



ON NIGERIA 2.0

CASE STUDIES: COLLABORATION STORIES

Evaluation and Learning Partner Team:

Lauren Else, Michael Moses, Pragati Godbole, Wali Tajzada, Lynne Franco, Isabella Gallegos, Clement Akeoba, and 'Sumbo Oladipo

Contact:

Michael Moses

Senior Advisor

mmoses@encompassworld.com

EnCompass LLC

1100 Wayne Ave #1200

Silver Spring, MD 20910

Tel: +1 301-287-8700



Contents

- CONTENTS..... I**
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY II**
 - Background and Methods ii
 - Overview of Cases..... ii
 - Findings iii
 - Conclusions..... iii
- INTRODUCTION..... 1**
- METHODOLOGY 2**
- CASE 1: JOINBODI-LED COLLABORATION TO STRENGTHEN WHISTLEBLOWING PROTECTIONS 3**
- CASE 2: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ACJMC IN GOMBE STATE 7**
- CASE 3: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PDSS IN ABUJA 10**
- FINDINGS..... 13**
 - How are grantees engaging “voice” and “teeth” actors and collaborating in the accountability ecosystem? 13
 - What has been accomplished through grantees’ collaboration efforts? 15
 - What are the essential elements of effective collaboration that may contribute to anticorruption results, and how do they emerge? 17
 - To what extent have grantee-led activities contributed to enduring collaborations involving ecosystem actors? 20
- CONCLUSIONS 21**

Executive Summary

Background and Methods

The MacArthur Foundation’s Big Bet On Nigeria program aims to combat corruption in Nigeria through grantee-led efforts to support and strengthen transparency, participation, and accountability. A central element of On Nigeria’s strategy includes collaboration involving diverse actors—including “voice” actors, or those demanding accountability; and “teeth” actors, the government/parastatal officials and entities responsible for implementing anticorruption activities. This report first highlights three “cases,” or grantee collaborations with partners from the government, the private sector, and civil society, then presents cross-case findings that emerged from the three collaborative efforts. To develop this learning product, the Evaluation and Learning (EL) Partner identified cases through a review of previous learning products and grantee reports. In consultation with the On Nigeria Program Team, three initiatives were selected for further analysis. The team conducted 18 key informant interviews with 23 respondents, analyzed and synthesized the data, and produced the case studies, findings, and conclusions presented in this report.

Overview of Cases

Snapshot of sampled collaborative initiatives

Case and key grantees	Types of collaborative relationships	Collaborative activities by grantees and partners
<p>Case 1: Joinbodi-led Collaboration to Strengthen Whistleblowing Protections</p> <p><i>African Center for Media and Information Literacy (AFRICMIL), Shehu Musa Yar’Adua Foundation (SMYF), Socio-Economic Rights and Accountability Project (SERAP), Progressive Impact Organization for Community Development (PRIMORG)</i></p>	<p>Joinbodi inter-cohort collaboration</p> <p>Joinbodi-government collaboration</p> <p>Joinbodi-media collaboration</p> <p>Joinbodi-international NGO collaboration</p>	<p>Collaboration around whistleblowing promotion and protection included facilitating strategic connections and conversations between various civil society and government actors; conducting coordinated advocacy and amplification efforts to share information through media and with communities; joint training sessions to educate government actors, legal professionals, community leaders, and community members about whistleblowing policy and protections; and sharing subject-matter and technical expertise.</p>
<p>Case 2: Criminal Justice–supported establishment of the Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee (ACJMC) in Gombe State</p> <p><i>Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee (ACJMC), Partners West Africa, Nigerian (PWAN)</i></p>	<p>Criminal Justice inter-cohort collaboration</p> <p>Criminal Justice grantee collaboration with state-level organizations and institutions</p>	<p>Collaboration around organizing the Gombe state ACJMC inauguration and supporting the development the committee’s action plan included leveraging networks to establish and implement the ACJMC, joint advocacy to raise community awareness of rights under the ACJL, conducting joint training of criminal justice actors and leaders, and sharing expertise to refine action plans.</p>
<p>Case 3: Criminal Justice grantee collaboration with government to implement the Police Duty Solicitors’ Scheme (PDSS) in Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Abuja</p> <p><i>ACJMC, PWAN, Nigerian Bar Association (NBA) FCT</i></p>	<p>Criminal Justice inter-cohort collaboration</p> <p>Criminal Justice grantee collaboration with state-level organizations and institutions</p>	<p>Collaborative activities around supporting the implementation of the PDSS included leveraging networks to engage police and recruit duty solicitors, collaboratively training police and solicitors, and sharing financial and logistical resources.</p>

Findings

Table 1 summarizes cross-case findings from this study.

Table 1. Summary of cross-case findings

How are grantees engaging “voice” and “teeth” actors and collaborating in the accountability ecosystem?	
#1	Across cases, grantees cultivated relationships and leveraged their networking and convening powers in a range of strategic collaborative activities that engaged both “voice” and “teeth” actors.
What has been accomplished through grantees’ collaboration efforts?	
#2	In all three cases, respondents suggested that grantees’ collaborative initiatives contributed to improvements in “voice” and “teeth” actors’ awareness of corruption, and subsequent emerging improvements in their engagement around issues related to criminal justice and whistleblowing culture.
#3	Across cases, the extent to which collaborative activities led to reported government or institutional changes varied. In part, the level of progress observed depended on both the focus of efforts and the level of buy-in from government actors.
#4	Grantees’ and partners’ initiatives contributed to government responsiveness and engagement as well as modest accountability improvements.
What are the essential elements of effective collaboration that may contribute to anticorruption results, and how do they emerge?	
#4	The Foundation’s Cohort model incentivized strong partnerships by providing a platform for regular engagement, trust building, and complementary learning and skill sharing across participants.
#5	Although challenges within the broader accountability ecosystem sometimes constrained collaboration efforts, strong leadership commitment, clear communication, and trust building were essential to the success of these initiatives.
To what extent have grantee-led activities contributed to enduring collaborations involving ecosystem actors?	
#6	There is evidence of grantees laying the foundation for durable partnerships , but concerns about longer-term sustainability persist.

Conclusions

Two key conclusions emerge from these cases (Table 2).

Table 2. Cross-case conclusions

#1	The “big tent” approaches grantees deployed in their collaborative activities involved a myriad of “voice” and “teeth” actors throughout the accountability ecosystem , and ensured the engagement of those playing essential roles in preventing, rejecting, and prosecuting corruption.
#2	The strategies and approaches at the heart of On Nigeria 2.0—including the use of the cohort model—gave grantees and their partners the time and space they needed to intentionally build relationships, grow trust, and establish strong communication channels , all of which are essential for effective collaboration that contributes to a robust accountability ecosystem. Building these collaborative relationships is an iterative process and will continue to take time and resources to develop and nurture.

