i> . (link) WJP. (various years). <i>Rule of Law Index Reports</i> (link) WJP. (2016). <i>Methodology</i> (link) |

GGRN42: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SANCTIONED FOR MISCONDUCT

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN42: Change in number of government officials sanctioned for misconduct</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Public officials owe a fiduciary duty to the public and therefore must comply with a more demanding standard of conduct than that required by the criminal law.' Breaches of that fiduciary duty, sometimes referred to as official misconduct or violations of the public trust,' may not necessarily establish a crime, but can lead to a variety of other consequences that range from public criticism to removal from office. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in number of public officials sanctioned for misconduct compared to baseline (the situation prior to the intervention). The change should be clearly linked to the intervention (e.g., following the adoption of a code of conduct, providing trainings on ethical behaviour, establishing electronic tracking data systems etc.) |
| Data sources | Administrative data Representatives of government entities Ethical commissions |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Codes of conduct (or code of ethics) are generally value-based guides on how public officials should behave, and outline what they should – and should not – do on the job. Codes are written documents and generally are divided into three key parts: a statement of principles, rules, and a regulatory framework. Official misconduct (also malfeasance in office), is the commission of an unlawful act, done in an official capacity, which affects the performance of official duties. Malfeasance in office is often grounds for a removal of an elected official by statute or recall election. |
| Further resources | Lindgreen, A. (2004). Corruption and Unethical Behavior: Report on a Set of Danish Guidelines. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> 51(1), 31-39. Stern, B. J. (1987). Revealing Misconduct by Public Officials through Grand Jury Reports. <i>University of Pennsylvania Law Review</i> 136(73). (link) Transparency International. (2012). <i>Calling out Public Official on Corruption: Codes of Contact</i> . (link) Transparency International UK. (n.d.). <i>Measuring Corruption</i> . (link) |

GGRN43: NUMBER OF FORMAL INFORMATION REQUESTS/COMPLAINTS FILED BY CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS AFTER RECEIVING SUPPORT FROM THE INTERVENTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN43: Number of formal information requests/complaints filed by civil society groups after receiving support from the intervention</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Trust in government can depend on citizens' experiences when receiving public services. With the technological revolution, government today have an array of options of communicating with citizens, providing information, accepting and responding to requests. Civil society organizations (CSOs) provide channels for citizen voice and can help citizens hold government accountable. This is important for: improved government responsiveness to the relevant needs of citizens; for helping to inform government policy decisions; and for assessing the performance of relevant sector policies and service delivery. This indicator also serves as a proxy to measure the effectiveness of support provided to CSOs to engage in advocacy, democratic governance etc. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of formal information requests and/or complaints filed by civil society groups after receiving support from the intervention compared to the similar activity (if any) prior to the intervention. |
| Data sources | Documented evidence of formal information requests and/or complaints raised Civil society groups |
| Methods of data collection | Interviews, focus groups Cases studies Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Civil society organization: Civil society organizations are broadly understood as the diverse groups, NGOs and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life and express the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations. Government responsiveness is the degree to which government listens to what people want and acts on it, and to which public policies and institutions respond to the needs of citizens and uphold their rights. |
| Further resources | Good Governance Learning Network. (2015). <i>In Pursuit of Responsible and Responsive Local Governance</i> . (link) Fourie, D. J. and Kakumba, U. (2011). <i>Assessing the Role and Capacity of Civil Society Organisations in Holding Local Government Accountable in Uganda</i> . (link) OECD. (2011). <i>Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society</i> . OECD Public Governance Reviews. (link) Sharma, B. (2008). <i>Voice, Accountability and Civic Engagement. A Conceptual Overview</i> . (link) UNDP. (2010). <i>Fostering Social Accountability: From Principle to Practice. Guidance Note</i> . (link) World Bank. (2007). <i>Civil Society's Role in the Governance Agenda in Ecuador: Assessing Opportunities and Constraints</i> . (link) |

