



GLOBAL INTEGRITY

Data, Learning & Action for Open Governance

Interim Narrative Report - Grant #2017-5808 (\$1,500,000.00)

Global Integrity is reporting on an unrestricted general support grant (Grant #2017-5808 - July 10, 2017 - July 10, 2020) that has covered expenses from July 10, 2017 through this reporting date. To help the Hewlett Foundation evaluate this grant, Global Integrity is providing a general overview of the organization's institutional progress, as well as providing the following summary of the kinds of work we conducted during the grant period. As you are aware, the Foundation did not impose any restrictions on the use of the grant in order to leave us the discretion to spend the grant funds on activities not described here, including administrative expenses, provided that any activity paid for with grant funds was consistent with Global Integrity's tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3). Grant funds were not kept separate from our general funds, and this report describes our work generally during the grant period and is not limited to activities charged to the Foundation's grant.

Our most recent annual report (covering all of 2017) details our progress over 2017,¹ while our May 2018 Integrity Insider covers our work over the first part of 2018.² The text below is taken directly from these two sources. Complete versions are linked in the footnotes.

1. [2017 Annual Report](#)
2. [May 2018 Integrity Insider](#)

¹ http://www.globalintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/AnnualReport_2017.pdf

² <https://www.globalintegrity.org/about/integrity-insider/integrity-insider-may-2018/>

1. 2017 Annual Report

2017 was a challenging year for champions of open governance, including for those of us enduring at close quarters the democratic reversals and increasingly closed governance of a Trump-led US administration.

Political transitions and turbulence around the world have posed challenges to the open governance agenda, including in several of the founding members of the Open Government Partnership. There have also been, not unrelatedly, growing questions about whether and how open governance can help to address poverty, inequality and social marginalization, and the day-to-day problems that people face as a result. And, more parochially, the challenge of working out whether and how organizations such as ours - working on global development issues, from a base in the US - can most effectively support progress towards more open governance in far away places, remains.

In 2017, Global Integrity stepped up to meet each of these challenges head on, both through our work in particular countries and through our global advocacy.

We've been thrilled to launch "[Defending Democracy: Lessons from around the world](#)", a collaboration with colleagues at the Sunlight Foundation and Transparency International, based out of the Open Gov Hub. This program provides a space for cross-border learning about defending democracy, in order to strengthen and support the efforts of those of us who are resisting the rolling back of democratic norms in the US and beyond.

We've challenged and sharpened thinking around the [value of open governance](#), encouraging greater attention to the [use of data](#), addressing issues around [power and learning](#), informing the evolution of approaches to [assessing governance](#) and tackling corruption, and - through our engagement with Professor Yuen Yuen Ang and her paradigm-changing analysis of "[how China escaped the poverty trap](#)" - encouraging exploration of how learning and adaptation can take place in environments that are not so open.

And, we've demonstrated that a small organization, working on global issues, can add value to the work of reformers around the world as they try, learn and adapt their way towards effective solutions to complex and fundamentally political development problems. Our groundbreaking work with [Making All Voices Count](#) grantees in Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Indonesia and the Philippines is one example of how we've demonstrated our value. Our field-leading work on understanding and improving the [fiscal data landscape in Mexico](#) is another.

As we get into 2018, challenges remain on all three fronts. But what we've learned over the course of 2017, combined with our ever-stronger culture and practice of learning, and the creative collaborations we're part of - with colleagues at the Open Gov Hub and across the countries where we work - put us in a strong position to support progress towards more open and effective governance here in the US, and around the world. And if you're keen to partner, or simply have questions or feedback about our work, please do drop our Executive Director a line at alan.hudson@globalintegrity.org

Our Programs

We're continuing the organizational evolution that we began in 2015, from an organization known primarily for our high quality research, to being known as the lead innovator in putting adaptive learning - and the partnering with in-country reformers that that entails - at the center of the open governance agenda. Throughout 2017, and in our plans for 2018, we further our commitment to demonstrating such methods, and to sharing lessons learned widely and advocating for more adaptive programming from the entire sector.

We support the work of in-country reformers, sometimes directly through our own research and on-the-ground programming, and also through our influence on a wider network of international organizations working on related missions. Our efforts rely on our core service strands - all of which inform our data, strategy, learning, and global advocacy. In 2017, our programmatic work covered 61 countries.

Below, find detail on what we've been working on, what we're learning, and what we're planning for 2018.