Introduction

The MacArthur Foundation’s Big Bet On Nigeria program aims to combat corruption in Nigeria through grantee-led efforts to support and strengthen transparency, participation, and accountability. Collaboration involving diverse actors—including “voice” actors, or those demanding accountability; and “teeth” actors, the government/parastatal officials and entities responsible for implementing anticorruption activities—is a central element of On Nigeria’s strategy, and essential to the program’s efforts to build and sustain momentum for long-term institutional transformation.¹

This case study explores Learning Question 5.1 from On Nigeria’s Evaluation and Learning (EL) Framework, as well as Learning Priority 2 (see box).² By analyzing how grantees engage with different actors in the accountability ecosystem, this study seeks to understand the extent to which collaborative work emerging from On Nigeria 2.0 has contributed to anticorruption results, and how it has done so.

This report first highlights three “cases,” or grantee collaborations with partners from the government, the private sector, and civil society, then presents cross-case findings that emerged from the three collaborative efforts.

Learning Question

5.1 *What actors are engaged in the accountability ecosystem? To what extent do they collaborate and share a common purpose? What factors enable and impede this collaboration?*

Learning Priority

2. *How do grantees come together to address other topics, beyond anticorruption, in the broader accountability ecosystem?*

¹ On Nigeria 2.0 uses strategic approaches to promote anticorruption efforts, including “voice” and “teeth” approaches. “Voice” actors are media, civil society, entertainment, and faith-based organizations that aim to amplify independent voices to report on corruption issues, advocate for transparency and accountability, and engage citizens and civil society to participate in monitoring corruption and advocating for action. “Teeth” actors include government actors and institutions that can strengthen transparency and accountability at the local, state and federal levels.

² In December 2022 and early 2023, the Program Team and EL Partner identified three Learning Priorities to explore throughout the duration of On Nigeria. These priorities complement the EL Framework’s learning questions.

Methodology

To identify the cases analyzed in this study, the EL Partner started by conducting a document review of previous learning products, grantee reports, and responses from the 2022 Social Network Analysis. In consultation with the On Nigeria Program Team, the EL Partner selected three initiatives led by different grantees for further analysis: (1) efforts to promoting whistleblowing policies, (2) the establishment of the Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee (ACJMC) in Gombe State, and (3) work to support the implementation of the Police Duty Solicitors’ Scheme (PDSS) in Abuja.³ In line with the selection criteria (see box), the selected cases address a range of different issues, engage various stakeholders, and take place across several geographies.

Criteria for Case Selection

- Demonstrates collaboration between “voice” and “teeth” actors
- Involves actors throughout the accountability ecosystem
- Shows the impact of collaboration
- Focuses on sustainability

The EL Partner team used snowball sampling to identify key informants involved with each case, and ensured that data were collected from relevant collaborating partners, including non-grantees and other accountability actors. In all, the team conducted 18 key informant interviews (KIIs) with 23 respondents representing grantees, partners, and government officials (Exhibit 1). The team then coded, analyzed, integrated, and synthesized the collected data to produce the cases, overarching findings, and conclusions presented in this analysis.

Exhibit 1: Respondent sample across cases

Case	# of KIIs	# of grantee respondents	# of partner respondents
Case 1: Joinbodi-led collaboration to strengthen whistleblowing protections	9	4	5
Case 2: Criminal Justice–supported establishment of ACJMC in Gombe State	5	3	2
Case 3: Criminal Justice grantee collaboration with government to implement PDSS in Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Abuja	4	2	2

³ The EL Partner originally selected two cases for review but identified a third case during data collection: the establishment of PDSS in FCT Abuja. The EL Partner subsequently conducted additional KIIs to get a more detailed understanding of this emergent case of collaboration.

Case 1: Joinbodi-led Collaboration to Strengthen Whistleblowing Protections

Context and Background. c

Exhibit 2: Snapshot of Joinbodi grantee AFRICMIL's collaborative relationships with different types of partners

JOINBODI INTER-COHORT COLLABORATION



- In 2017, with support from the MacArthur Foundation, AFRICMIL began the Corruption Anonymous (CORA) project to raise awareness about whistleblowing rights, advocate for clear whistleblowing guidelines and policy, and promote effective whistleblower protections. In 2022, **AFRICMIL** collaborated with Joinbodi cohort lead grantee **Shehu Musa Yar'Adua Foundation (SMYF)** to expand CORA to include a reporting mechanism for whistleblowers hosted on the Yar'Adua Foundation's Partners United platform. Together, they raised awareness about the CORA tool on social media and through advocacy videos aimed at both the general public and pro-accountability actors. In 2022 and 2023, the **Yar'Adua Foundation** also brought federal and state-level government actors together at roundtables with CSOs, including **AFRICMIL**, to gather input for the development of whistleblowing framework.
- In 2022, **AFRICMIL** and Joinbodi grantee **Socio-Economic Rights and Accountability Project (SERAP)** signed a memorandum of understanding under the CORA initiative to defend whistleblowers' rights and advocate for improvements of whistleblower protections. **SERAP** coordinated with **AFRICMIL** to provide pro bono legal services and train lawyers to defend whistleblowers. **SERAP** and **AFRICMIL** jointly filed corruption cases against ministries, departments, and agencies.

JOINBODI-GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION



- Spurred by the introduction and subsequent failure of the Whistleblower and Witness Protection Bill, 2019, in 2020, **AFRICMIL** endeavored to establish a relationship with the national-level **PICA** office. **AFRICMIL** eventually engaged PICA in training sessions around whistleblowing policies and protections, and accompanied PICA to advocacy meetings around the country. In 2021, **PICA** invited **AFRICMIL** to bring CSOs together to support a renewed whistleblowing bill that would be introduced to the National Assembly in 2022. These CSOs were from different cohorts, including Criminal Justice (**CLEEN Foundation and Centre for Democracy and Development**), Media and Journalism (**Progressive Impact Organization for Community Development, PRIMORG**), and Joinbodi (**Human and Environmental Development Agenda, HEDA Resource Centre**). **PICA** and the grantees also worked with the **Ministry of Justice, Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC)** and **Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC)** to inform updates to the whistleblowing framework.
- Though unable to make inroads with the national-level National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) on whistleblowing topics, **AFRICMIL** was able to successfully engage state-level offices such as the **NHRC Kwara state office**. **NHRC Kwara** aims to protect, promote, and enforce the rights of individuals in Kwara State, including through whistleblowing protections. In this case, **NHRC Kwara** helped to facilitate training sessions and connect **AFRICMIL** and other grantees in Kwara State with relevant government stakeholders, traditional leaders, communities, and grassroots-level stakeholders.

JOINBODI-MEDIA COLLABORATION



- **AFRICMIL** and Media and Journalism grantee **PRIMORG** collaborated to host radio town hall meetings and call-in shows as part of PRIMORG’s public conscience radio programming on its partner stations including **KISS FM** and **Raypower FM**. Programming included bringing together experts, public institutions, and civil society to discuss issues around the whistleblowing policy. Government agencies, relevant anti-graft agencies, and other stakeholders were also invited to participate in discussions to address the issues highlighted in the investigations. **AFRICMIL** and **PRIMORG** also issued joint press releases and appeared together on **Africa Independent Television’s (AIT) Focus Nigeria** program to discuss whistleblower protection.

