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Global Indicators: Measuring Governance & Peacebuilding

Executive Summary

This report covers the research and findings of a collaboration between Pact and four George Washington University graduate students in the M.A. in International Development Studies (IDS) program. As part of the IDS capstone research project, Travis Mayo, Michael Schwille, Jennifer Westervelt and Besian Xhezo consulted for Pact under the supervision of Kerry Bruce, Monitoring Evaluation Reporting and Learning (MERL) Director, and Nina Bowen, Democracy and Governance (DG) Director. Our task was to provide analysis and revision of Pact’s global governance indicator, which was introduced in 2011 in an organization-wide monitoring and evaluation (M&E) initiative. In response to increased donor demand for results-driven development, as well as the need for internal knowledge management, Pact instituted the global indicators initiative to annually measure their worldwide impact in six primary practice areas: natural resource management, health, livelihoods, business and markets, capacity development, and governance. Pact contracted our IDS team to revise and improve the first iteration of the global governance indicator, which is intended to capture results for Pact’s portfolio of programs improving civil society, governance, democracy, conflict resolution, and peacebuilding.

The Capstone research included the following activities and objectives:

- A desk review of literature on global indicators and governance measurement, as well as Pact program documents such as Performance Monitoring Plans, annual and quarterly reports, etc.;
- Extensive consultations with relevant Pact staff in DC and in implementation countries;
- Field research in Kenya and the Ukraine to validate and improve a new measurement tool;
- Substantive suggestions to improve the global governance indicator 1.0.

Over the course of five months (January – May 2012) the capstone team achieved each of these objectives, with final deliverables presented here, including a revised governance indicator 1.0 and a new tool, the governance scorecard, which was developed as a potential learning and reporting tool for Pact to capture more relevant, utilization-focused governance data.
Developing a Global Governance Indicator

Parameters for the Global Indicators

Guiding the revision process of the global governance indicator were several key principles and parameters outlined by Pact. A reflection of operational realities and learning needs of Pact headquarters, these principles played a large role in shaping the course of design and research used by the IDS team to achieve the capstone objectives.

Impact/Outcome Level Measurement: A key necessity of the governance indicator is the ability to measure impact and outcome level data. The need to capture the ‘so what,’ factor of Pact’s programs is a driving influence behind the creation of the global indicators. Consequently, the governance indicator must measure the impact of Pact’s work, collecting data informing how Pact’s work effects broader societal changes. In addition, a key challenge of the indicator is not only to measure outcome and/or impact level changes, but also to attribute those changes directly to Pact programming.

Applicable across Sectors: A second requirement for the governance indicator is the ability to measure governance across the separate sectors of Pact’s programming. In addition to governance-specific projects, the indicator must be designed in such a way that other sectors, such as health or livelihoods, can report on how their programs are affecting governance.

Resource Neutral: A fundamental reality of the global indicator process is the absence of dedicated funds to support it. Consequently, the global indicators must utilize collection methods requiring a minimum of resources and time. Financially prohibitive data collection methods include, for example, surveys, questionnaires, or heavily quantitative indices. In recognition of financial restraints and the need to place a minimum reporting burden on country offices, a governance indicator ideally utilizes data already collected under donor requirements, or data that requires minimal effort to gather and synthesize on part of the country office staff.

Inclusivity: To achieve support and buy-in from the country staff that carry out the actual reporting on the global indicators, it was essential for the IDS team to consult with and incorporate the feedback from Pact country officers at every step of the revision process. Incorporating interviews and field visits with Pact country staff to ground truth suggested revisions would play a large role in the creation of a revised indicator.

Scope of Work

The scope for our consultancy with Pact was broken down into 4 major phases:
1) **Desk Review:** We began by conducting thorough research, beginning with the existing data on Pact’s original global governance indicator and the material that went into its development. The team then conducted a review of best practices for measuring and evaluating governance throughout the greater international development community, including among other NGOs and in academia. We also met and interviewed program officers and MERL officers currently working on Pact programs (see Appendix A).

2) **Indicator redesign and Field Visit Planning** – The team began critically analyzing and revising the Global Governance Indicator 1.0 (Appendix C), incorporating the feedback from Pact field teams and the findings of the desk review. We also commenced development of a replacement indicator, and presented three options for a new indicator to Pact staff at a February webinar. The purpose of the webinar was to solicit feedback and initial impressions from field offices and the MERL Community of Practice (CoP). Based on this feedback, we proceeded with one of the options, the Governance Scorecard. We continued dialogue with field offices and HQ to finalize the itinerary and objectives for the field visit.

3) **Field Visit and Assessment** – In March, three team members traveled to Kenya and a fourth to Ukraine for one business week to gather additional input for the Governance Scorecard and to test for feasibility and ease of data collection. The team also addressed the issues of validity and reliability, focusing on the realities of Pact governance work and their method of change. The key objective of the field visits was to establish a constructive dialogue on the process with Pact personnel on the ground and their implementing partners (grantees), which would have been extremely difficult from abroad.

4) **Synthesis and Presentation** – We incorporated into the Governance Scorecard, and the revised measurement tool and accompanying protocol were circulated throughout Pact DC for additional feedback. The team presented key findings and a project overview at a brown bag session at Pact HQ in April. The final version of the Governance Scorecard, Global Indicator 1.0 and all accompanying research is contained in this final report.

