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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Anti-corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Albanian Institute for Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPI</td>
<td>Citizen Engagement for Public Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG NEAR</td>
<td>Directorate-General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDM</td>
<td>Institute for Democracy and Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDI</td>
<td>Kosovo Democratic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANS</td>
<td>Network for Affirmation of the NGO Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIS</td>
<td>National Integrity System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Stabilisation and Association Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI BiH</td>
<td>Transparency International Bosna i Hercegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Transparency Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-M</td>
<td>Transparency International Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-S</td>
<td>Transparency International Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-T</td>
<td>Transparency International Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Executive summary

This report sets out the findings of an independent, Mid-term Review (MTR) of the “EU4 Rule of Law: Citizen Engagement for Public Integrity in the Western Balkans and Turkey” (CEPI) project, as commissioned by the Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S). The findings from this MTR provide an assessment of the progress of project implementation and recommendations on how to ensure effective project implementation in the remaining period.

Data collection followed a mixed-methods approach, and took place in April 2023, with program staff (European Commission and TI Secretariat), Chapters and Partners across the seven participating countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). Data analysis focuses on the performance of project activities, in particular four targeted outputs, and is framed by evaluation objectives, key questions and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria.

The evaluation findings demonstrate that CEPI project activities are being implemented quite effectively at this Mid-term stage, but more efficient progress is hampered by the demands of implementing the National Integrity System (NIS) component. While the NIS is widely recognised for providing a comprehensive assessment of corruption in national contexts, the volume of information gathered through the research, difficulty in accessing government officials and levels of technical skill required for its reporting mean this component is taking longer than originally planned for.

Notwithstanding the demands of the data gathering through the research, Chapters and Partners are more confident in being able to deliver the other three outputs in a timely way (CSOs, advocacy, online database).

The CEPI project objectives are widely regarded as very relevant, coherent and well-aligned with all stakeholders, across professional, organisational and personal dimensions. While the objectives are viewed as ambitious and challenging, they are also regarded as achievable by the majority of Chapters and Partners, with no requests to amend them. Overall, there are good levels of cooperation and synergy between TI-S, Chapters and Partners.

In terms of the remainder of the project, the evaluation recommends re-establishing a forum (Advisory Board) for TI-S, Chapters and Partners to communicate as one, introducing semi-formal, quarterly communications with the EC on the progress of CEPI, consideration of a no-cost extension for completion of CEPI project activities and using the Final Evaluation to capture dimensions outside the CEPI scope in terms of processes and best practice.

In terms of the longer term, the evaluation recommends developing a lighter NIS tool (potentially online and/or focusing only on key pillars for each country) that is more agile to implement, update and disseminate, deploying CEPI as a backbone in shaping the regional anti-corruption strategy through a series of strategic planning activities (foresight exercises). In this way, CEPI can advocate for NIS information to be used as an instrument in impact assessments of the EC programming in the area of anti-corruption, using Chapters’ experience working on a common project to map processes that

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.
can improve future collaborations, and including a 3-month inception phase prior to commencement of project activities, to help avoid timeline delays.

While CEPI’s scope, relevance and importance are considered fit for purpose, some participating Chapters and Partners have weaker research capacity to fulfil the research component of the project, due to the (historical) lack of in-house expertise to conduct these activities. Recruiting staff with sufficient capacity, experience and skills therefore proves an ongoing challenge within the project context.

Ultimately, the CEPI project has achieved good progress against a challenging backdrop of external and internal factors. Good levels of support from TI-S has created a level of trust that has helped maintain positive collaboration, and while the implementation of NIS has impacted efficiency, familiarity with remaining activities will accelerate progress and build toward higher-level outcomes.

2. Background

2.1 Project context

The CEPI project was launched in the Western Balkans and Turkey to strengthen the rule of law by addressing public integrity deficiencies in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey. CEPI is a European Union (DG NEAR) funded action, to be implemented over three years from January 2022 to December 2024, and aims to increase evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation and enhance civic engagement for public integrity, transparency and accountability.

2.2 Project objectives

The overall objective of the CEPI project is to strengthen the rule of law by addressing public integrity deficiencies through:

1) Increased evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation.
2) Enhanced civic engagement for public integrity, transparency, and accountability.

The CEPI project in the Western Balkan and Turkey has an overall duration of three years and is being implemented in cooperation with the Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S) in Berlin. The evidence-generation aspect of the project will be underpinned by assessments of the performance of targeted beneficiaries’ systems relevant to integrity, accountability, and transparency through the so-called National Integrity System (NIS) assessments. NIS assessments will enable decision-makers to target reforms to needs and to support civil society action. Evidence generation will also be underpinned by updating a regional database of corruption cases with social impact to allow for greater public scrutiny. The project will also build capacities of CSOs and local groups to be able to support concrete advocacy work to involve the broader citizenry.
2.3 Project activities

Core CEPI project activities include:
- Drafting of the National Integrity System (NIS), an evidenced-based findings, assessment, which combines comprehensive research and active stakeholder engagement to assess the performance of an anti-corruption system.
- Development of policy proposals based on NIS assessment recommendations and priorities.
- Update of the Regional online database of corruption cases with social impact.
- Building capacities of CSOs, citizen groups and initiatives at the local level.

3. Mid-term Review purpose and objectives

3.1 Objectives

This Mid-term Review was commissioned to assess the implementation of the CEPI project thus far, as well as the overall strategy and programming. As well as assessing the implementation, signs of the potential impact of project activities on beneficiaries and recommendations for project, program and strategic amendments were also sought. This Mid-term Review had two core objectives:

1) Provide findings that demonstrate a level of progress of implementation, challenges and learnings from project set-up and execution approaches.
2) Develop recommendations on what might need to be adjusted to ensure effective project implementation in the next period.

The Mid-term Review was framed by the following OECD-DAC criteria:

Relevance / Coherence

- To what extent is the intervention aligned with the strategies of the key project implementing stakeholders?
- How well adapted is the project implementation to context changes (e.g., changes in needs, in policies, etc.)?
- How do the components of the logic model fit in with one another and with the objectives?

Effectiveness

- What progress has been made and to what extent are the objectives of the project likely to be achieved?
- What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Have there been specific approaches that proved successful/failed and what learnings can be drawn from this?
Efficiency

- To what extent have effective and inclusive results-based management and administration systems been in place?
- Were implementation risks adequately identified and managed?
- Is the MEL framework informing the decision-making in the project?
- What additional capacities, resources and support would be required for a successful implementation in the next phase of the project?

4. Methodological approach

4.1 Design and Methodology

A mixed-methods approach was followed, to answer questions through applying OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The application of OECD-DAC criteria provided a framework against which the evaluation was structured, and informed recommendations on optimising the programme's future adaptations, priorities and sustainability.

The Mid-term Review employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis tools including a desk review, survey and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). All tools were developed in close coordination with TI-S.

Assessment criteria

The Mid-term Review assessed evaluation findings against OECD-DAC criteria, against the following mapping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD-DAC criteria</th>
<th>Mid-term Review focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance / Coherence | • The extent to which the project is aligned with context in each participating country and has adapted to context changes.  
• How well the logic model components fit with one another, and CEPI objectives. |
| Effectiveness | • Progress made thus far, and the extent to which project objectives are likely to be achieved.  
• Significant factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.  
• Specific approaches that proved successful/ failed, and any associated learnings. |
| Efficiency | • The extent of effective and inclusive results-based management and administration systems. |
4.2 Evaluation Matrix

The Mid-term Review matrix (Figure 1) presents the core project components and audiences, mapped against the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, resulting in key evaluation questions where these intersect in the matrix. These key questions were used to guide the development of additional questions in the data collection tools.

Figure 1. Mid-term review matrix

4.3 Data protection

1. Protecting personal data is essential in any evaluation to respect the dignity and ensure the security of all stakeholders involved, especially in the project context, where risks of misuse of data are high. All personal data collected was minimal and anonymised; for any programme trainee / witness interviews, any name(s) or personal details collected or recorded were coded and anonymised, except for their gender (M/F), age category, and disability status. For all other stakeholders (key informants), although their names and title (function/role in an organisation) were collected by the evaluation team for analysis of any trend with regard to
information/data collected, their names or any details were not presented in any report produced by the team. This means that personal data will not be attributed to a specific source.

2. We are aware of the obligation not to publish or otherwise communicate to third parties, through any medium whatsoever, any information on the communities/beneficiaries. In its communication with communities and all stakeholders, we explained these commitments and procedures in a transparent way in order for participants to understand the data protection protocol, and based on that, they could decide whether to participate or not in the evaluation.

3. To protect data, specific security measures were implemented for database access and personal communication, including the protection of documents with secure passwords, and the use of anonymised communication applications for participant contact.