JOINBODI COLLABORATION WITH INTERNATIONAL NGOS








- **AFRICMIL** developed and leveraged its relationship with the **Whistleblower International Network (WIN)**, a global network of organizations committed to strengthening whistleblowing policies and protections. **WIN** shared resources, expertise, and connections with **AFRICMIL** to support individual whistleblowers. **WIN** also amplified **AFRICMIL’s** work by publishing information to its network.
- **Amnesty International** partnered with **AFRICMIL** to collect data and connect with whistleblowers in Nigeria to provide legal and advocacy support.

Activity Design and Implementation. Collaborative relationships for this collective effort on whistleblowing built on existing organizational relationships formed to address other topics, on the Foundation’s cohort model, and on connections created at gatherings. For example, Amnesty International had previously worked with AFRICMIL on topics related to press freedom, protection of journalists, and media literacy. AFRICMIL had served as an in-country contact and gathered information for Amnesty about journalists at risk. Amnesty then documented the cases and advocated to international audiences on behalf of the journalists. Grantees reported that the environment fostered by the Foundation’s cohort model facilitated or deepened some partnerships. One international nongovernmental organization (NGO) and one Joinbodi grantee noted that their relationships with key partners in this work gained momentum after they both participated in a conference and a forum that intentionally brought stakeholders together around the whistleblowing policy issue.

Collaboration around whistleblowing promotion and protection in this case took different forms, and included grantees: (1) facilitating strategic connections and conversations between various civil society and government actors; (2) conducting coordinated advocacy and amplification efforts to share information through media and with communities; (3) implementing joint training sessions to educate government actors, legal professionals, community leaders, and community members about the whistleblowing policy and protections; and (4) providing subject-matter and technical expertise.

Exhibit 3: Examples of collaboration around strengthening whistleblowing efforts and protecting whistleblowers

Collaborative activities	Examples
 Leveraging networks and facilitating connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• AFRICMIL connected Amnesty International with whistleblowers and access to data, which Amnesty used in whistleblower protection efforts.• SERAP lent pro bono legal support to defend whistleblowers identified and supported by AFRICMIL.

Collaborative activities	Examples
 Joint advocacy and amplification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHRC Kwara facilitated introductions between AFRICMIL and state- and local-level government actors. In turn, the NHRC Kwara office relied on AFRICMIL and other CSOs to act as trusted messengers to communities. AFRICMIL and PRIMORG pooled resources to host radio town halls and jointly appeared on radio and television programs to amplify information related to whistleblowing. SERAP coordinated with media and social media influencers to raise awareness around whistleblowing issues and protections.
 Complementary training activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFRICMIL tapped into PRIMORG’s media expertise to support its whistleblowing protections training for journalists. SERAP supported civil society and government entities to train lawyers and staff around whistleblower defense and policy.
 Sharing expertise to inform whistleblowing framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMYF brought together various civil society and government groups to provide technical expertise to government entities drafting whistleblower policies. AFRICMIL provided PICA with civil society insights used in creating the whistleblowing framework.
 Collaborative gender and social inclusion efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMYF engaged women-focused Joinbodi grantee Women’s Rights Advancement and Protection Alternative (WRAPA) and Inclusive Friends Association, a persons with disabilities–focused organization, to ensure representation by these groups in whistleblowing training and advocacy efforts. SMYF worked with marginalized population–focused Joinbodi grantee Connected Development (CODE) to train youth to track government projects.

Results. Respondents mentioned several results and “small wins” that stemmed from their collaborative efforts, and emphasized an emerging cultural and normative shift around whistleblowing. Such shifts align with On Nigeria’s Theory of Change (TOC) and the emphasis on broadening, deepening, and strengthening the ecosystem of actors engaged in social accountability work (the “trunk” in the ON 2.0 TOC tree). They manifested in several ways, including:

- Improved knowledge and awareness about whistleblowing as well as use of whistleblowing platforms and tools by some universities and civil society actors (multiple respondents); and
- A stronger, more collaborative community of civil society actors that can more effectively advocate for the protection of whistleblowers, and hold corrupt individuals and institutions accountable (multiple respondents).

Initiating Government Responsiveness.
In a recent case, a federal civil servant exposed the case of corruption in his workplace, Ministry of Works and Housing, where 23 people were given fake employment. As a result, the whistleblower was accused of violating the Official Secrets Act and threatened with termination of his employment. NGOs under the CORA advocated against this unfair act of retribution and prevented the whistleblower’s forced termination. Additionally, with the attention drawn to the case, in August 2023, the government responded by sacking the 23 people given fake employment —Joinbodi grantee, KII

Respondents also highlighted potential emerging results related to the prevention and rejection of corruption (“**branches**” in the **ON 2.0 TOC**), such as:

- Growing interest on the part of states, such as Anambra, to institutionalize the whistleblowing policy (AFRICMIL);
- Increased community reporting of wrongdoing related to whistleblowing (AFRICMIL); and

- Broader engagement with transparency efforts, as suggested by a rise in requests for assistance with drafting Freedom of Information (FOI) requests (SERAP).

Evidence of sustained improvements in transparency, accountability, and participation—considered long-term outcomes in the ON 2.0 TOC—is not yet apparent.

Case 2: Establishment of the ACJMC in Gombe State

Context and Background. President Goodluck Jonathan signed the Administration of Criminal Justice Act (ACJA) into law in 2015 to reform Nigeria’s criminal justice system, closing legal loopholes and enhancing prosecution processes. While the law does not specifically target corruption, its provisions aim to strengthen the legal system’s ability to handle corruption cases. On Nigeria’s efforts in criminal justice are centered around supporting the federal ACJA and seeking state-level consideration and implementation of parallel Administration of Criminal Justice (ACJ) state laws that include the ACJA’s four essential anticorruption elements⁴, which guided the development and ongoing promotion of the National Minimum Standards⁵. State-level Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committees (ACJMCs) are a critical element of the ACJA and the National Minimum Standards. These committees are multistakeholder groups that bring together government actors, CSOs, and legal experts to monitor states’ implementation of the ACJ laws and compliance with the National Minimum Standards.

This case follows the collaborative efforts of Criminal Justice grantees to assist in the development of an ACJMC in one state. Gombe State passed its Administration of Criminal Justice Law (ACJL) in 2021, and had limited funding allocated to ensure the establishment of an ACJMC. Criminal Justice grantees mobilized the Gombe State government and civil society actors to organize and establish an ACJMC and to design and implement a three-year action plan after the ACJMC was inaugurated in September 2022.

