

A USERS' GUIDE TO

MEASURING LOCAL GOVERNANCE



COMMUNICATION PACKAGE

A Users' Guide to Measuring Local Governance Communication package

Why use this communication package?

To help those exploring the possibility of carrying out local governance assessments:

- by providing a common language and framework for discussing their assessment objectives and options
- to reflect on the main challenges, and elements of good local governance in their setting
- to clarify their objectives
- to judge their readiness to undertake an assessment
- to consider the issues around leadership of local governance assessment
- to consider how to ensure inclusiveness
- to select appropriate tools, and to adapt them to the local context
- to consider how to ensure the findings are used

What does it include?

- Presentation slides (PowerPoint) with discussion notes
- Background information on indicators
- Notes for facilitating small group exercises
- Group work- ready case studies
- Participant feedback form

Who is it for?

It is intended to assist UNDP Country Office members in convening structured discussions with country partners who are exploring the possibility of carrying out local governance assessments and who are seeking advice and guidance.

How should it be used?

The Communication Package suggests a particular format of information presentation followed by exercises where “participants” are encouraged to reflect on the relevance and applicability of the information presented to their own settings. However, a minimalist approach can also be used, involving a simple presentation of information (using all or some of the topics), followed by unstructured discussion. The presentation slides are set up as a menu of topics for ease of this purpose.

This collection of discussion notes includes additional background information and discussion points for certain presentation slides.

This Communication Package is based on the Users' Guide to Measuring Local Governance, and a workshop session by Paul van Hoof of Idasa that was commissioned by UNDP.

Session overview

1. Objectives and overview
2. Users' Guide to Measuring Local Governance
3. Democratic local governance
 - Exercise 1: What is good local governance in your context?
4. Measuring local governance
 - Exercise 2: Brainstorming indicators
5. Issues to consider for carrying out LG assessments
6. Practical application
 - Exercise 3: Selecting a local governance assessment tool
 - Exercise 4: Case study

Background on indicators

Indicators

An indicator is a measure of performance that is used to demonstrate change, and which details the extent to which results are being or have been achieved. Generally speaking, this is done in two ways:

1. By counting
 - e.g. Number of local corruption scandals in the past year.
2. By giving a numerical value to a qualitative statement
 - e.g. In practice, election observers are able to effectively monitor elections.
[Assign a score: 100 75 50 25 0]

Input and output or outcome indicators

Complex assessments require balanced sets of indicators, which take account of *input-based* indicators (e.g. focusing on the legal and institutional framework), as well as *output/outcome-based* indicators, (e.g. data on the objective experiences and subjective opinions of those accessing the reporting mechanism).

Actionable and action-worthy indicators

An *actionable indicator* is one in which data allows disaggregation to pinpoint bottlenecks and inefficiencies within the public administration and within wider systems of accountability and indicate the need for corrective action. Data needs to be specific and localised, including locally-generated, and regularly collected to be actionable for policymaking and planning. These indicators tend to measure specific things under the control of policymakers, such as the statutory rules governing the business environment, measures of civil service recruitment and turnover practices, and specifics of budget procedures.

However actionable indicators are only useful if the intervention/ mechanism/ policy they are assessing is worthwhile. Otherwise they risk measuring things because they are easily measurable, leading to what Kauffmann and Kraay call “teaching to the test” and “reform illusion”. Assessing performance of interventions only makes sense if these are first deemed appropriate for the particular local context. Hence the call for indicators that are actionable but also *action-worthy*.

Poverty and gender sensitive indicators

Four ways of making indicators sensitive to vulnerable groups:

1. Disaggregating by poverty/gender
 - The proportion of poor households using public services who experienced corruption directly in the last 12 months in comparison to non-poor households.
 - The proportion women elected local councillors.
 - Voter turnout by sex.
2. Specific to the poor/women
 - Percentage of reported corruption cases in public agencies serving low-income communities in comparison to those in higher income areas, e.g. education (schools), health (clinics, hospitals), the police.
 - Existence of anti-sex discrimination laws and equal opportunities policies in the local government and evidence of their enforcement and implementation.
3. Implicitly poverty/gender sensitive
 - The percentage of small retail business can afford to bring a legal suit.
 - Transparency of land allocation practices.
4. Chosen by the poor/women
 - Level of satisfaction with public services expressed by women in poor households in comparison to men.
 - Percentage of citizens who have access to a justice mechanism at a reasonable cost.

Facilitation notes

Using small groups

There are a number of advantages of working in small groups, whether or not participants have the same or different professions.

