



# ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO IMPACT?

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL  
MONITORING GUIDE

Transparency International is a global movement with one vision: a world in which government, business, civil society and the daily lives of people are free of corruption. Through more than 100 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, we are leading the fight against corruption to turn this vision into reality.

Authors: Rute Caldeira and Daniela Werner

Contribution by: Itad Ltd., UK

© 2015 Transparency International. All rights reserved.

© Cover photo: Transparency International Lithuania Integrity School



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
THE TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL IMPACT MONITORING APPROACH .....	4
LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	4
THIS GUIDE .....	5
<b>1. THE IMPACT MATRIX .....</b>	<b>6</b>
THE IMPACT MATRIX AND CHANGE .....	6
THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE IMPACT MATRIX .....	8
<b>2. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS: DIFFERENT USES OF THE IMPACT MATRIX .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. PLANNING AND BASELINING OUR WORK .....	9
Planning new projects/initiatives .....	9
Establishing a baseline .....	10
Setting targets .....	11
Establishing a baseline in ongoing projects .....	11
2.2. MONITORING USING THE IMPACT MATRIX .....	11
Determining the scope and scale .....	12
Timing considerations .....	12
<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION: STEP-BY-STEP GUIDE TO MONITORING WITH THE IMPACT MATRIX .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>STEP 1: MAP THE CHANGE AND DISCUSS YOUR CONTRIBUTION WITH THE TEAM .....</b>	<b>14</b>
A. Writing the story .....	14
B. Mapping the changes .....	14
C. Organising a mapping meeting .....	14
D. Documenting the discussions .....	15
<b>STEP 2: STRENGTHEN THE EVIDENCE .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>STEP 3: EXTERNAL VALIDATION .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4. POST-IMPLEMENTATION: ANALYSIS AND USES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1. ANALYSING THE DATA .....	19
4.2. USES OF THE DATA .....	19
<b>ANNEX 1: CONTRIBUTION SCALE .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: EVIDENCE EXAMPLES FOR THE IMPACT MATRIX .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: FRAMEWORK FOR STRUCTURED LEARNING .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: POSSIBLE INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>28</b>

# INTRODUCTION

---

## THE TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL IMPACT MONITORING APPROACH

Transparency International has long recognised the critical need for better data in the effort to eradicate corruption. Most impact in the anti-corruption field is achieved against a backdrop of complex socio-economic contexts and enabled through dynamic and fast-paced processes involving a range of stakeholders. It can be challenging to measure the impact of our work – the results of our efforts can be unpredictable, and sometimes they take long periods of time to come about. Our progress can also be subject to occasional reversals that need to be understood and explained.

In 2014 Transparency International developed and adopted a new approach to monitoring the impact of anti-corruption work. This approach aims to build a more robust body of evidence regarding what works in the stopping corruption, as well as why and how it works. The Impact Monitoring Approach is designed to be sufficiently flexible in order to capture the different change processes that the Transparency International movement and the broader anti-corruption community are contributing to and achieving. It consists of two complementary elements:

- **Impact matrix:** an analytical lens that is used regularly and systematically in projects and initiatives to monitor their progress in achieving change that leads to a reduction in corruption, in order to understand how we can increase the effectiveness of our work and maximise impact.
- **Impact reviews:** in-depth impact assessments that zoom in on relevant trends and correlations identified through ongoing monitoring using the impact matrix. These impact reviews focus on particular areas and capture lessons that are not identified by the monitoring. Impact reviews, which are few in number and detailed in their scope, apply a rigorous methodology to the subject area in order to test assumptions made by the Transparency International movement with regard to anti-corruption changes and impacts.

## LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

At Transparency International we are committed to working towards greater transparency, accountability and integrity, including in our own work. The Impact Monitoring Approach will significantly improve the learning and accountability of Transparency International as it will enable us to draw lessons from our work. In turn, these lessons help us understand how we can improve our performance, design better interventions and use resources more efficiently. This approach is highly participatory – it requires and actively promotes the involvement of both internal and external stakeholders and constituents.

## THIS GUIDE

This guide focuses on **how to use the impact matrix to monitor impact**. The objective is to support programme and project managers in the Transparency International movement to monitor the impact of their work. The guide gives practical step-by-step advice on how to apply and use the impact matrix.

This guide has five sections:

- [Section 1](#) Introduction to the Transparency International impact matrix.
- [Section 2](#) What should be considered before implementing the impact matrix.
- [Section 3](#) Step-by-step guide to monitoring with the impact matrix.
- [Section 4](#) How to analyse the data and use the findings.
- [Annexes](#) Additional examples, resources and tools.

Monitoring using the impact matrix is a highly flexible approach that can be applied in a diverse range of conditions, irrespective of whether an existing monitoring and evaluation system is in place. All the methods suggested in this guide can be adjusted to ensure they apply in a given context.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Transparency International Secretariat's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Unit is here to support you in using and implementing the impact matrix. Feel free to contact us at [mel@transparency.org](mailto:mel@transparency.org) with your questions, comments and suggestions.

# 1. THE IMPACT MATRIX

## THE IMPACT MATRIX AND CHANGE

The impact matrix outlines the two main areas of change Transparency International is aiming to achieve:

- **Policy and institutional change.** The ultimate aim is to ensure that intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses have all the necessary mechanisms, policies or laws in place to redress and prevent corruption, sanction corrupt behaviour, and promote good governance.
- **Behaviour change.** The ultimate aim is that individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements act systematically to promote global good governance and prevent corruption.

The impact matrix describes the various components that together create the pathways to achieve change and the desired impact in the two aforementioned change areas. However, **context matters**: in some cases raising awareness is a big achievement in itself, but in others it falls short of the impact that could be possible given the context.