Exhibit 4: Snapshot of organizations and their roles in Case 2 collaborative activities

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTER-COHORT COLLABORATION

The **federal Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee (ACJMC)** is both a Criminal Justice grantee and a federal entity. It monitors implementation of the ACJA at the federal level and supports 24 states with inauguration and implementation of state-level ACJMCs, including Gombe State. The federal ACJMC and **Partners West Africa, Nigeria (PWAN)** provided Gombe State ACJMC members with technical expertise and financial support to develop an ACJL action plan.



⁴ Under the leadership of Criminal Justice grantee the Centre for Socio-Legal Studies (CSLS), CSOs identified four core elements of the ACJA system considered essential for effectively implementing the ACJA and ACJ/Ls at the state level. The four National Minimum Standards for implementing the ACJA are: (1) Establishing ACJMCs; (2) Setting time frames for trials and case management, including limits on adjournments; (3) Requiring legally trained professionals to handle crimes; and (4) Prohibiting the stay of trial proceedings due to interlocutory appeals.

⁵ The National Minimum Standards is an initiative that aims to establish a national system to assess the implementation of the ACJA/ACJLs, using a standardized scoresheet to evaluate and display each state's performance. Goals of the National Minimum Standards includes providing a uniform framework for evaluating criminal justice institutions nationwide, to foster consistency and accountability ([Centre for Socio Legal Studies. 2023. National Minimum Standards on the Implementation of the Administration of Criminal Justice Act & the Administration of Criminal Justice Laws in the Various States](#)).

CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRANTEE COLLABORATION WITH STATE-LEVEL ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS






After the passage of the ACJL in Gombe State in 2021, Criminal Justice grantee **PWAN** sought to facilitate the inauguration of an ACJMC in the state. Due to limited state-level connections, **PWAN** first reached out to the Gombe State branch of the **Nigerian Bar Association (NBA)** to request support in connecting with state-level government institutions, particularly those who would most likely have a role on a state ACJMC. **NBA Gombe** facilitated connections for **PWAN** with the Gombe State **Legal Aid Council, International Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA), Correctional Service Police, Chief Judge, and Attorney General and Commissioner for Justice**. **PWAN** held sensitization workshops for these groups to provide information about the responsibilities of an ACJMC.



Along with ACJMC establishment, **PWAN** sought to raise awareness among the general population and local leaders around the ACJL. **PWAN** depended on state-level actors such as **FIDA, National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), and NBA** to support outreach and awareness-raising activities and training such as legal aid clinics, due to their familiarity with and access to local leaders, populations, and institutions.

Immediately following the successful inauguration of the Gombe ACJMC in 2022, **PWAN** began coordinating with the **Gombe ACJMC** to develop a three-year action plan. **PWAN** collaborated closely with the **federal ACJMC**, which provided technical expertise and financial support. **PWAN** continued to lead training for judicial actors and CSOs, including for ACJMC members on their roles and tasks as a committee.

Activity Design and Implementation. **PWAN** conducted outreach, advocacy, and training with several organizations and agencies—the federal ACJMC, the Gombe state-level Ministry of Justice, Legal Aid Council, FIDA, Correctional Service, Chief Judge, the Police, and other stakeholders in the state—to organize the inauguration of the Gombe ACJMC and develop an action plan for the committee. **PWAN** played a convening role, and organized workshops, training sessions, and meetings for the ACJMC members to coordinate. The **federal ACJMC** provided financial support and technical examples that **PWAN** and the Gombe State ACJMC members referenced and borrowed from to fit the Gombe context. **PWAN** relied on other partners to access potential Gombe monitoring committee members throughout the activity. Consistent and continued collaboration has been challenging in this context, and in some respects did not continue beyond the establishment of the Gombe ACJMC.

Exhibit 5: Examples of collaboration in establishing and operationalizing the Gombe State ACJMC

Collaborative activities	Examples
 Leveraging networks and facilitating connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWAN brought together several government and civil society agencies to drive ACJMC inauguration and implementation. • NBA connected PWAN to stakeholders who could be recruited as Gombe State ACJMC members, including various Gombe State criminal justice actors, including the Chief Judge, Ministry of Justice, and police officials.
 Joint advocacy and amplification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWAN worked with Gombe State institutions to connect with and raise awareness among community-level leaders and communities about rights under the ACJL.
 Joint training activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After it was inaugurated, the Gombe ACJMC requested support from PWAN to train criminal justice actors and local governments and leaders in the provisions of the ACJL.

Collaborative activities	Examples
 Sharing expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple nongovernmental and governmental organizations jointly reviewed and provided input on the ACJMC action plan. • The federal ACJMC provided technical expertise and guidance to PWAN as they worked on supporting the state-level ACJL.
 Collaborative gender and social inclusion efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIDA and NBA worked together to ensure that female lawyers were receiving ACJL training.

Results. Respondents noted that multiple results emerged from this collaborative initiative. First, at the level of the *accountability ecosystem* (“**trunk**” in the ON 2.0 TOC), the Gombe ACJMC strengthened relationships between accountability actors, and demonstrated the commitment of courts, correctional centers, the National Human Rights Commission, and the Legal Aid Council (LAC) to collaborate (multiple respondents).

Second, respondents noted several emerging results related to the prosecution of corruption (“**branches**” in the ON 2.0 TOC):

The goal was achieved because there is a functional ACJMC and the committee members are carrying out their activities in line with the implementation of the law in the state—they sometimes visit correctional centres and also carry out awareness activities and the rest. —Criminal Justice Grantee, KII

- The ACJMC in Gombe was not only established, but also developed and began implementation of a three-year action plan (multiple respondents).
- There were improvements in the justice system in Gombe, such as changes in prosecutorial processes, reduction in trial durations, simplification of the bail process, decongestion of prisons, and efficiency in case management (multiple respondents). Among the improvements to which this work may have contributed are:
 - The introduction of the Gombe State Small Claims Court in December 2023, which aims to resolve simple debt disputes within 60 days (“[Gombe State Domesticates FG’s Small Claims Court Initiative](#),” Channels Television, 2024).
 - Improvements in trial efficiency. Where trials used to take up to five years, according to NBA Gombe, trials can now be initiated and concluded in less than one year.
 - Improvements in pretrial practices. According to the Gombe Ministry of Justice respondent, after the Gombe ACJMC received a letter regarding prison congestion, the committee visited custodial centers to assess the situation and, as a result of its findings, 185 inmates awaiting trial were released.

Funding remains an ongoing concern for the Gombe ACJMC. Despite the three-year action plan, the ACJMC does not have the resources to continue operating because grantee support was restricted to the creation of the committee and launch of the action plan.

