



FISCAL GOVERNANCE PROGRAM CLOSE-OF-PROGRAM EVALUATION

EVALUATION METHODS NOTE
SEPTEMBER 2021

INTRODUCTION	3
THE FGP CONTEXT	4
FGP THEORY OF CHANGE	5
EVALUATION PURPOSE + QUESTIONS	6
Key Evaluation Questions	7
Strategy Impact	7
External Outcomes in Key Areas	7
Grantmaking Practices	7
Lessons Learned for the Road Ahead	7
EVALUATION DESIGN + METHODS	8
Phase 1: Document Review + Outcome Mining	8
Phase 2: Outcome Description Validation via Grantee Survey	9
Phase 3: Outcome Substantiation via Workshops & Interviews	10
Phase 4: Sensemaking	14
APPENDIX	15

INTRODUCTION

As the world continues to combat the COVID-19 pandemic, grapple with the harsh realities of climate change, and mitigate the rise of nationalist agendas, the need for cross-sector, transnational commitments to greater openness, accountability, and equity in global governance norms and institutions remains salient than ever. Open Society Foundations (OSF) has demonstrated a long-standing awareness and commitment to tackling these issues. Namely, OSF's ***Fiscal Governance Program (FGP)*** was developed to address the ways in which corruption, plutocracy, and populism can undermine public finance management and economic policy-making in ways that hurt society's poorest and most vulnerable.

FGP spanned from 2013-2020. Upon closure of this program, ***OSF commissioned Intention 2 Impact (I2I) to design and execute a multi-faceted and comprehensive close-of-program evaluation*** to explore the achievements of its Fiscal Governance Program (FGP) from 2013-2020, as well as capture lessons learned to inform future strategy and grantmaking practices.

This document provides background information on the ***methodology*** utilized during this evaluation and constitutes ***a supplement to four other marquee evaluation reports*** that unpack the process and outcomes of FGP.

THE FGP CONTEXT

Launched in 2013, the FGP emerged as a thematic funding program intended to consolidate existing grants related to transparency, accountability, and anti-corruption as well as build on this portfolio with a broader strategy to ensure that public resources are used efficiently, effectively, and with accountability to benefit those who need them most.

Over its lifespan, the FGP mission promoted greater openness, accountability, and equity in the fiscal and economic systems globally. However, while the mission remained the same, the overarching strategy of the program adapted over time. Chiefly, in 2017, FGP developed a revised strategy focused on several main portfolios of work, including: *natural resource governance, anti-corruption, open government reforms, tax, public budgets, and trade governance*.

With this strategy, there was an increased emphasis on learning and understanding impact for FGP and its grantees. Additionally, the FGP team made their strategy publicly available in an effort to align with their strategic prioritization of transparency and access to information.

FGP deployed over \$140 million in grants to 127 organizations.

Over its seven years of operations, FGP deployed over \$140 million in grants to 127 organizations and an additional \$2.6 million in direct contracts. The majority (55%) of these resources were invested in the field of natural resource governance (for more on this portfolio, please read "[NRG Outcomes](#)").

FGP THEORY OF CHANGE

FGP had several Theories of Change (ToC) over the years, both at the strategy and portfolio levels. These documents were rich with detail and complexity, serving as important tools to assist with strategy implementation and learning. Ultimately, FGP staff decided to retain only portfolio-level ToCs and did not maintain a comprehensive ToC.

However, FGP did maintain focus on several goals and outcomes:

1. Increase equitable and inclusive participation and transparent governance of economic and fiscal systems

2. Increase accountability of regulatory regimes and the management of public finances and resources to affected populations

3. Increase adoption of evidence-based fiscal and economic policies that are effective, inclusive, and promote equity

4. Improve resilience and health of fiscal governance fields, especially the capacity and leadership of our grantees in their domains.

To achieve these outcomes, FGP committed to a multitude of actions, including:

- providing sustained, targeted, and strategically curated grant support to international and local NGOs with proven track records in fields of shared interest
- supporting collaboration among grantees
- coordinating deliberate convening to build momentum for specific issues areas
- promoting grantee capacity building and organizational health
- providing grantees with the flexibility to manage adaptively
- sharing FGP perspectives and current information on the fields with grantees

EVALUATION PURPOSE + QUESTIONS

The design and implementation of the FGP close-of-program evaluation was motivated by three distinct purposes, that were both summative and formative in nature:

- 1. Gain an Expanded Understanding of the Achievements of the Fiscal Governance Program (FGP) from 2013-2020.** After seven years, there was a desire to examine what was accomplished through FGP's thematic funding strategy on a global scale and summatively explore the extent to which three overarching program strategy goals (policy, process, and accountability) were realized. Specifically, there was a desire to understand the outcomes associated with the Natural Resource Governance (NRG) and Equitable and Accountable Fiscal Systems (EAFS) portfolios (with a prioritization on the budget aspect of EAFS).
- 2. Provide an Assessment of OSF's Grantmaking Practices and Effectiveness as a Funder within FGP.** To inform future grantmaking practices and decisions, a summative and formative process evaluation effort was needed to investigate OSF's grantmaking practices, coordination, and relationships with grantees over the life of the FGP program. Additional insights on the facilitators and barriers of funding at the global level were of high value.
- 3. Develop Lessons Learned for Field Building.** OSF sought to share lessons learned with external stakeholders and key players in the ecosystem of fiscal governance and public resource management to advance the field of transparency, accountability, and participation. Moreover, lessons learned to inform OSF-wide monitoring, evaluation, and learning procedures were also needed to inform future grantmaking and close-of-program procedures.

Key Evaluation Questions

In service of the outlined purposes for this evaluation, the following evaluation was driven by four lines of inquiry that were co-created by the OSF FGP Steering Committee and I2I Evaluation Team:

1. Strategy Impact
2. External Outcomes in Key Areas
3. Grantmaking Practices
4. Lessons Learned for the Road Ahead

Strategy Impact

1. What were the consequences (positive, negative, neutral) of strategic decisions on the fields of work?
 - a. How were the strategic decisions informed? Were they relevant? If yes, to whom?

