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Finally, the written style of this Report takes into consideration the need for a learning and capacity development approach to improve knowledge for a more effective implementation of the SWAP in the Kingdom of Swaziland. Insufficient knowledge and capacity related to the SWAP are issues of concern as the Report discusses. Terminology, key concepts, principles, modalities, and processes, for example, are therefore defined and explained (in some cases in great detail where determined necessary). The objective is to also use the Report as a learning tool to contribute, hopefully (no pun intended), in one small way to an increase in aid effectiveness by strengthening country ownership of sector policies and strategies; increasing the coherence in sector development policy; and strengthening national capacity at all levels to reduce the transactions costs associated with aid. The author of the Report is Dr. K. Ronald Hope.
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### Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACMS</td>
<td>Aid Coordination and Management Section of the MEPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>Aid Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAD</td>
<td>Development Assistance Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>Division of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI</td>
<td>Gross National Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPC</td>
<td>Heavily indebted poor countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLFAE</td>
<td>High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Water Resources Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPD</td>
<td>Ministry of Economic Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNRE</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOET</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS</td>
<td>National Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO(S)</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHSSP</td>
<td>National Health Sector Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Multisectoral Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Overseas Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBA(s)</td>
<td>Program-Based Approach(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>Planning and Budgeting Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER(s)</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Review(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFM</td>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIU(S)</td>
<td>Project Implementation Unit(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO(s)</td>
<td>Principal Planning Officer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRMRES</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction, Monitoring and Evaluation Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSAP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSPs</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP(s)</td>
<td>Sector Development Plan(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPCC</td>
<td>Swaziland Health Partners Coordinating Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Sector investment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAER</td>
<td>Swaziland Aid Effectiveness Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAP(s)</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approach(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWG(s)</td>
<td>Sector Working Group(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWGs</td>
<td>Technical Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Report presents an assessment of the SWAP in the Kingdom of Swaziland. The principal objective of this assignment exercise was to enhance the implementation of the SWAP by conducting an in-depth assessment of the progress made thus far in the four key priority sectors: agriculture, education, health, and water and sanitation and, based on those results, introduce effective measures that may revitalize the overall initiative of the SWAP as the feasible means of implementing the country’s Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme (PRSAP). The intended impacts and results were considered to be: (1) A better understanding of the on-going SWAPs activities in the four sectors; (2) Actionable recommendations; and (3) An improved implementation of the SWAPs and better services delivery that improves the lives of the beneficiaries.

Approach and Content

The Report was developed within a methodology that included an extensive analysis of the SWAP environment in Swaziland, a desk review of relevant documents, and a consultation and interview process of stakeholders based on a structured questionnaire. It (1) defines and explains the concepts of the SWAP and Sector Working Groups (SWGs); (2) compares and contrasts the SWAP with conventional project approaches; (3) discusses the desirability and feasibility of the SWAP; (4) summarizes in an overview the SWAP and SWGs in the Kingdom; (5) describes the aid coordination and management process; (6) assesses the experience and performance of the four SWAPs in the country against a uniform set of criteria and use of SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis; (7) furnishes an analytical discussion of key cross-cutting issues in relationship to the four SWAPs: (8) provides actionable recommendations with accompanying rationales and delineating stakeholder responsibility for each; and (9) sets out concluding findings and comments including a summary of the factors influencing performance in the health SWAP, details on when a SWAP is not a SWAP, and views on the way forward.

Policy Recommendations

The following are the policy recommendations that emerged from the assessment:

1. Stronger national ownership and leadership needs to be exerted by the Government of Swaziland in all aspects of the SWAP process.

2. Develop capacity building programs for all public sector personnel with responsibility for the SWAP activities.
3. The need for institutional strengthening seems to have been a perennial refrain in Swaziland. It needs to be heeded given the institutional demands of the SWAP in partnering with donors as well as other development delivery requirements.

4. Documentation and reporting systems need to drastically improve.

5. Sector Development Plans must be developed and adhered to.

6. Credible and precise indicators for monitoring and evaluating progress in the implementation of the SWAP need to be agreed and applied.

7. All SWGs now and in the future should refrain from using the generic terms of reference (which were to be used as guidelines only) and develop and adopt sector specific TORs consistent with their SDPs.

8. All SWGs in Swaziland need to have in place the support structure of a Secretariat.

9. All SWGs in the Kingdom should have a structured regular schedule of meetings.

10. An accurate and current database of all ODA received by Swaziland needs to be established.

11. Development partners must discontinue the practice of bypassing the ACMS and instead work through the ACMS for the delivery of all ODA.

