Global Partnership for Social Accountability: Long-term Results Evaluative Exercise
Final Report January 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction

The GPSA is gathering, aggregating, and analyzing data on long-term results of closed GPSA projects as an ex-post evaluative exercise. The objective of the exercise is to better understand the sustainability and scale-up of lessons and/or elements of collaborative social accountability processes as part of the GPSA's adaptive learning agenda (based on the GPSA's conception of sustainability, see below). The analyzed dataset was used to test and validate the logic and assumptions of the GPSA's global Theory of Action (ToA) and corresponding Results Framework. The data also provides valuable insight and adds evidence for GPSA communications products, adaptive internal learning, and methods in the GPSA's Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MERL) Guide. The evidence is also relevant for the ongoing independent program evaluation of the GPSA portfolio.

The following document provides a comprehensive summary of the exercise in terms of the process and findings, including preliminary results, the current methodology used, as well as a short guide to navigate the complete dataset.

Conceptualizing sustainability

Based on the past decade of iterations and adaptive learning, the GPSA's conception and approach for promoting and evidencing sustainability takes a systemic strengthening lens. It considers how interventions fit with the system in which they are implemented and to what effects. This approach focuses on interactions rather than siloed actions which is essential to capture sustainability outcomes and scale up processes that may be contingent on downstream actions taken by public sector institutions and/or other priority stakeholders (e.g., funders, other development actors) to adopt, adapt and/or sustain elements of social accountability process, rather than only depend on the civil society actors leading the implementation of social accountability interventions. Furthermore, the GPSA is more interested in the legitimacy of processes and how they are sustained, adapted and/or scaled by others through application of lessons. It also recognizes that sustainability outcomes are not always evidence nor exhaustive at the end of a project when an evaluation is conducted. Therefore, it is important to focus on the likelihood of sustainability (prospective sustainability) rather than only actual sustainability. This conception can differ from other development actor's and evaluation specialist's approaches to measuring sustainability which often focus on wholesale replication or uptake of a project's interventions or collaborative social accountability processes[1]. However, the GPSA does not expect nor design programming with this intention and finds this to be unrealistic. Focusing evaluation of sustainability outcomes in this way risks missing important learning and successes. That said, the most recently updated Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee's (OECD-DAC) criteria[2] for sustainability criteria is more in line with the GPSA's approach, incorporating both a systems lens and prospective sustainability.

Collaborative social accountability processes will evolve with the capacities and needs of beneficiary communities, civil society partners and public sector counterparts. They may, therefore, not resemble the

---

[1] For the GPSA, CSA processes include tools, mechanisms, approaches and practices in a 'package' that is context-specific for each grant project.

[2] For the OECD-DAC criteria, see https://www.oecd.org/dac/thedevelopmentassistancecommitteesmandate.htm

original processes after years of adaptation and replication. In many cases, stakeholders (e.g., communities, CSOs, public sector actors) may not have the resources or political will to continue specific processes, especially if these require ongoing budget allocations. They may instead choose to use lessons to generate their own approaches to collaborative social accountability or adapt the processes that have been used to fit contextual changes. Hence, outcome 4 of the GPSA RF is that "elements of collaborative social accountability processes are taken up by governments beyond individual GPSA projects, "and indicator 4a):in which GPSA counts sustainability in projects where public sector actors and other relevant actors seek to:

      i.Use substantive lessons for improvements of targeted policies, processes, and mechanisms;
      ii.Sustain elements of collaborative social accountability processes after the life of the project;
      iii.Adapt insights from GPSA projects to scale them through programs or policies; or
      iv. Apply elements of collaborative social accountability processes in additional localities or sectors.

Relevant actors include the public sector (any level), INGOs, CSOs, donors, and other development actors in context.

To assess projects on their sustainability at the end-line evaluation stage (and for monitoring purposes), the GPSA developed and tested a specific rubric for this indicator[3], which has been updated for the purpose of this ex-post evaluative exercise. In addition, a corrective measures rubric was developed for this exercise to identify the ways in which the public sector and other relevant stakeholders have used collaborative social accountability processes and contributed to improved service delivery post project closure. Other stakeholders taking corrective measures is an expected medium to long-term result and assumption with the GPSA ToA, and also included as a Program Development Indicator (PDO) in GPSA projects; therefore, these are relevant to track and analyze in the long-term where possible. See annex 1 for both rubrics.

Sampling and Methods

This section provides a brief overview of the sampling approach and methods employed to conduct this exercise. The overall approach combined sampling grant partners/projects, a document review and purposive Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). All this data was triangulated to reach the findings in this report

Sampling

The overall GPSA portfolio includes 33 closed grant projects, beginning with the first Call for Proposals in 2013. In FY22, the GPSA commissioned a retroactive coding of the RF's operational indicators based on 15 past GPSA projects, of which 14 were sampled in this exercise.[1] Inter alia, the coding assessed the performance of the projects in the sample based on the GPSA RF's operational output and outcome indicators using secondary data. This was largely the available project documentation including grant partner reports, Implementation Status Reports (ISRs), Implementation Completion Reports (ICRs), and project evaluations. Based on the available evidence, projects received scores between 1 and 5 (0-100%) on the sustainability rubric, as measured by outcome indicator 4a.

For the purposes of this exercise, convenience sampling was applied, first focusing on the 15 pre-coded projects, and particularly those that scored high on sustainability (see annex 3), to ensure a more efficient process and robust dataset by building on the existing evidence from the first exercise. Projects also needed to have been closed at latest in 2018 to assess long-term sustainability, making a smaller sub-set

of projects eligible. The exercise ultimately included 14 out of potential 15 grant projects. A total of 23 people (representatives of grant partners involved in these projects) were interviewed, as per the table below.

Table 1: Sample of GPSA Projects and Informants

Grant Partner/# of key informants	Project Information
First Call	
1. United Purpose Mozambique [3] (1 informant)	**Title:** Social Accountability Knowledge, Skills, Action and Networking **Country:** Mozambique **Implementation Years:** 2013-2018
2. Expert Grup Moldova (1 informant)	**Title:** Empowered Citizens Enhancing Accountability of the Education Reform and Quality of Education in Moldova Project **Country:** Moldova **Implementation Years:** 2013-2018
Second Call	
3. CARE Morocco (2 informants)	**Title:** LEAD Project Linking Education and Accountability for Development **Country:** Morocco **Implementation Years:** 2014-2018
4. Manusher Jonno Foundation Bangladesh (1 informant)	**Title:** Social Engagement for Budgetary Accountability (SEBA) **Country:** Bangladesh **Implementation Years:** 2014-2017
5. SEND Ghana (3 informants)	**Title:** Improving Budget Accountability in Health and Education Sectors **Country:** Ghana **Implementation Years:** 2014-2018
6. Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid (Cordaid) DRC (3 informants)	**Title:** Reinforcing Social Accountability of Health Services in Bas Congo and South Kivu Provinces **Country:** Democratic Republic of Congo **Implementation Years:** 2014-2019
7. Centro de Información y Recursos para el	**Title:** Tekopora Beneficiaries Empowered to Ensure Social Accountability Project

---

[3] Post project implementation, the CSO, formerly known as Concern Universal Mozambique, changed the name to United Purpose

Desarollo (CIRD) Paraguay (1 informant)	**Country:** Paraguay **Implementation Years:** 2014-2019
8. Yayasan Wahana Visi Indonesia (YWI) (2 informants)	**Title:** Citizen Voice and Action for Government Accountability and Improved Services **Country:** Indonesia **Implementation Years:** 2014-2018
9. Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG) Philippines (2 informants)	**Title:** Guarding the Integrity of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program for the Philippines **Country:** Philippines **Implementation Years:** 2014-2018
10. Globe International Center and All for Education Mongolia (1 informant)	**Title:** Transparency and Accountability in Mongolian Education **Country:** Mongolia **Implementation Years:** 2014-2018
11. Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC) (2 informants)	**Title:** Enhancing Accountability and Performance of Social Service Contracts **Country:** Uganda **Implementation Years:** 2014-2019
Third Call	
12. Oxfam Tajikistan (1 informant)	**Title:** Improving Social Accountability in the Water Sector Through the Development of Quality Standards and Citizen Participation in Monitoring in Tajikistan **Country:** Tajikistan **Implementation Years:** 2016-2018
13. Save the Children Georgia (1 informant)	**Title:** Improved Social Accountability for Bettering Preschool Quality **Country:** Georgia **Implementation Years:** 2017-2020
14. SAHA Madagascar (2 informants)	**Title**: Citizen Involvement in Municipal Service Improvement **Country:** Madagascar **Implementation Years:** 2017-2021

Document Review

The main sources were key relevant GPSA documents (e.g., Theory of Action and Results Framework iterations, learning notes, portfolio reviews); the data and findings report from the operational indicators coding exercise; key informant interviews (KIIs); and specific data related to GPSA social media engagement and the annual partner forums' participants provided by the GPSA Communications Team. In addition, raw data was organized in an excel file for documentation and analysis.