External Outcomes in Key Areas

2. What were the key outcomes from FGP's work in relation to Natural Resource Governance and Equitable and Accountable Fiscal Systems from 2013-2020?
 - a. To what extent are these outcomes sustainable?
 - b. How, if at all, did FGP support contribute to or hinder these outcomes?
 - c. What is the value of OSF's role in seeding the NRG space? And, to a lesser extent, tax?

Grantmaking Practices

3. Which OSF grantmaking practices were most and least effective in terms of organizational health, advancing the field, and supporting partners to achieve outcomes?

Lessons Learned for the Road Ahead

4. What lessons from the FGP can be applied across the field or to OSF grantmaking practices?
5. What lessons did we learn that can help donors identify good grantmaking practices?
6. What are the benefits of engaging in close-of-program evaluation? How can we apply lessons learned from this evaluation process to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) practices of ongoing or future programs?

EVALUATION DESIGN + METHODS

To fully understand the impact, outcomes, sustainability, grantmaking process, and lessons learned from FGP, the evaluation team designed and implemented multi-phased, mixed-method evaluation that applied an *Outcome Harvesting (OH)* approach. Throughout the process, both quantitative and qualitative data sources were triangulated, as well as archival and newly collected data. In total, there were *four phases* to this methodology.



What is Outcome Harvesting?

Outcome Harvesting is an evaluation method in which the evaluation team identifies, formulates, verifies, analyzes, and interprets outcomes in programming contexts where cause and effect are not fully understood. Unlike traditional evaluation approaches, OH “does not measure progress towards predetermined outcomes, but rather, collects evidence of what has changed, and then, working backwards, determines whether and how an intervention contributed to these changes” (Wilson-Grau, 2019, p. 1).

Phase 1: Document Review + Outcome Mining

Phase 1 of the evaluation approach leveraged a review of previous documents to lay the foundation for the subsequent stages of data collection.

Document Review. The systematic document review served a foundational role for the proceeding data collection methods, enabling the evaluation team to frame future data collection methods related to exploring the consequences of strategic decisions (EQ 1), assessing outcomes (EQ 2), understanding grantmaking practices (EQ 3), and illuminating evaluative lessons learned (EQ 4-6).

To conduct the document review, the evaluation team worked with the EJP team to identify and access the proper documents, before reviewing and analyzing the materials to better understand FGP strategy, outcomes, and grantee experience. The document review included FGP strategy documents, portfolio outcome maps, portfolio reviews, grantee reports, a recently constructed data mining database, previous M&E data, grantmaking procedures, and documented correspondences with grantees. In total, the evaluation team ***reviewed 70 documents***.

Outcome Mining. The evaluation team assisted the EJP team by going through all NRG and EAFS grantee partner reports and proposals to “mine” for all self-reported grantee organization outcomes. These data were input into ‘FGP’s outcome database’. In this way, the ‘FGP outcome database served as another document that the evaluation team reviewed.

Phase 2: Outcome Description Validation via Grantee Survey

Grantee Survey. The reportedly “achieved” NRG and EAFS outcomes from the outcome mining exercise were separately filtered, sorted, and thematically grouped into categories (e.g., public sector norm change, policy implementation), to ascertain “intermediate” or “high-level/longer-term” outcome themes.

Using these outcome themes, data from the document review, and conversations with the EJP team, the evaluation team formulated an online grantee survey, via Qualtrics. The survey allowed grantees to share their perspectives and experiences related to the effectiveness of FGP's grantmaking practices (EQ 3). For NRG and EAFS grantees, a few additional survey questions explored the attainment and sustainability of the mined outcomes, as well as the role of FGP support in achieving these outcomes (EQ 2). The survey was both quantitative and qualitative in nature (please see Appendix A for a copy of the survey), helping to inform the subsequent phases of the evaluation.

Grantee Survey Sample. Grantees who received funding between 2013-2020 were invited¹ to participate in the survey, via email by both the corresponding Program Officer and the evaluation team. Grantees were alerted that the purpose of the survey was not to measure the performance or impact of their work, but rather to help OSF better support grantees and understand the system of enabling factors and barriers related to outcomes. The survey took place in April 2021.

¹ Grantees that were funded early on, related to topics that were never pursued, (i.e., aid transparency) were filtered out, with the help of the EJP team)

Portfolio	Invited to the Survey	Completed the Survey
Anti-Corruption	12	12
Civic Space	1	0
Enhancing Impact	13	5
Fiscal Systems	19	13
NRG	12	12
People Centered Data	2	1
Trade	11	9
TOTAL	70	52 (from 47 orgs)

Phase 3: Outcome Substantiation via Workshops & Interviews

To further substantiate the outcomes and understand exactly how the outcomes were achieved, the evaluation team conducted Outcome Harvesting Workshops and collected primary data sources via interviews.

Outcome Harvesting Workshops. The evaluation team facilitated a series of *four outcome harvesting workshops in June 2021*; one for EJP staff, one for NRG grantees, one for EAFS grantees, and one for other actors in the field (*peer funders and field experts*). During the workshops, the evaluation team presented grantee survey results about the NRG and EAFS intermediate outcomes and higher level impacts and facilitated discussions. These workshops helped refine the outcomes derived from the document review and grantee survey, as well as informed the substantiation and classification (prioritizing and grouping) of the outcomes (ultimately informing evaluation EQ 2).

Outcome Harvesting Workshop Sample. The Outcome Harvesting Workshop were attending by the following:

- External Actors: 8 individuals
- NRG: 7 individuals from 6 organizations
- EJP Team: 7 individuals
- EAFS: 11 individuals from 7 organizations

Interviews. In total, the evaluation team conducted a series of **40 interviews across three purposive samples** (FGP grantees, EJP staff, and external actors (*peer funders and relevant field experts*)). All interviews took place via video or phone conferencing platforms (depending upon the geographic location of the interviewee), lasted approximately 45-60 minutes, and were recorded (with participant permission). The interviews with the three samples addressed all six evaluation questions, with the questions customized for each sample for relevance and to leverage their unique expertise.

The following table breaks down the distribution of interviewees, both who invited and completed an interview. Overall, there was a **response rate of 89%**.

