Governance Performance Assessment Note

Purpose

The purpose of the Governance Performance Assessment Note (PAN) is to assist country and regional teams as they design and manage their aid investments. This document underpins the DFAT Effective Governance Strategy which sets out the aid program's approach to 'effective governance' as one of the six priority areas of the aid policy Australian aid: promoting prosperity, reducing poverty, enhancing stability. This note also supports Australia's *Framework for supporting tax policy and administration through the aid program*, a subset of DFAT's governance framework and an emerging priority for the aid program.

This PAN provides a range of suggested evaluative questions and indicators to assist staff in assessing the performance of aid investments in the governance sector, or sub-sectors, such as public sector reform, economic management, political representation and accountability (including electoral reform), law and justice, and anti-corruption. This PAN also provides suggested methodologies and tools for assessing the governance aspects (including political economy, fragility and conflict dimensions) of aid investments in *all* development sectors. This is in recognition that development results are often driven, or hampered, by governance issues (such as trying to improve the annual planning of a Health Ministry, for example, or supporting politically complex reform efforts in the infrastructure sector). In this way, the Governance PAN aims to further the twin objectives of the Effective Governance Strategy, to support more effective aid investments in the governance sector, as well as enabling DFAT staff to take a 'governance approach' to all our aid investments.

This PAN is a living document; any feedback you may have to improve future iterations is welcome. Please contact the Governance Section (governance@dfat.gov.au) with feedback, or for further information and assistance on performance assessment in governance.

Structure

This PAN includes the following sections:

1. *Assessing the performance of governance investments*
   - (i) *DFAT guidance on performance assessment*
   - (ii) *Choosing evaluative questions and indicators*
   - (iii) *What makes a good indicator*
   - (iv) *Data sources*
   - (v) *Strategic targets*
   - (vi) *Aggregate Development Results*

2. *Assessing the performance of 'governance as an approach'*

3. *Further resources*
   - (i) *High-level governance indicators and analytical tools*
   - (ii) *Example evaluative questions and indicators*

1. Assessing the performance of governance investments

Assessing the performance of investments in governance is challenging. Progress is highly context-dependant and can usually only be seen over a long period of time. Change is often non-linear and unpredictable. Improvements in governance are often difficult to quantify. In particular, gender equality dynamics are frequently poorly captured. There is also no internationally recognised standard for assessing governance (though a number of different international indices and methodologies can be found in Section (3), below). This PAN takes these realities into account and is designed to assist DFAT's country and regional teams in their thinking about the monitoring and evaluation of governance investments.

(i) DFAT guidance on performance assessment

DFAT's Aid Programming Guide (APG) should be the fundamental source of advice for the design and implementation of aid investments. All advice given in this PAN is consistent with the APG and designed to be read in conjunction with it, especially the sections on Performance management for results and Aid program monitoring and evaluation standards.

All governance investments (and indeed *all* aid investments) should have a Program Logic (incorporating a Theory of Change), that is, a plausible and logical explanation for how the investment will cause or contribute to the planned result. For further information, please look at the Explanatory note on program logic.

All but the least complex aid investments will have some kind of a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (beneath a Performance Assessment Framework at the sector or thematic level) which sets out expected results that will follow our inputs; including outputs and various levels of outcomes. Whether these results have been achieved or not is demonstrated by the use of indicators and analysis. The APG contains a glossary in which these and other important terms are explained.

Ideally, your approach to performance assessment should be developed as part of the investment design process. This will help ensure that your choice of indicators suits your context and investment. In particular, your choices should be informed by the problem you are trying to address, what solutions have been identified, how your investment is designed (i.e., the form of aid or modality) and available data. While the monitoring and evaluation framework from a similar investment in another country may be a useful model for you, its indicators may not be the best ones for your situation.

Performance assessment in difficult contexts: remote monitoring

Remote monitoring occurs when a donor or implementing partner is unable, for security or access reasons, to directly monitor aid program activities, and monitoring responsibilities are delegated to others or technology-based information collection strategies are used. More specifically, remote monitoring involves:

- the withdrawal of, or significant reduction in, the number of personnel from the field so that direct observation of program implementation, political context, levels of fragility and conflict, population movements etc. are not possible;
- the oversight of a program by DFAT from another location; and
- the transfer of greater program responsibility to local implementing partners, the community or other third parties.

Remote monitoring strategies may also be used where program locations are inaccessible due to terrain, remoteness, weather (e.g. during monsoonal periods) or bureaucratic restrictions (e.g. non-issuance of visas, denial of permission to travel).

For more detailed information on remote monitoring, see the DFAT's guidance.

(ii) Choosing evaluative questions and indicators

The choice of evaluative questions and governance indicators should be aligned with an aid investment's Theory of Change; what questions and indicators are best suited to demonstrate the progress that you aim to achieve, in the available timeframe? Remember that meaningful development usually takes a long time. Real and lasting change, especially with regard to governance, will likely take decades; consider what usefully can be achieved towards such change in the 3-5 year life-cycle of our aid investments and tailor your indicators accordingly.

It is important to be realistic about attribution and contribution. Results in governance are reliant on many players and interacting elements. This makes identifying the aid program's contribution very difficult and is especially true of results beyond activity-level outputs. The evaluative questions, qualitative indicators, and a 'basket' approach (see below) will help you address this issue. On-going testing of assumptions and feeding back lessons to inform (and if necessary, adjust) governance investments will also be critical in order to ensure our objectives remain realistic and that we have the best chance of achieving results. On-going assessment will also give stakeholders confidence that intermediate changes are supporting progress toward longer-term results.

In this context, it is important to distinguish between outputs and lower-level or intermediate outcome indicators on the one hand, and higher-level outcome indicators on the other. Higher-level outcome indicators (such as those included in Section (3) below) are used to reach judgements about what is happening with regard to (usually national level) governance in the country concerned. Positive change in these indicators can provide useful evidence of longer term trends and progress. In some cases it may be possible to argue that Australia's aid investments have contributed to such progress. However, as noted above, the relatively small scale of our investments and the complexity of developmental changes we are seeking to support, means that in most cases we should focus on the 'short-to-medium term' outcomes and indicators in Section (3) below, for tracking the performance of our aid investments.

(iii) What makes a good indicator

Section (3) of this PAN contains a number of suggested evaluative questions and indicators for a range of governance investments. There are a number of factors to consider when choosing indicators. No single indicator will work in all contexts or show whether real and sustainable improvements in governance are being achieved. A 'basket' approach is recommended where several complementary quantitative and qualitative indicators are used to give a more complete picture of results and performance. An example of a basket approach can be found in Section (3), below.

When considering appropriate indicators, look across the entire table. Many outcomes overlap and governance reforms can be categorised in a range of different ways. For example, while those pursuing reform in the justice sector may find useful indicators and questions under the 'improved security and enhanced justice' outcome, they should also consider indicators under the 'public sector management, public financial management and civil service reform' outcome.

Consider the best use of quantitative and qualitative indicators taking into account their respective merits. Be careful with quantitative indicators; it's tempting to use them because they are often clear, simple and relatively easily obtainable. However, it's important to remember that such indicators often tell a very limited story by themselves. Using poorly targeted quantitative indicators, simply because they are available, can be misleading and distract from the longer term outcomes sought from the investment. They could also create perverse incentives for investment managers and implementers. When using quantitative indicators, having a meaningful baseline against which to collect and compare data over time is crucial.

While qualitative indicators can be more difficult to obtain and necessarily entail an element of subjectivity, they will help reflect the more complex story of progress in governance. This is particularly important because much of the work of governance investments is intangible and not easily categorised through outputs, in contrast to other sectors where outputs are often more easily identifiable (such as roads or clinics built; textbooks or drugs distributed; or teachers or engineers trained). Qualitative indicators will, for example, help tell if an increase in the number of crimes reported to the police means an increase in crime (a negative result), or improved community confidence that police will act on reports (a positive result).

Always disaggregate data as much as possible (by gender and ideally by disability) along with any further ways that make sense in context, such as geographically, by ethnicity or religious group, or socio-economically. This enables more nuanced analysis and reporting of results.

Indicator check-list:

Validity	Does the performance indicator actually measure the result?
Reliability	Is the performance indicator a consistent measure over time?
Sensitivity	When the result changes, will the performance indicator be sensitive to those changes?
Simplicity	How easy will it be to collect and analyze the data?
Utility	Will the information be useful for investment management (decision making, learning, and adjustment)?
Affordability	Can we (and/or our partners) afford to collect the information?

(iv) Data sources

Data sources for measuring aid investment indicators will vary. Ideally local actors in our partner countries will be undertaking performance assessments of reform processes and developmental change more broadly. However, often it will be DFAT staff asking the evaluative questions and quite possibly answering them; that is, making the judgement as to whether particular indicators have been satisfied. Such judgements will be more credible if they are supported by an independent and transparent data collection process (such as the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA)).

