



Review of the GTNI Programme

Final report, Brussels, 29 December 2015

ODS

www.odsupport.eu - info@odsupport.eu

+32 2 227 2714/ +32 04 72131725 (m)

4, Rue de la Presse - 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Table of contents

I.	Introduction	p. 3
II.	Executive Summary	p. 4
III.	Assessment of the current state of the GTNI	p. 5
	Some successes so far	
	Objectives of the GTNI as a TI global strategy	
	The way the GTNI are embedded in the TI Movement	
	Management of the GTNI	
	Sustainability of the GTNI	
IV.	Conclusions & Recommendations	p. 18
	General	
	Clarifying division of tasks	
	Streamlining structures and procedures	
	Creating awareness and enthusiasm	
	Conscious risk- and brand management	
	Financial and Human Resources	
	Aiming for success	

I. Introduction

Transparency International (TI) has commissioned ODS to perform a review of their Global Thematic Network Initiatives (GTNI). These GTNI were set up in 2013 as part of the 2010-2015 TI Global Strategy as a way to decentralise some of the content expertise to TI Chapters. Five thematic initiatives were chosen to become part of the GTNI programme: 'Humanitarian Aid Integrity' ('HAIP') run by TI Kenya; 'Integrity, Independence and Accountability of the Judiciary' ('the Judiciary') at TI Romania; 'Mining & Corruption' ('Mining') at TI Australia, and finally 'Pharmaceutical & Healthcare' ('PHP') and 'Defence and Security' ('DSP') at TI UK. Of these initiatives, the Defence and Security Programme already existed prior to the GTNI as a strategy. The GTNI has been kept as priority for the 2015 - 2020 programming period as the movement's most recent strategy - adopted in fall 2015 - implicitly calls for TI Chapter-led global initiatives to be strengthened.

This review looks at the strategic objectives of the TI Movement with the GTNI, the way the strategy has been implemented and embedded in the organisation, and the collaboration between the various actors implicated in the GTNI. The objectives, content or impact of the programmes themselves, will not be individually reviewed. The purpose of the review was to distil lessons that can be used to improve the setup, consolidate what works, and create the conditions for a successful potential expansion of the GTNI. To this end, this review report will:

- Assess the overall setup and approach of the programmes, including the structures and oversight mechanisms currently in place;
- Take into account challenges as well as successes and opportunities in the journey of the programme to date;
- Look at the internal impact of the GTNI on management and organisational systems in the TI Secretariat as well as the Chapters;
- Look towards the future with recommendations and conditions for success.

Finally, the review process aimed at facilitating learning from the experiences of the TI Secretariat (TI-S) and the chapters participating in the initiatives.

The ODS team has collected information through desk research, interviews, research briefing meetings, as well as a collaborative workshop with representatives of GTNI Lead Chapters and a two-day visit of the TI-S offices in Berlin. Information gathered fed into an organisational scan to structure and analyse the information. In addition to the desk research, ODS and the TI-S have performed a benchmarking exercise on comparable initiatives in TI's peer organisations, which will lead to a separate tool.

The present document is the final review report.

II. Executive Summary

The GTNI are working well on a few levels. First, a common purpose has emerged among lead chapters and dedicated TI-S staff, to further their common interests. This is an important step towards establishing the GTNI within the movement, but also to foster horizontal learning, collaboration and the transfer of knowledge on important topics. It has also contributed to an increased capacity in certain lead chapters to run a global programme, even as most lead chapters still need to develop further. For several programmes, the TI-S has also significantly contributed to this capacity of Lead Chapters to run a global programme and mobilise the necessary resources. Similarly, TI-UK has over the course of eight years not only established an excellent programme (DSP) but in the process has become a much stronger chapter that is now able to credibly start a second global initiative (PHP).

However, the role of the Secretariat is also an area of concern. Lead Chapters either have unrealistic expectations on what to expect from TI-S, or express a wish to decide much more at chapter level. Inversely, what is expected of the chapters, is also unclear and subject to constant change. Both aspects can in our view be traced back to a dichotomy between various stated objectives of the GTNI, and the roles envisioned for the various actors to achieve those objectives. Externally focussed objectives such as becoming a global authority on a certain topic, running a multi-million dollar global programme or accessing new funding streams, are difficult to unite with internal objectives such as chapter capacity building, horizontal collaboration and decentralisation from the TI-S to the chapters. When paired with a lack of sufficient additional resources to build Lead Chapter's capacities, and a light initial inception phase of the GTNI, this has led to mutual disappointment and high levels of stress.

Added to this are more specific problems in aligning risk management and brand usage between the programmes and the wider movement, and a difficulty to find minimal yet functional governance structures for the GTNI. In theory, these problems are not hard to solve as between the TI-S dedicated GTNI staff and the Lead Chapters there is general agreement on how to proceed. However, decisions for the TI movement as a whole impact the GTNI as well, as do possible disagreement at management level on what constitutes acceptable levels of risk, and a lack of visibility of the GTNI within the movement. This results in a less than friendly environment for the GTNI to flourish in.

There are ways to mitigate these circumstances. Firstly, the actors in the GTNI should unite and speak with one voice towards the movement whenever possible. Steps to that effect have already been taken and we advise to install some form of permanent steering group. Secondly, an individualised and flexible but clear agreement should be drafted for each of the programmes, between the participating chapters, Lead Chapters and TI-S, outlining expectations, resources needed and the nature of the collaboration. Finally, the reporting, monitoring and communications procedures and guidelines should be revisited and streamlined. These general measures would relieve much of the tension visible today and allow the programmes to start focusing more and more on creating impact.

