



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET)
Governance Assessment conference

**OECD DAC GOVNET Conference on
Governance Assessments and Aid Effectiveness**
London, 20-21 February 2008

“Governance Assessments in Practice”

Summary of case-studies to be presented in break-out groups (day 1)

1. Joint assessments: emerging lessons- Pakistan and Guyana
2. Multiple assessments in one country - Uganda and Mozambique
3. Governance Assessments and partner country participation and ownership - Madagascar and Cameroon
4. How helpful are assessments in conflict and crises? – Nepal and Kenya
5. Thematic and sector governance assessments – Nepal/Malawi and Mauritania

1. Joint assessments: emerging lessons. **Pakistan and Guyana**

There seems to be an increasing number of joint donor governance assessments which often reflect broader ongoing harmonization efforts. Nonetheless these joint assessments take many forms. For example, joint assessments can be conducted amongst “like-minded” donors who decide to use only one assessment tool. This requires that these donors combine or reconcile demands from their headquarters with the constraints of domestic harmonization, alignment and accountability vis-à-vis the partner government.

Guiding questions:

- What are the incentives for donors to conduct assessments jointly?
- Are donors able to agree upon the use of one particular assessment tool? If so is it only possible for donors already using similar methodologies?
- What are the logistical and political limits of undertaking assessments jointly?
- Have joint assessments proved satisfactory? Do they lead to further harmonization and donor alignment?

CASE PRESENTERS:

- Mr. David Johnson, Senior Governance Adviser, DFID Pakistan & Ms. Mirjam Krijnen, Political Governance Advisor, Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pakistan
- Mr. Pablo Alonso, Senior Modernization of State Specialist, IADB

PAKISTAN

Two donors (DFID, Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs) cooperated in Pakistan to develop a joint governance assessment based on DFID’s Country Governance Analysis (CGA) model. Although the CGA was undertaken jointly with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands also produced its proper assessment (Strategic Governance and Anti-corruption Assessment-SGACA) based on the CGA.

This case explains how the decision and the process of conducting the assessment jointly came about, looking into how the two donor reconciled their own objectives and incentives. The case also examines how their cooperation functioned on the ground as well as the main findings of the assessment. Insights will be provided on the added value of undertaking this governance assessment jointly, both from a donor and Pakistan’s perspective. It will finally explore lessons learned from conducting a single joint assessment.

GUYANA

In Guyana, both multilateral and bilateral donors rallied behind IDB’s governance assessment which was initiated as part of the regular IDB’s programming exercise with the Government of Guyana. Other Donors saw the IDB’s initiative as an opportunity to join forces to tackle perhaps the most salient issue in Guyana’s development. The assessment was carried out by a group of external consultants co-financed by the donor community, which jointly supervised and assisted the work of the consultants. Government, civil society, the private sector, academia, political parties, unions and other non-state actors were extensively consulted during the analysis and revision process. On the basis of the assessment, donors are planning to work, together with the Government, on a specific governance enhancement plan. The case will explore how and why this harmonization process was successful.

2 . Multiple assessments in one country - Uganda and Mozambique

It often happens that several donors undertake separate (un-coordinated) governance assessments more or less simultaneously in the same partner country. These assessments range from indicator-based ones to political economy analyses, and can be rather general or thematically specific. They can also be purely donor-driven or more participatory, involving local stakeholders from the start and using locally-generated indicators or assessments.

Guiding questions:

- What are the reasons for the proliferation of parallel donor assessments? Is the multiplicity of assessments based on clear comparative advantages of different assessment tools?
- Is there room for enhanced sharing and synergies between donors either at the early stages of the assessments (when developing TORs...) or when the assessments are released (to agree on key findings)?
- What are the effects of the multiple governance assessments on domestic efforts to enhance accountability?
- To what extent do the findings of different governance assessments and the resulting policies/decisions go in the same direction?

CASE PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Saul Kaye, Secretary, National APRM Commission, Uganda
- Mr. Marc De Tollenaere, Head of Governance, Swiss Development Cooperation

UGANDA

In Uganda, several donors are undertaking different governance assessments, while the National APRM Commission has just presented the President with the Country Self Assessment Report, which has been released for dissemination. In Uganda, government and donors have made progress in coordination and harmonization (with among other things the development of the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy). There is no written case on Uganda, but the case presenter will give first hand experiences of both donor governance assessments and matters relating to harmonisation and alignment. Moreover, insights may be shared on the usefulness of and interaction with the APRM process and products.