Type of Interviewee	Invited for an Interview	Completed an Interview
Grantees	23	21
EJP Team	10	9
Peer Funder	4	3
External Expert	8	7
TOTAL	45	40

FGP Grantee Interview Sample. A purposeful sample of grantees was selected, based on the grantee responses from Phase 2 Grantee Survey (please see Appendix B for a full breakdown of how these grantees were selected). As depicted in the table below, 23 grantees were invited to engage in the interview process and 21 grantees ultimately completed an interview.

Similar to the Grantee Survey, grantees who were selected to be a part of the interviews were invited, via email by the evaluation team, to engage in a conversation. In the invitation email, the I2I team explicitly stated that the purpose of the interview was not to measure the performance or impact of their work, but rather to help OSF support its grantees and better understand facilitators and barriers to overall outcome attainment.

Portfolio	Invited to the Survey	Completed the Survey	Invited for an Interview	Completed an Interview
Anti-Corruption	12	12	6	5
Civic Space	1	0	0	0
Enhancing Impact	13	5	3	2
Fiscal Systems	19	13	6	6
NRG	12	12	4	4
People Centered Data	2	1	0	0
Trade	11	9	4	4
TOTAL	70	52 (from 47 orgs)	23	21

Grantee interview questions further allowed grantees to share their perspectives and experiences related to OSF's key strategic decisions (answering EQ 1) and the effectiveness of OSF's grantmaking practices across FGP (EQ 3). Once again, for NRG and EAFS grantees, a few additional questions were asked to explore the degree of change, sustainability, and role of FGP's support in an effort to substantiate the outcome harvesting within the NRG and EAFS program areas (EQ 2). Interview questions strategically expanded on survey data, illuminating the “how” and “why” of grantee experience. Please see Appendix C for a copy of the grantee interview protocol.

EJP Staff Interview Sample. Phase 3 interviews with EJP staff explored their perceptions of strategic consequences related to decision-making (EQ 1), key outcomes (EQ 2), and grantmaking practices (EQ 3). Please see Appendix D for a copy of the EJP interview protocol. In total, ***eight interviews*** were conducted with members of the EJP team who had direct experience with the FGP.

Invited for an Interview	Completed an Interview
10	8

Peer Funders + Field Experts Sample. Peer funders and experts were interviewed primarily about the consequences of FGP strategic decisions (EQ 1), FGP’s contribution to these outcomes and sustainability (EQ 2), and their impressions of lessons learned from the FGP (EQ 3). Please see Appendix E for a copy of the external actor interview protocol. The evaluation team collaborated with the EJP team to identify relevant peer funders and field experts to engage in the interviews. In total, **ten interviews** were conducted with peer funders and external actors.

	Invited for an Interview	Completed an Interview
Peer Funder	4	3
External Expert	8	7
TOTAL	12	10

Interview Analysis Procedure. All recorded interview audio was de-identified and transcribed using Scribie, a professional transcription service. To complement the document review, interview transcripts were analyzed by the I2I team members using Directed Content Analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The approach involved several steps: (1) reading through the entirety of the transcripts to obtain a sense of the whole, and (2) re-reading line-by-line to identify codes, (3) mutually co-creating themes and subthemes that emerged from the data, and (4) reading through the data a final time and coding specific excerpts. Throughout this process, the I2I team used MAXQDA, a qualitative data analysis software, to sort each theme to obtain a quantitative count to determine thematic saliency.

Phase 4: Sensemaking

After all data were collected and preliminary data analysis was conducted, the evaluation team hosted a series of three sensemaking sessions with the EJP Team to present high-level findings, facilitate discussions around implications, and understand which types of analyses would be most valuable for the final reporting.

Additionally, grantees who provided quotes who were featured in the final reports engaged in an asynchronous validation process to ensure the evaluation results accurately capture the insights that grantees so generously shared.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Grantee Survey

Introduction

This survey is part of a larger final evaluation effort to explore the outcomes and processes embedded within Open Society Foundation (OSF)'s Fiscal Governance Program (FGP).

Distinct from other OSF funding efforts, the FGP operated from 2013 to 2019, distributing over \$140 million to 127 grantees. Since you were a grantee of the FGP, we would like to hear about your perspectives on FGP and experiences as an OSF grantee. Your input will help us learn more about the FGP's impact and hear your feedback for any opportunities for improvement.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary and 100% confidential. Your responses or your option not to participate will NOT affect your relationship with OSF. Further, this survey will NOT be used to evaluate you or your organization's performance, but rather will be used to inform OSF's ongoing commitment to learning and improvement.

We are asking for one reply per organization, so we recommend the respondent should be the person most familiar with the grant and with your organization's relationship with OSF.

We anticipate the survey will take 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please contact Nina Sabarre (nina@intention2impact.com).

1. Do you wish to participate in this survey?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

To get us started, please answer the following questions about your organization.

1. On behalf of which organization are you responding? [Select one]
 - (Drop down with all organizations to select from)

2. Which of the following fields were you a grantee of in relation to the Fiscal Governance Program (FGP)? Please select the one that **best** applies:
 - Anti-Corruption
 - Open Government
 - Public budgets and public resource management → INSERT SKIP LOGIC TO OUTCOME SECTION
 - Tax → INSERT SKIP LOGIC TO OUTCOME SECTION

- Natural Resource Governance (NRG) → INSERT SKIP LOGIC TO OUTCOMES SECTION
- Trade
- Research and evidence related to one or more fields above
- Other (please specify)

NRG + EAFS Outcomes [NRG + EAFS Grantees ONLY]

The following questions are intended to help us learn more about the outcomes you believe resulted from your time as an FGP grantee.

