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Introduction

Since 2010, Keystone has been conducting constituent surveys for international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), social investors, and social change networks. Where possible, the findings are benchmarked to demonstrate performance as compared to peer organizations. In August 2017, Keystone conducted such a survey for the Open Contracting Partnership (OCP).

In the survey, key constituent groups are asked to rate and comment on different aspects of the OCP’s performance. Such surveys are always conducted confidentially, with Keystone guaranteeing as an independent third party that respondents’ identities will not be revealed to the organization. The OCP survey process was no different.

This report presents what the partners of the OCP said about the organization compared to available benchmarks and provides credible data on how well the OCP carries out its role, as seen from their constituents’ perspective. Keystone surveyed and interviewed allies of the OCP, and benchmarked responses where possible, using the Net Promoter Analysis (NPA). The surveys were conducted anonymously on-line, and survey links were sent out by the OCP directly. Keystone Accountability conducted the interviews with a selected list of key stakeholders provided by the OCP (there were 85 survey respondents and 13 interviewees).

The Net Promoter Analysis (NPA) employed by Keystone allows for the analysis of the OCP’s allies’ satisfaction regarding different factors essential to their working relationship with the OCP. The NPA uses scores given to closed questions from 0-10, dividing respondents into three groups: Promoters (those giving a score of either 9 or 10), passives (scores of either 7 or 8), and detractors (scores between 0-6). Subtracting the percentage of detractors from that of promoters provides a Net Promoter Score, providing a single score for the interpretation of data. Moreover, using NPA allows Keystone to compare responses and benchmark scores with other organizations. For more information on methods used, the Net Promoter Analysis and benchmarking, please refer to the Methodology section below.

- Annex 1 is the questionnaire that was used for the survey.
- Annex 2 includes the raw quantitative data as well as all the responses given to the open-ended questions of the survey. These have been edited to protect the anonymity of respondents.
- Annex 3 is the semi-structured outline that was used for the interviews.
- Annex 4 is an interview data summary.
- Annex 5 contains a list of survey respondents that have expressed their willingness to take part in follow-up discussions with the OCP – see the performance summary section below.

The next step after this report is for Keystone to assist the OCP in digesting and understanding the results and to consider how to integrate a more regular, lighter-touch regular feedback system.
Performance summary

In general, the OCP is a well-regarded organization. Most respondents have been following the OCP and their work for several years, and as can be seen from the ‘ultimate question’ in figure 1, are likely to recommend them to others. The OCP has had a large impact on open contracting and respondents firmly believe that the advocacy work it does has advanced the field – see figure 2. While the OCP’s goal of putting itself out of business by 2022 may be ambitious, it is widely considered the ‘right’ goal to have, and respondents have confidence that the OCP are a team who may achieve it. The technical support offered by the OCP is clearly valuable, and while the OCDS is seen as demanding to implement, along with the responsive helpdesk, it has been well received.

With regards to the OCP’s attempts to support the field rather than be the field, however, the results are a little more mixed. Respondents are split as to whether the OCP has allowed them to link directly to other organizations or work independently from the OCP. In fact, overall, there is uncertainty as to how the arguments and advocacy work that the OCP has done at the field level has filtered down and been translated into value on the ground for organizations. This is an area where the OCP could direct more of its attention. In doing so, it should consider the extent to which it is involving the right actors in their work. There are strong calls to include more “demand side” actors, such as the private sector, CSOs and journalists.

Overall, there are many positive aspects of the OCP’s work that are clearly well respected and much needed. It is working in a complex and challenging space, and while progress may be hard-fought, a few tweaks could really improve how it delivers value to partners and allies across the globe.

- 64% of the OCP’s respondents are considered promoters, who are highly likely to recommend the OCP to a friend or colleague. 22% are classified as passives and 14% as detractors.
- The OCP’s NP score is 50, which is above the global cohort average of 20. This is a clear indication that the OCP is valued and that allies find tools and other products useful in furthering their own work.
- The table below shows that, while respondents rated OCP’s capacity and influence in the field highly, they did not feel that the OCP empowered them to act with less outside help or that it had as much impact on their own work.
Performance summary

**Figure 2 Index of key areas**

The OCP has substantial influence in its area of work.

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>GCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have confidence in the capacity of the OCP to achieve its goals.

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>GCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent has your interaction with the OCP helped you to connect with other organizations who support your work?

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>GCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the OCP I am empowered to do the things I want with less outside help.

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>GCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much has being part of the open contracting community impacted on relevant parts of your/your organization’s work?

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>GCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance summary

Next steps
We provide detailed guidelines for following up on the survey results in the conclusions section at the end of this report. In summary, they are:

- **Learn:** Dig into the report with key internal and external constituents. Many of our clients have found it useful to develop different presentations for different stakeholders such as staff, local and international allies and various governing bodies. During this process, it is important to put the focus on getting different inputs for the interpretation of the findings and co-deciding the actions to take in response. Annex 5 mentioned above lists respondents who are happy to be involved in discussions as you learn more about the survey and interview findings.

- **Act:** Take the corrective actions identified and agreed by staff and allies. Make sure everyone – staff, allies and board – understands what these corrective actions are, and that there will be future opportunities to provide feedback on whether the changes are having the intended effects. Consider publishing this feedback report.

- **Repeat:** Implement a continuous feedback system based on micro-surveys triggered by specific interactions with your allies. For taking stock of progress made over a longer period of time, repeat this in-depth survey in 12-36 months. The light-touch system will be included in phase 2 of the work with Keystone and will include:
  - A low-cost, high-value ongoing feedback system to capture and respond to feedback on how effectively OCP is supporting partners, broader community members, and contributing to making open contracting a global ‘movement.’
  - Identify other performance and outcome data sources that OCP could utilize to complement feedback data.

Using the comprehensive survey experience, we will collaboratively identify a reduced number of indicators – and their corresponding survey questions and methods – that OCP could use to collect actionable performance data in an ongoing way. Keystone will not help implement this system, but will use this comprehensive partner survey process as an opportunity to work through the principles of analysis, dialogue and course correction with OCP.
Methodology

On the recommendation of the OCP, Keystone Accountability has used the term “allies” to refer to all constituents - essentially the universe of people who are influenced by or who influence the work of the OCP, including those who responded to the survey or who were interviewed. Both the survey and the interview tools were designed collaboratively between Keystone and the OCP, drawing on the one hand from Keystone’s experience and previous standardized tools and on the other, from OCP’s theory of change and strategic plan. Eight interviews were conducted before the launching of the survey, and fed into the final survey design.

Interview process
The interview process was managed by Keystone Accountability. 19 interview requests were sent on June 20, 2017 of which 13 interviews were conducted in English, from June 26, 2017 to July 26, 2017. A reminder email was sent on July 10, 2017 to encourage participation. Response rates are detailed below.

The prospective interviewees were suggested by the OCP, and included key influencers and stakeholders. Throughout the interviews, interviewees were assured that their responses would be confidential and presented to the OCP anonymously with the survey results.

Survey process
The survey process was managed by both Keystone and OCP. The questionnaire was administered to 862 partners in English, from July 12, 2017 to August 9, 2017. Keystone administered the online survey, and OCP sent out the links, with regular reminders to encourage a high response rate. A detailed response rate is included below.

