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

Since October 2020 we have been contributing to the Yetu Initiative, working with organisations supported by the Aga Khan Foundation and USAID to increase the self-reliance of Kenyan civil society organisations. Through this initiative, Integrity Action has supported Local Development Organisations (LDOs) in Mombasa and Nakuru to monitor local projects and services and to work together with relevant stakeholders to solve any problems found.

To support this initiative, and the work of Integrity Action and our partners more broadly, we are seeking to build evidence on how data collected and reported by citizens can be of benefit to local authorities. What kinds of data do public officials in Kenya need to see in order to strengthen public services and infrastructure projects, what data do they currently lack, and (how) can citizens help to fill the gap?

This research project is funded by the Aga Khan Foundation, and the total available budget is £9,700. Due to programme deadlines, the work needs to be completed by 13th June 2022. Full details are set out in the terms of reference below, and the deadline for responses is 13th March 2022.

Applications are welcome from anywhere in the world, although due to the available budget and timeline it is unlikely that proposals involving international travel will be successful.
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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.

Our [organisational theory of change](#) 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.

The goal of the Yetu initiative is to enhance the capacity of Kenyan civil society to engage citizen, government and private sector support for county-level development. To support this goal, Aga Khan Foundation East Africa (AKFEA) has supported the formation of Local Development Organisations (LDOs), umbrella organisations that represent county-level civil society and the private sector, in five counties.

Integrity Action has supported the LDOs in Mombasa and Nakuru counties to monitor local services and infrastructure projects that are funded by the government. 17 LDO members are in the process of monitoring 27 local projects, using the DevelopmentCheck app to record any problems they find when monitoring and to record feedback from community members. This monitoring data is uploaded to the [DevelopmentCheck website](#). The LDO members then discuss any problems they find in meetings with key stakeholders including local authorities and contracted implementers, and work together with these stakeholders to solve these problems.

Integrity Action is also supporting AKFEA and the LDOs to consider in what form monitoring can continue beyond the end of the initiative in June 2022, and what tool could be used beyond this time for the collection and display of monitoring data.

Integrity Action has no physical presence outside the UK, and so we work closely with our local partners to deliver the programme.

For more information on our approach or the Yetu initiative, please have a look at our [website](#) as well as our latest [Annual Report](#). Please also note our [VOICE initiative](#), which has been implemented in Kwale county since 2017 and will have relevance to this assignment.
Research questions and purpose
The purpose of this research is to increase understanding of the data needs and practices of local public officials in Kenya, and how citizens can best provide input. The primary question the research seeks to answer is:

- In Kenya, what expectations do authorities responsible for public services and infrastructure projects have of citizen-generated data, and how does it add value to their work?

To address this question, three sub-questions are deemed valuable to explore:

1. What information is needed that citizens could reasonably provide? When and in what formats do the relevant stakeholders need this, how does it vary between different levels of stakeholder, and how will they use it?
2. For authorities already involved in existing initiatives such as Integrity Action’s, are they getting this information and, if so, what difference has it made to their work?
3. Other than information, what potential value do these authorities see in citizen engagement?

Findings will be used to improve Integrity Action’s work, including within the Yetu initiative, and will also be made publicly available so that others may draw the same benefits. Integrity Action is a citizen-centred organisation, and our programmes will always focus on issues identified by local communities, but we believe that this approach works best for both sides when there is constructive collaboration between citizens and duty-bearers – which this research will support.

Research approach, principles, and risks
Integrity Action does not have a preferred methodology for this research, and applicants are free to propose any approaches provided they adhere to our PICTURE principles on quality evidence, appropriate practice, and responsible use (below). However, given the topic, the primary focus of the research activities is expected to be engagement with public officials. A secondary (optional) sphere of engagement could be other civil society actors who have successfully engaged public officials on this topic, while engagement with citizens is not expected.

Integrity Action’s partners in the Yetu and VOICE initiatives can support with engagement of officials in their areas who have been involved with these initiatives. However, these would predominantly be at a very local level (for example in VOICE, Village Administrators, and a smaller number of Ward Administrators), and it is expected that the researchers would use their own initiative or connections to engage also with higher-level authorities. Integrity Action can also support with engagement of civil society actors.

As mentioned above, Integrity Action understands quality evidence through its PICTURE principles, defining it as that which is:

---

1 All communication of evidence will respect anonymity and confidentiality requirements of those participating in the research, as per our responsible use principles (see following pages)
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.