Small groups are ideal for problem-solving, experience sharing and learning from peers. They provide a safe environment where participants can practice new skills, test out new ideas, and give and receive feedback. In addition, some individuals may feel more comfortable speaking in small groups than in plenary, so using small groups also ensures that everybody talks!

Depending on the specific task, the ideal numbers for small groups will vary. In a group that is too large, not everyone will engage, while a group that is too small will bring together fewer perspectives and is likely to generate less creative exchange. Ideal numbers are anywhere from 4 to 8 people.

Getting groups to work together effectively may require some facilitation. This can be the decision by the group to assign a note-taker or time-keeper. It can also mean instituting rules (normally by the trainer), for example, that require each participant to contribute to the discussion, or that limit everyone's time to talk, as a means of managing reticent and dominant personalities.

There are many ways of dividing groups which may be suitable at different times. Here are a few possibilities:

Participant's preference

- *Letting participants choose* which group they want to join, for example when each group has a different assignment focus. In this case the trainer's job is to structure the choice of group by focus areas that are of interest to

participants. If a group is oversubscribed, split it. If a group is undersubscribed, it probably isn't a popular topic!

Random seating

- For example, by *numbering* participants. Here the trainer would count out participants according to the number of desired groups, assigning each one a number/letter: "1-2-3-4" or "A-B-C-D". Make sure to specify where each group should convene.
- For fun, you can even organize participants on the basis of what *colour* they are wearing. Be creative!

Ordered seating

- Participants are seated by *table cards* listing the names in each group. Ideally these should provide a new mix of participants who have not yet worked together. This requires advance preparation.

Setting *criteria*, for example: groups should include participants from different/the same countries/institutions/municipalities, or that groups should be gender balanced.

Brainstorming

Brainstorming is a technique used in groups to generate a large number of ideas on a given problem or topic. Creativity can be stifled when the brainstorming process is cut short, and individuals can become inhibited in groups when their ideas are rejected or seen as being off topic.

Here are a few recommended tips for brainstorming effectively:

- start by clearly defining the problem or question
- focus on quantity, generating as many ideas as possible
- encourage people to develop their ideas
- welcome unusual ideas
- withhold judgment and criticism - asking for clarification is ok, but not passing judgement
- combine ideas to create new ones

Options for reporting back

The traditional reporting back format (within the UN anyway!) is the plenary presentation of small group work. However, this should not necessarily be the default method, as it can become repetitive and boring. In order to decide the most appropriate reporting back format, consider the following questions:

- Are the topics and findings of groups of interest to each other?
- Have small groups worked on the same or different topics?
- Will there be repetition between what groups have to report?
- What will participants gain from listening to the presentations of other groups?

Consider the following reporting back options:

Focusing feedback

Ask groups to focus on the most interesting aspects of their findings, by providing a reporting back structure. For instance, asking them to present the three most important points, and allow for questions after to fill in gaps.

Opt to have no plenary

The objective of exercises is for participants to leave with information they can apply when they return to work. Sometimes reporting back is completely redundant. In these cases, it is completely fine for the person facilitating the session to skip this part, and instead to deliver a short debrief. Note that it is important to wrap up activities, by focusing on a few key points that were raised by groups, though it is not always necessary to summarize comprehensively the activity.

Have groups brief each other

The advantage of this reporting back format is that it requires minimal facilitation, once it is set up, allowing participants the freedom to discuss and exchange information.

Begin by assigning a label to each table (e.g. Table A,B,C,D) before groups begin an exercise. Ask groups to write their answers on flip-chart, and to post their poster on a wall by their table when they have finished.

After the exercise, explain the reporting format. Members from each table should go sit at different tables, so that at each of the 4 tables, there should now be a person from table A,B,C,D.

These new table groups then rotate from table to table to review the flipchart notes. At each new table, the member from the original group who knows the flipchart can present it to his/her new group members.

Continue learning through the GAP

Participants can seek out more information on other country initiatives, tools for assessing local governance, a library of resources and speak with other practitioners through the forum on the Governance Assessments Portal (www.gaportal.org)

Using the case studies

The following four fictional case studies demonstrate key concepts and themes raised in earlier chapters of this Guide and cover such issues as:

- Facilitating commitment and involvement - the role of a local government official
- Moving from government to the concept of governance – the role of a civil society activist
- Balancing comparability with local relevance – the role of a representative from a local government association
- Ensuring uptake of assessment findings in local policy-making – the role of a local elected government official

Although the names are fictitious, examples have been drawn to approximate real-life scenarios based on actual country experiences.