85 respondents completed it on-line but had the option to complete it off-line if necessary. The survey was limited to those who had a basic level of Internet access. From experience, we do not believe that this makes the data significantly less representative.

The survey emphasized to partners that their participation was voluntary and anonymous.

Due to the fact that a large proportion of the survey responses were from partners in the UK and US, the Open Contracting Partnership decided to extend their survey process and personally invite a second round of partners from other countries to participate. As a result, the OCP received 27 additional responses. However, it must be mentioned that the additional responses may bias the original dataset as these new respondents were directly approached by the OCP, which may influence the responses they provided. The charts in this report include the entirety of all survey respondents.

Benchmarks and indexes
Throughout the report, the OCP’s results are compared to the 8 social change networks listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3</th>
<th>Index of social change networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● ACODEV</td>
<td>● Practitioner Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Aflatoun</td>
<td>● Red Mercosur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● APC</td>
<td>● Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Gender at Work</td>
<td>● Vitamin Angels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two questions with different benchmarks: Figure 28 is benchmarked against 81 International NGOs, and Figure 1, the Ultimate Question, is benchmarked to 796 social change organizations. The benchmarks enable the OCP to understand their ratings in relation to how respondents rate other organizations and see what kind of performance ratings are possible. However, the data needs to be interpreted with care, in light of the OCP’s specific context, goals and activities. It is unlikely that any organization would be ‘best in class’ across all performance areas.

1 The list of INGOS who took part in the Development Partnerships survey is available upon request.
Methodology

The majority of benchmarks are calculated as the average ratings of the 8 social change networks, not the average of all survey respondents. This reduces the chance that data is skewed by larger organizations with larger respondent numbers. No benchmarks are available for OCP's unique questions.

Respondents
The figures in the table below show the total number of interview responses as well as the number of complete and partial survey responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 4. Respondents</th>
<th>OCP (Interviews)</th>
<th>OCP (Surveys)</th>
<th>Global Cohort Surveys (Social change networks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of partners invited to respond</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>3245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses received</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response rate</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews: The interviews targeted specific questions relevant to the respective interviewee. The reason for this was to utilize their specific areas of expertise, and to get valuable, relevant information. All interviewees were also asked if there were any questions we should have asked, but did not. There was nothing of note that was suggested. 13 interviews were conducted in total.

Surveys: The survey was split into two:

- The full list of 20 questions was sent to primary allies, those who were likely to take the time to respond. In total, 29 answered the long survey;
- A shorter survey of 10 substantive questions was sent to more peripheral allies, who might be less inclined to complete all 20 questions. Respondents were given the choice after answering 10 questions, if they would be available to answer 10 more. In the first round, 14 continued to answer all 20 questions, while 15 stopped after the 10, making a total of 29 who answered the shorter survey. In the second round, 15 continued to answer all 20 questions, while 12 stopped after 10, providing an additional 27 responses. In total, 56 answered the short survey.

Some respondents did not answer all questions in either version of survey. The response rate varies between questions. 85 responses were received in total across the two versions.

A response rate of 10% is below the global cohort average, however, given there is no formal relationship here, the response rate is about average. Unsolicited online surveys in similar contexts often aim for a 5-10% response rate. We believe that this 10% still gives an accurate representation for learning purposes. Organizations who send the survey to more constituents always have lower response rates. Moreover, surveys administered for the first time tend to have lower response rates, but this is expected to increase over subsequent rounds, providing the OCP follow up on feedback and communicates the findings and its responses back to allies.

Comments derived from surveys and interviews are included where relevant. Direct quotes are presented using quotations and delineated as either being a survey or interview response in parentheses.
Net Promoter Analysis

Keystone uses a technique of feedback data analysis increasingly common in the customer satisfaction industry known as Net Promoter Analysis (NPA)\(^2\) to distinguish between three profiles of constituents. As the OCP considers how to improve in light of the survey findings it is extremely important to develop distinct strategies to work with each of these constituent profiles.

The “Promoters” are constituents that rate the OCP as 9 and 10 on the 0 to 10-point scale used in the survey. These are the OCP’s champions. They are highly likely to be wholehearted participants in activities and consistently recommend the OCP to their friends and colleagues.

The “Passives” are those who give ratings of 7 and 8. They do not have major concerns, but they are not particularly enthusiastic about or loyal to the OCP. With the right encouragement, they could well become Promoters.

Those who provide ratings from 0-6 are categorized as “Detractors”. They have fairly negative perceptions of the partnership with the OCP and common developmental objectives are likely to be negatively affected as a result.

Many organizations find it useful to track their ‘Net Promoter score’ (commonly referred to as NP score). To get an NP score, one subtracts the proportion of detractors from the proportion of promoters. It is not uncommon to have negative NP scores. The most successful organizations generally have high NP scores. Data from thousands of companies show a clear correlation between high Net Promoter scores and corporate growth and profitability.\(^3\)

Keystone believes that the customer satisfaction approach is even more relevant to development and social change than it is to business. This is so because those who are meant to benefit from the intended change are key to bringing it about. In this survey context, the practices and policies of international organizations can profoundly affect the performance of those around them. Surveys such as this provide allies with a safe space to express what they honestly feel about the OCP, and enable more open, data-driven dialogue for improving performance by both.

The NPA also provides an effective way to interpret survey response rates. A growing number of organizations include non-responses to surveys as Detractors. Keystone did not take that approach in this report. The data reported here is only for actual responses. Occasionally we also use simple means in the analysis.

It was not possible to do any disaggregation of the survey data by demographic variables due to the small number of respondents for most categories. The only breakdown that was possible - comparing scores according to length of interaction with the OCP - did not result in any significant findings. The data charts only include survey respondents. Interview data are only included as open comments and in the section summaries and overall conclusions.

\(^2\) For more see: [www.netpromotersystem.com](http://www.netpromotersystem.com), as well as the open source net promoter community at [www.netpromoter.com](http://www.netpromoter.com).

\(^3\) You can see typical NP scores for a range of industries at [www.netpromoter.com](http://www.netpromoter.com).
Methodology

Reading the charts
Each section begins with key headlines and takeaways from the findings. This is a short bullet-point summary of what the data seems to be suggesting. This interpretation needs to be reflected on as part of OCP’s broader analysis process and should not be considered the only interpretation, or even the right one.

This report uses simple charts to show how the OCP is rated across all areas. These include simple bar charts, tables and stacked bar charts showing the NPA. Occasionally these NPA visuals include a benchmark NP score for comparison purposes, referred to as the Global Cohort Benchmark and depicted as “GCB”. The GCB is the average NP score of the global cohort to which the respective organization is being compared/benchmarked against. This should not be confused with the “MEAN”, which is merely the average score given by all respondents for this question on a Likert scale of 0 to 10.
Section 1: Partnership Profile

Key headlines and takeaways:

- 22% of respondents are based in the United States, the UK and Mexico are both represented by 8%, Nepal and Uganda are both represented by 7%, and Colombia and Nigeria are both represented by 6%. The remaining respondents are spread out relatively equally. As mentioned, no disaggregation of data by location was possible.