**Desk Review: Key Findings**

As part of the literature review for the capstone assignment our team looked at governance indicators and respective methodologies used by various development agencies (e.g. World Bank, UNDP, OECD, ODI, NDI), international NGOs (e.g. Oxfam UK, International IDEA, Mercy Corps), bilateral donors (e.g. SIDA, German Cooperation, DFID, AusAID, USAID), and gauged independent thinking and papers from research universities, governance think tanks (e.g. J-PAL Governance Initiative, GSDRC, The Policy Practice, Peace Foundation), policy experts and academics. Going into our research process, we were guided by three key questions:

1. What types of indicators measuring governance currently exist?
2. What makes for a good or bad indicator?
3. How is this relevant to our team in the framework of the Pact context and our assignment parameters?

What currently exists?

Although ‘governance’ has become an increasingly popular agenda item in international development, donors, development agencies, and experts have yet to come to an agreement on a single definition for it. Broadly speaking however, governance is seen as a power arrangement where the state delivers political goods and distributes resources in an efficient, accountable, and fair way. The actors that come into play in such an arrangement are both governmental and non-governmental. For example, the Jameel Poverty Action Lab (JLAB) defines governance as a two-part principal-agent problem. “In the first part of the problem, the principals are the citizens, who vote to elect as their agents, politicians, whose job is to enact policies that are in line with the voters’ interests. In the second part of the problem, politicians become principals themselves, who must in turn work with their agents, civil servants, and other service providers to actually implement those policies.”

Governance thus reflects the way in which stakeholders interact with each other in order to influence the outcomes of public policies. Consensus on a definition for indicators is more likely, and they are seen as qualitative and/or quantitative bits of information that provide a glimpse of, or communicate the state of, a larger picture.

Studies show that the myriad of donor approaches to governance measurements is quite colorful. Arndt and Oman (2008) maintain that there are currently around 400 D&G indicators in use worldwide. Two major types of indicators are more evident in terms of purpose: compliance and performance indicators. The former is usually a diagnosis of a given situation or context, while the latter is more concerned with the relation between inputs and outputs/outcomes. Most of the 400+ indicators belong in the compliance category and are used to inform country strategies. Consequently, they focus on political systems, public administration, corruption, pro-poor spending, and effectiveness of service delivery. There has been lesser use of governance indicators as a performance tool for donor accountability, managing for results, and demonstrating value for money.

Almost all tools used derive from perception-based data. Common data gathering methods include: document review and analysis (e.g. laws, country strategies), interviews, questionnaires,
direct observation, focus groups and expert opinions. Sometimes, the qualitative data is complemented with quantitative, including surveys and pre- and post-tests of knowledge. Experts seem to agree that the more aggregate the indicator the less likely it is to identify specific interventions.  

Another key question in the process of identifying appropriate use of indicators is whether governance is viewed as a technical or a normative issue, a means or an end. For our Pact-specific context, and also following the preliminary discussions of Pact’s 2011 Governance Community of Practice meeting in Mombasa, it is both. A joint DFID-AUSAID review looks at governance initiatives as attempting to be effective at “increasing community expectations of service delivery”, and “under what conditions this has translated into improved access, efficiency and quality of services.” An inclusive demand-and-supply approach is identified here. The OECD and World Bank emphasize the necessity to have “actionable” indicators (ones that measure specific things under the control of the policymakers – or organization using them). However, they also caution us that ‘actionable’ does not necessarily translation into action-worthy. It is in this vein that many international development NGOs have found global indicators for governance unworthy of the cost for limited benefit. In most cases, the only level at which such actionable indicators can measure results even at great effort and expense is at the output level, when the real desire is to assess global governance results at the outcome or impact level.  

What makes for a good indicator?

Common potential pitfalls associated with using qualitative indicators include: Conflating outputs with outcomes (i.e. the number of prosecutors trained becomes the outcome), conflating outcomes with impact (issues with attribution), linking micro- and meso-project level output to macro outcomes (e.g. the World Bank Governance Indicators, the Corruption Perception Index), confusing correlation with causation, leading to over- attribution of the role of the project in the governance score and failing to isolate the actual impact of the project (ensuring that changes occur because of, and not in spite of, the project), and failing to hypothesize a valid counterfactual. On the other hand, some of the issues associated with the application of experimental and quasi-experimental designs in governance evaluation point at high costs, insufficient sample sizes, lack of adequate baseline data, and the possibility of spillover effects. However, most importantly, it is generally agreed that the political nature of democracy and governance

---

8 Meeting with Kerry Bruce, Pact MERL Director, February 2012.
9 DFID. Research for Development. Systematic Review being led by Aus-AID. Publication year N/A.
assistance rarely follows a linear cause-and-effect model that could be measured by quantitative approaches alone. 10

There seems to be a consensus that the best indicator should a mixed-methods approach, one that employs not only experimental or quasi-experimental techniques able to address issues of attribution, causality, and provide a valid counterfactual, but also a qualitative approach that provides the contextual basis for it. 11 However, Kauffman and Kraay (2007), authors of the famous ‘next generation’ World Bank Governance Indicators (WGI), argue in favor of qualitative approaches, maintaining that perceptions matter as people take actions based on those perceptions. UNDP’s approach leans towards having a participatory process, rather than experiment subjects. 12

How is this all relevant to the specific Pact context?

Firstly, the literature review highlighted for us that both qualitative and quantitative approaches have flaws when implemented alone. However, qualitative approaches, in the form of expert opinions and focus groups, seem to be the norm. This is not only due to the costs and complexities associated with carrying out an experimental or quasi-experimental quantitative measurement, but also due to the highly complex and contextual nature of governance and democracy work. Experts maintain that perception data is important as governance is a power ‘game’ and actors do take actions based on perceptions. This is even more important when faced with the task of developing a revised global governance indicator for Pact, where resources available for such a data collection process are minimal, and the additional effort on both HQ and Pact offices worldwide should be kept to a manageable level. Therefore, it seemed directly appropriate that we would attempt to devise a qualitative tool that would be easy to understand and collect.

