Research terms of reference:
‘Achieving positive solutions to citizen-identified problems with service delivery’

Introduction

Integrity Action’s goal is for societies in which all citizens can - and do - successfully demand integrity from the institutions they rely on.

Thanks to core funding received from SIDA and the Hewlett Foundation, Integrity Action is now commissioning this research into how such institutions can act to resolve problems identified by citizens. We consider the answers to this question to be of great value, not only for our own programmes but for all others who seek to improve the responsiveness, inclusivity or transparency of services available to citizens in the global south.

Full details on this work are set out in the terms of reference below, and the deadline for responses is 17th May. We appreciate that the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic poses a number of challenges to research, but believe that there is still much that can be done if we are adaptive in our plans. The total available budget is £40,000, and it is expected that this work would be completed in approximately six months.

This is one of two terms of reference on the behaviour of duty-bearers for which Integrity Action is currently seeking applicants. Interested parties may respond to either or both terms of reference as discrete pieces of work, or we would also welcome joint proposals to address both pieces together.
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Background

Integrity Action is a charity registered in England and Wales, and based in London. We help citizens to monitor the delivery of essential services, infrastructure, and development projects – and to solve the problems they find.

Using mobile technology, we enable citizens to report publicly, in real time, whether they are receiving the quality of services they were promised. Citizens then take a collaborative approach to securing improvements to those services.

We work with various partner organisations in places where the need for effective services and infrastructure is critical. Whether it is secondary school teaching in Afghanistan, water systems in DR Congo, or the reconstruction of homes after Nepal’s 2015 earthquake, essential services and projects impact every aspect of citizens’ lives.

Our approach involves three core components:

**MONITORING:** we enable citizens to become monitors of essential services and development projects. They learn how to access information such as infrastructure contracts, and then check that whatever was promised is being delivered.

**TECHNOLOGY:** when monitors find that a promise hasn’t been kept, they report this on Integrity Action’s easy-to-use and award winning website and app DevelopmentCheck. Their feedback is posted in real time and visible to anyone.

**SOLUTIONS:** monitors don’t just report problems; they are actively involved in finding solutions. Monitors convene the relevant stakeholders and work towards finding solutions that work for everyone. These fixes are also posted on DevelopmentCheck.

To date, citizen monitors have used our technology tools to monitor more than $1 billion worth of development spending – and so far they have found solutions to around 50% of the problems they have found.

We have recently reviewed and refined our organisational theory of change, which aims towards outcomes in three areas:

- The citizens themselves, in which we also include groups such as migrants and refugees who may not legally have citizen-status;
- The institutions upon which citizens rely in order to enjoy their rights and entitlements;
- The platforms that exist, or that we provide, through which citizens and institutions interact.

Through this process of review, we have identified the priority learning questions for us as an organisation. This research project is being commissioned in response to these, to provide evidence
around what we describe as “feedback and appraisal” and the role this plays in enabling or inspiring
institutions to resolve problems identified by citizens\(^1\).

A visualisation of our theory of change is provided at the end of this document, and a full narrative
accompaniment is available on request.

**Research questions and purpose**

This research will address two primary related questions:

1. What factors contribute to the resolution by duty-bearers of problems that have been raised
   by citizens regarding service delivery?

2. What combination(s) of these factors are necessary or sufficient to achieve positive
   solutions?

Within these, the following sub-questions are to be addressed:

a. What roles are played by different elements of Integrity Action's approach; including use of
   technology, open publishing, real-time feedback, stakeholder engagement forums, and
   increasing citizens' access to information?

b. What is the role of solutions that are delivered by citizens or other actors, without the
   involvement of the duty-bearers who should be accountable?

c. What value do duty-bearers and citizens place on platforms and approaches that allow them
   to collaborate on identifying problems and agreeing solutions?

d. What is the relationship between these factors, and how does their contribution vary across:
   i. different types of citizens raising the problem;
   ii. different types of duty-bearer responding;
   iii. different types and complexities of problems raised;
   iv. different environmental, geographic or cultural contexts?

Our definitions of terms used in these questions may be found in Appendix 1.

The primary purpose of these questions is to improve our future work, through enabling us to better
plan for differing contexts and provide evidence-based support to citizens and duty-bearers who are
seeking to resolve problems. By exploring the value of our approach, we may also be able to revise our
methodology to design more effective or sustainable programmes that give a greater weight to
particular elements.