Suggested use of the case studies:

Form small groups on the basis of interest – some cases may be popular, requiring several groups, while others may not be of interest. Each case is given to the individuals of the groups in instalments. Individuals read about a problem, then come to a question which they should discuss with their group members before moving on to the next instalment.

Reporting back is optional, though the person facilitating this session may wish to debrief drawing attention to themes that were of interest or that link the cases.

Case study 1

Facilitating commitment and involvement: The role of a local government official

Svetlana has recently been appointed as the head of the policy unit in her municipality. She has a university degree in social sciences and has been working for an international development agency for a couple years. However, Svetlana has never been a local government official and her insight into the everyday practices and the specific organizational culture in the municipal administration was limited.

The major strategic responsibilities of Svetlana were to steer the development agenda, coordinate most critical policies and mobilize external resources. In her unit, there were only three persons and none of them had considerable experience in development cooperation.

After spending a couple of months trying to find her way through the rigid, poorly organized, and highly inefficient municipal administration, Svetlana decided to initiate an assessment of local governance for her municipality. The main purpose of the assessment was to identify development needs, mobilize support from civil society organizations, and set a factual foundation for more strategic organizational change. She prepared a brief for the president of the municipality and managed to secure the participation of all key local officials at the initial meeting.

The meeting ended up quite differently from Svetlana's original expectations. First, few officials understood the notion of governance. She spent most of the time trying to explain to them that local governance is not only about how much money central level transfers, the cost of particular local public services, division of post in the local assembly, etc. *but also includes* capacity development and empowerment of local communities, and facilitating the participation of citizens and groups in decision making.

Second, she faced great resistance from those that became concerned that conducting an assessment would produce a bad image of local officials. They argued that providing the local community a chance to express their concerns would publicly expose "dirty laundry" as well as weakness and failures of the local administration. Finally, Svetlana was strongly criticized for not being able to say "how much money this would bring us" and what other concrete benefits would come from conducting such an assessment.

How would you go about convincing colleagues of the value and the scope of the exercise?

✂-----

Frustrated with the reactions from her colleagues, Svetlana decided to build a "coalition of willing" partners for local governance assessment – this time starting with external stakeholders. Moreover, she decided to combine positive incentives with public pressure to ensure the commitment and involvement of local officials.

Svetlana paired up with a local NGO that promotes poverty reduction and social inclusion. They decided that the NGO will use a part of the funds from an ongoing

project to organize a public campaign. The campaign would steer public pressure for addressing most critical weaknesses and problems in local governance. At two public workshops, various organizations would have a chance to discuss the overall governance performance (not only that of the local government) and propose possible new solutions.

At the same time, Svetlana contacted her previous employer – the international development organization – and managed to persuade them to bring in two municipal representatives from another country where a successful local governance assessment had just been finalized. That case study would be presented at a large conference.

Svetlana also organized her staff to conduct research into the existing methodologies of local governance assessment. They used internet sources and also contacted people in regional and global think-tanks that deal with good governance.

After all that, and close to the mid-year period when budgets are being prepared for the following year, Svetlana organized a conference and ensured wide media coverage. Participants included local officials, representatives of civil society organizations, representatives of international and bilateral development agencies, key local and regional businesses, and officials from central government agency dealing with decentralization.

The conference started with a speech by the president (actually the one already used in the previous elections) on the need for democratization and sustainable development of the local community. Central government officials briefly informed the audience about the agenda for decentralization and Svetlana's staff made a presentation of comparative methodologies on local governance assessment. After a very heated discussion amongst civil society organizations and local officials, the case study of a successful assessment from another country was presented. Finally, a representative of a bilateral development agency (eager to re-active an old project) pledged funds and advisory support for implementation of the assessment.

The conference had a great impact. The local government endorsed Svetlana's plan for local governance assessment. A bilateral donor provided the resources, and a local expert group was formed with the involvement of Svetlana's staff, two international advisors, one representative of the municipality where an assessment was conducted successfully, and the local (umbrella) policy-advocacy NGO. Moreover, an advisory group was established with participation of all relevant civil society organizations, representatives of the private sector and media, one official from central-level government and several local officials. Finally, there was a public commitment that, if the assessment was conducted successfully and if its results were integrated into a new local development strategic plan, considerable financial support would be provided for future development projects.

What are the similarities and differences with your own situation?

What lessons could you apply in your setting?

