Supporting progress towards more open fiscal governance in Mexico at the subnational level: 
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan

I. Theory of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilitate dialogue on identification of local challenge</td>
<td>Local challenge identified and prioritized as commitment in subnational open government action plan</td>
<td>A. Improved availability and usability of fiscal data about locally prioritized challenges</td>
<td>Improved use of public resources to address locally prioritized challenges in three Mexican states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct user-led assessment of the fiscal governance landscape (using the Treasure Hunt method) around the local challenge identified in activity #1</td>
<td>Local stakeholders identify problems in data availability and usability, as well as opportunities for using data to address the identified local challenge</td>
<td>B. Increased use of fiscal data by local government and civil society to address locally prioritized challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local stakeholders agree on activities with which they can improve the availability and usability of data re: the local challenge</td>
<td>C. Stronger, more effective engagement and collaboration between local government and civil society in using fiscal data to address locally prioritized challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide technical support, including online/offline trainings, consultations, and a toolkit, to state level actors as they implement the activities agreed on as a result of activity #2.</td>
<td>Local actors improve their technical and political capacities for use of fiscal data, especially re: the local challenge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Outcome indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collection method</th>
<th>Data capture moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome A: Improved availability/usability of fiscal data re: locally prioritized challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Number of new commitments, involving fiscal data, and focused on a locally prioritized challenge, in subnational open government action plans | - Review of subnational action plans in target states  
- Focus group discussion (FGD) to track and understand process | - Upon completion of activity #1 (see ToC) |
| 2. Percent change in data quality, accessibility, and ease of use provided by data producers | - Review and scoring of available data | - Baseline  
- At completion of project |
| 3. Percent change in perception of data users on relevance, accessibility, and ease of use of fiscal data | - Survey with relevant stakeholders about availability and use of fiscal data  
- FGD discussion on findings to vet and understand why these perceptions are so | - Baseline  
- At completion of project |
| **Outcome B: Increased use of fiscal data by local government and civil society to address locally prioritized challenges** | | |
| 1. Percent of follow through on actions identified by group | - FGD with relevant stakeholders at state level | - Midway  
- At completion of project |
| 2. Percent change in fiscal data capacity. Capacity will be understood as:  
A. Understanding of the flow of public resources, especially with regard to the locally identified challenges fiscal process  
B. Ability to find and access fiscal data;  
C. Ability to prepare and analyze fiscal data;  
D. Ability to publish and present data in formats that meet users’ needs  
E. Ability to communicate results and advocate using evidence from fiscal data | - Self assessment surveys  
- FGD and Key Informant Interviews to verify/explain capacity gaps and changes | - Baseline  
- At completion of project |
| 3. Number of relevant stakeholders self-identifying as data users, infomediaries and/or advocates | - Self assessment surveys | - Baseline  
- At completion of project |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome C: Stronger, more effective engagement and collaboration b/w local government and CSOs in using fiscal data to address locally prioritized challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Number of relevant stakeholders reporting use of fiscal data to address local challenges | - Self assessment surveys | - Baseline
- At completion of project |
|  | - FGD with relevant stakeholders at state level | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
| 5. Average stakeholder score for trainings provided by project partners | - Survey (anonymized feedback)
- FGD with participants | - Throughout the project |
| 1. Proportion of relevant stakeholder groups who are represented and engaged throughout the process | - Survey with relevant stakeholders
- FGD discussion | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
| 2. Level of participant engagement throughout the process | - Participant engagement scale ranking | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
| 3. Percent change in stakeholder perception on the strength of collaboration by fiscal data users to address local challenges | - Interviews with relevant stakeholders in target states | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
|  | - FGD with relevant stakeholders at state level | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
| 4. Number Examples of concrete partnership, co-creation, and collaboration between stakeholders from different sectors | - Survey with relevant stakeholders about availability and use of fiscal data | - Baseline
- Midway
- At completion of project |
|  | - FGD with relevant stakeholders at state level | - Midway
- At completion of project |
## Goal indicators

**Goal: Improved use of public resources to address locally prioritized challenges in three Mexican states**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number documented use cases of local stakeholders working together to leverage fiscal data in order to improve the use of public resources with respect to local challenges</td>
<td>- Review of media reports and desk research</td>
<td>- Throughout the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews with relevant stakeholders in target states</td>
<td>- Throughout the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of action plan implementation</td>
<td>- At completion of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Number of documented changes in the use of public resources with respect to locally prioritized challenges | - Process tracing around instances of change - or the lack thereof - in the allocation and/or implementation of public resources to address the local challenges | - At completion of the project |