Key Informant Interviews

To assess past projects' sustainability, the team conducted a series of 14 interviews between August and October 2022 with a total of 23 key informants who worked closely on the projects, including lead grant and implementing partners.

The purpose of the interviews was not to generate comprehensive data sets for all GPSA projects, but to collect primary data and mitigate bias with external views from a diverse set of informants.

Interview questions focused on the uniqueness of each project guided by sustainability results, contributions to the GPSA ToA and RF, unintended results, and CSA corrective measures implemented post-project. Questions were further informed by recent literature on scaling social accountability interventions, as captured in the GPSA's MERL Guide. Interviews were semi-structured to maintain comparability across cases whilst ensuring sufficient flexibility to adjust questions to context as necessary. This also allowed respondents to give anecdotes, build excitement and make narratives more compelling and enabled them to elaborate on intangible factors or complex processes that cannot be unpacked easily in written form.

See annex 3 for an overview of the team's work plan, and annex 4 for a sample of the interview guide template.

Limitations

KIIs: There is risk for potential bias amongst KIIs as all were grant partners that have received funding from the GPSA and all expressed interest in re-engagement. There are also inherent asymmetrical power dynamics between a grantee and donor (GPSA). The two primary purposes of this exercise, as stated to the grant partners, were internal learning for the GPSA and increasing grant partner visibility through results stories and communications pieces. The latter could skew grant partner responses as it is possible that grant partners highlight organization successes to increase likelihood of re-engagement.

Documentation for substantiation of results: When applicable, grant partners provided supplement documentation and evidence of their sustainability and uptake examples. However, as not every example was supplemented with documented evidence, this presents a limitation in terms of a lack of external documented verification of all claims and examples provided in interviews.

Overview of Corrective Measures

Corrective measures include actions taken by public sector institutions (and other relevant stakeholders) to resolve specific proximate causes of service delivery failure; improve targeted service delivery in a given sector and context; and prevent them from recurring. It is important to note that the interview guide was

tailored for KIs to expand on the sustainability of the CSA framework rather than the concrete corrective measures that public actors took post project, especially once project funding had terminated. Several grant partners cited concrete examples of corrective measures but the differences in implementation arrangements (political environments, Covid-19, etc.) makes the analysis and robust representation of corrective measures difficult to measure with precision and more evidence would be needed to validate some of the examples provided with higher confidence. However, based on the KIIs, all projects had at least some evidence of corrective measures taken post project. Examples of corrective measures are reflected in the main findings section below.

Table 2: Aggregated sample scores on corrective measures using the rubric

	Corrective Measures Scores	Project names	%
1	No evidence of any corrective measures* taken by public sector actors based on the project's collaborative social accountability process (solutions, recommendations, advice), after the project closed. * Concrete actions to improve public service delivery or policy	N/A	0%
2	Evidence of limited corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (at least 1 but not more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's collaborative social accountability process. However, the evidence is weak therefore confidence in the project contribution is not well-evidenced. *e.g., solutions, recommendations, advice provided and documented	N/A	0%
3	Evidence of limited corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (at least 1 but not more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's collaborative social accountability process. There is good evidence to support confidence in the project's contribution.	Cordaid DRC; SEBA Bangladesh; United Purpose Mozambique	21.4%
4	Evidence of several corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's collaborative social accountability process. There is good evidence to support confidence in the project's contribution.	CCAGG, Wahana Visi Indonesia; Save the Children; Expert Grup Moldova; Oxfam Tajikistan; SAHA Madagascar; CIRD; CARE Morocco; AFIC	78.6%

Main Findings

The table below provides the most referenced findings in the data set. It is important to note that grant partners implemented tailored models of the CSA model to their specific project sector and context, as

intended in the GPSA TOA. Therefore, some findings will have varying relevancy for grant projects. Overall, the data suggests that post-project completion:

- 100% of grant partners are still utilizing CSA elements from the project.
- 100% of grant partners cited evidence of sustained tools from the project.
- 71.4 % of grant partners adopted the CSA model for future programming.
- 42.8% of grant partners cited project expansion/replication into other sectors.
- The majority of grant partners observed concrete uptake of CSA elements by other stakeholders, mostly international organizations.
- One of the most common findings in the samples is grant partners applying project CSA processes to other sectors beyond that of the original project implementation.

Theme	Most Referenced Findings in the Sample

Long-term implementation of CSA processes:
 	
This could include improved staff expertise, organizational capacity and any other work on collaborative social accountability processes
	Social Accountability framework adoption: grant partners cited adopting the CSA framework/model as a guide for current and future programming **71.4% (10/14) of grant projects in the sample**
	
	Internal capacity building on CSA: grant partners cited improved staff expertise and/or training in CSA post project - **42.8% (6/14)**
	
	Replication in other sectors: grant partner has replicated GPSA project-specific CSA elements to other sectors **78.6% (11/14)**
	
	Sustained partnerships brokered by the GPSA during the project: grant partner cited strong working relationships with partnerships brokered by the GPSA
	
	      Other CSO partners: **42.8% (6/14)**
	
	      National Government/ministry level: **50% (7/14)**
	
	      Local Government/public sector actors: **64.2% (9/14)**
	
	Evidence of CSA process adaptation by grant partners: grant partners developed, or modified elements of CSA processes based on the project CSA model. For example, CIRD Paraguay stated that a new online platform was created inspired by elements from the GPSA project online platform. - **57.1% (8/14)**
	
	Difficulty sustaining CSA online platforms: a few grant partners expressed difficulties sustaining the online platform tools developed during project lifetime This could be due to several factors including, Covid-19, capacity gaps, and/or funding. - **21.4% (3/14)**
	
	Gender Sensitive Programing: grant partners cited examples of expanding to women-specific programs and utilizing the CSA framework to support that- **35.7% (5/14)**

	Citizen engagement: grant partners cited increased citizen engagement in local governance since project closure - **64.3% (9/14)** [4]
Continued use of specific CSA tools by grant partners	**Evidence of sustained CSA tools:** grant partner organizations have continued to use the CSA tools (i.e., budget hearings, CSCs, etc.) as developed during project lifetime. - **100% (14/14)**
Continued dissemination of CSA learning and evidence	**Publishing and disseminating of CSA learning materials by grant partners post project**: grant partner organizations have shared learning materials and lessons learned with other relevant stakeholders, including government. - **57.1% (8/14)**
Stakeholder uptake of CSA processes (adoption, adaptation, etc.) Stakeholders e.g., government or international donors, CSOs interest in adopting the collaborative social accountability framework developed during the GPSA project	**Evidence of CSA adoption or uptake by other actors/relevant stakeholders:** **Local government:** KIIs provided specific examples of CSA uptake by local government - **42.8% (6/14)** **National government:** KIIs provided specific examples of CSA uptake by the national government - **57.1% (8/14)** **Other local CSOs**: KIIs provided specific examples of CSA adoption by other CSOs into their programs/projects- **50% (7/14)** **International Organizations and INGOs**: KII provided examples of CSA uptake by non-state actors - **78.6% (11/14) of grant partners interviewed** Grant partners cited CSA incorporation from international donor organizations including: USAID projects with CSA elements: **35.7 % (5/14)** GIZ projects with CSA elements: **21.4% (3/14)** EU projects with CSA elements: **28.6% (4/14)** **Generation of funding for CSA from international donors**: grant partners secured funding from an international donor to continue work on CSA - **28.6% (4/14)** **World Bank Uptake:** World Bank country management units have expressed interest in or integrated CSA in other funded country investments - **28.6% (4/14)**

---

[4] Citizen Engagement as defined by the "Strategic Framework For Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations"
https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/266371468124780089/pdf/929570WP0Box380ategicFrameworkforCE.pdf