Additionally, the various components are interconnected and build on each other. This means that there can be different ways of achieving change that do not necessarily follow a straight and ordinal path.



POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE	BEHAVIOUR CHANGE
<p><b>Theory of change</b> – Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses that are exposed to Transparency International anti-corruption messages, sensitised to the issues and made aware of possible solutions change their institutional processes and policies (including standards, laws, amendments) in order to be more transparent and accountable.</p>	<p><b>Theory of change</b> – Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements that are exposed to Transparency International's anti-corruption messages, sensitised to the issues and made aware of possible solutions increasingly move from seeking redress for personal/community-based grievances, toward engaging systematically in preventing or addressing corruption nationally and globally.</p>
<p><b>IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT OF POLICIES</b> Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses <u>implement and enforce</u> existing anti-corruption laws and policies.</p>	<p><b>ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTIVISM</b> Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements <u>act to reduce</u> corruption and promote integrity at the national/global levels.</p>
<p><b>POLICY ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT</b> Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses <u>develop/ adopt, amend and improve</u> anti-corruption laws and policies.</p>	<p><b>COMMUNITY ACTION</b> Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements <u>act to address</u> specific corruption problems identified in their communities.</p>
<p><b>BETTER INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES</b> Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses <u>change their processes</u> to become more transparent, accountable and inclusive.</p>	<p><b>SEEKING REDRESS AGAINST CORRUPTION</b> Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements <u>take action</u> against specific anti-corruption grievances.</p>
<p><b>AWARENESS</b> Targeted audiences have greater awareness of corruption and of possible solutions available to them. Individuals receive the necessary resources (informational, material, organisational, psychological, etc.) to make meaningful choices about fighting corruption.</p>	
<p><b>OUTREACH</b> People, groups and institutions are <u>reached</u> by Transparency International's work through <u>exposure</u> to anti-corruption messages.</p>	

## THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE IMPACT MATRIX

The impact matrix serves as a blank canvas that provides an **analytical lens** through which impact data can be structured and analysed. The resulting reflections can aid in adjusting and refining programme work, as well as reporting. It can be used as a planning and monitoring tool in most projects, initiatives and organisations.

The impact matrix allows for:

- Analysis at various levels depending on what is needed and most useful, due to its broad and flexible nature. For example, the impact matrix could be used to plan or review a project, or to work on a thematic area or a cross-cutting issue like gender. It can also be used to reflect on the entirety of a chapter's work.
- Easy adaptation to existing monitoring systems. This means that while existing indicators can be easily integrated, they are not required in order to use this approach. In Annex 3 of this guide you can find a list of sample indicators that can be used.
- Work with narrative data to review the various aspects of a project, programme or organisation in order to assess changes (positive and negative) over time. This offers a solution to the challenges we face in determining the impact of our work. The emphasis is not on the number of changes, but rather on the significance and degree of our contribution to those changes.
- A participatory approach that requires the involvement of both internal and external stakeholders and constituents.

Systematic implementation and use of the matrix for monitoring purposes will lead to a deeper and more structured **understanding of what works and what does not work to stop corruption**. In turn, this can influence and improve the way Transparency International and the wider anti-corruption community address corruption.

The findings from the impact matrix can be used to inform our **advocacy** and **lobbying**, as well as **communication materials** for external stakeholders (i.e. donor reporting, fundraising proposals, other reports) and for potential supporters. By demonstrating what has actually been achieved, we increase the quality of our **accountability to our stakeholders**.

Note that the impact matrix is not a substitute for performance monitoring. At the project and organisational levels there are core areas that must be regularly assessed: governance, financial management, human resources management, and leadership (see [Annex 5](#) for suggested performance indicators at the project and organisational levels).



## 2. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS: DIFFERENT USES OF THE IMPACT MATRIX

---

The following section provides an overview of the different ways the impact matrix can be applied. It aims to help determine the best possible approach to using the impact matrix in a given context, particularly when using it for the first time.

### 2.1. PLANNING AND BASELINING OUR WORK

#### Planning new projects/initiatives

The impact matrix can be applied when planning new projects and initiatives using the theory of change approach. The planning of every new project should start with the clear identification of the main issue we want to address, followed by the political, economic, sociological and cultural analysis of the context.<sup>2</sup> This will allow us to identify the most relevant trends that influence our issue.

The next step consists of agreeing on the **concrete changes** that are more likely to contribute to achieving our main objective. The questions to ask at this stage are: what can we realistically achieve with our work in the given context and how? What resources and strategies are needed to achieve our objectives?

The impact matrix should be introduced at this point. How? By doing an impact mapping. We can chart (or map) the expected changes against the impact matrix in order to identify where we will focus our efforts to have the most impact. This mapping will give us a clear understanding of whether we aim to achieve changes in the policy or the behaviour domain, and how they interact with each other. In turn, this will help us test our assumptions of how the concrete changes we can realistically achieve with our work will contribute to achieving the main objective.

In summary, the matrix should be seen as a tool to operationalise and enhance the theory of change approach to project planning. The following table summarises the necessary project planning stages and indicates at which point the matrix is to be introduced.

---

<sup>2</sup> Different tools and frameworks are available that facilitate this analytical process. A good summary of these can be found here [<http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/EIRS10.pdf>].