Case Study 2

Moving from government to the concept of governance: The role of a civil society activist

Mehtab is the director of an organization promoting local economic development that operates in a medium-size municipality. He returned from an international conference on good local governance where he had been very inspired by a speech on the link between governance assessment and development planning. Upon his return, Mehtab decided to initiate a comprehensive assessment in his own municipality.

Using contacts that he had established at the international conference, Mehtab managed to collect several documents that present different cases and different methodologies for governance assessment. On the basis of those, as well as in consultations with his colleagues, he designed a project proposal and presented it to a development foundation. His proposal was welcomed and financial resources were made available.

The main purpose of the assessment would be to build consensus on local development priorities through promoting the need for a more comprehensive local governance reform. Mehtab expected that, once everyone realized what the main problems were, an agreement on priorities would be much easier – maybe the priorities would even derive directly from the assessment recommendations.

Mehtab realized that a proper assessment would require a new kind of understanding amongst the local community and a new mindset that would be broadly shared. He did not want a “government”, but “governance” assessment – however, “governance” was an alien notion for almost everyone in the municipality. Therefore, Mehtab made a small flyer (cheap, but in many copies) where he presented some of the usual definitions of local governance as well as a particular one that he thought would be most appropriate for his municipality. Moreover, he included a couple of examples on good local governance in other countries and an explanation of the implications that the new concept would have on the existing structures, relationships and processes in the municipality. Most importantly, the flyer was written in the local language and used plain, simple words.

Another major issue was who should lead the whole assessment – an assessment of governance, not of government. This meant that the leadership of the process could not involve only local government officials. Moreover, the scope of the assessment included issues that are not the competence of any of particular civil society organization (there was no “NGO on good local governance”). A further problem was that many such organizations existed – and, normally, good local governance concerned all of them.

How would you mobilise support for the assessment, bearing in mind issues leadership and ownership?

✂-----

Mehtab organized a meeting with an advisor to the president of the municipality. They took the list of all local civil society organizations and agreed on a particular strategy. First, there would be an Expert Task Force comprising representatives of all civil society organizations that were directly related to the purpose of the local

governance assessment. The Expert Council would be chaired by the president's advisor and would meet on a monthly basis (plus, whenever there was a need for urgent consultations). The main role of the Expert Task Force would be to supervise the work of experts and consultants, discuss and decide upon methodological issues, monitor the implementation of the project, and endorse interim and final reports.

Second, there would be a Consultative Committee including all civil society organizations, as well as a representative of the local business association and several media representatives. It would be chaired by the president of the municipality and would meet only twice: at the beginning of the assessment and at the end. In addition, the members of the Consultative Committee would be kept informed about the progress of the assessment through brief monthly written updates.

While it was clear who should participate in the Consultative Committee, the problem with the membership of the Expert Task Force remained. There was no central organization that could select the members with sufficient legitimacy and credibility – and the whole point was that local government itself should not be leading the process (even though its representatives would chair the Task Force and the Consultative Committee).

What measures would you take to ensure the independence of the Expert Task Force?

✂-----

Mehtab suggested to map all civil society organizations using a specific matrix. The matrix would derive from concrete indicators of local governance assessment and would seek to identify which organizations had direct or indirect interest and an optimal capacity for becoming involved in the Expert Task Force. Such a selection method would be very transparent and would secure the credibility of the decision on the final list of members. Moreover, it would have an additional benefit - raising public awareness about the assessment itself.

A specific questionnaire was prepared – basically, a table with the list of indicators, on one side, and a limited number of answers, on the other. Each organization would be asked to identify the extent to which its activities were related to a particular indicator. Moreover, it would need to self-assess its capacity for assuming an active role (and responsibility) in the assessment.

Soon, the list was ready. There were a couple of organizations that did not qualify, but were of great relevance for the Task Force. Those included, amongst others, a local religious organization, an organization dealing with a small minority community, an organization for the disabled and handicapped, and a recent initiative providing counselling services to women affected by family violence. Including those additional organizations on the list of members did not present a problem, because it was fully justifiable and Mehtab and the President's advisor continued to act in a very transparent manner.

Although several of these organizations did not have the capacity to take on a leadership role in the Task Force, Mehtab and the President's advisor valued their

engagement at a less active level. After all, by being part of the Task Force they would strengthen their capacity and be exposed to intensive learning.

At the end, Mehtab prepared instructions on how the work of the Expert Task Force and Consultative Committee should be organized. This document included a set of procedures (setting the agenda for meetings, invitation to and organization of meetings, discussion and decision-making rules) and this was approved at the first meeting of both the Task Force and the Committee.