12. The MEPD must strengthen its coordination role pursuant to its mandate vis-à-vis the SWAP.

13. Donor coordination also needs to significantly improve.

14. Development partners in Swaziland are urged toward exploring opportunities to improve Division of Labour.

15. Development partners must make every effort to meet their financial commitments for SWAP-related activities and do so in a timely manner.

16. The representation at coordination meetings should be at a higher level than it is presently.

17. The SWAP initiative in the Ministries of Agriculture, Education and Training, and Natural Resources and Energy needs to be urgently re-launched.
Conclusion

The Report finds that, apart from the relatively good implementation process of the health SWAP, progress in general has been slow and there are still a number of challenges faced by the SWAP process in Swaziland. At the heart of the challenges can be found non-existent or ineffective SWGs and irregular coordination and alignment between development partners and with, as well as within, government structures, for which there are many reasons and elucidated in the Report.

Thus far, the SWAP process, as a whole in Swaziland, has not lived up to its full potential and intended results. There are challenges related to, among other things, the following:

- Inadequate enthusiasm for the SWAP among senior government officials particularly demonstrated in the non-prioritization of the importance of the SWAP process and its activities;
- Establishment and structure of the SWGs;
- The functions of each distinct SWG;
- The role of development partners in the SWGs;
- A seemingly lack of acceptance of the role and importance of sector development plans in the SWAP framework;
- Reporting, monitoring and evaluation;
- Non-existent or non-applied indicators for monitoring and tracking targeted progress related to inputs, outputs/outcomes, and impact;
- Inadequate, and delayed, funding from the development partners for the facilitation of SWAP-related activities which result in unnecessary delays in the implementation of the SWAP work plans. Some of this manifestation from the development partners may have something to do with the government's weaknesses in public financial management and its lack of commitment to comprehensive and sustainable good governance reforms including adoption and implementation of a robust anti-corruption policy;
- The time-intensive nature of the SWAP activities which generally require extensive consultations and interactions between the required participants;
- Capacity deficits in terms of knowledge and expertise related to the SWAP process;
- The lack of Secretariat support;
The lack of understanding and/or acceptance of the division of labour concept especially by the development partners;

The lack of a focused approach to the required and necessary inclusion of cross-cutting issues in all SWAP activities including capacity development and anti-corruption measures; and

The lack of meaningful progress on mutual commitments to implementing the agreed outcomes of the HLFAE.

This Report, with its assessment and recommendations, provides information for the Government of Swaziland to understand the application and experience of the SWAP in the Kingdom. It therefore also offers a platform from which the Government can consider its decisions with respect to the SWAP. The contents of the Report suggest that there is need for a rethink/regroup to determine the current desirability, feasibility, and framework of the SWAP in Swaziland. In that regard, it needs to be re-emphasized that the SWAP represents one design in development practice for organizing and managing ODA. It is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for a strong partnership between a government and development partners and should never be regarded as such. Moreover, unless all of the fundamental principles of the SWAP are adhered to, the SWAP process will be fraught with challenges and frustrations.

If the SWAP is to remain the framework for implementation of the PRSAP and meeting the objectives of the NDS and the ERS, then there has to be a regroup with the horse being put now before the cart in its rightful place. That means that, at least, the following three things would need to be regarded as prerequisites in pursuit of a re-launch of the SWAP initiative: (1) Demonstrated Country Ownership and Leadership; (2) SWAP Capacity Development; and (3) Cabinet Endorsement of a National Aid Policy.
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Although the Kingdom of Swaziland is categorized as a lower-middle income country, most of its human development indicators share common characteristics to those of low income countries. Approximately 52% of its population of just over one million is under the age of 20 years, and 78.9% live in rural areas. The incidence of poverty increased from 66% in 1995 to 69% in 2001 but declined to 63% in 2010. Key socio-economic indicators have deteriorated in the past decade, as captured in Swaziland’s falling Human Development Index score. The reasons behind these trends are many and complex including drought, macroeconomic imbalances, HIV and AIDS, soaring unemployment, food insecurity, externally driven shocks, and fiscal deficits.