Of course, local actors, such as partner government agencies and non-government organisations, also need performance information, and often the same information that DFAT requires. If possible, DFAT should support local actors to generate their own performance information and performance systems to make use of that information, and, where feasible, DFAT should also use these systems.

In addition to performance information generated by local partners, third parties (such as the OECD, multilateral development banks, or international non-government organisations) will also generate useful data. In some cases, this data is comprised of numerically scored qualitative indicators or composites of multiple datasets. High-level data sources of this kind, such as the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), can be useful, however, like all measures of governance, also have their limitations. Country ratings against the WGI, for example, do not assist in understanding why particular aspects of governance are changing, or what the contribution of any one donor or actor may be. For this reason, such indicators are unlikely to be good measures of the impact of an individual aid investment.

(v) Strategic targets

While this PAN is primarily focussed upon the gathering of investment-level results to manage and improve governance sector investments, it is also important to be mindful of DFAT's high-level performance reporting requirements as mandated by the Aid Policy.

Making Performance Count: enhancing the accountability and effectiveness of Australian aid sets out an overarching performance framework for the Australian aid program. As well as mandating the use of country and investment-level targets (which are to be included in Aid Investment Plans and investment designs respectively), the policy creates ten high level targets to assess the aid program with regard to key goals and priorities. Of these ten, the tenth 'Combatting corruption: Develop and implement new fraud control and anti–corruption strategies for all major country and regional programs by July 2015' is centrally focussed upon the governance sector.

A number of others are either partly relevant to governance investments or something that all investment managers should be following. For example, the fourth strategic target 'Empowering women and girls: More than 80 per cent of investments, regardless of their objectives, will effectively

address gender issues in their implementation' will be of significance to all governance investments. Considering the gender dimensions of a governance investment, therefore, is not only good aid practice but something that will feature in DFAT's external reporting.

Similarly, the [first strategic target](#) 'Aid for Trade: Promote economic development by increasing Australia's aid for trade investments to 20 per cent of the aid budget by 2020' will be relevant to many governance investments, especially in the economic management sub-sector.

Australia has also recently committed to a specific target to increase technical cooperation on tax policy and administration. The *Addis Tax Initiative* was launched on 15 July 2015 and requires participating donors, including Australia, to double their support to domestic resource mobilisation by 2020. The initiative also requires Australia to pursue policy coherence, including by ensuring Australia's domestic tax policies reflect the objective of increased revenue mobilisation in partner countries, and the principles of transparency and fairness.

(vi) Aggregate Development Results

The [2014-15 Aid Quality Reporting Good Practice Note](#) sets overall Departmental expectations and rules for quality reporting of aid investments. This PAN is to be read in conjunction with this Note which mandates the reporting of Aggregate Development Results (ADRs). ADRs are indicators that can be aggregated across the aid program to demonstrate the total contribution of Australian aid in partner countries (for example, kilometres of road built or number of children vaccinated). There are 20 ADRs which are to be found at Annex 1 of the Good Practice Note.

Only one ADR is directly relevant to the Governance sector: 'Number of police and law and justice officials trained (women & men)'. Collection of data that pertains to this result is therefore *mandatory* (for law and justice programs). A number of other ADRs may also be relevant, particularly when a governance approach is being used for a non-governance sector investment. Because ADRs are a prominent part of the aid program's external reporting and accountability, it makes sense to give them a central place in an investment's M&E framework where they are relevant.

2. Assessing the performance of 'governance as an approach'

The Effective Governance Strategy recommends taking a 'governance approach' to development, regardless of whether aid investments are in the governance sector or not. This approach recognises that our engagement in partner countries, including our aid investments, must be both technically sound and politically informed—that is, take into account the power dynamics of the context in which we work; who is supporting or resisting change and why? As the Strategy says, DFAT must:

> ***Be realistic about what can be achieved, and make your intervention flexible from the start.*** The aid program operates in complex places. Building effective institutions takes decades. Change may take a long time and can be non-linear, particularly where there is or has been conflict. It is important to be clear about what you want to achieve, but keep programs flexible. This allows you and your partners to take advantage of opportunities that present themselves, and change the direction of the program if it isn't having the impact you wanted it to.

In cases where the problem being addressed may seem intractable, an approach that focuses on building relationships with key players, expanding knowledge of the nature of the political landscape, routinely questioning our assumptions and adjusting our design strategy and tactics in response to new information or unexpected opportunities, is likely to be more effective.

However, such a flexible and non-linear approach presents a special challenge for performance assessment. It stands in sharp contrast to the conventional, pre-planned 'project' approach that tends to view development problems as chiefly technical in nature. Because development pathways cannot be charted out in advance, but instead emerge over time, as new information becomes available, relationships evolve and the context changes, it is often difficult to identify predetermined indicators of progress at the outset. This means that a highly structured monitoring and evaluation framework may not be appropriate (or possible) at the design phase, and we should expect that our approach will need to evolve over the life of the investment, until the final evaluation.

A Theory of Change, if flexibly applied, should provide a useful basis for the design and assessment of complex aid investments. However, it is important that the Theory of Change be continually re-examined over the life of the investment as further knowledge and intermediate results come to hand. Such a theory may even have multiple 'threads', which are tried and reworked or even discarded if they do not prove effective. A complex aid investment taking a governance approach may not only chart a new path to its original objective mid-journey, it may also yield unexpected or unintended results, which are identified along the way. Though, of course, care should be taken about the attribution of positive changes that are incidental to the work of the investment; they may simply be a coincidence.

Perhaps the most difficult element of this flexible approach to performance assessment in a complex setting is the low tolerance that many funding agencies, including DFAT, have for uncertainty. Understandably, bodies spending public money want as much certainty as possible about what that funding will achieve. *Making Performance Count: enhancing the accountability and effectiveness of Australian aid* says that: 'a key principle underlying the framework is that funding at all levels of the aid program will be linked to progress against a rigorous set of targets and performance benchmarks'. However, while targets and benchmarks are required for public accountability, it is not necessary for all measures of success to be *pre-determined*.

It is better that an investment make a genuine contribution to an identified problem than reach a number of generic benchmarks which, while quantifiable, do not represent or adequately describe real progress. Similarly, it is better that an investment is flexible enough to navigate unforeseen challenges, by revisiting and honing its Theory of Change and performance indicators, rather than adhering unreasonably to original ideas and assumptions.

A range of tools and methodologies for approaching the design, management and performance assessment of complex aid investments, including, in particular, the governance dimensions that underpin all developmental change are available. For example[1]:

- **Developmental Leadership Program (DLP), Action Research Approach:** Action research is research initiated to solve an immediate problem or a reflective process of progressive problem solving led by individuals working with others in teams. A DFAT partner, the Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) sets out at the linked page how action research can help build more politically informed development programs. It involves recurring constructive engagement with practitioners and it rigorously documents, contextualises and explains the processes and outcomes of programs as they unfold - and the resultant changes (or not). It aims to help development practitioners and their partners understand more clearly the contexts in which they are operating, the consequences of their practices and policy decisions, and how national and sub-national change is actually occurring.
- **Overseas Development Institute (ODI) RAPID Outcome Mapping Approach:** Outcome Mapping was first developed in the late 1990s as a way to identify and present the qualitative impact of research in terms of changed behaviour and practice. Outcome Mapping is not based on a cause-effect framework; rather it recognises that multiple, non-linear events lead to change. ODI's Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) program has adopted and adapted Outcome Mapping principles to link research and policy change, and develop the RAPID Outcome Mapping Approach (ROMA). The ROMA framework assumes that political environments and social realities are extremely complex and that simple, linear engagement strategies for research and policy-making are insufficient. A key aspect is analysis of forces that may support or obstruct change and the design of a monitoring and learning system to support an iterative process of analysis, action, review and refinement or even a complete revision of action.
- **Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) Standard for Results Measurement:** The DCED Standard for Results Measurement provides a framework, tools and incentives to help development practitioners who are working in complex market systems to articulate their hypothesis very clearly, and to systematically set and monitor indicators which show whether events are occurring as expected.

---

[1] See also, Monitoring and learning in politically smart and adaptive programmes and here.

3. Further resources

This section provides a range of data sources, tools and methodologies which may be of use in assessing the performance of governance investments.

(i) High-level governance indicators and analytical tools[2]

High-level indicators are note typically very useful for assessing the performance of a single aid investment, as such investments are unlikely to have this level of impact. Such indicators will be most helpful in analysing the overall governance environment as the context for our aid investment or when preparing sector or country level analysis and reporting (such as an Aid Investment Plan or Annual Program Performance Report).