Interestingly, one of the findings identified by the local governance assessment was precisely the lack of structures and capacities for continual consultations amongst local stakeholders. Given the effectiveness of the Task Force and the Committee, a plan was made to transform them into more institutionalized structures for local governance policy consultations and development planning.

What are the similarities and differences with your own situation?

What lessons could you apply in your setting?

Case Study 3

Balancing comparability with local relevance: The role of a representative from a local government association

In the last couple of years there had been many different local assessments, evaluations and audits but Lia realized that something had to be done to make them more relevant for development purposes as well as the need to address their increasing conceptual and methodological confusion. She was working as a local government advisor for the local government association that covered the whole country. From her point of view, there was an urgent need for standardization and national coordination of various local governance assessments.

Establishing a methodology common to all sub-national units would produce many benefits. First, it would enable inter-municipal comparison and help identify systemic needs for the sub-national governmental system as a whole. Such an approach would also provide a sound factual basis for the design of new national and sub-national development projects, the promotion of comprehensive policies, and an enhancement of the legal framework.

Second, the opportunity to publicly present the results of the assessment of all sub-national units would enable the sharing of experiences and also enable benchmarking amongst sub-national units. Furthermore, it would mobilise public pressure for governance reforms and facilitate the sharing of knowledge and experience on standards of good governance.

Finally, the new initiative would help address the increasing confusion produced by the use of the different methodologies that various international and bilateral organizations applied. For instance, in several municipalities a team of international experts had conducted “assessment of accountable and responsive local government” based on public perception surveys. When the reports were finalised, the experts left and it became obvious that there was weak local ownership of the findings and even weaker capacity to deal with the recommendations.

Elsewhere, in selected municipalities, a regional institute funded by a bilateral donor had introduced an index on democratization. The methodology included some consultative workshops, but there were problems of localization of the global indicators. Many local stakeholders argued that the findings were either irrelevant for their local context or that they could not use them for development purposes. In addition, there were also several assessments focusing on local service delivery – but many of these were conducted without a clear normative framework for good local governance.

Lia received the endorsement of the leadership of the association to establish a new standing committee on local good governance. The standing committee was chaired by herself and comprised a representative group of sub-national units (from urban to rural, from small to medium to large population size, and from small to medium to large territorial size). Moreover, officials from central government ministries and agencies were included on a permanent basis. In addition, there were researchers and analysts from national non-governmental organizations dealing with decentralization and local development.

What tasks would you include in the Committee’s work plan?

✂-----

The committee prepared a work plan that included:

- Development of a national concept on principles and norms of good local governance – based on comparative research and localization of the existing universal “models” and frameworks used in other countries – as well as the previous indigenous practice regarding good local governance
- Mapping of all local governance assessments conducted in the previous three years (methodologies, reports, identification of weakness and strengths)
- Design of a standardized methodology for local good governance assessment
- Training of local stakeholders on the implementation of the methodology
- Creation of pool of permanent and “on-call” experts to coach and provide advisory services to sub-national units in the implementation of the methodology
- Introduction of a system for financial and non-financial incentives for sub-national units regarding implementation of an assessment
- Endorsement of an annual cycle for a local good governance assessment on a regular basis and for better coordination and alignment amongst assessments conducted in different sub-national units
- Establishment of a donor trust-fund for local good governance to coordinate and improve the cost-efficiency of different donor funds

The work plan was also endorsed by the national government and the international donor community.

What special provisions would you make for the new methodology for it to meet the desired purpose?

What basic principles would you set to guide the development of a methodology?

✂-----

Special emphasis was placed on the need to balance comparability and local relevance of assessments. The methodology had to be sufficiently standardized to reflect the agreed principles and norms of good local government in each particular sub-national case. Moreover, that concept needed to be aligned with international best practices and some of the existing normative frameworks.

At the same time, the methodology had to be sufficiently flexible to allow for incorporation of local specificities and to ensure relevance for local development planning and policy making. The differences between sub-national units were considerable, and the same framework could not necessarily be identically applied everywhere.

Therefore, it was decided to proceed on the basis on three principles:

1. First, standardized processes, procedures and roles and responsibilities
2. Second, a set of common indicators
3. Third, and most important, a national assessment framework, localized and customized through the use of particular sub-indicators. In other words, each sub-national unit was allowed to modify a limited number of indicators to reflect its particular local context. Moreover, if need be, sub-national units were allowed to add other indicators that they considered relevant. It was also important that, before application of the customized methodology, each sub-national unit sought endorsement by the committee for the proposed modification introduced into the standardized methodology.