---

\(^1\) Our methodology distinguishes between ‘feedback’ as the primarily subjective questions of citizen satisfaction, and
‘appraisal’ as the primarily objective comparisons between what has been promised and what has been received. Our
citizen monitors gather feedback from their communities, and share this with institutions alongside their own
appraisals of how well promises are being fulfilled.
We also aim for our findings to be of value for other groups who have an interest in increasing the quality, responsiveness, inclusivity or transparency of public services or projects. All evidence will therefore be published and shared openly², with target groups including:

- Citizens and civil society groups located in the global south, who may use our findings to more effectively engage with duty-bearers and constructively hold them to account for promises that have been made.
- Duty-bearers themselves, including those who are already motivated to resolve problems but are constrained by not knowing how to effectively engage their communities and/or how to use community feedback to influence others around them.
- The international development sector at large, and particularly the field of social accountability. These groups may draw on our findings in their own work, especially where they are using methodologies whose elements are comparable with our own.

Finally, the analytical approach taken by this research will itself inform our internal practices and our use of data in ongoing and future programmes.

Research approach and principles

Integrity Action does not have a preferred methodology for this research, although some possibilities for handling existing data may include elements of comparative configurational methods (such as QCA or EvalC3) or multivariate cluster analysis. Applicants are free to propose the most suitable approaches, given consideration of our PICTURE principles on quality evidence, appropriate practice, and responsible use.

These principles mean that we understand quality evidence as that which is:

1. **Precise.** Claims are not generalised, but are specific about their context and have findings disaggregated according to relevant social and demographic differences.
2. **Inclusive.** The perspectives of communities and other stakeholders are clearly represented in all evidence, with space given to divergent views.
3. **Credible.** The data and methodology accurately measures what it is intended to measure, with sample size and composition being in proportion to the conclusions sought.
4. **Triangulated.** Data is collected consistently from multiple sources, with tools to capture both quantitative and qualitative information.
5. **Useable.** Evidence is fit for purpose and responds to users’ needs and timelines, with no data being collected unless there is a clear purpose or commitment to using it.
6. **Results-focused.** Evidence clearly demonstrates what (if any) changes have happened, and explores our contribution to these alongside the roles of other actors and factors.
7. **Ethically collected, analysed and used.** Quality evidence processes are ones that are appropriate and responsible, and that focus on improving the lives of participants.

² All communication of evidence will respect anonymity and confidentiality requirements of those participating in the research, as per our responsible use principles (see Appendix 2)
As per the *E* of PICTURE, we view collection, analysis and use of quality evidence as an ethical issue, and the above principles set the framework for how we think about research ethics. ‘Appropriate’ and ‘responsible’ practices around evidence are further defined in Appendix 2 of this document.

In addition to the above principles, Integrity Action makes the ethical commitments also set out in Appendix 2, to which successful candidates would also be expected to commit. However, we understand that ethical practice can require more fluidity than just procedural compliance, and emergent issues are to be identified as they arise and will be managed by Integrity Action. Our policies on safeguarding and data protection are available at integrityaction.org/about/governance/, and would be applied.

Should a proposed research approach require formal ethical approval from any third-party government or body, this will be the responsibility of the applicant to obtain.

We estimate this work would take place over approximately six months.

**Available data**

Integrity Action has programmes currently running in eight countries: Afghanistan, DR Congo, Kenya, Madagascar, Nepal, Palestine, Tanzania and Uganda.

We collect information from our programmes regularly, including through site visits, case studies, tracking of activities and output delivery, and narrative reports from implementing partners. Our citizen monitors also complete knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) surveys, including questions about their trust in, and interactions with, local authority figures. Much of the data that our monitors themselves capture using DevelopmentCheck is available online as soon as it is recorded, and can be explored at integrityaction.org/devcheck

DevelopmentCheck itself (also known as DevCheck) has existed in multiple iterations, with the current version having been piloted since April 2019 and used more widely in all of our programmes since October 2019. This version captures data in three main areas:

1. Monitors’ ability to access information about the project they are monitoring. This section is standard across all projects, and records whether they have the information they need, who they got it from, and how easy it was to obtain.