Problem statement	Identify the problem and examine its underlying causes, i.e. conduct a political, economic, sociological and cultural analysis of the context.
Overall changes	Following the problem statement, identify the changes to be achieved, i.e. the changes we want to see. In a more traditional project management approach these changes can be framed as overall goals.
Change strategies	Identify what we can and will do that will lead to the changes we want to see. In a more traditional project management approach these changes can be framed as activities.
Assumptions	Clearly articulate why we believe the chosen change strategies will enable the changes we want to see, i.e. substantiate the link “If...then...”.
Areas of change	<b>Map the changes we want to see against the impact matrix in order to identify where we will focus our efforts to have the most impact.</b>
Change markers	Identify milestones, indicators or other tools to assess/measure extent of change.
Actors	Identify the actors in the change process and define their roles and relationships. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End-users / Intended beneficiaries</li> <li>▪ Implementing actors</li> <li>▪ Spoilers</li> <li>▪ Points of collaboration with other agencies</li> <li>▪ Additional external stakeholders</li> </ul>
Internal risks	Identify the potential impacts of the programme that could undermine its success.
External risks	Identify the external risks to the programme that could undermine its success and outline plans to overcome them.
Obstacles to success	Identify the obstacles likely to threaten the change process and outline plans to overcome them.
Knock-on effects	Identify the potential unintended consequences of the project, both positive and negative.



Source: Stein and Valters (2012:16)

## Establishing a baseline

After mapping our expected changes, we need to establish a baseline of our project using the impact matrix. This involves collecting relevant information on the context of each expected change. For example, if one of the changes we are aiming to achieve is the effective enforcement of a law, we must determine and describe the context and challenges, what the enforcement of the law will entail, and which of the conditions have already been fulfilled.

Much of this information, with the exception of very specific detail, should be easily retrieved from the political, economic, sociological and cultural analysis of the overall context carried out at the beginning of the planning stage.

The baseline will show us where we are and hence how far or how close we are from where we would like to be by end of project. This exercise should also give us a first sense of what information we will need in order to demonstrate our progress and impact throughout the project cycle. We must

nevertheless decide whether we want to define specific indicators, and how we will measure progress and impact.<sup>3,4</sup>

## Setting targets

The baseline will allow us to **set clear targets**, and later to determine how much progress we've made from where we started. When setting targets, the question of whether to define indicators or use the impact matrix directly is an important one. The impact matrix was purposively designed to do away with indicators. However, many donors and project managers still prefer to use them. This question does not affect the formulation of the targets as such, but it does affect the number of steps that precedes it.

When indicators are not defined, targets are defined with direct reference to the expected change. On the other hand, if indicators are defined, targets are then formulated with reference to these indicators. In most cases the two different approaches should result in similar targets. Nevertheless, the advantage of not using indicators and instead basing the targets directly on the expected change(s) is that they can be formulated more as markers of change, or milestones.

The impact matrix does downplay the relevance of targets and emphasises change in a much stronger way than indicators do. Whilst targets still have a role as lamp posts towards change, real progress happens whenever we are able to demonstrate that we are (a) progressing in relation to our baseline and (b) increasing the strength of our contribution to the changes we want to see.

## Establishing a baseline in ongoing projects

The impact matrix can be used to establish a baseline in an ongoing project. In this case it is best to use the impact matrix as a monitoring tool as described in the step-by-step guide (see [Section 3](#)) in order to collect the relevant data. This first impact mapping will serve as the baseline and progress can be assessed by comparing future impact mappings with the first one.

In cases where our projects have a log frame (e.g. due to a contractual agreement with a donor), it is advisable to map the log frame indicators against the impact matrix. To do this, we need to consider which components in the impact matrix these existing indicators relate to.

If we have already established baselines for our projects based on existing log frames, we should map the findings of these baselines against the impact matrix. Progress will be assessed by comparing the baseline mapping against future impact mappings.

## 2.2. MONITORING USING THE IMPACT MATRIX

The first step when monitoring with the impact matrix is to decide on the scope, scale and periodicity (or frequency) of use.

---

<sup>3</sup> In Annex 3 we provide a list of possible indicators that can be used for each level within the change areas.

<sup>4</sup> On the definition of indicators please see the TI Guide (2014) *Monitoring and Evaluation in a Nutshell*.

## Determining the scope and scale

Before using the impact matrix, we must decide what we want to monitor and the time period. This includes defining the area of work, which can range from a thematic focus, to a project or even an entire organisation:

- **Thematic monitoring** applies the impact matrix to a thematic area of work which often cuts across several projects. For instance, we may decide that it is important to identify what impact we have been having on women and access to public services. In this case we must discuss all relevant projects from a gender and public services perspective.
- **Project monitoring** applies the impact matrix to one or more projects/ interventions separately and independently, without necessarily drawing a link between them.
- **Organisational monitoring** applies the impact matrix to the overall work of an organisation, such as a chapter. This involves selecting a number of projects and interventions that are representative of the most strategic work. Even if each project is mapped onto the matrix separately, all achievements will ultimately be aggregated in one matrix, giving a more complete picture of the changes the organisation has contributed to.

## Timing considerations

To decide on when to start and how often to monitor using the impact matrix, we recommend considering the following:

- **Overall ambition.** If we want to measure changes that will take longer to occur, we suggest using the impact matrix once a year. On the other hand, if we want to measure smaller and more incremental changes, then the matrix should be applied twice a year.
- **Length of the project cycle.** If we want to monitor a project with a shorter cycle, say two or three years, it may be appropriate to use the impact matrix annually, as short-cycle projects generally have fewer ambitions than longer-cycle projects. However, if we want to monitor projects in a wider context – entire programmes, departments, organisations – then the matrix should be applied twice a year regardless of the duration, given that the overall aim is greater than the sum of the individual projects.
- **Strategic relevance.** The impact matrix can be used in cases where we need to demonstrate our impact for fundraising or a mid-project report to a donor or other stakeholders. Keep in mind that the changes a project aims to achieve are often only seen after a project comes to an end. This means the impact matrix should be used again six months to one year after the end of the project to fully capture the impact of our work.

# 3. IMPLEMENTATION: STEP-BY-STEP GUIDE TO MONITORING WITH THE IMPACT MATRIX

The following steps provide guidance in using the impact matrix for monitoring. Note that some of the steps may overlap and/or repeat, and should be adjusted to fit the context.