- The majority of respondents describe themselves as policy or governance advocates. This is not surprising, and many interview respondents mentioned the fact that the OCP is very focused on government structures. They called on the OCP to work more with private sector and the “demand side” more generally. This is discussed at various points throughout the report.

- Respondents are quite familiar with the OCP, having mostly followed the OCP’s work for a year or more. Perhaps the OCP could do more to engage new allies and ensure more of them respond in subsequent surveys.
Respondents represent a global cohort based in Asia, Africa, Australia, Europe, North America and South America. This suggests a wide and diverse constituent base.
Section 1: Partnership Profile

The majority of respondents (25%) describe themselves and their interaction with open contracting as ‘policy or governance advocates’ along with 18% who describe themselves as ‘program or policy implementers in government’ and 10% describing themselves as ‘activist or grassroots advocates’ and another 10% identifying as ‘technical implementers for government(s)’. On the whole, the above classification was well understood, and while one interviewee said they sat almost equally across two groups, the distinction worked for everyone else. The one survey comment received in this area was:

“I’m an advocate for a civil society organization but my primary advocacy targets - and therefore relationships - are with people in positions of power (government, inter-governmental organizations, etc.)” (survey response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percent/Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector advocate</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or governance advocate</td>
<td>n = 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist or grassroots advocate</td>
<td>n = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program or policy implementer in government</td>
<td>n = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical implementer for government(s)</td>
<td>n = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical implementer from civil society or media</td>
<td>n = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder/donor to open government /open data projects</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder/donor to procurement reform projects</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist - local/national</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open data user</td>
<td>n = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Researcher</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer/support provider</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The bar indicates the percentage of respondents and the labels in the x-axis, the count*
Section 1: Partnership Profile

When asked about the duration of the respondents’ relationship with the OCP, 37% claim to have been working with the OCP for one to two years. The second highest response, with 34% were those who have been working with the OCP for over two years. Overall, almost 70% have been interacting with the OCP and its work for more than a year, suggesting they were allies who know the OCP and its work relatively well.
Section 2: OCP Strategy

**Key headlines and takeaways:**

- Respondents find the OCP’s arguments and resulting advocacy work highly credible. At the government level, there was a clear sense that emphasizing the intrinsic benefits of open contracting, as opposed to simply avoiding harm (such as corruption) played much better.

- That said, there appears to be a slight disconnect between the arguments put forward and the implementation on the ground, including how to use open contracting data. There needs to be a clearer causal link between elements of OCP’s advocacy work, so allies understand that doing X can directly lead to Y.

- Not all advocacy work is well planned or inclusive in its design. This should be addressed with allies in the future.

- The OCP’s technical support (such as the OCDS) has been their most valuable contribution. While some organizations establish valuable links to others through the OCP, as the report shows later on, this added-value could be improved significantly.

- Overall, in terms of strategy, the 2020 goal is not seen as realistic, although laudable just the same. As a result, there are calls for the OCP to balance quality and quantity when it comes to coverage and what they try to do. Similarly, there are some who suggest OCP should rethink its tone, and contemplate a more forceful or critical approach.

- OCP is not yet at the point where they are not “the field” themselves, and need to do more to facilitate the work of their allies. In doing so, there is a clear need for more active engagement with civil society actors.
**Section 2: OCP Strategy**

Respondents were asked whether they believe the OCP’s advocacy and arguments are credible.

- On a Likert scale of 0 to 10, 93% of the respondents gave a score between 7 and 10. 46% of respondents are categorized as passives, giving a score of 7 or 8, and 47% as promoters, giving a score of 9 or 10. The promoters represent allies who strongly believe that the OCP’s advocacy and arguments are credible.

- Only 7% are categorized as detractors who have some doubts about the claims made by OCP. This gives an overall NP score of 40, a good endorsement of the arguments laid out by the OCP.
Section 2: OCP Strategy

- In addition, the OCP asked its partners: **What have you found to be the most useful argument?**

  Comments received from **survey responses** in this area included:

  “Different stakeholder groups are responsive to different arguments, but for government staff, the arguments that appeared to resonate are that staff time and resources will be freed up, and that decision makers can be more confident that they will not be held responsible for the petty corruption of their staff, if that staff has less opportunity to be corrupt.”

  “The economic benefits for government and business. It is listened to quicker and easier than ethical ones, or ones about quality of actual services delivered, sadly.”

  “The fact that it does serve government, citizen and private sector interests through greater quality and cost savings for government, better results and accountability for citizens, and easier market access and less corruption for the private sector.”

  “Some middle steps between advocacy/commitments and implementation are not clearly addressed, which makes it hard to work with middle managers and implementers.”

  Comments received from **interview responses** in this area included:

  “Advocacy work they are doing is great, but from a more distant perspective, the field needs to be aware of not following the data and programmatic approach but also know how to use this data. Appreciate the field building approach, but risk that focus too much on supply side (like broader open data movement) and tech solutions, rather than legislative framework for example.”

  “The credibility of the people I interact with is incredibly high. I have realized however, that there is a lack of showing “X will lead to Y and why.”

  “The OCP is working with our government and I feel that they are portraying them in a good light where they are not doing enough or not doing what they say they are doing. I understand that the OCP is just trying to push the government and remain good relations but they also need to be critical.”

  “Although our approaches are complementary, we are here with the same mission, sometimes I feel a little disconnected. Like some things come up and are publicly launched but they are just brought up and perhaps we could have discussed being part of it or consult with others.”
Moreover, the OCP asked its partners: **What has been the most useful way the OCP has supported your work, and why? What can you do now that you couldn’t do before interacting with the OCP?**

Comments received from **survey responses** in this area included:

“Creating links with other partners, government staff, etc.”

“Helpdesk, giving answers to technical questions.”

“The OCP were fantastic in the lead up to the anti-corruption summit, helping to push countries to sign up to open contracting and advising DFID on countries that were close to adopting. Since the summit, they have continued to follow up and support implementation.”

“Collaboration on positions for global advocacy efforts, producing concrete tools that support messaging.”

“Constant engagement and sharing of implementation and use of OCDS in other countries.”

“Case studies and examples to show private companies how non-transparency can go badly and how good transparency can benefit the business.”

“Creating the documentation about how the public procurement works that helps us to quickly understand the process and how we can work with it.”

“Providing materials and global pressure on our government.”

“Providing specific references and information on open contracting. Most useful is the OCDS which provides an actionable recommendation to make to governments.”

“Connection us with both civil society and governments working on open government reform in several countries; as well as complementing messaging around transparency, accountability, and citizen participation in governance.”

Comments received from **interview responses** in this area included:

“The OCP have provided us with a standard that formed the basis of the design for our own OCD system. They also reviewed our draft legislation that ensured that information disclosure will be enshrined in the procurement law.”

“Great question! The OCDS is a concrete example of how reform, transparency, open data and collaboration works together. They have championed the OCDS, a leading product which is concrete – helps make the argument and show it can work. It’s a good demonstration tool.”