3. During the FGP grant period(s), to what extent did your organization make progress on the following types of high-level impacts? [SCALE 1-5: no progress at all, a little progress, some progress, a lot of progress, a great deal of progress; Not relevant]
 - a. Public sector policy or norm change
 - b. Private sector policy or norm change
 - c. Public narrative or awareness change
 - d. Public sector policy implementation
 - e. Private sector policy implementation
 - f. Changed allocation or management of public and natural resources
 - g. Strengthened criminal and legal cases on corruption and financial secrecy
 - h. Other, please specify

4. During the FGP grant period(s), to what extent did your organization make progress on the following types of intermediate outcomes? [SCALE 1-5: no progress at all, a little progress, some progress, a lot of progress, a great deal of progress; Not relevant]
 - a. Internal organizational health and/or resilience(e.g., increased internal capacity, improved infrastructure or internal processes)
 - b. Increased capacity and coordination of relevant organizations and agencies
 - c. Increased public or stakeholder awareness and action
 - d. Identified and supported champions for change inside relevant systems, institutions, and actors
 - e. Increased political will for change inside relevant systems, institutions, and actors
 - f. Increased scope and/or depth of partnerships, networks, or coalitions for change
 - g. Developed and tested new models/policy options, guidelines, or approaches
 - h. Gathered needed evidence or research on issue and/or solutions for addressing it
 - i. Produced evidence and investigations
 - j. Other, please specify

5. What were the **most important changes** that occurred as a result of your work funded by OSF's FGP grant(s)? These changes can occur at any level — among individuals, organizations, networks, governments, or corporations. [open-ended]

6. If you are able to share, what other entities or funders support your work? Please list the names of your other funders below. *[open-ended]*

Grantmaking Practices

Thank you for your continued participation. These next questions will explore specific types of financial and non-financial support that OSF provided during your organization's grant period(s).

Valuable Types of Support for Org Health, Outcomes, Field Building

*To begin, we will ask about the extent to which you believe the **financial assistance provided by OSF** was valuable to your organization.*

7. What type(s) of financial support were provided to your organization from FGP? Please select all that apply.
- Core/general support
 - Program-level support
 - Project-support
 - Unsure
 - Other (please specify): _____

→ → → [7a] if selected multiple: What was the primary or most common type of support provided?

- Core/general support
 - Program-level support
 - Project-support
 - Unsure
 - Other (please specify): _____
8. How valuable was each type of financial support to your organization? [Scale 0 to 6: Not At All Valuable, A Little Valuable, Moderately Valuable, Quite Valuable, Extremely Valuable]
- INSERT SELECTED ANSWERS FROM Q7 AS RESPONSE OPTIONS

9. To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statements? [SCALE 1-5: strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree/agree, agree, strongly agree]
- OSF financial support is timely
 - OSF financial support allows us to be flexible in our programming
10. In comparison to your other funders, what, if anything, is distinctive/different, either positive or negative, about OSF financial support? *[open-ended]*

11. Based on your organization's experience and vantage point, to what extent do you perceive FGP's financial support to have contributed to:
[Scale 1 to 5: Significant negative contribution, Some negative contribution, neutral/no contribution, Some positive contribution, Significant positive contribution]
- Your organization's ability to make progress towards your identified fiscal governance goals?
 - Your organization's internal operations and health?
 - Your organization's overall resilience?
 - Advancement of field coordination?
 - Collaboration within the field?
 - Advancement of underheard voices and representation in the field?

*The next set of questions will ask about the extent to which **technical assistance provided by OSF** was valuable to your organization.*

12. My organization received direct technical assistance from OSF-FGP
- Yes
 - No → If no, "Why didn't or couldn't your organization take advantage of any of these types of additional, direct technical support?"
 - Unsure → [skip to next section on "thought partnership"]
13. What type(s) of technical assistance were provided to your organization from FGP? Please select all that apply.
- Strategy design consultation/advice
 - Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning advice and training (via MEL Jamboree or one-on-one engagement)
 - Communications/Social Media consultation or advice
 - Use of OSF voice or platform to communicate about your work or issues
 - Organizational and operational advising (eg board, leadership, fundraising, recruitment)
 - Managing contracts on behalf of your organization (not common)
 - Other (please specify): _____

14. While receiving grantmaking funds from OSF-FGP, how valuable was each type of additional, direct technical support to your organization? [Scale 0 to 6: Not At All Valuable, A Little Valuable, Moderately Valuable, Quite Valuable, Extremely Valuable]
- INSERT SELECTED ANSWERS FROM Q13 AS RESPONSE OPTIONS

15. Based on your organization's experience and vantage point, to what extent do you perceive FGP's technical assistance to have contributed to:
[Scale 1 to 5: Significant negative contribution, Some negative contribution, neutral/no contribution, Some positive contribution, Significant positive contribution]

- a. Your organization’s ability to make progress towards your identified fiscal governance goals?
 - b. Your organization’s internal operations and health?
 - c. Your organization’s overall resilience?
 - d. Advancement of field coordination?
 - e. Collaboration within the field?
 - f. Advancement of underheard voices and representation in the field?
16. How would you characterize your relationship with the FGP or OSF staff mostly closely involved in the technical assistance? Feel free to make note of any power dynamics you experienced.
17. What additional types of technical assistance, if any, would have been useful during this time period?

*The next set of questions will ask about the extent to which **thought partnership provided by OSF** was valuable to your organization. Thought partnership might include supports such as: shared research, shared expert opinions, commissioning of research, strategy conversations, and more.*

18. My organization received thought partnership support from OSF-FGP.
- a. Yes
 - b. No → If no, “Why didn’t or couldn’t your organization take advantage of any of these types of additional, thought partnership support?”
 - c. Unsure → Skip to next section
19. While receiving grantmaking funds from OSF-FGP, which types of additional, thought partnership support did your organization receive? Please select all that apply.
- a. Sharing insights and information from OSF observations on the field or particular topics (OSF opinion)
 - b. Sharing insights or research gathered from other sources
 - c. Commissioning research or project work to overcome a particular field dilemma or meet a new opportunity
 - d. Engaging in strategy or organizational positioning conversations
 - e. Other (please specify): _____
20. How valuable was each type of thought partnership support to your organization? [Scale 0 to 6: Not At All Valuable, A Little Valuable, Moderately Valuable, Quite Valuable, Extremely Valuable]
- a. INSERT SELECTED ANSWERS FROM Q19 AS RESPONSE OPTIONS
21. Based on your organization’s experience and vantage point, to what extent do you perceive FGP’s thought partnership support to have contributed to:
[Scale 1 to 5: Significant negative contribution, Some negative contribution, neutral/no contribution, Some positive contribution, Significant positive contribution]

- a. Your organization’s ability to make progress towards your identified fiscal governance goals?
 - b. Your organization’s internal operations and health?
 - c. Your organization’s overall resilience?
 - d. Advancement of field coordination?
 - e. Collaboration within the field?
 - f. Advancement of underheard voices and representation in the field?
22. How would you characterize your relationship with the FGP or OSF staff mostly closely involved in the thought partnership? Feel free to make note of any power dynamics you experienced.
23. What additional types of thought partnership, if any, would have been useful during this time period?

