

Kenya City Integrity Project

Methodology Whitepaper

Introduction

The Kenya City Integrity Report mobilized a highly qualified network of local researchers to generate quantitative data and qualitative reporting on the health of anti-corruption framework in Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu. Each city assessment contained in the Report is based on an Integrity Indicators scorecard.

Experts from KAM and Global Integrity carefully drafted Integrity Indicators for this assessment of the three cities' transparency and accountability mechanisms. KAM, as a bearer of local knowledge, played a pivotal role in this process. They suggested the initial set of indicators so that it reflects the most important areas that needed to be evaluated at the city level. Following their suggestions, Global Integrity systematized their proposals and drafted the indicators. These were then discussed among all partnering organizations, in April of 2011 in Nairobi. The outcome was a list of very actionable questions, rooted in Kenyan reality, and relevant for an objective evaluation of the current situation in the three cities.

The Integrity Indicators scorecard employed in this project assesses the existence, effectiveness, and citizen access to key governance and anti-corruption mechanisms through 177 questions, or "indicators." It examines issues such as information transparency, elections at the city level (including political financing), conflicts of interest issues in the executive and well as local legislatures, fiscal and budgetary management, and public administration and business regulation. Scorecards take into account both existing legal measures on the books and *de facto* realities of practical implementation in each city. All indicators were scored by a lead in-country researcher (from the three partner groups mentioned above in their respective cities) and blindly reviewed by two peer reviewers, as well as outside experts.

The Report unpacks these concepts by looking not only at what laws or institutions are "on the books" but also by assessing their implementation and enforcement through indicators of staffing, budget support, political independence, and citizen access to the most important anti-corruption mechanisms. Combined with vivid qualitative explanation for all indicators, the extensive data provided by the Integrity Indicators aims at informing and empowering citizens, activists, donors, businesses, and governments in each city.

Research Team Members and Roles

The team for the Kenya City Integrity Report consisted of:

- A lead researcher for each of the three cities who compiled the initial scores for the Integrity Indicators.
- Two "peer reviewers" who blindly reviewed the raw data to provide unvarnished corrections, comments, and criticisms. Peer review comments on all data and reporting are published transparently alongside the original data and reporting, offering readers an alternative perspective.

The teams were coordinated from Washington via the Internet and phone. Until the public release of the country assessments, the researchers and peer reviewers are unaware of the identities of other members of the city team. This was done to maintain the independence of the individual responses and avoid a peer-influenced consensus. All data gathering was carried out using the Indaba fieldwork platform (<http://getindaba.org>), a project management software-as-a-service developed by Global Integrity to efficiently manage complex global research.

To identify appropriate researchers in each city and peer reviewers, Global Integrity and CIPE actively recruited potential team members through informal partnerships with several well-placed international and Kenyan NGOs working in the anti-corruption and good governance field. After a competitive selection process, the most qualified researchers and peer reviewers were identified, invited, and sent a contract with specific instructions on the scope of the work.

Global Integrity, CIPE, and KAM jointly developed the project's methodology and organized a training session with all partners to harmonize research techniques and provide training on the use of Global Integrity's Indaba fieldwork platform. Global Integrity staff reviewed all draft data for completeness and accuracy; managed the peer review process; and produced cross-city analyses of the resultant qualitative and quantitative information.

Fieldwork and City Selection

From May to August 2011, the partners conducted field research (assessing the period January 2010 to June 2011) in Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu.

Our 2011 sample by no means represents the complete picture of the state of governance at the city level in Kenya, but it nevertheless provides interesting city coverage across several key variables. The three cities were selected because of their economic prominence and size.

The City Reports

The primary component of the city assessments that make up the Kenya City Integrity Report is each city's Integrity Scorecard, comprising the 175-plus Integrity Indicators.

The Integrity Scorecard for each city examines three concepts:

1. The existence of public integrity mechanisms, including laws and institutions, which promote public accountability and limit corruption.
2. The effectiveness of those mechanisms.
3. The access that citizens have to those mechanisms.

More specifically, indicators of existence assess the laws, regulations, and agencies/entities or equivalently functioning mechanisms that are in place in a particular city. Indicators of effectiveness assess such aspects of public integrity as protection from political interference; appointments that support the independence of an agency; professional full-time staff and funding; independently initiated investigations; and imposition of penalties. Indicators of citizen access assess the ready availability of public reports to citizens, or publicly available information, within a reasonable time period and at a reasonable cost.