III. Assessment of the current state of the GTNI

Some successes so far

Although the GTNI strategy as a whole is still in too early a stage of development to be evaluated on impact, lead -and participating chapters cited several examples of good outcomes. These include:

- Some of the chapters (lead and non-lead) have noticed an increase in global authority and mentioned that being able to approach funders and other counterparts (eg. governments) in the role of a global initiative gave them additional traction and enabled access to funding.*
- Chapters were enthusiastic about the opportunity to work together with others, transfer learning experiences and tools. This was recognised mainly as a great potential but in some instances such collaboration has already taken place.*
- One chapter mentioned the positive example of a tool developed for GTNI work which has been transferred to projects within the home country of the chapter.*
- The two UK-based initiatives have mentioned benefits from informally mentoring and collaboration between themselves.*
- Capacity building: the TI UK and Australia chapters have clearly benefited from the work they have done on global themes, even as in the case of TI UK the programme predates the GTNI strategy. TI Kenya also indicated that leading the programme and engaging with the other Lead Chapters, will most likely increase their capacity to act on a global level.*
- By most accounts, the DSP has succeeded in becoming the global expert in its field.*

Objectives of the GTNI as a TI global strategy

The GTNI as a strategy has, like many new strategies, more than one origin. Some interviewees have indicated that it was envisioned as a way to copy the success of TI UK's Defence Programme, others that seizing opportunities to profile TI on mining prompted the GTNI, elsewhere they were named as a logical next step in the reduction of the size and responsibilities of the TI-S. This review does not aim to determine the exact history of the GTNI. It is important however, to understand which objectives have been stated and subsequently used to shape the various programmes. By reviewing those objectives and the way they have or have not been met, the most relevant objectives can be identified and the conditions for meeting those going forward, can be specified.

From the inception documents it appears that the decentralised approach to thematic initiatives was rationalised as a way to recognise that individual Chapters could and should be stimulated to contribute more to developing anti-corruption expertise on specific themes or in certain sectors. Another reason for placing the thematic initiatives with chapters is that the capacity to develop global programmes at TI-S, is limited. According to this line of reasoning, a shift away from TI-S and towards the chapters could

improve the movement's sustainability and resilience. And even if the capacity were available at TI-S, the assessment is that chapter-led initiatives will generate a much broader range of topics than if only one office (i.c. TI-S) would be responsible. Decentralising thematic initiatives also fits within a broader theory prevailing among INGOs to enable chapters to act globally rather than relying solely on an organisation's secretariat or headquarters. For some (potential) funders this is important as well, which means that the GTNI could potentially provide additional flexibility in mobilising resources at the global level.

Other stated purposes - both in various inception documents and expressed during the interviews - include strengthening cross regional cooperation, offering horizontal learning, exchange of information and experiences, and strengthening the capacity of chapters to run global programmes. Finally, the network initiatives could act as important vehicles for developing and disseminating the knowledge developed in the various chapters, throughout the TI movement. All this with the eventual goal of building up expertise in a broader range of areas, increase the global relevance and credibility of the TI movement, and thereby realise more impact on a global scale.

To reach these objectives, each initiative was conceived along a 'hub and spokes' model, with a Lead Chapter taking responsibility for coordinating the work of national TI Chapters on a certain global issue. This constituted a new way of working compared to the traditional division of tasks within the movement, with country chapters focussing on issues within their national borders as well as ad hoc regional cooperation, and TI-S responsible for most of the coordination of global initiatives.

Theme	Lead Chapter	Other participating Chapters
Humanitarian Aid Integrity (HAIP)	TI Kenya	Guatemala, Norway, Kenya, Senegal, Pakistan, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Jordan, Lebanon
Integrity, Independence and Accountability of the Judiciary (the Judiciary)	TI Romania	Bangladesh, France, Chile, Guatemala, Indonesia, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Philippines, Senegal, Zimbabwe
Mining & Corruption (Mining)	TI Australia	Colombia, Mozambique, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Mongolia, Cambodia, DR Congo, Liberia, Zambia, Indonesia, South Africa, Chile, Brazil, Guatemala, Canada, Armenia
Pharmaceuticals and Healthcare (PHP)	TI UK	Albania, Armenia, Colombia, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Slovakia, South Africa, Thailand, Trinidad & Tobago, Turkey
Defence and Security (DSP)	TI UK	73 TI Chapters

The way the GTNI are embedded in the TI Movement

Shifting responsibilities

The GTNI strategy has brought innovations to the traditional way of working within TI, and has at times challenged an organisational culture described as conservative by some interviewees. At a minimum, this setup shifts the burden of management and corresponding responsibilities of global programmes to the Lead Chapters. Assessing the impact of these shifting responsibilities is not easy as the various programmes are in different stages of development - ranging from the start-up phase in case of the Mining programme, full development in the HAIP or well-established as the DSP currently is.

It is clear however, that this shift is not without its problems in any of the initiatives. With all of them it has proven challenging to find the right balance in their relationship with TI-S, between handing over responsibility, providing and receiving support, and monitoring quality. This is true for several aspects of the transition, including the extent to which the chapters are allowed to speak and publish on behalf of the movement, the ability of Lead Chapters to mobilise resources independently, and with respect to reporting requirements. This tension is both a cause and a result of uncertainty within the network as to exact nature of the GTNI: a cause because it has allowed all involved to follow their own ideas about the GTNI and a result since it is in line with the lack of concrete decisions on the strategy from its inception.

No comprehensive procedures or processes were drafted at the outset of the GTNI, which resulted in an uncertain relationship between TI-S and the chapters, as well as among the chapters participating. This lack of guidance may have been a deliberate choice, in order to allow the strategy to develop freely within the movement without decisive influence on its shape by any person or office. In that sense it has worked well, as it has led to the wide variety of initiatives - in terms of topic, structure and capacity of its Lead Chapter - visible today. This means that while several issues persist that could and perhaps should have been avoided by detailing more clearly what the GTNI were supposed to be, as an incubator for new initiatives the strategy has succeeded. Some uncertainties in the division of tasks between TI-S and the chapters, are thus a function of a deliberately loose inception.