Case 3: The Implementation of the PDSS in Abuja

Context and Background. The Police Duty Solicitor Scheme (PDSS) was initiated in 2005 as a pilot project in four states (Imo, Kaduna, Ondo, and Sokoto). It aimed to deliver free and prompt legal assistance to Nigerians who were arrested or apprehended at police stations. A key goal of the PDSS was to facilitate quicker resolution of cases prior to court escalation by providing legal services at police stations, thus reducing court case loads, minimizing unnecessary incarcerations, and alleviating overcrowding in prisons. In 2017, the Inspector General of Police issued Force Order 20, which sought to broaden and strengthen implementation of the PDSS across Nigeria and complement provisions around legal services as outlined in the ACJA and state-level ACJLs.⁶

This case centers on collaborative efforts undertaken by Criminal Justice grantees to support the Legal Aid Council (the responsible government entity for PDSS) to implement the initiative in FCT Abuja and in doing so, improve access to legal protections and services and reduce pretrial detention time, particularly for more vulnerable populations, as well as provide a model for states to implement.

Exhibit 6: Snapshot of organizations and their roles

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COLLABORATION WITH STATE-LEVEL ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS



In 2020, Criminal Justice grantee **PWAN** received support from the MacArthur Foundation to improve and expand their work to support the implementation of PDSS in FCT. **PWAN** established a partnership with the **Legal Aid Council (LAC)**, a government entity mandated to implement the PDSS. **LAC** was able to facilitate introductions between **PWAN** and the **FCT Commissioner of Police**. With **LAC** leading, **PWAN** and **LAC** were able to gain buy-in and permission from the **FCT Commissioner of Police** to train police officers and post duty solicitors at FCT police stations. The **FCT Commissioner of Police** facilitated establishment of relationships between **FCT police stations** and **PWAN** and **LAC**. **LAC** provided ongoing support to **PWAN** to facilitate training and maintain the relationship with the police.

Nigerian Bar Association (NBA) FCT and **PWAN** worked together to recruit, train, and organize lawyers to serve as duty solicitors at police stations in **PWAN**'s project areas in FCT. **NBA FCT** leveraged existing relationships and connections with legal actors in the area, while **PWAN** organized and provided resources for training.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTER-COHORT COLLABORATION



Throughout this case, the **federal ACJMC**, which oversees criminal justice institutions such as the police, courts, and correctional facilities, provided legal expertise for **PWAN** and **NBA FCT** and served as an intermediary between **PWAN** and **police** if challenges arose.





Activity Design and Implementation. The context around the PDSS was complex due to the range of relationships and the need to coordinate among police hierarchy, judicial actors, other government

⁶ Ernest Ezinu Uwanaka, "An Efficient Duty Solicitor under the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme in Nigeria," *Idemili Bar Journal* 3 (2023).

institutions, and civil society groups. PWAN approached the Legal Aid Council to support implementation of PDSS in FCT, and together, they asked the FCT Commissioner of Police for permission to post duty solicitors at police stations. Later, they engaged NBA's support in recruiting and training duty solicitors. PWAN and NBA collaborated with the Legal Aid Council and they leveraged each other's networks and relationships to gain buy-in from police to implement the PDSS, allocate and organize resources to strengthen the capacity of police, and identify and train lawyers to serve as duty solicitors in FCT police stations (Exhibit 1).

The collaborative efforts were everything. NBA can do this alone, but the collaboration helped us. It helped with access to funding and better relations with target persons/agencies because you know the relationship between the NBA (lawyers) and some of these law enforcement agencies is not always cordial. In terms of what was achieved, I think the scope of our intervention was broadened working with PWAN, Legal Aid Council and others. — KII, Criminal Justice Grantee

Exhibit 7: Snapshot of organizations and their roles in Case 3 collaborative activities

Collaborative activities	Examples
 Leveraging networks and facilitating connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the Legal Aid Council's familiarity and established relationship with police, PWAN leveraged its support to engage police stations. • NBA used its network to recruit duty solicitors to the PDSS. • The FCT ACJMC served as an intermediary between grantees and the police to resolve issues around communication.
 Joint training activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWAN provided capacity-building to NBA-recruited duty solicitors.
 Resource sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the LAC had limited funding to implement the PDSS, NBA and PWAN provided important financial and logistical support.
 Collaborative gender and social inclusion efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBA and PWAN sought to intentionally train and assign women, younger professionals, and people with disabilities as duty solicitors.

Results. At the level of the *accountability ecosystem* (“trunk” in the ON 2.0 TOC), results of the collaborative activities around the PDSS in this case included:

- Lawyers, including younger early career lawyers and female lawyers, received training and the skills required to serve as duty solicitors to provide legal representation to detainees at police stations in FCT (multiple respondents). For example, at a single one-day intensive training event held in 2022, PWAN and partners trained 112 lawyers, including 36 women, as duty solicitors (PWAN, 2022 Grantee Annual Report).

The collaborative efforts were everything. NBA can do this alone, but the collaboration helped us. It helped with access to funding and better relations with target persons/agencies because you know the relationship between the NBA (lawyers) and some of these law enforcement agencies is not always cordial. In terms of what was achieved, I think the scope of our intervention was broadened working with PWAN, Legal Aid Council and others. — KII, Criminal Justice Grantee

- Police had increased awareness around their responsibilities to detainees, the role of duty solicitors, and the resources that should be made available to those in their custody (multiple respondents).
- Police who took part in training sessions reported to the trainers that it helped them change their outlook and habits when processing suspects (Legal Aid Council, KII).

Emerging evidence of improved accountability around achieving the essential elements of the ACJA/ACJLs ("**branches**" in the ON 2.0 TOC) included:

- In prior efforts to strengthen the PDSS, indigent detainees in the FCT generally did not have reliable access to legal and support services when in police detention. Though details are not available, the collaborative PDSS activity reportedly improved access to ACJA/ACJL-trained lawyers for indigent detainees. As a result, PWAN's activities led to some decrease in pretrial detentions and to changes in police officers' compliance with the laws. Across PWAN's four intervention states, including Abuja FCT, 8,925 detainees were provided representation through PWAN and partners' interventions between September 2022 and August 2023 (PWAN, 2023 Grantee Annual Report).

Findings

The cross-case findings presented below explore four lines of inquiry: (1) how collaboration took place, (2) the results collaborative efforts contributed to, (3) essential elements for anticorruption collaboration, and (4) the sustainability of collaborative initiatives.

How are grantees engaging “voice” and “teeth” actors and collaborating in the accountability ecosystem?

Finding 1. Across cases, grantees cultivated relationships and leveraged their networking and convening powers in a range of strategic collaborative activities that engaged both “voice” and “teeth” actors.

Grantees and others in these cases consistently looked to other actors to fill gaps, complement, and strengthen their activities. Collaboration most often took the form of facilitating connections; sharing resources, information, and expertise; and conducting joint advocacy and skill building. “Voice” actors consistently launched the initial collaboration, but in all cases, eventually engaged “teeth” actors.

This was also one of the objectives . . . this idea [that] collaboration can work and organizations with different setup, with different strengths can come together and can work seamlessly around the same objective —Case 1, Joinbodi Grantee, KII



Facilitating connections. Across cases, grantees mentioned building or leveraging relationships with other organizations or institutions to more successfully engage communities, groups, or professionals that were important to their anticorruption work.