*The next set of questions will ask about the extent to which **networking support provided by OSF** was valuable to your organization. Networking support might include supports such as: hosting convenings, forging connections with civil society organizations, providing access to decision-makers, or providing introductions to other funders.*

24. My organization received networking support from OSF-FGP
- a. Yes
 - b. No → If no, “Why didn’t or couldn’t your organization take advantage of any of these types of additional, networking support?”
 - c. Unsure → Skip to next section
25. While receiving grantmaking funds from OSF-FGP, which types of additional, networking support did your organization receive? Please select all that apply
- a. Convenings (e.g. shared learning opportunities, events)
 - b. Connecting to other civil society organizations
 - c. Providing access to decision-makers or governments
 - d. Providing access or introductions to other funders and funding opportunities
 - e. Other (please specify): _____
 - f. None → If none: “Why didn’t or couldn’t your organization take advantage of any of these?” [skip to next section]
26. How valuable was each type of networking support to your organization? [Scale 0 to 6: Did Not Receive, Not At All Valuable, A Little Valuable, Moderately Valuable, Quite Valuable, Extremely Valuable]
- a. INSERT SELECTED ANSWERS FROM Q25 AS RESPONSE OPTIONS

27. Based on your organization's experience and vantage point, to what extent do you perceive FGP's networking support to have contributed to:
[Scale 1 to 5: Significant negative contribution, Some negative contribution, neutral/no contribution, Some positive contribution, Significant positive contribution]
- Your organization's ability to make progress towards your identified fiscal governance goals?
 - Your organization's internal operations and health?
 - Your organization's overall resilience?
 - Advancement of field coordination?
 - Collaboration within the field?
 - Advancement of underheard voices and representation in the field?
28. How would you characterize your relationship with the FGP or OSF staff mostly closely involved in the networking support? Feel free to make note of any power dynamics you experienced.
29. What additional types of networking assistance, if any, would have been useful during this time period?

Perceptions of Support

The following questions ask about your relationship with OSF. As a reminder, your honest responses are confidential and will only be shared anonymously with OSF. Your candid feedback is essential in ensuring OSF continues to improve the grantmaking experiences for partners, like you.

30. To what extent do the following characteristics describe your organization's overall relationship with OSF? *[Semantic differential with sliding scale]*
- Inequitable → Equitable
 - Not transparent at all → Transparent
 - Inflexible → Flexible
 - Unresponsive → Responsive
31. Is there anything OSF could have done differently to better support your organization in achieving **desired outcomes**? *[open-ended]*
32. Is there anything OSF could have done differently to better support your organization's **organizational health**? *[open-ended]*

Closing Remarks

Thank you for taking part in this survey. Your responses are instrumental in improving OSF's future grantmaking processes and ongoing learning. If you have any final thoughts, comments, or questions, please leave them in the box below.

[open-ended]

Thank you again for your time. If you have questions about this survey, please contact Nina Sabarre (nina@intention2impact.com).

Appendix B: Grantee Interview Sample Selection Protocol

The following document outlines the FGP Grantee **selection criteria** used to establish the interview sample and the **selected sample demographics**.

CRITERIA USED FOR SELECTION

The sample was selected based on four criteria that emerged from the Grantee Survey. Each is outlined below.

LEVEL 1 CRITERIA: Overall ‘relationship’ rating

The first criteria that was used to develop the sample frame was “overall relationship with OSF.” The criteria was created via the survey data. Using responses to four survey questions (see below), we created a composite (average) score that spanned from 1-10. The survey questions used to inform this composite score were:

“To what extent do the following characteristics describe your organization’s overall relationship with OSF?”

- Inequitable → Equitable
- Not transparent at all → Transparent
- Inflexible → Flexible
- Unresponsive → Responsive

Across the 49 survey respondents, composite score ratings of these four survey questions spanned from 4-10. From there, we created **five categories/intervals (i.e., lower, medium, high, higher, missing scores)** of relationships ratings (as demonstrated in the table below). If a grantee’s composite score fell within that range, they were assigned to that category.

We then proportionally selected a number of grantees from each of the five categories. For example, there were 6 grantees that ended up with an “overall relationship” composite score between 4-6. This range of scores constituted our “lower” category. These 6 grantees represented 13% of the total number of grantees who completed the survey. As such, we included 3 grantees from this category in the survey sample (since 3 is nearly 13% of 20).

	Lower (4-6)	Medium (6.01-8.50)	High (8.75-9.50)	Higher (10)	Missing	TOTAL GRANTEES
# in total sample (% based on 49)	n=6; 12%	n=8; 16%	n=15; 31%	n=13; 27%	n=5; 10%	49

survey respondents)						
# for interviews (% based on 20 needed for interview sample)	3 interviewees needed	3 interviewees needed	6 interviewees needed	6 interviewees needed	2 interviewees needed	20

LEVEL 2 CRITERIA: financial support typology

Once we had these five categories, we selected grantees from each category (1) based on the type of final support they received as a part of FGP as well as (2) their composite score rating of their overall satisfaction with the financial support. Within each category, we aimed to select an equal number of grantees who received “core”, “program,” or “project” support. We also selected an equal number of grantees who rated their satisfaction as low (1-2.5), medium (2.6-3.9) to high (4-5).