### 4.4 Limitations and Challenges

Overall, the scope of data collection was regarded as satisfactory, in terms of capturing relevant data to the CEPI project across three tiers: donor (EU), programme team (TI-S), and implementing partners (Chapters and Partners). In this way, qualitative interviews with stakeholders allowed for full discussions of all relevant topics, and for meaningful and clear data to be collected and analysed.

One area where the evaluation was less able to collect data related to the online survey with Chapters and Partners. The evaluation team developed a short survey and shared the online link with 37 contacts, as provided by TI-S, yet only 20 completed surveys were achieved. While two reminder emails were sent to the remaining participants, this had little effect on the final total achieved. However, of those responses received, these proved useful in largely corroborating the evaluation findings as generated from the desk review and qualitative interviews. It is understood that all Chapters and Partners were busy during this time with CEPI (and other) project commitments, and overall it was not felt that any further steps could have been taken to increase engagement with the survey.

### 5. Data collection methods

The different mixed-methods data collection tools were designed to complement each other and to explicitly answer the evaluation questions posed in the LogFrame matrix.

#### 5.1 Secondary data (document review)

The secondary data review made use of TI-S documents, partner reports and relevant literature, to summarise and assess against each guiding question and define the scope of the evaluation, and was used to:

- Monitor the outputs and outcomes of the project.
- Identify gaps and avoid redundancies with ongoing MEL activities.
- Assess unintended consequences of CEPI project activities, both positive and negative.
- Complement TI-S MEL activities with this Mid-term Review.

TI-S project documents reviewed included:
- MEL documents (CEPI Logframe, Logframe monitoring tools).
- CEPI contact list.
- Communications and Visibility Plan.
- Project proposal.
- Year 1 interim narrative report.
- Grand Corruption project documents.
- Project partners narrative reports.
- TI Strategic documents.

5.2 Primary data collection

Primary data was collected through qualitative interviews with all relevant project stakeholders, including the European Commission, TI-S and Chapters and Partners. Number of respondents in interviews varied, in the region of 1-4 staff, as determined by availability, organisational status, and level of CEPI project knowledge. An online survey was also conducted with staff from Chapters and Partners. All data collection was conducted in April 2023.

The MTR sample can be seen in Annex A.

6. Data analysis

A mix of quantitative and qualitative analysis tools were utilised, with descriptive analysis applied as appropriate. GoogleForms was the main tool for both collecting and analysing the quantitative data.

6.1 Quantitative data analysis

Prior to the analysis and before the endpoint submission to Internews, all data collected was thoroughly reviewed and cleaned, ensuring the accuracy of values and information. During the data cleaning process, the validity of the data was confirmed, whilst ensuring the deletion of any incomprehensible data or duplicated values.
6.2 Qualitative data analysis

Central to the qualitative data analysis was capturing the key points from the specific context, and the narratives and discourses of the interviewees. This aimed to complement the quantitative analysis, by providing additional validation, perceptions and opinions, providing a fuller and more detailed insight on the issue(s) at hand in the report. Qualitative data analysis consisted of comparing and contrasting the similarities and differences between organisations, locations, roles etc., while also extracting key details and anecdotal evidence to support the other primary and secondary data. All key findings were analysed according to the themes outlined in the assessment objectives, using a qualitative evaluation matrix that combined all the similar themes under each relevant assessment question. This qualitative matrix enhanced the rigour of findings, data management and analysis.

6.3 Triangulation of Data and Quality Assurance

Data triangulation and quality assurance followed the data analysis, and was necessary to strengthen the rigour of the assessment and data analysis process. The assessment employed several types of triangulation to highlight any inconsistencies between different data sources, as follows:

1. Mixed methods triangulation, both qualitative and quantitative data were analysed to elucidate complementary aspects of the same subject.
2. Triangulation against external sources was based on triangulation of secondary documents with primary data collection. This process helped ensure consistency across different data sources within the same methods and prevent duplication.
3. Quality Assurance ensured both technical and procedural quality assurance.

7. Findings

To summarise the findings, a RAG rating (Red, Amber, Green) provides a simple visual identifier of how the evaluation has assessed the project against three colour-coded categories for each OECD-DAC criterion:

- Positive evidence of the project in relation to this OECD-DAC criteria.
- Mixed / Indeterminate evidence of the project in relation to this OECD-DAC criteria.
- Limited / Negative evidence of the project in relation to this OECD-DAC criteria.

By applying this scheme, the table below provides a summarised RAG rating of the ADOPTABLE project:
The CEPI project is assessed as very relevant in how it reflects the needs of the region and matches the experience and skills of Chapters and Partners.

The CEPI project is assessed as coherent in how project activities are designed and content is logically and clearly structured.

The CEPI project is assessed as quite effective in how activities have been implemented.

The CEPI project is assessed as quite efficient in how activities have been sequenced and implemented with regard to timeline, resources, capacity and budget.

7.1 Relevance / Coherence

The CEPI project was assessed as very relevant and coherent to the context in Western Balkans and Turkey, where anti-corruption efforts are a particular focus with regard to potential, future admission to the European Union. Chapters and Partners also felt aligned with TI-S, and as part of one, coherent movement with the same focus, aims and objectives.

All participating stakeholders in the CEPI project regarded project activities as required in the region, and appropriate to their context. The relevance of the project had also remained constant despite significant local and regional changes (e.g. Turkey/Syria earthquake, Ukraine war, general elections, domestic politics, legal framework changes, etc.).

“We are a global movement and we try to influence policies of international organisations, especially in our region. We feel the same way, and with regard to EU integration.”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

However, there was some recognition that the war in Ukraine has somewhat shifted the attention and focus of international diplomacy, with some impact on the sense of urgency of anti-corruption (AC) activity at higher levels of governance.

“Fighting corruption was always at the top of the agenda of the international community, it still is. But we are noticing that they are spending a lot of time dealing with the crisis in Ukraine.”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

In addition, following the review of the TI’s strategic documents such as “Holding Power to Account: A Global Strategy Against Corruption 2021-2030”, “Transparency International Secretariat Strategic
Plan 2023-2026” and its “Transparency International Secretariat Road Map 2023-2026” it is evident that CEPI is relevant for the achievement of movement’s main goals.

**CEPI objectives are clear and relevant**

When asked to assess the CEPI objectives, all respondents assessed them as clear and aligned with all stakeholders, with no suggestions for any changes at this Mid-term stage. All respondents also stated that the CEPI objectives are aligned with their organisational values and common goals (i.e. across TI-S, Chapters and Partners). As an extension to this assessment, all Chapters and Partners regard the CEPI project highly, in terms of what it is aiming to achieve. While there was some recognition the objectives were ambitious, and that there still remains much to be done, this was matched by a resilience and belief that the project objectives need to be ambitious, and that their associated tasks will be achieved.

Both the CEPI project Logic model and MEL framework were widely considered as fit for purpose, clear in design, well structured and not too rigid in their application. The four CEPI project outputs were also considered as relevant, coherent and well articulated, and their sequencing as appropriate to the context in which Chapters and Partners typically work (i.e. NIS establishes the evidence base, which advocacy can subsequently work from).

“The activities, outputs and outcomes contribute to the overall impact. It is well considered overall.”

[KII, Chapter/Partner]

Finally, regarding more practical aspects of the project, the widespread increase in cost of living across the region, as caused by inflation (and exacerbated by climate change and the war in Ukraine) means some Chapters and Partners may require additional budget in the remaining period of project implementation, to ensure they are able to cover their overheads. While all Chapters and Partners feel they are able to manage their financial affairs currently, there is a sense that salaries and other activity overheads may become harder to meet in future months.

The CEPI project and its activities are fully compatible with TI's strategic goals. Furthermore, CEPI with its activities is contributing to the Movement wide outcomes as prescribed by the TI’s key strategic documents.

**7.2 Effectiveness**

The CEPI project is assessed as **quite effective** in how activities have been implemented by TI-S, Chapters and Partners.
Overall, it is still too early to see tangible effects of CEPI projects activities at this Mid-term stage, as the majority of Chapters and Partners are focused on finalising the National Integrity System assessments (NIS), and the project got off to a slightly delayed start (please see Efficiency section). Evaluation respondents do not expect to see tangible impact in the remaining half of CEPI, as anti-corruption activities in their very nature represent long-term processes. In terms of the four CEPI project outputs in the Logic Model, NIS and advocacy are ultimately viewed as most crucial for the effectiveness of CEPI overall, as they constitute the generation of evidence and the activation of that evidence in the public sphere to bring about change.

**NIS is challenging to implement**

Regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of CEPI project activities, there was some concern from some TI-S staff around the quality of research outputs for some NIS pillars, in that they were too narrative / descriptive ‘heavy’. This is assessed as being a result of the structure of the NIS itself, which by its design requires a significant level of information capture and presentation.