Decentralisation has been one of the objectives of the GTNI, and interviewees as well as strategic documents cite several (potential) advantages of the setup: enabling cost savings and increasing the resilience of the organisation. However, these advantages have not been realised because has remained unclear how and which tasks currently performed by TI-S could be shared or taken over by the Lead Chapters, and how this would reflect on internal quality control processes. This is true for both the extent of TI-S involvement and the nature of that involvement. The various ways in which the TI-S could or does support the Lead Chapters (fundraising, capacity building, monitoring & evaluation, expertise, communications, quality control, etc.) are not defined nor have the Lead Chapters formulated clearly what they expect from TI-S. This has led to gaps in expectations between TI-S and the programmes, inefficiencies and in some instances frustration.

Internal awareness of the GTNI

The ambiguity in the allocation of responsibilities also has another, perhaps less deliberate cause apart from a lack of fixed processes: it reflects low visibility of the GTNI within TI-S and the wider movement. All internal stakeholders interviewed for this review agreed that there is very little awareness of the goals, aims and contributions of the GTNI to the work of the movement in units and chapters not directly involved with them. Some interviewees estimate that less than 50% of TI employees could name one or more of the GTNI. Overall, the enthusiasm that could accompany an innovative, more distributed way of working and increase its chances at success, is not present within the movement.

These low levels of awareness and enthusiasm may be a function of a low-key starting period for the GTNI, and the fact that many of the programmes have become fully operational only relatively recently. Furthermore, the GTNI strategy was given little publicity internally (e.g. information sessions in staff meetings, well-published calls for participation, or a newsletter). According to the interviewees, many colleagues do not feel that they have a clear view of why the initiative had been set up, why it could be important, what the mandate of the GTNI is and how tasks are divided between the networks and the Secretariat. Interviewees saw the purpose of the initiative in different ways: for some its main purpose was funding, for others decentralisation. Non-Lead Chapters interviewed saw the network and expertise building function as most important. Similarly, the confidence in the potential for success differed significantly between interviewees as some considered it an experiment likely to fail while others were convinced this could become a strategy central to the movement as a whole.

Interviewees did agree that International Board and Management Team support for the GTNI has not been unequivocal over the two programming periods. They felt that the current Board is supportive of the GTNI, in particular as it has been included in the new Strategy, but that they have not yet put their full weight behind it.

Organisational chart

Assigning responsibilities within the TI Secretariat concerning the GTNI, has not followed any clear strategic planning. It currently sits within the ODD department, and is covered by two members of staff: a senior manager and a dedicated programme coordinator. Despite the suboptimal conditions, their work is greatly appreciated by the chapters. Within a relatively short timeframe this team has succeeded in forging a group of programmes that are in contact with each other, they have built an understanding among the GTNI on ways to improve their work and have supported them in mobilising resources. The lack of clarity on what is expected of the TI-S in general and of the dedicated staff in particular, has unfortunately also led to some frustrations within TI-S and among the chapters. As the chapters and other units within TI-S are unsure what they can expect from the dedicated staff, they receive a broad range of requests on top of their duties monitoring the GTNI as a strategy. This has resulted in a high workload and dilution of attention, which in turn has at times led to disappointment among the chapters.

The GTNI are not formally connected to the geographical units in TI-S, although regional coordinators are informed and sometimes involved in the work led from ODD in an informal, case-by-case manner. Other units within TI-S are also involved in providing support to the GTNI, for instance the Communications and Research departments. It is felt however that in the case of the Communications department, they currently understand their role as monitoring GTNI communications whereas the programmes would prefer them to support and improve the effectiveness of their communications. This dichotomy again seems caused by a lack of clarity on what is expected from each actor in communicating externally.

Recruitment and inception of initiatives

Originally, the recruitment of the GTNI chapters was envisaged along five objective criteria, which would have to make sure that the Lead Chapter was in grade of leading and managing a strong global network, had the credibility and expertise to be a global thought leader on the topic and lead the way in mobilising resources to run the programme. These five criteria were the following:

- **Relevance and Focus:** The proposed area of thematic and sector anti-corruption work must be relevant to a critical number of other chapters within the TI Movement, as focused as possible, and with clear boundaries.
- **Stewardship:** The governance of the host chapter must be robust and its board of directors strongly engaged with knowledge of the theme or sector.
- **Leadership:** The host chapter must have a vibrant entrepreneurial spirit and participatory leadership qualities. It must demonstrate its legitimacy, and be able to operate at high level of professional standards.
- **Management:** The initiative must be conceived, designed and managed to benefit both the host chapter and the TI Movement and must be fully integrated into the chapter's own work and management arrangements.
- **Fundraising:** The host chapters must have the ability to proactively fundraise for this new area of work.¹

However, in practice these guidelines have not been fully adhered to. Out of the five current GTNI Lead Chapters, only one - the DSP - meets all or most of the above criteria and one or two others can be expected to fulfil them in the coming two years. Especially the criteria pertaining to the chapters' capacity to run a global programme (Stewardship, Leadership, Management and Fundraising) were in most cases not present yet before the start of the initiative. That capacity had and still has to be built up with the support of the Secretariat and others within the movement. The initiatives are deemed to live up to the Relevance and Focus criterium according to most interviewees, an assessment the reviewers agree with.

¹ Chapter-led Thematic Network Initiatives, Governance and Operational Guidelines; approved during the International Board of Directors meeting, 6th November 2013.

If the criteria were not leading, how were the programmes selected? Interviewees described the recruitment process as political and not fully transparent as the current GTNI Lead Chapters have been selected to pursue other goals pertinent to the mission of the movement, such as chapter capacity building or accessing certain funding streams. Furthermore, it was felt that the application process had not been publicised widely enough within the movement. Nonetheless, all interviewees supported the current GTNI Lead Chapters and no one perceived their inclusion in the initiative as unfounded even as there are some concerns on the sustainability of some of them. It was also acknowledged that flexibility in the selection of chapter is justified to allow for a bottom-up selection of topics for the GTNI.