Integrity and Anti-Corruption (IAC)

About this program

Our work in this program area aims to strengthen the efforts of domestic and international actors working to craft solutions to governance and corruption-related challenges. We work with our partners to improve the quality, use and impact of governance data and help them to develop and apply innovative approaches to engage with complexity and power.

In 2017, we pursued these goals by producing a new round of our [Africa Integrity Indicators](#), working with Transparency International chapters in Tunisia and Georgia to explore [how citizens decide to act](#) against corruption, contributing to workshops focused on '[Doing Anti-Corruption Differently](#),' and engaging with various external actors, including the Millenium Challenge Corporation, the World Bank, and others, with respect to the use and usefulness of governance indicators.

What we did, and achieved, in 2017

Upon completing the 2017 Africa Integrity Indicators, we offered governments and NGOs in Africa the opportunity to review and comment on the draft data. The governments of Egypt, Togo and Mauritania sought to understand and supplement the data and thereby improve the quality of the final dataset. We published our findings as easy to use [infographics](#).

We also contributed a chapter to the [Palgrave Handbook of Indicators in Global Governance](#), in which we explore the evolution of Global Integrity's approach to governance indicators. We discuss the importance of ensuring that governance data is useful to domestic actors and consider the implications of prioritizing indicators about governance functions over those that focus on form. We are glad to see an uptick in the discussions around this important conceptual frontier, including at major institutions such as the World Bank.

The outputs of our work with Transparency International - coming in the first quarter of 2018 - will help anti-corruption practitioners and funders better understand how they can contribute more effectively to fostering citizen action against corruption around the world.

We also worked with Professor Paul Heywood and the British Academy to organize a series of workshops that brought together academics, practitioners and policy-makers across a range of countries and institutions to think through how they might more effectively analyze and address the varied causes, manifestations, effects, and consequences of corruption.

What we learned in 2017

The 2017 round of Africa Integrity Indicators - despite the engagement from Egypt, Togo, and Mauritania - generated less uptake and country-level interest than in 2016. This indicates to us that, though we put a good amount of effort into country outreach, our research - like many assessments - needs to better address the priorities of country level actors if it is to play a useful role in supporting meaningful reform. More on this to come in 2018!

Multi-stakeholder Governance Initiatives (MSGIs)

About this program

Our work in this area aims to sharpen the impact and effectiveness of MSGIs, primarily by supporting their efforts to put learning center-stage, and by helping country-level partners leverage MSGIs in particular places to tackle governance challenges in their contexts.

In 2017, we pursued these goals in various ways, including through supporting partners in Costa Rica in strengthening local multistakeholder OGP processes, engaging with members of the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency, and supporting the efforts of CSOs in Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Indonesia, and the Philippines to strengthen citizen engagement in sub-national governance processes, and OGP, in their contexts.

What we did, and achieved, in 2017

In Costa Rica, we helped our partners at Costa Rica Integra leverage the evidence we'd gathered, to encourage, and achieve, [more effective, balanced collaboration](#) between civil society and government on the Costa Rica OGP multistakeholder forum.

In [Tanzania](#), we facilitated community-level improvements in the accountability and inclusiveness of local governance councils; in [Indonesia](#), we helped our partners at Prakarsa learn and adapt their way towards overcoming thorny political challenges, and successfully advocating for evidence-based policy making; in the [Philippines](#), we worked with local civil society organizations to deepen participatory budgeting processes, even in a challenging national context; and in [Kenya](#), we supported efforts to implement national OGP commitments at community level.

And across these countries, we developed and applied a participatory, learning-centered, and adaptive, project management methodology. This methodology combined comparative, cross-country peer learning with robust bilateral engagement to improve the capacity of civil society organizations working at country level, and generate evidence on how external actors - MSGIs, donors, and others - can support local change agents more effectively. For more on the project, check out [this summary brief](#), and/or visit our [Youtube page](#). [Our website](#) has even more info, including [a brief](#) on how to support effective learning and adaptation at country level, a [full synthesis paper](#), and case stories produced by our partners.

What we learned in 2017

Our work in 2017 demonstrated the importance of paying attention to the [interpersonal relationships and incentives](#) that our partners - at country level and in MSGIs, INGOs, and donors - confront in the complex systems in which they work, and pursue reform. To maximize our influence and impact, we need to do a better job of understanding those political dynamics, and of providing support that helps our partners engage with and shape them. Only having done that can we effectively contribute to, and support, meaningful systems change.