GGRN44: NUMBER OF CASES OF LAWFUL TRANSITIONS OF POWER AT REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL WITHIN FIVE YEARS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN44: Number of cases of lawful transitions of power at regional/national level within five years</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Lawful and peaceful transition of power between political parties and/or between high-ranking elected officials such as presidents is a hallmark of democracy. However, in some situations, these officials or parties refuse to step down and hang over their office/mandate. An appropriate legal framework, mechanisms and institutions guaranteeing democratic elections and strong opposition parties can help avoid such situations. Commitment to democracy secured by neighbouring countries or regional alliances represents another mean when internal mechanisms fail (as was the case in Gambia in 2017). Furthermore, coups d'état represent another form of anti-democratic transfer of power. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of cases of lawful transitions of power at different levels of government (local, regional, national) within the past five years. The linkage between the intervention/support provided and the improved democratic processes needs to be established. |
| Data sources | Election data and historical data on transitions of power Electoral institute (or a similar body) Media coverage of elections Citizens, community leaders Watchdog organizations |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Media analysis Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Lawful transfer/transition of power is the act of handing over power to an official elected in free, democratic elections according to the laws of the country or territory. Peaceful transfer of power refers to transition of power which proceeds without any conflict (political, armed). |
| Further resources | Bell, C. (2015). <i>Governance and Law: The Distinctive Context of Transitions from Conflict and its Consequences for Development Interventions</i> . University of Edinburgh. (link) Chesterman, S. (2007). Ownership in Theory and in Practice: Transfer of Authority in UN Statebuilding Operations. <i>Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding</i> 1(1) (link). Varol, O. O. (2012). The Democratic Coup d'état. <i>Harvard International Law Journal</i> 53(2), 292-356. (link) |

GGRN45: NUMBER OF REPORTED FRAUDULENT ELECTIONS AT REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.1 Open government and corruption |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN45: Number of reported fraudulent elections at regional/national level within the past five years</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Many governments are not responsive to their citizens. Fair elections provide an important means of improving responsiveness by making elected officials accountable to voters. However, election fraud undermines this critical function in many young democracies, often at the hands of tightly networked groups of political elites. There are many ways to manipulate elections, including voter intimidation, ballot box stuffing, and changing vote totals after ballots are cast. |
| What the indicator measures | Number of reported fraudulent elections at different levels of government (local, regional, national) within the past five years compared to previous five/year (or longer) period. The linkage between the intervention/support provided and the change in (non-)democratic processes needs to be established. |
| Data sources | Election observers Electoral institute (or a similar body) Accusations of fraud, vote recounts etc. Media coverage of elections |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Media analysis Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Electoral fraud (also election manipulation or vote rigging) is illegal interference with the process of an election, whether by increasing the vote share of the favored candidate, depressing the vote share of the rival candidates, or both. What constitutes electoral fraud varies from country to country. |
| Further resources | Bell, C. (2015). <i>Governance and Law: The Distinctive Context of Transitions from Conflict and its Consequences for Development Interventions</i> . University of Edinburgh. (link) Callen, M. & Long, J. D. (2015). <i>Institutional Corruption and Election Fraud: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan</i> . (link) López-Pintor, R. (2010). <i>Assessing Electoral Fraud in New Democracies: A Basic Conceptual Framework</i> . (link) |

GGRN46: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – OPEN GOVERNMENT AND CORRUPTION

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN46: Shift in country ranking on internationally recognized measures/indices of rule of law – open government and corruption</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | <p>There are currently two recognized international rule of law / good governance ranking systems - the World Justice Project (WJP) and the World Governance Indicators (WGI). They both issue their rankings of countries on several dimensions of rule of law / good governance annually. In terms of regulatory processes, the following dimensions are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WJP: Constraints on government powers; Absence of corruption; Open government • WGI: Control of Corruption |
| What the indicator measures | Change (improvement) or deterioration of country's ranking on the WJP Absence of corruption, Constraints on government powers and Open government rankings and the WGI Regulatory quality ranking between the year considered baseline for the intervention and the last year for which data is available in the year of the evaluation. |
| Data sources | WJP Rule of Law Index Reports (link) or interactive data for the last year available (link) WGI interactive data (link) |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research Comparison in time |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Absence of corruption (WJP) includes the dimensions: Government official in the executive branch; the legislative branch; the judiciary; and the police and the military do not use public office for private gain.</p> <p>Constraints on government powers (WJP) includes dimensions of: Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature; the judiciary; by independent auditing and review; government officials are sanctioned for misconduct, government powers are subject to non-governmental checks; transition of power is subject to the law.</p> <p>Open Government (WJP) includes the following dimensions: Publicized laws and government data; Right to information; Civic participation; Complaint Mechanism.</p> <p>Control of corruption (WGI) captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as "capture" of the state by elites and private interests.</p> |
| Further resources | WJP. (various years). <i>Rule of Law Index Reports</i> (link) WJP. (2016). <i>Methodology</i> (link) WGI. (n.d.). <i>Methodology</i> . (link) |