However, as with the purpose of the GTNI strategy, this flexibility does mean that there is still little clarity on how and when a new initiative could be established, how decisions about new initiatives would be taken, and how the GTNI would support the wider goals of the movement. The fact that clear goals for the GTNI or sunset provisions are also lacking, heightens this lack of clarity. Throughout the process, it thus becomes difficult to pin down why a programme is global, and why it should be part of the GTNI and receive the corresponding support. In the current phase of development of the GTNI, this is not necessarily a major issue yet. When expanding or consolidating the strategy however, a more comprehensive procedure and set of guidelines would increase the internal credibility of the initiatives as its value to the movement becomes embedded in a verifiable process.

As mentioned, there are no conditions for withdrawing the GTNI Lead Chapter status from a chapter, for discontinuing an initiative or passing the lead status onto a different chapter. This is in part due to the lack of indicators for success and the lack of monitoring and evaluation. The GTNI Lead Chapter status is granted for a certain number of years, after which it would be possible to pass that status on to another chapter. It is however not very clear what would happen to the capacity building, finances and expertise invested in the Lead Chapter in the years prior to that. Neither is there a clearly defined process for taking these difficult decisions and implementing the move. The same is true for unwinding a programme if it underperforms or the movement deems that it is not in its interest to support the initiative any further. Overall, closing GTNI does not seem to be considered a real possibility, and this may lead to reluctance in setting up new network initiatives or difficulty in monitoring them effectively.

Governance

Within the movement or even among those involved with the GTNI, there is no agreement yet on the ideal mix of governance tools to balance the desire for bottom-up creativity and ownership by the chapters, with the need to monitor the global work and minimise the reputational risk to the movement. Currently the following monitoring and reporting levels are in place in the GTNI or the chapters involved:

- the Lead Chapters' boards
- oversight (board) subcommittees in the Lead Chapters' boards
- the boards of the non-lead participating chapters

- the International Board's Governance Committee (and through its reports also the full board)
- the editorial board
- the TI management team
- the GTNI team in the Secretariat (dedicated staff)
- the regional directors

These are too many layers where some form of oversight is taking place, which makes the governance structure unclear and therefore both ineffective and overly bureaucratic.

Management of the GTNI

The task of managing the GTNI strategy is divided between the Lead Chapters, TI-S and the Board, especially its Governance Committee. Regarding the day-to-day management, two elements were mentioned recurrently as focal areas for this review: the division of tasks between TI-S and Lead Chapters on the one hand, and the relationships between Lead and non-Lead Chapters on the other.

The general role of the TI Secretariat

In the workshops and interviews, internal stakeholders discussed the most important contributions of the TI-S in running the programme:

- Facilitating contact between chapters: TI-S is seen as an important **connector**, in touch with all TI Chapters and in a good position to make introductions and facilitate communications.
- Supporting **project management** where needed: managing complex international programmes is new for some Lead Chapters. In the long term it is still envisioned that they should be able to manage the programme on their own but in the meantime TI-S offers valuable management support and expertise.
- Facilitating **horizontal learning** between the chapters: interviewees were enthusiastic about the potential for learning between the initiatives about running the programmes, and to share learning and tools within chapters. There appears to be ample scope for learning exchanges, and TI-S can leverage their position in facilitating this.
- **Resource mobilisation** and managing funds: TI-S can draw on significant expertise in raising and managing funds. The Lead Chapters, with the exception of TI UK, have the experience nor the capacity for global fundraising and therefore rely heavily on TI-S to support them. TI-S' position in Europe and as a central hub also enables it to facilitate the management of funds from donors with specific requests (e.g. regarding the geographical position of beneficiaries) or advise chapters in managing their own funds in cases where they issue subgrants.
- Supporting **publications**: TI-S has a specialised communications team which manages the publications carrying the global brand, and the review process connected to those publications. They facilitate media relations and produce various types of communications for the movement.

Capacity building

As illustrated by the above list, TI-S is still quite heavily involved in the management of the various programmes. This is pertinent to one important aim of the GTNI: to allow chapters to build capacity and expertise to lead on global topics which are key to TI as a movement. This goal and whether the GTNI structure is conducive to stronger chapters has not yet been tested in some chapters (Romania and Australia), which are still in the process of operationalising their initiative. The HAIP, PHP and DSP initiatives have had significant successes in building their expertise, reputation and capacity.

The heavy involvement of TI-S goes against the purported goal of decentralisation. Only with the DSP programme has the role of the TI-S been limited and facilitating rather than executing. The reason for this seems to be two-fold. First, as mentioned above, the entry requirements for new global initiatives (as opposed to the existing DSP) have not been adhered to. This meant that the capacity of Lead Chapters to run and finance a global programme, needed to be built up as opposed to that capacity already being in place. This has led the newer programmes to request increasing external support from TI-S. Second, the DSP programme has built up its expertise - both regarding content and programme management - over the course of around eight years. During that time, the programme has strengthened the UK office out of which the programme was run. So when assessing the current new initiatives, which have been in existence between 0 and 2 years, this timeline for the build-up of the DSP and TI-UK should be taken into account. In programmes where most of the capacity building has yet to take place, impact could be delayed by several years, potentially beyond the current strategic planning cycle.

There is as a result of the above, a conflict between the allocated resources - decentralisation meaning decreased funding and capacity at the TI-S - and the actual functions performed by the Secretariat, which have not been redistributed but rather have been expanded. Unfortunately, the impact of the GTNI strategy on the workload and responsibilities of TI-S staff has never been assessed, either prior to the GTNI as a strategy or during the past two years. Also, the various units within TI-S engaging with the GTNI (other than GTNI dedicated staff) have not seen the GTNI included in their work descriptions. TI-S staff (both GTNI dedicated and otherwise) have in the interviews reported high workloads and stress levels due to the fact that a decrease in capacity has not been accompanied by a decrease in tasks. In fact, the non-adherence to the initial GTNI requirements combined with the short amount of time envisioned for the new GTNI to succeed, have added to the TI-S workload. The costs and benefits of this, in terms of financial resources, time and personnel, are currently not clearly understood, and not reflected in the strategic conversation around the GTNI.