The Integrity Indicators are a unique instrument designed to provide a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment of anti-corruption safeguards in a particular city. Carefully selected from a comprehensive review of the anti-corruption literature and other democratic governance sources, as well as Kenya's concrete reality, the Integrity Indicators are used to "score" the institutional framework that exists at the city level to promote public integrity and accountability and prevent abuses of power.

For this Report, the Integrity Indicators were organized into five main categories and 15 subcategories. These were:

1 City Information Transparency

1.1 City Media

1.2 City Public Access to Information

2 City Elections

2.1 Integrity of City Elections

2.2 City Political Financing

3 City Government Conflicts of Interest Safeguards & Checks and Balances

3.1 City Executive Accountability

3.2 City Legislative Accountability

4 City Fiscal and Budgetary Management

4.1 City Budget Process

4.2 City Procurement

4.3 City Auditing

4.4 City Taxes

5 City Public Administration and Business Regulation

5.1 City Civil Service Regulations

5.2 City Health Regulation

5.3 City Safety Regulation

- 5.4 City Environmental Regulation
- 5.5 City Land Record Management

Generating an Integrity Scorecard

Each Integrity Indicator was scored directly by the lead researcher and substantiated with relevant references and comments based on desk research and original interviews with key informants. The data was relayed from the field to Global Integrity managers via the Internet using Indaba. There were two types of indicators fielded for this project: "in law" and "in practice." All indicators, regardless of type, are scored on the same ordinal scale of 0 to 100 with zero being the worst score and 100 best.

"In law" indicators provide an objective assessment of whether certain legal codes, fundamental rights, government institutions, and regulations exist. These *de jure* indicators are scored with a simple "yes" or "no" with "yes" receiving a 100 score and "no" receiving a zero.

"In practice" indicators address *de facto* issues such as implementation, effectiveness, enforcement, and citizen access. As these usually require a more nuanced assessment, the "in practice" indicators are scored along an ordinal scale of zero to 100 with possible scores at 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100. In only a few cases, the "in practice" indicators are scored with "yes" or "no."

Lead researchers are required to provide a reference to substantiate each of their scores. This may be an interview conducted with a knowledgeable individual, a website link to a relevant report, or the name of a specific law or institution, depending on the particular indicator. Lead researchers are also offered the opportunity to include additional comments to support their score and reference for a particular indicator. These are particularly useful in capturing the nuances of a particular situation, namely the "Yes, but..." phenomenon which is often the reality in undertaking this type of research.

Personality, language, and culture can all affect the interpretation of a particular indicator and the score assigned to it. To minimize this effect and maximize inter-coder reliability, this project's methodology provided researchers and peer reviewers with scoring criteria for every single Integrity Indicator. The scoring criteria anchor each indicator and sub-indicator to a predefined set of criteria. In essence, the scoring criteria guide the lead researcher by suggesting, "If you see X on the ground, score this indicator in the following way." For binary yes/no "in law" indicators, scoring criteria are provided for both "yes (100)" and "no (0)" responses. For "in practice" indicators, scoring criteria are defined for each of the 100, 50, and 0 scores with 25 and 75 deliberately left undefined to serve as in between scoring options. Scoring criteria for each indicator can be accessed via any of our online Integrity Scorecards by hovering one's mouse over a given indicator's scoring scale.

In summary, a given indicator has the following elements:

- Indicator question;
- Indicator scoring criteria;
- Indicator score (either yes (100)/no (0) or ordinal scale of 0 - 100 with steps at 25, 50, and 75), assigned by the lead researcher based on:
- References, provided by the lead researcher;
- Comments (optional), provided by the lead researcher;
- Peer review comments (optional), as provided through a double blind peer review process (see more on the peer review process below).

Data Aggregation

For the purpose of producing a city's aggregate scorecard, a simple aggregation method was used. As described above, original indicator and sub-indicator values were assigned by the lead researcher for the city. Each indicator score was then averaged within its parent subcategory, which produced a subcategory score. The subcategory score was in turn averaged with the other subcategory scores into a parent category score. Category scores were averaged to produce an overall country score. The Kenya City Integrity Report groups cities into five performance "tiers" according to a city's overall aggregated score:

- Very strong (90+)
- Strong (80+)
- Moderate (70+)
- Weak (60+)
- Very Weak (< 60)

Because some aspects of governance and anti-corruption mechanisms are harder to measure definitively, some categories require a more complex matrix of sub-indicators questions than others. Thus, the categories are equally valued, even if some categories are derived from a more lengthy series of sub-indicators/ questions than others. Similarly, the subcategories are equally valued within their parent category.