GGRN50: NUMBER AND TYPE OF REGULATIONS PRESENTED AND/OR ADOPTED

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN50: Number and type of regulations presented</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Building effective regulations is essential to protect public safety and health of citizens while effective economic governance is a key condition for economic growth and development. Good regulations are thus essential for the development and wellbeing of a country or district. The capacity of local regulators to design good, modern regulations may be strengthened via technical cooperation through the means of additional training, knowledge-transfer sessions and others. |
| What the indicator measures | Number and type of regulations presented and/or adopted using tools or mechanisms introduced by the intervention and/or elaborated and presented by regulators who were trained with the intervention support. Considering that regulatory processes may take a long time, the evaluator should establish whether she will focus on regulations presented or adopted (or both). |
| Data sources | Regulations presented/adopted |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research |
| Definition of key terms | Good Regulation serves the public interest through supporting ongoing confidence in processes, such as the market process, in which the public participates and in activities, such as auditing, on which the public relies. Criteria for good regulation comprise: whether the action or regime is supported by legislative authority; whether there is an appropriate scheme of accountability; whether procedures are fair, accessible, and open; whether the regulator is acting with sufficient expertise; and whether the action or regime is efficient. After explaining each of these criteria, the chapter turns to their role in assessing regulation. |
| Further resources | Baldwin, R., Cave, M. and Lodge, M. (2011). <i>Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice</i> . Oxford Scholarship Online, April 2015. (link) Kirkpatrick, C. (2014). Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Reform in Developing countries. <i>Public Administration and Development</i> 34, 162-168. (link) Thomadakis, S. B. (2007). <i>What Makes Good Regulation?</i> (link) World Bank. (2015). <i>Building Regulation for Resilience. Managing Risks for Safer Cities</i> . (link) |

GGRN51: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW – REGULATORY PROCESSES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.2 Regulatory enforcement |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN51: Shift in country ranking on internationally recognized measures/indices of rule of law – regulatory processes</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | <p>There are currently two recognized international rule of law / good governance ranking systems - the World Justice Project (WJP) and the World Governance Indicators (WGI). They both issue their rankings of countries on several dimensions of rule of law / good governance annually. In terms of regulatory processes, the following dimensions are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WJP: Regulatory Enforcement • WGI: Regulatory Quality |
| What the indicator measures | Change (improvement) or deterioration of country's ranking on the WJP Regulatory enforcement ranking and the WGI Regulatory quality ranking between the year considered baseline for the intervention and the last year for which data is available in the year of the evaluation. |
| Data sources | <p>WJP Rule of Law Index Reports (link) or interactive data for the last year available (link)</p> <p>WGI interactive data (link)</p> |
| Methods of data collection | <p>Desk research</p> <p>Comparison in time</p> |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Regulatory enforcement (WJP) encompasses following dimensions: Government regulations are effectively enforced; Government regulations are applied and enforced without improper influence; Administrative proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delay; Due process is respected in administrative proceedings; The government does not expropriate without lawful process and adequate compensation.</p> <p>Regulatory quality (WGI) captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>WJP. (various years). <i>Rule of Law Index Reports</i> (link)</p> <p>WJP. (2016). <i>Methodology</i> (link)</p> <p>WGI. (n.d.). <i>Methodology</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRN60: SHIFT IN COUNTRY RANKING ON INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED MEASURES/INDICES OF RULE OF LAW - JUSTICE

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN60: Shift in country ranking on internationally recognized measures/indices of rule of law - justice</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | <p>There are currently two recognized international rule of law / good governance ranking systems - the World Justice Project (WJP) and the World Governance Indicators (WGI). They both issue their rankings of countries on several dimensions of rule of law / good governance annually. In terms of regulatory processes, the following dimensions are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WJP: Civil justice; Criminal justice • WGI: Rule of law |
| What the indicator measures | Change (improvement) or deterioration of country's ranking on the WJP Civil justice and Criminal justice rankings and the WGI Rule of Law ranking between the year considered baseline for the intervention and the last year for which data is available in the year of the evaluation. |
| Data sources | <p>WJP Rule of Law Index Reports (link) or interactive data for the last year available (link)</p> <p>WGI interactive data (link)</p> |
| Methods of data collection | <p>Desk research</p> <p>Comparison in time</p> |
| Definition of key terms | <p>Civil justice (WJP) consists of the following dimensions: people can access and afford civil justice; civil justice is free of discrimination; corruption; and improper government influence; civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delay; civil justice is effectively enforced; alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, impartial, and effective.</p> <p>Criminal justice (WJP) consists of the following dimensions: criminal investigative system is effective; criminal adjudication system is timely and effective; correctional system is effective and reducing criminal behaviour; criminal system is impartial; criminal system is free of corruption; and of improper government influence; due process of law and rights of the accused.</p> <p>Rule of Law (WGI) captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.</p> |
| Further resources | <p>WJP. (various years). <i>Rule of Law Index Reports</i> (link)</p> <p>WJP. (2016). <i>Methodology</i> (link)</p> <p>WGI. (n.d.). <i>Methodology</i>. (link)</p> |

