



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC  
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

DAC Network on Governance

# Survey of Donor Approaches to Governance Assessment

Annexes

February 2008

PROCESS & CHANGE CONSULTANCY

Nils Boesen a/s



development  
advice  
AND production

## ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfD	French Agency for Development
AfDB	African Development Bank
AML	Anti-money Laundering
CGA	Country Governance Assessment
CGAC	Country Governance and Anti-Corruption
CGP	Country Governance Profile
CPIA	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
DAC	Development Co-operation Directorate
DFID	Department for International Development
DGIA	Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment
DIAL	Développement, Institutions & Analyses de Long Terme
DoC	Drivers of Change
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
GA	Governance assessment
GAC	Governance and Anti-Corruption
GACD	Governance and Anti-corruption Diagnosis
GICRA	Governance, Institutional, and Corruption Risk Assessment
GOVNET	Governance Network
GP	Governance Profiles
HQ	Headquarters
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financing Institutions
IGR	Institutional and Governance Reviews
IMF	International Monetary Fund
JVP	Joint Venture for Procurement
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MERV	Monitoring of Development-Related Context Changes
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MINEFE	Ministry of Economy, Finance and Employment
NA	Non applicable
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PD	Paris Declaration
PEFA	Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability
ROSC	Report on Standard and Codes
SAF	Stability Assessment Framework
SCA	Strategic Conflict Assessment
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
WB	World Bank
WBI	World Bank Institute
WGI	World Governance Indicators

## LIST OF CONTENTS

### Annexes

Annex 1	References	p. 1
Annex 2	Persons met/interviewed	p. 2
Annex 3	Survey methodology	p. 6
Annex 4	Governance assessment tools - summary and individual sheets	p. 9

## Annex 1. References

- ADB. (2006). *Review of the Implementation of ADB's Governance and Anticorruption Policies - Findings and Recommendations*. Manila: ADB.
- Arndt, C., & Oman, C. (2006). *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- Besançon, M. (2003). *Good Governance Rankings: The Art of Measurement*. Cambridge: World Peace Foundation.
- Court, Fritz and Gyimah-Boadi (2007) "Measuring governance: What guidance for aid policy?"-
- DFID. (2002). *Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes*. London: DFID.
- EC. (2007). *Governance Incentive Tranche - Methodology*. Brussels: European Union.
- GOVNET. (2005). *Lessons Learned and Drivers of Change Analyses in Development Cooperation*. Paris: OECD/DAC.
- Grindle, M. S. (2007). Good Enough Governance Revisited. *Development Policy Review*, 25(5).
- Hyden, G. (2007). The Challenges of Making Governance Assessments Nationally Owned, *Governance Assessments and the Paris Declaration: Opportunities for Inclusive Participation and National Ownership*. Bergen Seminar.
- IMF. (2005). *The Standards and Codes Initiative—Is It Effective? And How Can It Be Improved?* Washington D.C.: IMF & World Bank.
- Kaufmann, D., & Kraay, A. (2007). *Governance Indicators: Where Are We, Where Should We Be Going?* Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Kjaer, A. (2004). *Governance: Key concepts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Landman, T., & Häusermann, J. (2003). *Map-Making and Analysis of the Main International Initiatives on Developing Indicators on Democracy and Good Governance*. Essex: University of Essex.
- Levy, B., & Manning, N. (2006). *Institutional and Governance Reviews - An Evolving Type of Economic and Sector Work*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Meisel, N. and Ould Aoudia, J. (2007). Is "Good Governance" a Good Development Strategy? *Document de Travail de la DGTPE 2007/11*. Paris: DGTPE
- ODI. (2007). *Governance Assessment: Overview of Governance Assessment Frameworks and Results from the 2006 World Governance Assessment, Report from ODI Learning Workshop*. London: ODI.
- Ottaway, M. (2002). Rebuilding State Institutions in Collapsed States. *Development and Change*, 33(5).
- PEFA (2006). *PFM Performance Measurement Framework. Report on Early Experience from Application of the Framework*. PEFA Secretariat
- Rakner, L., Menocal, A. R., & Fritz, V. (2007). *Democratisation's Third Wave and the Challenges of Democratic Deepening: Assessing International Democracy Assistance and Lessons Learned*. London: ODI.
- SIDA. (2006). *Power Analysis - Experiences and Challenges*. Stockholm: SIDA
- UNDP. (2007a). *Governance Indicators: A Users' Guide*. Second Edition. New York: UNDP.
- UNDP. (2007b). *Preliminary Survey on Donor Use of Governance Assessments*. Essex University/(UNDP
- UNDP. (2007c). *Seminar Report: Governance Assessments and the Paris Declaration. Opportunities for Inclusive Participation and National Ownership*. 2007 Bergen Seminar.

## Annex 2. Persons interviewed

Organisation	Persons interviewed <sup>1</sup>	Form
Finland, MFA	Iina Soiri, Governance Advisor, Tanzania	Phone interview
France MFA, AFD, MINEFI	Beatrice Ravanel, President - vice director of Democratic Governance, Ministère des Affaires étrangères Séverine Bellina, Sous-direction de la gouvernance, Ministère des Affaires étrangères Jacques Ould Aoudia, Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie Nicolas Meisel, Département Recherche, Agence Française de Développement Javier Herrera, Directeur de Recherche IRD, Directeur de l'UR, DIAL	HQ visit
Netherlands MFA	Mette Gonggrijp, Senior Policy Adviser, MFA Governance and Peace-building Division Delphine Pronk, MFA, DGIS Jelte van Wieren, Deputy Head of Peacebuilding and Good Governance Division, Human Rights and Peace-building Department	HQ visit Phone interview Phone interview
United Kingdom DFID	Julius Court, Governance Adviser, Policy Department Jeremy Armon, Governance Adviser, DFID Rwanda David Newton, Conflict Adviser, Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department Conflict Humanitarian and Security Department	HQ visit
United States USAID	Christina A. del Castillo, Anticorruption Advisor, Governance Division Elizabeth Hart, Senior Anticorruption Advisor Joshua M. Kaufman, Democracy Specialist Jessica Zaman, Governance and Democracy Advisor, Bolivia	HQ visit Phone interview
EC	Alfonso Pascual, Principal Administrator, Panafrican Issues and institutions, governance and migration, DG DEV Clodagh O'Brien, Desk Officer Cameroon, DG DEV Dominique Dellicour, Head of Unit Governance, Security, Human Rights and Gender, EuropeAid	HQ visit
AfDB	Abdoulaye Coulibaly Abdul-Nashiru Issahaku (AfDB, Tunis)	Phone interview
IADB	Xavier Comas, Chief, Institutional Capacity of the State Division	HQ visit
IMF	Lynn MacFarlane, Technical Assistance Advisor, Fiscal Affairs Department John Dalton, Deputy Division Chief Safeguards Assessments, Finance Department Nadia Rendak, Counsel, Legal Department	HQ visit
MCC	Thomas Kelly, Director, Economic Policy Department of Policy and International Relations Richard A. Morford, Managing Director, Donor &	HQ visit

<sup>1</sup> The list reflects survey-specific interviews only.

	Multilateral Relations, Department of Policy and International Relations	
WB	<p>Vera A. Wilhelm, Senior Economist, Poverty Reduction Group</p> <p>Brian Levy, Senior Advisor, PREM</p> <p>Francesca Recanatini, Senior Economist, PREM Public Sector Governance Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network</p> <p>Sanjay Pradhan, Director, PREM Public Sector Governance Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network</p> <p>Frans Ronsholt, Head of Secretariat, Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability Program</p> <p>Nick Manning, Sector Manager, Public Sector Group Poverty Reduction &amp; Economic Management</p> <p>Doris Voorbraak, Senior Public Sector Specialist</p> <p>Christine I. Wallich, Senior Advisor, Governance and Accountability</p>	HQ visit

## Annex 3. Methodology

### *Survey approach*

A three-pronged survey approach has been applied to the methodology, the components of which are set out below:

1. A *scoping questionnaire* to establish an overview of governance assessment (GA) tools currently used, or under development by the agencies, and to identify cases which may enrich the London conference.
2. A *desk study* to assess the methodological differences of the applied GA tools in terms of resource requirements, analytical rigour, availability of necessary information, ease of use, robustness of results, potential for collaboration with other stakeholders and suitability for a variety of situations. See Annex 2 for list of documents reviewed.
3. Follow-up HQ visits and/or phone *interviews* to gather further information, and deepen insight on the usage and impact of the GA tools used by the agencies. See Annex 3 for list of persons interviewed.

Similar questions and study categories have been applied to all tools regardless of their type (see further below).

### *Survey sampling frame*

Two types of sampling frames have been applied for the survey; one pertaining to the tools assessed and one regarding the donors to be contacted.