“Working in the African sector, the OCP is developing the OCDS, which is great because they are helping out these African organizations by adding with their technology and know-how, and leveraging the locally grown systems to monitor contracts and procurement and strengthening the mapping of those systems, rather than just dropping something on them. The fact that the OCP provides support to replicate the system in other countries is a useful thing for us.”
Section 2: OCP Strategy

“We see them as very close partners - we would not have a work stream with open contracting without the OCP. They provide practical ongoing advice and collaborations through workshops and have helped by reviewing our advocacy materials.”
The OCP also asked its partners: The OCP aims to make open contracting the new norm by 2022 - to achieve this they aim to build a field of open contracting champions and support providers. What do you believe is the most important service, product or resource that they should offer but which they currently do not?

Comments received from survey responses in this area included:

“A strong evidence base on the impact of open contracting on improving government service delivery (and by extension, lives).”

“A more in-depth country level engagement and advocacy, advocate for OCDS based government procurement systems by default, and more support in developing capacities of demand side actors.”

“An easy to implement open source platform for basic contracting so that agencies that cannot afford expensive systems can still use this platform and publish their processes in OCDS.”

“Mentoring support that is strategic (e.g. focused on key reformers to show impact), sustained (e.g. not one shot), and expansive (covers a lot of countries, several sectors, and all relevant stakeholders).”

“The focus on ensuring that we are – as a movement – creating ongoing evidence of what open contracting enables and delivers, and being serious about the potential negative or unintended consequences is crucial.”

“OCP needs to do a better job at opening doors for their partners in terms of funding and partnerships. OCP is currently too focused on being the central body, not allowing their partners to move forward without them.”

“I believe OCP champions should provide more real world examples to those who are new in the process. Furthermore, I believe some online video clips for using different OCP tools will prove beneficial in expediting the process of OCDS implementation and capacity building in this area.”

Comments received from interview responses in this area included:

“The OCP are doing a very good job at building the global community and encouraging progress with government commitments. The strength of the OCP is that they have been focused on several things and there is no need to increase their scope.”

The OCP does not do any “naming and shaming and their tone is carefully considered, which I don’t think they should necessarily change. But they should definitely reflect on whether the friendly tone is the right one or if they want to take a stronger stance.”

“We have seen quite a change. The field has developed quite a bit in the last year. Achievements are impressive and outstanding. The question here is scope, quality, and ambition. The issue of quality vs. quantity. – Having an open contracting seal or badge is perhaps not the best thing to do but maybe we need it as well?”
Section 2: OCP Strategy

“A lot of organizations like the OCP need to first demonstrate their impact (prove themselves) - The key is to find out what it is that they are doing, that is making a difference and focusing on that and stop doing other things that may be adding to this information overload.”

“They have a good strategy on how to involve the government but not how to engage with civil society groups.”

“They need a plan on how to bring in civil society, and have someone in OCP be the top lead on this - from start to finish. They should create region-specific teams to focus on local issues better, and bring in local organizations too. The OCP could be more critical in its position, and push for REAL open contracting, rather than superficial token gestures from the government.”

“Their goal is not achievable from a practical standpoint. Maybe there is room for more collaboration to link open contracting data with broader open discussion.”

“The OCP is doing a great job positioning itself in terms of advocacy – Moving the discussion and agenda forward. Nonetheless, far away from meeting goal of it becoming the ‘norm’. That is “wishful thinking.” “Need evidence of the value of this work, and in climate of focus on “impact”, they need more evidence on value and causation.”
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

Key headlines and takeaways:

● The OCDS is one of the OCP’s flagship products, yet almost 10% of respondents have never heard of it. Those who have and have used it are largely positive about it – more so than other resources used.
● While there seems to be a sense that the OCDS is hard to implement, the support provided by the helpdesk has been very well received. One respondent suggests having a public forum for OCDS-related questions, where discussions occur between allies directly, without having to just be through the OCP.
● There are also calls for more tools on the demand side, to empower civil society for example. In addition, respondents would like more targeted tools, either in particular languages (Spanish) or with a regional focus (Africa).
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

56 out of 62 respondents who answered this question (90%) claim to have been aware of the Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS), whereas 10% have not heard of it before (Figure 9). Out of the 90% who are aware of the OCDS, 70% have used OCDS documentation (Figure 10). Out of these 70% that are aware of the OCDS and have used its documentation, 60% consider the documentation to be very useful.

- 25% of the respondents that have used the OCDS documents, are neutral in their opinion of how useful the documents are.
- 15% of respondents that have used the OCDS documents are seen as detractors - they do not believe that the OCDS documentation is useful.
- The NP score for the OCDS documentation is encouraging, and demonstrates that respondents find them valuable, if not - as the open comments suggests - a little hard to implement.
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

Comments received from interview responses in this area included:

“The OCDS is pretty good. It is the best thing you can find on the market. It is a little difficult to implement, which is a hurdle, but procurement is complicated so no blame there. OCDS and all of its guidelines are for the supply side, for government implementers. They need more useful cases for civil society/media.”

“It is useful as it puts order to the organization of data, but I doubt that it is meant for Africa,” working in an environment “absent of freedom of information legislation in most countries.”

“Great examples of how to build a standard. It is a great tool and easy to use if you have the right technical background. Needs more internal capacity though.”
In addition, the OCP asked its partners how useful they found the OCDS tools.

- 7% of the respondents claim to not have been aware of the tools and 38% claim to have been aware but to have never used them.
- Out of the 55% who are aware of the OCDS tools and have used them, 50% of respondents found the tools to be very useful and 33% are rather neutral about the tools.
- With a NP score of 33 it appears that the tools are seen as a valuable resource.
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

- The OCP also asked its partners: **Which is the most useful resource you have used?**

Comments received from *survey responses* in this area included:

“OCDS mapping template – We use it to map fields and explain OCDS to those who are not familiar with OCDS.”

“Case studies, helping me to make the case for a DFID push on open contracting (e.g. the Ukraine case study).”

“Open data in municipal open contracting.”

“The red-flag document was very inspiring and we don’t know why it is not on the webpage.”

“Open Government Guide – Has been useful in terms of advising countries considering open contracting reform on how to map out and frame actions to advance transparency in procurement.”
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

77% of the OCP’s respondents claim to have received or downloaded resources, guides and other tools provided by the OCP. 23% have never received or downloaded any materials from the OCP.
When asked about the relevance of the OCP’s resources (such as the OCDS documentation) to pushing the open contracting agenda forward, the majority of respondents who have accessed the resources are classified as passives: 51% have neither a positive nor a negative opinion.

39% of the OCP’s survey respondents consider the resources to be very helpful in pushing forward the open contracting agenda. Only 10% of the survey respondents do not consider the resources to be useful in achieving this goal.

The OCP receives a NP score of 29, with 91% of the respondents either taking on a neutral position or strongly agreeing that these resources are pushing the open contracting agenda forward. Nonetheless, more than half of the respondents are considered passives, which should be seen as an opportunity and potential priority for OCP to persuade this large group into becoming more positive about these resources.
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

- The OCP also asked its partners: **What other resources, tools, guides and templates would you like the OCP to produce?**

  Comments received from **survey responses** in this area included:

  “Simple open source e-procurement system.”

  “As before, any examples/evidence on linking beneficial ownership and open contracting data (including examples in which there was take up of this information to make an impact on service delivery and anti-corruption).”