- Type of financial support (core, program, project)
- Financial Support ‘Satisfaction’ Composite
 - “To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statements?” (Scale 1-5)
 - OSF financial support is timely
 - OSF financial support allows us to be flexible in our programming

LEVEL 3 CRITERIA: portfolio

As a third layer, we also ensured the grantees selected represented a mix of the various portfolios. At this stage, grantee selection became an art as much as it was a science. For example, to ensure a mix of portfolio representation, we looked across the five initial categories and tweaked and refined our selections, doing the best we could to retain grantees who represented a diverse range of financial support criteria while also attaining a spread of portfolios.

LEVEL 4 CRITERIA: other supports

Further, we ensured the selected grantees had received a mix of technical support, thought partnership, and networking support. This criterion was not difficult to apply, as many grantees had received multiple types of funding.

Appendix C: Grantee Interview Protocol

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. As a refresher, we are speaking with you today as a part of a close-of-program evaluation effort to explore the outcomes and processes embedded

within Open Society Foundation (OSF)'s Fiscal Governance Program (FGP).

Since you were a grantee of the FGP, we would like to hear about your perspectives on FGP and experiences as an OSF grantee. Your input will help us learn more about FGP's efforts and also hear your feedback for any opportunities for improvement.

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and 100% confidential, so we welcome your candor and honesty. Your responses will NOT affect your relationship with OSF. Further, this interview will NOT be used to evaluate you or your organization's performance, but rather will be used to inform OSF's ongoing commitment to learning and improvement.

Do you give consent to participate in this interview?

With your permission, I'd also like to record our conversation, just to help with note taking. All transcripts will be de-identified and they will not be shared with anyone else outside our evaluation team. Further, we will not identify individuals or organizations in any of the reports we create. Is this alright with you?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Opening Questions

Just to kick us off, it would be helpful to learn a bit more about you and your role in your organization.

1. What is your current role at your organization?
 - a. How long have you worked in this capacity?
2. What was your involvement with OSF-funded activities?

NRG + EAFS Outcomes (for NRG + EAFS grantees only)

The following questions are intended to help us learn more about the outcomes you believe resulted from your time as an FGP grantee.

3. What were the key intermediate outcomes your organization achieved, utilizing OSF support, between 2013-2020?
 - a. Can you share with me an example of something you consider a success? (*Probe on several cited outcomes, if needed*)
 - b. Are you able to share an example of something that perhaps didn't go as planned during this time frame that you were able to learn from and were perhaps able to adapt based on?

4. What were the key higher level impacts your organizations achieved, utilizing OSF support, between 2013-2020?
 - a. Can you share with me an example of success? *(Probe on several cited outcomes, if needed).*
 - b. Are you able to share an example of something that perhaps didn't go as planned during this time frame that you were able to learn from and were perhaps able to adapt based on?
5. Thinking about the changes associated with these outcomes that we just discussed, how would you know if these changes -- in any form -- are likely to persist over time and be sustained? For example, what clues or evidence would indicate changes are sustainable or on track to be sustained?
6. To what extent do you think OSF specifically played a role in helping/hindering your organization achieve these outcomes?
 - a. [Ask after grantee's initial response] What other enabling factors, if any, contributed to progress on your outcomes? *[If probing needed, ask about other funders, other potential "windows of opportunity"--perhaps mention current events].*

Grantmaking Practices

Thank you for your honest responses thus far. Our next questions will explore specific types of financial and non-financial support that OSF provided during your organization's grant period(s).

7. Overall, what were your impressions of the **financial support** provided by FGP to your organization?
 - a. For example, how would you describe the timeliness of the financial support provided?
 - b. Furthermore, to what extent did the funding allow you to be flexible in your programming?
8. What modifications or improvements, if any, do you think should be made to OSF's **financial support** processes?
9. Based on your survey responses, I see that you received [INSERT INFO; e.g., *technical assistance, thought partnership, networking support*] as various forms of **non-financial assistance** from OSF. What were your impressions of this non-financial support provided by FGP to your organization?
 - a. For example, to what extent was it timely, useful, flexible?
 - b. How critical was convening and network support to achieving your goals?

10. How did your organization end up receiving these types of **non-financial support**? For example, did you request the assistance or did OSF offer?
11. Of **all the types** of OSF support you received, to what extent was OSF support valuable in terms of:
 - a. Promoting your organization's health?
 - i. Why? Do you have any examples that lead you to this determination?
 - b. Assisting your organization in reaching your goals?
 - i. Why? Do you have any examples that lead you to this determination?
 - c. Advancing the field?
 - i. Why? Do you have any examples that lead you to this determination?
12. Do you notice any difference between the role of OSF and the role of other funders in advancing the overall goals of your organization?
13. What further types of support from OSF, if any, would have been useful during this period?

Questions surrounding importance of FGP strategic decisions

This next set of questions concerns your view of FGP's strategy over the years, with a particular focus on those things that had or are having an effect on the fields where they work. Over the course of FGP, OSF made several (other) strategic decisions. I now want to ask you about your perceptions on some of these and their influence on the field. If you don't have insight on the specific decision, just let me know and we will skip it.

1. OSF entered the trade field in 2016-2017.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
2. In 2017 OSF eliminated its portfolio on open government reform.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
3. Over the course of FGP, OSF decided to dedicate the vast majority of its spending and resources to the NRG field.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
4. In 2017 OSF began a new anti-corruption portfolio, targeting individual and corporate accountability.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?

5. OSF helped to seed and start the Open Government Partnership and the Transparency and Accountability Initiative.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?

6. Lastly, in 2016, FGP made the decision to start focusing on grantee MEL capacity and practice.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?

7. From your perspective, were there any other specific strategic decisions or actions taken by OSF during the FGP period, from 2013-2020, that had noticeable impacts on the field?
 - a. If so, please share what these actions were.

Overall Perceptions

All right! We are now on our last set of questions, which will discuss you and your organization's relationship with OSF. As a reminder, your honest responses are confidential and will only be shared anonymously -- and not as part of an entire transcript -- with OSF. Your candid feedback is essential in ensuring OSF continues to improve the grantmaking experiences for partners, like you.