Secondly, taking stock of M&E consultations during Pact’s 2011 Governance Community of Practice (COP) in Mombasa, but also in line with some of the scholarly thinking on how to look at governance through the normative lens, an ideal indicator for Pact should take stock of both demand (as in increased expectations of community and community agents), and supply (as in the local or central government’s capacity and willingness to deliver services effectively, fairly, and in an accountable way.)

Thirdly, the literature suggests that a great deal of problems exist with the use of aggregate indicators and ‘one-question-capture-all’ approaches, especially when dealing with such a complex and multi-layered thematic area as governance. Given that indicators are solely

proxies for a contextual situation, single-question indicators have a tendency to be detached from the reality on the ground, and can provide misguided information, a fact that was corroborated in our team’s consultations with various Pact country offices. MERL officers globally maintained that it has not been easy to link activities on the ground with in place definitions of the current single-question global governance indicator, and vice versa.

Lastly, for the purpose of this assignment, and taking stock of some of the early discussions with Pact staff, it is necessary to look at governance as both a means and an end in itself in coming up with a governance indicator to measure change at the outcome level for Pact-supported projects. In other words, improving the rules of the game is just as much at the core of what Pact does as reaching the end goal of good governance in itself.

Indicator Redesign and Field Visit Preparation

The inclusion of field visits to Pact country offices played a critical role in the IDS team’s ability to ‘ground truth’ and thoroughly test suggested revisions to the governance indicator. In preparation for the field visits to the Pact offices in Kenya and Ukraine, the team developed a research methodology to ensure comparable, consistent and accurate data collection. The primary tools used to carry out the field research included a semi-structured interview questionnaire to conduct with Pact staff and partners, and a draft version of the governance scorecard we had developed (fully explained later in this report and in Appendix D) to perform preliminary feasibility testing.

The semi-structured interview questionnaire used by the IDS team during field visits is composed of three sections designed to capture feedback on a revised governance indicator 1.0, the governance scorecard, and suggestions for next steps (see Appendix B). Preliminary Skype interviews with Pact country staff revealed a common complaint of governance indicator 1.0 was the definition of terms used in the wording of the indicator. Specifically, the terms ‘initiative’ and ‘positive state-society engagement’ caused confusion among Pact county officers, and the IDS team used the field research semi-structured interview as an opportunity to collect suggestions on how these terms could be better defined.

The second section of the field interview questionnaire focused on the proposed governance scorecard indicator. For the scorecard to function as a viable indicator it would need to capture each element of governance relevant to Pact programming. The field research questionnaire was structured to solicit feedback on this critical area, with the intent to confirm elements of governance already classified by the IDS team (e.g. accountability, effectiveness, equity, enabling environment) and to identify potential gaps or missing elements.

The third and final section of the field research questionnaire provided an opportunity for respondents to give open-ended feedback on any concerns or suggestions they may have on the indicator revision process, or make to suggestions for further follow-up on part of the IDS team.
In addition to the interview questions, the IDS team prepared to utilize the draft governance scorecard in field interviews with Pact staff and implementing partners, performing a mock reporting exercise with interviewees when appropriate. The intended purpose of the mock reporting exercise would be to collect feedback on several key criteria: if country officers and partners would find the tool useful; if the scorecard met the requirements of placing a minimum reporting burden on staff; to determine if respondents could comprehend the governance elements and scoring system; and finally to observe how respondents reported their projects when using scorecard and using follow-up questions to understand reasoning and justifications for reported scores.

Field Research: Kenya and Ukraine

In March, the capstone took the research project to Ukraine and Kenya. In each of the countries, members of our team met with Pact MERL officers, program officers, and various Pact grantees working in numerous thematic areas of governance and peacebuilding (see Appendix A).

Our interviews with MERL officers were mainly concerned with gauging input on the indicator reporting process, including the type of information provided, the time it took to collect the data, quantifying the effort required in obtaining data, the level of data accuracy, and recommendations on how to improve future reporting rounds. We also introduced the governance scorecard and collected valuable suggestions on how to feasibility incorporate its use, the clarity of the scorecard definitions and scaling used, and the potential advantages and practical challenges of replacing indicator 1.0 with the governance scorecard.

Pact program officers in governance and peacebuilding were very resourceful in providing critical feedback on the current indicator, but also in helping us revamp and fine-tune our governance elements’ definitions within the governance scorecard. For example, following the literature review and our consultations with Pact HQ and MERL officers globally, we had identified five governance elements to include in the scorecard – accountability, transparency, equity/fairness, effectiveness/responsiveness, and peacebuilding. Once in the field, we immediately understood that participation (i.e. inclusiveness) was an important component of the governance work that most Pact programs were doing on the ground, and added it as a sixth element to the scorecard. Additionally, we had insightful discussions with all program staff on how to define each particular governance element so that it would best capture Pact’s understanding of those governance terms. We received valuable feedback on the scoring scale used in the scorecard, acknowledging the difficulty of a 1 to 5 scale, but attempting to provide language and examples for each step that could be applied to Pact programs across countries and thematic areas.

Lastly, the team had numerous meetings with key Pact partners and grantees working in both countries. Our primary goal for those sessions was to understand the nature of their Pact-
supported work on the ground. We did, however, delve into their ideas of governance and gathered language that spoke of their efforts. We also tested the scorecard with several of the groups as a potential future tool.