To prepare for this process, teams working on the selected projects should each arrange a **kickoff meeting** to agree on how the process should be organised in order to advance most efficiently. Having an open and participatory approach will help to ensure learning across teams.

In this meeting the following points should be discussed and agreed upon:

- **Who will lead.** One staff member should be responsible for leading the monitoring process. We'll call this person the monitoring lead. This senior member of the team will be responsible for:
  - managing the budget
  - managing communications
  - writing the report and seeking input from others
  - coordinating the logistics (scheduling meetings, making travel arrangements, inviting stakeholders, etc.)
- **Roles and responsibilities.** It is important to discuss and understand the role that the different team members and stakeholders (internal and external) will play, in order to be clear about when they should participate and to what end.
- **The budget.** All costs involved should be estimated. For instance, if the project involves people from different parts of the country there will be costs for travel, data collection in the field, stakeholder meetings and perhaps interpretation/translation.
- **The timeline.** Deadlines for the completion of each step of the monitoring process need to be agreed upon. This is particularly important when using the impact matrix in parallel across projects or initiatives. This may include synchronising learning events or data collection in the same region.

## CHECKLIST

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ✓ | Organise inception meeting                    |
| ✓ | Appoint the monitoring lead                   |
| ✓ | Clarify and assign roles and responsibilities |
| ✓ | Discuss and approve budget                    |
| ✓ | Agree on timeline                             |



## STEP 1: MAP THE CHANGE AND DISCUSS YOUR CONTRIBUTION WITH THE TEAM

In this step the monitoring lead will ensure that all the existing data is captured through a **general mapping** and **team discussion** of the changes achieved. This can be broken down into four parts:

### A. Writing the story

The “story” explains the underlying logic of our project/ intervention and remains constant throughout the impact mapping. Telling the story will allow us to understand our **pathway for change**: e.g., where did we start, what did we achieve, what strategies did we use to enable success, what changes did we strongly contribute to and what other changes were simply an unexpected by-product of our work?

#### CHECKLIST

✓	Desk-based impact mapping
✓	Impact mapping meeting (with the team)

The narrative can be organised around the following:

- **Socio-political context** of the monitoring year concerned.
- **Goal and objective**: what did we seek to achieve?
- **External relationships**: how partnerships developed throughout the year.
- **Internal relationships**: how relationships with/within the target groups developed throughout the year.
- **Success and failure** based on the determining factors and the perception of advancements and set-backs.
- **Unexpected events**, actors, and factors that may have also played a role.
- **Anecdotes** illustrative of the development and achievements of the project in the year considered.

### B. Mapping the changes

After formulating the story, the monitoring lead is responsible for identifying concrete examples of our impact by going through all existing project documents, reports, and other available material.<sup>5</sup> This is a desk-based research activity. We should also consider the gender aspects of our work and look for evidence that illustrates the impact on different groups, where applicable. A preliminary mapping of these impact examples against the impact matrix should be completed ahead of the more in-depth discussion that will take place at the mapping meeting.

### C. Organising a mapping meeting

After completing the desk-based mapping, the monitoring lead should organise a **mapping meeting** with the project team members. **It may be useful to invite colleagues from other teams, to encourage horizontal learning.** This meeting will be used to discuss the preliminary desk-based mapping and our contribution to the changes identified. Ahead of the meeting it may be useful to

<sup>5</sup> While there is no specific format to capture the mapping, you can use the impact mapping report template provided by the MEL Unit. The template can be requested at [mel@transparency.org](mailto:mel@transparency.org) or downloaded from the MEL site on Office 365 [<https://transparencyinternational.sharepoint.com/sites/Movement/MEL/>]

share the preliminary impact mapping with those who will be invited to participate. The meeting could be organised as follows:

- i. **Discussion of impact.** The monitoring lead begins by briefly presenting the preliminary impact mapping. The team discusses the mapping and adds any other achievements and impacts that may be missing. It is equally important to also discuss the unintended and negative consequences that the project may have contributed to. Everyone should discuss positive and negative lessons learned.
- ii. **Reflection on contributions to impact.** The team then discusses and rates their contribution against each and every claim of change mapped onto the impact matrix (for concrete examples see [Annex 2](#)). This helps us to reflect on the strength of our contribution. In cases where compelling evidence is missing, this discussion will clarify what evidence is still needed. In Step 3, the rating will be validated by external stakeholders. The strength of our contribution is rated using a **four-point scale** (see also [Annex 1](#)):

#### Contribution Scale

3	<b>Significant contribution:</b> Our contribution to the change was essential. It is clear that the change would not have happened or would not have happened in the same way without our involvement
2	<b>Medium contribution:</b> Our contribution to the change was important. The change would probably have happened without our involvement, but it might not have had the same quality
1	<b>Little contribution:</b> Our contribution made only a little difference. The change would most likely have happened without our involvement and would have had a similar quality, but our involvement is likely to have nudged the change slightly in a specific direction
0	<b>No contribution:</b> Our contribution to the change was insignificant or non-existent

Through this discussion, we can move beyond looking at the activities we did to making an assessment of the value and relevance of our specific contribution to the change we claim has occurred. This is sometimes called the “so *what?*” question. Critical points to consider include:

- What has been done and achieved? Is there clear evidence that our input and involvement was essential and added value?
  - Would the changes have happened if we had not acted and carried out the project?
  - Can we identify our “added value”?
- iii. **Identification of data gaps.** Sometimes we may be sure that we have enabled a certain change but may not be able to produce the evidence to back this claim. In such a case we must discuss the additional data we need to collect, which will be done in Step 2.

## D. Documenting the discussions

Finally, it is very important to have a good record of these discussions. A note-taker should be assigned at the start of the meeting. After the meeting, the monitoring lead will be responsible for

organising the notes, updating the impact mapping report, and developing some of the suggestions further – for example, collecting the additional data required to substantiate a claim of impact.