“I am not sure the NIS is not the best tool for this project. It is too big, too research inefficient. It takes a lot of input and a lot of energy. The NIS in its current form...is not necessarily conducive in reaching high-level objectives” [KII, TI Secretariat]

While TI-S carried out training of Chapter and Partner researchers in the early stages of CEPI implementation, and which was well received, there remains a sense among TI-S staff that this was insufficient in raising their skills to the requisite level to produce high quality NIS reports (at least in the immediate / short term). In some cases, Chapters and Partners hired experts to assist with the NIS data gathering and drafting process.

With the exception of one country (North Macedonia), the NIS is also viewed as challenging to implement due to the changeable and at times unresponsive domestic, political environment, and difficulties in accessing government officials for information. In some cases where general elections are planned, or have recently taken place, there is a state of near-stasis where officials are simply unavailable due to ongoing departmental changes and uncertainty, and some try to circumvent this by accessing secondary data.

In addition, all respondents concluded that NIS is not an instrument that can be easily updated with data on an annual basis. Some stakeholders observe that once the NIS is completed, by the time it has been reviewed and finalised, some of the information captured in the early stages of its implementation (i.e. 1-2 years previously) is now somewhat out of date, thus presenting a difficult challenge relating to maintaining currency of information.

**NIS is viewed as a credible component**

While the volume of data collection (NIS) slows the timeframe of CEPI significantly, the majority of Chapters and Partners, however, still believe that the NIS remains a valuable resource for subsequent advocacy. The majority view NIS as providing value for years, and outside of the immediate CEPI
project confines. Chapters and Partners view the NIS also acts as a strong comparative tool that can be used to compare countries in the region and progress in their own country by comparing back to previous NIS reports.

“NIS is important as it constitutes the political system of a country. In the end it provides a comparative analysis of all the countries”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

There is a desire to amend the NIS design

In assessing these demands, some TI-S respondents reflect that there are too many pillars within the NIS, and that this needs revision to lighten its demands on Chapters and Partners. Some suggest ‘lightening’ the NIS by reducing the breadth and depth of data collection, with less text-heavy outputs, and making it easier to update and share with third parties (e.g. an agile, online version that can be continuously updated and accessed).

“Some kind of digital tool that can present these findings and recommendations and needs for each country would be good, as people do not like to read all the details, and our obligation is to remind institutions of these recommendations and bring more attention to these issues”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

It is clear the NIS is viewed positively as a highly credible resource in the anti-corruption movement, feedback from CEPI project stakeholders suggest it requires further refinement in order to make it more fit-for-purpose in the context of a funded project.

“We should improve NIS. It is not fit for purpose as it is now”
[KII, TI Secretariat]

Other CEPI elements are familiar and appear on-course

Advocacy is widely viewed as an integral activity and inherent strength of Chapters and Partners, albeit with some wariness around implementation in some state capture contexts. In this way, advocacy is largely viewed positively by Chapters and Partners, as a highly familiar activity, and one that they can make good progress in once the NIS is finalised. Respondents highlight numerous advocacy initiatives that can be contributed to CEPI activities that have been conducted and/or are ongoing. Project reports identify 37 separate advocacy initiatives as per Activity 2.2.4 in the first project year with several of them having a policy impact in terms of direct anti-corruption policy implications in several countries.

---


NB At the time of report finalisation (August 2023), it is likely that this number of separate advocacy initiatives will have increased.
“Advocacy is the most important part, as through this we make ourselves stronger, and we make changes in policy...and recommendations, through advocacy, in parliament, etc.”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

Regarding initiatives relating to CSOs, the majority of respondents report good progress is being made with CSOs capacity activities, in particular as Chapters and Partners typically do this as part of their ongoing work (i.e. non-CEPI). However, this is accompanied by some concern at the challenges which some CSOs face in some countries with regard to their safety, as a result of their activity and how it challenges the status quo.

“Talking about corruption is not easy. There is a law that makes people afraid to write on social media, as they end up in prison easily. It is hard to find NGOs and partners to work with us, as they want to stay anonymous”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

Similarly, all respondents note the online corruption database is also largely aligned with their core activities, though there are divergent opinions around how best to integrate previous iterations of this database. Several respondents pointed out that integrating the databases (as generated through CEPI activities) with previous databases may represent a challenging task.

The table below summarises overall progress across the four core CEPI project Outputs, as made by Chapters and Partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEPI outputs</th>
<th>Mid-term Review assessment of progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1: <strong>NIS</strong> evidenced-based findings, assessments, and recommendations are produced and disseminated.</td>
<td>- Key component of CEPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Widely regarded as challenging to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 <strong>Online database</strong> of corruption cases with social impact is publicly available and continuously updated.</td>
<td>- Largely aligned with usual scope of work (i.e. non-CEPI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some uncertainty around how best to integrate and configure the database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 <strong>CSOs</strong>, citizens groups and initiatives at the local and regional level are built.</td>
<td>- Good progress made already, as within usual scope of work (i.e. non-CEPI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 <strong>Fully-fledged advocacy</strong> campaigns on public integrity are delivered.</td>
<td>- Key component of CEPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comes naturally to Chapters and Partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- May be challenging in some country contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents state that the CEPI project MEL framework is proving effective in that it provides clarity and guidance which help contextualise their activities. Several respondents also shared that the CEPI MEL framework is being repurposed for their other projects, as a result of its credible design and effectiveness.
Aside from the challenges represented by NIS implementation, there is some early evidence of effective capacity building among Chapters and Partners - with regard to coalition building, improved MEL knowledge, a more systemic perspective and some legislative successes.

7.3 Efficiency

The CEPI project is assessed as quite efficient in how activities have been sequenced and implemented with regard to timeline, resources, capacity and budget.

**NIS is main obstacle to project efficiency**

The current level of project progress is slightly behind the timeline, as the majority of Chapters and Partners are still finalising the NIS. The project start was delayed due to administrative issues during the inception phase, particularly related to staffing of key positions within the TI-S, and initiated only after the grant agreement was concluded with the EC. The current TI-S procedures make any new hiring a lengthy process that can impede on the project implementation as is the case with CEPI. At the same time, participating Chapters and Partners are unaware of this and believe that project implementation was delayed due to the “finalisation of methodology”, as mentioned by representatives of Chapters and Partners.

The NIS in particular is delaying the timeline, due to the weight of research requirements (e.g. 15 Pillars), liaising with unresponsive public sector officials from whom information is required, and high levels of staff turnover within some Chapters and Partners (e.g. Turkey). Currently, project documents show that all Chapters and Partners are still completing assessments for at least one or more pillars. All Chapters and Partners are committed to finalising and publishing their NIS reports by September 2023.

“If we do NIS by September, we can achieve all activities, and set up the database”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

While there are some concerns around meeting the remainder of the project timeline given the blockage caused by NIS activity, the majority of Chapters and Partners are cautiously optimistic that once NIS is complete they can move forwards with efficiency on other activities. In this way, the NIS is regarded as the main challenge in terms of level of difficulty and timely delivery. As discussed in the effectiveness section, there are discussions around how the NIS may be amended to make it more fit-for-purpose for future such projects, and thereby more efficient in terms of its implementation within the context of a project timeline.

“We discussed a lot, with chapters and TI-S, on how to improve and update the NIS, but the effort needed is almost the same as doing NIS from scratch, and we can’t update NIS within a project”
[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]
It is also observed that Chapters and Partners differ in their ability to implement the NIS in an efficient way, reflecting the variance in context across each participating country (e.g. researcher capacity and experience, responsiveness of government officials, etc).

Other internal efficiency challenges are identified as meeting requirements of other funded (non-CEPI) work, managing staff turnover, adequate staff capacity and levels of researcher skill (in some cases). While external challenges are also ever-present (e.g. inflation, Ukraine war, general elections, restrictions on work NGOs), overall it seems challenges related to the NIS make this the most challenging project component with regard to efficiency.

**Project management is largely efficient**

All respondents assessed the CEPI project to be quite efficient in how it is organised and coordinated, albeit with concerns from some TI-S stakeholders that the timeline will not be met by some, due to NIS displacement. The majority of Chapters and Partners regard TI-S as very supportive, helpful, and responsive in how they work with their teams, and in providing induction and training. Overall, working relations between TI-S, Chapters and Partners appear good, and the use of Microsoft Teams between TI-S and Chapters is considered a very efficient collaboration platform for project management and administration.

“Relations are good with the Secretariat. They did induction training, supported on financial management, and were hands-on when we needed more time in certain areas.”

[KII, TI Chapter/Partner]

The clarity of the Logic Model and MEL framework is also credited in assisting in maintaining efficiency with regard to internal project planning, guiding project activities and monitoring of progress.