### *Tools assessed*

- *Range of tools.* The number of GA tools surveyed has been determined by donor usage; this means that only the GA tools that donors *apply* have been surveyed, regardless of whether the tools identified are ‘home-grown’ or not. To a lesser extent, GA tools under development have been surveyed as well.
- *Types of tools.* Four types of tools have been assessed: i) general governance GA tools of qualitative and macro-oriented (country/state level) nature, ii) thematic GA tools as per the four areas (anti-corruption, human rights, capacity, and conflict); (iii) sector-specific or “sub-national” GA tools; and (iv) partner-originated GA tools. To a limited extent, governance assessment processes have been surveyed as well.

### *Donors surveyed*

- *Bilateral donors.* The bilateral donors to be surveyed include the 21<sup>2</sup> GOVNET country members: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States.
- *Multilateral donors.* Asian Development (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), The European Commission (EC), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB),

---

<sup>2</sup> Several bilateral donors such as Germany and France operate through a number of governmental development organizations; hence the number of organizations surveyed will be higher than the number of donor countries contacted. For Italy, a respondent could not be identified.

International Monetary Fund (IMF), Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and the World Bank (WB) including World Bank Institute (WBI).<sup>3</sup>

Responses were received from 18 of the bilateral donors<sup>4</sup> contacted, and all of the multilateral donors contacted. From here on, the terms “donor” and “respondent” will be used interchangeably.

### *Limitations*

Limitations of the survey relate mainly to the limitations of analysis in terms of detail and depth. The survey was only able to reach a certain level of analysis in these areas for the following reasons:

#### *Survey scope*

- Auto-selection of GA tools for review has probably led to a narrower field of GA tools surveyed than what was originally intended with e.g. no capacity development tools included. Also, large tool-oriented donors such as the World Bank probably under-reported on applied assessments tools, focusing on mainstream tools only.
- Other tools surveyed fell outside of the pre-defined survey scope such as tool source books (SDC’s Conflict Sensitive Programme Management (CSPM) tool); and governance assessment applying a multi-instrument process (e.g. World Bank’s CGAC process); These tools have therefore only been included in the survey analysis to a limited extent.
- Finally, the survey focus on *applied* tools turned out to result in a *de facto* limitation of analysis to donor-issued governance assessment tools only.

#### *Tool classification*

- The distinction between general, sectoral and thematic tools was not easily applicable in practice as several tools fit within several categories such as the Dutch SGACA tool (general and anti-corruption assessment tool), and DFID’s Politics of Development (PoD) tool (general and sectoral tool).

#### *Survey instruments*

- While the survey instruments did capture usage of own GA tools; the survey was not designed to capture usage of findings emerging from donors applying other donors’ GA tools. Hence, as a result the survey may not capture all usage/impact of the surveyed GA tools.

#### *Time-frame*

- The tight survey time-frame did not allow for an extensive desk-study or comprehensive follow-up consultations. Similarly, due to time constraints, some donors decided to participate in the survey in a more limited capacity than had been originally intended. Other donors did not respond at all.

---

<sup>3</sup> For the joint tools the data were forwarded from their attached secretariats. Information on the Public Financial Management Performance Measurement Framework was forwarded from the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) programme secretariat located within the premises of the World Bank. The Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems was reported on by the Joint Venture for Procurement (JV-Proc) secretariat located at OECD DAC.

<sup>4</sup> Scoping questionnaires/responses were received from Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

## Annex 4. Governance assessment tools summary sheets<sup>5</sup>

### GENERAL GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT TOOLS

#### *Bilateral tools:*

France, AFD/MINEFI - Institutional Profiles  
Germany, BMZ - Criteria Catalogue  
Netherlands, MFA - Strategic Governance and Corruption Analysis (SCAGA)  
Sweden, Sida - Power Analysis  
Switzerland, SDC - Governance as Transversal Theme: Implementation Guide  
Switzerland, SDC - Key Questions for Context Analysis  
Switzerland, SDC - Monitoring of Development-Related Context Changes  
United Kingdom, DFID - Country Governance Analysis (CGA)  
United Kingdom, DFID - Drivers of Change (DoC)  
United States, MCC - Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Scorecard  
United States, USAID - Democracy and Governance Strategic Assessment Framework (DGSAAF)

#### *Multilateral tools:*

African Development Bank - Country Governance Profile (CGP)  
European Commission - Methodology to Allocate the Governance Incentive Tranche  
Inter-American Development Bank - Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment (DGIA)  
World Bank - Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)  
World Bank Institute - Governance and Anti-Corruption (GAC) Country Survey  
World Bank Institute - Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)

### THEMATIC ASSESSMENT TOOLS

#### Anticorruption Assessment Tools

##### *Bilateral tool:*

United States, USAID - Anticorruption Assessment Framework

##### *Multilateral tool:*

International Monetary Fund - Assessment of the anti-money laundering (AML) and combating the financing of terrorism (CFT) regimes

#### Human Rights Assessment Tools

##### *Multilateral tools:*

European Commission - Human Rights Fact Sheets

#### Conflict Assessment Tools

##### *Bilateral tools:*

Germany, BMZ - Internal Assessment on Conflict Prevention Need (Early Warning)  
Germany, GTZ - Security Sector Reform Assessment  
Netherlands, MFA - Stability Assessment Framework (SAF)  
United Kingdom, DFID - Strategic Conflict Assessment (SCA)  
United States, USAID - Conflict Assessment Framework (CAF)

#### Other Thematic Tools

##### *Multilateral tools:*

International Monetary Fund - Assessment of Central Bank Financial Safeguards  
International Monetary Fund - Fiscal Report on Standards and Codes  
OECD/DAC Joint Venture for Procurement, JV-Proc - Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems  
Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability programme, PEFA - Public Financial Management Performance Measurement Framework  
World Bank - Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR)

---

<sup>5</sup> Summary sheets are not provided for governance assessment tools currently under development.

## GENERAL GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT TOOLS

## FRANCE

### Institutional Profiles

Name of organisation: French Development Agency (AFD)/French Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Industry (MINEFI)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2001

Document(s) consulted: Ould Aoudia, J. 2007. *Profils institutionnels. Une base de données originale sur les caractéristiques institutionnelles de pays en développement et développés.*

Available at [http://www.cepii.fr/institutions/02\\_2007.pdf](http://www.cepii.fr/institutions/02_2007.pdf)

Meisel, N. & Ould Aoudia, J. 2007. Is "Good governance" a good development strategy?

Available at [http://www.cepii.fr/institutions/11\\_2007\\_eng.pdf](http://www.cepii.fr/institutions/11_2007_eng.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
Focus areas/actor group considered	The institutional profiles database consists of some 120 indicators covering nine topics related to a country's institutional framework: the functioning of political institutions; public governance (transparency, corruption...); law and order; market's operating freedom, security of transactions and contracts (property rights, contract law,...); regulation (capital market, labour market, social dialogue...); openness to the outside world (freedom of circulation of goods/services, capital, persons and information); social cohesion (social and regional balance, social mobility, solidarity,...) and coordination of actors/strategic view of the authorities. These nine areas are cross-tabulated with four sectors: the general institutional environment; markets for goods and services; the capital market (financial system) and the labour market and social relations.
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. GA purpose?	- to generate awareness
1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?	No information available
<i>Where</i>	
2.1 Where is the GA performed?	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA	Database covers 85 countries, See <a href="http://www.cepii.fr/anglaisgraph/bdd/institutions.htm">http://www.cepii.fr/anglaisgraph/bdd/institutions.htm</a>
<i>When</i>	
3.1 What triggers a GA process?	No information available
3.2 How often is GA performed?	Data elaborated in 2001 and 2006
3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final	4- 6 months

<i>draft?</i>	
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1 GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a primary indicator set
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform indicator set across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	- No time-horizon, here and now snapshot - To the extent possible comparability of scores across the years
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	Primary data generated by the GA
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Generation of quantitative data - Standard statistical reliability checks - Non representative samples of opinion
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Data are triangulated - Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	No consultation
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	- Actively disseminated to the public (media, printed publication) - "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website)

## GERMANY

### Criteria Catalogue

Name of organisation: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 1990, revised in 2006

Document(s) consulted:

<http://www.bmz.de/en/principles/rules/determiningFactors/index.html>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
Focus areas/actor group considered	<p>The criteria catalogue is a list of criteria based on which BMZ assesses whether or not, and to what extent Germany engages in development cooperation with a country. The catalogue consists of 15 criteria clustered around five areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pro-poor and sustainable policies (orientation towards the MDGs; sustainable, broad-based economic and financial policy; support for ecological sustainability)</li> <li>- Respect for, protection and fulfilment of all human rights (implementation of human rights treaties, promotion of women's rights, observance of human rights standards by state actors);</li> <li>- Democracy and the rule of law (democratic participation and a responsible parliament; limitation of state power through justice and the law; peaceful resolution of internal conflicts);</li> <li>- Efficiency and transparency of the state (government willing and able to act effectively; corruption-free state institutions; transparent, efficient, people-oriented public administration);</li> <li>- Cooperative stance within the international community (constructive participation in regional cooperation mechanisms, in international processes and bodies and pro-peace stance in crisis and conflict situations)</li> </ul>
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. GA purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform aid allocations : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall country allocations of aid</li> <li>- Sector allocations</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks</li> </ul>
1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?	Clearly and operational
<i>Where</i>	
2.1 Where is the GA performed?	In all countries receiving development assistance
2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA	<a href="http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/laenderkonzentration/tabelle.html">http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/laenderkonzentration/tabelle.html</a>
<i>When</i>	