## STEP 2: STRENGTHEN THE EVIDENCE

In Step 1 we considered whether the available data provides the sufficient evidence to our claims of achievement. Data gaps were identified and some initial suggestions as to how the missing data could be collected were discussed.

In Step 2, the monitoring lead further addresses the **data gaps identified**, by developing more concrete suggestions for additional data, finding the most appropriate and cost-effective methods for collecting this data,<sup>6</sup> and organising the data collection process. The latter may involve:

- semi-structured interviews with project partners and targeted stakeholders
- focus group discussions with beneficiaries and other stakeholders
- short feedback surveys

CHECKLIST	
✓	Go back to data gaps identified
✓	Make concrete suggestions for further data collection
✓	Organise data collection process
✓	Triangulate, triangulate, triangulate!

Note that in most cases the tools used to collect the additional data should be mainstreamed into the project's cycle and continue to be used for monitoring purposes.

All evidence must be triangulated in order to strengthen the claims regarding achievements and changes. Triangulation means using three or more sources or types of data to cross-check reliability and validity. In order to triangulate evidence the following questions are helpful:

- Do different types of evidence (reports, press articles, quantitative data, etc.) support our contribution claim? For example, are there newspaper articles that provide additional external evidence?
- Have stakeholder interviews or surveys confirmed our claims of change?
- If there are conflicting findings and perspectives, can we explain the differences?

This data should ideally be collected before the meeting with external stakeholders. Therefore it is likely that a number of weeks will elapse between the first mapping meeting in Step 1 and the stakeholder meeting in Step 3. The monitoring lead is responsible for updating the impact mapping report with the new data.

## STEP 3: EXTERNAL VALIDATION

This aim of this step is to validate our impact mapping by getting feedback from our stakeholders. The monitoring lead is responsible for organising an **external stakeholders meeting**, where relevant staff present the impact mapping and seek validation on their contribution rating and the

<sup>6</sup> If you have doubts about this step or how best to go about collecting relevant evidence, please contact the MEL Unit for support at [mel@transparency.org](mailto:mel@transparency.org). Further, a collection of tools and methodologies to strengthen data is available on the MEL site on Office 365 [<https://transparencyinternational.sharepoint.com/sites/Movement/MEL/>].

corresponding supporting evidence. This meeting allows us to demonstrate the impact of our work to our stakeholders and may create new opportunities and lead to mutual learning.

The group of stakeholders could include our constituents, clients, people affected by our work, partners, donors, and also critics. For instance, for a policy development project we may want to invite government officials involved in the drafting of the policy, civil society partners, representatives of the media, and research or academic institutions involved in anti-corruption policy research, amongst others. Look for informed perspectives from an array of backgrounds.

It is important that all participants are encouraged to validate our claims or to challenge us in terms of the role we played in enabling these changes. The structure for such a meeting could be as follows:

CHECKLIST	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State the purpose of meeting</li> <li>- Provide an overview of the project/initiative being discussed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	✓ Organise external stakeholders' meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Changes achieved</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Present the main changes enabled through the project and who benefited from these (women, men, minority groups).</li> <li>- Is there anything that is not captured by the impact mapping yet?</li> <li>- Discuss any unintended or negative consequences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	✓ Compare the notes and findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Contribution rating</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Present and discuss the contribution ratings made by the team in Step 1.</li> <li>- Confirm that our evidence is sound and convincing, and warrants the contribution ratings. Be sure to accept criticism as a constructive contribution to the validation of our claims.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	✓ Finalise the monitoring report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lessons learned</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discuss the lessons learned and how to improve future work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

After the stakeholders meeting, the monitoring lead should finalise the monitoring report begun in the previous two steps.

# MONITORING WITH THE TI IMPACT MATRIX



## STEP 1

Map the change and discuss your contribution with the team



## STEP 2

Strengthen your evidence



## STEP 3

Validate your data with stakeholders and partners





# 4. POST-IMPLEMENTATION: ANALYSIS AND USES

---

After completing the monitoring process using the impact matrix it is essential that the resulting information is analysed and used. This is where the learning and improvement takes centre stage.

## 4.1. ANALYSING THE DATA

The analysis of the monitoring data should:

- **Assess progress.** Changes achieved should be compared to the baseline data and what the project initially set out to achieve.  
Ask questions like: Were the main targets hit? Were new aims discovered mid-project? Can we explain why some ambitions were not met?
- **Identify impact clusters.** The impact matrix can be used as a tool to identify clusters of impact data, highlighting areas of progress and those which were more challenging.  
Ask questions like: Were we successful on only one strand of our ambitions, and if so, why?
- **Identify trends.** Developing trends can be detected, for example, by comparing findings of several projects being monitored.  
Ask questions like: Do our projects or initiatives show similar findings/lessons?
- **Analyse pathways for change.** Examine how certain actions and changes may have contributed to changes and impacts, and what the enabling strategies were that brought about these results.  
Ask questions like: How and why did a set of interventions lead to the intended or unintended change? What factors played a role?
- **Re-assess assumptions.** The validity and relevance of the underlying logic or theory of change should be tested in light of the current context. This can be done by assessing the effectiveness of our approaches in bringing about our intended changes.  
Ask questions like: Were the approaches chosen the best in yielding results or could other approaches have yielded similar or better results?

## 4.2. USES OF THE DATA

The data resulting from the impact monitoring process can be used to:

- **Produce reports for accountability.** The completed impact matrix provides a rich picture of impact across the various components and areas of our work. It helps to demonstrate our work and its impact, and can be used as a basis for an annual accountability report. Robust evidence and a

compelling narrative of impact can also be a powerful tool for mobilising additional funds to support our work. Don't sit on the data – use it!