However, there appears scope (and appetite) for more structured collaboration between TI-S, Chapters and Partners to create synergies and more effective ways of working, with some suggesting the return of a regular Advisory Board. While there are benefits and drawbacks of calls featuring all Chapters and Partners, overall it appears such a forum can only assist in strengthening project implementation. In addition, there was a suggestion from TI-S for a pan-project GANTT chart that provides a more comprehensive overview of all activities.

It is worth noting that the donor did not conceptually make CEPI as a core funding type of activity. However, CEPI is acting as a type of core funding in the case of Chapters and Partners because it offers important support in implementation of the long-standing ‘traditional’ activities of TI, e.g. advocacy initiatives. In essence, Chapters and Partners would likely be conducting these activities without the support of donors, but CEPI offers the much needed long term financial sustainability, has positive implications on effective functioning and improves the Chapters and Partners quality of core activities. In addition, CEPI funding is flexible to the extent that it improves capacity to deliver high-quality project initiatives by ensuring staff are trained and have the tools to perform.
Finally, the situation in Turkey appears to be very challenging, as the Chapter faces a range of internal and external factors that are affecting the implementation of project activities. Internally, the Chapter in Turkey is experiencing high levels of staff turnover, and a lack of transparency and support from the Board of Directors. Externally, the country context is probably the most challenging across all seven CEPI countries, due to the restrictions placed on many aspects of public life by the current government. TI-S are aware of these issues and are assessing their options.

8. Conclusions

- CEPI project objectives are very relevant, coherent and well aligned with all stakeholders’ visions of their work, at a professional, organisational and personal level.

- While there are good levels of cooperation and synergy between TI-S, Chapters and Partners, some do note the lack of regular Advisory Calls.

- CEPI project objectives are viewed as ambitious and challenging, yet also as achievable, by the majority of Chapters and Partners. There are no requests to amend the objectives.

- The level of the completion of the research related tasks directly correlates to the level of external risks present in each country. For example, as a participating country, North Macedonia faced minimal external factors and completed the research as specified by the methodology and timeframe, whereas Montenegro faced greater challenges due to political instability (N.B. all countries had experienced some influence from external factors related to domestic politics).

- Despite the CEPI project timeline of activities being slightly behind at the mid-term point, there remains a belief and commitment among CEPI implementers that the project’s planned activities will be completed, as activities post-NIS are viewed as less onerous on time and resources. It is also worth noting that Chapters and Partners are not typically structured (and have the capacity) to carry out academic-style research, and so recruiting appropriately skilled staff to carry out the NIS / research activities does require additional foresight and effort from TI-S, to rethink the ‘traditional’ research aspect of the project and make it better suited for advocacy.

- While TI has long-standing expertise in evidence-based advocacy initiatives, CEPI stipulates substantial efforts in gathering the primary data for use in advocacy, which effectively still makes it a ‘research intensive’ type of project, despite efforts to make it “lighter, manageable, and less time consuming”, therefore it is one less well suited to the current capacities of most participating Chapters and Partners.

- The CEPI project acts as a ‘hybrid core funding’ project because it offers a broad base and flexibility to use NIS findings from 15 pillars of political integrity and support TI Chapters’ and Partners’ work on anti-corruption and advocacy.
- Some concerns were raised in the TI Turkey Chapter, regarding internal workload demands, staff turnover and job security, and which are impeding CEPI implementation. Revisiting the agreed ways of working between chapter staff and board members in the TI movement can help clarify the responsibilities, accountabilities and risk management between both parties (e.g. TI-S are not responsible for the job security and staffing of Chapters and Partners).

- NIS provides a wealth of information, yet as a tracking mechanism within the context of a funded project, it would be more easily and cost-effectively updated (and sustainable) over the longer term because it will be focused on a select number of the most relevant NIS recommendations (rather than encompassing them all); hence, it is currently inconclusive as to whether NIS is fit-for-purpose, as specified by the project design.

- Chapters and Partners view the remaining three outputs (i.e. CSOs, database, advocacy) with more confidence than the NIS, due to their familiarity with these activities, and an understanding that they represent a less 'heavy lift' than the NIS.

- The processes of publishing cases in the online database are still under discussion by some stakeholders, especially with regard to how best it can be integrated and configured with previous iterations.

- The CEPI project Logic Model and MEL system are widely regarded as appropriate, well-structured and fit for purpose.

- The results of CEPI activities may not be evident for some time, as anti-corruption activities in their nature represent a long-term process.
9. SWOT analysis

The SWOT analysis below has been included to provide a high-level overview of CEPI project strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats at this Mid-term stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● CEPI is relevant, comprehensive and appropriately designed.</td>
<td>● Research activities are time-intensive, challenging and slow to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Chapters and Partners are confident in advocacy and familiar with CSO activities.</td>
<td>● NIS implementation is affecting the project timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Logic Model and MEL framework are fit for purpose.</td>
<td>● NIS requires substantial effort in strengthening research capacity to produce high quality NIS reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Good working relations between TI-S, chapters and partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● NIS provides significant value for AC efforts.</td>
<td>● Domestic contexts and political events (elections, legislative changes, oppressive governments, Ukraine war, state capture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● CEPI generates new program opportunities for all stakeholders.</td>
<td>● Uncooperative governments affect NIS data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Chapters and Partners capacity is strengthened by CEPI activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Lessons learned

- The NIS can place a significant burden upon implementers when included and activated within a funded project, bounded by time, capacity and resources.
- Identifying and hiring specialist staff can take more time and effort than planned, with adverse effects on project timelines.
- Building the capacity of researchers in equipping them to meet the demands of research products such as the NIS is a significant task, and one that may require more than refresher training before a project commences (though this does contribute).
- Stronger risk management processes do not compensate for the complex context of each individual country; each country is unique but they share the same obstacles, such as elections, changes to legal frameworks, prevalence of corruption.
11. Recommendations

For the remainder of the CEPI project

1. **TI-S to re-establish a forum** (Advisory Board) for TI-S, Chapters and Partners to communicate as one. Such a forum would benefit from having a specific theme or action point, to give it purpose and meaningful engagement for attendees. TI-S to lead on establishing scheduling and agenda for the forums, in close collaboration with CEPI Partners/Chapters.

2. **TI-S continues to arrange semi-formal (at least quarterly) communications with the EC** on the progress of CEPI.

3. **TI-S to agree upon a protocol and methods for merger and configuration of databases** at the end of the project and proceed with creation of a database for CEPI as planned. This process should ideally be formal and considered (e.g. form a task force with clear methodology, duties and deadlines), and led by TI-S in close collaboration with relevant partners.

4. **TI-S use the Final Evaluation of CEPI to calibrate not only performance vis-a-vis LogFrame and MEL Plan, but also to assess best practices on how CEPI made the movement stronger.** The TOR of the final evaluation to be prepared by TI-S, but also shared with all CEPI Chapters/Partners for their review and input, with prompts around evaluation objectives, impact indicators, etc.

5. **TI-S use the Final Evaluation to capture dimensions outside the CEPI scope** in terms of processes and practices for the more effective and efficient movements’ work in the region. Although chapters are independent entities with full responsibility for their operations capacities, when complex projects such as CEPI are jointly implemented, TI-S should consider formalising interactions with chapter board members to mitigate the impact of staff turnover on project implementation. Also, TI-S mechanisms for risk reduction, business continuity policies and emergency procedures should be reflected on.

6. **TI-S considers a no-cost extension** for completion of CEPI project activities (e.g. 3-6 months, as appropriate and feasible), to ensure full completion of activities. TI-S to consult with CEPI Chapters/Partners in the final quarter of 2023 to understand the need for any potential extension, and preferred terms and conditions (while Chapters and Partners conceded completing all activities in the timeline would be challenging, no specific concerns, or requests for a no-cost extension were raised).

7. **Chapters/Partners consider joint advocacy initiatives** on the topics, issues and teams that are represented in the whole region with all or some of the CEPI implementers.

8. **Chapters/Partners should make additional efforts in making sure that their staffing structure is sufficiently well versed and adaptable** in responding to project challenges and fluctuations in team composition, as experienced.
For future consideration

1. **TI-S deploy CEPI as a backbone in shaping the regional anti-corruption strategy**, through a series of strategic planning activities.

2. **TI-S consider focusing the final evaluation of the CEPI project on the role of NIS** - in terms of its efficiency and effectiveness, to discern if it is fit-for-purpose (i.e. in its current design and deployment) for similar endeavours in the future. Outputs of such a final evaluation can be used to inform discussions, at a high, programmatic level, between TI-S and EC regarding the future structure and role of NIS.