  “More guides/case examples on how OCDS can be adopted partially by CSOs (e.g. Example of a real document, how the fields map to OCDS, the problems, and how it can be worked around (or not) and steps).”

  “Detailed implementation guides including foreseeable blowback and strategies for engaging reluctant/skeptical stakeholder groups.”

  “An interactive map of the OCP developments in different European countries.”

  “Translate the resources into other languages (e.g. Spanish).”

  “Success stories on how countries have gone about advancing procurement reform – capturing challenges, successes and best practices.”
To ensure support when using the OCDS and its many features, the OCP set up a help-desk to respond to inquiries from its allies and constituents.

A plurality of respondents (44%) know about the OCDS help-desk but have not interacted with it. However, another 7% were even unaware of its existence.

48% of the OCP’s respondents were aware of the helpdesk and have interacted with it. 15% have interacted with the help-desk 1-4 times, 11% have interacted with it 5-10 times and 22% have interacted with it more than 10 times.
Of the respondents that interacted with the OCDS help-desk, 53% are considered promoters, who found it to be very helpful, scoring it a 9 or 10. Similarly, 40% of the OCP’s respondents scored its helpfulness a 7 or 8, categorizing them as passives that are unsure about its helpfulness. Only 7% of respondents claimed the OCDS help-desk was not helpful.
Out of the respondents that interacted with the OCDS help-desk, 97% considered the help-desk to have been responsive, giving it a 7 or more on the Likert scale. 61% of respondents classify as promoters who found the OCDS help-desk to have been very responsive.

Overall, the helpdesk is seen as a responsive source of helpful advice. NP scores of 46 for helpfulness and 58 for responsiveness are to be applauded. More however, could be done to raise awareness about it, and to encourage allies to engage with it.
Section 3: Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)

Comments received from interview responses in this area included:

“We get a lot of help for OCDS but no help in the community with other issues – they are not helping the implementers.”

“It would be good to have a public channel, like a public live forum where people can talk and ask questions. Good way to open discussions and include others without just OCP.”

“The helpdesk was very helpful in training our staff and later on even commenting on the Terms of Reference. They had a session to train consultants on OCDS.”

“Most of the technical experts on the OCDS sit within the helpdesk – hard to get independent support on technical side of things. Need a broader set of people who can help with the standard, but independent of the help desk.”
The OCP also asked its partners: **What could have made the OCDS helpdesk more helpful?**

Comments received from *survey responses* in this area included:

“More emphasis on understanding the needs of the country vs. too quickly focusing in on the data issues.”

“In-country or at least regional presence in countries where OC agenda has picked up.”

“More examples in the documentation.”

“Use of standards with partial information, incomplete records by civil society organizations that don’t have transparency.”

“More understanding about the work that the CSO organizations are doing and their place in the OCDS user ecosystem.”
Section 4: OC Community, Communications and Events

Key headlines and takeaways:

- Respondents are split on whether OCP connects organizations effectively. Not only does the OCP receive an equal mix of detractors and promoters, the open comments show a wide range of views. Data later on in the report supports this split – with some people establishing positive relationships outside the OCP, and others less so.
- Respondents want more by way of “success stories”, and for this to be from around the globe, so they can use it in their own regional contexts.
- It is clear from section 5 that OCP has a significant influence on the open contracting space writ large, although as can be seen below this is not translated into impact at the level of ally organizations. In part this is due to the complexities of the subject matter, but as seen, there are specific areas OCP could improve in.
- On the whole respondents do not feel there is the right mix of allies in the network. In particular, there is a sense that there is not enough involvement from the private sector. In addition, there seems to be a focus on technical actors, with a lack of ‘demand side’ players such as CSOs and journalists. This lack of diversity affects the network as a whole as well as specific events OCP runs.
One of the OCP’s main goals is to create a community or network of people allowing them to share resources and experiences directly with each other. When asked to what extent the OCP has helped to connect its allies to other organizations, 46% claim that the OCP has been very helpful.

However, another 39% of survey respondents claim that the OCP has not been helpful in connecting them with other organizations and stakeholders.

This NP score of 7 warrants further investigation, and should be a key area of inquiry for OCP in ongoing dialogue discussions with allies, exploring why the OCP have failed to significantly move the needle forward on this important strategic area.
Section 4: Community

Comments received from survey responses in this area included:

“OCP has done a great job organizing or co-organizing side events and sessions at key gatherings, such as the EITI summit, OGP events, and the IODC. We have met and/or solidified relationships with organizations through these events.”

“The OCP have a great network of contacts - for example in Nepal they put me in touch with a local NGO who could link up with the local DFID office on procurement oversight.”

“OCP could stand to convene the community more often and more accessibly.”

“From my first engagement with the OCP last year until today we have met somebody new and inspirational every month. The community and support have made our work easier and made it feel worthwhile” (survey response).

“The same people are always at events using the same stories.”

“The team is great on bringing new partners into OCP, however, I have not experienced the reverse (e.g. OCP contacting one of their partners to us for other non-contracting open government/anti-corruption activities).”

“OCP has been instrumental in facilitating peer exchange and learning at OGP’s global, regional and national events; bringing together different stakeholders to share best practices, challenges and successes in instituting open contracting reforms. OCP has also been generous in providing travel support to important global and regional events for stakeholders working in the open government space to facilitate capacity building, networking and peer exchange around open contracting specifically and open government generally.”

Comments received from interview responses in this area included:

“They have been crucial to introducing us to NGOs, governance, civil society and private sector. Have definitely developed partnerships through and with OCP.”

“I do not think that the OCP is creating a community at all. They never introduced me to anyone even those of which I know that they are from the same area. We create our own groups.”

“OCP has helped bring different people together and help them get to know each other, who are working on similar issues, but before this was not so much the case. Still lacks private sector angle, but that has always been the case – needs their support and their voice represented. Technical support and OCDS has been critical – couldn’t do it without them.”
The OCP also asked its partners: **What would you like to learn more about?**

Comments received from **survey responses** in this area included:

“The feedback from their various country locations.”

“How geospatial data can be or has been included in open contracting processes. Also, impact stories are always useful - how open contracting has led to improved environmental or social outcomes, as this helps us to make the case for further disclosure and the need for transparency.”

“Are there any examples or cases where OC has not worked? How do you gain political buy-in/support for OC? How do you integrate OC with other Open Data initiatives like IATI?”

“Countries who could demonstrate the impact of combining beneficial ownership information with open contracting.”

“Work in adopting and using open data standards in environments for which government data is not readily available or of poor quality such as in LDCs or countries with low rankings on corruption and governance.”

“How to convince government to open contracting data from outside? How to create an enabling environment for OC to work? How to strengthen the work of intermediaries in making OC information more accessible?”

“Use of technology for disclosure of information.”

“Civil society/government joint actions, successes and challenges in advancing open contracting reform at the national level.”

“I like about the OCP that they are dedicated through learning and sharing. However, it could be very useful, specifically in Africa, if we could get some more learning. We love OCP’s approach but if we do not get it right from the beginning it will be a big miss. Don’t know how well other countries have integrated open contracting across different institutions. Institutions that are controlling data, not just providing it. Thus, it would be nice to know how others are doing it and see what we can integrate from the budget cycles, implementation cycles, etc. – We would like to see more, and share the findings and learning so that we can adapt our approaches.”