14. How would you characterize your relationship with the OSF staff with whom you most closely worked?
 - a. To what extent did you and your organization feel you had autonomy when engaging with OSF? Please explain with as much detail as you feel comfortable.
 - b. To what extent did you feel the power dynamics between your organization and OSF influenced (positively or negatively) the outcomes of the grant? Please explain with as much detail as you feel comfortable.

15. In an ideal world, what changes would you make to the OSF grantmaking process to make it more equitable, transparent, flexible, and responsive?

Closing Remarks

Those are all the questions I have for you today!

Do you have any final thoughts, comments, or questions that you would like to share?

Thank you for taking the time to chat with me today. Your responses are instrumental in improving OSF's future grantmaking processes and ongoing learning. If more thoughts arise, please feel free to email me!

Appendix D: EJP Staff Interview Protocol

Introduction

Hello and thanks so much for agreeing to speak with me today. As you know, your input is critical for this close-of-program evaluation to gain insights on FGP's influence on the field in general as well as potential areas for improvement. I want to reiterate that your participation is voluntary and 100% confidential, so we welcome your candor and honesty. Your responses will NOT be shared outside of the evaluation team, and will be de-identified for use by members of the evaluation team only. No individuals or organizations will be identified in any report we create.

Do you give consent to participate in this interview?

With your permission, I'd also like to record our conversation, just to help with note taking. Is this alright with you?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Opening/Background Questions

To begin, it would be helpful to understand a bit about your role in OSF and your work on FGP.

1. Could you tell me a bit about your role in OSF, and how long you have worked in this capacity?
2. Could you tell me more about your involvement with FGP?
 - a. Which portfolio would you say you are most familiar with?

Questions surrounding importance of FGP strategic decisions

This next set of questions concerns your view of FGP's strategy over the years, with a particular focus on those things that had or are having an effect on the fields where you work. First I want to ask you about

your perceptions of specific strategic decisions, and their influence on the field. If you don't have insight on the specific decision, just let me know and we will skip it.

3. In 2017, OSF integrated budget and tax into one portfolio....and then chose to separate them again in 2019.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
4. OSF entered the trade field in 2016-2017.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
5. In 2017 OSF eliminated its portfolio on open government reform?
 - a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
6. In 2017 OSF began a new anti-corruption portfolio, targeting individual and corporate accountability?
 - a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
7. Over the course of FGP, OSF decided to dedicate the vast majority of its spending and resources to the NRG field.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
8. In 2017, OSF dedicated a concept on “People Centered Data Use and Accountability”².

² FGP launched a new multi-country, multi-year partnership with other Transparency and Accountability Initiative (TAI) donor partners (Omidyar, Hewlett, Ford, DFID) with the two goals of (1) increasing our understanding of what financial information local oversight actors and policy influencers really need to effectively address problems of fiscal equity and accountability, and (2) working with existing and new grantees

- a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
9. OSF has also made the choice to make the FGP strategy publicly available.
- a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
10. OSF helped to seed and start the Open Government Partnership and the Transparency and Accountability Initiative.
- a. Were you aware of OSF's role in seeding either of these organizations? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed the decisions to start/seed either?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
11. In 2016, FGP made the decision to start focusing on grantee MEL capacity and practice.
- a. Were you aware of this decision, or do you know why the decision was made? If so, do you know what the evidence-base (e.g., logic, rationale, literature, data) was that informed this decision?
 - b. In your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
12. From your perspective, were there any other specific strategic decisions or actions that OSF took during the FGP period that had noticeable impacts on the fields where it works?
- a. If so, please share what these strategic decisions or actions were and how - specifically - they impacted the field?
 - b. To the best of your knowledge, why were these actions taken? For example, are there evidence-bases that are frequently drawn upon to inform this work?
 - c. What have been the consequences of these actions -- positive, negative or neutral?

NRG + EAFS Outcomes

Thank you for your helpful input thus far. The following questions are intended to help us learn more about the outcomes you believe have resulted from OSF's work in FGP.

to adjust global and local transparency advocacy efforts, as well as capacity-building strategies, to better meet local accountability actors' demand. In partnership with TAI, FGP supported user-centered design workshops in at least two countries with a wide range of stakeholders—government, civil society, private sector, journalists, parliamentarians, independent oversight authorities and prosecutors, affected communities—and shared the results with the field to help partners refine their strategies going forward.

13. What do you feel were the key intermediate outcomes achieved by the NRG or EAFS grantees (only ask NRG or EAFS, based upon the expertise of the interviewee), between 2013-2020?
 - a. Is it possible to talk about a particular example of a success? *(Probe on several cited outcomes if you think it relevant to do so...partnerships, evidence creation, org health, public awareness, champions)*
 - b. Can you think of any examples of things that perhaps didn't go so well during this time frame? *(probe on specific details of the failure and whether anything was adjusted due to learning from it)*

14. What do you feel were the key higher level impacts achieved by NRG or EAFS grantees (only ask NRG or EAFS, based upon the expertise of the interviewee), between 2013-2020?
 - a. Is it possible to talk about a particular example of a success? *(Probe on several cited outcomes if you think it relevant to do so...narrative change, norm change, legislation, policy implementation)*
 - b. Can you think of any examples of things that perhaps didn't go so well during this time frame? *(probe on specific details of the failure and whether anything was adjusted due to learning from it)*

15. Thinking about the changes associated with these outcomes that we just discussed, how would you know if these changes -- in any form -- are likely to persist over time and be sustained? For example, what clues or evidence would indicate changes are sustainable or on track to be sustained?

16. To what extent do you think OSF played a role in helping/hindering to achieve these Outcomes?
 - a. How does this role vary, if at all, from other funders in the field?

Grantmaking Practices

Thank you for your honest responses thus far. Our next questions will explore specific types of financial and non-financial support that OSF provided during FGP implementation.

17. We want to learn a bit about which OSF grantmaking practices, such as financial support, technical assistance (e.g., MEL, Advocacy), networking support, thought leadership, were most and least effective in terms of the following:
 - a. In terms of grantee organizational health:
 - i. What practices were most effective and why
 - ii. What practices were least effective and why?
 - b. In terms of advancing the field of fiscal governance at large:
 - i. What practices were most effective and why?
 - ii. What practices were least effective and why?