Horizontal Collaboration

Among the Lead Chapters, and together with the TI-S staff dedicated to the GTNI, a core group is emerging that has started to discuss the commonalities and common interests of the various programmes.

In a first meeting in August 2015 at a side-event to the TI AMM in Malaysia, the Lead Chapters started a conversation on what they can do together within the movement. A second horizontal learning meeting in London in November 2015, solidified this collaboration and fostered a strong desire among participants to continue the conversation. This emerging structural exchange between the most important actors in the GTNI strategy, is a significant success. Not only will it help the programmes to carve out a space for the GTNI within the movement, but the horizontal learning has the potential to further increase the capacity of the Lead Chapters, foster mutual understanding of the different environments in which these chapters need to operate, and distribute the knowledge acquired throughout the movement.

Within the GTNI programme networks themselves, the relationship between Lead Chapter and participating chapters appears to be minimally regulated, despite the existence of some general guidelines. In some cases, participating chapters reported having little contact with other participating chapters. They indicated that most of the communications and activities were channelled through the Lead Chapter. It was felt that this resulted in a missed opportunity to build true networks, for instance at the regional level, in favor of a more centralised model. In some instances, participant chapters felt that communications between them and the Lead Chapter were not sufficiently clear and transparent either, and that there is less horizontal engagement than they would have liked. Some interviewees also mentioned difficulties in planning a programme that reflects the priorities of the participating national chapters, which can be significantly different from those of the Lead Chapter, for instance when Lead Chapters in developed countries work with chapters in developing countries.

Branding, external communications and quality control

One specific area that has been cause for concern and frustration among the actors involved in the GTNI, is external communications. There does not seem to be any agreement on the guidelines applicable to branding GTNI outputs or on the preceding publication process. In theory, the GTNI programmes should have the authority to speak on behalf of the movement and would prospectively be the point of contact for media enquiries relating to their area of expertise. Unfortunately, the branding of publications and communications (as TI national chapter rather than Transparency International outputs) and an update of the regular publication process for global publications, have not been settled yet. An issue further complicating the matter is the identification of the programmes with its lead chapter. This means that outputs are seen as outputs of one chapter rather than of the programme as a whole, which reduces the outputs' credibility as representative for the network as a whole.

In general, external communications around the GTNI are not based on a strategy. There are no guidelines on whether the programmes should be given a place on the global TI web platforms or if they should be confined to the Lead Chapter websites. It is clear from this lack of external communications on the GTNI (as has been the case for internal communications), that the strategy is still in its testing phase and/or there is no broad consensus yet that this is the right strategy for global topics.

The GTNI are given the support to develop movement-wide policy positions in their areas of expertise. Thus far, some Lead Chapters seemed unaware of this possibility and the procedures to be followed at the time of the review. At the same time, other chapters have indicated that they would like more freedom in truly developing policy positions for the movement, and to be given the ability to become the external face of the movement in their area of expertise.

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

At present, GTNI do not have a systematic Monitoring and Evaluation approach with key performance indicators, objectives, activities and outcomes. Some Chapters utilise internally developed tools in their national work, but these are not entirely applicable to the GTNI activities.

The reporting currently follows a standardised process and templates, with quarterly reports to TI-S on the activities of the Initiatives, and a yearly report to the Board. In the past two years, reporting periods have been irregular due to organisational scheduling changes. Interviewees from the Lead Chapters did not consider the reporting burdensome. However, interviewees in general did not have a clear insight on the utility of the reporting towards improving the delivery of the programmes.

At the level of the International Board, the Governance Committee is responsible for reporting to the full International Board on the GTNI strategy. From the interviews it appears that this reporting is lacking in depth and analysis due to the limited time available for preparing, presenting and discussing the progress of the various initiatives in the International Board meetings. Some in the Governance Committee have indicated that a more timely delivery of the initiatives' own reports, would help them to better prepare their own reporting to the full Board, thus perhaps leading to greater investment of the International Board in the GTNI.

Conflict management

Interviewees highlighted that there are currently no regulations on enforcing the agreed GTNI processes within the TI movement. For instance, if a GTNI chapter chooses to not follow publications processes, the movement has few ways to sanction that decision and - similarly - few ways of incentivising chapters to comply with the process. This is particularly relevant when responsibility is with the GTNI Lead Chapter, for example in publishing studies, or where the TI-S relies on due diligence and collegial collaboration from the part of the chapters in order to monitor their performance.

TI-S staff has expressed frustration at not having tools at hand to ensure that chapters respect the time and human resources needed to effectively follow some of these processes. At the same time, some lead chapters have expressed frustration at the overly bureaucratic procedures they feel they need to follow. This leads to the conclusion that the rules and procedures need to be clearer and probably lighter for some types of publications, but that for those transgressions that all understand pose a threat to the movement, strong enforcement mechanisms should be in place.

Sustainability of the GTNI

As discussed above, some uncertainties remain regarding the planning and management of the GTNI. These are in part due to the political nature of the planning, the flexibility in applying the guidelines, and the early stage of implementation of several of the initiatives. However, some questions may already be distilled. Below we discuss the financial sustainability and the expected potential for sustainable impact.

Financial sustainability

At present it is challenging to assess the sustainability of the GTNI initiative as a whole. The chapters are at very different stages of implementation, and operate in diverse funding environments. They also differ in the extent to which they are cross-subsidised by the TI-S or have been successful in fundraising independently. The main question for the coming period will be if the GTNI programmes can unlock new funding opportunities without diverting funds from other TI Chapters or initiatives that would be funded by the same donors. Some interviewees were confident this is indeed possible as there is a perception that donors often prefer to donate to an initiative with local links. Building up GTNI in previously uncovered industries and geographical areas therefore increases the potential of reaching out to these funders. To date, some initiatives, such as the HAIP, have had some success in securing funding from government and EU programmes. The Mining Programme has had similar success securing funding from industry.