- **Steer strategic direction and allocation of resources.** Even if good MEL systems are in place, the impact matrix provides a unique opportunity to develop a coherent and overall picture of our work's impact. It allows us to identify areas where we are not making an impact, prompts discussions about opportunities for further change, and informs decisions around prioritisation and allocation of resources.
- **Identify advocacy opportunities and issues.** The impact matrix allows us to discern certain patterns and trends which we can use as compelling evidence for advocacy, as proof of emerging issues worth advocating on, or as grounds to change the direction of our advocacy.
- **Strengthen organisational learning.** The process of completing the impact matrix with our teams, colleagues and partners provides an important space to periodically reflect on achievements and challenges, learn from them, and draw conclusions for the future. This is particularly relevant in contexts where sophisticated learning systems are not in place. It is important that staff are supported and understand the value of learning about the different areas of their work. A framework for structured learning is provided in [Annex 3](#).

# ANNEX 1: CONTRIBUTION SCALE

We can use the contribution scale to assess Transparency International's contribution to changes and to assess the achievements of our work. The traffic light should be applied in Steps 1 and 3 of the impact mapping process. Further information on how to use it is described in [Step 1](#) of Section 3, *Implementation: Step-by-Step Guide to Monitoring with the Impact Matrix*.

Rating the contribution is important because the evidence of our impact is often qualitative in nature. Assigning a score adds rigour to the approach by moving beyond looking at the activities we did, and to making an assessment of the value and relevance of our specific contribution.

RATING	STRENGTH OF CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHANGE OBSERVED	EXAMPLES
3	<b>Significant contribution</b> Our contribution to the change was essential. It is clear that the change would not have happened or would not have happened in the same way without our involvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BEHAVIOUR CHANGE:</b> There is evidence of communities engaging with government primarily due to our action. Evidence shows that Transparency International was the only anti-corruption actor active in the particular communities, which suggests that we made a significant contribution to mobilising those communities.</li> <li>• <b>POLICY CHANGE:</b> There is evidence from a number of sources that our work significantly contributed to the development of the anti-corruption policy. The policy is almost identical in language to Transparency International's position paper on the policy, showing our significant contribution as a member of the policy drafting committee.</li> </ul>
2	<b>Medium contribution</b> Our contribution to the change was important. The change would probably have happened without our involvement, but it might not have had the same quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BEHAVIOUR CHANGE:</b> There is evidence of our contribution to communities increasingly engaging with government. Different sources prove that Transparency International was a major actor in mobilising communities, although not the only one.</li> <li>• <b>POLICY CHANGE:</b> There is evidence of our contribution to the policy development. Evidence shows that Transparency International was consulted during the policy drafting process, along with various other stakeholders.</li> </ul>
1	<b>Little contribution</b> Our contribution made only a little difference. The change would most likely have happened without our involvement and would have had a similar quality, but our involvement is likely to have nudged the change slightly in a specific direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BEHAVIOUR CHANGE:</b> There is evidence that we contributed to a small extent to catalysing the engagement of communities with the government. Sources and stakeholders primarily cite other catalysts but they do also mention Transparency International.</li> <li>• <b>POLICY CHANGE:</b> There is evidence of us contributing to a small extent to the policy development. Evidence shows that Transparency International recommended the anti-corruption policy in its reports and engaged some actors in uncoordinated lobbying activities.</li> </ul>
0	<b>No contribution</b> Our contribution to the change was insignificant or non-existent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence does not show Transparency International's involvement or engagement in the process.</li> </ul>

# ANNEX 2: EVIDENCE EXAMPLES FOR THE IMPACT MATRIX

## POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

**Change we want to contribute to** – Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses have all the necessary mechanisms, policies or laws in place to redress and prevent corruption, sanction corrupt behaviour, and promote good governance.

**Theory of change** – Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses that are exposed to Transparency International's anti-corruption messages, are sensitised to the issues and are made aware of possible solutions change their institutional processes and policies (including standards, laws, amendments) in order to be more transparent and accountable.

## IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT OF POLICIES

Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses implement and enforce existing anti-corruption laws and policies.

### Evidence relating to:

- Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses ensuring their adherence to existing anti-corruption laws and policies and sanctioning corrupt behaviour

## POLICY ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT

Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses develop/adopt, amend and improve anti-corruption laws and policies.

### Evidence relating to:

- Developing and adopting specific laws, amendments, policies, standards

## BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

**Change we want to contribute to** – Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements systematically act to promote global good governance and prevent corruption.

**Theory of change** – Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements that are exposed to Transparency International's anti-corruption messages, sensitised to the issues and made aware of possible solutions increasingly move from seeking redress for personal/community-based grievances, toward engaging systematically in preventing/addressing corruption nationally and globally.

## ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTIVISM

Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements act to reduce corruption and promote integrity at the national/ global levels.

### Evidence relating to:

- Groups promoting integrity at the national level (e.g. monitoring national elections, requiring political candidates to make anti-corruption pledges)
- Individuals/groups raising national and global issues relating to lack of integrity and corruption (e.g. investigative journalism)
- Individuals/groups initiating and signing petitions that focus on national/global corruption issues
- People voting for “clean” candidates/buying products from “clean” companies

## COMMUNITY ACTION

Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements act to address specific corruption problems identified in their communities.

### Evidence relating to:

- Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements demanding accountability/transparency from their community leaders (e.g. demonstrations asking for corrupt public official to step down)

- Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements monitoring public and private institutions (e.g. teachers' absenteeism)
- Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements actively participating in local/regional processes of decision-making (e.g. in relation to mining companies and community profit sharing)
- Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements setting up informal corruption reporting mechanisms in their communities

---

### BETTER INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses change their processes to become more transparent, accountable and inclusive.