3. **TI-S consider developing a lighter NIS tool** (potentially online) that is more agile to implement, update and disseminate. Consider conducting NIS-like activity for only ‘core’ pillars.

4. **TI-S consider focusing on the advocacy activities that come ‘naturally’ to the Movement**, rethink type of research components for Chapter/partner implementation, consider demands of producing research and primary data and outsource data gathering activities to organisations with long standing reputation in research (e.g. think-tanks, institutes).

5. **TI-S consider positioning the NIS as the inception of the formative study** for creating a scenario with a roadmap (foresight\(^2\) exercise through workshops) in which the region has reduced corruption.

6. **TI-S and Chapters/Partners continue to utilise NIS assessments** when engaging with authorities and at the level of the EC and EU Delegations, to further strengthen reform of anti-corruption legislation.

7. **Donor consider strengthening the future NIS** and positioning it as a credible source of information for impact assessments of the EC programming in the area of anti-corruption. This may also help reaffirm the NIS as a highly valuable resource for future EC programming.

8. **TI-S to calibrate the final evaluation of CEPI to assess good practices on how the CEPI movement can be made stronger** (for TI-S), as well as the performance vis-a-vis LogFrame and MEL Plan.

9. **TI-S target capacity building of researchers**, to develop more experienced research staff in each participating country (though this will depend upon any future amends to the NIS implementation process).

10. **TI-S use Chapters’ experience of working on a common project to map processes that could improve TI-S working with chapters** (face-to-face meetups, future donors, existing structures).

11. **TI-S consider including a 3-month inception phase** prior to commencement of project activities, to help reduce timeline delays that impact on subsequent phases of activity (e.g. hiring new staff).

12. **TI-S address widespread desire for a more regional approach by individual Chapters** in the future applications to the donors. More specifically, consider working jointly on certain topics, issues and teams that are experienced in all countries, and making a case for the Western Balkans as a distinct region within the TI movement.

13. **Chapters/Partners consider repurposing the CEPI MEL framework** for other projects that are faced with similar challenges and are implementing a similar range of activities (as some have already done so on other parallel projects).

14. **Donors should consider increasing the funds and deploying the CEPI framework as a starting point for larger programmes / projects** that could track corruption related issues in the wider European region (and the outputs of which could inform broader programming and planning in anti-corruption).

15. **NB The authors of the evaluation have included a reference to the Multiple Streams Network (Annex F), which provides an overview of how the impact of projects such as CEPI can be framed in a specific policy ecosystem.**
Annex A: Primary Data collection sample

The overall data collection sample included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant types</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interviews / respondents</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>TI-S</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country implementing stakeholders</td>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDM</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI BiH</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KDI</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MANS</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI Macedonia</td>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI Turkey</td>
<td>Türkiye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL PARTICIPANTS PER DATA COLLECTION UNIT | 24 | 20 |

| TOTAL PARTICIPANTS | 44 |
Annex B: KII Discussion Guide for European Commission representative

For notetaker:
Interview Date:
Interviewer(s):
Respondent’s Code:
Affiliation:
Location:
Interview Type: KII or Group Interview.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today. My name is ____ and this is my colleague_____. We are interviewing you on behalf of Transparency International Secretariat for the Mid-term Review of the CEPI project. We represent a fully independent evaluation team, not directly associated with the Donor, Transparency International, or any other entity involved with anti-corruption.

We are undertaking an evaluation of the anti-corruption project’s activities in Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia. The information we collect will guide future anti-corruption programming in the mentioned countries. Our focus is on i) identifying the findings that demonstrate level of progress of implementation, challenges and learnings from project set-up and execution approaches, and ii) developing recommendations on what might need to be adjusted to ensure effective project implementation in the next period.

If you do wish to participate, you do not have to answer any question you do not wish to and please ask for clarification if there is any question that you do not understand. You can also choose to end the interview at any time you wish, without any consequences to you or anyone else. There are no anticipated risks to your participation. We have put measures in place to reduce the risk of breaching your privacy or confidentiality by following strict rules and ethical principles that our team members have agreed to observe. While you will receive no direct benefits from participating in this analysis, your contribution will help inform Transparency International in its efforts to improve anti-corruption programming.

[IF AUDIO/VIDEO RECORDING IS DESIRED] To ensure we capture everything shared, we will take notes and record the discussion on a platform we are using for this interview, if you agree. If you do not wish to be recorded, we can take notes by hand, and you can still participate in the study.

The information you provide will be combined with that from other interview respondents, reviewed documents, and other data sources. It will be consolidated and presented in a final report that will be shared with the Transparency International Secretariat and participating TI chapters. While the report will include a list of individuals who have contributed, there is no intention to link individual opinions or statements to your person. We will store information, such as transcripts, notes, and databases, electronically on password-protected computers and analysis platforms to which only the Evaluation Team has access to.
[IF CALLING REMOTELY] I want to assure you that we are the only ones on this call and that we’re calling from a private location where no one else will be able to listen to our conversation.

Do you voluntarily consent to participate in this study? YES NO

**Can you please start by introducing yourself and your role in this project?**

Name:
Gender:
Role:

**BACKGROUND**

**Q1.** We would like to start the interview by asking you how would you describe your collaboration with TI-S at this mid-term stage?

<PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength/advantage aiding cooperation?
<PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What are the greatest challenges in cooperation?

**Q2.** What is your understanding of the chapter’s attitude(s) in relation to TI’s global mission and vision?

<PROBE> Is there a sense that ‘you’ are one movement? Why? / Why not?

**Q3.** To what extent has CEPI strengthened the movement in fighting corruption?

<PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength / advantage of CEPI?
<PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What is the weakness of / threat to CEPI?

**RELEVANCE / COHERENCE**

**Q4.** What is your assessment of the CEPI project objectives - at this mid-term stage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core CEPI project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Increased evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Enhanced civic engagement for public integrity, transparency and accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5.** To what extent are the objectives aligned with yours as a donor?

<PROBE> Which objectives are more / less aligned with your objectives?
<PROBE> Which objectives are more / less challenging to achieve in the participating countries? Why?
<PROBE> If you could modify any of the CEPI objectives, which might you change?

To what extent are the CEPI objectives SMART? (Smart, Measurable, Realistic, Achievable, Time-bound).

Q6. Have there been any significant changes in project context since the CEPI project began?
   <PROBE> Can you describe them? (e.g., changes in needs, in policies, etc.)
   <PROBE> What impact have these had on the project?

EFFECTIVENESS

Q7. From what you know of all the activities used in the project, which ones do you feel have been most effective in reducing corrupt activities?
   In the short-term? Over the long-term?
   <PROBE> What types of corrupt activities were they most effective at reducing? What has contributed to the effectiveness of these activities? What inhibited their effectiveness?
   <PROBE> Which contributed most to the approaches' effectiveness: the interventions, the techniques used, the mechanisms used, or other factors? Why?

Q8. From what you know, how would you assess the overall progress of the project thus far?
   <PROBE> Which areas have seen most / least progress? [probe from list below, as appropriate / required]

CEPI project output indicators
- Publishing of NIS beneficiary and regional comparative assessment reports.
- Dissemination of hard-copy beneficiary and regional NIS assessment reports.
- Downloading and sharing of beneficiary and regional NIS assessment electronic version reports.
- Production of an online NIS tracking mechanism tool.
- Launch of a regional database of corruption cases with social impact with beneficiary filters.
- Publishing of cases of corruption with social impact in the database.
- Visits made to the online database.
- Development of capacity-building tailor-made toolkits for anti-corruption.
- Reaching people from CSOs, local groups and initiatives by capacity-building efforts and interaction.
- Interactions with civil society stakeholders through partnership building and promotion of findings.
- Targeted anti-corruption advocacy and campaign plans developed and implemented at beneficiary and regional levels.
- Citizens reached by advocacy and campaign raising awareness activities through different forms of engagement.
- Personal corruption stories or case studies developed from database or NIS assessments illustrating impact of corruption.
- Different types of produced advocacy campaign materials and visual aids.
- Domestic and international media reports about campaign actions, joint initiatives, NIS assessments and database cases.

<PROBE> Which areas are proving the most challenging? Why? How might the project better approach these areas?
Q9. What are your thoughts regarding the NIS assessments? (NB chapter levels of engagement with NIS will vary considerably)
   <PROBE> How would you assess their value overall?
   <PROBE> How might this value be increased in the future?

Q10. To what extent are the objectives of the project likely to be achieved within the remaining time?
   <PROBE> What makes you say that?
   <PROBE> What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Q11. How would you describe the way in which the TI Secretariat has worked with your organisation?
   <PROBE> And how well have they worked with the other regional implementing stakeholders?

**EFFICIENCY**

Q12. What is your assessment for how well the project has been implemented overall - in terms of timeliness, coordination, sequencing of activities, administration and use of budget?