Governance (multi-dimensional)	
Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)	Since 1999, the WGI report on six broad dimensions of governance (Voice and accountability, Political stability and absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption). The WGI are composite governance indicators based on 32 underlying data sources on governance for 215 countries over the period 1996-2012.
Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	The V-Dem project distinguishes among 7 high-level *Principles of Democracy* (Electoral, Liberal, Participatory, Majoritarian, Consensual, Deliberative, and Egalitarian) and disaggregates into dozens of lower-level *Components of Democracy*, providing disaggregated indicators for each conception and component. Covers a large number of countries (and some dependent territories) from 1900 to 2012, whenever possible.
Government at a Glance	Collects data and develops indicators describing government activities and performance. It also covers outputs and outcomes both for the whole government, such as trust in government, fiscal sustainability, fairness and rule of law, as well as for some key policy sectors, such as education, health, justice and tax administration. It has been published every two years since 2009. It is mainly centred on OECD countries, but also includes data from emerging economies (China, Russia, Indonesia, India, et al.).
Institutional Profiles Database (IPD)	The IPD provides a measure of countries' institutional characteristics through composite indicators built from perception data. The database covers nine aspects of governance: political institutions; safety, law and order, control of violence; functioning of public administrations; free operation of markets; coordination of actors, strategic vision, innovation; security of transactions and contracts; market regulations, social dialogue; openness to the outside world; social cohesion and mobility. The 2012 edition of the database covers 143 countries and contains 130 indicators, derived from 330 variables.
Barometers (Asian) (African) (Arab)	Different regional initiatives are grouped with the aim of producing and disseminating scientifically reliable data on the politically-relevant attitudes of ordinary citizens on economic, political, and social matters, based on surveys conducted in different countries. Asian Barometer and African Barometer are more irregular and have limited coverage of countries in their regions.

---

[2] This section is a summary of a OECD GovNet aggregation of governance indicators in 2015 (internal working document).

Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)	The BTI analyses and evaluates the quality of democracy, the market economy and political management in 129 developing and 'transition' countries. It measures successes and setbacks on the path toward a democracy based on the rule of law and a socially responsible market economy. A group of country experts assess the extent to which a total of 17 criteria have been met for each of the countries. Focusing on the quality of governance, the Management Index assesses the acumen with which decision-makers steer political processes. The BTI covers 129 developing and transition countries and is published every two years.
Actionable Governance Indicators	The Actionable Governance Indicators (AGIs) focus on specific and narrowly-defined aspects of governance. Because of this specificity these indicators provide greater clarity regarding the actions that governments can take to achieve better results on assessments of certain areas of governance. The AGI data portal consolidates information on actionable governance indicators, provides a one- stop-shop platform to navigate these indicators. The AGI Data Portal provides data from over a thousand indicators.
IADB/DFID Governance Indicators Database	DataGov provides a user-friendly interface for accessing most of the publicly available indicators related to governance. It contains approximately 800 governance indicators for a global sample of countries whose coverage depends on the source. A key feature of the web tool is the information provided in respect to each indicator about the methodology used to build it and the implications this has for the indicator's reliability, validity and suitability for making comparisons across countries and over time. The indicators used in DataGov are drawn from about 30 different publications of a variety of institutions, including multilateral organizations, NGOs, private firms, and think tanks.
Quality of Government Institute database	The Quality of Government Institute database draws on a number of freely available data sources related to quality of government The data is organized by: (1) WII (What It Is) variables: variables pertaining to the core features of quality of governance (such as corruption, bureaucratic quality and democracy); (2) HTG (How To Get it) variables: variables posited to promote the development of quality of governance (such as electoral rules, forms of government, federalism, legal & colonial origin, religion and social fractionalization), and (3) WYG (What You Get) variables: variables pertaining to some of the posited consequences of quality of government (such as economic and human development, international and domestic peace, environmental sustainability, gender equality, and satisfied, trusting & confident citizens). The data set contains data related to quality of government from 107 countries and from 1946 to 2012.

Public Sector Administration, Public Financial Management (including Tax) & Regulatory Environment

Public Expenditure & Financial Accountability (PEFA)	The PEFA Assessment is used to evaluate the current status of countries' Public Finance Management (PFM) systems. The PEFA indicators measure the central government's PFM systems and the performance of donors involved in the government's budgetary processes. The PEFA assessment is divided into six broad categories: credibility of the budget, comprehensiveness and transparency, policy-based budgeting, predictability and control in budget execution, accounting, recording and reporting, and external scrutiny and audit. PEFA is a methodology used by different stakeholders and certified by the PEFA Secretariat. The Framework was launched in June 2005. The application of the Framework at sub-national government level has become widespread and guidelines were developed in 2008. Data on assessments undertaken or planned are updated every six months. The data is available from the Assessment Portal.

Open Budget Index	The Open Budget Index creates an independent, comparative measure of government budget transparency across countries. The report suggests reforms that might be adopted to improve budget transparency, increase public participation, and strengthen institutions of accountability. The Open Budget Index rates countries on how transparent their budget books are to their citizens. The index assesses the availability of key budget documents, the quantity of information they provide, and the timeliness of their dissemination to citizens in order to provide reliable information on each country's commitment to open budgeting. Produced every two years by experts outside government, the survey assesses approximately 100 countries.
Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS)	The MAPS provides a tool to assess the quality and effectiveness of procurement systems. The MAPS addresses four pillars: a) the existing legal framework that regulates procurement in the country; b) the institutional architecture of the system; c) the operation of the system and competitiveness of the national market; and d) the integrity of the procurement system. Over 60 countries have undertaken a MAPS assessment.
The Tax Administration Diagnostic Assessment Tool (TADAT)	The IMF's TADAT provides an objective and detailed performance assessment of a country's system of tax administration. It helps to identify administrative strengths and weaknesses, gives support to setting a reform agenda and facilitating the management and coordination of external support for reforms. The TADAT is a relatively new tool and few assessments have been completed to date in the Asia-Pacific. DFAT's Growth and Revenue Analysis Section (GRA) can assist teams who are interested in supporting a TADAT assessment in partner countries.
OECD Tax Administration	Tax Administration 2013 (formerly the Comparative Information Series), is a unique and comprehensive review of tax administration systems and practices across advanced and emerging economies. The information is mainly obtained from a survey of revenues bodies in the countries covered and from revenue bodies' key corporate documents. The report covers 52 advanced and emerging economies. The report was most recently published in 2013, and a 2015 edition is due to be released shortly.
Revenue Administration Fiscal Information Tool (RA-FIT)	The IMF's RA-FIT is a broad-based online data collection tool that captures key indicators of countries' revenue administration. RA-FIT is less detailed than TADAT and is collected from a large number of countries on a regular basis. It is valuable for cross-country comparisons and comparing a country's performance over time.
Revenue Administration Gap Analysis Program (RA-GAP)	The IMF's RA-GAP is a relatively new technical assistance service that identifies a country's 'tax gap', the difference between potential and actual revenue collection. The analysis includes revenue shortfalls arising from both tax policy and tax administration. While the program is currently focussed on gap analysis of value-added taxes, the IMF is working on extending the methodology to other taxes.
Indicators of the Strength of Public Sector Management Systems (ISPMS)	The ISPMS initiative is a multi-stakeholder effort coordinated by the World Bank to identify and develop international consensus around a comprehensive set of cross-national performance indicators for governance and public management systems that will provide a 'health check' and help to prioritize and target reform efforts. Initially, the initiative has focused on identifying indicators in the areas of public financial management, procurement, public administration and civil service, tax administration and public information. Transparency, accountability and participation are key themes that cut across these systems.

Doing Business	Since 2002, the Doing Business Project provides objective measures of business regulations and their enforcement across economies and selected cities. It looks at domestic small and medium-sized companies and measures complexity and cost of regulatory processes and the strength of legal institutions. Data is collected via a survey based on a standardized business case and completed by experts from the different countries. A report is produced every year. The 2014 report covers 189 economies.

Law & Justice, Anti-corruption & Accountability

The Rule of Law Index (World Justice Project)	The Rule of Law Index measures how the rule of law is experienced in 99 countries around the globe, based on over 100,000 household and 2,400 expert surveys. Adherence to the rule of law is assessed using 47 indicators organized around eight themes: constraints on government powers, absence of corruption, open government, fundamental rights, order and security, regulatory enforcement, civil justice, and criminal justice.
Corruption Perceptions Index	The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) measures the perceived levels of public sector corruption in countries worldwide. Countries are scored from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean). It is a composite index – a combination of polls – drawing on corruption-related data collected by a variety of organisations. The CPI reflects the views of observers from around the world, including experts living and working in the countries and territories evaluated. The CPI is released annually and now covers 177 countries.
Public Accountability Mechanism (PAM)	PAM provides assessments of countries' in-law and in-practice efforts to enhance the transparency of public administration and the accountability of public officials. Several transparency and accountability mechanisms are studied: (1) financial disclosure (income, assets and interests); (2) conflict of interest restrictions; (3) freedom of information (openness, access, rights); and (4) immunity provisions. The initiative covers 87 countries and is updated biannually.

Example evaluative questions and indicators

The table, below, contains <u>examples</u> of *short, medium and longer term outcomes, evaluative questions* and *indicators* that can be used for assessing governance investments, grouped according to governance sub-sector.