Institutionalization of CSA at the national government and policy level	**Institutionalizing CSA elements:** evidence shows the institutionalization or intent to institutionalize CSA by the national government. KII stated that the CSA framework is now protected by national law which ensures its sustainability - **21.4% (3/14)** **Influencing national policies:** grant partner cited examples of national policy influence or input post project. For example, one KII was invited post project to be on the national committee for the National Finance Management System in Ghana. - **42.8% (6/14)**
Corrective Measures Improved public service delivery or policy based on proposed solutions from the project's collaborative social accountability framework	**Examples in the interviews of improvements in service delivery based on CSA feedback** **Evidence of corrective measures:** Evidence of several corrective measures taken by public sector actors (more than 3) after the project closed. - **71.4% (10/14)** Evidence of limited corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (at least 1 but not more than 3) - **28.6% (4/14)**
Unintended results Unintended positive or negative results from the GPSA project or brokered partnerships	**Active participation and engagement from women:** grant partners cited exceptional engagement from women post project. KIIs stated that increased and disproportionate engagement from women contributed to the sustainability of the CSA approach. - **14.3% (2/14)** **Political representation in local government:** community PTA members of GPSA project who were trained and actively engaged in CSA, ran for local office post project and won several seats. KIIs noted that that parents were motivated and empowered through the GPSA experience which gave them the confidence and skillset to run for office and succeed. This was a unique finding that only applied to one sample case. - **7.1% (1/14)** **Skepticism and reluctancy with national government counterparts on CSA:** grant partners cited difficulties in collaborating with the national government on CSA post project. KIIs stated that there was pushback or reluctancy by the national government due to factors including changing political environments, shrinking of the civic sphere, and lack of coordination between grant partner and government counterparts. - **35.7% (5/14)**
Lessons Learned Continued application or reference to lessons learned from the GPSA project	**Fostering multi-stakeholder trust and relationships:** grant partners cited trust-building as one of if not the most important lesson learned for continued application of CSA - **57.1% (8/14)** **CSA capacity building:** grant partners expressed the importance of capacity building for CSA for all relevant stakeholders to ensure sustainability - **28.6% (4/14)**
Recommendations and Reflections	**Difficulties attracting funding to replicate projects:** grant partners cited funding issues as the sole reason for not replicating projects - **35.7% (5/14)**

Overall recommendations and reflections on GPSA operations during project implementation and engagement post project	**Appreciation of GPSA learning exchanges:** grant partners gave positive feedback for the GPSA forum and other learning events - **42.9% (6/14)** **Difficulties coordinating with the WB:** grant partners expressed difficulties in communicating with relevant WB counterparts post project (this could include GPSA Secretariat, TTLs, CMUs etc.) - **21.4% (3/14)**

Overview of Sustainability Results

The table below provides an overview of key actions taken by priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions on adoption, adapt and/or sustain elements of a collaborative social accountability process in other operations, policies, or programs, after the project closed. The table and the accompanying source excel file includes details on the analysis of each project in terms of the sustainability results and respective rubric scores, as captured through KIIs and supporting evidence (where available). It is important to reference the qualitative data available in the file in conjunction with the percentages below to gain a comprehensive understanding of the process and findings. All projects scored 100%. However, a true 100% is distinguished by the grant partner providing supplemental documentation to support the examples provided during the KIIs. One of the most common findings in the samples is grant partners applying project CSA processes to other sectors beyond that of the original project implementation. While it is encouraging that the sample shows so many examples of sustainability, it is important to note that there is still a present challenge of influencing government action. However, the process of integrating or adopting elements of CSA in government is a continuous process. There were more examples of sustainability and uptake by civil society and international donors than government. This poses a question on how projects can work to influence the government for long term sustainability of project programs.

Project	Score on sustainability rubric	Explanation

1.CARE Morocco	Score: 100%
	
	Good adoption of CSA tools and expansion into other sectors and
		SUSAINABILITY
		- Parent Associations (PA) are still meeting each month
		- Project fostered a strong relationship and impact and local and regional level, but have difficulties in building a relationship at the national level
		
		UPTAKE
		Government:
		- Care Morocco succeeding in getting funding from academy level of the Ministry of Education for the Action Plan
		
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		Replication
		- Using existing CSA expertise and adapting it to the education sector
		   o Expansion into the preschool sector, transferred GPSA methodology, expanded to included economic services for women
		- Participatory Assessment and Monitoring Tool (PAMT) designed during GPSA project helped one school post-project select one problem they wanted to solve: improve WASH
		   o Helped them find funding in the private sector to build toilettes in 9 or 10 schools, CARE works with them about hygiene

		Scale: - Conducted impact study with CARE International and the Gates foundation o The study selected 6 schools to see the sustainability of the project, found that the project created a good working dynamic between schools and parents, and Parent Associations (PA) continue to meet each month - Developed scale up designed project for CSA in the education sector and health sector, challenge to attract funding

2. SEBA Bangladesh	Score: 100 %
	
	KII suggests good adoption of CSA tools and processes by government ministries. There is participation from local government officials and higher-level officers in CSA training.
		SUSAINABILITY
		- Continued to use social audits, citizen participation and engagement, participatory planning in the sectors and locations identified during project lifetime
		- 3/5 CSOs that partnered with SEBA during the project have continued to work with the Manusher Foundation to implement CSA mechanisms
		- 45/60 NGO partners of the Manusher Foundation are utilizing social accountability tools in their programming
		- Designed training programs for other CSOs and government counterparts
		   o Training designed for CSA for community representatives
		   o Community leaders at the ground level participated in the Training Program on Orientation of CSA mechanisms
		   o A few high-level officers, community officers, and local administration participated in the training for CSA

		UPTAKE **Government:** - Collaboration with government ministries: the project facilitated the disclosure of information, transparent and open data, participatory beneficiaries, and social audits within their own projects **WB country office** - Manusher Foundation has engaged in dialogue with the WB country office on possibly integrating CSA mechanisms into future programming. Concrete actions have not been taken.
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION - Social accountability mechanisms expanded to be implemented in Manusher Foundation's agriculture extension program, economic empowerment, government services for social safety net programs
3. SEND Ghana	Score: 100% The grant partner has actively sustained partnerships with the national government with received high level recognition and annual budget inputs. The project has created synergies with NGOs to fund other CSA –related projects. The grant partner has expanded CSA programming into other sectors post project closure.	**SUSTAINABILITY** - Social Accountability Manual: manual developed during the project is still the main tool of guidance and framework for SEND's work and available for download on their website - Civic Participation in budget analysis, over 300 people in civil society are trained in budget analysis, almost all SEND staff members are trained in budget analysis - Sustained Partnerships: collaboration with the Ministry of Finance. SEND is still providing inputs to Ghana's annual budget (on invitation from the ministry- post project), sustained partnership with the Ministry of Health - Recognition: SEND has received high level recognition to promote budget transparency and support equity reforms in Ghana's annual budgets - Steering Committee Model: served as a helpful advisory committee with feedback on project implementation and accountability, trying to replicate in other projects. - SEND is the secretariate for the Ghana Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) Platform on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) providing training for 400 members on public expenditure tracking in service delivery for the SDGs
		UPTAKE **Government:** - GPSA Project Coordinator was invited post project to be on the national committee for the national financial management system in Ghana - District Assemblies: cooperation with CSOs on budget work, has continued well beyond project closure

		o Budget Literacy: assemblies adopted budget literacy post GPSA project, various communities are now entitled to inputs in the budget
		        ▪ Focused in particular on the public relations units and social audit units of the assemblies
		    o Assemblies have recognized the value of the input of civil societies and have invited SEND to the DPCU (district planning and coordinating units) made up of sector directors
		    o Many journalists and parliamentarians are doing budget analysis and using it to back their debates
		NGO:
		- USAID funded project "People for Health Project", implemented by SEND Ghana, had a component on budget analysis and transparency, citizen input on the budget, assemblies are required to get citizen participation on the budget, budget literacy.
		    o People For Health (P4H)
		    o Steering Committee model used in project funded by USAID Food Security through Co-operatives in Northern Ghana (FOSTERING)