In other words, each score (sub-indicators, indicator, and so on) was equally weighted with its peers addressing the same subcategory/category. However, indicators from different categories are not necessarily equally weighted. Our approach of using equally valued concepts and adding subordinate elements as needed has produced score weightings that reflect the five main conceptual categories evenly. Although we recognize the rationale for a non-equal weighting system (to give emphasis to issues of greater import), we could not defend such a weighted option in the context of this project.

Peer Review Process

The importance of the peer review process cannot be overstated. Since our methodology utilized an "expert assessment" approach to compile the Integrity Indicators, it was crucial that we employed quality control mechanisms to ensure our data was as accurate and balanced as possible. Individually contracted and carefully vetted peer reviewers, selected for their independence and expertise, were asked to blindly review the raw Integrity Indicators through Indaba. The double-blind peer review process ensures that peer reviewers are unrestrained in their commentary, which likely adds to frankness when commenting on the draft city report. Peer review comments were used to interpret—and in some cases adjust—scores and reporting that they identified as containing errors, bias, or out-of-date information. Indicator score adjustments follow certain rules and generally require repetition (i.e., similar comments from multiple peer reviewers) or solid referencing of a factual dispute.

For the Integrity Indicators in this project, peer reviewers were asked to consider the following:

- Is the particular Indicator scored by the lead researcher factually accurate?
- Are there any significant events or developments that were not addressed?
- Does the Indicator offer a fair and balanced view of the anti-corruption environment?
- Is the scoring consistent within the entire set or sub-set of Integrity Indicators?
- Is the scoring controversial or widely accepted? Is controversial scoring sufficiently sourced?
- Are the sources used reliable and reputable?

The peer review process for the data scorecard does not assign direct attribution to peer review comments. This ensures that peer reviewers are unrestrained in their commentary. Peer review comments on the city's data scorecard were published alongside the final scorecard and played an important role in final scoring adjustments prior to publication.

Peer reviewers were offered one of four standardized choices in responding to a given indicator or sub-indicator, using the above guidance to evaluate each data point:

1. "Yes, I agree with the score and have no comments to add."
2. "Yes, I agree with the score but wish to add a comment, clarification, or suggest another reference." Peer reviewers then provided their comment or additional reference in a separate text box which was published alongside the original data.
3. "No, I do not agree with the score." In this third case, peer reviewers were asked to explain and defend their criticism of the score and suggest an appropriate alternative score or reference.

4. I am not qualified to respond to this indicator.

For the Kenya City Integrity Report, the partners retained the services of two highly regarded peer reviewers.

Final Scores

The project partners take full and final responsibility for the scores contained in the Integrity Scorecard for each city. These scores were generated following an elaborate and collaborative review process that included balancing information from several (sometimes conflicting) sources while being guided by the master scoring criteria.

Following the peer review process, Global Integrity staff identified specific data points where peer reviewers had flagged problematic scores. The staff then engaged the city research team in a discussion of the issue in question and ultimately decided on appropriate changes, when necessary, to the original data based on the city team's feedback.

While the partner organizations make every attempt to produce credible information, we welcome all feedback on the veracity and accuracy of our data. Please contact any of the partners with specific comments on indicator scores that you may not agree with, particularly with regard to factual accuracy.

Implementation Gap

The Kenya City Integrity Report also measures what we term the “implementation gap” for each city. The implementation gap refers to the difference between the city’s legal framework for good governance and anti-corruption and the actual implementation and enforcement of that same legal framework. We generated an implementation gap only at the city score level as opposed to the category and/or subcategory levels.

The implementation gap was created by first generating a “legal framework score” and an “implementation score” for each city. These two values were generated through two separate calculations. In each case, we performed the same aggregation technique described above for the city’s Integrity Indicators except that we first removed either all “in law” or “in practice” indicators from the data set (for example, to generate the “legal framework” score, we first removed all “in practice” indicators from the city’s data set and then performed the indicator aggregation technique described above). Once the legal framework and actual implementation scores had been generated, we simply subtracted the implementation score from the legal score to generate the implementation gap for the city.

Example: 56 (legal framework) – 26 (actual implementation) = 30 (implementation gap)