The divisions between the different sub-sectors are not absolute and any given investment might involve outcomes that range across the various sub-sectors. For example, an anti-corruption investment might involve public sector reform (e.g. improving the performance of the Ombudsman's office), political representation and accountability (e.g. encouraging NGOs to monitor the performance of government agencies and make use of complaints mechanisms) and law and justice (e.g. resourcing a police internal affairs unit), as well as 'core' anti-corruption activities.

These examples could be used at the sub-national level as well as at the national or even regional level. However, as noted above, it is important to be realistic about outcome trajectories: some of these outcomes may take decades to achieve while others will be accomplished in a shorter time-frame as an intermediate step towards a greater impact.

Ideally, a mixed 'results basket' of evaluative questions, quantitative and qualitative indicators should be used, based on the nature of the particular aid investment and reporting needs. Here is an example of a results basket, drawing on the table below:

WHAT are we focusing on? (*Longer term outcomes*)	**WHAT** are our programs trying to achieve? (*Short-to-medium outcomes*)	**HOW** we will tell if our support is working (*Example basket for one of the medium or short term outcomes. Indicators chosen from example qualitative and quantitative indicators listed*)
Better public sector and financial management	Plans for reform are managed effectively, have an adequate allocated budget and budgets are disbursed as planned	<u>Example basket</u>: Plans for reform are managed effectively, have an adequate allocated budget and budgets are dispersed as planned *Evaluative Question:* What evidence is there that agendas and plans for public sector and financial management reform are being successfully implemented? *Qualitative Indicators:* • Continued progress of implementation on government reform agenda/s • Decreasing political interference in bodies managing reform agenda/s, which is derailing or substantially changing original reform agenda • Quality of communication and coordination between bodies managing reform agendas and other agencies *Quantitative Indicators:* • Percentage of planned reform activities implemented according to timetable • Percentage of reform plans adequately resourced (budgets and actual)

At the end of each example outcome is a list of '*higher level indicators*' to help consider overall national or sub-national trends in the countries in which we work. It is important to note that our aid investments would *not* normally be held accountable for this level of outcome. Rather, these indicators will be most useful when drafting an Aid Investment Plan, Annual Program Performance Review, or otherwise when considering the broader context for our investments.

Table of _example_ evaluative questions and indicators for governance investments

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Governance Sub-sector: Public Sector Reform (including Public Financial Management, Tax, and other aspects of Economic Management)			
Outcome: Better public sector and financial management			
Improved planning in government agencies	In what ways are government agencies utilising their plans in their day to day operations?	Improved timeliness, and timely revision, of plans and planning processes Agency plans are of better quality, including: clear objectives; short, medium and long term outcomes; risks and risk mitigation strategies; process and systems improvements; and address change management Agency plans include responsibilities and accountabilities for implementation Implementation of agency plans is supported by budget allocations	Percentage of government agencies who are reporting progress against strategic or operational plan through annual and financial reports
Improved budget and expenditure management in government agencies	How is the program addressing the political or structural incentives for and against effective budget and expenditure management?	Improved timeliness of budget preparation Increased quality of expenditure management processes Increased transparency and accountability of expenditure management processes Increased transparency of public procurement processes Legal frameworks regulating government procurement are in place Legal frameworks regulating government procurement are used/adhered to Decreasing political interference in public procurement processes Decreasing corruption in public procurement processes Legal frameworks for public financial management are in place Legal frameworks for public financial management are utilised/adhered to Improved quality of government financial statements Timely preparation of government financial statements Effective internal audit procedures Independent audits of agencies show that allocated budgets were received and expended as planned	Percentage of agencies whose accounts are independently audited Number of reviews of auditor general reports conducted by Parliamentary committees
Improved quality of policies and policy development processes	What policy and information is informing development priorities?	Improved targeting or prioritisation of policy reforms towards development priorities Increased commissioning of research by government agencies Increased quality of research commissioned by government agencies Greater application of research and evidence (including relevant international standards) in developing policies Increased transparency of policy development process	Number and percentage of agencies (note which ones) that commission research to inform policy Number of research projects commissioned by government agencies Number of policies that are based on research and evidence
Plans for reform are managed effectively, have an adequate allocated budget and budgets are disbursed as planned	What evidence is there that reform plans are influencing government actions? What evidence is there that agendas and plans for public sector and financial management reform are being successfully implemented?	Continued progress of implementation on government reform agenda/s Reform agendas not subject to political interference, other than through the legitimate political process Quality of communication and coordination between bodies managing reform agendas and other agencies	Percentage of planned reform activities implemented according to timetable Percentage of reform plans adequately resourced (budgets and actual)

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Greater transparency of national to sub-national fiscal relations and more timely and reliable transfer of financial resources	Do people at the level of service provision understand what funds they should get and when?	Increase in the reliability of transfer of funds from national to sub-national agencies Timely release of funds for service provision to sub-national government	Release of funds for service provision to sub-national government made within +/-
More effective coordination between national and sub-national delivery agencies	How are reforms in whole of government service delivery addressing the political or structural incentives for and against coordination and efficiency? How are sub-national priorities reflected in national plans and budgets?	Quality of communication and coordination between national and sub-national service delivery agencies. National and sub-national service delivery agencies adopt harmonised systems.	(Increase in) number of coordination meetings between national and sub-national service delivery agencies.
Higher level indicators	What evidence is there that improvements in public sector management or financial management have led to better delivery of services? How are improvements in public sector staff, plans, systems and processes leading to system-wide capacity development and reform?	Citizen perceptions of basic services, *Country Surveys, Gallup, World Values Survey*[1]	Government Effectiveness Score, *World Bank World Wide Governance Indicators*[2] Social spending as a share of total spending, *Country Statistics, World Bank* Percentage variance between budgeted and actual expenditure (disaggregated by sector), *National Statistics, PEFA*[3]
Outcome: Better public sector and financial management			
Increased tax revenues in a fair and sustainable manner	What were the sources of the increased revenue? How was the additional revenue distributed across income deciles, geographic regions and disadvantaged groups? To what extent is the increase in revenue obtained from a range of taxpayers? To what extent was the increase was driven by broader economic conditions? To what extent does the tax policy change impact on economic efficiency? To what extent does the tax policy change impact on fairness of the tax system? To what extent does the tax policy change increase complexity for administrators and tax payers?	The passage of legislation to amend tax policy An improvement in the incentives facing tax administrators and their alignment with policy objectives The introduction of consistent approaches to enforcement Reduction in the number and scope of tax incentives	Increase in tax collections (either in aggregate, or for specific taxes) Reduced 'tax gap' (the difference between potential and actual revenue collected), various sources, including *RA-GAP (IMF)* Increase in the number of registered taxpayers Reduced stock of outstanding tax arrears Increase in revenue productivity (the amount of revenue collected from a particular tax, given its rate structure)

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
More effective tax administration	To what extent are incentives facing tax administrators aligned with policy objectives? To what extent are there broad, qualitative performance measures in place to avoid punitive enforcement practices?	Existence of risk-based auditing Effectiveness of data-management tools Efficiency of processing and accounting systems Introduction of self-assessment procedures Accurate and reliable taxpayer information Improvement in the identification and mitigation of compliance risks Introduction of appropriate external oversight of the tax administration Expansion of e-services Introduction of electronic information sharing between the tax authority and its international counterparts Establishment of a large taxpayer unit Greater geographic coverage of tax offices Development of customer feedback mechanisms.	Higher rate of taxpayer registration Reduced average processing times for tax returns An increase in rates of electronic filing Reduced stock of tax arrears Improvement in customer satisfaction ratings.
Broaden the tax base	How has the tax incidence changed according to income distribution? To what extent does the change in taxes impact on different genders? What is the impact of the program on the informal sector and incentives to transition to the formal sector?	Passage of legislation (e.g. introduction of VAT) Reduction in the number and scope of tax exemptions or incentives Improvement in the tax authority's knowledge of the potential taxpayer base An increase in outreach and education activities	Increase in the number of registered taxpayers An increase in the VAT gross compliance ratio
Simplified tax compliance processes	How have the compliance requirements of taxpayers changed?	Existence of an independent, workable and graduated resolution process Streamlined tax regimes for micro and small businesses Introduction of electronic tax filing options	Increased on-time filing rate Reduction in the number of times a taxpayer must submit a form to the tax authority Reduction in the time it takes to comply with tax regulations Improvement in the 'paying taxes' ranking, *World Bank, Doing Business* survey Reduced time taken to resolve disputes
Higher level indicators	Is there sufficient revenue to deliver on the partner countries' development objectives? How does the government's revenue collection and tax administration relative to comparable countries. What evidence is there that improvements in public sector management or financial management have led to better delivery of services? How are improvements in public sector staff, plans, systems and processes leading to system-wide capacity development and reform?	Citizen perceptions of basic services, *Country Surveys, Gallup, World Values Survey*[4]	Revenue to GDP ratio World Bank *World Development Indicators* 'Paying taxes' ranking World Bank *Doing Business* survey results Tax gap (the difference between potential and actual tax revenue), various sources, including *RA-GAP (IMF)* assessment of the VAT tax gap Average tax rate (ATR) for each income decile (a measures of the progressivity of the overall tax system) Taxpayer morale, *World Values Survey*