We also learned that some of our communications products, and the way in which we release those products, isn't quite getting to the actors who might find those products most useful. This is most clear in the uptake from our Learning to Make All Voices Count project - there's been a good deal of response and engagement by external actors and international governance organizations, but far less engagement by CSOs working in particular countries. We need to do better at understanding the challenges they're facing and designing activities or outputs that might help.

Open Fiscal Governance (OFG)

About this program

Our work on open fiscal governance aims to sharpen the impact and effectiveness of pro-reform actors pursuing more open fiscal governance. We do this by: supporting in-country partners in their efforts to access and use fiscal data to address problems in their contexts; working with global partners to develop policies and standards that encourage data use, learning, and adaptation at the country level; and facilitating collaboration between in-country reformers and global actors.

In 2017, we pursued these goals in various ways. First, by working with partners in Mexico to support reformers from government and civil society at the subnational level in their efforts to strengthen citizen participation and accountability as regards the use of public resources. And second, through promoting dialogue among global and in country reformers – including the Open Contracting community, and members of the Follow the Money network – on how to bridge the gap between improving the availability of data and strengthening the use of that data to solve problems that citizens care about.

What we did, and achieved, in 2017

In Mexico, we've helped INAI - the national access to information institute - and GESOC - a CSO leading the way on transparency and accountability issues across Mexico - promote and support subnational efforts to use data on public resources to address local challenges – like gaps in the delivery of infrastructure at the municipal level. We've built relationships with local stakeholders in government and civil society in six states, and worked with them to better understand the challenges they face. We're currently preparing citizen-led assessments of existing policies and data around specific problems – using our Treasure Hunt method – to inform the design and implementation of local initiatives in each state.

We've also promoted dialogue on the use of fiscal data to address problems that matter to citizens. We've done this in various ways, including: facilitating a [workshop](#) with the Open Contracting Partnership around experiences about opening, linking, and using open data to follow the money; leading a [panel](#) discussing challenges on promoting open government at the subnational level; and hosting, in collaboration with the Transparency and Accountability Initiative, The Open Data Charter, and the Latin American Open Data Initiative, a workshop conversation on challenges and lessons around [data, use and accountability](#).

All of these efforts have provided a useful space for reflection about how different approaches to supporting the use of data are playing out in practice, and how the open data community might more effectively leverage these approaches to address different problems. This is an important step towards increasing the impact and effectiveness of organizations working to increase the availability and support the use of data.

What we learned in 2017

Our work in five Mexican states, in which we're supporting efforts to open and use fiscal data to address local challenges, is enabling us to explore how the incentives of different local stakeholders, and the ways in which they work, need to be taken in consideration when opening and promoting the use of fiscal data. With this in mind, we are paying greater attention to local stakeholders' work and interests, in order to help them find meaningful ways of engaging with the project, and finding value in ongoing local dialogues around subnational open government.

Additionally, a key initial assumption in this project in Mexico was that subnational spaces for open government would continue functioning well – as they worked in previous years. This has been the case in some states, but in others local political dynamics – like elections and changes in key government representatives – have affected the pace of conversations. This has taught us that, in order to strengthen existing local space for reform, we need to strengthen the role of existing actors, and explore complementary entry points for promoting local dialogue, and bring in new contributors as well.

These actions are bearing fruit and we have seen encouraging movement in local conversations, We will keep making use of our project's monitoring, evaluation, and [learning plan](#) to uncover insights about

these dynamics and use them to adapt our strategies as we move forward so we are able to better support their work.

3.4 Open Gov Hub (OGH)

About this program

Through our leadership of the Open Gov Hub, which we co-founded in 2012 and manage in partnership with Development Gateway, we aim to increase the impact of the global open governance movement by facilitating learning, innovation, and collaboration among organizations in this field. The Open Gov Hub brings together over 40 like-minded organizations (and over 200 individuals) to share resources and work together in a variety of ways (in addition to hosting an average of 1,000 visitors/month).

What we did, and achieved, in 2017

2017 was an exciting year for the Open Gov Hub. We implemented our first-ever [strategy](#) (published summer 2016), including through our “[2017 Collaboration Toolkit](#) -” a menu of 25 different high-priority activities, collaboratively developed and led by a dozen of our individual leaders from within our community (to practice what we preach!). These efforts helped us make progress towards maximizing our community’s shared impact. We doubled our activity in 2017 compared to 2016 (hitting a record number of 150 activities/events in 2017, or 3 per week), while prioritizing activities that align with our Hub strategic objectives and themes, and our members’ interests and needs.