- c. Finally, in terms of supporting partners to achieve outcomes:
 - i. What practices were most effective and why?
 - ii. Which practices were least effective and why?
- 18. In an ideal world, what changes would you make to the OSF grantmaking process to make it more equitable, transparent, flexible, and/or responsive?
- 19. Can you point to anything that OSF has done in its FGP grantmaking process that has influenced others who are active in the field? Please feel free to share both positive and negative influences, if relevant.
- 20. What lessons, if any, from FGP do you think can be applied across the field or to OSF grantmaking practices?
- 21. What are your views on the value of close-of-program evaluations in general? Do you think they are helpful for MEL efforts, and if so, how?

Closing Remarks

Do you have any final thoughts, comments, or questions that you would like to share?

Thank you for taking the time to chat with me today. Your responses are instrumental in improving OSF's work and ongoing learning. If more thoughts arise, please feel free to email me!

Appendix D: External Actor Interview Protocol

Introduction

Hello and thanks so much for agreeing to speak with me today. As we communicated via email, this conversation is part of a close-of-program evaluation effort to explore processes and outcomes of Open Society Foundation (OSF)'s Fiscal Governance Program, or FGP. Given that you work in similar technical areas, we would greatly appreciate hearing about your perspectives of OSF's work; your feedback will help us learn more about the influence of FGP on the field in general, as well as potential opportunities for improvement.

I wanted to reiterate that your participation is voluntary and 100% confidential, so we welcome your candor and honesty. Your responses will NOT be shared with OSF, and will be de-identified for use by members of the evaluation team only. No individuals or organizations will be identified in any report

we create. The information you kindly provide during this interview will only be used to inform OSF's ongoing commitment to learning and improvement.

Do you give consent to participate in this interview?

With your permission, I'd also like to record our conversation, just to help with note taking. Is this alright with you?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Opening/Background Questions

To begin, it would be helpful to understand a bit about your work and how it may relate to that of FGP. (Note to I2I team: We should be prepared to answer questions about FGP as a refresher to some respondents.

1. Could you tell me a bit about your role in the organization, and how long you have worked in this capacity?
2. How would you describe how you and your organization's work relates to that of FGP?

Questions surrounding importance of FGP strategic decisions

This next set of questions concerns your view of FGP's strategy over the years, with a particular focus on those things that had or are having an effect on the fields where they work.

3. From your perspective, were there any specific strategic decisions or actions taken by OSF during the FGP period, from 2013-2020, that had noticeable impacts on the field?
 - a. If so, please share what these actions were.
 - b. If so, what have been the consequences of these actions -- positive, negative or neutral?

Over the course of FGP, OSF made several (other) strategic decisions. I now want to ask you about your perceptions on some of these and their influence on the field. If you don't have insight on the specific decision, just let me know and we will skip it. (Note to interviewer: please skip it if already discussed in #3)

4. In 2017, OSF integrated budget and tax into one portfolio....and then chose to separate them again in 2019.

- a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
5. OSF entered the trade field in 2016-2017.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
6. In 2017 OSF eliminated its portfolio on open government reform.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
7. In 2017 OSF began a new anti-corruption portfolio, targeting individual and corporate accountability.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
8. OSF has also made the choice to make the FGP strategy publicly available.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced your work, if at all?
 - i. How has it influenced the field, if at all?
9. OSF helped to seed and start the Open Government Partnership and the Transparency and Accountability Initiative.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?
10. Lastly, in 2016, FGP made the decision to start focusing on grantee MEL capacity and practice.
 - a. Were you aware of this decision? If so, in your estimation how has this influenced the field, if at all?

NRG + EAFS Outcomes

Thank you for your helpful input thus far. The following questions are intended to help us learn more about the outcomes you believe have resulted from OSF's work in FGP.

11. What do you feel were the key intermediate outcomes achieved by OSF's natural resource governance, tax, and budget grantees (only ask NRG or EAFS, based upon the expertise of the interviewee), between 2013-2020? Please tell us if there are additional key outcomes that come to mind that are not represented on this list. Feel free to discuss those as well.
 - a. Is it possible to talk about a particular example of a success? (*Probe on several cited outcomes if you think it relevant to do so.*)

- b. Can you think of any examples of things that perhaps didn't go so well during this time frame? (probe on specific details of the failure and whether anything was adjusted due to learning from it)
12. . What do you feel were the key higher level impacts achieved by OSF's natural resource governance, tax, and budget grantees (only ask NRG or EAFS, based upon the expertise of the interviewee) , between 2013-2020?
- a. Is it possible to talk about a particular example of a success? (*Probe on several cited outcomes if you think it relevant to do so.*)
 - b. Can you think of any examples of things that perhaps didn't go so well during this time frame? (probe on specific details of the failure and whether anything was adjusted due to learning from it)
13. Thinking about the changes associated with these outcomes that we just discussed, how would you know if these changes -- in any form -- are likely to persist over time and be sustained? For example, what clues or evidence would indicate changes are sustainable or on track to be sustained?
14. To what extent do you think OSF played a role in helping/hindering to achieve these outcomes?
- a. How does this role vary, if at all, from other funders in the field?
 - b. What do you see as the contribution of other actors' achievements?

Grantmaking Practices

Thank you for your honest responses thus far. Our next questions will explore the types of financial and non-financial support that OSF provided during FGP implementation.

15. Are you familiar at all with OSF's grantmaking practices? For example, the types of financial, technical, and organizational support they provide to their grantees?
- a. If so, are there any particular practices that you think have affected grantee organizational capacity or the field in general?
 - b. What, if anything, do you think is missing from OSF's grantmaking practices?
16. Can you point to anything that OSF has done in FGP that has influenced others who are active in the field? This might be peer funders, experts, or external actors, like yourself.
- a. Please feel free to share both positive and negative influences, if relevant.

Closing Remarks

Those are all the questions I have for you today!

Do you have any final thoughts, comments, or questions that you would like to share?

Thank you for taking the time to chat with me today. Your responses are instrumental in improving OSF's work and ongoing learning. If more thoughts arise, please feel free to email me!