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Outcome: More transparent, accountable and locally legitimate institutions			
Greater public availability of plans, budget allocations and performance reporting	What evidence is there that government agencies are making it possible for citizens to assess their performance?	Extent to which plans, budgets, and performance reports are publically available Public availability of performance data Public availability of financial and annual reports *(Note: Public availability requires considering the context of how citizens can access information. For some countries, availability on a website may be sufficient, but for others it will not).*	Percentage of government agencies (national and sub-national) whose budget is publicly available Percentage of government agencies (national and sub-national) whose plans are publically available
Accessibility of more timely and accurate financial and service performance information	What use are government agencies and civil society actors making of institutional information?	Timely availability of plans, budgets, budget allocations Timely availability of performance data Timely availability of financial and annual reports Improved reporting against plans and budgets *(Note: Public availability requires considering the context of how citizens can access information. For some countries, availability on a website may be sufficient, but for others it will not).*	Percentage of government agencies (national and sub-national) who publicly report expenditure against budgets Number of schools or health clinics whose budget and expenditure is publicly available Percentage of agencies (national and sub-national) publishing financial and annual reports on their websites Number of complaints about government performance in relation to specific services
Financial and service performance information is more effectively used in institutional decision-making, planning and reporting	What evidence is there that government agencies are making effective use of institutional information within decision-making, planning and reporting processes?	Greater use of performance information/data in decision-making Greater reference to performance information/data in plans and planning processes More consistent inclusion of performance data in financial and annual reports	
Government agencies invite public participation/ comment in developing new policies	What evidence is there that government agencies are making it possible for citizens to understand and influence public policy?	Greater public participation/comment in policy development process Greater participation of disadvantaged and marginalised groups in the policy development process	Number of policies developed which included a public consultation process
Higher level indicators	How are formal institutions demonstrating accountability to citizens? How is this improving? How are informal institutions demonstrating accountability to citizens? How is this improving? What evidence is there that formal institutions are becoming more locally legitimate? (that governments and citizens alike respect formal institutions)	Public perceptions of budget fairness, *Gallup, World Value Survey* Public trust in political institutions, *Country Indices and Surveys, Regional Barometer Polls* Service delivery data available to the public Public commitments (international and domestic) to reform and good governance Freedom of information legislation is in place and effective	Open Budget Index Score, *Open Budget Survey* Public perception of corruption, *Transparency International*[5]

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Outcome: More independent and professional civil service			
More effective human resource management and improvement in performance management/culture	How has decision-making around human resource management become more transparent? How are performance management systems acknowledging and addressing the political or structural incentives for and against good performance?	Accurate reflection of roles and responsibilities in job descriptions Accurate reflection of agency business plan in staff job descriptions	Number and percentage of agencies with performance management frameworks Number and percentage of agencies with staff professional development plans Rates of completion of staff performance agreements and assessments Percentage of funded positions filled Rates of attendance Average number of days taken to recruit staff
Improved skills of public servants in planning, budgeting and expenditure management	What evidence is there that training is leading to public servants more effectively performing their roles? What are public servants doing differently as a result of training?	Public servants report that training has improved their ability to effectively perform their roles Trainee managers' report that training has improved their staff's ability to effectively perform their roles	Number of public servants trained
Improved transparency of recruitment and performance management, towards systems based on merit and professional standards	How are civil service appointments becoming more transparent?	Decrease in improper political interference in civil service appointments Increasing incidence of civil servants being recruited on the basis of merit Increasing transparency of decision-making around promotion Increasing incidence of promotion being based on merit and performance Increased utilisation and adherence to recruitment policies	Number of civil service agencies with recruitment policies
More consistent adherence to internal controls within government agencies	What evidenced is there that internal controls are being applied effectively across the civil service?	Breaches of codes of conduct are dealt with appropriately Increased adherence to staff codes of conduct	Number of agencies with staff codes of conduct
Higher level indicators	What evidence is there that the civil service is moving towards being independent of political interference? What evidence is there that the civil service is moving towards being more professional? How are improvements in the professionalism and independence of individual public servants and teams leading to system-wide improvements?	Effectiveness of payroll controls, *PEFA*[6] Existence of code of conduct for civil servants Existence and effectiveness of professional associations to support civil servants Public perception surveys of civil service	Reported breaches of staff codes of conduct Ratio of ghost workers to total staff
Outcome: Local civil society actors playing an active role in ensuring transparency and accountability of service delivery			
Improved capacity of civil society actors monitoring service delivery performance	What public information is being made available about service delivery as a result of civil society monitoring?	Increased public visibility of civil society actors monitoring service delivery Instances of international networking between civil society organisations (facilitated by Australian Aid) Instances of national networking between civil society organisations (facilitated by Australian Aid)	Number of civil society organisations supported to track service provision

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Improved capacity of civil society actors to influence delivery of services (including to disadvantaged and marginalised groups)	How are the service delivery needs of disadvantaged and marginalised groups being represented by civil society actors?	Increasing incidence of civil society engagement with government regarding service delivery Examples of civil society engagement with government leading to better services	Number of Australian Aid supported programs that engage citizen-based consultative groups
Formation of women's coalitions and active participation in monitoring or influencing service delivery	To what extent are policy development and reform processes involving women's coalitions? How important was the support of women's coalitions to successful implementation of policies and reforms?	Increased formation of women's coalitions More active participation of women's coalitions in service delivery reform	Number of women's coalitions formed.
Formation of local coalitions spanning civil society, the private sector and government and active participation in monitoring or influencing service delivery	To what extent are policy development and reform processes involving local coalitions? How important was the support of local coalitions to successful implementation of the policies and reforms?	Increased formation of local coalitions spanning civil society, private sector and government More active participation of local coalitions spanning civil society, private sector and government in service delivery reform	Number and percentage of aid programs that engage civil society and government agencies in joint activities Number and percentage of aid programs that engage private sector and government agencies in joint activities
Higher level indicators	To what extent are civil society actors influencing the agenda of the institutions and agencies delivering services? What evidence is there of civil society actors influencing the transparency and accountability of service delivery? (linked below) In what ways are civil society actors contributing to more responsive and effective service delivery? (linked above)	Achievement of stated civil society actor goals in relation to government services Instances of civil society acting as an informed watchdog on government service delivery	Number of civil society actors engaging with government on service delivery Government Effectiveness Score, *World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators* Social spending as a share of total spending, *Country Statistics, World Bank*
Outcome: Enhanced government engagement with communities and civil society			
More inclusive and equitable government policy and policy formulation processes	Which groups from the public and civil society are involved in the government policy formulation processes? (linked below) What difference is public and civil society involvement making to policies? (linked above)	Budgets and timetables for policy formulation processes increasingly allow for the input of the public and civil society A cross-section of relevant civil society actors is increasingly involved in policy formulation processes	Number and percentage of government agencies supported to engage civil society or communities in policy development or service delivery Number and percentage of policy development processes that have publicly sought civil society or community input
Higher level indicators	What evidence exists that an enabling environment exists for civil society?	Public statements and global commitments of partner governments indicate improved openness to and engagement of civil society	Percentage of enacted legislation that has involved consultations with the community Voice and Accountability Score, *World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators*

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Governance Sub-sector: Anti-Corruption			
Reduction in the crime of corruption and related offences	What evidence is there that corruption and corruption related offences are decreasing (as a result of the intervention)? What formal and informal power is available to anti-corruption bodies?	Anti-corruption bodies are resourced and able to undertake their anti-corruption mandates Police and law and justice agencies are resourced and able to undertake investigations and prosecutions Quality of police reports, court records and evidence supporting corruption investigations and prosecutions Data from 'incidences of corruption 'and 'perceptions of corruption' surveys	Number of corruption related crimes reported Number of investigations Number of prosecutions Number of convictions Number of disciplinary actions
Reduction in the tolerance for corruption in the public, private and government sectors	What evidence is there that corruption, and tolerance of corruption is decreasing (as a result of the intervention)?	Effective implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and related anti-corruption reforms (including in corruption prevention, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, asset recovery and information exchange) Civil society and private sector engagement in the UNCAC review process A functioning national anti-corruption framework Quality and type of support for national anti-corruption institutions Quality and content of legislative reviews, national assessments and surveys, Quality of NGO reports and media reporting	Ratification of UNCAC, and compliance with the UNCAC review process Implementation of UNCAC measures (including in corruption prevention, criminalisation and law enforcement, international cooperation, asset recovery and information exchange) Corruption surveys (e.g. Transparency International's *Corruption Perceptions Index*, *Global Corruption Barometer* and *Bribe Payers Index*) National budget for anti-corruption initiatives Percentage increase in national and sub-national government budgets for anti-corruption corruption initiatives Number of NGO reports and media reports
Examples of Intervention-level anti-corruption outcomes and indicators[7]			
Anti-corruption authorities (a type of public sector reform)			
Anti-corruption authorities (ACA) are strengthened to better prevent and combat corruption[8]	Can the ACA effectively carry out its mandate? Is the ACA's performance viewed as good by the community and donors? Is the ACA independent and does it have a secure budget? Does the ACA have competent and adequate numbers of staff? Does the ACA effectively communicate its work and interact with stakeholders (including the public)? Is the ACA's structure, systems and processes functioning well? Does the ACA contribute to the development and implementation of specific corruption prevention activities? Has the ACA contributed policy inputs to the national agenda or does it have positive policy influence? What impact has the ACA had on the level of asset freezing and seizures?	Decreasing amount of political interference in ACA's operation Reports recognising positive contribution by the ACA Staff competence levels in anti-corruption related areas Processes involving staff recruitment and retention Quality and use of ACA information resources Quality of ACA's advocacy, training or policy inputs	Percentage of complaints or cases actioned Percentage of population who find ACA performance satisfactory Stability and amount of funding received by the ACA Number of staff, recruitment and retention rates Publication of information resources Number of information meetings and events held by the institution and attendance at those events Number of visits/downloads/length of stay/interactions with the ACA or ACA's website Percentage of cases or responses to corruption related issues addressed within a predefined period Number of shortcomings in systems or processes requiring review or action Number of public servants trained on issues of corruption prevention, ethics, integrity, conflict of interest, etc Number of public service institutions that have developed or implemented related anti-corruption reforms Number of policy inputs produced Number of government policy documents that are measurably influenced by ACA's inputs Value of assets frozen and seized as part of investigations Percentage of convictions that involved asset freezing or seizure