Q13. What additional capacities, resources and support might be required for a successful implementation in the next phase of the project?
   <PROBE> Which of these are most important?
   <PROBE> How might that best be activated?

*The questions below are only to be asked for those with finance / budget knowledge of CEPI.*

Qf1. To what extent is the CEPI project sufficiently resourced?
   <PROBE> Which areas are well / less well resourced?

Qf2. How would you describe the process of receiving / managing / spending project budget?
   <PROBE> How well structured is it? How clear is it for yourself and other colleagues?

Qf3. How will CEPI implementing stakeholders manage when the funded project comes to an end?
   <PROBE> How prepared are they for this?
   <PROBE> What might help make them better prepared?
   <PROBE> What kind of steps can be taken to make them more financially resilient?

**SUMMING UP**

Q14. In your opinion, how has the project performed as a whole? What have been some of its accomplishments? What are some of its shortcomings?
   <PROBE> What has been the most distinct aspect of the project so far?
   <PROBE> What has constituted best practice?
<PROBE> If you were to start this project all over again, what would you do differently?
<PROBE> What have been the key lessons learned?

Annex C: KII Discussion Guide for TI-S program staff

For notetaker:
Interview Date:
Interviewer(s):
Respondent’s Code:
Affiliation:
Location:
Interview Type: KII or Group Interview.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today. My name is ____ and this is my colleague_____. We are interviewing you on behalf of Transparency International Secretariat for the Mid-term Review of the CEPI project. We represent a fully independent evaluation team, not directly associated with the Donor, Transparency International, or any other entity involved with anti-corruption.

We are undertaking an evaluation of the anti-corruption project’s activities in Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia. The information we collect will guide future anti-corruption programming in the mentioned countries. Our focus is on i) identifying the findings that demonstrate level of progress of implementation, challenges and learnings from project set-up and execution approaches, and ii) developing recommendations on what might need to be adjusted to ensure effective project implementation in the next period.

If you do wish to participate, you do not have to answer any question you do not wish to and please ask for clarification if there is any question that you do not understand. You can also choose to end the interview at any time you wish, without any consequences to you or anyone else. There are no anticipated risks to your participation. We have put measures in place to reduce the risk of breaching your privacy or confidentiality by following strict rules and ethical principles that our team members have agreed to observe. While you will receive no direct benefits from participating in this analysis, your contribution will help inform Transparency International in its efforts to improve anti-corruption programming.

[IF AUDIO/VIDEO RECORDING IS DESIRED] To ensure we capture everything shared, we will take notes and record the discussion on an platform we are using for this interview, if you agree. If you do not wish to be recorded, we can take notes by hand, and you can still participate in the study.

The information you provide will be combined with that from other interview respondents, reviewed documents, and other data sources. It will be consolidated and presented in a final report that will be shared with the Transparency
International Secretariat and participating TI chapters. While the report will include a list of individuals who have contributed, there is no intention to link individual opinions or statements to your person. We will store information, such as transcripts, notes, and databases, electronically on password-protected computers and analysis platforms to which only the Evaluation Team has access to.

[IF CALLING REMOTELY] I want to assure you that we are the only ones on this call and that we’re calling from a private location where no one else will be able to listen to our conversation.

Do you voluntarily consent to participate in this study?  YES  NO

Can you please start by introducing yourself and your role in this project?

Name:
Gender:
Role:

BACKGROUND

Q1. We would like to start the interview by asking you how would you describe cooperation with TI’s participating chapters on CEPI activities at this mid-term stage?
   <PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength/advantage aiding cooperation?
   <PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What is the greatest impediment for cooperation?

Q2. How would you describe chapter’s attitude(s) in relation to TI’s global mission and vision?
   <PROBE> Is there a sense that ‘you’ are one movement?
   <PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] Why?

Q3. To what extent has CEPI enabled you to be stronger as a movement in fighting corruption?
   <PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength/advantage of CEPI?
   <PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What is the greatest shortcoming of CEPI?

RELEVANCE / COHERENCE

Q4. What is your assessment of the CEPI project objectives - at this mid-term stage?

Core CEPI project objectives
   3) Increased evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation.
**Q5.** To what extent are the objectives aligned with those of the implementing stakeholders?  
<PROBE> Which objectives are more / less aligned with your IP’s objectives?  
<PROBE> Which objectives are more / less challenging to achieve in the participating countries? Why?  
<PROBE> If you could modify any of the CEPI objectives, which might you change?  
<PROBE> To what extent are the CEPI objectives SMART? (Smart, Measurable, Realistic, Achievable, Time-bound).

**Q6.** Have there been any significant changes in project context since the CEPI project began?  
<PROBE> Can you describe them? (e.g., changes in needs, in policies, etc.)  
<PROBE> What impact have these had on the project?  
[IF POSITIVE] How well has the project implementation adapted to these changes? How might it have been more adaptable?

**Q7.** What is your assessment of the CEPI Logic Model overall?  
<PROBE> How fit for purpose is it overall?  
<PROBE> How well do its components fit in with one another?  
<PROBE> How well do the components fit in with the overall project objectives?

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**Q8.** We would like to explore the effectiveness of CEPI activities in reducing specific types of corrupt activities.  
Q8.1 Of all the activities used in your project, which ones were/will be the most effective in reducing corrupt activities? In the short-term? Over the long-term?  
<PROBE> What types of corrupt activities were they most effective at reducing?

Q8.2 What contributed to the effectiveness of these activities? What inhibited their effectiveness?  
<PROBE> Which contributed most to the approaches' effectiveness: the interventions, the techniques used, the mechanisms used, or other factors? Why?

**Q9.** How would you assess the overall progress of the project thus far?  
<PROBE> Which areas have seen most / least progress? [probe from list below, as required]

**CEPI project output indicators**  
- Publishing of NIS beneficiary and regional comparative assessment reports.  
- Dissemination of hard-copy beneficiary and regional NIS assessment reports.  
- Downloading and sharing of beneficiary and regional NIS assessment electronic version reports.  
- Production of an online NIS tracking mechanism tool.
- Launch of a regional database of corruption cases with social impact with beneficiary filters.
- Publishing of cases of corruption with social impact in the database.
- Visits made to the online database.
- Development of capacity-building tailor-made toolkits for anti-corruption.
- Reaching people from CSOs, local groups and initiatives by capacity-building efforts and interaction.
- Interactions with civil society stakeholders through partnership building and promotion of findings.
- Targeted anti-corruption advocacy and campaign plans developed and implemented at beneficiary and regional levels.
- Citizens reached by advocacy and campaign raising awareness activities through different forms of engagement.
- Personal corruption stories or case studies developed from database or NIS assessments illustrating impact of corruption.
- Different types of produced advocacy campaign materials and visual aids.
- Domestic and international media reports about campaign actions, joint initiatives, NIS assessments and database cases.

<PROBE> Which areas are proving the most challenging? Why? How might the project better approach these areas?

Q10. What are your thoughts regarding the NIS assessments? (NB chapters’ levels of engagement with NIS will vary considerably)

<PROBE> How would you assess their value overall?
<PROBE> How might this value be increased in the future?

Q11. To what extent are the objectives of the project likely to be achieved within the remaining time?

<PROBE> What makes you say that?
<PROBE> What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Q12. Have there been specific approaches that have proved more / less successful than others?

<PROBE> Which ones specifically?
<PROBE> Why are these more / less successful?
<PROBE> What learnings can be drawn from this?

Q13. How would you describe the way in which the TI Secretariat has worked with the other regional implementing stakeholders?

<PROBE> How effective is the collaboration?
<PROBE> What areas are most / least effective? Why?
<PROBE> How might this relationship be strengthened in the future?
Q14. What is your assessment for how well the project has been implemented overall - in terms of timeliness, coordination, sequencing of activities, administration and use of budget?
   <PROBE> Have there been any delays / bottlenecks / significant challenges?
   <PROBE> Where are these most likely to occur? (e.g. simultaneous activation of project elements across countries?)

Q15. What is your assessment of the project’s results-based management and administration systems?
   <PROBE> What role have they played in the project?
   <PROBE> How effective have they been in this role? Can you give any examples?
   <PROBE> To what extent have they made the project more / less efficient?

Q16. How would you describe the presence of risks in this project implementation?
   <PROBE> To what extent were implementation risks identified and managed? Can you give any examples?
   Have any potential risks been missed or overlooked?
   <PROBE> Could stronger risk management processes have been put in place? Which ones specifically?

Q17. What is your assessment of the CEPI project MEL framework overall?
   <PROBE> What has been its main benefit so far?
   <PROBE> Are there any areas where it has been less useful?
   <PROBE> To what extent is it informing decision-making in the project?
   [IF POSITIVE] Can you give any examples?