The various people and subjects covered during our field visits are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pact MERL Officers</th>
<th>Pact Program Officers</th>
<th>Pact Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nature, and examples of Pact-supported governance work</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of governance and peacebuilding as perceived by Pact staff and partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges faced with reporting on the global governance indicator 1.0.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance scorecard definitions and scoring methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of using the governance scorecard (clarity, effort required, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages and challenges of the scorecard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Governance Scorecard

Overview of the Governance Scorecard

As stated in the above sections, our team’s final recommendation to Pact for an alternate global governance indicator is called the governance scorecard. The governance scorecard is a perception-based measurement tool that we designed to the specifications of the parameters and best practices identified in the first phases of our research: to capture change at the impact/outcome level of governance and peace-building initiatives, in a manner that is participatory, easy to implement, and which provides value added for Pact projects on the ground. The scorecard defines governance as the overarching enabling environment composed of six Pact-relevant elements: Accountability, Transparency, Equity & Fairness, Effectiveness & Responsiveness, Participation & Inclusiveness, and Conflict Transformation. A concise definition is provided for each governance element as follows:

I. **Accountability**: Personal and social accountability. Government and bearers of public trust are responsible for actions, decisions and policies, and citizens are able to hold them to account for effective and honest performance.

II. **Transparency**: Government and bearers of public trust operate in such a way that it is easy to see what actions are performed, and the public is able to access, comprehend, and utilize this information.

III. **Equity and Fairness**: All people - including women, youth, and the disabled - expect and are provided equal access to justice, distribution of resources, protection of rights under the law, and the opportunity to fully participate in political, economic, and cultural life, regardless of ethnicity or regional identity.

IV. **Effectiveness and Responsiveness**: Government and bearers of public trust provide quality services, policies, and justice in a timely manner in response to public needs.

V. **Inclusiveness and Participation**: The public – as individuals and in civil society groups – fully engages with the government and bearers of public trust in the pursuit of transparency, accountability, equity, and responsiveness.

VI. **Conflict Transformation**: Relevant stakeholders are engaged in effective peace-building processes that address and reduce the driving factors of conflict.

For each of the governance elements above, respondents (Pact grantees or Pact personnel directly implementing programs) are asked the following:

*To what extent has your PACT-supported work resulted in changes toward increased* ________?*

This verbiage was crafted to ensure that responses would be attributable to Pact, and would capture incremental successes, not simply full achievement of governance objectives.

Pact respondents are asked to provide an answer only for those elements that are relevant to their work. The answer is a number on a scale from 1 to 5, where a one is associated with little
or no change, and a five is associated with achieving their project goal. A definition for each score is provided in the attached protocol (Appendix D), together with accompanying examples. Next to the score, respondents are also asked to provide qualitative evidence for their score, which serves to justify the score and give examples of the work they are doing on that particular governance element.

As the data is perception-based, respondents are asked to score projects based on their best judgment, referencing the incremental milestones en route to their ultimate project goal. In the case of grantees, the score is then validated by the appropriate Pact staff at the program level. Ideally, the grantee and the Pact program staff would reach a consensus on the score for each project.

The tool is also flexible in that it allows all Pact projects to report on it as long as they have an inherent governance component, explicit or implicit. Respondents report on only the governance elements relevant to their work, and skip the elements which do not represent their work. The **unit of measurement is the discrete project supported by Pact**, whether implemented by a grantee or by Pact directly. In contrast to the global governance indicator 1.0, the governance scorecard allows any Pact-supported project to report on the indicator, regardless of whether the project falls wholly within the governance and peacebuilding portfolio, or is aimed at a different sector but improving governance incidentally.

As with the other global indicators, data will be collected once per year, and all possible data collection methods are provided in the associated protocol.

**Aggregation of the Data**

The primary purpose of the governance scorecard is to synthesize the perceptions of Pact’s governance impact into quantifiable data. Field research and country interviews, however, revealed a wide demand for the inclusion of qualitative data to provide an outlet for nuanced justifications of why partners rate their governance impacts at their reported scores. The current iteration of the governance scorecard (Appendix D) reflects this demand, and is a mixed method tool that aggregates both quantified scores and qualitative reasoning. The scorecard provides different opportunities for learning and utilization of its data at various Pact organizational strata, including the partner, project, country, and global levels.

At the **partner level**, the scorecard initiates a conversation between Pact country staff and partner representatives with an opportunity to discuss outcome and impact level changes over the course of a year. Feedback solicited from partners as well as Pact staff highlighted these conversations as a welcome and beneficial function of the scorecard. The process of assigning scores to each of the six governance elements outlined in the scorecard encourages partners and Pact country staff to think critically about achievements and challenges accrued over the year.
During the field visits, the team received indications that the scorecard provided qualitative data collected at the country level that could be a useful database of vignettes and quotes for inclusion in donor reports, proposals, communications pieces, and updates. In addition, the quantified scores provide Pact country managers with the ability to identify where projects are achieving the most impact in relation to the various elements of governance. Because the scorecard allows disaggregation of data by implementation region within a country, it also provides the opportunity for Pact managers to assess whether certain geographic areas of operations are meeting greater challenges or success in relation to the average level of progress throughout the country.

