

Annex: Illustrative Example of a Rubric Scale

Indicator: Inclusiveness of Local Decision-Making Processes ([see here](#))

Indicator wording: Extent to which local decision-making processes related to [specify] are inclusive

An illustrative example of a rubric scale and the description of each level:

Minimal (= 1)

- *Representation* – Only authorities or elites participate.
- *Voice and influence* – Only officials or dominant actors speak and decide. Other participants are passive or silent.
- *Accessibility* – Decision-making processes are not accessible: information is not publicly shared and practical barriers (language, timing, venue, format, cost) effectively exclude most citizens.
- *Accountability* – No feedback is provided to participants or the wider public, and decisions are not communicated.

Emerging (= 2)

- *Representation* – Some efforts made to include diverse participants (e.g. women or CSOs invited), but representation remains limited and ad hoc.
- *Voice and influence* – Some participants can express views, but these are rarely discussed or reflected in final decisions.
- *Accessibility* – Processes are occasionally open or observable, but information is inconsistently shared and significant barriers (distance, language, timing, cost, awareness) prevent many people from participating.
- *Accountability* – Authorities occasionally acknowledge that decisions were made (e.g. verbally or informally), but provide little or no information on outcomes, rationale, or follow-up, and most citizens remain uninformed.

Moderate (=3)

- *Representation* – A wider range of actors (e.g. women, youth, community groups) is present in some decision-making spaces, but participation is irregular or uneven across processes.
- *Voice and influence* – Diverse participants actively shape discussions and their inputs are reflected in decisions or actions, but this influence depends on specific forums, leaders, or initiatives rather than formalised rule.
- *Accessibility* – Information about processes is sometimes publicly shared, and meetings are generally open, but accessibility depends on individual initiatives and barriers remain unaddressed for certain groups.
- *Accountability* – Authorities sometimes share basic information on decisions or outcomes with participants or communities, but feedback is partial, informal, and limited in reach.

Significant (=4)

- *Representation* – A broad and diverse range of actors is regularly represented in decision-making processes, making inclusive participation the norm rather than the exception.
- *Voice and influence* – Diverse participants actively shape discussions and their inputs are clearly reflected in decisions, priorities, or agreed actions.
- *Accessibility* – Processes are regularly announced and designed to reduce common barriers (e.g. accessible venues, appropriate timing, local languages), though accessibility measures are not yet applied consistently across all settings.
- *Accountability* – Authorities regularly communicate decisions and provide explanations or responses to participants' inputs, but feedback practices are not yet standardised or consistently applied.

Institutionalised (=5)

- *Representation* – Inclusive participation is formalised or routine, with consistent involvement of women, youth, marginalized groups, and CSOs across decision-making processes.
- *Voice and influence* – Diverse participants routinely influence agenda-setting, deliberation, and final decisions through established procedures, roles, or mandates, making influence predictable and sustained.
- *Accessibility* – Decision-making processes are systematically and deliberately designed to be inclusive and accessible (e.g. appropriate languages, formats, timing, venues, multiple participation channels).
- *Accountability* – Authorities are required to provide timely, transparent, and accessible feedback on decisions and how public inputs were used, through formalised mechanisms applied across processes.

When formulating rubric levels, you may also draw on progress marker language (*more guidance in resources below*) such as *Expect to see*, *Like to see*, and *Love to see*. You could also formulate options such as a *Wouldn't like to see* progress marker to capture negative change, as well as *Need to see* progress marker to report on the outputs necessary for the outcome to happen.