Q18. What additional capacities, resources and support would be required for a successful implementation in the next phase of the project?
   <PROBE> Which of these are most important?
   <PROBE> How might that best be activated?

[The questions below are only to be asked for those with finance / budget knowledge of CEPI.]
Qf1. To what extent is the CEPI project sufficiently resourced?
   <PROBE> Which areas are well / less well resourced?
   <PROBE> If resources are an issue, how does this affect how in-country implementing stakeholders implement activities specifically? (e.g. office rent, office equipment, digital costs, campaign funding etc).
   <PROBE> To what extent is this a significant issue?

Qf2. How would you describe the process of receiving / managing / spending project budget?
   <PROBE> How well structured is it? How clear is it for yourself and other colleagues?
   <PROBE> Have there been any challenges experienced in these areas? (e.g. exchange rates)
   [IF POSITIVE] Can you give any examples? How might these challenges have been reduced / avoided?
   How can they be managed and overcome?
Qf3. How will CEPI implementing stakeholders manage when the funded project comes to an end?
   <PROBE> How prepared are they for this?
   <PROBE> What might help make them better prepared?
   <PROBE> What kind of steps can be taken to make them more financially resilient?

SUMMING UP

Q19. In your opinion, how has the project performed as a whole? What have been some of its accomplishments? What are some of its shortcomings?
   <PROBE> What has been the most distinct aspect of the project so far?
   <PROBE> What has constituted best practice?
   <PROBE> If you were to start this project all over again, what would you do differently?
   <PROBE> What have been the key lessons learned?

Annex D: KII Discussion Guide for in-country project stakeholders

For notetaker:
Interview Date:
Interviewer(s):
Respondent’s Code:
Affiliation:
Location:
Interview Type: KII or Group Interview.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today. My name is ____ and this is my colleague_____. We are interviewing you on behalf of Transparency International Secretariat for the Mid-term Review of the CEPI project. We represent a fully independent evaluation team, not directly associated with the Donor, Transparency International or any other entity involved with anti-corruption.

We are undertaking an evaluation of the anti-corruption project’s activities in Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia. The information we collect will guide future anti-corruption programming in the mentioned countries. Our focus is on i) identifying the findings that demonstrate level of progress of implementation, challenges and learnings from project set-up and execution approaches, and ii) developing recommendations on what might need to be adjusted to ensure effective project implementation in the next period.
If you do wish to participate, you do not have to answer any question you do not wish to and please ask for clarification if there is any question that you do not understand. You can also choose to end the interview at any time you wish, without any consequences to you or anyone else. There are no anticipated risks to your participation. We have put measures in place to reduce the risk of breaching your privacy or confidentiality by following strict rules and ethical principles that our team members have agreed to observe. While you will receive no direct benefits from participating in this analysis, your contribution will help inform Transparency International in its efforts to improve anti-corruption programming.

[IF AUDIO RECORDING IS DESIRED] To ensure we capture everything shared, we will take notes and record the discussion on an audio recorder, if you agree. If you do not wish to be audio recorded, we can take notes by hand, and you can still participate in the study.

The information you provide will be combined with that from other interview respondents, reviewed documents, and other data sources. It will be consolidated and presented in a final report that will be shared with the Transparency International Secretariat. While the report will include a list of individuals who have contributed, there is no intention to link individual opinions or statements to your person. We will store information, such as transcripts, notes, and databases, electronically on password-protected computers and analysis platforms to which only the Evaluation Team has access to.

[IF CALLING REMOTELY] I want to assure you that we are the only ones on this call and that we’re calling from a private location where no one else will be able to listen to our conversation.

Do you voluntarily consent to participate in this study?  YES  NO
If the answer is yes, the note taker will mark yes. If not, we wish to thank you for the time you have spent with us.

Can you please start by introducing yourself and your role in this project?

Name:  
Gender:  
Role:  

BACKGROUND

Q1. We would like to start the interview by asking you how would you describe cooperation with TI Secretariat on CEPI activities at this mid-term stage?
   <PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength/advantage aiding cooperation?  
   <PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What is the greatest impediment for cooperation?

Q2. How would you describe TI-S attitude(s) in relation to TI’s global mission and vision?  
   <PROBE> Is there a sense that ‘you’ are one movement?
[IF NEGATIVE] Why?

Q3. To what extent has CEPI enabled you to be stronger as a movement in fighting corruption?
   <PROBE> [IF POSITIVE] What is the greatest strength/advantage of CEPI?
   <PROBE> [IF NEGATIVE] What is the greatest shortcoming of CEPI?

RELEVANCE / COHERENCE

Q4. To what extent are the objectives of the CEPI project aligned with those of your organisation?

Core CEPI project objectives
1) Increased evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation.
2) Enhanced civic engagement for public integrity, transparency and accountability.

<PROBE> Which objectives are more / less aligned with your organisation's objectives?
<PROBE> Which are more / less challenging to achieve in this country? Why?
<PROBE> If you could change any of the CEPI objectives, which might you change?
<PROBE> To what extent are the CEPI objectives SMART? (Smart, Measurable, Realistic, Achievable, Time-bound).

Q5. Have there been any significant changes in project context since the CEPI project began?
   <PROBE> Can you describe them? (e.g., changes in needs, in policies, etc.)
   <PROBE> What impact have these had on the project? How well has the project implementation adapted to these changes? How might it have been more adaptable?

Q6. How aware are you of the CEPI project logic model?
   [NOTE: if their awareness / recall is limited, share screen and quickly go through the logic model]
   <PROBE> What is your assessment of it overall?
   <PROBE> How well do its components fit in with one another?
   <PROBE> How well do the components fit in with the overall project objectives?

Q7. How would you describe the way in which you (and other regional implementing stakeholders) work with the TI Secretariat?
   <PROBE> How effective is the collaboration?
   <PROBE> What areas are most / least effective? Why?
   <PROBE> How might this relationship be strengthened in the future?

EFFECTIVENESS
Q8. We would like to explore the effectiveness of CEPI activities in reducing specific types of corrupt activities.

Q8.1 Of all the activities used in your project, which ones were/will be the most effective in reducing corrupt activities? In the short-term? In the long-term?

   <PROBE> What types of corrupt activities were they most effective at reducing?

Q8.2 What contributed to the effectiveness of these activities? What inhibited their effectiveness?

   <PROBE> Which contributed most to the approaches’ effectiveness: the interventions, the techniques used, the mechanisms used, or other factors? Why?

Q9. How would you assess the overall progress of the project thus far?

   <PROBE> Which areas have seen most / least progress? [probe from list below, as required]

### CEPI project output indicators
- Publishing of NIS beneficiary and regional comparative assessment reports.
- Dissemination of hard-copy beneficiary and regional NIS assessment reports.
- Downloading and sharing of beneficiary and regional NIS assessment electronic version reports.
- Production of an online NIS tracking mechanism tool.
- Launch of a regional database of corruption cases with social impact with beneficiary filters.
- Publishing of cases of corruption with social impact in the database.
- Visits made to the online database.
- Development of capacity-building tailor-made toolkits for anti-corruption.
- Reaching people from CSOs, local groups and initiatives by capacity-building efforts and interaction.
- Interactions with civil society stakeholders through partnership building and promotion of findings.
- Targeted anti-corruption advocacy and campaign plans developed and implemented at beneficiary and regional levels.
- Citizens reached by advocacy and campaign raising awareness activities through different forms of engagement.
- Personal corruption stories or case studies developed from database or NIS assessments illustrating impact of corruption.
- Different types of produced advocacy campaign materials and visual aids.
- Domestic and international media reports about campaign actions, joint initiatives, NIS assessments and database cases.

   <PROBE> Which areas are proving the most challenging? Why? How might the project better approach these areas?

Q10. What are your thoughts regarding the NIS assessments? (NB chapters’ levels of engagement with NIS will vary considerably)

   <PROBE> How would you assess their value overall?
   <PROBE> How might this value be increased in the future?

Q11. To what extent are the objectives of the project likely to be achieved within that remaining time?

   <PROBE> What makes you say that?
   <PROBE> What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
Q12. Have there been specific approaches that have proved more / less successful than others?
   <PROBE> Which ones specifically?
   <PROBE> Why are these more / less successful?
   <PROBE> What learnings can be drawn from this?

EFFICIENCY

Q13. What is your assessment for how well the project has been implemented overall - in terms of timeliness, coordination, sequencing of activities, administration and use of budget?
   <PROBE> Have there been any delays / bottlenecks / significant challenges?
   <PROBE> Where are these most likely to occur? (e.g. simultaneous activation of project elements across countries?)

