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Who we are & what we do

3ie is a global leader in the generation and use of evidence for decision making

- **Funds, produces, quality assures** and synthesises rigorous evidence on development effectiveness. We support evaluations and reviews that examine what works, for whom, why and at what cost in low-and middle-income countries. We are an efficient grant maker as well as producer of evidence.

- **Builds and facilitates** networks of evaluation to improve capacity and commitment to generate and use evidence in decision-making

- **Provides global access to** knowledge products for policymakers, programme managers, researchers, civil society, the media and donors
Transparency and Accountability Initiatives: background

• Extractives sector accounts for about 90 per cent of total exports and budget outlays in some developing countries.

• Majority of these countries often fail to benefit from their resource wealth and are sometimes embroiled in violent clashes.

• Better TAI in the natural resources sector is considered to be the antidote to the resource curse.

• 3ie developed evidence gap map and this evidence programme at the community level to increase the body of high-quality, policy-relevant evidence on TAIs in the natural resource governance sector.
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: Theory of change

Figure 1: Transparency and accountability causal mechanism

Interventions

- Information disclosed is timely, accessible, reliable, and relevant
- Users have the time and ability to process the information
- Limits to collective action addressed (e.g., high cost of action, potential repercussions)

Outcomes along the causal chain

- Increased knowledge
- Increased trust
- Increased demand for accountability
- Change in expectations and attitudes
- Civic action
- Improved access to services
- Improved quality of services
- Better environment compliance
- Inclusive access to resources
- Social, economic, and environmental benefits

Transparency:

- Information
- Citizen participation and deliberation
- Feedback to political elites

Accountability:

- Media freedom, and media and civil society disseminate information
- No powerful vested interests and administrative bottlenecks limit reporting
- Democratic institutions are functional (quality and effectiveness of judiciary, law enforcement, and auditing agencies)
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: geographical scope

- Ecuador
- Ghana
- Tanzania
- Peru
- Uganda
- Mozambique
- India

Legend:
- **Oil and gas**
- **Mining**
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: interventions

Information:
- promoting greater awareness on legal and regulatory frameworks.
- Includes: videos, print media (flyers, infographics), workshops, citizenship engagement platforms, ICTs, and websites.
- Information shared: revenue collected, licensing procedures, environment clearance processes, familiarizing population with legal rights.

Deliberation:
- platform for people to engage and voice their opinions
- generally involves a broad set of stakeholders
- Seeks to enhance citizen participation.
- Popular platforms: focus group, deliberative poll, citizen’s jury, consensus jury and scenario workshops
### Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: interventions

**Information only:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Design and Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Mode of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>RCT 1,191 households</td>
<td>Participatory workshop amongst communities on water quality, providing materials to participants and community representatives</td>
<td>Workshops; videos; printed materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(treatment: 620; control: 571)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador and Peru</td>
<td>Phased-in randomization</td>
<td>Monitoring package consisting of training, software and hardware (smartphones and drones)</td>
<td>Monitoring package using apps; smartphones; drones and user-friendly interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 monitoring teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 per country)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>DID 934 mines</td>
<td>Environmental impact assessment published on the website; project and environmental impacts discussed in the public hearing</td>
<td>Website and press conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>RCT 3,110 households</td>
<td>Information package and a two-day stakeholder engagement workshop</td>
<td>Information packet; structured multi-stakeholder forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(treatment: 1,590 control: 1,620)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transparency and Accountability Evidence Program: *interventions*