2. Problems and their resolutions. This section comprises approximately 20 questions, which have defined relationships to types of problems and solutions, and which vary according to the context of the project being monitored; currently there are approximately 25 different

---

2 As of 3 April 2020, the DevelopmentCheck website showed this version being used to monitor 326 projects, with 2,522 problems logged – of which 1,374 have been subsequently marked as resolved. A breakdown of problem categories can be seen at integrityaction.org/devcheck/data-analytics
question sets in use, although these overlap heavily and represent about 150 different questions. For each project being monitored, this section is completed by a citizen monitor approximately once a fortnight.

Questions in this section are all multiple-choice, although if a response triggers a problem or a solution then there is space for a free-text description to be added. Solutions also trigger a picklist (standard across all question sets and problem types) for monitors to indicate the activity they believe was most influential in resolving this problem. Problems are automatically categorised into one of eight problem types, and also linked to SDG indicators.

3. Community surveys, conducted by our citizen monitors. These typically comprise about 15 questions, of which seven are standard across all surveys – and many more are also shared between multiple surveys. Each ‘problems’ question set has one associated survey.

The majority of questions are multiple-choice, although each includes at least one free-text question for collection of additional comments. As with all other free-text fields, this will include responses in languages other than English; DevCheck is currently being used in Arabic, Dari, English, French, Malagasy, Romanian, Nepali, Kenyan KiSwahili, and Tanzanian KiSwahili.

Previous versions of DevelopmentCheck included the same three sections, although data may not be comparable between versions. All sections were standard across all projects rather than allowing for context, and problems were not automatically categorised but relied on citizen monitors to select the appropriate category. From 2013 to the end of 2019, 1,080 projects were monitored on older versions of DevCheck, with 4,144 problems reported and 2,133 solved.

Addressing our research questions will additionally require collection of new data, most likely qualitative, to add context and detail to existing data as well as to explore any emerging patterns. This may involve travel to sites where we work, to speak with people who have participated in or interacted with our programmes.

The sampling strategy for any such travel will be agreed with Integrity Action, in order to ensure the countries selected are representative of our programmes and to minimise any burdens placed upon our implementing partners through their involvement in other research activities or ongoing evaluations. Certain countries may also be deemed higher-risk, and work in these locations would be subject to approval.

It is expected that options for remote data collection are also explored.

---

Six of the standard questions display their aggregate responses on the DevCheck website; these include three on respondent demographics (age group, gender, self-identified disability status), as well as questions on respondents’ awareness of the project being monitored, whether they believe it is addressing a genuine need, and their overall satisfaction with it. As of 3 April 2020, the DevCheck website shows 3,740 responses have been collected.

This figure is comprised of 828 infrastructure projects and 252 ongoing services.
Anticipated risks and challenges

The ongoing Covid-19 pandemic poses a number of challenges to this research, with risks including:

- Inability to travel, either internationally or nationally
- Reduced capacity for Integrity Action and/or our partners to engage (for example, due to staff illness or need to provide family care)
- Reduced capacity or willingness for duty-bearers and/or other planned participants to engage
- Unplanned changes to our country portfolio as a consequence of an altered funding environment

It is expected that candidates use their proposals to explore options to address the first of these, with thought given to how activities may progress should international travel be unfeasible; for example, through remote data collection or by leveraging existing networks of local data collectors. Remaining risks will be managed by the research steering group in conversation with the successful candidates.

Further risks to be considered by candidates are:

- Burdening our local implementing partners or programme participants by requiring their intensive involvement in research activities. Our partners are typically small, local CSOs who may have limited funding beyond our programmes.
- Damaging our, or our partners’, existing or future relationships with duty-bearers.
- Expected difficulties in obtaining sufficient detail about historical problems and their resolutions

Expected timeline and deliverables

The below outline is an indication of when key research outputs are due. The challenges associated with Covid-19 require flexibility in planning, but we believe this is best achieved through ongoing conversation throughout the inception period – for which dates here are indicative only.

As well as addressing the research questions, it is expected that the successful candidates will provide Integrity Action with output useful for our ongoing use of DevelopmentCheck data. This should be provided as an annex to the final report, and may include an analytical framework or tool (e.g. as used in this research and that could be applied internally on an annual basis) and/or a recommendation and guidance on adopting an affordable, commercially-available tool\(^6\).

Other outputs may be needed to more appropriately communicate findings with different audiences, and applicants are free to suggest these in their proposals or (if successful) at a later stage. These will be agreed, and may be developed in collaboration, with Integrity Action; and may include, but not be limited to, blogs, infographics, podcasts, and summary materials in all appropriate languages.