“Story-telling around the results and what they took is important. The OCP have done that a lot around Ukraine. Would be good to do that for other places as well. Need to nail more how we can incorporate the private sector. How can we involve other sectors and from other countries as well?”
When asked about the influence of participation in the open contracting community in impacting its allies or their organizations’ work, 35% of OCP respondents consider that their involvement has not had any direct impact on their work. The NP score of -8 is lower than the global cohort benchmark.

Only roughly a third of the survey respondents (27%) claim that the organization has positively impacted their work. This again is an area in need of further investigation, as there seems to be a disconnect between having useful materials and creating impact for those using them.
Section 4: Community

Figure 19

Please indicate which of the following steps or actions you have taken in relation to the OCP’s work and open contracting generally.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocated for more transparency</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke about open contracting in public events and fora</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared learning from program/policy implementation with other OCP partners</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared impactful tools and approaches</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanded disclosure of contracting data</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyed stories from countries to the open contracting community</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated quality open contracting language into policy</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in research or pilots</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored procurement</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a tool</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinced donors to begin/scale open contracting project funding</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used open contracting data accurately</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started publishing OCDS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinced businesses that open contracting is good for business and the right thing to do</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed a policy to promote disclosure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed a policy to promote stakeholder monitoring &amp; feedback loops</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Community

- Respondents were asked to indicate which steps or actions they have taken in relation to the OCP’s work and open contracting in general. It is unclear if such steps were ‘caused’ by OCP directly, if respondents found these steps to be valuable at all, or if these are even the most important steps to be prioritizing.
- In the last two years, the two actions that most respondents had done included speaking about open contracting at public events and fora (26%), and using open contracting data correctly (25%).
- The two actions that were taken the most in the last six months according to respondents were, advocating for more transparency (52%), and speaking about open contracting in public events and fora (48%) as well as sharing learning from program/policy implementation with other OCP partners (48%).
- Allies were also asked which of these steps or actions they have not taken yet. The two areas in which the least action has been taken are convincing businesses that open contracting is good for business and the right thing to do (33%), and changing a policy to promote stakeholder monitoring and feedback loops (31%). The lack of engagement with business is a theme that is touched on at several points in this report.
- Lastly, when asked what OCP’s partners were planning on doing in the next 12 months, 30% responded that they plan on using open contracting data accurately. 28% claim that they plan on participating in research or pilot programs.
Section 4: Community

When asked to what extent the current diversity within the OCP network is adequate for achieving the strategies and meeting purposes of the OCP? (One way to think about it is to ask whether constituents collectively comprise the different skills, experiences, perspectives, interests, geographical representation, and influence required to enable the network to meet its goals.)

When asked to what extent the current diversity within the OCP network is adequate for achieving the strategies and meeting the OCP’s purposes, 38% of the respondents gave a score between 0-6 and do not believe the OCP network to have enough diversity. Additionally, 37% gave a score of 7-8, with neither a particularly positive or negative opinion.

25% of the respondents consider the current diversity involved in open contracting discussions to be adequate for achieving the strategies and meeting purposes of the OCP. The resulting NP score of -13 is well below where OCP would like to be. There is a clear sense, which is supported through the open comments, that the OCP, and in general the open contracting movement is failing to engage with key constituent groups.
Section 4: Community

- The OCP also asked its partners: **In terms of outreach, who is missing?**

  Comments received from **survey responses** in this area included:
  
  “Citizens and beneficial contractors.”
  
  “Grassroots civil society/community based organizations.”
  
  “Bring both technical people, policy makers and users together.”
  
  “Journalists, policy makers and elected representatives.”
  
  “Increased number of voices from the global south.”
  
  “Bigger players in the private sector.”
  
  “More national government stakeholders dealing with public procurement.”
  
  “Definitely a need for more private sector engagement and support. A challenge in this regard is the potential perception that what open contracting is, is set and only one thing - and that it is a technical fix and not something to be experimented around or shaped.”

  Comments received from **interview responses** in this area included:
  
  “Much of open contracting agenda has focused on data angles, and not enough focus on incentives and political dynamics – the same goes for OCP. Given that governance challenges rely on incentives and politics, OCP needs to pay more attention to these issues.”
  
  “So far it is a community of change agents or champions, which is fine and good. I guess the private sector engagement is still very low as it is with the whole field. At the national level, there are only a few NGOs observing activity - need to get more demand side at local level” (interview response).
  
  “Bring in the politicians.”
  
  “Need more journalists (ICIJ, etc.). Could OC have their own “panama papers”? Use investigative journalism more?”
  
  “At this point I think they have a good mix of Government and CSO but I think they need to make sure that there is full government buy-in. Some countries have signed up to implementing it nationally but the question always remains that if you want this to be effective and having OC as a principle, but not having policies and laws in place that allow for transparency, etc. makes that difficult. They are bringing in the private sector to a certain extent but I think at the country level there is a need to build that component a little more. There is no intentional private sector engagement at the moment. This should increase to have them more interested and engaged - They are the critical drivers of this!”
  
  “OCP is creating a field but needs more strengthening. They do some direct working (‘learning projects’) which is useful but takes a lot of their energy away from reflecting with partners on learning and facilitating at a higher level. Could be more systematic in their way of documenting learning and then sharing, learning events happen only now and then.”
With respect to the communication mechanisms and quality of OCP’s communication, 90% of the respondents are passives (45%) or promoters (45%). The OCP received a NP score of 35 for its communication quality, which is significantly higher than the global cohort benchmark of -4.

10% out of the OCP’s respondents gave a negative rating with regards to the timeliness, openness, relevance, and accuracy of information being communicated.

This positive NP score is a good indicator, although as the open comments suggest, there are a few small things which might improve it yet further.

Comments received from interview responses in this area included:

“They need more advanced planning – Sometimes they move too fast, which can be great but in this case, we sometimes suddenly hear about new things and initiatives that we would have liked to be involved in or even funded.”

“Always good experiences. They are timely, open, and the information is relevant. They are very honest people.”

“They could tell more stories, and make more links between OC and other issues (but that requires more capacity, and they want a lean secretariat). They could also point the finger more often, but that’s not their approach. The frequency and content is all good.”

“We were not happy with the process of the Open Contracting Innovation Challenge. The application form was terribly long (have been doing grant proposals for years and I can honestly say that this form was the worst). The OCP also did not explain the criteria by which the winners were chosen. An interesting contradiction: An organization that promotes transparency, but does not open their criteria, or judges for the Challenge. This is not a good example of what they advocate for.”
Section 4: Communications and Events

- 65% of respondents claim to have attended events run by the OCP in the last 12 months.
- When asked about the relevance of these events to the content of the respondent organizations’ work, 46% of the respondents consider the events to have been highly relevant. Similarly, 40% of OCP’s respondents are passives, who consider these events to neither be highly relevant nor irrelevant.
- OCP received a NP score of 32, which is a positive indication on the quality of the events.
With a NP score of 29, 48% of those who have attended OCP’s events claim they have been very helpful in pushing the open contracting agenda forward.