Our programmatic growth facilitated a real culture shift in our community, which became far more open, connected and organically collaborative in 2017 (see the Hub Director’s talk [here](#)). We saw new connections being made between organizations almost daily, especially during the second half of 2017. Anecdotal evidence supports this observation, as do our member survey results, which show a significant uptick in collaboration, including a 30 percentage point increase in knowledge of others’ work and collective identity, and significant increase in frequency and reported outcomes of collaborations.

Just a few examples of collaboration outcomes include:

- one organization giving media training for another, helping that group successfully launch their flagship report and secure media coverage for it in [the Washington Post](#), [NPR](#) and other outlets;
- and one organization temporarily “borrowing” a staff member from another organization (from Global Integrity) to help them successfully spin off from their fiscal sponsor and become an independently operating entity, along with numerous other staff referrals.

Finally, we also shepherded the development of four joint funding proposals involving a total of 10 different organizations. This resulted in the launch of our exciting new collaborative program, [Defending Democracy](#), in which we’re working with the Sunlight Foundation and Transparency International to link international and US efforts to defend and strengthen democratic norms and practices.

What we learned in 2017

In our experimental efforts to create an environment conducive to collaboration, we learned some key lessons. The first is that informal, casual spaces for organizations and individuals to get to know and trust one another, are even more important than formal spaces for working together. The second is that decentralizing leadership can generate significant community benefits, as many individuals step up in small ways to support collective efforts. The third is the importance of establishing clear, predictable rhythms of activity (For example, email digests and whiteboard prompts every Monday) that make it easier for various individuals to plug in to shared efforts designed to make the whole larger than the sum of its parts. Related to all these, we also realized that people are ultimately every organization's top asset, so a key way the Open Gov Hub can continue to transformatively support its members is by continuing to provide a pool of vetted talent, and support shared staffing to enable our member organizations to have greater impact.

Internally, we also learned how valuable it is to pause on a regular basis and reflect on what we're doing, including by establishing quarterly learning sessions for our team - as for the wider Global Integrity team - in 2017.

What's next - Global Integrity Adapting into 2018

In 2018, we'll build on the good work we did in 2017, and continue leveraging our retooled monitoring, evaluation and learning system to incorporate 2017's key lessons - as well as new ones that emerge throughout the course of 2018 - into our ways of working. Program by program, this means that:

Integrity and Anti-Corruption (IAC)

We intend to make a major push to better understand how, when and why governance data is useful to country level actors, including through a revised and more user-focused Africa Integrity Indicators project;

We'll contribute to the emerging thinking about an approach to corruption that starts with specific problems, rather than with ready-made conceptions of what corruption is and why and how it needs to be curbed;

We also plan to test a participatory and inclusive approach to mapping corruption in specific sectors at country level, with a view towards supporting country level action on corruption problems, including by fostering reform coalitions.

Multi-Stakeholder Governance Initiatives (MSGIs)

We'll be continuing to flesh out, in collaboration with colleagues at the Open Government Partnership, the Open Data Charter, and Open North, how to broaden and deepen support for systematic learning and adaptation in OGP processes;

We'll also be kicking off the Learning Collaborative³, a partnership with Twaweza, CEGSS⁴, De Justicia, the Accountability Research Center, and MIT/GOV Lab, in which we'll be working collectively to improve both our own capacities for learning and adaptation, and that of the field;

We'll be providing on-demand learning and implementation support to our partners in particular countries, and helping them navigate the complex governance challenges they face - including through leveraging MSGIs;

And finally, we intend to improve our communications functions, and work with MSGI partners in and across countries to ensure that the evidence we produce - and the way we produce and share it - helps them tackle the challenges they face.

Open Fiscal Governance (OFG)

We will continue to learn with and from our Mexican partners about how to better use data to improve the use of public resources. Our work will move from identifying and agreeing on areas for collaboration, to more deeply exploring data availability and use in ways that are relevant for local stakeholders, and fit the context in which they work.

We'll also make a conscious effort to sharpen our methods and tools so they better respond to our partners' needs and interests, including through continuing to refine and test our Treasure Hunt method in Mexico and in collaboration with other partners such as the Open Contracting Partnership. We will get systematic feedback on our efforts to facilitate dialogue, develop capacities, and enable monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation at the local level. And, we will test out different ways to communicate our work to different audiences.

Finally, we'll keep leveraging our country-level work to inform global level dialogue on the use of fiscal data, including through writing a chapter on the [state of open data for accountability and anti corruption](#) in advance of the International Open Data Conference in Buenos Aires.