This was particularly important in cases where government institutions or “teeth” actors were key players. Often, a “champion” government institution was instrumental in connecting grantees with other government actors important to their work. For example, in Case 3, although PWAN ultimately spearheaded efforts to strengthen PDSS in FCT, it first approached LAC, a government entity, and requested support to engage police stations to participate in the pilot, due to LAC’s familiarity and relationship with the police. LAC arranged and led an initial meeting with the FCT Commissioner of Police and PWAN to seek permission from the Commissioner to approach police stations with PDSS programming efforts. The Legal Aid Council then led initial meetings and advocacy with police stations prior to handing leadership to PWAN to organize and post the duty solicitors.

In Case 1, AFRICMIL relied on the NHRC Kwara office to connect it with the state- and local-level government actors necessary to conduct policy-related whistleblower training and advocacy in Kwara State. In turn, the NHRC Kwara office reported that due to issues around trust in government, it encouraged community members to report wrongdoing on AFRICMIL’s whistleblowing platform.



Sharing information and technical expertise. In Case 2, although PWAN played an organizing role in bringing together the Gombe ACJMC, PWAN needed the federal ACJMC’s expertise and guidance with respect to the

more technical elements of the ACJL and its essential elements. In Case 1, SMYF invited other grantees (primarily “voice” actors) to participate in the community training it organized, allowing these grantees to share their organizations’ unique technical expertise with the training participants. The SMYF respondent valued this collaboration, as it provided participants with exposure to external knowledge on various topics, policies, and toolkits. SMYF and AFRICMIL also cited Partners United (which is hosted by SMYF) as a platform where grantees exchanged information, including on whistleblower-related content.

The collaboration we had with the ACJMC at the federal level . . . provided the technical expertise with regards to development of their action plan and the activities that they can carry out to ensure that they keep their committee operational and that they effectively discharge their duties as a committee. —Case 2, Criminal Justice Grantee, KI



Joint advocacy and amplification. Common goals of collaboration across cases were to share information, raise awareness, and educate Nigerian citizens about their rights and accountability efforts, while also amplifying corruption issues to increase pressure on

government actors. In Cases 1 and 2, grantees amplified issues or information through coordination with grantee and non-grantee media partners. In Case 1, grantees partnered with Kwara radio stations to host call-in shows and SERAP engaged social media influencers to post information about whistleblower rights and protections. This amplification aimed to empower Nigerians with information about how to call out corruption, and call attention to responses from the relevant government actors.

PWAN conducted public awareness and sensitization using the media of the citizens of Gombe state using Amana radio in the local dialect of the people (Hausa). —Case 2, 2023 PWAN Grantee Annual Report

In Case 2, PWAN built relationships with local and traditional leaders and engaged radio stations to spread awareness about the provisions of the new ACJL in Gombe State. In Case 3, LAC and PWAN approached police stations together to provide information about the PDSS and advocate for police buy-in around posting duty solicitors at their stations and training their officers.



Joint skill-building activities. Grantees engaged accountability ecosystem actors— legal professionals, government actors, and

community leaders— in a variety of skill-building and sensitization workshops. Joint training sessions enabled partners to reach new or more stakeholders and to complement gaps in subject-matter or technical expertise.

. . . we identified over 30 young volunteers who were interested in learning more about tracking government projects and their communities. And we collaborated with CODE because they have quite a lot of experience in strengthening or building capacity around public accountability, especially project tracking . . . the process was collaborative in building capacity for communities. —Shehu Musa, Case 1

In Case 2, PWAN engaged NBA to support its training to access NBA’s network of legal professionals, which was more robust in Kwara state than its own. In Case 1, SMYF reported that it collaborated with various organizations on training, leveraging

different areas of expertise and skill sets to develop and deliver more effective content. For example, it collaborated with Connected Development Initiative (CODE) to train youth to track government projects, due to CODE’s extensive experience in community-level project tracking. SERAP worked with NHRC Kwara to train judicial officers in public interest litigation, and NHRC Kwara engaged AFRICMIL to train its staff on whistleblower rights.

What has been accomplished through grantees’ collaboration efforts?

Finding 2: In all three cases, respondents suggested that grantees’ collaborative initiatives contributed to improvements in “voice” and “teeth” actors’ awareness of corruption, and subsequent emerging improvements in their engagement around issues related to criminal justice and whistleblowing culture.

In the context of Case 1, while efforts to broadly institutionalize whistleblowing was not yet achieved (as is to be expected, given that such efforts often take years of concerted effort), respondents noted that there were improvements related to the “culture of whistleblowing.” Collaborative activities improved citizens’ awareness of relevant polices and violations of rights, improved skills around reporting financial fraud, and shed light on injustices. This change in knowledge was tied to greater engagement by ordinary Nigerians around reporting wrongdoing and demanding a government response (Exhibit 8).

Exhibit 8: Examples of collaborative activities leading to improved knowledge and subsequent changes in behavior

Case #	Activity	Collaborative elements	Change in knowledge and skills	Change in behavior
1	Freedom of Information Request training and information sharing.	<i>Organizations coordinated together and leveraged their different strengths: SERAP provided legal and FOI-drafting expertise, Public and Private Development Centre (PPDC) contributed procurement knowledge, BudgIT focused on community-level tracking projects, and CODE excelled at mobilizing communities for FOI drafting. Together, they also extended their impact by reaching smaller community-based organizations (CBOs) which shared coalition training lessons within their own communities.</i>	Respondents reported that communities and individuals gained greater understanding and improved skills around drafting and filing FOI requests.	SERAP received reports of communities taking initiative to draft FOI requests and then approaching SERAP to invite their participation.
1	Coalition building, amplification, and awareness raising around whistleblowing protections and policy.	<i>Strong partnerships and ease in coordination among civil society organizations and media outlets facilitated consistent joint messaging and greater reach to audiences.</i>	Grantees noted that coalition efforts improved civil society knowledge about whistleblowing protections and policy.	Shehu Musa reported a greater “culture of whistleblowing,” citing the adoption of whistleblowing tools by universities around the country.

Case #	Activity	Collaborative elements	Change in knowledge and skills	Change in behavior
3	Joint training for police academy students related to PDSS.	<i>After joint outreach to police stations by PWAN and LAC succeeded in gaining commitment from police stations to participate in the PDSS, NBA and PWAN provided training to police academy students on Force Order 20.</i>	Grantees reported that police academy students were sensitized to PDSS elements and rights of detainees.	Police students reported to grantee trainers that it helped them change their outlook and habits when processing suspects.

Finding 3: Across cases, the extent to which collaborative activities led to reported government or institutional changes varied. In part, the level of progress observed depended on both the focus of efforts and the level of buy-in from government actors.