#### Evidence relating to:

- Institutions setting up participatory, inclusive and transparent processes of decision-making (e.g. participatory budgets, public procurement)
- Institutions joining collective efforts to improve organisational processes (e.g. the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI))
- Institutions assessing and monitoring their vulnerability to corruption (e.g. by implementing the assessment tool for Anti-Corruption Agencies or the ABC anti-bribery checklist for companies)

---

### SEEKING REDRESS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements take action against specific anti-corruption grievances.

#### Evidence relating to:

- Corruption-related complaints being submitted to available Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres (ALACs)
- The reporting of specific cases to existing mechanisms (e.g. anti-corruption agencies, institutions' official complaints mechanisms)
- Court cases on corruption allegations being brought by individuals/groups

---

### AWARENESS

Targeted audiences have greater awareness of corruption and of possible solutions available to them. Individuals receive the necessary resources (informational, material, organisational, psychological, etc.) to make meaningful choices about fighting corruption.

#### Evidence relating to:

- Target audiences increasingly agreeing that corruption is a problem
- Target audiences increasingly agreeing about the need to address corruption
- Target audiences increasingly agreeing on how to stop corruption
- Target audiences increasingly agreeing that they can do something to stop corruption

---

### OUTREACH

People, groups and institutions are reached by Transparency International's work through exposure to anti-corruption messages.

#### Evidence relating to:

- Transparency International receiving improved media visibility
- Transparency International mobilising its partners
- Transparency International improving attendance at its meetings, gatherings, outreach events
- Transparency International's brand having increased visibility and a stronger reputation



# ANNEX 3: FRAMEWORK FOR STRUCTURED LEARNING

---

This framework for structured learning can be used as a tool for staff and teams to build on and adapt to their needs. The approach here is to support Transparency International staff to move from “single loop learning” to “double loop learning”, where initial learning about what happened is further reflected on to understand the issues and causes for the various successes, mistakes, unintended consequences and challenges faced by a project.

The two key questions are:

- Did our work make a difference? (effectiveness and impact)
- Was the approach we used the right and best possible one? (value addition)

Each broad question can be expanded on, by asking the following:

- Has there been a change? If so, how significant was the change?
- Have there been any unintended changes (positive or negative)?
- Have changes been positively or negatively affected by external factors (context)?
- How many people were affected by the change? Which target groups were affected by the change? What was the impact on various groups (women, men, youth, etc.)?
- Was the change intended or not? What led to the change?
- Is the change likely to be sustainable/durable?
- How do changes compare to what was hoped for, or considered realistic?
- How did our work or that of our partners contribute to the change?
- What could be done differently in future work?

Moving another step ahead, we can consider what we have learned about our work and the potential need to change our practices, behaviour and approaches. The following questions help to guide this discussion:

- What can we learn from our approach to addressing an issue? Do we need to adjust the approaches we took?
- What can we learn about Transparency International's value added? Was it clear and appropriate? If not, what needs to be changed?
- What can we learn about the impact and reach of our work? Was it as effective and influential as it could or should have been?
- What lessons and/or approaches can be replicated or scaled up? Why (or why not)?
- What can be learned about the specific impacts (positive and negative) of contextual factors in relation to future scale-up/replication or for developing similar projects?

Useful websites with information on effective learning include:

- Community Development Resource Association (CDRA): [www.cdra.org.za](http://www.cdra.org.za)
- The Barefoot Guide to Learning Practices in Organisations and Social Change: [www.barefootguide.org/barefoot-guide-2.html](http://www.barefootguide.org/barefoot-guide-2.html)
- “Organisational Learning in NGOs: Creating the Motive, Means and Opportunity (Praxis Paper 3)”. Bruce Britton. 2005: [www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=398#sthash.XI2hgqFZ.dpuf](http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=398#sthash.XI2hgqFZ.dpuf)
- “Learning and Accountability: A Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant's Perspective” (Praxis Note 32) Adams. 2007: [www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=476#sthash.eJKLRliJ.dpuf](http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=476#sthash.eJKLRliJ.dpuf)

# ANNEX 4: POSSIBLE INDICATORS

The following list provides an overview of relevant indicators that can be used across a range of Transparency International initiatives. These indicators can be used to measure whether we are on track to meet our expected results.

To be truly useful, the indicators should be adjusted to suit the specific goals and objectives of our work in each context. Indicators should be as relevant and specific as possible.

The baseline for the indicators should be established before the start of our work. From this baseline we can then set targets. This allows us to later compare the achieved results with our baseline to assess progress made.

AREA OF CHANGE	POSSIBLE INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF WHAT TO REPORT ON
<b>POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE</b>		
<b>IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT OF POLICIES</b>	Improvement in the adherence to and enforcement of laws and policies	<p>Instances of public and private institutions implementing transparency, accountability and integrity standards</p> <p>Instances of improvements in how laws or policies are enforced (practice and procedure) and their perceived effectiveness</p> <p>Describe how corrupt persons or organisations are being held to account and punished</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>POLICY ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT</b>	Change in standards, policy and legislation to prevent corruption	<p>Instances in which Transparency International's policy recommendations have been adopted by targeted institutions (can also be businesses)</p> <p>Improved policies, standards and codes of conduct that afford protection and redress to victims of corruption</p> <p>Describe elements of and satisfaction with the newly adopted or amended policy</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>BETTER INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES</b>	Change in institutional capacities, practices and internal mechanisms to promote transparency, accountability and integrity	<p>Instances of public institutions and businesses strengthening their capacities and abilities to prevent and reduce corruption</p> <p>Instances of public institutions and businesses adopting mechanisms and practices in line with Transparency International's recommendations</p>