Enabling the GTNI to successfully raise their own funds would require building their capacity to do so, with the exception of TI-UK, where such capacity is already present. This would need to be tailor-made support as the funding needs and contexts of the various programmes are quite distinct. Providing such support through the TI-S would however significantly increase the workload of the Secretariat, at least in the initial 3 to 5 year period. Aside from building capacity and providing support, new funding opportunities will also raise demands regarding the management of those funds, as in the case of funding sources channelled through the EU which are managed by TI-S on behalf of a programme. The balance of responsibilities and the available capacity within TI-S will need to be assessed to ensure that the support provided to the initiatives does not come at the expense of resource mobilisation for the whole movement, and that funders' monitoring requirements will be met once funding is secured.

Finally, corporate funding has been secured for some of the programmes. In cases where this results in a programme or chapter depending on one industry stakeholder for a majority of its funding, as in the case of the Mining Programme, interviewees have expressed concern about the possible consequences for the perceived independence of the initiative and ultimately the movement. Among TI chapters, there is no general agreement on whether to engage corporations and industries and to which extent. TI-UK has expressed an interest in further exploring these opportunities and are well placed to do so but there is a risk that this will lead to conflicts with other chapters if clear and widely accepted checks and balances are lacking, as they currently are.

Relying on a sole funder - whether corporate, private or government - does expose the GTNI, especially the Lead Chapter, to vulnerabilities, should this funder decide to discontinue collaboration. Similarly, in the case of funding dependent on the relationships between Lead Chapter and funder, there is currently no strategy for managing situations where a Lead Chapter of the GTNI would pass to a different chapter.

The funding landscape for the movement as whole - as is the case for other INGOs - is complex and rapidly changing. Currently, the strategic aspects of different funding scenarios and their risks for the programmes have not been explored, nor have strategies been developed to manage these risks. In keeping with this, the additional funding opportunities that the GTNI could provide as the combine a global movement with a track record with national chapters with the required know-how, have yet to be taken full advantage of. This means that while there are risks that need to be mapped and mitigated, such a mapping exercise should also lead to a positive resource mobilisation strategy for the GTNI.

Sustainability of impact

In the next 3 to 5 years, only some of the GTNI can be expected to see concrete impact of their work, most notably the PHP and HAIP, while the DSP already has a strong track-record of global impact in their field. The other two programmes, Mining and the Judiciary, will likely have to focus on building up their expertise and capabilities, and engage in initial research.

In several GTNI, expertise is concentrated within few individuals, whose leaving the organisation would potentially compromise the work of the whole programme. Several interviewees expressed concerns about this dependence on a few key individuals. At the same time, interviewees agreed that TI is probably not drawing on all the expertise available within the movement, as there is no clear understanding or mapping of the background and skills of all colleagues. It is our understanding that technical solutions are being developed to better utilise the existing potential within the movement.

Those programmes that are likely see some impact in the next 3 to 5 years are the initiatives led by a chapter that already has experience in the sector, and where some tools and products have already been developed. In initiatives that are at a less advanced stage of development, the timeline for impact is likely to be significantly longer, as has been the case with the DSP.

Although the programme planning documents contain results frameworks, the implementation plans in many GTNI have not been met. Impact will also depend on the extent to which chapters work together. At the moment, collaboration between the various chapters is in early days. This is especially true for transversal collaboration between non-Lead Chapters.

Risk management

Currently, there is no overarching (TI movement level) strategic assessment and management of risks connected to the GTNI programmes. Therefore, approaches to risks may be driven by the attitudes of key people within TI and the TI-S. For instance, in the case of the management of legal and reputational

risks, this may mean that the understanding of the likelihood and severity of potential damage to TI is driven by a few recent incidents, and therefore may be biased. The programmes have submitted their individual risk assessments with the programme planning documents. However, the risk assessment template used does not indicate risk owners or specify a periodic review of these assessments.

IV. Conclusions & Recommendations

Based on interviews, discussions during the workshop with the Lead Chapters and a review of the available documentation, we have identified some areas for improvements within the GTNI strategy. Given the scope of this review, it has not been possible to research all potential improvements or test recommendations within the network. Therefore, the reviewers have opted to add to the more concrete recommendations several suggestions for topics that should be discussed within TI internally, in order to collectively determine the future of the GTNI. This will help to adjust the way the GTNI are operationalised and will foster a coherent internal conversation which can help to alleviate perhaps the main issue: a lack of understanding and alignment.

General

The general conclusion is that a relatively light inception phase of the GTNI, with limited procedures in place, no hard requirements for the initiatives, a broad mandate for the dedicated staff and limited internal visibility of the GTNI, has had a profound effect on the development and the current state of the GTNI as a strategy. On the one hand it has resulted in a vibrant network of interesting programmes, the leaders of which have recently started to come together as a group. On the other hand, expectations of the strategy and the people involved, are quite different among those people, and this has been cause for concern and friction. In addition, the relatively light set-up and ensuing interpretations of what the GTNI is or should be, have increased the need for support for new GTNI programmes even as the capacity in TI-S was not increased commensurately.

It is the reviewers strong opinion that this has created a situation that is currently stable but not tenable for much longer. According to us, TI needs to answer the question: will the movement provide the Secretariat and potential new global thematic initiatives the resources and allow them the time to develop the programmes into global authorities on their topics, or are there insufficient reasons to put more effort into the GTNI? Given the promising progress of several of the programmes, albeit with significant TI-S support, and the time it has taken the Defence and Security Programme to become a global leader, we believe there are sufficient reasons to follow through now.