At the global level, the scorecard data is aggregated to provide one country score for each element of governance. As is true with any data aggregated to the national level, making cross-country comparisons is inadvisable due the reality of complex systems creating uniquely different governance environments in each country. The full benefit of the governance scorecard’s aggregated quantitative data grows with each successive year, when comparisons can be drawn within one country over time. As scores within each governance element fluctuate (or remain constant) over time, Pact can assess which country programs are achieving breakthroughs in governance development and which are stagnating or quickly sliding backwards. An additional benefit of the governance scorecard is that each partner reports on the elements of governance their work influences, providing a snapshot of not only how many Pact partners in total are impacting governance in any given country, but also the number of partners working in each element of governance.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Throughout our consultancy with Pact, the IDS team developed one new governance measurement tool and revised the original governance indicator 1.0. The products of these efforts, informed by months of research, are only final insofar as they represent the culmination of this stage of Pact’s global indicators initiative and our capstone project. We present to Pact in Appendices C and D the most updated version of the governance scorecard and our suggested revisions to the governance indicator 1.0. In this section it is incumbent upon us to convey our notes, cautions, and recommendations for Pact to move these products into the next stage of their global indicators initiative.

Based on our research in the field and in the Pact DC office, we have identified several strengths of the governance scorecard as compared to the original indicator, but also several weaknesses.

In terms of feasibility, the scorecard fares well. The elements adequately capture the full range of Pact’s portfolio and are relevant to the work on the ground. The 1 to 5 scale strikes a balance between nuance and simplicity of reporting. The one-page format for the actual scorecard respects the time and complexity limits we wanted to follow, and the perception-based score also serves this purpose by avoiding time-consuming or complicated data collection and review throughout the year. The scorecard can thus be completed in a single session, with few resources. The flexible collection format lends itself to multiple methods: phone calls, focus groups, or e-mail exchanges will all be adequate means of collecting the data from respondents when individual, in-person meetings between Pact program staff and grantees are not feasible.

In terms of utility, the scorecard also achieves the goals of both reporting and learning, avoiding a common pitfall of M&E tools that are useful for either the in-country staff or the headquarters staff of the NGO, not both. The participatory implementation of the scorecard facilitates capacity building of grantees, a validity check of progress toward goals, and learning for all parties. It encourages reflective analysis of progress and the bigger picture that is often absent from daily interactions among implementers and their supporting personnel. The resulting data can be used for more purposes than simply the headquarters global measurement initiative, such as identifying gaps or potential entry points for future programming. The mixed-method design provides qualitative content that is useful for proposals and communications, and a quantitative score for headquarters.

Yet, the scorecard is not perfect. We believe certain weaknesses of the current scorecard may be overcome with further effort on the part of Pact personnel, while others are simply inherent to the trade-offs we had to make in developing a tool within specific parameters.

The protocol is lengthy and would be difficult to translate, which is a result of the level of detail requested by potential respondents to help them understand each step of its completion. In
providing examples of work under the governance elements and examples of progress under each score on the scale, we were also responding to specific country requests, yet it is impossible to capture all examples of Pact governance work and the milestones of progress within them. There are many types of projects under Pact’s support in this sector and in others, embodying numerous different theories of change. We recommend that respondents completing the scorecard in the first round of its implementation be asked to contribute examples to the protocol for this reason. We would also encourage Pact leadership to seek to articulate common theories of change for governance initiatives moving forward, to better bring the whole governance program into mutual alignment across countries if it will seek to measure global progress in this area.

And additional weakness of the scorecard is the reliability and validity of the data it produces. Timing of the collection will likely affect the answers. If, for instance, it is an election season, the optimism or pessimism prevalent in the environment may skew the type of responses and scores in that country. Validity may also be compromised if the person ranking the project believes that a lower score will be perceived as poor performance, and conversely, that a higher score would help them obtain more funding or other positive incentives. Insofar as the scorecard seeks to measure the true facts of whether a project is achieving the steps en route to its overarching objective, the scorecard’s validity will increase for projects with specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely (SMART) objectives. For projects without such objectives, measuring progress will likely always be a subjective matter. Thus, we would encourage Pact to help all its grantees and projects develop SMART objectives through the type of hands-on capacity-building assistance in which Pact excels as an implementing partner.

Another acknowledged drawback is that the scorecard does not capture the prevention of backsliding or negative change. Simply maintaining the status quo is an accomplishment in many governance situations, but the scorecard cannot measure this adequately. While we considered including negative numbers on the scale, we decided that respondents would be loath to use them. This may remain an inherent weakness in the scorecard design, unless Pact later finds a way to eliminate this challenge.