		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		Scale: - SEND expanded beyond health and education into agriculture and social protections, utilizing the CSA manual as the main framework for projects - SEND in Sierra Leone is using the CSA manual as a guidance tool in their projects for budget transparency and citizen engagement Social Accountability Framework in other sectors: - 7 Publications on the SA framework
4. Cordaid DRC	Score: 100 % Evidence that the GPSA supported an ongoing process of CSA uptake and adoption international NGOs for other projects. Adaptations of CSA modules are used for other Cordaid projects. Discussions with key government actors to collaborate on CSA mechanisms but difficulty in learning exchanges at the state level.	**SUSTAINABILITY**
		- Civic participation and engagement in project design - Multi-stakeholder collaboration has continued o CORDAID is working with the military and police to create dialogue, collaboration, capacity building on accountability mechanisms. CORDAID is in the process of organizing community structures (modeled after CODESA) in the security and justice sector. The objective is to create community structures with matching grants approach as designed by the GPSA project. - CORDAID report on Kivu for the last 10 years (not yet published) frequently quotes and cites the GPSA - In the health sector, CORDAID continues to use CSC - Partnerships with project stakeholders (negotiated by the GPSA) and Comité de Développement Sanitaire (Sanitary Development Committee, CODESAs) remain (particularly in South Kivu). The project aimed to improve the quality and access of primary health care services in DRC by strengthening the capacity of a key local actor, CODESA. CODESA members continue to use CSA tools such as CSC and community audits to facilitate feedback between health facilities and communities.
		UPTAKE
		Government: - Creation and continuation of a Solidarity Fund for community needs that operates even in times of crisis - Often, restitutions/sharing of learning are not well done at the state level. The end of the project has left "a void" that is difficult for the state to fill post project. **NGO:** - UNICEF, USAID, GIZ have all copied the model from the project - In Burundi, CORDAID implemented another project with the EU using lessons learned from the GPSA project
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		Adaptation: - When Covid hit, the CODESAs reinforced during the GPSA project were more active in response to the pandemic. The committees utilized approaches from the GPSA project

		- CSA modules are reinforced and adapted for other projects
		Scale:
		- During project lifetime, the GPSA/CODESA project matched the cash or in-kind contribution (matching grants) of the CODESA/community to fund projects relevant to the well-being of the population and the quality of its health facilities. Since project closure, other matching grants projects have been developed in the security and justice sector.
		   o Modeling community structures for security and justice after project model, including the "matching grants" approach
		- CORDAID utilizes the same approach of CODESA but for the education sector with Comité des Parents d'éleves (COPA). CORDAID expanded performance-based financing (PBF) to education in school management.
		- Cordaid developed another tool for security based on the CSA model: The Local Security Plan
		   o Includes: diagnosis of problems, decision, level of responsibility of the actors. The Local Security Plan is linked to the security policy: CORDAID's aim is to use the Local Security Plan as a framework with the ultimate goal of institutionalization.
		
		Supplementary Documentation Provided:
		   o Community PBF Pilot Project in North and South Kivu: Final Report (French)
		   o Evaluation of the Performance Based Funding Project at Community Level: PBF-C Final Evaluation 2021 (French)

5. CIRD Paraguay	Score: 100%
	
	Evidence was provided showing government uptake of CSA elements by three ministries, continued use of online platform after project closure, and strong reception from government on CSA training.
		SUSTAINABILITY
		- Continue to use methodology from the GPSA, including
		- Model of collaboration which has helped to facilitate working with other NGOS in the public sector
		   o KI states that CIRD is now recognized by other organizations that they engage with as "collaborators" rather than "controllers"
		- The online platform continues to be implemented and reformed according to the Ministry's recent reforms. CIRD is actively analyzing its efficacy. Ministry has asked for the project's data from the past year.
		- Secretariat of Social Action is the organization that implements the TEKOPORA project and continues to use the tools developed in the project; the monitoring platform continues to be used within the Ministry 3 years after project closure
		- The role of women is seen the most in the "consejos communitarios" or the Community Councils, it was observed that women are involved in a more "participatory and proactive" way than before the project
		- The Ministry of Health: continues to use the platform of "management control of finances" from CIRD and GPSA project so that any organization can use it.
		
		UPTAKE
		Government:
		- Ministry of Social Action – used to be the Secretariat of Social Action
		   o Three ministries continue to use the online monitoring dashboard: The Ministry of Social Action, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Education (they manage the dashboard now)
		- Ministry of Planning took up elements from the GPSA project for a project on Open Governance
		   o Open Governance: in the last 2 years, CIRD has dedicated more effort into these open governance programs using lessons learned from the GPSA. CIRD consults with the national government on how to restructure the national program of open governance and to understand what was working and what wasn't, using CSA tools like information monitoring systems
		      ▪ Open Governance Action Plan
		- The Ministry of Health asked to incorporate elements from the GPSA project when it was receiving donations from the private sector during Covid
		- When the new political administration came into power, CIRD worked to onboard the government for approximately 6 months to incorporate the elements of CSA- the new government was very receptive
		NGOS:

		- USAID implemented a project "More Citizenship, Less Corruption" based on elements from the GPSA project on social monitoring. CIRD collaborated with USAID on the project to transfer lessons learned from the TEPOKORA project.
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		Scale: - GPSA lessons learned influenced CIRD's gender unit for implementing programs for women and youth, outfitting them with the tools for social auditing. **Adaptation:** - In collaboration with the Ministry of Health, CIRD developed a platform during Covid to measure and apply private sector donations to strengthen the national health response during the pandemic. CIRD referenced the CSA framework when developing the online platform. o [Online Platform](#)
6. Save the Children Georgia	Score: 100% KII states that the NPA established during project lifetime has since registered as a CSO since project closure. The benchmarking system is sustained and data from the system is used as a baseline indicator at the national level. There is evidence that priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions have sustained/replicated project tools in other sectors.	**SUSTAINABILITY**

		- The benchmarking system established during the project lifetime continues to be used for self-assessment of services of preschools for quality improvement
		- The National Preschool Association (NPA): established by the GPSA project, uses the benchmarking methodology and is now registered as a CSO, governing body
		    o National Preschool Association (NPA) now operates in 40 local self-governing municipalities (27 at project closure)
		    o Out of 42 municipal kindergarten unions, 35 participated in the benchmarking at project closure - and continue to participate
		- The National Preschool Association (NPA) engages with focus groups with parents for feedback: educating parents on what quality kindergarten is and informing government through CSA tool holding them accountable for policies
		- Citizen engagement has increased with benchmarking system, as well as the accuracy of the results. KII stated that before the benchmarking, parents were hesitant to provide feedback to schools. With benchmarking parents are more engaged and feedback is now centered around improved service delivery.
		- Save the Children Georgia (SCG) built capacity for the National Preschool Association (NPA) to sit with kindergartens to discuss the results of benchmarking. The dialogue is ongoing and the NPA has taken over capacity building as they now primarily engage with the preschools.

		UPTAKE
		World Bank: - WB-sponsored project "IQ Project-P168481" on education quality at different levels and expanding access to preschool education. The national government of Georgia is still in the process of implementing the project. The Project Coordinator from the GPSA grant has been hired as a consultant for the WB-sponsored project. She intends to have conversations about implementing benchmarking systems into the project design. **Government:** - Collaborated with the Government and Ministry of Education to scale benchmarking tool - Data from benchmarking has served as baseline indicators for current government monitoring on quality and access to preschool education - New federal law in 2016 on preschool education: preschools are required to develop internal monitoring systems that consider national standards o Preschool education standards were introduced later than expected but the benchmarking system is very similar to the national standards - SCG have collaborated with the Ministry of Education and WB on how the benchmarking tool can be enforced by the government **CSOs:**

		- Civitas (co-implementing partner) has tried to sustain CSA work: partnering with National Preschool Association (NPA) on preschool education projects, projects funded by UNICEF, assessment of covid influence on preschools **NGOs:** - World Vision contacted Save the Children Georgia for gender sensitive approaches in kindergarten programs - Save the Children Georgia is implementing a project with UNICEF on "Alternative Care for Infants with Disabilities." UNICEF and other disability organizations in Georgia requested benchmarking data from the National Preschool Association (NPA)
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		- **Replication:** National Youth Agency developed a platform with SCG for technical and financial support to replicate the benchmarking tool for project "Youth Training and Education for Better Employment"
7. Wahana Visi Indonesia	Score: 100% There is evidence of CSA institutionalization and continuous engagement with government and replication in other regions. Grant partner secured funding from other NGOs to apply programming with CSA incorporation in the entrepreneurship sector.	**SUSTAINABILIT**Y