GGRN61: CHANGE IN COURT CASE PROCESSING TIMES

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN61: Change in court case processing times</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Effective legal and judicial projects are often hampered by resource constraint problem; improving the capacity and quality of a judicial system requires material and human resources that are in short supply in developing economies. A lack of administrative capacity of judicial organizations results in a serious backlog in processing cases, prolonged detentions of persons without being granted timely hearings and other human rights violations. The effectiveness and streamlining of case processing in some cases may also be achieved by training, increasing salaries of judicial and administrative staff and implementing measures to increase discipline within justice system organizations. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in court case processing times compared to baseline (state prior to the intervention), which has occurred as a direct or indirect result of the intervention. |
| Data sources | Administrative data |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Comparison in time |
| Definition of key terms | Court case processing times standardly include the period from an arrest to a court decision. |
| Further resources | Dakolias, M. (1999). Court Performance Around the World: A Comparative Perspective. <i>Yale Human Rights and Development Journal</i> 2(1). (link) Lee Luskin, M. and Luskin, R. C. (1986). Why So Fast, Why So Slow: Explaining Case Processing Time. <i>Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology</i> 77(1), 190-214. UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) |

GGRN62: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF REPORTED CASES OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BY THE JUSTICE SYSTEM ACTORS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN62: Change in number of reported cases of fundamental rights violations by the justice system actors</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | All individuals, regardless of nationality, statelessness, or other status, must have effective access to justice, which includes a fair trial and a due process. In this context, criminal charges, or a person's rights and obligations in a suit at law, must be determined by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The right to a fair trial involves the right to a public hearing and the right to a trial without delay or within a reasonable time. Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in number of reported cases of fundamental rights violations by the justice system actors compared to baseline (state prior to the intervention), which has occurred as a direct or indirect result of the intervention. Reported cases may be defined as officially filed complaints with a higher justice system body, ombudsman or other official entity or as cases registered by NGOs/CSOs active in the area or a combination and comparison of the two. |
| Data sources | Administrative data NGOs and their reports |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Comparison in time |
| Definition of key terms | Violations of rights in the justice system may include but are not limited to the following: denying interpreters, a lack of protection of the rights of defendants and victims, denying or a lack of access to redress for miscarriage of justice, a lack of access to courts due to unaffordable fees, unavailability of free legal assistance for indigent defendants, poor quality of legal representation, inadequate response to gender-based violence, not providing legal assistance for children in conflict with the law, a lack of assessment of mentally ill offenders, failure to establish special (protective) procedures for child victims and crime witnesses. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) |

GGRN63: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF REPORTED CASES OF BRIBE REQUESTS MADE BY JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS' STAFF

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN63: Change in number of reported cases of bribe requests made by justice system organizations' staff</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Integrity and independence represent a central feature of a functioning judiciary system. Integrity means that courts are free of incidents of corruption and misconduct or that such cases are prevented, reported, investigated and punished. Bribes to judges, prosecutors or court personnel then greatly contribute to the actual and perceived lack of integrity of the judiciary system. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in number of reported cases of bribe requests made by judges, administrative and other staff of justice system organizations compared to baseline (state prior to the intervention), which has occurred as a direct or indirect result of the intervention. Reported cases may be defined as officially filed complaints with a higher justice system body or other official entity or as cases registered by NGOs/CSOs active in the area or a combination and comparison of the two. |
| Data sources | Administrative data NGOs and their reports Citizens, business owners, court users |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Comparison in time Surveys, opinion polls |
| Definition of key terms | Bribes can take the form of direct economic rewards and payments, gifts, personal favours and are given in exchange for an alteration of behavior or decisions of the receiver of the bribe. Courts with a lack of integrity violate human rights, abuse their power or allow undue influence of political and private interests. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) |