MOZAMBIQUE

Despite profound governance deficiencies, the Mozambican government has succeeded in building a fairly strong partnership with its major donors on governance reforms. Still, donors have differing views on the nature of the governance deficiencies, their seriousness and the general 'direction of travel' of the reform process in Mozambique. The case study looks into the main recent donor governance assessments, the reasons why they have been undertaken and what the effects have been, both within agencies as within the broader context of cooperation between donors and government. Have governance assessments for instance affected the quality of the policy dialogue between government and donors? Has there been any effect on the quality and depth of the performance assessment framework and its monitoring within the budget support partnership?

The study will look at efforts made to align donors' efforts with governance processes that are part of the poverty reduction strategy processes of the government. Have efforts been made to ensure linkages with country driven governance assessments and monitoring processes such as in the context of the Performance Assessment Framework of the budget support partnership? Have donors supported or integrated home-grown governance assessments such as the peer

review of the APRM? The case will also focus on attempts by donors to cooperate and coordinate governance assessments. The recent experiences with the World Bank's CPIA, the EC's Governance Profile/Incentive Tranche and the MCC's scorecard may illustrate to what extent the findings of different governance assessments and the resulting policies/decisions pull in the same direction or not.

3. Governance Assessments and partner country participation and ownership - Madagascar and Cameroon

Some donors have been involving partner countries in multiple ways and for different reasons when assessing governance. Forms of partner country involvement cover a wide range, from support to capacity development to enable domestic stakeholders to take over, over joint partner-donor assessments (as for instance pioneered in Rwanda through the *Joint Governance Assessment*), to less ambitious forms of partial involvement and consultation in one or other component of the assessment process.

Guiding questions:

- Why and how do donors encourage domestic stakeholders to engage in governance assessment processes and how does this affect the assessment approach and tools?
- What restrains donors from involving partner countries more actively in their governance assessments?
- What are emerging good practices in engaging with domestic stakeholders when assessing governance?

CASE PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Franck Razafindrabe, Director Monitoring and Evaluation of the *Comité pour la Sauvegarde de l'Intégrité*, Madagascar & Mark Nelson, Senior Operations Officer, World Bank Institute
- Ms. Clodagh O'Brien, Desk Officer Cameroon, European Commission DG DEV

MADAGASCAR

Madagascar is one of the growing number of countries that has taken the governance assessment problem into its own hands. Using a methodology that has been utilized by the World Bank Institute in more than two dozen other countries, Madagascar carried out an opinion-based governance and anti-corruption survey that helped the government formulate a more focused and targeted reform strategy. This case traces the history of the government ownership over this diagnostic process. It gives a brief overview of the methodologies of the surveys, their main findings and the subsequent policy actions. Process elements such as participation by domestic stakeholders and transparency and dissemination of findings are dealt with. Finally, the case focuses on (the potential for) harmonization among donors and donor alignment behind domestically driven diagnostics and approaches to improve governance and fight corruption.

CAMEROON

The Cameroon case deals with the EC's *Methodology to allocate the Governance Incentive Tranche*. The methodology is a 'composite' process which involves an analytical component (the EC's Governance Profile), but also policy dialogue and a mechanism for allocating additional financial resources (the incentive tranche) to the partner country. The methodology – in which EU member states cooperate in various ways and phases - is applied to all partner countries of the ACP-EU Cotonou Partnership Agreement. This case describes how the methodology was applied in Cameroon, how the policy dialogue with the government took shape, what the government's response was through a Governance Action Plan, and the subsequent steps of the incentive tranche mechanism. The case presents the first results and the perceived strengths and weaknesses in the context of Cameroon. Some questions to be addressed include: Does the

cooperation among donors also lead to the development of joint activities and strategies on governance? Is domestic accountability, buy-in from local stakeholders, and alignment with government enhanced through this assessment and allocation process?

4. How helpful are assessments in conflict and crises? – Nepal and Kenya

Power/political economy analyses hold promises for the historical and contextual perspectives they bring on the nature of conflict, by looking at power configurations, interests, drivers and obstacles of change. Sometimes these tools even take conflict and violent crisis as a specific starting point. Despite the increased use of these governance diagnostics and assessments, donors still find themselves ill-prepared to anticipate (re-)emerging conflict and crisis.