		- Wahana Visi uses the GPSA CSA model as a guideline for current projects
		- Wahana Visi continues to use documentation (GPSA Monitoring and Evaluation document), videos, and other learning materials to increase capacity building and expertise on social accountability for staff and for WVI partners. In addition, the KII cites the GPSA Forum as a helpful exercise for learning exchanges.
		- Still use learning materials, documentations, and videos from the GPSA to support their partners and staff to implement Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) methodology.
		- Still using community score cards (CSC), which has become the organization's strategy in advocacy
		- All technical programs in districts and villages (health, child health, education, economic empowerment, child protection projects) are still using the Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) methodology.
		- Continue to use GPSA monitoring and evaluation documents to advocate to the national government for institutionalization
		    o WVI produced many learning materials which continue to be disseminated to other CSOs and organizations
		- Continued in GPSA learning events, including GPSA Forum
		- Continued relationship-building based on the network established during the project with the government
		    o Looking to find CSA champions within the National Planning Ministry of Villages
		    o Invited high officials in the National Planning Ministry to the field to see CSA in action, received good feedback
		- Based on learning materials and findings WVI has found that participation of women has increased since project closure because of CSA

		UPTAKE

		Government:
		- The government has institutionalized CSA with implementation in more than 17 districts (growing from the 3 targeted districts during project lifetime), 10 provinces, and 71 villages in 2022.
		- The Ministry of Villages produces a national guideline on Social Accountability using contributions and lessons learned from the GPSA project
		    o The GPSA model is included in the guideline
		NGO:
		- Working with Open Government Indonesia through the National Action Plan on open governance
		- After the GPSA project, WVI secured support from the European Union to expand CVA programs into a new sector, entrepreneurship and business development. The programs focused on economic issues and improving services of village governments through the entrepreneurial/business unit at the village level.
		    o Focusing on strengthening the participation of youth and women using CVA to improve the services of village government through the business unit

		- Grant support from USAID which incorporated the CVA approach in the project - World Vision United States supported WVI in project ("WAS BP") to increase universal governance
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION

		- Based on the results from the GPSA project, WVI looks to strengthen the participation of youth women, and children in other organization projects
		   o Taking a more gendered lens in policy decision making and budgeting with focus on local governance through CVA
		- Replicated in other regions: implementing CSA in 71 villages
		   o [Improving Disaster Management Services](#) through CVA

8. CCAGG Philippines	Score: 100% KII shows evidence of collaboration with other NGOs to promote CSA. Evidence shows potential government uptake through advocacy and "social contract" but has not reached the policy level.	**SUSTAINABILITY** - CCAGG adopted the CSA model for current and future projects - Continued CSA tools: self-monitoring, capacity building for CSOs, community score cards (CSC) - Project Manual: "Enhanced Family Development System" (eFDS) manual still being used in CCAGG programs o Post-project: the manual was disseminated to other regions. Implementing partner, RECITE, was piloting the manual with the GPSA in a few municipalities during the project and were later invited to Region 1 (a subsection of the larger Northern Luzon region) to give an orientation on how CSC to be adopted in the rest of the Northern Luzon region - Since project closure CCAGG has produced other learning materials ranging from manuals, stories, case studies and reports

		UPTAKE
		Local CSO partners from the GPSA using CSC and advocating them to government projects
		
		NGO collaboration: in addition to sustaining GPSA-brokered partnerships with CSOS, CCAGG has collaborated with two other NGOs post project: Government Watch and NGO Network in the region
		   o Government Watch builds capacity on governance and promotes accountability, participation, transparency, and they published the experience
		       ▪ Invited founding member of CCAGG to present the results in Aug 2022
		   o NGO Network have collaborated with RECITE to promote CSA and development work to engage govt.
		       ▪ September 2022, RECITE will present to members on the CSC approach and learning for local level influence
		Local Government:
		   o Beneficiaries from all three local government units identified during the project demonstrated increased participation in recent elections. Trained parent leaders from the project ran for local office and won.
		   o During the project, local government units (LGUs) and parent leaders (PL) entered a social contract that articulated the community vision that community beneficiaries crafted during family development sessions (FDS), with a list of commitments for both parties to agree to. The feedback continues to be presented to LGU officials for consideration and possible inclusion in the Municipal Development Plan. Some LGUs and PLs continue to engage in commitments listed in the social contract
		       ▪ 12 of the 19 of the social contracts have continued beyond the monitoring project
		       ▪ For example, Mapandan's social contract provided for the formation of third-party monitors while Pilar's agreement provided for annual assessments to be initiated and facilitated by a partner CSO
		   o KII states that the process of capacity-building, monitoring and engagement has resulted in a reduction of the 'benefit-gap' and

		a education in service delivery gap, and has improved government responsiveness
		o The Conditional Cash Transfer Program 4Ps that the GPSA project monitored: "4Ps, with all its citizen engagement and accountability features, has been institutionalized through the passage of the 4Ps Law in 2019, ensuring 4Ps' continuity as the government's national poverty reduction program."
		o "Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) consistently improves the Family Development Session as the 4Ps' capacity building program for its beneficiaries."
		▪ [Monitoring the Philippine Conditional Cash Transfer: Gains, Lessons, and Ways Forward](#)
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		- Adapted CSA for their current projects "Building Resilient Communities" with a partner organization from the GPSA project using CSC - RECITE (implementing partner organization): RECITE developed the manual in their own projects and new set of eFDS manual building on the GPSA project
9. Expert Grup Moldova	Score: 100% KII identified that the grant partner has utilized GPSA lessons learned in other projects. There was evidence of scale up with international organizations on CSA. Discussions have been held with the local Government with strong interest in CSA learning guides. However, grant partner has had difficulty moving past local governance level.	**SUSTAINABILITY**
		- Improved team expertise, capacity to engage at the local level with schools and throughout the entire country, increased presence at the local level - Continuation of public hearings by grant partner and local government in the education sector in locations identified during the GPSA project - Continuation of citizens budget instrument: budget is being translated into simple language like an infographic which shows citizens the provisions of budget law - Continued independent budgetary analysis at the local level to inform citizens before going to public hearings which helped build capacity so that citizens can compare their community budgets to other communities
		UPTAKE

		Government:
		- Continue to engage with the government at the local level, 25 local public administrations (LPA)
		- Communication with LPAs is strong
		- After the GPSA and EU-funded project (see below) mayors have shown strong interest in guides and practical instructions on how to organize proper budgets, public hearings and independent budgetary analysis
		NGOs:
		- Following the GPSA project, Expert Grup obtained funding from the EU to implement CSA tools in the budgetary process including public hearings and independent budget analysis. Expert Grup used lessons learned from the GPSA project.
		   o 25 LPAs in the entire country, project ended last year
		   o Scaled to 2 X bigger than the GPSA project
		   o Engaged 700 activists at the local level with CSA tools and developed guides and trainings for LPAs
		- GIZ in Moldova – approached Expert Grup to learn about how they were implementing CSA and they undertook some of these tools for a large anti-corruption project that they are implementing

		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		- Expert Grup organized budget hearings in other sectors like [social protections and cultural heritage](#) to discuss budget accountability and transparency - Utilized lessons learned and practical insights from the GPSA project that helped Expert Grup to better engage with local public administrations (LPA) and civil society at the local level in other projects
		SUSTAINABILITY