Lastly, in our consultations with MERL officers, we discovered that there is a desire to map out the various sectors in which Pact is implementing a governance approach. This may easily be incorporated into the governance scorecard and/or the global governance indicator 1.0, if Pact develops a list of those sectors it seeks to identify and provides checkboxes for each one on the indicator protocol. In our research, we found that there was not yet a consensus on the sectors for which Pact would like to collect this information, and thus we did not include the checkboxes for relaying such information on our final version of the scorecard.
Appendices
## Appendix A: List of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Names, Positions, Project</th>
<th>Interviewer(s)</th>
<th>Date, Time, Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Nirinjaka (Niry) Ramasinjatovo, Director of Programs and Dr. Zo Maharavo Rasoloarivelvo,</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Mon 2/13/12, 8 am EST, Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Mauro Tadiwe, Country Director</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Thurs 2/16/12, 6 am EST, Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Roland Kovats,</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Mon 2/13/12, 6 am EST, Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Jacquie Ndiragu -M&amp;E Officer, Rosithwa (M&amp;E Officer)</td>
<td>Besian</td>
<td>Thursday 2/17/12 9 am EST, Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Metalign Ayehu, M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Officer e-mailed suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Rachel Dubois</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Tues 2/14/12, 2 pm EST, at Pact’s DC office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Robinson Chikowero, M&amp;E officer</td>
<td>Besian</td>
<td>Fri 2/17/12, 2am EST, Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>James Collins, DG officer</td>
<td>Jennifer and Travis</td>
<td>Wed 2/8/12, 4 pm, at Pact’s DC office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Nina Bowen, DG Director</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael Besian, Travis</td>
<td>April 11, In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Brown Bag Presentation with 10 Pact HQ Staff</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael Besian, Travis</td>
<td>April 13, In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Yulia Yesmukhanova, MERL Officer</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 13 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Irina Nikolenko Program Officer</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 13 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Irina, DCOP</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 13 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Center for Independent Political Research</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 14 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Institute for Economic Policy and Research</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 14 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Democratic Initiatives</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>March 14 In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation/Team</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Pact M&amp;E Team: Hannah Kamanu (MERL Officer), Chris Wakube (Program Officer), Geoffrey Muga (MERL Officer)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Pact KCSSP DG Team: Felicia Muyia-Odada (Program Officer), Lynette Ochola (DCOP), Beverline Ongaro (Program Officer), Loise Maina (Program coordinator), Jared Ontita</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Pact KCSSP and PEACE II PB Teams: Ahmed Mohammed (Senior Program Advisor), Alice Achoki, Godfrey Olewe (Program officer), Nikolai Hutchinson (DCOP)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>ADVANCE &amp; LEAD (via Skype): Ahmed Mohammed (Deputy Country Representative), Ibrahim Sanusi (MERL Officer).</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>National Council of Churches Kenya (NCCK)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Genesis Arts Creation (GAC)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Association of Professional Societies of East Africa (APSEA)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Matatu Welfare Association (MWA)</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>ABANTU</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Center for Rights, Education and Awareness (CREAW)</td>
<td>Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Foundation for Women’s Rights</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Pact Peace II PB Team: Nikaloi</td>
<td>Jennifer, Michael, Besian</td>
<td>March 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:  Interview Guides

Interview Guide: Preliminary Discussions with Individual Countries

Category 1: Opinions on the global indicator V. 1.0
1. Are you in favor of the indicator or opposed to it? Why?
2. How feasible was collecting the data for the global governance indicator?
   a. In terms of time?
   b. Effort?
   c. Understanding of the process?
3. In your opinion, did the global indicator measure something useful and/or meaningful about Pact’s governance work?
   a. Was the actual data collected useful and/or meaningful?

Category 2: Suggestions for improvement in V. 2.0
4. Where do you feel improvements can be made on the last indicator?
   a. On what is being measured?
   b. On how it gets measured?
5. What one statement could you use to effectively capture what your program has done this year? In other words, what would be a measure of success in your opinion?

Category 3: Dialogue on GW Team’s specific ideas for improvement in V. 2.0
6. Do you see benefits or challenges of including a governance module into the Capacity Development Index that was rolled out last year as another global indicator? (As opposed to a separate measuring protocol)
7. Regarding Demand vs. Supply sides of governance, we know this was a key topic in the first debates surrounding the governance indicator. Many of PACTs (even non-governance projects) try to measure the demand side. We are trying to broaden the scope and make it more inclusive of both results. Do you have suggestions for capturing both sides of the governance coin?

Category 4: Next Steps
8. What else would you like us to know or consider?
9. As we move forward with this research, would it be valuable for you to compare your answers to these questions to other countries’ answers? In other words, what would be most valuable for you in terms of seeing the process or participating further?
Interview Guide: Field Research

Date
Organization:
Location:
Organization’s mission:
Introductions:
We’re here to discuss the revision of Pact’s global governance indicator. We’ve solicited input on this indicator over the past several weeks to create the options we’re presenting here, and we’re talking with you now to dig deeper into your thoughts and opinions for what measuring tools best capture your governance work. Our end goal is to present Pact with an option for a revised indicator that is relevant and feasible, but also highlights your added value to the governance sector in Kenya/Ukraine.

Governance Indicator 1.0

1. Looking at the current indicator, how would you better define the term “initiatives”?
2. Looking at the current indicator, how would you better define the term, “positive state society engagement”?
3. If the current indicator remains in use for the coming year, what would you like to see different about it?

Governance Scorecard:

1. Do you see your governance work represented in at least one of these components?
2. Do you have suggestions for edits or additions to these components?
3. How would you define these components to make them relevant to your governance work?
4. We would like to develop a scale that enables you to show progression in improving governance in these component areas over time. Do you have suggestions for what a low and/or high score would represent on this scale?

Next Steps

1. What else would you like us to know or consider?
2. Do you have any questions for us, or suggestions for other stakeholders we should speak with?
Appendix C: Revisions to Original Global Governance Indicator

Number of initiatives that resulted in positive state-society engagement

Results from desk review and feedback solicited on the Global Governance Indicator 1.0 are mixed. Below are the findings and several recommendations that the GI 1.0 can incorporate to help address points of contention, streamline data collection, and enhance the effectiveness of this tool.

Recommendation 1: Definition of Term – “Initiatives”
Further define the term “initiatives,” to include the following list, generated by program officers in Ethiopia and Nigeria: town hall meeting, workshops, trainings, focus group discussions, advocacy visits, advocacy campaigns, seminars, rallies, consultative meetings, contribution to law, public hearing, social network-foi bill, online, stakeholder meetings, exposure visits, events.