Q14. What is your assessment of the project’s results-based management and administration systems?
   <PROBE> What role have they played in the project?
   <PROBE> How effective have they been in this role? Can you give any examples?
   <PROBE> To what extent have they made the project more / less efficient?

Q15. How would you describe the presence of risks in this project implementation?
   <PROBE> To what extent were implementation risks identified and managed? Can you give any examples?
   Have any potential risks been missed or overlooked?
   <PROBE> Could stronger risk management processes have been put in place? Which ones specifically?

Q16. What is your assessment of the CEPI project MEL framework overall?
   <PROBE> What has been its main benefit so far?
   <PROBE> Are there any areas where it has been less useful?
   <PROBE> To what extent is it informing decision-making in the project?
   [IF POSITIVE] Can you give any examples?

Q17. What additional capacities, resources and support would be required for a successful implementation in the next phase of the project?
   <PROBE> Which of these are most important?
   <PROBE> How might that best be activated?
   <PROBE> How might TI-S best provide support in this?

[The questions below are only to be asked for those with finance / budget knowledge of CEPI.]

Qf1. To what extent is the CEPI project sufficiently resourced?
   <PROBE> Which areas are well / less well resourced?
Qf2. How would you describe the process of receiving / managing / spending project budget?
   <PROBE> How well structured is it? How clear is it for yourself and other colleagues?
   <PROBE> Have there been any challenges experienced in these areas?
   [IF POSITIVE] Can you give any examples? How might these challenges have been reduced / avoided? How can they be managed and overcome?

Qf3. How will your organisation manage when the funded project comes to an end?
   <PROBE> How prepared is your organisation for this?
   <PROBE> What might help make it better prepared?
   <PROBE> What kind of steps can be taken to make it more financially resilient?

SUMMING UP

Q18. In your opinion, how has the project performed overall? What have been some of its accomplishments? What are some of its shortcomings?
   <PROBE> What has been the most distinct aspect of the project so far?
   <PROBE> What has constituted best practice?
   <PROBE> If you were to start this project all over again, what would you do differently?
   <PROBE> What have been the key lessons learned?

Annex E: Survey tool for in-country project stakeholders

Hello. Thank you for your participation in our research! This questionnaire is forwarded to you in order to collect information for Mid-term review “EU4 Rule of Law: Citizen Engagement for Public Integrity (CEPI) in the Western Balkans and Turkey”. We would really appreciate it if you could respond to this survey (c.15 mins), which relates to the CEPI project your organisation is involved in. We are sharing this survey on behalf of Transparency International Secretariat, who we are working with to assess the current level of progress of this project.

Your responses will help us identify how to improve this project (and others like it) in the future.
All responses will be kept confidential, and we will not ask you to provide any personal and/or identifiable information.

Are you OK to continue with the survey?

**SELECT ONE**
- Yes
- No [Terminate]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. How well aligned are the two CEPI project objectives with the work your organisation does in your country?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Increased evidence-based anti-corruption policy making and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Enhanced civic engagement for public integrity, transparency and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELECT ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH OBJECTIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very well aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quite well aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neither aligned or not aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not well aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very unaligned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. How effectively are these outcomes being progressed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Recommendations and knowledge from the National Integrity System (NIS) assessments and database are used by authorities to preserve, improve or create anti-corruption frameworks such as laws, policies and their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Key domestic stakeholders (decision-makers and CSOs) demonstrate commitments to implement recommendations coming out of NIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Outreach partnerships, initiatives or networks strengthened or formed with targeted beneficiary and regional civil society actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Joint actions and initiatives with civil society actors and groups demanding political integrity and improving the anti-corruption framework such as laws, policies and their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Decision-makers at local and beneficiary-level engaged by TI and other CSO partners through advocacy efforts to discuss findings and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELECT ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH OUTCOME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quite effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quite ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very ineffective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. To your best knowledge, how much progress has your organisation made so far on these targeted outputs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Publishing of NIS beneficiary and regional comparative assessment reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Dissemination of hard-copy beneficiary and regional NIS assessment reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Downloading and sharing of beneficiary and regional NIS assessment electronic version reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Production of an online NIS tracking mechanism tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Launch of a regional database of corruption cases with social impact with beneficiary filters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Publishing of cases of corruption with social impact in the database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELECT ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH OUTPUT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very good progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not much progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No progress at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g) Visits made to the online database.

h) Development of capacity-building tailor-made toolkits for anti-corruption.

i) Reaching people from CSOs, local groups and initiatives by capacity-building efforts and interaction.

j) Interactions with civil society stakeholders through partnership building and promotion of findings.

k) Targeted anti-corruption advocacy and campaign plans developed and implemented at beneficiary and regional levels.

l) Citizens reached by advocacy and campaign raising awareness activities through different forms of engagement.

m) Personal corruption stories or case studies developed from database or NIS assessments illustrating impact of corruption.

n) Different types of produced advocacy campaign materials and visual aids.

o) Domestic and international media reports about campaign actions, joint initiatives, NIS assessments and database cases.

### Q4. Which of these best describes the collaboration between TI Secretariat and your organisation?

**SELECT ONE**

- Very effective collaboration
- Quite effective collaboration
- Neither effective nor ineffective collaboration
- Quite ineffective collaboration
- Very ineffective collaboration

### Q5. What is your assessment of these component parts of the project?

**SELECT ONE FOR EACH COMPONENT**

- Very positive
- Quite positive
- Neither positive nor negative
- Quite negative
- Very negative

### Q6. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

**SELECT ONE**

- Fully agree
- Somewhat agree
c) CEPI is a project without clear purpose or applicability for my country.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagrees
- Fully disagree

d) My tasks on CEPI are taking away my time from more important tasks in my organisation.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagree
- Fully disagree

e) CEPI interventions are aligned with the strategies of my organisation.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagree
- Fully disagree

f) All CEPI objectives are likely to be achieved.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagree
- Fully disagree

g) Management and administration of the CEPI project by my organisation is effective.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagree
- Fully disagree

h) Risks to CEPI implementation are well identified and adequately managed.

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Quite disagree
- Fully disagree

SELECT ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT

Q7. Please describe what additional capacities, resources and support would be required for a successful implementation in the next phase of the project.

FREE TEXT RESPONSE

Annex F: Multiple Streams Network

The authors of this report consider it useful to assess how projects such as CEPI can contribute to impact (i.e. changes in anti-corruption legislation) by framing it against the Multiple Streams Network (Kingdon, 1984\(^3\)). This network views the policy/legislative process as three distinct streams of actors and processes:

1. A **problem stream** consisting of information about various problems.
2. A **policy stream** featuring a mass of potential solutions to problems.
3. A **political stream** consisting of elections and elected officials.

On occasion, the three above streams converge, providing a precious opportunity for an issue to be advanced, known as a ‘policy window’. The appearance of the policy window is of particular interest to ‘policy entrepreneurs’, those individuals (or organisations) who have been pushing, and waiting, for this policy window to open. This provides them with an opportunity to further the case of a policy they may have been nurturing and developing for many years. This network is visualised in Figure 1 below:

---

The table below sets out the definitions of the Multiple Stream Network, together with examples of where these same elements can be observed in the CEPI project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>CEPI project example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem stream</td>
<td>This is where onlookers see a situation as a problem.</td>
<td>The policy stream is provided by the NIS research, which provides the evidence base for the corruption context in each CEPI project country. The NIS reports help frame this underlying context as the ‘problem’ and can be viewed as the policy window ‘opening’ onto the problem stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy stream</td>
<td>This is where policy proposals are initiated around relevant topics and developed in papers and at conferences (though in reality, few proposals may receive serious consideration).</td>
<td>This is represented by the advocacy work, networking and lobbying, as carried out by the Chapters and Partners advocacy teams. This approach has already demonstrated success, and is an example of a policy window opening onto the policy stream to match a solution to a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political stream</td>
<td>This is where power exists and key decisions are made. It features events such as general elections, resignations, shifts in national mood, interest groups and campaigns, and is open to the vagaries of political zeitgeists.</td>
<td>This is evident in the alignment of targeted advocacy and lobbying by CEPI Chapters and Partners, lobbying by TI-S using the weight of evidence provided by CEPI, a shift in the attitude of government officials and legislators in target countries to anti-corruption measures, and growing public demand for greater transparency in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case described above, the policy entrepreneur can be viewed as the CEPI project - provided their ‘policy window’ opens at an opportune moment in time, and they are well positioned to exploit it. The transposition of the Multiple Streams Network to the CEPI project can also be seen in Figure 2:

![Multiple Streams Network](image)

**Figure 2**: Multiple Streams Network - mapped to the CEPI project.

This network is useful in that it offers a framing of the different but connected processes that all play a role in policy adoption, once their collective efforts are harmonised and aligned.
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