The cases reviewed for this analysis each had different starting points along the response, responsiveness, and responsive accountability (RRA) continuum.⁷ These starting points, along with the specific contextual factors of each case, and the social accountability strategies participants deployed to engage and influence “voice” and “teeth” actors, affected the results to which each case contributed during the period under review. Case 1, for example, was largely focused on mobilizing “voice” actors to take action with respect to whistleblower protections. By knitting together a network of committed, active “voice” and “teeth” actors, and in line with the On Nigeria Theory of Change’s expectations regarding progress, Case 1 participants hoped to lay the foundations for longer-term changes that might eventually improve government responsiveness. Cases 2 and 3, by contrast, were built around supporting the implementation of policies that already existed, and therefore focused more on bringing “voice” and “teeth” actors together to engage in work to strengthen responsiveness and accountability in the criminal justice system.

In line with the long-term nature of the work undertaken in Case 1, there were ample examples of increased citizen engagement that resulted from Joinbodi’s collaborative activities, with citizen engagement and action—including regarding FOI requests—expanding considerably, even as actual government responses to those requests remained limited.

*. . . whether the **government responded**, we can say that that is **it is not looking so good**. In a general call for FOI, we can say . . . the objective for citizens to own the fight and be [at] the forefront was [to] a significant extent [what] we have achieved. —Case 1, SERAP, KII*

⁷ The response, responsiveness, and responsive accountability continuum refers to the three overlapping categories of government response to citizen-led accountability initiatives. Simple “response” can include “teeth” actors’ promises and one-off concessions to “voice” actors. “Responsiveness” looks like increased access to and promises carried out by “teeth” actors, as well sustained changes made as a result of “voice” actors’ accountability efforts. Finally, “responsive accountability” can include intentional power-sharing between “voice” and “teeth” actors, institutionalized accountability mechanisms, and litigation in response to corruption. For further reading, see the 2024 working paper, [Disentangling Government Responses: How Do We Know When Accountability Work Is Gaining Traction?](#)

Similarly, though there were significant successes related to coalition building and sensitizing the public to the whistleblowing policy (*Exhibit 8*), government response and responsiveness were less apparent.

The government has drafted a whistleblowing act that civil society has been given an opportunity to make input into . . . it has not gotten to the point of being an act, but there is progress that has been made in that area. —Case 1, Shehu Musa, KII

In cases focused on Criminal Justice grantees' collaborative efforts (Cases 2 and 3), which took direct engagement with “teeth” actors as their starting point, there was evidence of more significant changes regarding response and responsiveness.

In Case 2, respondents agreed that after the inauguration of the collaboratively formed Gombe State ACJMC, the state's justice system improved significantly. Cited improvements which the ACJMC may have contributed to included changes in prosecutorial processes, reduction in trial durations, simplification of the bail process, decongestion of prisons, and efficiency in case management (see Box 1).

In Case 3, PWAN's collaborative PDSS activity resulted in increased access to ACJA/ACJL-trained lawyers to provide detainees, including those from historically marginalized communities, with legal and supportive services that were not previously available.

The activity contributed to [a] reduction in pretrial detention. It made police work in accordance with the law because, if somebody is there to always check you to do the right thing, with time you will want to at least fall in line with that right thing and it becomes part of your culture. —Case 3, Government Actor, KII

What are the essential elements of effective collaboration that may contribute to anticorruption results, and how do they emerge?

Finding 4: The Foundation's Cohort model incentivized strong partnerships by providing a platform for *regular engagement, trust building, and complementary learning and skill sharing* across participants.

Grantees suggested the cohort model fostered a culture of mutual motivation and structured support, which facilitated opportunities for organizations to build trust and develop the types of practices—clear communication, shared tools, and complementary programming (see Finding 5)—that lead to more effective collaboration and stronger relationships. Case 2 respondents noted that prior to grantee efforts to form an ACJMC in Gombe, the represented institutions and organizations

Box 1. Case 2 improvements in justice delivery in Gombe State

- ✓ **Trial duration.** Trials can now be initiated and concluded in less than one year, reduced significantly from the up to five-year wait prior to the ACJL Gombe.
- ✓ **Bail process.** The process of granting bail was simplified, with greater ease of bail for non-capital cases.
- ✓ **Case management.** Transfer of some types of cases from police to state counsels led to more efficient management and quicker resolutions.

worked independently. The relationships fostered by Criminal Justice grantees PWAN and ACJMC Gombe facilitated more opportunities to pool resources and knowledge to address gaps.

When designing and implementing collaborative efforts, grantees considered the strengths and expertise possessed by the different actors involved to facilitate more-effective activities. Robust Joinbodi cohort coordination was a cornerstone in Case 1 whistleblowing efforts, and grantees leveraged their complementary skill sets to extend the reach of their activities across regions and populations. For example, Joinbodi grantee SERAP noted that in its coalition, it possessed legal experience, another grantee had more procurement expertise, and a third had special skills implementing community-level projects.

We are really happy that we could tap off on the cohorts, they have strengths in different areas. We are happy that we have been able to leverage on the skills, and then the experience of collaboration to push our advocacy and then maybe also sustain us. —Case 1, Joinbodi Grantee, KII

Effective collaboration was also facilitated by existing relationships between organizations, and momentum could be gained from focused regular engagement and gatherings. For example, gatherings around whistleblowing issues hosted by both grantee and non-grantee organizations spurred further partnership around the issue.

Finding 5: Although challenges within the broader accountability ecosystem sometimes constrained collaboration efforts, strong leadership commitment, clear communication, and trust building were essential to the success of these initiatives.

Leadership and individual commitment. Across cases, respondents noted that commitment by leaders and other stakeholders in partner organizations greatly contributed to successful collaboration. In Case 3, all respondents emphasized the stakeholders' passion and commitment as a major factor contributing to the successful implementation of the PDSS. In Case 1, both grantee and non-grantee respondents similarly reported the importance of anticorruption champions who were committed to fostering trust and minimizing competition. The ACJMC respondent in Case 2 credited the commitment of the various criminal justice sector stakeholders in Gombe State for the successful inauguration of the state monitoring committee.

Respondents in all cases reported instances of inaction and slow progress from some government agencies, with barriers such as bureaucratic inefficiencies, leadership changes, lack of buy-in, and limited communication all appearing. Respondents consistently noted, however, that **clear and consistent communication** helped to facilitate effective collaboration, especially when engaging with these government actors and institutions. For example, a Criminal Justice grantee in Case 2 cited difficulties in establishing effective communication channels with state actors, and explained that setting up communication platforms and expectations took longer than expected. This grantee, and others across cases, emphasized the importance of establishing communication practices early to enable easier coordination later. In Case 3, a Criminal Justice grantee eventually set up a WhatsApp group to sustain close ties between relevant partners involved in the PDSS work. A Joinbodi grantee in Case 1 reported initially using informal communication channels to build relationships and facilitate trust, then after the relationship was established, ensured that engagement continued through clear agenda- and goal-setting.