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 evaluation ethics. ‘*Appropriate*’ and ‘*responsible*’ practices around evidence are further defined in the Annex of this document. Our assessment framework for translating these principles into measurable criteria is available on request.

In addition to the above principles, the Annex also includes the ethical commitments that Integrity Action makes and to which successful candidates would 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](http://integrityaction.org/about/governance), and would be applied.

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

Besides the ongoing challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, an additional risk to duty-bearer engagement in this research is the upcoming Kenyan general election. Candidates should consider this in their applications, and explain how they plan to mitigate the challenges this may cause.

**Existing data**

While this assignment is focused on collecting new primary data, the successful candidates may also wish to draw on Integrity Action’s existing evidence for context. Publications that may be of particular interest include:

- Our research report into *What makes frontline duty bearers act with integrity?* – This featured Kenya as one of two focus countries, and included a section on what duty-bearers

---

2 Less relevant for this assignment as we are not exploring change.
would expect to see from initiatives such as ours – although here the duty-bearers were health workers and teachers, rather than officials

- A learning paper on "What information helps citizens demand accountability and improvements to services?" – In some ways, the other side of the equation to this current research

Programme information on VOICE and Yetu can also be shared as relevant, including a final evaluation of VOICE that is due to be completed in the coming months (data collection is already complete).

Research budget and deliverables
The available budget for this assignment is £9,700. This is inclusive of all costs, including any professional fees, international travel, visas, in-country costs (including interpreters where appropriate), translation and printing of any materials, and all relevant taxes.

The assignment should be carried out between April and June 2022, with the final output to be submitted by 13th June 2022. This output may be in the form of a research report or other appropriate learning material(s) to be agreed with Integrity Action.

Due to the budget and timeline of this assignment, a full inception report is not required. However, a workplan should be developed that clearly documents:
- the counties that will be visited for in-person data collection;
- an overview of the research timeline, to include time spent on the finalisation of tools, data collection, analysis, and any other key milestones;
- roles and responsibilities of the research team, if applicable; and
- how the selected methodology, tools and sources will address the research questions

Payment will be made in instalments, according to the following schedule:
1. 25% on approval of the research inception plan
2. 50% on presentation of the draft output and findings
3. 25% on approval of the final output

The following outline indicates when key milestones are expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output / Activity</th>
<th>Date expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for proposals</td>
<td>13 Mar 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of successful candidate</td>
<td>28 Mar 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception plan drafted and shared with Integrity Action</td>
<td>18 Apr 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final inception plan approved by Integrity Action</td>
<td>22 Apr 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft research output submitted</td>
<td>6 Jun 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final research output submitted and approved</td>
<td>13 Jun 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application details
Applications are welcomed from individuals or teams, whether belonging to an organisation or otherwise.

The following skills and experiences are essential criteria for applicants:

- Strong understanding of appropriate data collection methods, their benefits and limitations
- Experience in conducting and/or managing similar or comparable assignments
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills, with experience of working collaboratively with civil society organisations and/or public officials
- Ability to conduct data collection in all locations required by the proposed methodology
- Ability to present a range of inputs and views in a clear and concise format that adds insight while respecting all participants’ contributions

Knowledge of the social accountability field within international development would be beneficial, but is not essential. 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 (no more than two pages) demonstrating how you or your team meets the essential criteria above
- An outline of how you plan to address the research questions, including any appropriate detail on methodology as well as an estimate of time to be allocated to research activities (maximum three pages)
- CVs for all individuals, with references available to be contacted
- Maximum two examples of previous work that demonstrates skills or experiences relevant to this assignment. These may be provided as links, or if unpublished then they may be attached and will be reviewed in confidence

Please send your complete proposals to daniel.burwood@integrityaction.org by the end of 13th March 2022. Applications will be assessed against the relevance and appropriateness of their proposed approach to the research questions and scope (55%), expertise and experience of the team (35%), and quality/coherence of the proposal’s overall structure and use of budget (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.
Annex: 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

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 and evaluation:

- 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. This requires consideration of local behaviours and norms, and the ways in which risk of harm may vary based on each individual's gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion, marital status, social position, sexual orientation, level of education, physical and mental health, and more.

- 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

---

3 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.
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.