Recommendation

1. Create an informal GTNI steering group with a Board Member as an observer, representatives of various units within TI-S, the Lead Chapters and non-lead chapters. This group should build on the work done in the Kuala Lumpur and London meetings of GTNI actors. **Lead: TI-S**
2. Strive to create a real community among the GTNI and relevant TI-S staff, through encouraging contacts via online tools, social media, and by meeting in person as regularly as possible.
Lead: Chapters

3. Define what success would look like for the GTNI as a whole and each network by developing a Road Map with clear time line and follow up on the indicators, even if these are qualitative rather than quantitative. Include investment of resources, also within the movement (e.g. investment of resources from TI-S; funding regrouped from other recipients) and a system for addressing underperformance. **Lead: the Governance Committee**

Clarifying division of tasks

We have identified two types of objectives of the GTNI. The first are internal objectives for the movement, which include collaboration between chapters, fundraising opportunities, decentralising, capacity building, etc. These objectives have been reached to a substantial degree, albeit at the expense of the TI-S and especially those dedicated staff coordinating the GTNI. Externally the objective to create impact, build expertise and gain external credibility on certain topics has only been reached in certain programmes (most notably the DSP) but not because the GTNI was adopted as a strategy within the movement. Rather, the low-key start of the DSP and the newer GTNI programmes, have allowed the programmes to find their own way and succeed insofar as they have been resourceful and persistent.

This means that the creative start-up phase has proven useful. However, this approach is not sustainable. Choices have to be made as to the role of the dedicated staff and the other units within TI-S, the expectations of and from new and existing chapters participating in an initiative, and the distribution of responsibilities between those involved. The choice for a loose, flexible, incubator type inception, has not shifted the burden of the start-up phase towards the chapters but has instead increased the need for additional TI-S resources. New initiatives need more support or more time, similar to the time it has taken the DSP at TI-UK to build up expertise and operational capacity.

So if it is decided that the present flexible approach is the best way forward, and there seems to be a consensus there, more resources should be made available at TI-S to build the lead chapters' capacity, or a longer trial period should be foreseen for chapters to be able to build up their own capacity. This however, would mean that current strategic priorities would only become fully functioning Global Thematic Network Initiatives in five years or so. The other option would be to set stricter entry requirements and KPIs, and enforce those diligently, to increase the chances of already achieving impact under the current strategic plan.

Recommendations

4. The TI-S should be a flexible organisation able to deploy their various roles - connector, capacity builder, resource mobilisator - for the whole movement, including the GTNI on an as needed basis. For the GTNI specifically, TI-S dedicated staff should play the role of coordinator and facilitator, ensuring that within the various other units within TI-S enough attention is given to the

programmes' needs. In order for those other units to be able to build capacity of (lead) chapters or mobilise resources together with them, the GTNI should be included in these unit's work plans and resources should be made available to ensure they have sufficient capacity. If this is not done, the progress in the new programmes will slow down and impact will be achieved later.

Lead: the Governance Committee

5. Draft individual development plans for each initiative. In such a plan, the Road Map for building up the expertise, capacity and credibility needed for a successful programme, should be outlined, including necessary resources and where to find them. It could become an MoU type of agreement outlining the expectations of the various actors: of TI-S (what kind of support, what not to do, role of communications, regional directors, etc), the lead chapter (initial requirements, deliverables, fundraising objectives etc.) and chapters participating in the programme network. Such an individualised approach will ensure maximum flexibility while at the the same furthering mutual understanding of the expectations and costs involved. **Lead: the GTNI Steering Group**
6. Develop a structured plan for capacity building for each of the GTNI programmes. This should cover an assessment of gaps, an evaluation of potential options for filling those gaps, and a clear reasoning for choosing the most cost-effective approach. This could be beneficial for all chapters regardless of their level of progress. **Lead: the GTNI Steering Group**
7. Lead chapters should make an effort to facilitate the creation of a true network by increasing contact between the participating chapters. In other words, the Hub-and-spokes model should be complemented by a light network function among the participating chapters. **Lead: Chapters**

Streamlining structures and procedures

Recommendations

8. One important condition for success would be to streamline TI's governance structures (in general but especially around the GTNI), to prevent duplications, bureaucracy, inefficiencies etc. Ensure that the programmes are governed individually through a structure suitable for the type of programme, where controversial topics such as Mining or DSP would require a more objective and intensive oversight than HAIP or the Judiciary. **Lead: the Governance Committee**
9. Develop clear selection procedure and transparent criteria for recruiting GTNI. Make sure that the criteria are relevant, supported by the Board and applied in practice. The criteria should be widely published and applications assessed based on a clear weighted system. However, the criteria need to be flexible enough to allow for different types of subjects, size and location of the Lead Chapter, and potential for fundraising. Selection criteria should be linked to the goals of the global strategy. **Lead: the Governance Committee**

10. Develop an exit strategy for GTNI and GTNI Lead Chapters with clear conditions for discontinuing a GTNI, taking the lead role from a Chapter, and management processes for the transition of expertise, contacts and assets. **Lead: the GTNI Steering Group**
11. Develop a strategy for the GTNI on building up topical expertise and increasing their visibility as go-to expert on the topic area within TI and globally. This would also include internal processes on responding to media queries, reviewing whether there is untapped expertise within TI through previous experience of colleagues, and strategic thinking around recruitment. **Lead: Chapters**

Creating awareness and enthusiasm

Once there is more clarity on what the GTNI are, how they are managed within the movement, and what is expected of the various actors, an internal marketing campaign for the GTNI may be in order. If the strategy becomes more widely known within the movement, the willingness of chapters to lead or participate in a global programme, should increase, which in turn strengthens the strategy. If that happens, the GTNI can become an invaluable additional way for the TI movement to collaborate on a network level, promote the TI brand and battle corruption on a global scale.