3.1 <i>What triggers a GA process?</i>	Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)
3.2 <i>How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
3.3 <i>How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	3 days
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
4.1.1. <i>GA type?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
4.1.2 <i>GA characteristics?</i>	Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
4.1.3 <i>GA rigorousness?</i>	Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
4.1.4 <i>Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
4.1.5 <i>Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
4.1.6 <i>Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
4.2.1 <i>Types of data - overall</i>	Mainly based on secondary sources, produced among others by: - other donors (WB - NGOs/think tanks (Bertelsmann Foundation, GIGA) - reports of German diplomatic missions
4.2.2 <i>Specific types of data</i>	<i>No information available</i>
4.2.3 <i>Robustness of data</i>	<i>No information available</i>
4.2.4 <i>Validation of data and analysis</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
4.3.1 <i>Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
4.3.2 <i>Performing the GA process</i>	Donor HQ staff
4.3.3 <i>Standard consultation procedures</i>	No consultation
4.3.4 <i>Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only

## NETHERLANDS

### Strategic governance and corruption analysis (SCAGA)

Name of organisation: Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2007

Document(s) consulted: Unsworth, S., and Conflict Research Unit, 2007. *Framework for Strategic Governance And Corruption Analysis. Designing Strategic Responses Towards Good Governance*. Available at <http://www.minbuza.nl/binaries/pdf/dossiers/goed-bestuur/sgaca-framework-october-2007.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	Starting point of the SCAGA process are the findings of the Track Record and other available reports. This information serves as a basis for the Power and Change Analysis, which is based on three dimensions: foundational factors (history, territorial and contextual factors), rules of the game (extent to which state, civil society and private sector institutions work according to formal/informal rules: distribution of power, political competition, relationships between state and society) and an analysis of the 'here and now' (context and key actors/stakeholders). A discussion on operational implications complements the analysis.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies</li> <li style="padding-left: 20px;">- Country strategies</li> <li style="padding-left: 20px;">- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- General accountability to donor constituencies</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Not always perceived clearly and operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In partner countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Benin, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Egypt, Etiopía, Georgia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	Development of country strategies/programmes
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Once off
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of</i>	1 - 3 months

<i>TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	-Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation - Also producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	Descriptive as well as analytical
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Somewhat rigorous following fairly clear standards. However, not rigorous when based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Mainly based on secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Focus groups - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Local consultants - International consultants - with support of the Embassy
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	Depends on country: Embassy decides which stakeholders to engage
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Depends on country

## SIDA

### Power Analysis

Name of organisation: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2003

Document(s) consulted: Power Analysis - Experiences and Challenges Concept Note

Available at

[http://www.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp?d=118&a=24300&language=en\\_US](http://www.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp?d=118&a=24300&language=en_US)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
Focus areas/actor group considered	Power analysis analyses the distribution of power across different actors, as well as the institutions and structures that shape the opportunities of these actors. The analysis focuses on underlying structural factors impeding poverty reduction as well as incentives and disincentives for pro-poor development.
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. GA purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies</li> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> </ul>
1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?	- Clear and operational, but not always clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
2.1 Where is the GA performed?	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA	Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Sudan
<i>When</i>	
3.1 What triggers a GA process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)</li> </ul>
3.2 How often in GA performed?	On an ad hoc basis
3.2 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final	4 - 6 months

<i>draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries with a limited set of standard core issues
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	5-20 year horizon in trend description and analysis
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National</li> <li>- Sub-national</li> </ul>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly based on secondary sources produced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other donors</li> <li>- Partner government</li> <li>- locally generated data like CSO surveys</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Sometimes primary data is also generated by the GA</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Focus groups</li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Mainly qualitative data/expert opinion based are used
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data sources are publicly available</li> <li>- Data are triangulated</li> <li>- Peer review of results and analysis</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Depending on context
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Donor field office staff</li> <li>- Government staff</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- Local university/think thank</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOR/process consulted with government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with Government</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with non-governmental domestic stakeholders</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> <li>- TOR/process and draft GA product consulted with partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No standard policy but the assessments are</li> <li>- Actively disseminated to cooperation partners and partner countries and made</li> <li>- Publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li> <li>- Selected parts may be kept confidential</li> </ul>

## SWITZERLAND

### Governance as transversal theme: implementation guide

Name of organisation: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: Launched in 2007

Document(s) consulted: SDC, 2007. *Governance as a transversal theme: an implementation guide*. Available at [http://162.23.39.120/dezaweb/ressources/resource\\_en\\_156840.pdf](http://162.23.39.120/dezaweb/ressources/resource_en_156840.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The guide develops a method to support the integration of governance as a transversal theme based on five governance principles: accountability, transparency, participation, non-discrimination, and efficiency. For each of those principles, a series of questions is formulated related to four different levels of governance - global, national, local, and institutional - and two aid categories - programmes/projects/sectors and new aid modalities.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	Development of country strategies/programmes Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	According to the needs (set-up of programme)
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	Varies widely
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	

<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Not rigorous
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries/programmes
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No time-horizon, here and now snapshot
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National Sectoral Programme/Project
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative) - Secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	No validation of findings
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	No consultation
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	None - results are integrated in context analysis and design/planning of programmes/projects

## SWITZERLAND

### Monitoring of development-related context changes (MERV)

Name of organisation: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2001

*Document(s) consulted: SDC, 2001. MERV (Monitoring of development-related context changes). List of possible 'checkpoints' for the sub-domains. March, internal document*

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The 'monitoring of development related context changes' provides a checklist of indicators for seven assessment areas: the so-called political, economic, social, security, environmental, cultural and humanitarian conditions. For each of these domains, a trend analysis since last reporting is performed.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Risk management - General accountability to donor constituencies
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Clear and operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	See <a href="http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Countries">http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Countries</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes - Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	- Annually - in selected countries where the situation changes quickly, frequency is higher
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	Half a day
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation - Within-country comparative, enabling country specific

	comparison/ranking over time
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Not rigorous
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries - Variable indicator set across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	Mainly based on secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely based on factual data
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Peer review of results (during annual planning process)
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ (SDC Directorate)
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	Depends on country: - TOR/process consulted with partners implementing programmes
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only

## SWITZERLAND

### Key Questions for Context Analysis

Name of organisation: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

Tool type: General governance assessment

Tool status: launched in 2004

Document(s) consulted: SDC, s.d. *Context analysis; understanding what's going on around us.*  
SDC internal document.

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The key questions for context analysis are structured around six dimensions that are framed against SDC priority crosscutting themes: might and right, crisis and conflict, poverty, exclusion and gender, sustainability and natural resources management, and HIV/aids. For each of these dimensions, ongoing social processes and challenges are analysed, as well as the forces and actors that drive these processes.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies: - Design of specific governance enhancement support
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Clear and operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	Development of country strategies/programmes
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Ad hoc
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	-Mainly or also producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Not rigorous

<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Mainly based on secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely qualitative data/Expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	No consultation procedure
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, not disseminated as such in a specific document

## UNITED KINGDOM

### Country Governance Analysis (CGA)

Name of organisation: Department for International Development (DFID)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2007

Document(s) consulted: DFID, 2007. *How to note. Country Governance Analysis*. Available at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/how-to-cga.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	CGAs cover 15 elements of governance, structured around three dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- state capability (stability/security, economic/social policy management capability, government effectiveness, revenue mobilization/PFM, conditions for investment, trade and private sector development);</li> <li>- accountability (political freedoms/rights, transparency/media, political participation, rule of law/access to justice, civil society)</li> <li>- and responsiveness (human rights, pro-poor policy, (gender) inequality/discrimination, regulatory quality, corruption).</li> </ul>
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Risk management</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- General accountability to donor constituencies</li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Yes
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandatory for all countries with a CAP (country assistance plan)</li> <li>- Optional for other countries receiving development assistance</li> </ul>
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	15 countries in total, including: Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria (state level CGA), Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Vietnam, and Zambia.
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Events in partner countries</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Every 3-4 years (prepared in CAP context)</li> <li>- Sometimes a country event triggers a CGA</li> </ul>
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	7 - 9 months