- Are conflict assessment tools – or the more analytical general assessment tools – sufficiently sophisticated to pick up conflict fault lines? To what extent do governance assessments lend themselves to assessing possible conflicts and crises?
- Have such assessments proven their usefulness in distinguishing a blip (or a series of blips) from a trend in governance?
- What is the added value of conflict assessments compared to the general political economy analysis?
- When politics matter most – and donors risk of differing strongly on appropriate responses (volumes, conditionality, tools etc.) – have these tools proven to allow for developing common understanding, common approaches, or even whole of government approaches within donors?

CASE PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Mark Segal, Conflict Advisor, DFID
- Mr. Karuti Kanyinga, Senior Research Fellow, University of Nairobi, Kenya

NEPAL – thematic tool – conflict assessment

The Nepal case presents a thematic tool, i.e. DFID's Strategic Conflict Assessment and a Programme Level Conflict Assessment. The case looks at the scope and main characteristics of this systematic and explicit analysis of conflict and peace-building opportunities, dissemination and its effects on donor policies, strategies and actions in the field. Has it influenced the other governance assessment tools in use? What have been first experiences integrating conflict, security and justice issues in general governance assessments? Experiences in promoting a whole-of-donor approach and practices of inter-agency cooperation will also be dealt with.

KENYA

The recent upsurge of post-electoral violence in Kenya prompts questions about the levels of understanding by donors of the conflict dynamics and the deeper governance fault lines that may have fed it. On the one hand, the Kenya case will look into the newer generation of political economy analyses and assessments, including some recent anti-corruption and conflict assessments. It will present the coverage and scope of these assessments ('foundational' factors and the nature of the state, power structures, stakeholder interests and behavior etc.) and look at experiences with sharing these diagnostics. The case will, on the other hand, provide an overview of standard indicator based assessment tools. For both categories, the case will verify if the assessments have been sensitive to the conflict potential – or have been able to pick up trends. Other questions that the Kenya case will try to answer relate to the relevance of these assessments for informing longer term strategies of donors and their operational significance (choice of instruments and prioritization of actions).

5. Thematic and sector governance assessments – Nepal/Malawi and Mauritania

Some assessment tools focus specifically on a particular theme or on a sector. The purpose for undertaking such assessments range from strengthening governance dimensions in particular sector work, to sensitizing stakeholders around specific themes or issues such as human rights or corruption. While some of these thematic (procurement) or sector-specific (e.g. education, health) assessments may seem to offer more ‘technical’ and therefore less politically contested avenues for domestic reformers to utilize or act on, others thematic assessments (such as human rights or corruption) are potentially highly sensitive and make it hard for stakeholders to agree upon.

Guiding questions:

- Why and how are these thematic and sector-specific governance assessments undertaken?
- How do they relate to broader governance assessments and/or political economy analyses?
- Have these thematic and sector governance assessments stimulated stronger harmonization with other donors, or closer involvement of domestic stakeholders?
- To what extent can sector-specific governance assessments support domestic stakeholders and donors in their strategic and operational choices? Are these specific assessments more “actionable” than more general governance assessments?

CASE PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Carole Samdup, Co-ordinator, Rights and Democracy & Mr. Basanta Kumar Karki, Regional Manager, Nepal
- Ms. Camille Bryan, Governance Specialist, The World Bank Institute

MALAWI/NEPAL - Assessing food insecurity

The application of the thematic governance assessment on the human right principle of food security in the context of Nepal and Malawi brought up a number of issues that will be dealt with in this tool-based case. The case answers questions on why and how this thematic human rights assessment was undertaken in both countries. It will look at usage and results, for instance, whether there has been downstream follow-up by stakeholders and more broadly how this assessment process affects relations or interactions between civil society, government and donors. It will also deal with the way in which donor behavior affects domestic accountability.

MAURITANIA

This tool-based case is a World Bank (WB) sector-level pilot aimed at generating policy solutions for sector/thematic specific governance challenges in transport, public construction and procurement. The case clarifies the objectives of this pilot exercise, and links these to the diagnostic methodology which combines research/in-depth interviews (to capture the sector ‘production chain’), experience based surveying and audits. These diagnostics are embedded in a phased approach involving civil society, private sector stakeholders and government. The case highlights the importance of different forms of domestic participation and input throughout these phases, as well as the cooperation with other donors. It also deals with tensions and dilemmas, and presents some of the early lessons of this pilot exercise pertaining to the combined diagnostics, as well as to the efforts to promote locally determined governance agendas.