---

\(^6\) These may include machine learning solutions, such as BigML or Apache PredictionIO, or more traditional statistical packages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output / Activity</th>
<th>Date expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for tenders</td>
<td>17 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews &amp; appointment of successful candidate(s)</td>
<td>w/c 1 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report drafted</td>
<td>5 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised inception report submitted and approved</td>
<td>24 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report drafted</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key findings presented to steering group</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised final report submitted and approved</td>
<td>By end Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget requirements

The available budget for this research is £40,000. This is inclusive of all costs, including professional fees, international travel, visas, in-country costs (including interpreters where appropriate), translation and printing of any materials, and all relevant taxes.

Payment will be made in instalments, according to the following schedule:

1. 30% on submission and approval of the inception report
2. 40% on presentation of the draft report and findings
3. 30% on submission and approval of the final report

### Governance

This research has been commissioned by Integrity Action’s Head of Programme Development, and will be managed by the Evidence & Impact Manager. Regular updates are to be provided during the course of the research, on a schedule to be agreed by both parties.

Oversight will be provided by a research steering group, which will include thematic and technical experts external to Integrity Action. This group’s role will be to ensure quality in design and implementation of the research methodology, as well as objectivity in the analysis.

Final research outputs will be owned by Integrity Action, who will seek to make as much of it publicly-available as is responsible and appropriate.

### Application details

Applications are welcomed from individuals or teams, whether belonging to an organisation or otherwise. Integrity Action is based in London, but applicants need not be. However, it would be an advantage to be based in a similar time-zone and to have a good internet connection.
The following skills and experiences are essential criteria for applicants:

- Strong understanding of appropriate research methodologies, their benefits and limitations
- Experience in conducting and/or managing similar or comparable research studies in the Global South (preferably East Africa, South Asia, or the Middle East)
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills, with experience of working collaboratively with civil society organisations and communicating complex concepts to non-specialist audiences
- Ability to travel to any countries required by the proposed methodology
- Ability to bring together a range of inputs into clear and concise summaries or recommendations

Knowledge of the social accountability field within international development would be beneficial, as would language skills appropriate to any relevant countries. Applicants should have appropriate levels of both professional indemnity insurance and public liability insurance.

Interested parties should submit a proposal to Integrity Action, to include:

- A brief cover letter demonstrating how you or your team meets the essential criteria above, as well as any reflections you may have on these research questions or changes you would propose. This should be no more than two pages
- An outline of your proposed methodology, including explanation of why it is suitable for these research questions as well as any associated risks and proposed mitigations. This should be no more than three pages
- A draft work plan and associated budget, to include the daily rates of all individuals involved and a description of the roles they each play within the team (if applicable)
- CVs for all individuals, with references available to be contacted
- Maximum two examples of previous work that demonstrates skills or experiences relevant to this research. These may be provided as links, or if unpublished then they may be attached and will be reviewed in confidence

If you are submitting a joint proposal to address both of the research projects we are currently advertising, you should ensure that your proposal meets the criteria of both terms of reference. No preference will be given to either joint or individual proposals, and Integrity Action reserves the right to ask applicants who submit joint proposals to re-purpose their proposal for just one project.

Please send your complete proposals to daniel.burwood@integrityaction.org by the end of 17th May 2020. Proposals will be scored and assessed against their understanding of the terms of reference (20%), appropriateness of the proposed methodology (35%), expertise and experience of the team (35%), and quality of work planning and financial/HR organisation (10%). Consideration will also be given to a proposal's value for money.

Please note that we will not be able to give feedback on unsuccessful applications.
Appendix 1: Definition of terms used in this document

In addressing the research questions, the following guidelines should be applied:

- **Duty-bearers** may be any actors upon whom citizens rely in order to enjoy their rights and entitlements. They include state actors (such as local and national governments), private-sector contractors and service providers, as well as development agencies and others. We may use the term to refer to the whole organisation or to the individuals within them, who have their own personal agency and integrity that may differ from their employer’s.

- A **citizen**, by contrast, is role that all persons are equally entitled to play as rights-holding members of the human family. Integrity Action’s use of the term recognises that not everybody holds legal citizenship of the places in which they live, and our usage of the term purposefully includes groups such as migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, victims of trafficking, foreign students and stateless people (amongst others) who may otherwise be viewed as ‘non-citizens’.