Recommendation 2: Definition of Term – “State-Society Engagement”
1. Further explain the term “state-society engagement,” in the protocol. It should better describe the spirit of that phrase, by including the following verbiage:
   a. If you are working with both the state (government) and society (the public, civil society, etc) this should assess whether you saw positive communication, dialogue, representation, or overall improvement in relationships between these two groups.
   b. Even if you are working only with the state (government), not society, this should assess whether you created the conditions or improved the capacity for government actors to better engage with their citizens. This would ultimately lead to positive state-society engagement.
   c. If you are working only with the public, not the government, this should assess whether you created the conditions or improved the capacity for the public and/or civil society to better engage with the state (the government). This would ultimately lead to positive state-society engagement.
2. Replace the term “positive state-society engagement” with “improved governance environment.”

Recommendation 3: Change the Unit of Measurement
Change the indicator unit of measurement from “initiatives” to “Pact projects.” In this way, we pull the unit of measurement up to a higher level. Projects do not include sub-grants. Examples would be UNITER in Ukraine or KCSSP in Kenya. Reporting at this level would allow four advantages:
1. It puts each country or project on equal footing, whereas “initiatives” gave an advantage to those grantees or projects that did more activities
2. This will standardize the unit of measurement. Projects cannot be disputed, whereas initiatives was interpreted and will continue to be interpreted differently by different actors.

3. It is less burdensome to collect. Project staff do not need to ask their grantees for data. They will simply report on whether their project is working on and making progress in state-society engagement.

4. With the addition of sector-specific disaggregation, this will allow Pact to count the number of projects that use a governance approach in various practice areas.

Caveats:
Regardless, the issue of comparing year-on-year data will be difficult.
1. First, if we further define “initiatives,” country programs will be reporting on the indicator differently than they did last year, as they will be including activities and initiatives that they previously did not. Thus, no matter what, the data will be skewed for the second year.

2. Additionally, no matter how many examples are provided, there is no way to make the list exhaustive, and some people will still be unsure of whether or not to report a certain activity or initiative.

3. If the wording is changed to make the unit of measurement the program, then of course the data will not be comparable to the Year 1 data.
### Appendix D: Governance Scorecard

1. The blue boxes below list several principles of good governance. Begin by considering which principles your work influences.
2. In the yellow boxes beneath the principles relevant to your work, score the level of progress toward your project goals on a scale of 1 to 5.
3. In the white boxes, or on a separate sheet if necessary, please provide an explanation and/or example that supports the score you chose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation/Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government and bearers of public trust operate in a way that it is easy to see what actions are performed and the public is able to access, comprehend, and utilize this information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government and bearers of public trust are responsible for actions, decisions and policies, and citizens are able to hold them to account for effective and honest performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity &amp; Fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>All people - including women, youth, and the disabled - expect and are provided equal access to justice, distribution of resources, protection of rights under the law, and the opportunity to fully participate in political, economic, and cultural life, regardless of ethnicity or regional identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness &amp; Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government and bearers of public trust provide quality services, policies, and justice in a timely manner in response to public needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation. The public – as individuals and in civil society groups - fully engages with the government and bearers of public trust in the pursuit of transparency, accountability, equity, and responsiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant stakeholders are engaged in effective peacebuilding processes that address and reduce the driving factors of violent conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Governance Scorecard Protocol**

**Description and rationale:**
The governance scorecard measures positive changes in governance directly resulting from Pact’s activities. The indicator measures Pact’s governance work in all topical areas (health, livelihoods, natural resource management, markets and capacity development), including peace building, civil society engagement and local governance/decentralization. The scorecard breaks down governance into six key principles most relevant to Pact’s global activities. Each principle is provided with a definition representing the ideal positive enabling environment for good governance. The scorecard is not intended to measure governance on a broad national level; rather, it measures the contributions from each Pact partner engendering positive changes toward ideal governance enabling environments.

**Data Source and Collection Method:**
The scorecard’s unit of measurement is Pact partner organizations. Country offices should complete a single score card for each partner whose work affects governance. Country Officers should work in collaboration with partners to complete the scorecard. If a partner works on multiple activities, they should use their best judgment to determine one score for each sector of governance on the scorecard. The individual scorecard data can then be aggregated into one country number for each listed criteria.

**Instructions:**
Below are three potential methods to collect information for the Scorecard. Each method is based on a different set of conditions that program staff could potentially encounter. The options are not ranked in any order of preference.

- Facilitated focus groups with a sample of partner organizations each filling out the scorecard for their initiative, but also producing one, combined set of scores for each focus group to get a consensus score
- Meeting between Pact program officer and partner (i.e. during a routine site visit) to complete scorecard together
- Individual partner organizations fill out the scorecard on their own with feedback and validation from the Pact Program Officer

**Guidelines:**
1) The unit of measurement is the partner, not the activity, so activities for each organization should be combined and one number should be provided for each principle that organizations influence.
2) Partner organizations should report on the sectors of governance in which they believe they work. After carefully reviewing the definitions and examples, partner organizations should rate from 1 – 5 the perceived amount of progress that their organization has made this year towards the selected element. If an organization does not work in the selected element, mark “not applicable or N/A” and continue on to the following elements. Not everyone will fill in a score for all six components.
3) Some years may see very little positive change in one component, even when much effort has been put forth. That is okay, and it is still important to note “no change” instead of “not applicable.” In this way, if positive change is noted the following year, the scorecard will be doing its job to measure year-on-year progress toward governance goals.