10. Oxfam Tajikistan	Score: 100% KII evidence indicates that specific actors have demonstrated actions for CSA uptake or expressed interest/support to it. The project was actively creating synergies with other programs and actors to help with uptake. Evidence of actions taken by priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions to adapt, adopt, and/or sustain elements of CSA in other operations.	- Adopted GPSA Theory of Action model and adapted it to Oxfam Tajikistan as a "Convening and Brokering" model o Oxfam uses their Theory of Action model as their driving force acting as "middlemen" connecting consumers and service providers for improved service delivery - Continuation of community advisory boards - Participated in an [Europe and Central Asia (ECA) forum in in Tajikistan](#) (looking to host more events like this) - Continued capacity building and outreach on SA, community-based monitory system, CSA manuals have been published. Booklets on the learning from the GPSA project have been disseminated to share what CSA means for other CSOs and stakeholders - Citizens have remained active and engaged, understand their roles better, and raise awareness - The increase in engagement and participation of women in the project expressing themselves and giving feedback has contributed to the sustainability of the programming
		UPTAKE
		- The Ministry of Energy and Water Resources is interested in their work because they have seen an increase in payment from consumers **NGOS:** - Asian Development Bank, USAID, Swiss Development Bank, Helvetas Foundation, UNICEF have customized the social accountability approach and are trying to replicate the project model and mechanisms for water management - Oxfam has been contracted by UNICEF as a consultant to advise them on how they can customize CSA in different areas especially in public health, water service delivery, and the agriculture sector
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		- Through the GPSA project Oxfam Tajikistan was able to work directly with women and foster trust which helped inform Oxfam's gendered programming in other projects - **Scale:** Oxfam established their own spin-off organization **Equidev** comprised of staff fully trained in the CSA framework and is actively working with Oxfam's local partners, NGOs, and community-based organizations on CSA - Equidev draws from Oxfam Tajikistan's previous programs and campaigns on social accountability in the WASH sector.
11. SAHA Madagascar	Score: 100% KII states evidence of replication of the project CSA mechanisms in other sectors. GPSA project tools have been adapted for new projects. Evidence shows uptake and dissemination of CSA learning materials at the ministry level.	**SUSTAINABILITY**

		- After the GPSA project "Citizen Involvement in Municipal Service Improvement" (CIMSI), SAHA's work on social accountability became more localized and precise. SAHA has retained influence in local governance through strengthening consultations and dialogue with local government actors.
		- KII stated that the GPSA project influenced the internal strategic approach of the SAHA organization
		- Knowledge and learning from the project helped strengthen and operationalize local consultation structures. The learning has been valuable for other SAHA projects, internal staff expertise on adaptive management, and structuring monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approaches
		   o 2-3 other SAHA projects have applied GPSA CSA approach
		- Since project closure, SAHA has developed a closer relationship with the Ministry of Education because SAHA is recognized as an NGO well placed to talk about citizen participation.
		   o SAHA is recognized as an important player and leader in encouraging reflection on participatory democracy, particularly at the municipality level
		- Continue to apply the approach of transparent management, and multi-stakeholder involvement
		- CIMIS initiated the local consultation structure which facilitated the connection between the community and the local government
		   o Example: when SAHA returned to the municipalities where SAHA worked with CIMSI, the municipalities still value the budget

		transparency tools + the complaint management tools + the local consultation structures continue to meet periodically.
		UPTAKE
		Government: - At the end of the CIMSI project, SAHA developed a strengthening local consultations structures (SLCS) guide/kit: which is used by the Ministry of Health; the guide is distributed by the Ministry for technical partners working on governance in participatory planning and budgeting. - The Ministry of Decentralization invested using the WB fund and SAHA utilized CIMSI to do data collection and develop learning materials beyond the duration of the project - CIMSI worked within the legal framework of participatory budgeting policies that had already been institutionalized in Madagascar. This facilitated continued support by the government for CIMSI beyond project closure **NGO:** - SAHA has worked with UNESCO International on a case study regarding local consultation structures (LCS) at the municipal level based on experiences in the education sector. The GPSA and mechanisms from the project were cited in the study. o [SAHA Case Study (French)](#)
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		Replication: - SAHA projects including CSA in health and education sectors as well as project working on solar energy in municipalities - Other projects including CSA: Project on securing of land rights and the management of natural resources: enhancement of local consultation structures **Adaptation** - CIMISI tools have been adapted for new SAHA projects, project municipalities were chosen from CIMSI project municipalities - SAHA adapted processes (tools and citizen assessments) and scaled them to be used in new municipalities. Have seen the best collaboration with the Ministry of Health - SAHA has prepared a study to identify ways that digital technology can improve citizen consultation **GPSA project #2**: "Strengthening Community and Municipality Co-Engagement for Better Basic Health Services (SMS) and solar energy project were influenced by CIMSI - Project #2 has seen most influenced in the health sector - produces better data than other ministries
12. TAME Mongolia	Score: 100% CSA elements from the grant project have seen strong uptake by Government, CSO partners, and NGOs. The grant partner has expanded services to new areas of project implementation and has adapted CSA tools to other projects.	**SUSTAINABILITY**
		- The concept of constructive engagement has guided their work and is still being used at the school, local, and now national level. The model established during the project helped facilitate engagement with government ministries, provincial government, and parliament. TAME is recognized by the government as a partner. - Have seen improved engagement with school principals since project closure on GPSA project training activities on accountability o For example, TAME has started to work with school principals on trainings for bullying prevention programs. Post project there is now more coordination and dialogue between principals, teachers, and parents. - Initiated capacity building programs on CSA for young local parliament members - All staff are trained in CSA - TAME receives requests from schools to form PTAs but funding is lacking - TAME's member organizations and representatives work as facilitators of CSA, when they conduct trainings, they include the CSA framework
		UPTAKE

		- **Two main amendments** were made by the Ministry of Education after the project using lessons learned from the project on parent engagement and mobilization for the education goal "Education Sector Medium Term Development Plan." TAME engaged with parliament in the amendment of this goal.
		   o The amendment included
		      ▪ Increasing parent involvement in school activities (planning, budget, governance). The Plan includes integrated actions to promote child development through active participation of parents and guardians including "parent education programs."
		      ▪ Implementing collective assessment of schools on physical, psychological, governance criteria
		- Post Project: Increased legitimacy of TAME and collaboration with government:
		   o The organization now participates in working groups and drafting committees with the Minister of Education
		   o In 2022, TAME was invited by the Ministry of Education and Department of Education to observe and monitor the budget processes in school to then identify the gaps (using GPSA tools) and present the findings back to the Ministry of Education to amend their budget processes
		- Increased listening to TAME:
		   o A representative from the Ministry of Finance who sat on TAME's steering committee is now the head of the budget department in the Ministry of Education and adopts CSA mechanisms
		- Since project closure, TAME has increased access to government
		   o Last month TAME was invited to discuss the national budget for education for the first time
		NGOs:
		- The National School PTA was invited to consult GIZ on a project to improve the insulation of dormitory buildings to monitor the budget process
		- TAME organized 8 public hearings at the local and provincial level for inclusive education policy on students with disabilities (Open Society Forum funded)

		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
		- The organization has now expanded into new areas of project implementation, using the model GPSA-constructed model, to provide services to deaf people and ethnic minorities, and bullying prevention programs - Budget Trust Tool: the project tool was remodified. Proved to be successful in schools in schools, facilitating teacher salary engagement o Data compiled from the Budget Trust Tool on budget tracking was compiled and findings and recommendations were submitted to the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance. School funding has improved since then. - Secured funding from a regional coalition for youth constituency building for the mobilization of marginalized youth. The group formed a club that now engages with local government (with the smallest administrative unit in Mongolia) to improve their living conditions and life-long learning opportunities. The group then started working at the district level with elected local parliament members. The group uses CSA methodology - During project lifetime, a representative from the Anti-Corruption Agency sat on their steering committee. Since project closure, TAME collaborates with the Independent Agency Against Corruption using CSA tools to decrease corruption and bribes in education
13. United Purpose Mozambique	Score: 100% KII and supporting documents show evidence of uptake	**SUSTAINABILITY**
		- Provinces have continued to work on CSA o Continue to use social audits and public hearing processes – United Purpose has found that a more narrative-based approach is helpful to promote trust building in communities and allow for storytelling. - The GPSA project has influenced the global United Purpose organization on proper capacity building for social accountability

	from international organizations and replication of CSA in other sectors. Grant partner expressed difficulty on steps to institutionalization and government uptake.	- Program managers went to Washington, hosted webinars, with other countries in the region, resources have been shared. Big push from the World Bank has facilitated a much better understanding of CSA at the global level than at the country level, direct relationship with Washington worked well
		UPTAKE
		Government: - Institutionalization of social accountability has been a challenge due to shrinking civic space in and increased government oversight over NGOs in Mozambique. In response, UP allows government to take the "driver's seat" and consults with government through constructive engagement on government-led programs to institute CSA mechanisms for improved service delivery. Government-led programs are seen as less critical, less intrusive, more sustainable. o Small steps have been taken towards institutionalization but still have to navigate complex government landscape **NGO:** **Three projects linked to CSA:** - UNDP: decentralization for development regarding the new decentralized structure in Mozambique. The project is more general, not sector linked, focused on different tiers of government, and quality of infrastructure. - Swiss Agency for Development Corporation and UNCDEF: funded UP project aimed to strengthen public services (particularly water sanitation and hygiene), engaging in constructive dialogues (2014-2026) (see **Scale** below)
		SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION

		- UP integrated CSA lessons learned in climate projects focusing on sustainable livelihoods and sustainable landscapes
		- **Scale:** United Purpose (UP) is currently implementing a project entitled 'Boosting Equitable Development through Citizen Participation and Social Accountability' 2021-2024. The project is part of the Support Program to Municipalities and District Governments, funded by the Swiss Embassy and implemented by UNCDF and United Purpose.
		    o The project will use CSA tools including social audits and public hearings and works in partnership with citizens in target districts and municipalities organized in Social Accountability Monitoring Committees (SAMComs). The project targets three districts (Lago, Lichinga, Mandimba).
		    o Mandimba District: 14 SAMCom members participated (7 women, 7 men)
		    o Lago District: 9 SAMCom members participated (2 women, 7 men)
		    o Lichinga District: 6 SAMCom members participated (2 women, 4 men)

14. Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC)	Score: 100% KII evidence shows different parts of the Government have taken forward elements of the CSA processes into their wider operations including promoting government inclusivity and public safety during elections, influenced by the experience and learning from the	**SUSTAINABILITY**
		- The partnership brokered during the project between the government and AFIC has continued and improved since project closure, particularly with the Ministry of Finance - AFIC and the government continue to use the online platform designed by the GPSA project: o Government continues to publish data on the Procurement Portal - Training manuals still being used – Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) requested that AFIC train their grantees using the tools from the project - Learning from the GPSA project informed AFIC's 5-year strategic plan, particularly on one major objective of promoting transparency and accountability
		UPTAKE
		Government: - Increased listening from and collaboration government:

project. Evidence was provided of actions taken by priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions to adapt, adopt, and/or sustain elements of CSA in other operations	o KII states that there is no major policy or initiative on public procurement that is done by the government without consulting AFIC first
	- The system of citizen monitoring and feedback became more structured based on GPSA project tools. Feedback on the portal became less about blaming government official and is now focused on improving service delivery. As a result of the improvement of feedback quality, AFIC has been able to implement an agenda focusing on promoting inclusiveness of women and youth in government
	    o Based on the recommendation from AFIC, the government has agreed to restructure the public disclosure feedback system in a gender disaggregated manner
	- The government created the Public Procurement Policy Forum (convened by the Ministry of Finance) which brings together key government agencies, the World Bank, and African Development Bank. The government appointed UP to be one of two CSOs represented in this space.
	- AFIC had no policy objectives during the project. Post project AFIC is now pushing for policy amendments regarding open contracting. AFIC was able to promote the inclusion of open contracting in the Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act.
	- AFIC has seen more government policies change to promote inclusivity. In addition, they have noticed more civil society collaboration with the Ministry of Finance.
	NGO:
	- DGF- specifically asked them to train their grantees on accountability
	
	SCALE/REPLICATION/ADAPTATION
	Scale:
	- Other Sectors: education, agriculture, infrastructure, promoting public access to information in elections
	- AFIC is implementing related initiatives on public procurement and disclosure in 5 other countries: Kenya, Malawi, Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda
	    o AFIC is working with each country on promoting disclosure, social accountability, and contract monitoring
	Adaptation:
	- Contracts Monitoring Tool: the tool was originally on paper. GIZ has adopted and transformed the tool into an online app and disseminated it

Aggregated total	**Score of 100%**: 100% of grant projects (14/14 grant projects) While all projects scored 100%, it is important to note that they are not equivalent. While some projects had many more examples, the rubric scores projects individually, not in comparison to each other.

Sustainability Score Comparisons: pre and post exercise

The table below shows the aggregated results of the KIIs. The re-engagement with grant partners over the course of this exercise highlights the sustainability of the GPSA CSA framework, years after projects have closed. The exercise shows that results are subject to change over time and tracking the sustainability of the CSA approach is important to validate the GPSA TOA.

Sustainability scores	Grant Projects: GPSA RF's operational output and outcome indicators	Grant Projects: GPSA Long Term Results Exercise
1 (0%)	N/A	N/A
2 (25%)	CARE Morocco; SEBA Bangladesh	N/A
3 (50%)	SEND Ghana; Cordaid DRC; Save Georgia; CIRD Paraguay	N/A
4 (75%)	Wahana Visi Indonesia; Expert Grup Moldova; CCAG Philippines; Oxfam Dominican Rep	N/A
5 (100%)	Oxfam Tajikistan; AFIC Uganda; United Purpose Mozambique; TAME Mongolia; SAHA Madagascar	Oxfam Tajikistan; AFIC Uganda; United Purpose Mozambique; TAME Mongolia; SAHA Madagascar; Wahana Visi Indonesia; Expert Grup Moldova; CCAG Philippines; SEND Ghana; Save Georgia; CIRD Paraguay; CARE Morocco; SEBA Bangladesh; Cordaid

Observations and recommendations

The following table provides some observations that the consultant documented throughout this exercise regarding the process, knowledge management, data access and quality. Where relevant or possible, recommendations referenced below could inform the GPSA Secretariat on future data/evidence collection, Results Framework assessments, and evaluations. These should be read alongside the report and table of observations and recommendations provided for the GPSA Long Term Results assessment exercise.

Topic	Observation	Recommendation
Access and availability of evidence/data	Due to the nature of the exercise, re-engagement after a few years since project closure can limit the robustness of data. Grant partners may have difficulty recalling specific examples that may be relevant to the exercise.	Increasing frequency of re-engagement with former grant partners to better understand the trajectory and uptake of CSA. This could include highlighting grant partners in communications pieces and cross promoting their progress on social media.
Uptake of CSA by government	While there were concrete examples of CSA uptake by government, most examples came from other CSOs, international organizations, and INGOs. KIIs expressed	The GPSA to do more investigation, targeted learning and evaluation on this specific challenge of uptake and

	that finding champions of the CSA framework is necessary but difficult for its uptake by government.	sustainability by government at the local and national levels.
KII coordination and representation	Coordinating with grant partners for KIIs took time as grant partner contacts have been subject to change post project. Since the window for the conduction of KIIs was small, grant partner interviews were prioritized based on availability. Thus, KIs were not representative of all relevant stakeholders within each project.	To facilitate communication with grant partners it is important to consistently update grant partner contacts with the most relevant and available stakeholders involved in project implementation.
GPSA grant partner feedback on WB/GPSA support	Many grant partners said that there was little engagement between their CSO and the World Bank country office post project closure. Some expressed difficulty in maintaining open lines of communication and follow up engagement with the GPSA team at WB headquarters. While grant partner feedback is helpful, the donor/grantee dynamic can create social desirability bias.	To gather more data and insights from grant partners, an annual anonymous survey could be disseminated to better understand the ways in which the GPSA and WB can improve engagement with former, current, and future grant partners.
GPSA learning events	Grant partners expressed positive engagement with current GPSA learning events such as the Annual Grant Partner Forum and the Grant Partner Workshop. Most expressed interest in more learning events to facilitate the sharing of best practices and lessons learned amongst current and past grant partners.	The GPSA can increase the visibility and success of former grant partners in the social accountability sphere through consulting with the communications GPSA team to design more interactive learning events.

Annexes

Annex 1: Sustainability and Corrective Measures Rubric

Sustainability and Scale Rubric for analysis, scoring and aggregation of sample ex-post

Score	Description

1	No evidence of any use/application/adaptation of element(s) of or insights from a collaborative social accountability process by any priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions after the project closed. No evidence of any stakeholder interest, dialogue of alignment post-project. In this instance, a score of 0% would be provided and considered as 'no uptake'.
2	Evidence of interest expressed by priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions publicly or privately about learning from a collaborative social accountability process after the project closed. In this instance, a score of 25% would be provided.
3	Evidence that priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions identified where to adopt, adapt and/or sustain elements or insights from a collaborative social accountability process and how this could be incorporated in some way into other operations, programs, policies (i.e., concrete entry points have been identified), after the project closed. In this instance, a score of 50% would be provided.
4	Evidence of that priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions identified how to adopt, adapt and/or sustain elements of the collaborative social accountability process in their operations, policies, or programs, after the project closed. In this instance, a score of 75% would be provided.
5	Evidence of concrete actions taken by priority stakeholders and/or public sector institutions on adoption, adapt and/or sustain elements of a collaborative social accountability process in other operations, policies, or programs, after the project closed. Triangulation of data with at least 2 sources of evidence to confirm this is required. In this instance, a score of 100% would be provided.