- **Services** encompass anything that is, or should be, provided to a citizen by an institution in order to meet a need or fulfil an entitlement. They may be delivered directly to a citizen or specific group of citizens (such as healthcare or education service), or may be delivered to a whole community in the form of public or common goods (e.g. roads or water infrastructure).

- **The problems** we are interested in are those that are identified by citizens, and that relate to a shortcoming of a relevant duty-bearer or the services they provide (including issues that result from a duty-bearer’s lack of capacity or opportunity, as well as commitment). A problem has been successfully **resolved** only when citizens have identified it as such; with a **positive solution** being one in which the change has been delivered by the duty-bearer (i.e. rather than citizen groups or other actors having to step in).

Problems broadly fall into two categories:

- A breach of a promise that has been made to a citizen; for example, where a local authority has committed to build a new classroom and this has not been completed, or where a health clinic or development project has committed to deliver services of a defined quality and has fallen short. This type of problem is the focus of DevelopmentCheck.

- Citizens’ dissatisfaction with the goods and services available to them, even though there is no specific breach of promise. This may be the result of an inappropriate or inadequate promise (for example, the successful delivery of one classroom when in fact two were required), or of a difference of opinion between citizens and duty-bearers over needs and entitlements (and so no promise has even been made, although citizens believe it should be). Such an issue would likely not be categorised

---

7 More detail on this can be found in our recent blog: [Is it accountability without a promise?](#)
as a ‘problem’ on DevelopmentCheck, but may be captured through community surveys⁸.

- Exploration of combinations of factors (question 2) will likely also include consideration of permutations, or pathways. For example, does one approach (such as escalation of a problem to a higher authority) only work once other options have been tried?

- In question (a), the core elements of Integrity Action’s approach are:
  
  o **Use of technology** – We provide our citizen monitors with access to our DevelopmentCheck app (and, where necessary, a smartphone to use it), through which they can record problems, fixes, and community feedback.

  o **Open publishing** – Data captured by our citizen monitors is published directly to the DevelopmentCheck website⁹, and can be viewed by anyone with access to the internet.

  o **Real-time feedback** – Because data is published unfiltered and unaltered, it is uploaded to the website as soon as it is submitted.

  o **Stakeholder engagement forums** – Technology is only a part of our approach, and indeed it is easier to imagine our programmes without technology than with only technology. The face-to-face interactions between citizens and duty-bearers are crucial, and it is through these that problems are most typically communicated and solutions sought. We support the establishment of forums – also known as joint working groups – to include citizen monitors and duty-bearers (at a minimum), and may also include other community members and leaders, local civil society organisations, or other interested parties.

  o **Access to information** – For citizens to identify broken promises, they must have a clear understanding of what the promise entails. We support our citizen monitors to navigate the appropriate channels to obtain information that should be available to them; such as a service charter that sets out quality standards, or a bill of quantities that provides exact specifications of a new construction project.

- In question (c), **platforms** may be any mediums or channels for interaction between citizens and institutions. At Integrity Action, we provide and support platforms that are both digital (DevelopmentCheck) and face-to-face (our stakeholder engagement forums). **Approaches** are the associated processes, methodologies, or implementation strategies used to encourage or enable citizens and institutions to engage with such platforms.

---

⁸ Community surveys are routinely conducted using DevelopmentCheck and responses to three standard questions are included in the data that is openly-published online. These questions relate to community members’ awareness of the project in question, their view on whether it is a genuine need, and their overall satisfaction with how it is being delivered.

⁹ [https://integrityaction.org/devcheck/projects](https://integrityaction.org/devcheck/projects)
In question (d), environmental, geographical and cultural contexts is not intended as a comprehensive list; the question is intended to explore how a similar combination of factors may be associated with differing outcomes depending on the wider system and society in which they operate.

Appendix 2: Responsible use, appropriate practices, and Integrity Action’s ethical commitments

Integrity Action’s PICTURE principles state that all data must be collected, analysed and used appropriately and responsibly.