<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing a secondary indicator set</li> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Very rigorous
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partially a uniform indicator set across countries (core mandatory indicator set)</li> <li>- Partially a variable indicator set across countries</li> <li>- Partially uniform set of issues to be considered across countries</li> <li>- Partially variable set of issues to be considered across countries</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	Cover roughly 3-4 year time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National</li> <li>- Sub-national (Nigeria)</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- Secondary sources - mandatory indicators set are composed of indicators produced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other donors (WB, UNDP, WHO, UNHCR...)</li> <li>- IOs/think tanks/foundations (freedom house, Bertelsmann foundation, TI,...)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Combines different sets of indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some data sources are representative samples</li> <li>- Some data sources are non-representative samples of opinion</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data sources are publicly available</li> <li>- Data are triangulated</li> <li>- Peer review of results and analysis</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor field office staff with help from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with Government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with development partners in case of joint analysis</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li> <li>- Selected parts may be kept confidential</li> </ul>

## UNITED KINGDOM

### Drivers of Change (DoC)

Name of organisation: Department for International Development (DFID)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2003

Document(s) consulted: DFID, s.d. *Drivers of Change: The Politics of Development. Briefing Note*. Internal draft document. <http://www.gsdr.org/go/topic-guides/drivers-of-change>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	Drivers of change study political processes within the context of longer-term change processes in the economy and society. These analyses are structured around three dimensions: agents, structures, and institutions. The new generation of drivers of change will be underpinned by the politics of a development framework, and will highlight four elements of a political decision making process: the wider historical, socio-economic and cultural environment, pressures from groups and interests, formal/informal processes through which decisions are made, and the politics of implementation.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Country strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Yes
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cambodia, Georgia, Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	Ad hoc
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Once off
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	4 - 6 months
<i>How</i>	
GA content	

<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	Descriptive as well as analytical
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Depends on circumstances
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional (East Africa)</li> <li>- National</li> <li>- Sectoral</li> <li>- Also DoC of donors/international organisations</li> </ul>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- Secondary sources</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data</li> <li style="padding-left: 20px;">- Expert opinions</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor field office</li> <li>- Donor field office in consultation with other development partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Usually: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sometimes draft GA product consulted with Government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with development partners when joint exercise</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Depends on country

## UNITED STATES

### Democracy and Governance Strategic Assessment Framework (DGSAF)

Name of organisation: United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2000

Document(s) consulted: Center for Democracy and Governance, 2000. *Conducting a DG assessment: a framework for strategy development*. Washington: USAID. Available at: [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnach305.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnach305.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The democracy and governance strategic assessment is structured around four steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an analysis of the country and its politics, based on five variables (consensus, rule of law, competition, inclusion and good governance), a characterization of the regime type and a brief country history;</li> <li>- identification of the key players, their interests, resources, alliances, and strategies;</li> <li>- an analysis of four institutional arenas (legal arena, competitive arena, governance and civil society);</li> <li>- an assessment of donor resources and interests, the existing portfolio, and timeframes to define and prioritize an assistance program.</li> </ul>
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform aid allocations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall country allocations of aid</li> <li>- Specific aid allocation decisions</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear</li> <li>- Operational</li> <li>- Clearly communicated to those involved or affected</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In most countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Has been developed in about 70 countries
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)</li> <li>- Events in partner countries (elections, perceived change in governance situation, etc)</li> </ul>

<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Dependent on events in partner countries. In cases where multiple assessments have been realized in the same country, normally every 3-5 years
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	1 - 3 months
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Not rigorous
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- Secondary sources</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Peer review of results and analysis on most DGSAF assessments since 2006
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HQ functional bureau</li> <li>- HQ policy branch</li> <li>- HQ regional bureaus</li> <li>- Field office</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Donor field office staff</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<p>Depends on country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partner government is consulted - degree of involvement depends on nature of the regime</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<p>Depends on country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li> <li>- Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only</li> <li>- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities</li> </ul>

## UNITED STATES

### Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Scorecard

Name of organisation: Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2004

Document(s) consulted: <http://www.mcc.gov/selection/index.php>  
Millennium Challenge Corporation, 2007. *Guide to the MCC Indicators and the Selection Process*. Available at  
<http://www.mcc.gov/documents/mcc-fy08-guidetoindicatorsandtheselectionprocess.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
Focus areas/actor group considered	MCC candidate countries are measured and evaluated according to 17 policy indicators that assess the degree to which the political, social, and economic conditions in these countries promote poverty reduction and sustainable economic growth. The indicators deal with three dimensions: - Ruling justly (rights/liberties, rule of law, control of corruption, government effectiveness, voice/accountability); - Economic freedom (inflation, trade and fiscal policy, land rights and access, natural resources management); - Investing in people (public expenditure on health/primary education, immunization rate, girls' education completion rate).
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. GA purpose?	- Inform aid allocations - Overall country allocations of aid - Performance assessment frameworks
1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?	It is clear
<i>Where</i>	
2.1 Where is the GA performed?	In select countries decided on the basis of eligibility criteria (not exceed certain per-capita, annual income levels; not be subject to any number of U.S. or international sanctions)
2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA	<a href="http://www.mcc.gov/selection/scorecards/index-2008.php">http://www.mcc.gov/selection/scorecards/index-2008.php</a>
<i>When</i>	
3.1 What triggers a GA process?	- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process
3.2 How often is GA performed?	Annually
3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of	<i>Not applicable</i>

<i>TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a secondary indicator set
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- very rigorous
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform indicator set across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	Based on secondary sources, produced by: - Other donors (WBG, UNESCO, WHO, IFAD) - NGOs/think tanks (Freedom House, Heritage Foundation)
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Uses different sets of indicators - Some data sources are representative samples - Some data sources are non representative samples of opinion
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Data sources are publicly available
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor HQ staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	TOR/process consulted with general public
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	“Passively” publicly available (e.g. posted on website)

## AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

### Country Governance Profile (CGP)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2002 - updated in 2004, review in 2006

Document(s) consulted: AfDB, 2004. *Country Governance Profile Assessment Checklist/questionnaire guidelines to staff*, AfDB internal document.

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The Country Governance Profile is structured around five broad governance areas: accountability (political accountability, public sector management, corporate governance,...), transparency (information disclosure, public expenditure reviews, public policy analysis), participation (elections, NGOs, gender, decentralization...), legal and judicial system and corruption.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Risk management</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform aid allocations               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sector allocations</li> <li>- Specific aid allocation decisions</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- General accountability to donor constituencies</li> <li>- Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and Partly operational</li> <li>- Partly clearly communicated to those involved or affected</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In partner countries in one region - Africa
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	CP conducted in 27 countries including: Benin, Botswana, Burkina-Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia.
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process</li> <li>- Specific country demand from the Bank's member countries</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	No set regularity
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	6 - 12 months
<i>How</i>	

<b>GA content</b>	
4.1.1. <i>GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative
4.1.2 <i>GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation - Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation - Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time
4.1.3 <i>GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis
4.1.4 <i>Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
4.1.5 <i>Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
4.1.6 <i>Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
4.2.1 <i>Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative) - Secondary sources - produced among others by: - donors (WB, IMF reports) - partner country (national oversight agencies) - NGOs/think tanks
4.2.2 <i>Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys - Expert opinions
4.2.3 <i>Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
4.2.4 <i>Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
4.3.1 <i>Initiating the GA process</i>	Depends on country: - Donor HQ - Donor HQ in consultation with field office - Donor field office - Donor field office in consultation with other development partners - Donor field office in consultation with government partner - Request from government
4.3.2 <i>Performing the GA process</i>	Depends on country: - Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff - Government staff - Local consultants - Local university/think thank - International consultants - other donors' staff
4.3.3 <i>Standard consultation procedures</i>	- TOR/process consulted with government - Draft GA product consulted with Government - Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders - eventually TOR/process consulted with development partners - Draft GA product consulted with development partners
4.3.4 <i>Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Depends on country: distribution arrangements are agreed with government: - either "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website) - either confidential, distributed internally in the agency only

## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

### Methodology to allocate the Governance Incentive Tranche

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2006

Document(s) consulted:

EC, 2006. *Governance in the European Consensus on Development*. COM (2006) 421. Available at

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2006:1020:FIN:EN:HTML>

Aid allocation criteria for the geographic cooperation with the ACP countries in the framework of the 10th European Development Fund covering the period 2008-2013

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The EC methodology consists of three related components: the governance profile, a policy dialogue and the development by the partner country of a governance action plan, and the decision on the allocation of an incentive tranche. For every ACP country a governance profile is elaborated, consisting of 107 questions that cover 9 governance dimensions: democratic governance, rule of law, corruption, government effectiveness, economic governance, social governance, security, regional integration/trade/migration, and quality of political dialogue/programming and participatory approach to development.  On the basis of the governance weaknesses identified a policy dialogue is initiated and the partner government is invited to present a governance action plan. The allocation of a governance incentive tranche is based on the EC assessment of the reform commitments contained in this action plan.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Country strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support - Inform aid allocations - Incremental, incentive based aid allocations - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Clear and Operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In partner countries in one region - ACP countries
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	All ACP countries
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes - Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually

<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	4 - 6 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a descriptive narrative
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No time-horizon, here and now snapshot
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by GA (qualitative) - Secondary sources, possible sources include: - other donors' assessments (WB, AfDB, ECA) - think tanks/NGOs (TI, IDEA) - APRM
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Sometimes peer review of results and analysis with other donors
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- GA product consulted with Government - Draft GA product consulted with development partners
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities - Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country - Governance action plans publicly available (annexed to CSP)

## INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

### Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment (DGIA)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status DGIA methodology was developed and launched in 2004 in Spanish. New, upgraded version (in English) will be published shortly.