Recommendations

12. Take action to increase enthusiasm within the movement and raise the profile of the GTNI internally. Internal communications around new initiatives should be carefully crafted if TI wants the movement to be on board. This could include tools such as dedicated sessions at the AAM, more intense presence on internal and external social media, presentations at staff meetings at TI-S, etc. **Lead: TI-S**
13. More positive reporting with more analysis and active promotion of the quality of the GTNI. The GTNI need champions. **Lead: Chapters**
14. Create a regular internal newsletter on the GTNI, focussing on successes rather than on organisational aspects. **Lead: Chapters**
15. Consider a relaunch of the GTNI once the TI-S has been reorganised in 2016. This should focus - again - on promoting the successes of the programmes. **Lead: TI-S**

Conscious risk- and brand management

The question of quality control, brand and risk management and representing the whole network externally, needs to be urgently addressed. Agreement needs to be reached between the Lead Chapters, TI-S and the TI Board, on what the acceptable levels of risk are, how these risks are managed, and by whom. Again here, the keywords are alignment and a flexible approach.

The procedures for the GTNI should be complementary to the existing ones for chapters and other TI actors, and should be as light as possible. Only if some of the responsibilities for quality control and brand management are also decentralised, will the GTNI programmes become truly independent from the TI-S. Especially when the GTNI strategy would be consolidated or even expanded, a more comprehensive procedure and set of guidelines would increase the internal credibility of the initiatives as valuable to the movement. Ideally, there would be one smart set of monitoring procedures for the Movement, in which the GTNI are given their logical space.

This leads to the conclusion that the rules and procedures need to be clearer and probably lighter for some types of publications, but that for those transgressions that all understand pose a threat to the movement, strong enforcement mechanisms should be in place. The movement needs to decide how to govern on two levels:

- The quality of the programmes themselves, which should be governed as close to the Lead Chapters as possible. Control mechanisms should cover only for top-line issues like global reputational risk and legal liability and need to be aligned with similar mechanisms for individual chapters and other parts of the movement.
- The GTNI as a strategy, which should be governed (and supported) through a clear and simple mechanism in which the TI-S and the Board receive the right information periodically and are provided the tools to intervene where necessary. The GTNI Steering Group could support this.

Recommendations

16. Introduce a mix of minimum and maximum reporting requirements, voluntary peer reviews, and communications support, to safeguard the legality and quality of external communications. The focus should be on preventing legal implications for other chapters and the network, building a strong TI brand together (positive) and supporting chapters to increase the quality of their output and general external communications. **Lead: the GTNI Steering Group**
17. Support GTNI in developing monitoring and risk management policies in line with the existing TI processes, either at TI-S or regional level. **Lead: TI-S and the Governance Committee**
18. Aim to streamline the use of the TI International brand for GTNI publications, with the Lead Chapters included as implementers or producers rather than owners of outputs. **Lead: TI-S**
19. Draft comprehensive guidelines on communications and branding of GTNI through publications and online. Develop a system for sanctioning non-adherence to guidelines if this is uncollegial or harmful to the goals or reputation of the movement. **Lead: TI-S Communications team**
20. Consider allowing for individualised reporting structures. Revisit the goals of reporting: it is important to understand what the purpose of the reporting is, what happens as a result of reporting and tailor reporting structure to these needs. **Lead: TI-S**

21. Below are some suggestions for risks and impacts that could be further elaborated through as collaborative risk assessment exercise between GTNI chapters and TI. A separate risk assessment should be performed for funding scenarios. **Lead: the GTNI Steering Group**

Risk/Vulnerability*/Threat	Likelihood**	Impact***	Owner****	Possible mitigation strategy
Claims or statements in GTNI publications lead to legal challenges				
Claims or statements in GTNI publications lead to tarnished reputation of TI movement				
GTNI not financially sustainable				
GTNI fails to position itself as global hub of expertise				
GTNI Lead Chapter fails to manage the network efficiently				
Key people leave GTNI				
Failed division of tasks between TI-S and GTNI				
GTNI attracts funding from sources which damage reputation				

*Vulnerability - errors or weaknesses in planning, processes and procedures. Threat - external actors or factors that can harm you and your work. **Likelihood - the probability that negative consequences will occur. ***Impact - the negative consequences of vulnerabilities and threats. ****Owner: The actor or entity that has the power to take action in order to mitigate the risk.

Financial and Human Resources

In order for the GTNI to reach their full potential, some choices need to be made. Does the movement consider the programmes important enough to add resources to build the capacity of the chapters to lead a global programme, or does TI accept that it takes more time to develop the capacity and expertise to become a global leader in a certain area? Under the current conditions, the cost to TI-S of supporting the programmes to the extent to which they require support is covered nor included in work programmes and budgets. This is untenable both from a Human Resources perspective and from an Organisational Development perspective, as it prevents the GTNI strategy from becoming fully functional.

22. With the inclusion of global thematic programmes in the newly adopted strategy, the issue of resourcing the capacity building of GTNI Lead Chapters should be revisited. If there are no strict requirements to a new chapter leading an initiative, more resources are needed to build capacity, mobilise resources externally and monitor progress. This is important also because if these resources are not made available, only existing strong members will be able to lead a

global programme to short-term success, thus defeating the purpose of building the capacity of chapters to lead on global issues. The only other option would be to accept an extended inception phase, similar to for example the DSP. **Lead: the Governance Committee**

23. Perform risk assessment and develop risk management approaches which include strategic risks and funding scenarios at the level of the movement and individual GTNI. These should be periodically revised. **Lead: the Governance Committee and TI-S**

Aiming for success

In case of global collaboration between more or less equal actors, which is what the GTNI should be, more coordination and clarity is needed than for simple bilateral collaborations or if there is one Hub (TI-S) and several chapters are the spokes. This change in culture from multiple bilateral or centralised collaborations to network collaboration, has not permeated yet for a variety of reasons mentioned above. In order to reach the potential that most interviewees and the reviewers think the GTNI strategy has, it needs to be perceived as more than a mere extension or expansion on bilateral collaborations. The programmes need to be executed by a Global Thematic Network.

The purpose of any organisational strategy is always to increase more impact, more efficiently. This means that the conditions for the success of the programmes themselves, will need to be put in place in the coming years, until the end of the programme period in 2020. TI can build on some important and very promising successes thus far but only by choosing which type of animal the strategy really is, will it become a sustainable and successful part of the movement.