Open Gov Hub (OGH)

In 2018 we look forward to formalizing a process for how the Open Gov Hub innovates and adapts its programs in response to the evolving needs and interests of our community. We hope this will help us enable even more rapid, relevant spaces for collaboration, while allowing us to better document how we're doing and what we're learning with time.

We also plan to pilot and refine an intro to opengov training for government and other delegates, and are excited for a full year of monthly Democracy Dialogues and case studies reflecting on international experiences, in order to inform and strengthen the efforts of US-focused democracy advocates facing new challenges to American democracy.

³ Full name: Transparency, Accountability, and Participation Learning Collaborative

⁴ Full name: Centro de Estudios para la Equidad y Gobernanza en los Sistemas de Salud

2. May 2018 Integrity Insider

This week sees the whole team back at the Open Gov Hub for the first time in several weeks. Johannes and Elsa are just back from the [Mo Ibrahim Foundation's Governance Weekend](#) in Rwanda. Jorge is recently returned from a three-week road-trip across Mexico, working with access to information commissions and civil society organizations in five states to assess and improve the usefulness of information about the flow of public resources. And I've been busy with trips to Tanzania for [Twaweza's Ideas and Evidence reflection session](#), and Mexico for a [National Open Government Summit](#) (see [here](#) for a piece inspired by that event).

Amongst the travel, and our intensive efforts across our program areas, we've also taken advantage of the welcome trend towards more open donor strategies, providing commentary on revised strategies on transparency, accountability and fiscal governance published by [DFID](#) and the [Open Society Foundations](#), as well as on the [Hewlett Foundation's draft learning strategy](#).

Last but not least, we've set in motion two streams of consultancy work, to improve our own effectiveness. First, with Adrio Bacchetta at [Sandstone Consulting](#) and [Linda Keene Solomon](#), to focus our vision, clarify our value proposition, and sharpen up our offer of products and services. And second, with Eugene Flynn at [54 Degrees](#), to help us better communicate with potential partners, funders and advocacy targets. Oh, and in case you missed it, we published our [Annual Report for 2017](#) in February.

[Integrity & Anti-Corruption](#)

What We've Been Doing

We've been working tirelessly over the first few months of 2018 to finalize the Africa Integrity Indicators data collection, and have published the provisional [data](#). We've also reached out to governments and civil society organizations across Africa, to ask for feedback about the data and to learn whether and how the data is useful to them.

In March, as part of our project on how to mobilize citizen action against corruption, we led a learning workshop for Transparency International as part of our joint effort to better understand how to generate [impact](#). The event focused on how domestic and external stakeholders can support meaningful and sustained citizen action against corruption. We are putting final touches on the full report from the project, and will publish in May.

We have also supported the [U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Center](#) to think through and design an anti-corruption innovation lab, [TRIAL](#), which aims to develop and test new approaches to tackling corruption. And finally, we have explored with a number of partners whether and how they might take more adaptive approaches to their work on corruption. This has included engagement with the Center for International and Private Enterprise, collaboration with the Partnership for Transparency at the World Bank [Civil Society Policy Forum](#), participation at the Mo Ibrahim Foundation's [Governance Weekend](#), and attendance at the National Endowment for Democracy's event on illicit flows, in Ghana.

What We've Learned

Our work builds on the insight that addressing complex problems requires stakeholders to try, learn and adapt their way towards solutions. We have, over the course of many months, been making this case to one of our key partners, suggesting that their approach to working with data might need to change. Despite some encouraging signs, it has proved more difficult than expected to persuade this partner that our joint work ought to evolve. We have learned that, in the future, we ought to be more thoughtful, up-front, about how much time to invest in trying to get partners onto the same page as us, and spend more time better understanding our partners' positions and constraints.

Multi-Stakeholder Governance Initiatives

What We've Been Doing

We've been hard at work as part of the Transparency, Accountability, and Participation Learning Collaborative, a collaboration involving [Twaweza](#) (Tanzania and East Africa), [Dejusticia](#) (Colombia), [CEGSS](#) (Guatemala), which aims to strengthen the participants' capacity, and that of the transparency and accountability field, to effectively learn and adapt. Following on from the project kick-off meeting in Colombia in February, we're now in discussions with civil society partners in Kenya, Indonesia, and South Africa about how we can support their implementation of projects related to the [Open Government Partnership](#) (OGP).

We've also supported the [Executive Session on the Politics of Extractive Industries](#), and worked with its members to more effectively integrate cycles of learning and adaptation into their MSGIs-related work, including in projects tied to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.