Of course, Lia's initiative was not flawless. However, in the course of three years, continuous modifications and enhancements brought about a framework that now satisfies a large set of objectives – including the balancing of national comparability with local relevance. Moreover, donor money is being spent more effectively and local assessments are now used for genuine developmental purposes.

What are the similarities and differences with your own situation?

What lessons could you apply in your setting?

Case Study 4

Ensuring uptake of assessment findings in local policy-making: The role of a local elected government official

Davron has recently been elected to the municipal council with responsibility for the promotion of local democratic governance. His first priorities were to better understand the relationships amongst the key stakeholders in local governance and to try to improve the local governance capacity for strategic planning and policy making.

At that time there was a new initiative developed by an international development partner for an assessment of local governance. Davron immediately understood that such an analysis would be perfect for setting a foundation for achievement of his priorities. However, Davron also understood from the comments of his more experienced colleagues that it would not be an easy exercise and that there had been failed attempts in the past. Therefore, Davron was cautious, but also proactive. He took on the role as focal point for the whole endeavor, as it offered him an opportunity to impact on the way that it was conducted and on the way that the results of the analysis would be used.

What type of collaboration would you propose between international partners, the local government and civil society organisations for enhancing the local ownership of the assessment?

✂-----

After a series of discussions with international partners, the local government and civil society organizations that would be involved in the assessment, Davron proposed the following:

- He and two other local politicians would become permanent members of the Steering Committee on the assessment, thus ensuring local political ownership and continual support for the methodology and the results. Their role would be to continually ensure that the assessment was aligned with local strategic priorities and the policy agenda, and to ensure that the assessment results were relevant and applicable.
- He would oversee the establishment of mechanisms for external and internal communication to keep the political parties, the public, and the central-level political representatives informed about progress and the preliminary findings. Davron would prepare monthly plans and disseminate them to local and central-level politicians, as well as regular press-releases for the local media.
- There would be three public workshops for open and transparent discussion about progress of the assessment. Beside local stakeholders, the events would involve representatives of the main political parties and central-government officials who would provide critical input on the interdependence of the local governance reforms with the process of decentralization.

Davron organized two consultative meetings with broad participation from local and national stakeholders that facilitated endorsement of a normative agenda for local governance reforms. A document that had been developed in a neighboring country and that had been shared with Davron was discussed and considerably adjusted to

the case of Davron's municipality. Some aspects of that normative agenda were used to formulate several policy documents. Davron understood that local development should be closely linked to the political agenda that his party promoted in the previous elections. This included, amongst other, reshaping of mechanisms for the provision of local administrative and public services towards a greater citizen orientation, more gender-sensitivity and more focus on marginalized groups.

It took a lot of personal initiative by Davron and his colleagues to ensure an understanding of the assessment by a majority of members of the local assembly. However, once approved, this new framework ensured a sound foundation for the local governance assessment as well as clear guidance for the local government regarding the priorities for reform. In addition, the new framework envisaged the continual and active participation of civil society organizations in local policy making, as well as regular public consultations.

A number of challenges were faced in carrying out the assessment. Most problems related to data collection because of the weak local statistical system. The methodology was adjusted a couple of times but at the end it was successfully implemented. Already, in the course of the assessment, several members of local assembly were able to use preliminary results in order to put forward new legislation. They simply saw an opportunity to apply the evidence produced by the assessment to promote new policies that had already received public support, given the participation of local stakeholders in the assessment,.

After the assessment, Davron initiated the establishment of a cross-sector committee in the local assembly on local governance reforms. The first task of the committee was to prepare a local governance strategy based on the recommendations of the assessment. Realizing the potential that the assessment could yield for the future, the committee also decided that similar exercises would be conducted on an annual basis – as an input in the evaluation of the implementation of the local governance strategy.

What are the similarities and differences with your own situation?

What lessons could you apply in your setting?

Participant Feedback Form

Profession:

Date of training:

Name of trainer:

Overall evaluation			
1. Was this programme what you expected? Please explain:	No Yes <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. What did you find most useful about the programme?			
3. What did you find least useful about the programme?			
4. Reflect on what you found most useful. If you could apply any lessons or techniques you learned from this programme tomorrow, what would it/they be? Please explain.			
5. Have you changed your perceptions/ideas in any of the areas discussed as a result of what you learned in the programme? Please explain.	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Other comments.			