		<p>For example, improved abilities to recognise and address their vulnerability to corruption or better processes to engage citizens in decision-making</p> <p>Describe the quality of the improved capacities, practices and internal mechanisms</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>BEHAVIOUR CHANGE</b>		
<b>ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTIVISM</b>	<p>Change in civic action challenging national/global corrupt practices and advancing the transparency, accountability and integrity agenda</p>	<p>Instances of civic action advancing the transparency, accountability and integrity agenda</p> <p>Instances of coalitions, communities, individuals, and/or leaders challenging national/global corrupt practices</p> <p>For example, monitoring of national elections, changes in voting behaviour, investigations into corruption cases or demands for access to information</p> <p>Describe the context, stakeholders and quality of the civic actions</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>COMMUNITY ACTION</b>	<p>Change in community action to address local corruption issues</p>	<p>Instances of communities successfully using social accountability approaches to prevent corruption</p> <p>Instances of local initiatives organised to stop corruption (e.g. monitoring actions, petitions, demonstrations)</p> <p>Describe the citizen involvement, alliances and quality of actions taken including their effectiveness</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>SEEKING REDRESS AGAINST CORRUPTION</b>	<p>Change in the percentage of people willing to report and act against corruption (and success rate)</p>	<p>Number of corruption grievances reported to Advocacy and Legal Advice Centres (ALACs), disaggregated by sex and topic</p> <p>Percentage and description of instances where justice is pursued in corruption-related grievances</p> <p>Success rate and description of concluded legal cases</p> <p>Describe the nature of the corruption grievances and quality of the resolution</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>OUTREACH AND AWARENESS</b>		

<b>AWARENESS</b>	Changes in awareness of corruption issues	<p>Percentage of people or groups who report increased awareness of corruption issues</p> <p>Percentage of people or groups who report increased awareness of available approaches to prevent/stop corruption</p> <p>Percentage of people who increasingly agree with Transparency International's messages</p> <p>Increased media coverage of corruption issues including the type and quality of the coverage</p> <p>Describe the quality and relevance of the change in awareness</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>
<b>OUTREACH</b>	People, institutions and groups reached by Transparency International's message	<p>Number and type of outreach activities</p> <p>Estimate of number and type of audiences (e.g. organisations, partners, policy makers, citizens - disaggregated by sex) reached by our outreach, campaigns and advocacy efforts</p> <p>Number of Facebook/Twitter followers</p> <p>Number of unique visitors viewing the website and/or downloading Transparency International knowledge products, such as research reports</p> <p>Describe the audience and quality (heavy or light touch) of the outreach activities</p> <p>→ <b>Describe Transparency International's role and contribution in all of the above</b></p>

# ANNEX 5: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The following selection of indicators and scorecards can be used to assess our performance in core organisational areas such as governance, financial management, human resources management and leadership. To be truly useful, they should be adapted to suit the specific needs and priorities of our work in each context and mainstreamed in processes at the organisational and project levels.

The scorecards help to assess the capacity of the board and executive management by considering and reflecting on each of the different dimensions. The scorecards can be applied in self-assessment exercises or in group discussions with the relevant staff members.

## A. Performance indicators

PROJECT LEVEL	ORGANISATIONAL LEVEL
→ Quality and timeliness of delivery, as per the plan and against set deliverables and targets	
→ Feedback from project/organisation's stakeholders (including donors) and beneficiaries on quality of delivery	
Budget deviation from the planned budget, evaluated at the end of the project cycle	Budget deviation from the planned core organisational budget, evaluated annually
	Staff engagement survey, at organisational level
	Staff turnover

## B. Board performance monitoring scorecard

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE BOARD...	To no extent	To almost no extent	To some extent	To large extent	Supporting evidence
Involved in ongoing strategic planning and risk management?					
Monitoring the external environment?					
Addressing the emerging opportunities and risks?					
Reviewing existing policies that address risks and opportunities (internal and external)?					
Actively monitoring the CEO and executive management's performance, progression and succession plans?					
Making decisions that reflect active understanding of performance (impact) conditions?					
Making decisions that reflect active understanding of financial conditions?					
Accepting responsibility for assuring adequate funding?					
Monitoring compliance with policies, standards and codes?					
Taking responsibility for its own operations?					
Agreeing on expectations of board members?					

Meeting as frequently as needed to adequately conduct the business of the organization?					
Developing policies that address attendance and participation of board members?					
Writing meeting minutes that reflect the actions of the board?					

### C. Executive management performance monitoring scorecard

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT...	To no extent	To almost no extent	To some extent	To large extent	Supporting evidence
Monitoring the external environment?					
Fulfilling the strategic commitments in the organisation's implementation plan?					
Taking timely strategic and operational decisions?					
Addressing the emerging opportunities and risks?					
Reviewing existing organisational policies?					
Monitoring compliance with policies, standards and codes?					
Actively involving constituents in setting organisational priorities (e.g. board and staff)?					
Being transparent and accountable to their constituents (e.g. board and staff)?					
Making decisions that reflect active understanding of monitoring and evaluation data?					
Making decisions that reflect active understanding of financial condition?					
Accepting responsibility for assuring adequate funding?					
Taking responsibility for its own operations?					
Agreeing on expectations for executive management members?					
Meeting as frequently as needed to adequately conduct the business of the organization?					
Creating a workplace that lets people thrive and harnesses talent?					
Writing meeting minutes that reflect the actions of the executive management?					



Transparency International  
International Secretariat  
Alt-Moabit 96, 10559 Berlin, Germany

Phone: +49 30 34 38 200  
Fax: +49 30 34 70 39 12

[ti@transparency.org](mailto:ti@transparency.org)  
[www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org)

[blog.transparency.org](http://blog.transparency.org)  
[facebook.com/transparencyinternational](https://facebook.com/transparencyinternational)  
[twitter.com/anticorruption](https://twitter.com/anticorruption)