Document(s) consulted:

- DGIA 2007 checklists

<http://www.iadb.org/datagob/>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The DGIA consists both of a static and dynamic diagnostic governance assessment. The static assessment focuses on five so-called attributes: democratic system, rule of law, public management, decentralization, and market institutions. Each of these attributes is disaggregated into different aspects, each of those being composed of components linked to different indicators. The static analysis is complemented by a dynamic analysis: the historical, social, economic and other factors that have given rise to the state of each of the attributes. A matrix of policy options complements the analysis.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms</li> <li>- Promote reform agenda among civil society actors</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and operational</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis</li> </ul>
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana, Perú Currently being applied to Paraguay
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Rule in your agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process</li> <li>- Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Depending on the country strategy cycle; usually strategy process is linked to country national electoral cycle
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final</i>	4 - 6 months

<i>draft?</i>	
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing a secondary indicator set</li> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries</li> <li>- Uniform indicator set across countries</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- Secondary sources produced among others by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- donors (WB, UNDP, UNCTAD, UNHCR)</li> <li>- locally generated data (Latinobarometer)</li> <li>- International NGOs/foundations/think tanks (TI, IDEA, Bertelsman, Freedom House...)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Combines different sets of indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some data sources are representative samples</li> <li>- Some data sources are non-representative samples of opinion</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most data sources are publicly available (DataGob-website)</li> <li>- Data are triangulated</li> <li>- Peer review of results and analysis</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ in consultation with field office and HQ regional bureau
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Donor field office staff</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- Local university/think thank</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process consulted with Government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with Government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with development partners when joint exercise</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actively disseminated to the public (media, printed publication), but the government is consulted prior to publication</li> <li>- "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li> </ul>

## WORLD BANK

### Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since the late 1970s with revision in the criteria in 1998 to include governance and social policies; further revision in 2004

Document(s) consulted: World Bank, 2006. *Country Policy and Institutional Assessments, 2006 Assessment Questionnaire*. Available at [siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/CPIA2006Questionnaire.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/CPIA2006Questionnaire.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The CPIA consists of 16 criteria for which countries are rated depending on the level of performance in a given year assessed against the criteria. The criteria are grouped in four equally weighted clusters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic management (macroeconomic management, fiscal and debt policies);</li> <li>- Structural policies (trade, financial sector and business regulatory environment);</li> <li>- Policies for social inclusion and equity (gender equality, equity of public resource use, human resources, social protection and labor, and environmental sustainability);</li> <li>- And public sector management and institutions (property rights and rule-based governance; quality of budgetary and financial management; efficiency of revenue mobilization, quality of public administration and transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector).</li> </ul>
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform aid allocations: Overall country allocations of aid - Performance assessment frameworks
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational - Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	All countries receiving World Bank assistance
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- annual review of country performance
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the</i>	1 - 3 months

<i>assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a primary indicator set - Also producing a descriptive narrative
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation - Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison/ranking between countries - Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries - Uniform indicator set across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	- No time horizon, here and now snapshot - to the extent possible comparability of scores across the years
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by the GA - Secondary sources, produced among others by - donors (IMF, other WB reports, UN data)
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Benchmarking phase to set the ratings at the right level
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- draft GA product consulted with government
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	- IDA - CPIA "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website) - Non-IDA - Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only

## WORLD BANK INSTITUTE

### Governance and Anti-Corruption (GAC) Country Survey

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use

Document(s) consulted: WB, s.d. *Governance diagnostic surveys. A step-by-step guide.*

Available at

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/WBI/EXTWBIGOVANTCOR/0,,contentMDK:20726143-menuPK:1740556-pagePK:64168445-piPK:64168309-theSitePK:1740530,00.html>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus/actor groups considered</i>	WBI GAC country surveys are based on a set of three questionnaires. A public officials' survey focuses on institution specific determinants of corruption, discretionality/informality, performance and governance. An enterprise survey studies the business environment, emphasizing on the effects of corruption and public sector governance on private sector development, while a household survey studies citizens' experiences with and perceptions of corruption in public and private sectors. A specialized survey can equally be carried out, focusing on a sector where corruption is perceived more prevalent, or one that is known to play an important role in restraining corruption.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	Inform programming/strategies: - Country strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Clear and Operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In selected countries, selection based on: - demand from government - evidence of commitment to carry out reforms
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Diagnostics completed in 20 countries: Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Paraguay, Peru, Sierra Leone, Zambia
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Dependent on demand from government to follow up
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of</i>	7 - 9 months

<i>TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a primary indicator set
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	- Partially here and now snapshot - Partially 1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National Sub-national
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	Mainly primary data generated by the GA
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	Perception data - Surveys - Expert opinions Experiential data
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Generation of quantitative data: - Standard statistical reliability checks - Representative samples
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Data are triangulated
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Primarily a country decision to carry out this process with WBI assistance - also donor HQ, policy branch involved
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - local university/think tank/NGO - Local consultants
<i>4.3.4 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- TOR/process consulted with government - Draft GA product consulted with Government <i>No information available for other stakeholders' consultation procedures</i>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Actively disseminated to the public (media, printed publication)

## WORLD BANK INSTITUTE

### World Governance Indicators (WGI)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 1996

Document(s) consulted: Kaufmann, D., A. Kraay and M Mastruzzi, 2007. *Governance Matters VI: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators 1996-2006*, Washington: World Bank. Available at <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/resources.htm>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The world governance indicators are composite indicators that measure six dimensions of governance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- voice and accountability (citizen participation, freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media);</li> <li>- political stability and absence of violence (perceptions of the likelihood that the government will be destabilized, domestic violence and terrorism);</li> <li>- government effectiveness (quality of public services, quality of the civil service, quality of policy formulation and implementation);</li> <li>- regulatory quality (the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development);</li> <li>- rule of law (the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society);</li> <li>- control of corruption (the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, as well as "capture" of the state by elites and private interests).</li> </ul>
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	Main purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to generate awareness, stimulate dialogue and draw attention to areas of weakness that can be further specified and diagnosed through more specific instruments</li> </ul> Other purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Risk management</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear - Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	212 countries, see <a href="http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/resources.htm">http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/resources.htm</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA</i>	- produced annually

<i>process?</i>	
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	Ongoing process of data collection
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a primary or secondary indicator set
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison/ranking between countries</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform indicator set across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No time horizon, here and now snapshot</li> <li>- To the extent possible comparability of scores across the years</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aggregated data generated by the GA</li> <li>- Secondary sources produced by 30 different organizations, among others by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- donors (WB, AfDB, ADB, EBRD)</li> <li>- locally generated data (Afrobarometer, Latinobarómetro)</li> <li>- think thanks/foundations (TI, Bertelsmann, Freedom House,...)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Combines different sets of indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some data sources are representative samples</li> <li>- Some data sources are non-representative samples of opinion</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Statistical model used for data reduction</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Almost all data sources are publicly available</li> <li>- Data are triangulated</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor HQ staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	No consultation
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Actively disseminated to the public (media, printed publication)

## THEMATIC ASSESSMENT TOOLS

## ANTICORRUPTION ASSESSMENT TOOLS

## UNITED STATES

### Anticorruption Assessment Framework

Name of organisation: United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (corruption)

Tool status: In use since 2006, currently undergoing revision to be more streamlined and user-friendly

Document(s) consulted: USAID, 2006. *Corruption Assessment Handbook. Draft final report.*  
Washington: Management Systems International. Available at  
[www.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/USAIDCorAsmtHandbook.pdf](http://www.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/USAIDCorAsmtHandbook.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups concerned</i>	The corruption assessment framework is a four step methodology. In a first step, a review of the legal institutional framework is conducted: the status of anticorruption-related laws, institutions, programs, stakeholders, donors, and government and donor priorities. A second step consists of a political-economic analysis, assessing how power and wealth are used, by whom, within what institutional context, and with what effect. In Step 3, detailed assessments are conducted for the most risky sectors (e.g. healthcare, education,...), institutions (e.g. legislature, regional/local government, political parties,...) and cross-cutting issues (e.g. budget and financial management, public procurement,...). In Step 4, these sectoral/functional recommendations are integrated and prioritized into an anti-corruption programme.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Country strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Yes
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Ukraine, Mongolia, Mozambique, Senegal
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes - Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design) - Events in partner countries (elections, perceived change in governance situation, etc)
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	On ad hoc basis