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Legislative Reform (a type of public sector reform)			
Legislative frameworks are developed or strengthened to better prevent and combat corruption	What has been the actual impact of the legislative reform? Has there been actual implementation or greater enforcement of the legislation (as a result of the intervention?) Has there been political will and ownership of the reform agenda?	Quality of legislative or regulatory input Quality of new or amended laws or regulations Assessments of new or amended laws or regulations Findings from compliance reviews	Number of new anti-corruption legislative or regulatory proposals successful introduced Number of amendments to existing laws or regulations successfully adopted Number of legislative inputs for drafting or amending laws prepared Number of compliance reviews conducted
Financial Intelligence Units (a type of public sector reform)			
Financial intelligence unit is supported to improve compliance with anti-money laundering & counter financing of terrorism obligations	What has been the actual impact of FIU strengthening? Has there been political will and ownership of the reform agenda?	Recognition of transaction reporting responsibilities Quality of transaction reporting among required reported entities Recognition of compliance reporting obligations Assessment of implementation against Financial Action Task Force Recommendations	Quantity of transaction reporting among required reporting entities Number of regulated entities with compliance programs in place FIUs Compliance with Financial Action Task Force Recommendations
Financial intelligence unit is supported to better counter money laundering and terrorist financing risks	What has been the actual impact of FIU strengthening? Has there been political will and ownership of the reform agenda?	Significance of operational matters FIU has contributed to	Number of operational matters FIU has contributed to Level of use of FIU's databases and systems by partner agencies Number of planned intelligence products disseminated Typologies and case study reports published Level of financial intelligence exchange with counterpart FIU/agency
Compliance with international anti-corruption standards			
Partner countries comply with multilateral agreements on international anti-corruption standards (e.g., UNCAC, Financial Action Task Force recommendations for combating money laundering and the financing of terrorism, and the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention)	To what extent has there been technical and actual compliance with the international anti-corruption standard? Has there been political will and ownership of the reform agenda? What evidence is there that implementation of the international anti-corruption standards have the resources and support needed for implementations?	Effective implementation of international agreement provisions or recommendations Self-assessments, peer reviews and assessments Increased cooperation (for example, exchange of information, mutual legal assistance or police to police assistance) between partner countries to combat corruption, money laundering and terrorist financing	Ratification of relevant international anti-corruption agreements States are participating in relevant review mechanisms and processes Number and type of reforms implemented in compliance with international anti-corruption agreements and standards

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Governance Sub-Sector: Law and Justice			
Outcome: Safer and more secure communities			
Law and order is restored and maintained in conflict-affected societies	What evidence is there that progress has been made towards the restoration of law and order? What evidence is there that any restoration of law and order achieved is sustainable?	Public confidence in security personnel Public perception that the community is safer and more secure Due process is followed to resolve community conflicts	Number of violent incidents reported to police Percentage of assaults per overall crime (crude and per 100,000) Percentage of successful police prosecutions (convictions or guilty pleas) Decrease in reported crime rate in local areas where Australian Aid had invested
Police and security forces are more responsive and accountable	What evidence is there that the professionalism and accountability of the police and security forces has improved?	Complaints of police misconduct are investigated and addressed in accordance with code of conduct and/or legislative standards Citizens report increased levels of satisfaction with the handling of their complaints by police officers	Number of police misconduct allegations Length of time taken to investigate police misconduct allegations
Police are better resourced and better trained to maintain law and order	What evidence is there that the training of police officers has improved? What evidence is there that resource levels of the police force have improved?	Positive feedback from police on the usefulness of training courses undertaken Police report increased confidence in the field following completion of a training course Public perception that interactions with the police result in fair and just outcomes	**Number of police and law and justice officials trained (women & men) (Aggregate Development Result)** Average number of training days in relevant training per employee Number of police briefs that are prosecuted by the public prosecutors' office Percentage of successful police prosecutions (convictions or guilty pleas)
Police are locally legitimate, visible in communities and have the confidence of the community	What evidence is there that the local legitimacy of the police force and the quality/strength of their community relationships have improved?	Diversity of representation in police and armed forces Public confidence in security personnel Public perception that the community is safer and more secure	Increased reporting of crimes to police Police attendance rates Percentage of women and other special interest groups represented in police and armed forces Decrease in crime in local areas where Australian Aid had invested
Increased prevention of conflict, violence and crime	What evidence is there that violence and crime has decreased in the community?	Changes in men and women's attitudes towards family and sexual violence Women reporting that they feel safer and more secure in their communities Citizens reporting that they are able to run their businesses without criminal interference	Percentage of assaults per overall crime (crude and per 100,000) Number of gender based crime incidents reported to police (age disaggregated) Decrease in crime in local areas where Australian Aid had invested
More women able to influence decision-making processes around peace-building and security	What evidence is there that women are more involved in the decision-making processes around security in their communities?	Women reporting that they are aware of and able to engage in decision-making processes Women reporting that they have their views and ideas included in the peace-building process	Number of women's groups operating in conflict areas Increase in the representation and engagement of women in informal and formal decision-making bodies and processes regarding security and peace building
Improved recourse and protection for victims of sexual and gender-based violence	What evidence is there that victims of sexual and gender-based violence have improved access to justice?	Accessibility of specialised family/domestic violence support in police stations (geographical spread) Improved quality of service provided to victims of family/ domestic violence Existence of special procedures or processes for dealing with gender-based violence cases Public awareness of services available to victims of family/domestic violence	Number of gender based crime incidents reported to police (age disaggregated) Use of Protection Orders for victims of family/domestic violence - number of applications - percentage of orders granted over total number of applications Percentage of community who report satisfaction with police handling of family/sexual violence

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Violence against women is not condoned by customary or traditional authorities	What evidence is there that customary or traditional authorities are seeking to combat violence against women in their communities?	Changes in the attitudes of customary or traditional authorities towards family and sexual violence Women reporting that they have received fair treatment from customary authorities in addressing their grievance	Number of gender based crime incidents referred to police by customary or traditional authorities Number of customary or traditional leaders completing gender based violence training
Higher level indicators	What evidence is there that communities are becoming safer and more secure?	Public perceptions of personal safety, *Country Surveys, Gallup, Regional Barometers* Strengthened accountability of security services to civilian authorities, *Freedom House*[9] Extent to which citizen's and civil society groups resort to non-violent measures to express grievances, *Country Surveys, CIVICUS*[10] Confidence in security personnel, *Country Surveys, Gallup Poll, Regional Barometers, UN RoL Indicators*[11] Diversity of representation in police and armed forces	Crime rate per 1000 population (disaggregated by type of crime), *Country Statistics, UNCTS*[12] Total recorded assaults (crude and per 100,000), *Country Statistics, UNCTS* Percentage of women experiencing sexual and gender-based violence, *Country Statistics and Surveys* Number of referred cases of sexual and gender-based violence reported, investigated and sentenced , *Country Statistics, UN Women* Police attendance rates: *Country Statistics*
Outcome: More equitable access to justice			
Vulnerable and marginalised groups can access courts and other justice systems	What evidence is there that access to justice is improving for vulnerable and marginalised groups?	Increase in number of poor people aware of their basic rights and of justice mechanisms (formal and informal) for fulfilling them Vulnerable and marginalised groups report increasing confidence in engaging with the justice system	Percentage of hearings held by circuit or mobile courts Number of CSOs engaged in improving access of women and marginalised people to the justice system Percentage of citizens with legal identity (male/female)
Fewer human rights violations within the criminal justice system	How is the criminal justice system protecting the human rights of all parties to a criminal proceeding?	Public perception that the criminal justice system operates fairly Increased willingness among citizens to refer disputes to the criminal justice system Quality of court documents and judgments Findings from compliance reviews	Number of prosecutions that result in non-custodial sentences (eg. Community based orders, alternative justice dispositions) Number of misconduct complaints against law and justice officials
The needs of women and children are addressed appropriately by the justice sector (including by police and courts)	What evidence is there that the justice sector is taking into account the needs of women and children?	Female and juvenile prisoners report increased perception of safety within the prison system Women report increased levels of satisfaction with the handling of their cases Judges report increased awareness and conviction that children require specialised hearings and sentencing approaches	Number and percentage of female prisoners separated from male prisoners Number and percentage of juvenile (girl/boy) prisoners separated from adult (women/men) prisoners Number of and percentage of total cases of waiver of court fees
Increased access to locally delivered justice services	How is the treatment of marginalised and disenfranchised groups in informal and traditional justice systems, improving, or becoming fairer?	Accessibility of informal justice systems (eg. Village Courts or customary justice systems) Accessibility of village/community/neighbourhood-based formal sector courts Quality and frequency of engagement of aid programs with customary or traditional leaders	Number of CSOs engaged in improving access of marginalised groups to the informal justice system Number of women and members of marginalised groups accessing local informal justice services