Annex 2: Corrective Measures Rubric

In the context of the GPSA and informed by collaborative social accountability mechanisms, corrective measures are actions taken by public sector institutions (and other relevant stakeholders) to resolve specific proximate causes of service delivery failure; improve targeted service delivery in a given sector and context; and prevent them from recurring. Identifying what corrective measures have been taken by grant partners is useful in contributing to the sustainability of collaborative social accountability.

Score	Description
1	No evidence of any corrective measures* taken by public sector actors based on the project's collaborative social accountability process (solutions, recommendations, advice), after the project closed. * Concrete actions to improve public service delivery or policy
2	Evidence of limited corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (at least 1 but not more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's

	collaborative social accountability process (). However, the evidence is weak and therefore confidence in the project contribution is not well-evidenced. *e.g., solutions, recommendations, advice provided and documented
3	Evidence of limited corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (at least 1 but not more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's collaborative social accountability process. There is good evidence to support confidence in the project's contribution. Triangulation of data with at least 2 sources of evidence to confirm this is required.
4	Evidence of several corrective measures* taken by public sector actors (more than 3) after the project closed. These are plausibly linked to the project's collaborative social accountability process. There is good evidence to support confidence in the project's contribution. Triangulation of data with at least 2 sources of evidence to confirm this is required.

Annex 3: Work Plan

July 18th – 22nd	Review & Finalization of the method and interview guide Review of coded dataset to pull out relevant project findings Consultant reaches out via email to grant partners to schedule interviews • An excel sheet will be populated with rolling interviews to keep track of grant partner response
July 25th – Aug 15th	Consultant will conduct interviews with grant partners (15 projects) and keep notes and recordings Each interview guide will be slightly adapted for the project in question Interviewees will be asked to provide additional documents/contacts to verify results where possible
Aug 16th – Sept 15th	Analysis of interviews with input from Lukas and Alix, subject to Ann-Sofie's review A survey or extra interviews may be considered depending on the data quantity and quality received Decide on which projects will be for results and technical briefs
Sept 16th – Sept 30th	Draft the aggregate findings document Technical briefs and results stories (ongoing until complete)

Annex 4: Project sustainability scores in the previous coding exercise

Sustainability scores/quality of data	Project names
1 (0%)	N/A
2 (25%)	CARE Morocco; SEBA Bangladesh
3 (50%)	SEND Ghana; Cordaid DRC; Save Georgia; CIRD Paraguay

4 (75%)	Wahana Visi Indonesia; Expert Grup Moldova; CCAG Philippines; Oxfam Dominican Rep
5 (100%)	Oxfam Tajikistan; AFIC Uganda; Concern Mozambique; TAME Mongolia; SAHA Madagascar

Types of uptake based on indicator 4a) for the sample	Based on the project coding, GPSA projects that meet the outlined components of indicator 4a are categorized below. Some projects fulfill more than one component, and the list is not exhaustive.
I) Used substantive lessons for improvements of targeted policies, processes, and mechanisms	Concern Mozambique, TAME Mongolia, AFIC Uganda Wahana Visi Indonesia, Expert Grup Moldova
II) Sustained elements of collaborative social accountability processes after the life of the project	Tame Mongolia, Oxfam Tajikistan Expert Grup Moldova, Oxfam DR
III) Adapted insights from GPSA projects to scale them through programs or policies	Concern Mozambique, Tame Mongolia, SAHA Madagascar, AFIC Uganda, Oxfam Tajikistan Wahana Visi Indonesia, CCAG Philippines
IV) Applied elements of collaborative social accountability processes in additional localities or sectors	Concern Mozambique, Tame Mongolia, SAHA Madagascar, AFIC Uganda, Oxfam Tajikistan, CCAG Philippines

Annex 5: Interview Guide

Brief introduction of myself and my role

The purpose of this interview is to gain insight on how grant partners have utilized GPSA collaborative social accountability processes and mechanisms after project competition. We're interested in hearing about how grant partners have implemented lessons learned from projects and if any CSA elements have been sustained and/or scaled to other sectors, stakeholders, regions etc. There is a wide range of options for grant partners seeking sustainability.

Thank you **(participant name _____)** for agreeing to participate in this interview today the **(day_____)** of **(month_____) (year___)**. This interview is being conducted on behalf of the World Bank with the GPSA as the commissioning organization. During this interview, I will be asking open-ended questions. There are no right or wrong answers, therefore please respond to the best of your ability. Feel free to state or draw attention to any point of relevance or to abstain from answering any questions.

The interview is informal and confidential, and we will not reference you by name unless we specifically ask to quote you. It should last about 45 minutes. Are you comfortable with me recording the interview, solely for note taking purposes? Recordings will not be shared beyond the GPSA consultants/staff directly working on this assignment.
Do you have any questions before I begin? **(PAUSE; ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS)**

Section I: Participant Information:

Interviewee name:	
Current role & Organization:	
Length of time at organization:	
Interview date & location:	
Informed consent (Y/N)	

Section II: This next section of questions will allow me to learn more about your role and your perspective on the GPSA framework. If you feel uncomfortable with responding to any of the questions, please let me know and we can skip those questions.

1. Before we get into the thematic areas we want to cover today, can you briefly share a little about your role in providing support to the GPSA project of XX?

Section III: This next section will allow me to learn more about the steps taken to pursue long-term sustainability of the CSA framework with regards to your project. Sustainability does not have to be wholescale or transformative.

2. How did partnering with GPSA inform your organization's work in the long-term beyond the specific project? This could include: improved staff expertise, organizational capacity and any other work on collaborative social accountability processes

3. Did your organization use learning and lessons gained from the GPSA project?
    a. If so, how? If not, why?

4. Is the grant partner still using CSA processes (including tools, strategies, approaches) that they are based the previous GPSA project and support?
    a. If so, in what other sectors/regional areas/public service facilities/media?
    b. Describe the estimated additional investment in terms of finance, human resources and time.
    c. How did your organization/grant partner adapt those CSA processes to better respond to its specific needs/operating environment?

5. Did your organization continue to use project tools to support capacity building for collaborative social accountability for others?
    a. If so, what resources did you invest to sustain activities?

b. What kind of support does the grant partner require to sustain the project work? (e.g., with brokering/capacity building)

6. Did your organization access other funding to continue working on collaborative social accountability?
a. If so, how did the GPSA project experience inform your follow up work?

Section IV: This next section will help inform me on any on-going dialogue or synergies with other programs and actors that could help with uptake and sustainability of the elements of the CSA process beyond the project.

7. Did any stakeholders e.g., government or international donors, CSOs express interest in adopting the collaborative social accountability framework developed during the GPSA project?
a. Did you sustain contacts with any stakeholders? (That were brokered by the WB and GPSA)
b. Did any stakeholders use processes and lessons from the Project in service delivery or policy? If so, please describe the details, including any results and investment.
c. Who if any of these stakeholders should we follow up with? (Can you link us by email?)
d. Do you have any evidence (documents, weblinks, social media) that you can share related to this?

8. Are you aware of any actions taken by public sector actors post-project to improve public service delivery or policy based on proposed solutions from the project's collaborative social accountability (i.e., corrective measures)? If so, please elaborate.

a. Follow-up, if yes: Can you provide any documents or evidence about this?

Section IV: I just have a few more general questions to ask you and then we will be done for today.

9. Were there any unintended positive or negative results from the GPSA project that you are aware of? If so, please elaborate.

10. Do you have any other reflections or comments related to what we discussed today?
a. Do you have any recommendations regarding future application/implementation of collaborative social accountability processes in your context (regarding sustainability and scale)?

Closing: Thank you for meeting with me today. I very much appreciate you participating in this interview and for thoughtfully responding to my questions. For any concerns or questions post-interview, please contact XXX