**Information and deliberation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Design and Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Information Mode</th>
<th>Deliberation Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>RCT 3,516 respondents(T1–meeting: 893, T2–ICT platform: 849 and T3–both 882; control: 892)</td>
<td>Leaders and citizens’ information engagement forums; use of interactive voice response, SMS, and other information and communications technology tools</td>
<td>Infographics; citizen engagement platforms; SMS</td>
<td>Citizen information and engagement platform; interactive information, and information and communications technology platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>RCT 2,065 households (55 control; 50 information to leaders; 51 information to leaders and citizens; 50 information and deliberation)</td>
<td>Information module combined with a platform for deliberation and community theatre</td>
<td>Information flyers; community theatre; explanation of the content in local language by trained facilitators</td>
<td>Voting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting process</td>
<td>RCT 2,000 individuals (information-only arm: 300; information and deliberation arm: 400; control: 1,300); elite pool: 125 individuals</td>
<td>Public consultation on natural gas discovery; information provided via video, followed by small group deliberation</td>
<td>Video; Q&amp;A with expert panel</td>
<td>Informational video to also reach the non-literate audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: *findings*

- **Knowledge and Awareness:** Measured by an individual’s self-reported level of understanding of natural gas exploration and revenue management;
  
  *Mixed evidence: information necessary but not sufficient*
  
  - *Mozambique:* information campaign alone was effective in raising both the leaders’ and citizens’ knowledge and awareness; but did not have an effect in Tanzania or Uganda.
  
  - *Tanzania: Combined with information,* extended, structured and participatory deliberation generated a measurable increase in knowledge in Tanzania, Mozambique, and Uganda.

- **Changing attitude:** Measured as a change in perception on the rights and entitlement of people regarding extractive revenues, the obligation of gov’ts and companies to supply information and right of citizens to have that information.
  
  *Mixed evidence: also*
  
  - *Uganda:* Multi-stakeholder forums (MSFs) helped increased efforts to pursue information and transparency perception; but did not change assignment of blame
  
  - *Mozambique:* information campaign made people more optimistic about the future benefits of the oil discovery. But *Ghana:* found no improvement in the feeling of entitlement towards natural resource revenues.

- **Trust:** Measured as self-reported belief by citizens that institutions and political reps will share information on extractive revenues and expenditures.
  
  - *Uganda:* MSF significantly increased participants’ trust in the key decision makers.
  
  - *Mozambique:* the trust game did not find any significant change in citizens’ desire to contribute or to punish.
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: *findings*

**Elite’s and leaders’ attitude and roles: Do they change when informed of citizen views?**
- Seems to have a positive effect in Tanzania and Ghana but not in Mozambique
  - Tanzania: deliberative polling created an accountability loop.
  - Ghana: PIAC forum had a positive but small effect on DA members’ and UC members’ knowledge.
  - Mozambique: leaders did not introduce any clear within-community effort for distributing the information to citizens; in fact may have led to elite capture.

**Collective action for demanding more Transparency and Accountability: Measured as engagement in meetings and discussions.**
- Strong positive effect when information is combined with deliberation.
  - Uganda: I&D increased participants’ self-pursuit of independent information and their attendance at village meetings.
  - Mozambique: I&D had strong positive effect on citizens’ demand for transparency
  - Ghana: CIEP had a positive effect on ordinary citizens’ willingness to demand transparency.
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: findings

- **Other effects**: Difficult because of short-term nature of studies.
  - **Developmental Outcomes**: Only Uganda was able to measure. No significant impact on land management or land ownership. Little improvement seen in access to secondary schools, electricity or safe drinking water.
  - **Environmental outcomes**: No significant effect seen on regulatory or environmental compliance or in outcomes in 3 studies

- **Heterogeneity Analysis**
  - **Uganda**: MSF increased the perception of transparency for men and women.
  - **Mozambique**: Positive effect on the K/A level of the rural respondents while not so precise in urban and semi-urban regions.
  - **Tanzania**: Educated respondents seemed to support transparency measures, whereas wealthier individuals demanded it lesser.
Transparency and Accountability Evidence Program: challenges

• Lack of a valid control group and counterfactual

• Voluntary codes of conduct and soft policies

• Inadequate, linear theories of change
Transparency & Accountability Evidence Program: lessons and session takeaways

• Need for more realistic theories of change and manageable evaluation scopes

• Little evidence on long-term impact

• Information should be combined with deliberation

• Interventions should seek to provide more clarity on action steps

• Reduce information asymmetry between the elite and ordinary citizens
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