GGRN64: CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CASES PROCESSED BY JUSTICE SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN64: Change in number of cases processed by justice system organizations on an annual basis</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | Effective legal and judicial projects are often hampered by resource constraint problem; improving the capacity and quality of a judicial system requires material and human resources that are in short supply in developing economies. A lack of administrative capacity of judicial organizations results in a serious backlog in processing cases, prolonged detentions of persons without being granted timely hearings and other human rights violations. The effectiveness and streamlining of case processing in some cases may also be achieved by training, increasing salaries of judicial and administrative staff and implementing measures to increase discipline within justice system organizations. |
| What the indicator measures | Change (improvement) in the number of cases processed by the justice system organizations on an annual basis compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). In some instances, it may make more sense to focus on <i>proportion</i> of cases rather than <i>number</i> (e.g., in case of a sudden increase or a drop in the number of cases filed/open from year to year). |
| Data sources | Justice system statistics and administrative data NGOs, think tanks Independent observers |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Justice system refers to the series of organizations and processes established by governments involved in apprehending, prosecuting, defending, sentencing, and jailing those involved in crimes - including law enforcement, attorneys, judges, courts of law, prisons. It is commonly divided into three groups – the police, judiciary and prisons. |
| Further resources | Stephenson, M.C. (2007). <i>Judicial Reform in Developing Economies: Constraints and Opportunities</i> . (link) UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools</i> . (link) |

GGRN65: CHANGE IN PROPORTION OF PERSONS HELD IN CUSTODY/PRISONS WITHOUT DUE JUDICIAL PROCESSING OF THEIR CASE

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN65: Change in proportion of persons held in custody/prisons without due judicial processing of their case</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | All individuals, regardless of nationality, statelessness, or other status, must have effective access to justice, which includes a fair trial and a due process. In this context, criminal charges, or a person's rights and obligations in a suit at law, must be determined by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The right to a fair trial involves the right to a public hearing and the right to a trial without delay or within a reasonable time. Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in proportion of persons in custody/prisons who are held without due judicial processing of their case compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention). |
| Data sources | Prison system statistics and administrative data NGOs advocating on behalf of those detained Independent observers |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Interviews |
| Definition of key terms | Due process means that laws must be applied fairly and equally to all people, especially to a citizen accused of a crime. All persons are, according to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, entitled to a fair and public hearing, and at trial stage, to be informed promptly and in a language in which he / she understands the nature of the charge. |
| Further resources | UN. (2011). <i>The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators. Implementation Guide and Project Tools.</i> (link) UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2015). <i>Basic Human Rights Reference Guide: Right to a Fair Trial and Due Process in the Context of Countering Terrorism.</i> (link) |

GGRN66: CHANGE IN CRIME RATES (BY TYPE OF CRIME)

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Crosscutting theme | Good Governance |
| Dimension | 3. Rule of Law |
| Subdimension | 3.3 Justice |
| Indicator name | <i>GGRN66: Change in crime rates (by type of crime)</i> |
| Indicator level | Outcome |
| Purpose of indicator | There is a strong relationship between income inequality and the incidence of crime, particularly violent crime. Change in crime rates may thus be caused by economic growth and corresponding income redistribution or, on the contrary, by shrinking of the economy and increased poverty and inequality. However, change in reported crime rates (positive or negative) may also be caused by differences in reporting and categorizing crime between two points in time or other social or political events that influence the confidence level between citizens and the responsible authorities. Furthermore, better policing may also have impact on observed rates of crime. Careful attention thus needs to be paid to the influences behind the changes observed in order to avoid false attribution. As well, whenever possible, official statistics should be crosschecked with independent watchdog/observer reports. |
| What the indicator measures | Change in crime rates by type of crime compared to baseline (situation prior to the intervention) that can be directly or indirectly attributed to the intervention. |
| Data sources | Official crime statistics Reports by independent watchdogs, observers, NGOs, human right defenders etc. |
| Methods of data collection | Desk research, basic statistics Comparison in time |
| Definition of key terms | Crime or offence (or criminal offence) is an act harmful not only to some individual but also to a community, society or the state ("a public wrong"). Such acts are forbidden and punishable by law. (Wikipedia) |
| Further resources | Fajnzylber, P., Lederman, D. and Loyaza, N. (2002). Inequality and Violent Crime. <i>Journal of Law and Economics</i> 45. (link) |