Last but not least we've been engaged in various things related to the OGP, from helping the OGP Support Unit think through how to support more effective peer learning in and across OGP countries, to putting together a proposal – along with [Open North](#) and the [Open Data Charter](#) – that centers on supporting data-driven learning in multi-stakeholder forums to improve the design and implementation of ambitious OGP commitments.

What We've Learned

We're a small team at Global Integrity. This means that we need to be strategic and selective about the organizations and individuals we try to engage. When we're not – as was sometimes the case this past quarter – we end up spreading ourselves too thin, and spending valuable time and resources on engagements that aren't of much strategic value, and which reduce our overall efficiency.

Moving forward, we will be more strategic, and focus our efforts on a few, strategically relevant partners (and potential partners), and partners who have already expressed interest in working with us. While remaining open to unexpected opportunities, we hope that greater selectivity will help us to make the most of our limited resources.

Open Fiscal Governance

What We've Been Doing

This quarter we have doubled down on our engagement with local stakeholders, in support of their efforts to address challenges relating to social policy, public works, corruption, and public procurement. This has enabled us to better understand their needs, and adjust our activities accordingly.

In Mexico, working alongside GESOC and the National Institute for Access to Information, we have provided in-person and online support to local partners in five states as they seek to access and use data about public resource spending in relation to specific sectoral problems. Our approach begins with local challenges selected by our partners – governments, civil society organizations and access to information commissions – and aims to facilitate dialogue and build the capacity that is need to drive progress towards more open fiscal governance and improved development results.

We've also worked to strengthen open contracting in various places. In New York we [partnered with the Open Contracting Partnership and Reboot](#). We challenged citizens and government representatives to use procurement data to improve the participation of minority and women owned businesses in city procurement (see [this post](#) too). In Africa, we are working with the The Africa Freedom of Information Center and the Open Contracting Partnership to support the emerging African Open Contracting Working Group (see [this piece](#) from AFIC on the Ugandan model of open contracting).

Finally, we've been advocating for improved use of open data for anti-corruption. This has included participating in discussions informing the Summit of the Organization of American States (see [here](#) for Jorge's webinar on open data and anti-corruption, and [here](#) a declaration put together by our friends at [ILDA](#), which we co-signed in advance of the Summit) and writing a chapter for the State of Open Data report that will inform dialogue at the International Open Data Conference in Argentina this September.

What We've Learned

We have been engaging with local partners in Mexico, facilitating dialogue and helping them to better understand the challenges they face, and the opportunities available for improving the use of public resources. Yet the capacities of partners, the scope for dialogue and other aspects of the political landscape, vary from state to state. We are accounting for these differences, and adjusting our methods accordingly in order to more effectively increase the impact of our partners.

As a result of this we are diversifying the ways in which we communicate with our local partners and facilitate dialogue and collaboration amongst them. For instance, by facilitating working groups in some states while using different channels to communicate with civil society and governments in others. We also revised the documents and materials we are producing so these can be more practical and helpful for local stakeholders as they navigate the complex challenges they face.

[OpenGov Hub](#)

What We've Been Doing

In recent months the Open Gov Hub has been busy with new and ongoing work. We've been piloting new ways to engage international government delegations and other external partners, adding new members, and further improving the support we provide for our members' learning and collaboration. To accommodate the persistent high demand for Hub membership, we've embarked on a space-sharing partnership with our friends and office neighbors at [Global Giving](#).

We organized over 40 activities in the first quarter of the year to promote learning, collaboration and innovation across different groups for open governance (check out the [Hub blog](#) for highlights). We also recently concluded a rebranding process with a communications consultant to help us better understand our audiences, tailor our programs and refresh our brand.

What We've Learned

As a result of researching our different audiences, we discovered that the Open Gov Hub, at its core, is a meeting place – both a physical and virtual hub for a tremendous variety of diverse people, organizations, ideas and resources to connect. We now constantly ask ourselves how can we be the best possible meeting place to help advance more open, accountable, responsive and citizen-driven governance around the world. And because we lie at the crossroads and intersection of so many different actors, the Hub team is increasingly engaging with more external partners – from international and local governments to universities and anti-corruption advocacy networks. Our increased external partner engagements is a good sign of our growth and fulfilling our role as facilitator of connections. Yet at the same time, we are striving to keep in mind that we are a small team with limited capacity and therefore would benefit from more narrowly defining and prioritizing specific external partners to engage with and influence.