Appropriate practices mean that:

Our data is collected and quality-assured
- With the active and informed participation of affected communities, including those at risk of exclusion
- By teams with appropriate skills and characteristics to capture the voices of different groups
- Using justifiable methodologies, relevant to the purpose and context
- Using reliable tools, neutrally worded, that produce consistent and meaningful results
- In alignment with existing programme management and organisational needs, capacities and timelines

Our data is analysed and reviewed
- Collectively, through ongoing dialogue with participants and other stakeholders to sense-check and validate conclusions
- Sensitively, with understanding of the local power dynamics and their importance
- Systematically, with clear logical links between data collected and conclusions reached
- Transparently, so that methods are protected from intended or unintended bias
- In comparison to other relevant data sources, such as through use of baselines to show whether a change has occurred

Responsible use means that:

Our evidence is presented and used
- In accordance with what was communicated and agreed with participants
- In accessible formats for all appropriate audiences, including consideration of language and literacy. One piece of evidence may need to be shared in multiple formats
- With acknowledgment given to everyone who contributed significantly (unless anonymity was requested), and with references provided for all sources used
Without assumptions, especially regarding any unidentified changes or causal links between identified changes and the programme

With aggregation of people avoided wherever possible, and with real case studies presenting the real stories of real individuals

Communication of our evidence is open about

- The tools and methodologies used to collect and analyse data, and any associated limitations
- The questions and audiences that drove the collection and analysis activity, and how the evidence responds to these needs
- The results and changes identified by the analysis, whether intended or unintended, negative or positive
- The sources of quotes or judgements, with any conflicting perspectives clearly presented and explored\(^\text{10}\)
- The independence, or otherwise, of everyone involved in data collection, analysis and presentation; including explanation and justification of any potential bias

Integrity Action makes the further following commitments to ethical research practice:

- We will respect the dignity, privacy and agency of all who contribute to, or are affected by, our research. We will work within all international human rights conventions and covenants to which the UK is a signatory, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as all relevant local and national laws.

- We will recognise the burdens and costs for all stakeholders in participating in our research, and will only conduct such activities when the benefits can reasonably be expected to outweigh the risks. This includes aiming for evidence of a sufficiently high quality that it can be used for its intended purpose.

- We will pursue objectivity, while recognising that all stakeholders will bring their own agendas. We will not use tools or methods designed to produce misleading results or misrepresent findings, and our communication of evidence will be clear about the roles of authors and participants. We will encourage and enable all stakeholders to follow appropriate procedures if they feel under pressure to provide inaccurate results.

- We will take reasonable precautions to ensure our design and application of tools, methods and methodologies do not cause harm to participants; such as stress, loss of dignity or self-esteem. This includes consideration of the extent to which methods or questions are intrusive or sensitive, and applies to the wellbeing of the data collectors as well data providers and subjects.

\(^{10}\) This should not breach anonymity, but a reader should be able to distinguish between (for example) the views of a community member and those of a government official
• We will maintain confidentiality of information, and store all records in line with our data protection policy. Identifiable data will not be shared or used without consent, but any publication of evidence will include publication of anonymised primary data alongside a description of the methodology to allow validation of findings.

• We will ensure voluntary participation in our research is based on informed consent, with each individual being accurately informed of the purpose and what the method involves – including their right to refuse or withdraw. Where feasible and appropriate, this information should be provided in advance (e.g. before potential participants have travelled to the venue). It also includes providing participants with contact details should they later wish to make a complaint, withdraw their consent, or simply find out more about the activity.

In the case of children, informed consent should be obtained from both the child and their parent or guardian. In the case of vulnerable adults, a judgement should be made about their capacity to give consent; if it is deemed that such capacity does not exist then the individual’s participation should be reconsidered, and only proceed if there is a justifiable purpose and with the informed consent of a guardian or next of kin.
Appendix 3: Our Theory of Change – a diagram

Learning & working in partnership

GOAL: Societies in which all citizens can and do successfully demand integrity from the institutions they rely on

Trusted platforms are sustainably embedded and accessible to all citizens and institutions

Citizens are motivated, able and have the knowledge they need to demand integrity

Institutions are committed, permitted and have the capacity to respond to citizens’ demands

Mutual trust is built between citizens and institutions

Citizens are incentivised to demand integrity

Institutions are incentivised to act with integrity

Provide institutions with access to valuable information that supports their service delivery

Providing other actors with evidence from and about our approach

Other actors use our evidence to influence policy change or enforce existing rules

Preconditions
1. Constructive collaboration is possible
2. Reasonable safety is assured

Provide citizens and institutions with inclusive platforms for constructive engagement

Provide citizens with knowledge and support to demand integrity

Informed citizens engage constructively with local projects and services

Gender equality & social inclusion