One Joinbodi grantee used clear communication around goal-setting, expectations, processes, and definitions of impact and success to ensure partner alignment, but added that this took significant time to establish. Several grantee and non-grantee civil society respondents in Case 1 noted that they did not have sufficient time to regularly engage partners while also pursuing their own strategies and programming. This is a key challenge in their work.

I would say the relationship . . . or the friendship between or amongst the leaders of these individual organizations . . . has actually helped. For instance, I know that my Executive Director is a good friend with some of the Directors of some of these organizations. . . . They bounce ideas with each other . . . I know that I have heard people say that organizations compete. So, for us and some of the people, organizations we have really worked with, there is nothing or any semblance of competition. It is about putting our efforts together and getting results. —Case 1, Media and Journalism Grantee, KII

Initially when we started, [the police] thought that we wanted to take over their duties. But when we stayed there and built our relationship with them, they came to understand that we were not there to take over their responsibility but to support them. It got to a level that even when our duty solicitors were not present at the police station, they sometimes call us to tell us that there was a matter requiring our attention. —Case 3, Criminal Justice Grantee, KII

Trust-building. When coordinating with government actors especially, respondents in both Criminal Justice–related cases cited some initial **mistrust** or suspicion that grantee involvement threatened their roles or impinged on their duties. Engaging meaningfully with or gaining buy-in from government actors was a challenge cited by grantee and non-grantee responses across cases. Joinbodi grantees working on whistleblowing efforts in Case 1 reported that their work was hindered by an inability to sufficiently engage in collaborative efforts with several federal-level government actors.

Respondents across cases noted that grantee commitment to building positive relationships (as described above) was essential for fostering trust and

engaging successfully with both government and civil society stakeholders.

To what extent have grantee-led activities contributed to enduring collaborations involving ecosystem actors?

Finding 6: There is evidence of grantees laying the foundation for durable partnerships, but concerns about longer-term sustainability persist.

Across cases, many activities and collaborative efforts have endured over time, and respondents confirmed their intention to stay engaged with their partners in the future (Exhibit 9). Though sustained collaboration reported by respondents includes continuing the work and activities conducted in each of these cases, respondents also indicated that engagement may shift in terms of goals and activities, depending on the challenges and opportunities that arise.

The passion and commitment I see in all these partners have made me realize that when we come together as a team we can achieve more and then we'll do our work better. Case 2, Non-grantee CSO, KII. —Case 2, Non-grantee Government Actor, KII

There is also some emerging evidence that after grantee facilitation, collaboration among non-grantee actors was strengthened and sustained. For example, after grantees in Case 2 brought together Gombe State criminal justice actors to form the Gombe ACJMC, a Gombe State ACJMC member reported improved and sustained coordination between the institutions represented on the committee, even with limited continued grantee involvement.

Exhibit 9: Examples of current and future collaboration across cases

Case	Duration of collaborative efforts	Examples of current and future collaboration
Case 1	6+ years (collaborative efforts related to this case starting in 2017)	Collaboration around whistleblowing protections has continued through activities like radio call-in shows and joint advocacy. One grantee noted that with recent crackdowns on journalists reporting on corruption issues, organizations have mobilized together to advocate for protection of these individuals. Another grantee noted the continued community that they have with other organizations has also transformed beyond the scope of whistleblowing protections, and they work together on other issues related to gender-based violence and climate change.
Case 2	2+ years (collaborative efforts related to this case starting in 2021)	An ACJMC member reported that the relationships built among committee members representing different organizations led to sustained improvements in the working relationships between these institutions more broadly.
Case 3	3+ years (collaborative efforts related to this case starting in 2020)	The Legal Aid Council has started a new initiative, the Legal Aid Providers Network, and reported representation from police, ACJMC, PWAN, and others they had previously collaborated with in their PDSS work.

Ongoing collaborative efforts are facing challenges related to funding, leadership transitions, and maintaining partnerships. Grantees cited these concerns especially in cases where government institutions are tasked with continuing to implement programs without grantee or Foundation funding. Specifically in Cases 2 and 3, respondents expressed concern about the lack of adequate funding into the future, but they have nonetheless continued their partnerships for now.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The “big tent” approaches grantees deployed in their collaborative activities involved a myriad of “voice” and “teeth” actors throughout the accountability ecosystem, and ensured the engagement of those playing essential roles in preventing, rejecting, and prosecuting corruption.

Grantees in these cases actively engaged partners with the expertise, skill sets, and access to other ecosystem actors that could complement their own. By leveraging relationships within their cohorts and with other cohorts, grantees were able to expand their reach to deliver joint training, amplify information, and advocate for accountability. Grantees worked to reinforce the collaboration between “voice” and “teeth” actors by establishing relationships with state-level civil society actors to build trust with state and local leaders and gain access to local stakeholders important to implementing anticorruption activities, from lawyers and police to ordinary citizens. Grantees also identified and cultivated relationships with government actors that are charged with implementing anticorruption policies, and engaged them in training to improve their skills, shared subject-matter expertise, and provided opportunities and resources to help them more effectively carry out their work.

By pursuing engagement with a range of actors, grantees critically expanded the reach of their activities, and in some instances, brought in historically disadvantaged populations, including women, youth, and those residing outside of capital regions. Despite the inroads grantees and their

partners made with many government actors, there are still significant challenges to engaging actors and institutions that resist collaboration, engage in corrupt practices, or are noncompliant with accountability measures.

Conclusion 2: The strategies and approaches at the heart of On Nigeria 2.0—including the use of the cohort model—gave grantees and their partners the time and space they needed to intentionally build relationships, grow trust, and establish strong communication channels, all of which are essential for effective collaboration that contributes to a robust accountability ecosystem. Building these collaborative relationships is an iterative process and will continue to take time and resources to develop and nurture.

Across cases, grantees reported increased buy-in and deepened collaboration only after extensive and ongoing engagement efforts. This suggests that duration and persistence are key to the success and sustainability of multistakeholder collaboration. When connecting with some government institutions, such as PICA at the federal level or police at the state level, grantees had to continuously engage in lengthy processes, and often avail themselves of intermediaries that could facilitate introductions to, and trust building with, key “teeth” actors.

These efforts, though intense, pay off over time—as demonstrated by PICA requesting grantees help in drafting the whistleblower policy, and police granting access to police stations throughout FCT for PDSS implementation. Without sustained investments in cultivating relationships and building rapport, it is unlikely that these and other successes would have occurred. Similarly, some results are not guaranteed, especially on a first attempt, and timelines for ultimate success can be quite—as the example of AFRICMIL, PICA, and whistleblowing legislation makes clear. For grantees, the cohort model provided space and resources for grantees to gather, share ideas, and establish and maintain the communication required for identifying opportunities for engagement and iterating on collaborative initiatives over extended periods, even over several years in the case of the Joinbodi cohort’s CORA whistleblowing tool.

Though respondents in these cases report confidence that their partnerships will endure in some form, concerns persist about whether and how intentional, iterative collaboration will continue without additional funding support after the conclusion of On Nigeria 2.0.