3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?	4 - 6 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
4.1.1. GA type?	- Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
4.1.2 GA characteristics?	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
4.1.3 GA rigorousness?	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?	No clear time horizon
4.1.6 Level of GA?	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
4.2.1 Types of data - overall	- Primary data generated by the GA - Secondary sources
4.2.2 Specific types of data	- Factual data - Perception data - Surveys - Focus groups - Expert opinions
4.2.3 Robustness of data	- Non-representative samples of opinion - Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis	Data are triangulated
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
4.3.1 Initiating the GA process	Donor field office
4.3.2 Performing the GA process	- Donor HQ staff - Local consultants - International consultants
4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures	Depends on country: - Draft GA product consulted with Government - Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders - TOR/process consulted with development partners - Draft GA product consulted with development partners
4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures	Depends on country: - "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website) - Confidential, distributed internally in your agency only - Confidential, made available to partner government authorities - Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country - Confidential, made available to selected stakeholders on a case-by-case basis

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

### Assessment of the anti-money laundering (AML) and combating the financing of terrorism (CFT) regimes

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2004

Document(s) consulted: FATF-GAFI, 2004. *Methodology for Assessing Compliance with the FATF 40 Recommendations and the FATF 9 Special Recommendations*. February 2004, updated February 2007. Available at <http://www.fatf-gafi.org/dataoecd/14/53/38336949.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The Anti-Money Laundering/Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) methodology is designed to guide the assessment of a country's compliance with the international AML/CFT standards as contained in the FATF Recommendations. Countries are assessed against both essential criteria (those elements that should be present in order to demonstrate full compliance with the mandatory elements of recommendations) and additional elements (desirable options that can further strengthen the AML/CFT system). Areas of assessment cover the legal framework, the measures to be taken by financial institutions and non-financial businesses to prevent money laundering and terrorism financing, institutional measures and the country's national and international cooperation in the field of AML/CFT.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and Operational</li> <li>- Clearly communicated to those involved or affected</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc (voluntary) basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	<p><i>Conducted by IMF:</i> Bahrain, Belarus, Bermuda, Denmark, Djibouti, Gibraltar, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lichtenstein, Latvia, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Thailand, UAE, and Uruguay.</p> <p><i>Conducted by the World Bank:</i> Botswana, Cambodia, CEMAC (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon), Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Madagascar, Mauritania, Namibia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, and Uganda.</p>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA</i>	Approximately every five years

<i>performed?</i>	
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	7 - 9 months
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison/ranking between countries</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No time-horizon, here and now snapshot
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the partner government (laws and regulations, authorities, agencies..)</li> <li>- Secondary sources, produced among others by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- other GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- other sources (mostly public)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experts' analysis</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely based on factual data
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<p>Data sources are publicly available</p> <p>Data are triangulated</p> <p>Peer review of results and analysis (cross-country comparison..)</p> <p>Validation of findings (perception &amp; analysis) with the country's authorities</p>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	At country's request
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HQ staff</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOR/process consulted with government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with Government</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with non-governmental domestic stakeholders</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners (for review)</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website) at the country's request</li> <li>- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities</li> </ul>

## **HUMAN RIGHTS ASSESSMENT TOOLS**

## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

### Human Rights Facts Sheets

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (human rights)

Tool status: In use

Document(s) consulted: None, procedure is confidential

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
Focus areas/actor group considered	<i>No information available</i>
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. <i>GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level
1.2 <i>Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	No
<i>Where</i>	
2.1 <i>Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all developing countries
2.2 <i>Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	All developing countries
<i>When</i>	
3.1 <i>What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process
3.2 <i>How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
3.3 <i>How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	1 - 3 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
4.1.1. <i>GA type?</i>	Mainly producing a descriptive narrative
4.1.2 <i>GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation
4.1.3 <i>GA rigorousness?</i>	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
4.1.4 <i>Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
4.1.5 <i>Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No time-horizon, here and now snapshot
4.1.6 <i>Level of GA?</i>	National

<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary sources - secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data produced studies, direct observation of EU staff and intelligence sources of EU, state bodies, national and international human rights organisations and individuals, international bodies (UN), other bilateral donors, media etc...
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Some primary data publicly available; - other qualitative data/expert opinion based,
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Data are triangulated (also dialogue with government)
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ (reminder sent from HQ) - Donor field office (each presidency responsible for initiating the review)
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor field office staff - EU Member States
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- TOR/process consulted with EU Member States - Draft GA product consulted with EU Member States
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, shared with all EU Member States

## **CONFLICT ASSESSMENT TOOLS**

## GERMANY

### Internal Assessment on Conflict Prevention Need (Early Warning)

Name of organisation: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (conflict)

Tool status: In use since 1999

Document(s) consulted: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2005.  
*Early Warning Indicators of Armed Conflict*, Bonn: BMZ

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The internal assessment on conflict prevention need serves to identify potential crises, to observe these in the longer term, and to develop appropriate courses of action to prevent escalation. The early warning system consists of three main elements: - a qualitative questionnaire to be answered by country expert about the political and societal situation, hypothesising causal links between the status quo and the likelihood of further crises; - an overview of changes in the crisis potential in cooperation countries evaluated by an independent unit within the German Overseas Institute; - and an elaborated overview matrix of the latest country ratings categorised in terms of geographical scope and conflict phase classified after level of 'prevention needs'
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies - Country strategies - Risk management - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level - Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	See <a href="http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/index.html">http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/index.html</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of</i>	1 - 3 months

<i>TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly or also producing a descriptive narrative
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation - Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison/ranking between countries
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	- No time-horizon, here and now snapshot - For some questions 1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	Secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Internally reviewed- Data not publicly available
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	International consultants
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	Not consulted with government, non governmental stakeholders or other development partners
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, distributed internally in your agency only

## GERMANY

### Security Sector Reform Assessment

Name of organisation: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (conflict)

Tool status: In use

Document(s) consulted: None

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor group considered</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Inform aid allocations</li> <li>- Incremental, incentive based aid allocations</li> <li>- monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	According to requirements
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of</i>	<i>No information available</i>

<i>the GA?</i>	
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ - Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Local consultants - International consultants
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<i>No information available</i>
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities - Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country - Confidential, made available to selected stakeholders on a case-by-case basis

## NETHERLANDS

### Stability Assessment Framework (SAF)

Name of organisation: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (conflict)

Tool status: In use since 2002

Document(s) consulted: Clingendael Institute, 2005. *The Stability Assessment Framework: Designing Integrated Responses for Security, Governance and Development*, prepared for the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Available at [http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050200\\_cru\\_paper\\_stability.pdf](http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050200_cru_paper_stability.pdf)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups concerned</i>	The stability assessment framework presents a composite assessment consisting of four main levels of analysis: a trend analysis which assesses 12 indicators for (in)stability (governance, security and socioeconomic development indicators); an institutional analysis assessing the effectiveness and legitimacy of institutions such as police, judiciary and civil service; a stakeholder analysis mapping the various political actors' interests and activities; and a policy analysis that outlines the activities of international organisations.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	Purpose is determined by the FO/Embassy on an ad-hoc/case-by-case basis
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	Not relevant (see 1.1)
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In category 2 states (security development and fragility states)
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Burundi, Rwanda, Pakistan, Bolivia, Colombia, DRC, Afghanistan.
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	Depends on context; flexible
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	Varies widely in scope : - 1-3 months - 4-6 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation

	- Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Partially uniform set of issues to be considered across countries (indicator set) - Partially variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by GA - Secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Focus groups - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Data are triangulated - Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ (most recent SAFs) - Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Local consultants - International consultants
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	Depends on country: Role of partner government and non-governmental stakeholders determined by Embassy (from no involvement to being consulted/commending on results)
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Confidential, distributed internally in the agency as well as in other Dutch Ministries (e.g. Defense)

## UNITED KINGDOM

### Strategic Conflict Assessment (SCA)

Name of organisation: Department for International Development (DFID)

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (conflict)

Tool status: In use since 2001

Document(s) consulted: DFID, s.d. *Strategic Conflict Assessments: An initial Review*. Internal document. DFID, 2002. *Conducting conflict assessments: guidance notes*. Available at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/conflict-assess-guidance.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The conflict assessment framework is a flexible framework that can be adapted as needed. Its methodology consists of three stages: - the conflict analysis as such, focusing on structures (long term factors underlying the conflict), actors (their interests, incentives, capacities, relations) and dynamics (trends, triggers, future scenarios); - an analysis of international responses (from development and other actors) to the conflict and interactions between these and the conflict; - the development of strategies/options for programming interventions.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	- Inform programming/strategies: - Country strategies - Design of specific governance enhancement support - Risk management - Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level - Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational - Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Non-exhaustive list: Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia & Azerbaijan, Balkans, Burma, Georgia, Iraq, Israel & Palestine, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mozambique, Nagorno Karabakh, Nepal, Nigeria, North Caucasus, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uganda, Yemen
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes - Events in partner countries (elections, perceived change in governance situation, etc)
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Often a one-off; trying to encourage regular reviews every 1 or 2 years
<i>3.3 How long does it take on</i>	4 - 6 months