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
More widely available legal aid and free advice and assistance (including paralegal services) (formal and informal justice systems)	What evidence is there that and free legal advice and assistance is both available and used within the community?	Quality and type of legal aid services being provided Geographical reach of legal aid services Support for victims and witnesses in trials Awareness within the community of the existence of legal aid and advice services	Number of and/or percentage of total cases of waiver of court fees (where possible note at which point in the court system they are waived – total transactions at each stage and what percentage waived at each stage) Number of legal aid cases (disaggregated by percentage of women and people with a disability) Percentage of legal aid cases to total number of cases Number of legal aid access points Amount and percentage increase in state budgets for legal aid – longitudinal Percentage of courts/jurisdictions which offer information desks and/or paralegals to provide free advice to claimants
More effective coordination and integration of justice system agencies	What evidence is there that justice system agencies are working together better?	Justice system agencies adopt harmonised systems Justice system agencies coordinate their activities	Number of inmates held past release date Length of time spent in remand detention
Greater efficiency in the administration of justice	What instances are there of gains made in the efficiency of the justice system leading to greater responsiveness of that system to the needs of citizens?	Existence of complaints mechanisms responding to grievances about the administration of justice (within courts and prosecutors' offices, and independent commissions) Availability of appeal pathways Stage at which guilty pleas are entered by defendants Public perception that it is worthwhile to engage with the justice system to achieve meaningful outcomes	**Number of police and law and justice officials trained (women & men) _(Aggregate Development_ Result)** Number of court buildings displaying court fees for registering civil disputes Percentage and number of cases disposed of within case management benchmarks Number of courts which have established internal complaints handling mechanisms Number of indictments filed Percentage of successful police prosecutions (convictions or guilty pleas) Percentage of successful prosecutions by public prosecutor (convictions or guilty pleas) Number of successful prosecutions for offences involving violence (including violence against women) Reduction in the length of time to dispose of cases from date of originating process Average number of adjournments, at what stage of proceedings, requested by whom Case clearance ratio (number of cases disposed over number of cases lodged) to track case backlog Change over time of average time spent on remand

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Improved prison conditions – including access to rehabilitation, time outside of cell, prison over-crowding, separation of men, women and juveniles, prison infrastructure	What evidence is there that conditions within prisons are upholding the dignity of the prisoners?	Increasing budget allowance for prison infrastructure maintenance Increased availability of rehabilitative services within prison Prisoners report greater feeling of safety and security within prisons	Percentage of prisoners accessing rehabilitation (low, medium, high security prisoners) Average hours prisoners spend out of their cells (low, medium, high security prisoners) Number and percentage of female prisoners separated from male prisoners Number and percentage of juvenile (girl/boy) prisoners separated from adult (women/men) prisoners Number and percentage of prison and courts under two years old and/or improved infrastructure Number and percentage of accused on remand separated from sentenced prisoners Number of days spent by prisoners in the infirmary (women/men)
Greater budgetary allocations for improvement of justice system infrastructure	What evidence is there that the improvement of justice system infrastructure is being prioritised in the government's budget?	Increasing budget allocations for justice system infrastructure Improvements to justice system infrastructure highlighted in government budget statements and speeches	Number of prison infrastructure projects commenced / completed Number of investments in court and police infrastructure commenced / completed
Increased transparency of the justice system	How is the transparency of the justice system changing or improving?	Timely and accessible publication of decisions by courts, including reasons Quality of publicly-available court documents and judgments Publication of criminal case information (including charges laid, status of case, and days held in pre-sentence detention)	Number and percentage of court decisions published online Number of complaints made to justice system watchdog
People increasingly aware of their legal rights and responsibilities	What evidence is there that the public are more informed about their legal rights and responsibilities?	Information on legal rights and obligations is widely available in an appropriate and accessible medium Increased public dialogue, e.g. in the media or on social media, on legal issues	Number of laws and regulations published online Number of complaints made to justice system watchdog
Higher level indicators	To what extent are the formal and informal justice systems accessible and responsive to the needs of all citizens? How are informal institutions becoming fairer and more equitable?	Representation of jurisdiction's ethnic and gender composition on bench Public satisfaction with treatment in justice systems for victims or vulnerable groups (children, youth, women, disabled, indigenous groups) *Country Surveys, Vera Institute, Women, Business and the Law*[13] Existence of options for mediating lower-level disputes Existence and use of non-custodial penalties	World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators – Rule of Law[14] Percentage of citizens who believe they will get fair treatment from courts (including in cases against the state), *Country Surveys* Percentage of public confidence in the judiciary, *Gallop, Bertelsmann and UN RoL Indicators*[15] Average number of days in remand/pre-trial detention, *UNCTS, UN RoL Indicators*[16] Case lodgement fee as a percentage of average monthly income

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Governance Sub-Sector: Political representation and accountability			
Outcome: Electoral cycle is perceived by local populations as credible and legitimate			
Improved management of elections by electoral management bodies	Is there increasing public confidence in the election process? What changes have electoral management bodies made to their management of elections? Do election management bodies have the resources and support they need to implement election reform? How are levels of resourcing and support improving?	Election management bodies demonstrate improved management processes and documentation Increased partner government budget allocation to support elections	Number of election petitions or challenges of election outcomes Number of elections supported by aid programs Number of complaints received by election management body about elections administration infringement or un-ethical conduct of electoral management body members Number of staff of electoral agencies who have undertaken professionalisation programs on running free and fair elections Increased number of people participating in elections
Greater public understanding of electoral process and their rights and obligations	What evidence is there that the public are more informed about the electoral process and their legal rights and obligations in relation to it?	Feedback on voter education material reflects increased understanding of rights and obligations Increased participation in election processes (e.g. voters, party members, candidates, members of community organisations, etc.) Quality (well designed) and type of voter education materials produced	Number of voters reached with voting messages Quantity of voter education materials produced
Electoral laws and regulations developed through transparent, participatory processes and are not subject to repeated challenge	How is the transparency of the development of electoral laws and regulations changing or improving?	Fewer instances of electoral laws and regulations being challenged Budgets and timetables for electoral law and regulation development processes increasingly allow for the input of the public and civil society A cross-section of relevant civil society actors is increasingly involved in electoral law and regulation development processes	Number of challenges to electoral laws and regulations Number of public/civil society inputs in development of electoral laws and regulations
Higher level indicators	What evidence is there that election results are accepted with more confidence?	Satisfaction of election observers with election process Existence of an independent electoral commission Public satisfaction with impartiality of electoral management bodies Incidents of public dispute of election outcome Number and percentage of voter turn out Confidence in honesty of elections *Country Surveys, Gallup*	Number of incidents of election related conflict Number of elections (at all levels) not affected by conflict Number and percentage of elections (at all levels) that are properly conducted, on schedule and comply with relevant legislation
Outcome: Progress in parliamentary reform and strengthening			
Greater understanding by parliamentarians of the role and responsibilities of office	In what ways is the behaviour of parliamentarians more in accordance with their roles and responsibilities?	Parliamentarians demonstrate increased awareness of roles and responsibilities, following mentoring and training	Number of training and mentoring sessions attended by parliamentarians Number of days spent in constituencies
Greater public understanding of the role of parliamentarians	What evidence is there that the public are more informed about role of parliamentarians?	Increase in informed correspondence and approaches to parliamentarians by members of the public	Percentage of correspondence received by parliamentarians being responded to in a timely manner