33% of the respondents have a rather neutral opinion and 19% consider the events to not have been useful in furthering the open contracting agenda.

Overall, OCP-run events are viewed positively, but again, there were some comments about ensuring the right mix of participants involved.
Section 4: Communications and Events

- The OCP also asked its partners: What suggestions do you have to improve OCP events in the future?

  Comments received from survey responses in this area included:

  “They are very useful for the open contracting agenda, but sometimes they fall short in responding to what or why people want to use the open contracting agenda.”

  “The OCP should separate events and have exclusive spaces for journalists, developers, business analysts, etc.”

  “We would like to see some sessions in getting collaboration happening. Everyone using a common standard should result in people re-sharing tools and methods built around OCDS globally.”

  “To engage more actors beyond the usual crowd.”

  “Less centered around the schema, more centered in ways to use. How can we make the government more accountable with them and what are the other experiences?”

  “Having more government actors, procurement people, and tool developers (technical people) in the room.”
Section 5: Overall satisfaction

**Key headlines and takeaways:**
- According to respondents, the OCP has had a large impact on open contracting and advances the issues on the public policy agenda. For this OCP should be commended.
- Similarly, the OCP is viewed as a valuable organization, one which is reliable, capable and responsive. Although more could be done to make all allies feel they a part of the movement.
- Again, while some report having confidence in the OCP to achieve its goals as well as help its partners to establish valuable relationships, there is no consensus that involvement in the OCP movement has increased respondents’ own capacity to work independently yet.
Section 5: Overall satisfaction

Figure 25  To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. I have confidence in the capacity of the OCP to achieve its goals.
   - NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS
   - **Promoters**: 56%
   - **Passive**: 32%
   - **Detractors**: 12%
   - **NPS**: 44
   - **GCB**: 11

2. I establish valuable new relationships because of my interaction with the OCP.
   - NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS
   - **Promoters**: 58%
   - **Passive**: 23%
   - **Detractors**: 19%
   - **NPS**: 39
   - **GCB**: 33

3. The OCP has substantial influence in its area of work.
   - NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS
   - **Promoters**: 51%
   - **Passive**: 35%
   - **Detractors**: 14%
   - **NPS**: 37
   - **GCB**: -2

4. I am ready, willing and able to participate in pushing the open agenda movement and am open to trying out new things suggested by the OCP.
   - NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS
   - **Promoters**: 51%
   - **Passive**: 35%
   - **Detractors**: 14%
   - **NPS**: 37
   - **GCB**: 5

5. The OCP has raised the priority of our issues on relevant public policy agendas.
   - NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS
   - **Promoters**: 44%
   - **Passive**: 37%
   - **Detractors**: 19%
   - **NPS**: 25
   - **GCB**: -19

\[\text{Detractors} \quad \text{Passive} \quad \text{Promoters}\]
OCP partners were given statements related to their overall satisfaction with their relationship with the OCP and asked to what extent they agree with these statements. The respondents agreed that they have confidence in the capacity of the OCP to achieve its goals, resulting in the highest NP score of 44, with 56% promoters. This is significantly higher than the global cohort average, which has a NP score of 11. The second highest NP score (39) was given for the statement which refers partners establishing valuable new
Section 5: Overall satisfaction

relationships as a result of their interaction with the OCP. The OCP received a slightly higher NP score than the global cohort average of 33 and comprises 58% promoters.

For one of the statements, the OCP received a negative NP score (-3). The statement with which respondents agree the least, is: “because of the OCP I am empowered to do the things I want with less outside help.” Despite this being the lowest NP score that the OCP received for a statement, it is still significantly higher than than of the global cohort benchmark of -52. This is however, a particular strategic focus of the OCP, and the positive comparison should be interpreted with care. With a NP score of 5, respondents also disagree with the statement that the OCP has significantly contributed to increasing trust amongst key players in its area of work. This NP score is still higher than the NP score of -12 of the global cohort.
Section 6: Learning and understanding progress

**Key headlines and takeaways:**

- On the whole, OCP is making progress towards some of their goals. As mentioned earlier, respondents – both interviewees and survey respondents – feel the aim to make open contracting the norm by 2022 is overly ambitious.

- That said, the OCP has had a large impact on open contracting and has advanced the collective agenda. Credit to OCP for doing so on such a complex and challenging topic.

- The one area that respondents would like OCP to focus on more, is also the area OCP is not performing well in, namely developing a shared understanding of the key gaps in the open contracting field, and the solutions needed to address them. This should be an immediate focus.

- Most/many respondents believe that the OCP will use these findings to make improvements in how they work. It is imperative for ongoing relationships with allies that OCP is seen to take these results seriously.
Figure 26  To what extent do you feel the OCP has achieved the following goals in the past 12 months?

Profile open contracting efforts and celebrate progress made so far

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Develop a shared understanding of the key gaps in the open contracting field, and the solutions needed to address them

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promote concrete activities to deliver collaborative, innovative and impactful engagements in advocacy

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided specific tools and resources to deepen and accelerate the implementation of open contracting, including country and sector-specific products

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connect organizations to others who are working on open contracting issues, to encourage peer learning and exchange

**NET PROMOTER ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Detractors</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Learning and understanding progress

- OCP allies were asked to what extent they feel the OCP has achieved some of its goals in the last 12 months.
- With a NP score of 35 and 19% detractors, most respondents believe that the OCP has successfully connected organizations to others who are working on open contracting issues, to encourage peer learning and exchange. 54% of the respondents strongly believe that the OCP has achieved this goal. Another goal which the respondents believe the OCP has met, is the profiling of open contracting efforts and celebration of progress made thus far. The OCP received a NP score of 28, with 87% of the respondents scoring it with a 7 or higher.
- However, the OCP also received negative scores, in which respondents claim that the OCP has not learned from previous successes and mistakes. This is particularly apparent with a NP score of -16, with roughly half of the respondents being in the detractor’s category (48%). Again, if the full survey process is followed - with its ongoing dialogue and improvement - we would expect this to increase sharply in the coming years. Another goal which respondents do not believe the OCP has met, is the development of a shared understanding of the key gaps in the open contracting field and the solutions needed to address them. Only 23% of the respondents are promoters, resulting in a NP score of -14.
When asked which two goals the OCP should focus on and prioritize in the upcoming 12 months, allies responded with the following:

- The highest percentage, 54%, of respondents believe that the most important goal for OCP to focus on is the development of a shared understanding of the key gaps in the open contracting field and the solutions that are needed to address these gaps. This area was one of the lowest scored on progress to date. With 49% of support, the goal that the OCP should prioritize second is the provision of specific tools and resources to deepen and accelerate the implementation of open contracting.
- The two goals that were deemed the lowest priority, with 19% and 21%, respectively, are to learn from previous successes and mistakes and profile open contracting efforts and celebrate progresses made so far.
OCP’s allies were asked how likely it is that the OCP will make changes as a result of the answers provided in the survey.