<i>average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	-Mainly producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation - Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	- Regional - National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by GA (qualitative) - Secondary sources
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Focus groups - Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor field office - Donor field office in consultation with other development partners in case of joint exercise
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Always: - Local consultants - International consultants Sometimes: - Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff In exceptional cases (Nigeria): - government staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- Draft GA product consulted with Government - generally draft GA product consulted with likeminded development partners - Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders

<p><i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i></p>	<p>Depends on country context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- “Passively” publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li><li>- Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only</li><li>- Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country</li><li>- Confidential, made available to selected stakeholders on a case-by-case basis</li></ul>
---	---

## UNITED STATES

### Conflict Assessment Framework

Name of organisation: United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Tool type: Thematic assessment tool (conflict)

Tool status: In use since 2003, currently under refinement

Document(s) consulted: USAID, 2005. *Conducting a Conflict Assessment: A Framework for Strategy and Program Development*. Available at

[http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/publications/index.html](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/publications/index.html)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The USAID conflict assessment framework assesses five broad areas: the incentives for violence (e.g. ethnic/religious tensions, economic causes, demographic shifts, competition over natural resources); the access to conflict resources (financial and human resources) ; the institutional and social capacity for managing violence (the state of democracy, local governance); regional and global dynamics and the windows of opportunity and vulnerability. In a second step, potential interventions are identified on the basis of a mapping of existing USAID interventions against the identified causes of conflict.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Risk management</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- sufficiently clear, operational and clearly communicated
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Publicly available: Bulgaria, Georgia, Guatemala, Mongolia, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, Uzbekistan, Kyrgystan
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Specific aid programming exercises (project or programme formulation/design)</li> <li>- Events in partner countries (elections, perceived change in governance situation, etc)</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	On an as-needed basis
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the</i>	1 - 2 months

<i>assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly or also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation - Mainly or also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Not rigorous, based on non-standardized data-set and analytical approaches
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	The framework can be applied nationally or sub-nationally.
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by GA (through key informant interviews). - Secondary sources, among others: USAID's quantitative early warning system
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data - Focus groups - Expert opinions - Surveys
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based.
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	Data are triangulated Peer review and analysis (multiple stakeholders are asked similar questions to verify facts and distinguish facts from opinions)
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ (policy branch and regional bureaus) - Donor field office
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff - International consultants
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- Draft GA product consulted with Government - Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders Depending on country: - TOR/process consulted with development partners - Draft GA product consulted with development partners
<i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Depends on country: - "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website) - Confidential, distributed internally in your agency only - Confidential, made available to partner government authorities - Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country - Confidential, made available to selected stakeholders on a case-by-case basis

## OTHER THEMATIC TOOLS

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

### Assessment of Central Bank Financial Safeguards

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 2000

Document(s) consulted: IMF, 2006. *Safeguards Assessments - 2006 Update*. Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2006/103106.pdf>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	Financial safeguards assessments aim to provide reasonable assurance to the IMF that a central bank's framework of reporting and controls is adequate to manage resources, including IMF disbursements. They cover five key areas of control and governance within central banks: the external audit mechanism; the legal structure and independence; the financial reporting framework; the internal audit mechanism; and the internal controls system.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	Inform programming/strategies - Risk management
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational - Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries borrowing from IMF
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	In 143 countries, see <a href="http://www.imf.org/external/np/tre/safegrds/complete/index.asp">http://www.imf.org/external/np/tre/safegrds/complete/index.asp</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Rule in the agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Annually (assessment at time of initial request; thereafter annual monitoring)
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	1 - 3 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a primary indicator set - Also producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison/ranking between countries</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uniform indicator set across countries</li> <li>- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No time-horizon, here and now snapshot</li> <li>- 1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA</li> <li>- Secondary sources</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data</li> <li style="padding-left: 20px;">expert opinions</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	-Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Donor HQ
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	Donor HQ staff
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	No standard rules for consultation
<i>4.3.5 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only</li> <li>- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities</li> </ul>

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

### Fiscal Transparency Module of Report on Standards and Codes (Fiscal ROSC)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since 1999

Document(s) consulted:

- IMF, 2006. *Questionnaire on fiscal institutions*. Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/fad/trans/question/quest.htm#question>

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The fiscal transparency ROSC is one of 12 reports on standards and codes, covering assessment areas related to policy transparency, financial sector regulation and supervision, and market integrity. The fiscal ROSC gathers information on a country's fiscal institutions, legal structures, and practices to assess observance in relation to the fiscal transparency code. Covered topics relate to the legal fiscal framework, the structure and working of fiscal institutions (government, legislature, audit authority etc.), budget processes, provision of information to the public, and assurances of integrity.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	-Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level -Identify the need for TA
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational - Clearly communicated to those involved or affected
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In countries that have requested it
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Over 90 countries, see: <a href="http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/fiscal.htm">http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/fiscal.htm</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	There are no formal rules or requests stemming from the IMF
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	No formal rules, but the expectation is that some member countries will find it useful to request full fiscal ROSCs on a frequency of about once every 5 years
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	4 - 6 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative, containing precise and

	<p>comprehensive assessments relative to clearly defined good practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current governance situation</li> <li>- Also producing a forward looking road map, with prioritized and time-sequenced recommendations for action to improve fiscal transparency</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation</li> <li>- Horizontally comparative, enabling comparison - but not designed for ranking between countries</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	- No time-horizon, here and now snapshot
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	- National
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative)</li> <li>- Secondary sources</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	- Largely factual/qualitative data, processed by experts
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data publicly available</li> <li>- Data are triangulated (country authority opinions sought on draft text)</li> <li>- Internal peer review of results and analysis</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Informal request by government, perhaps in consultation with staff
<i>4.3.2 Triggers of the GA process</i>	Request from government
<i>4.3.3 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HQ staff</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.4 Standard consultation procedures</i>	- GA product shown to Government in draft. Finalization requires government consent
<i>4.3.5 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if country agrees: "Passively" publicly available (e.g. posted on website)</li> <li>- if country doesn't agree on publication: Confidential, distributed internally in your agency only</li> </ul>

## OECD/DAC

### Joint Venture for Procurement - Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems

Member institutions of OECD DAC Development Cooperation Directorate, Aid Effectiveness Division “Joint Venture for Procurement”: OECD-DAC, World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, UNDP, 13 bilateral donors and currently 25 partner countries from Francophone and Anglophone Africa, Latin America and Asia.

Tool type: General governance assessment tool (public procurement)

Tool status: There are two components of the methodology: the Baseline Indicators (in use by the World Bank, the IADB and the ADB since early 2005 as part of CPARs) and the Compliance and Performance Indicators (the complete methodology in use by the 22 pilot countries since early 2007)

Document(s) consulted: “Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems v.4” (eff. July 2006), on JV website [www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/procurement](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/procurement)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	<p>The methodology is intended to provide harmonized tool to enable a country to do a self-assessment to determine its strengths and weaknesses or to help development partners carry out joint or external assessments. The Baseline Indicators (BLIs) present a “snapshot” comparison of the actual system against the international standards the BLIs represent. The BLIs address: the existing legal framework that regulates procurement, the institutional architecture of the public sector within which procurement is carried out, the operation of this systems and the competitiveness of the national market and the integrity of the public procurement system. The Compliance and Performance Indicators (CPIs) address how this system actually performs by examining data samples that represent the performance of the system.</p> <p>The results of the application of the methodology provide the partner country with precise information on areas of weakness and risk. The development partners use the same results as input to their assessment of the risk associated with using the country procurement system.</p>
<i>Why</i>	
1.1. GA purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support eg capacity development</li> <li>- Risk management strategies for development partners and partner countries</li> <li>- Inform aid allocations</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall country allocations of aid (eg if scaling up via budget support is being considered)</li> <li>- Sector allocations (eg sector budget support)</li> <li>- Specific aid allocation decisions</li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general and at sector level</li> <li>- General accountability to donor constituencies</li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks of the procurement system</li> <li>- International benchmark/advocacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feed into other governance assessments (linked to PEFA assessments of the public financial management system, provide an overall assessment of capacity and areas of risk for the management and use of country financial systems including procurement)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	- Clear and Operational
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Eventually in all countries receiving development assistance</li> <li>- Other non-aid dependent developing economies seeking to improve governance and effectiveness</li> </ul>
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	Countries receiving assistance from the World Bank, the IADB and the ADB since 2005, including the 22 pilot countries of the JV for Procurement in Francophone and Anglophone Africa (Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia) Paraguay in Latin America and Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mongolia; Philippines, Sri Lanka and Vietnam).
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- ongoing monitoring of the results of the procurement capacity development strategy</li> </ul>
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	As needed (e.g. to measure progress in strengthening capacity or in support of a decision to use a country procurement system)
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	3 - 6 months
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a primary indicator set</li> <li>- also producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing an analysis of causal factors, drivers and constraints shaping the current situation of the procurement system</li> <li>- also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve identified areas of weakness</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation</li> <li>- Within-country comparative, enabling country specific comparison/ranking over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Variable indicator set across countries</li> <li>- Uniform set of issues to be considered across countries</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of</i>	No time-horizon, here and now snapshot