4) Partners will then justify their numerical ranking in the space provided for qualitative data to the right of the number box. A brief description of why the partner chose that specific number, challenges faced and other pertinent information can be included.

5) If a facilitator is being utilized for a focus group dialogue is to be encouraged and a consensus score should try to be achieved.

Definitions of key terms:

**PACT-supported work** – Any work supported by Pact technical assistance or funded by Pact grants -- initiatives, programs, or projects; this work could be fully supported by Pact or partially supported by Pact with another source.

**Change** – An alteration of the status quo in any of the above governance areas. To your best judgment, such change should be a direct result either fully or in part of Pact-supported work, and should relate to the geographical and demographical areas where such activity takes place.

**Bearer of public trust** – Elected or appointed officials, or traditional authorities in the public realm, including the legislative, judicial, executive, and agencies independent of the executive branch at the national, district or local level.

**Public** – Individuals and communities at large, inclusive of all disadvantaged and under-represented minorities, formal and informal civil society organizations, media, and other entities with a stake in the public realm.

**Public Needs** – Public demands addressed to office-holders that require government action, as stipulated by law or by popular request. Such demands correspond with a direct and reasonable need for members of the public to conduct a healthy and prosperous life.

**Accountability** refers to the process of holding individual agencies and organizational actors to account for executing their power according to certain standards. Accountability has two elements - answerability (the obligation to give an account of actions) and enforceability (sanctions, or consequences for failure to give account and failure to fulfill obligations). Both dimensions require transparency, for in the absence of reliable and timely information there is no basis for demanding answers or for enforcing sanctions.

**Responsiveness:** refers to a type of behavior, extent to which public policies and institutions respond to the needs of citizens and uphold their rights, including human rights/liberties, access to basic public services, pro-poor policy, equality, regulation and corruption.
Examples of activities for each element of governance.

Note: These are not all inclusive, but meant to give a sense of the types of activities that may fall under each category.

Transparency:
- Supporting processes of drafting or revision, adoption, and implementation of legislation related to public information, government openness, and Public or CSO capacity to scrutinize government and public officials, and their actions
- Advocacy for and/or technical support to government for greater disclosure, accessibility, demystification of budget and expenditure data, strategies and activities, performance information
- Stakeholder consultations
- Informational community workshops and campaigns
- Strengthening communication channels and independent media

Accountability:
- Technical assistance to support government accountability mechanisms (performance monitoring, supervision systems, monitoring of frontline worker performance)
- Election and referendum activities
- Working to establish or improve vetting processes for public officials
- Supporting watchdog entities (NGOs or public agencies) and related legislation
- Activities that mobilize citizens to demand better accountability
- Local government hearings or town hall meetings
- Activities that provide space for leaders and citizens to dialogue and interact
- Standard setting, codes of conduct for public officials, including frontline workers

Equity and Fairness:
- Supporting legislation for rights of women, disabled, youth, ethnic minorities and groups, LGBT or other groups
- Public campaigns to demand implementation of such laws
- Educational workshops, activities and campaigns for members of these groups on rights guaranteed by international or national laws

Effectiveness and Responsiveness:
- Technical assistance for public officials in planning, procurement, drafting legislation
- Activities that bridge gaps in service delivery by facilitating equipment, procurement, and/or capacity building
- Providing policy formulation and implementation advice and support for public officials
- Implementation of complaint systems, use of client/citizen feedback mechanisms
- Local government hearings or town hall meetings
- Activities that provide space for leaders and citizens to dialogue and interact
Inclusiveness:
- Campaigns on participation quotas for parliament, local government, or other public offices (could be for gender, youth, disabled, ethnic groups, minorities and other underrepresented groups)
- Get out the vote initiatives
- Reintegration of internally displaced persons

Conflict Transformation:
- Any initiatives that involve peacebuilding objectives such as dialogues, market-based reconciliation, natural resource sharing
- Initiatives to decrease the root drivers of violence such as inequitable distribution or access to resources or tension-creating policies
- Campaigns at national or regional level to address stereotypes about differences among the population
- Working with a country’s Truth, Justice and Reconciliation Commission or the process

Guidelines for 1 to 5 scale
Each score on the scale is meant to represent the incremental stages of change that happen as you work toward a specific project’s goals and objectives. For some, these may be pre-identified project milestones, or other successes that happen prior to achieving the project goal. General guidelines for each score are as follows:

1. No or very limited change; this may be because you are in the start-up phase of the project, or circumstances posed a threat to progress
2. The stage before new opportunities happen, when the preconditions for change are in place; for example:
   - You’re seeing a reduction in the sensitivity of a particular issue, or
   - Effective activities are taking place that build capacity, or
   - You are creating space for activities to occur;
   This level recognizes that especially in areas where just implementing activities is difficult, creating an enabling environment for new opportunities is a significant success.
3. Some tangible change is taking place toward your goals; for example:
   - Perhaps some of your intermediate results are starting to be realized; or
   - New opportunities for change have been created; or
   - There is widespread momentum and support for change among stakeholders

4. Opportunities are starting to build on each other, or intermediary results are being realized, for example:
• Leaders and communities are agreeing on peace protocols, or collective actions for improvements in governance; or
• The legislation for which you have been working to build support is introduced to Parliament; or
• If legislation was already in place at the beginning of the project, it is now beginning to be implemented and enforced

5 Your program’s longer term, sustainable results are secured. This level often cannot be achieved in one year, as it must include:
• The end goals and objectives you laid out in your proposal have been achieved and
• You played a key role in achieving that change and
• There is local ownership of the change so that it is sustainable