With a NP score of 20, compared to the global cohort of 9, the OCP lies above the global cohort average. This is reflected in the distribution of scores given across the Likert scale. 43% of OCP’s respondents are promoters that believe the OCP will make changes as a result of the responses provided to them through the survey. 34% of all respondents are neutral in their belief that the OCP will make changes, and 23% are detractors who do not believe that the OCP will make changes.

This lack of confidence in the OCP using the findings as was expressed by the detractors can be associated with the previous table, in which respondents gave the OCP a NP score of -16 for how well they learn from previous mistakes and successes. This lack of confidence might also have prompted people not to respond, with there being a sense that it’s “not worth my while”. This is a common sentiment when surveys are first introduced, but again, if the survey process is completed fully, and findings and corrective action communicated back to all allies, then we would expect to see scores for this question, along with response rates, increase.
Conclusion

This report examines the OCP and the extent to which it fulfills its role in the eyes of its partners and constituents. Robust data has been collected through interviews and surveys, and has been benchmarked where possible against other similar organizations, using the Net Promoter Analysis. This gives the OCP an accurate gauge of how it is performing, as well as a sense of what is possible.

The OCP is operating in a challenging field, in which it has a significant impact advocating for transparency and open contracting. Although objectives such as the OCP’s 2022 goal may seem ambitious, it receives a lot of support from respondents who believe the OCP to be the right organization to push such an agenda forward. However, there are certain areas that respondents have criticized and highlighted as areas for improvement. One of these areas is the degree to which the OCP connects organizations with one another and communicates certain findings and advancements across the network. In fact, overall, there is some uncertainty as to how the arguments and advocacy work that the OCP has done at the field level has filtered down and been translated into value on the ground for organizations. Moreover, respondents have voiced their concerns about an imbalanced network that does not include enough “demand side” actors such as the private sector, CSOs and journalists.

Nonetheless, when asked to what extent respondents were likely to recommend the OCP to a friend or colleague, 64% were categorized as promoters, scoring this question with a 9 or higher out of 10. With a NPS of 50, the OCP was well above the global cohort average of 20. This score underlines the positive ways in which the OCP is performing. These areas include the influence the OCP has in the field, as well as the useful tools and products that partners can use to further their own work. The next step for the OCP is to better understand how it can better empower partners to be more self-sufficient and to play a more active role in facilitating peer-to-peer exchange with a wide range of different, yet aspirationally-aligned actors.

In order to successfully discuss and integrate the feedback provided in this report by the OCP’s partners and constituents, it should consider the following next steps, which would allow it to improve its social impact.
Next steps

The leitmotiv for partner feedback is Listen, Learn, Act, and Repeat. You have now listened, so it is time for Learn, Act and Repeat. Following are some recommendations to take into account for making the most of partner feedback. These will be used as the basis for OCP’s ongoing work with Keystone to design a light touch ongoing feedback approach.

**Learn**

Dig into the report with key internal and external constituents. Many of our clients have found it useful to develop different presentations for different stakeholders.

1. **Staff.** It is generally best to start with the staff, and then return to them after dialogues with allies (see below).
   - Different staff may need different presentations. Themes to explore with staff include:
     - The implications of the main findings
     - Interpretations of the data where, as they often are, the meaning is ambiguous. This is also explored with the local partners.
     - Possible explanations for the feedback received
     - Possible corrective actions
     - Their sense of your organizational capabilities around feedback
       - Working together with our partners at Feedback Labs, we have created a simple organizational self-diagnostic tool called the Quiz. We recommend that you have a number of staff take the Quiz and that you aggregate and compare their answers to discuss in staff meetings.

2. **Allies and respondents.** The main way to deepen your interpretation of your feedback is through dialogue with your allies. These activities serve the additional all-important purpose of demonstrating that their feedback is taken seriously. This can be done in dialogue sessions with groups or through follow up interviews with a sample of them. Annex 5 to the report provides a list of respondents that expressed a willingness to take part in follow up interviews. We recommend that these sessions be introduced as an opportunity to co-create solutions. These sense-making dialogues build directly out of staff discussions and focus on three main themes:
   - Areas where the OCP needs improvement
   - Questions arising from the findings that need more interpretation to understand (including staff-generated ideas)
   - Corrective actions – co-creating solutions

3. **Governing Board.** Your board members need a simple dashboard with the key metrics that you propose to track and report to the board, accompanied by a narrative that sets out the main findings and your response, including planned improvement activities. This board report can be done right away, when your interpretations of the data are not yet validated through dialogue with allies and your response plans are prospective, or after some follow up and therefore incorporating more about how improvement activities are bedding down.

**Act**

Take the corrective actions identified and agreed by staff and allies. Make sure everyone – staff, allies and board – understands what these corrective actions are, and that there will be future opportunities to provide feedback on whether the changes are having the intended effects.

Consider publishing this feedback report and similar such reports in the future. This establishes your commitment to public accountability for your work, and creates incentives that lubricate the joints between performance, reporting and funding. A growing number of the organizations in the benchmark dataset have published their Keystone partner survey reports.⁴

---

⁴ Links to these reports can be found here: [http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/ngoreport](http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/ngoreport)
Next steps

**Repeat (This is where our joint work will go next)**

1. Get a short cycle of feedback-to-action going
   
a. The “Big Bang” survey that you just completed is comprehensive, and generates a wealth of data that you are now busy digesting. Going forward, in order to make sustained and steady progress, you need a continuous, clean signal that will tell you if things are getting better or worse in real time. Fortunately, this is easy and inexpensive to do by sending out micro-surveys (one or two questions only) that are triggered by interactions with your allies (e.g., when they attend an event, after downloading some materials, or even after a meeting). You can rotate different questions in these micro-surveys, allowing you to get a steady signal on different issues. By surveying in this way at or near these touch points you will get a high response rate – as long as you remember to continue to demonstrate to people that their feedback makes a difference. Our first step towards such a model will be to identify a sub-set of questions from the survey and interviews tools which we want to use on an ongoing basis.

b. Your allies experience you in different ways, so don’t engage with them all in the same way! Develop and implement distinct strategies to respond to feedback based on the three categories we used in this report – promoters, passives and detractors.

c. Over the next year, as you work steadily to reduce the time between listening and acting, you will want to invest in your staff.
   
i. Empower frontline staff to try different ways to improve and learn from what happens. If your allies feel listened to, they will appreciate what you do, as long as you keep trying until you get it right.

   ii. Discuss with them the benefits of receiving and being open to feedback. Receiving feedback is not easy. In fact, recent neuroscience tells us that we are all to different extents hard wired to resist feedback!

   d. Use on-going micro-surveys to discover some leading questions. You can do this by correlating partners’ answers to certain questions to other outcome measures you may be collecting. To give you one example, the Gates Foundation discovered five questions that predicted student learning in US high schools. Now schools can use these questions to identify which teachers need help at the beginning of the school year and not after the annual test results come in at the end of the year.

2. Repeat this in-depth survey in 12-36 months to evaluate progress. The time frame depends on how you move ahead with light touch, continuous micro-surveys. If you do so quickly, you can go longer before the next in-depth survey is needed.

---

5. For a great review of the science and a lot of practical advice on how to help staff get ready for feedback, see *Thanks for the Feedback: The Science and Art of Receiving Feedback Well*, by Douglas Stone & Sheila Heen (2014).
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