<i>the GA?</i>	
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National</li> <li>- Sub-national</li> <li>- Sectoral</li> </ul>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA</li> <li>- Secondary sources, produced among others by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner government</li> <li>Development partners</li> <li>CSOs, private sector</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Focus groups</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Expert opinions</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data sources are publicly available</li> <li>- Review of results and analysis by procurement stakeholders in the country</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	Partner country authority in collaboration with development partners
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Donor field office staff</li> <li>- Government staff (lead role in self-assessment)</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOR/process consulted by government with development partners and other stakeholders</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted by Government</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with non-governmental domestic stakeholders by government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders by government</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with development partners by government</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners by government</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.5 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	Governments are encouraged to actively disseminate and to encourage discussion by the public (media, printed publication)

## PEFA Programme Public Financial Management Performance Measurement Framework

Partners: World Bank, IMF, EC, UK DFID, Swiss SECO, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use (since when?) launched June 2005

Document(s) consulted: see [www.pefa.org](http://www.pefa.org)

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor groups considered</i>	The PFM Performance Measurement Framework is an integrated monitoring framework that allows measurement of country PFM performance over time. It uses an indicator-based analysis to develop an integrated assessment of a country's PFM system against six critical dimensions of performance of an open and orderly PFM system: credibility of the budget; comprehensiveness and transparency; policy-based budgeting; predictability and control in budget execution; accounting, recording and reporting; and external scrutiny and audit.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level on PFM reform</li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks for monitoring of progress</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PEFA purpose is in principle clearly communicated but there potentially a few different purposes, and the one applied in each different country case needs to be defined and clearly expressed at the planning stage.</li> <li>- The PEFA tool is definitely operational.</li> <li>- The tool is for the most clearly communicated to those involved.</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For some development partners: in all countries receiving development assistance</li> <li>- For other partners: in select countries decided on an ad-hoc basis</li> </ul>
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	All regions; as of Aug 2007: 58 with (draft) final report; by Jan 2008 about 70; a further 15 in progress (no report yet). For list see <a href="http://www.pefa.org">www.pefa.org</a>
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	- Development of country strategies/programmes particularly in relation to formulation of donor support programs for PFM reform and in relation to donor decisions on budget support operations.
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Recommendation is every 3-5 years, but some annual and bi-annual examples seen.
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the</i>	Varies widely: - 1 - 3 months; rarely

<i>assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 - 6 months; occasionally</li> <li>- 7 - 9 months; most usual, but varies significantly</li> <li>- 10 - 12 months; often</li> <li>- More than a year; occasionally</li> </ul>
<i>How</i>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative</li> <li>- Also producing a primary or secondary indicator set</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As a standard characteristics, descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation</li> <li>- Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation holding analytical elements in terms of linkages between different indicators and analysis of the most important weaknesses that need to be addressed</li> <li>- For repeat assessments in a given country: enabling comparisons over time</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- for some indicators very rigorous, based on a well-defined data-set, as well as clear and transparent criteria for use of data</li> <li>- generally speaking only somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uniform indicator set across countries</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No time-horizon, here and now snapshot for baseline assessment (standard)</li> <li>- 1-5 year horizon in trend description and analysis for repeat assessments</li> </ul>
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National standard</li> <li>- Sub-national occasionally</li> </ul>
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data generated by the GA</li> <li>- secondary sources</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Factual data</li> <li>- Perception data: expert opinions (key informants, professional judgment)</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data publicly available for some quantitative indicators</li> <li>- Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based</li> </ul>
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data sources are publicly available for some indicators</li> <li>- Data are typically triangulated</li> <li>- Peer review of results and analysis for most assessments</li> </ul>
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor field office is usually in consultation with other development partners</li> <li>- Donor field office is always in consultation with government partner</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	<p>Depends on country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor HQ staff</li> <li>- Donor field office staff</li> <li>- occasionally government staff (self-assessment usually followed by ext. validation)</li> <li>- Local consultants</li> <li>- International consultants</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOR/process is always consulted with government</li> </ul>

<i>procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft GA product is always consulted with Government</li> <li>- TOR/process is occasionally consulted with development partners</li> <li>- Draft GA product is usually consulted with development partners</li> </ul>
<i>4.3.5 Standard dissemination procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Passively” publicly available (e.g. posted on website) is the intention/policy by most lead agencies</li> <li>- Confidential, made available to partner government authorities</li> <li>- Confidential, shared with all or some of the other donors in the country</li> </ul>

## WORLD BANK

### Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR)

Tool type: General governance assessment tool

Tool status: In use since the 1980s

Document(s) consulted: World Bank, 2002. *Revised CPAR Procedures*, World Bank/IFC/MIGA Office Memorandum 38874

Issues	Responses
<b>GA PROCESS</b>	
<i>What</i>	
<i>Focus areas/actor group considered</i>	The CPAR provides a broad review of a country's procurement system, including the legal and organizational framework; the procedures; the decision making, control and complaints systems; the existence of anti-corruption programs and of private sector participation in the system, and the system performance in different sectors. In order to fully assess the overall risks associated with the procurement process, different factors underlying the quality of the procurement system are equally analyzed, such as the existence of a culture of accountability, the absence of political interference, the existence of honest and capable staff, and the presence of clear written standards.
<i>Why</i>	
<i>1.1. GA purpose?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inform programming/strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country strategies</li> <li>- Design of specific governance enhancement support</li> <li>- Risk management</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform aid allocations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall country allocations of aid (looked at as part of IDA allocation process)</li> <li>- Incremental, incentive based aid allocations (often conditionality for tranche release)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Inform policy/political dialogue at general or at sector level</li> <li>- Performance assessment frameworks</li> <li>- General accountability to donor constituencies</li> <li>- Detailed operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms</li> </ul>
<i>1.2 Is GA purpose clearly communicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and Operational</li> <li>- Clearly communicated to those involved or affected</li> </ul>
<i>Where</i>	
<i>2.1 Where is the GA performed?</i>	In all countries receiving development assistance
<i>2.2 Names of countries having been subject to GA</i>	All countries having received World Bank assistance
<i>When</i>	
<i>3.1 What triggers a GA process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of country strategies/programmes</li> <li>- Rule in your agency requesting regular application of this governance assessment process</li> <li>- Events in partner countries (elections, perceived change in</li> </ul>

	governance situation, etc) - Sometimes requested by country
<i>3.2 How often in GA performed?</i>	Every three to five years or when a major change occurs
<i>3.3 How long does it take on average to conduct the assessment from launch of TOR to approval of final draft?</i>	7-9 months
<b>How</b>	
<b>GA content</b>	
<i>4.1.1. GA type?</i>	- Mainly producing a descriptive narrative - Also producing a forward looking road map or recommendations for action to improve governance
<i>4.1.2 GA characteristics?</i>	- Descriptive, mainly aiming at providing a snapshot of the current governance situation - Descriptive as well as analytical, aiming at identifying underlying causal factors explaining the current governance situation - The CPARs vary widely and are customized to country situations
<i>4.1.3 GA rigorousness?</i>	- Somewhat rigorous, following fairly clear standards for data sampling and use, as well as a standardized approach to presentation and/or analysis.
<i>4.1.4 Adaptability of GA to country context?</i>	Variable set of issues to be considered across countries
<i>4.1.5 Time-perspective of the GA?</i>	No clear time horizon
<i>4.1.6 Level of GA?</i>	- National - Some regional grouping have also been examined
<b>Data sources</b>	
<i>4.2.1 Types of data - overall</i>	- Primary data generated by the GA (qualitative) - Secondary sources, among others produced by donors, partner government
<i>4.2.2 Specific types of data</i>	- Factual data - Perception data Surveys Focus groups Expert opinions
<i>4.2.3 Robustness of data</i>	Largely qualitative data/expert opinion based
<i>4.2.4 Validation of data and analysis</i>	- Peer review of results and analysis
<b>GA conduct and dissemination</b>	
<i>4.3.1 Initiating the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ - Donor field office - Sometimes also requested by government
<i>4.3.2 Performing the GA process</i>	- Donor HQ staff - Donor field office staff - Local consultants - International consultants - moving towards self-assessments
<i>4.3.3 Standard consultation procedures</i>	Depends on country: - TOR/process consulted with government - Draft GA product consulted with Government - TOR/process consulted with non-governmental domestic

	<p>stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with non-governmental stakeholders</li> <li>- TOR/process consulted with development partners</li> <li>- Draft GA product consulted with development partners</li> </ul>
<p><i>4.3.4 Standard dissemination procedures</i></p>	<p>Depends on country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actively disseminated to the public</li> <li>- “Passively” publicly available (posted on website)</li> <li>- Confidential, distributed internally in the agency only (when specific objection by the government)</li> </ul>