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Effective and efficient functioning of parliament	What evidence is that parliamentary processes are functioning more efficiently and effectively?	Existing legislation is increasingly being resourced to enable implementation (ie budget allocated to implementation) Progress of planned parliamentary reform agenda against planned timetable Parliamentary/legislative committee system is in operation Parliamentary/legislative committee effectively consider/debate draft bills	Number of new legislative reform bills ratified in past twelve months Number of committee sitting days and how often Parliamentary Committees sit Number of bills modified by Parliamentary Committees
Higher level indicators	What evidence is there that parliament is improving its representation of all people? To what extent is the separation between the executive and legislative branches of government clear and upheld?	Diversity (gender, ethnicity, disability) of candidates and elected officials (at all levels) Public decision-making processes are open and accessible to the public	Number of days from legislative submission to ratification Percentage of citizens satisfied with parliamentary performance, *Country Surveys, Gallup* Number of parliamentarians declaring assets in accordance with regulations
Outcome: More women participating actively in democratic processes at all levels			
More women aware of their right to participate, vote and to be elected	How are programs addressing structural barriers to women's participation in democratic processes? How are election education campaigns communicating to women specifically? How are women engaging differently in elections?	Extent of voter education campaigns that use communication techniques that do not require literacy Increasing involvement of women in policy development processes Electoral law reforms facilitate the participation of women as candidates for elections or as voters	Greater number of education campaigns deliberately targeting women Expenditure on voter education targeted at female voters Number of female candidates receiving political education
More women have access to resources and support necessary to campaign for election	How are programs addressing structural barriers to (potential) women candidates? How are (potential) women candidates engaging differently with electoral bodies and related political processes?	Targeted cohort of women report improvements in access to and quality of resources and support necessary to campaign for election	Number of female candidates campaigning for (national, sub-national, local) elections Number of training programs deliberately targeting women candidates
Higher level indicators	How is greater representation of women in democratic and decision-making structures and processes, leading to their more active participation? How are decisions changing as a result of women's active participation in decision-making processes? What changes are evident in the structural barriers to women's participation in democratic processes?	Extent of women's participation in traditional, informal and formal decision-making structures and processes Women's political rights, *CIRI Human Rights Data Project Index*	Percentage of women elected members of government (national, sub-national levels) Percentage of candidates for election who are female Percentage of female headed CSOs Percentage of seats in national Parliament reserved for women Percentage of eligible females registered as voters

WHAT are our programs trying to achieve? (short-to-medium outcomes)	Example evaluative questions	Example qualitative indicators	Example quantitative indicators
Outcome: Strengthened media and communications supporting informed public policy debate			
Strong, independent and diverse media	How are private or political interests influencing the media? How is this changing? How are different voices and interest groups in society being represented in the media?	Increasing amount of in-depth issues-based reporting Decreasing instances of government interference (ie through licensing or legislation) curbing media independence Media organisations report on elections in an informed an unbiased manner Medium of reporting is most appropriate for reaching the greatest number of targeted audience	Number of reporters trained in public policy reporting Number of reporters trained in elections reporting Number of privately funded media outlets
Media organisations comply with media guidelines	What evidence is there that media organisations are complying with media guidelines? How, and in what areas, are compliance levels changing?	Increased awareness of media guidelines within media organisations Increased adherence to media guidelines within media organisations Fewer instances of breach of media guidelines Breaches of codes of conduct are dealt with appropriately	Number of public broadcasters with set codes of practice and editorial guidelines
Social and development issues receive better coverage in the media	How are social and development issues being represented in the media? How are audiences responding?	Increasing quality of the media's reporting on health, education, gender equality, disability inclusiveness and good governance Public report greater awareness, due to media coverage, on health, education, gender equality, disability inclusiveness and good governance	Number of media outlets supported to increase coverage or improve coverage of development issues
Higher level indicators	Strengthened media and communications supporting informed public-policy debate	What examples are there of the media influencing the quality of the public-policy debate?	Press Freedom, *Reporters Without Borders*[17] Public perception of media honesty and independence, *County Surveys* Existence of media guidelines
Outcome: Strengthened civil society capacity supporting informed public policy debate			
Civil society actors play a role in political governance processes	What evidence is there of improved capacity among civil society actors to engage in political governance processes?	Increased public visibility and awareness of civil society actors engagement in political governance processes Increasing incidence and quality of national/international networking between civil society actors Increasing incidence and quality of civil society engagement in electoral and parliamentary processes	Number of civil society actors engaged in political governance processes (including, e.g., citizen-based consultative groups) Number of new public policies and/or legislative instruments (in general or on a target issue) that reflect the interests of civil society actors
Disadvantaged or marginalised groups can make their voices heard in political governance processes	What evidence is there of increased engagement by marginalised and minorities groups in political governance processes? What evidence is there of disadvantaged and marginalised groups influencing public policy debate and outcomes?	Increased public visibility and awareness of disadvantaged and marginalised groups engagement in political governance processes Increasing incidence and quality of disadvantaged and marginalised groups representation in political governance processes	Number of disadvantaged or marginalised groups engaged in political governance processes (including, e.g., citizen-based consultative groups) Number of new public policies and/or legislative instruments (in general or on a target issue) that reflect the interests that give effect to international human rights obligations
Higher level indicators	How has the involvement of civil society supported more effective, inclusive and accountable political governance?	Public decision-making processes are open and accessible to the public Freedom of information legislation is in place and utilised by CSOs Policy or laws support freedom of speech and/or association for CSOs Organisations exist to protect human rights (such as ombudsman or human rights commissions) Human rights instruments enshrined in constitution	Voice and Accountability Score, *World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators*

[1] Gallup, World Value Survey (only sporadically collected, every 4-5 years).

[2] http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp.

[3] World Bank's Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) program. Indicator 2. Only selected countries, updated every few years. Based on a common framework of PEFA, relatively wide and improving coverage and comparable. There are some problems associated with using PEFA indicators which include the fact that not all countries complete the full framework of indicators and there are indications that PEFA evaluators utilise different scoring values for similar situations. Please bear these limitations in mind when using them.

[4] Gallup, World Value Survey (only sporadically collected, every 4-5 years).

[5] Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer Survey.

[6] Coverage/availability: covers most countries post-2008 but annual reporting not guaranteed.

[7] These are just a small example of specific anti-corruption interventions and related outcomes and indicators. Anti-corruption reforms are often part of broader public sector reforms, justice sector and police reforms, public financial management reforms, and support for civil society and oversight institutions. Please refer to other parts of this Indicators Table as appropriate. More guidance on specific anti-corruption interventions and related indicators is available from the Law and Justice Section.

[8] There are many different ways ACAs can be strengthened, and assessment of an ACA's performance will depend on its function and mandate. Indicators vary depending on the specific strengthening outcome sought in relation to an ACA.

[9] See http://freedomhouse.org/uploads/ccr/page-46.pdf and Freedom House's signature reports: https://freedomhouse.org/reports.

[10] http://www.civicus.org/what-we-do/cross-cutting-projects/csi/csi-indicator-database The proposed indicator gauges the extent of change in the "use of non-violent measures" by selected civil society actors. The indicator itself draws from a combination of selected variables and is derived through community surveys, media reviews and fact finding studies undertaken by CIVICUS. CIVICUS features data on approximately 50 countries between 2003-2006 and additional assessments are expected in 2008-2010. See the CIVICUS Civil Society Index.

[11] See Gallup+100/Poll, Afro, Arab, Asian and Latin barometers, UNDPKO Q8, Q9. Q10, and Q11 at http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/un_rule_of_law_indicators2011.pdf.

[12] UNODC collects information on crime and criminal justice through the United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Criminal Justice (UN-CTS) since the late 1970s. See UNCTS - http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/Tenth-CTS-full.html See UNCTS - https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/United-Nations-Surveys-on-Crime-Trends-and-the-Operations-of-Criminal-Justice-Systems.html.

[13] *Women, Business and the Law* (see http://wbl.worldbank.org/) objectively highlights differentiations on the basis of gender in 142 economies around the world, covering six areas: accessing institutions, using property, getting a job, providing incentives to work, building credit and going to court. The data was collected over a two year period, ending in March 2011.

[14] http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp.

[15] The question "*In this country do you have confidence in the judicial system and the courts?*" is a performance proxy and has been tested by Gallop since 2006 in more than 100 countries. See Gallop - https://worldview.gallup.com/. Alternatively, Bertelsmann 3.2 (See Bertelsmann - http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/) and UN RoL (Q58) ""Do you think that judges are able to make decisions without direct or indirect interference by Government politicians?" cover the question for 128 countries and 3 countries respectively.

[16] There are a number of sources of information for assessing the extent of remand, including UNODC CTS 1.1 in more than 85 countries as well as Q54 of the DPKO RoL Department of Peacekeeping Operations Rule of Law Indicators manual. See http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/un_rule_of_law_indicators2011.pdf.

[17] World Press Freedom Index. See http://en.rsf.org/IMG/CLASSEMENT_2012/CLASSEMENT_ANG.pdf.