In her endeavour to advance development, the Kingdom of Swaziland has prepared a National Development Strategy (NDS) which defines the vision for the period 1997-2022. Furthermore, faced with the challenges of increasing levels of poverty, the Government of Swaziland formulated the Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme, which is a critical component for the implementation of the NDS and for attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The process of formulating the PRSAP started in 2001 and led to a Prioritised Action Programme on Poverty Reduction in 2002. The PRSAP itself was finalized in 2006, and was launched by His Majesty King Mswati III on 01 April 2008. It includes policies and action programs intended to ensure broad-based growth through equitable access to productive assets to increase the efficiency of individuals, communities, families and businesses and other institutions in furthering their well-being.

The PRSAP is based on the following six pillars that will underpin the policy framework for addressing the problems of poverty in the country:

1. Macro-economic stability and accelerated economic growth based on broad participation;
2. Empowering the poor to generate income and reduce inequalities;
3. Fair Distribution of the Benefits of Growth through Fiscal Policy;
4. Human Capital Development;
5. Improving the Quality of Life of the Poor; and
6. Improving governance and strengthening institutions.

Since late 2008, efforts have been made to re-focus the government’s priorities toward improved service delivery, particularly in agriculture and food security, education, health, and water and sanitation, as well as combating HIV and AIDS and poverty. Yet, there have been substantial lags between the diagnosis of development issues, strategy and overall policy formulation on the one hand, and effective implementation on the other. The government has identified the inadequacy of the institutional framework and capacity deficits as reasons for these implementation gaps.
To address the identified implementation challenges, the government is engaged in restructuring the planning and budgeting framework, based on the SWAP. In addition, the government also decided to establish Sector Working Groups aimed to serve as the platform for ensuring the participation of all stakeholders in the formulation of sector programs based on the principles of the SWAP. Seen from this perspective, the SWAP is basically a means of implementing the PRSAP and monitoring the achievement of its goals. Overall, the decision taken aims to enhance the government’s coordination and facilitation of the involvement of other stakeholders in the planning and budgeting process through the SWAP where applicable (Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) Circular No 1 of 2008 for the budget preparation of FY 2009/2010, 2010/11, and 2011/12). This process has already started with four key priority sectors: agriculture, education, health, and water and sanitation. The ultimate aim is to expand the coverage of the SWAP to other sectors as experience accumulates and coordination capacity develops. In a nutshell, this is a step forward in reforming the planning system of the country.
2 PRINCIPAL OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSESSMENT

The principal objective of this assignment exercise is to enhance the implementation of the SWAP by conducting an in-depth assessment of the progress made thus far in the four key priority sectors: agriculture, education, health, and water and sanitation and, based on the results of the assessment, introduce effective measures that will revitalize the overall initiative of the SWAP as the feasible means of implementing the country’s PRSAP. More specifically, the eventual outcome from the assessment aims to:

1. Better improve the development planning and budgeting process for poverty reduction in Swaziland through strengthening the SWGs and their capacity to successfully formulate and implement the SWAP;

2. Provide the MEPD and concerned sector ministries with viable policy and programmatic recommendations to better play their respective strategic leadership and coordinating roles in re-strengthening the SWGs in the key sectors determined by the government, namely education, health, agriculture and food, and water and sanitation;

3. Identify key constraints and challenges facing the on-going SWAP as well as stipulate potential opportunities and possible solutions that will assist to promote the implementation of the SWAP in other sectors; and

4. Propose optional measures for enhancing the roles that could be played through the SWAP to effectively implement the recently adopted government strategies like the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS).

2.1 Intended Impacts and Results

The intended impacts and results are considered to be the following:

- Better understanding of the on-going SWAPs activities in the four sectors;

- Actionable recommendations; and

- Leading to improved implementation of the SWAPs and better services delivery that improves the lives of the beneficiaries.
3 KEY CONCEPTS AND ISSUES

In undertaking this assignment exercise it is important to take into consideration a few key concepts and issues pertaining to the context and nature of the SWAPs and the SWGs in development and aid effectiveness practice generally, and for comparison to, and assessment of, the reality in Swaziland as a viable and feasible means of implementing the Kingdom’s PRSAP. A good beginning, in that regard, is to note the nature of the SWAP.

3.1 The Sector Wide Approach

Sector-wide approaches originated in the mid-to-late nineties as a response to weaknesses found in the delivery of development assistance. Traditionally, aid to developing countries had been provided in the form of self-contained projects, each funded by their own donor. In the 1990s this approach began to attract criticism for being donor-driven (i.e., reflecting donor rather than country priorities) and leading to fragmentation and duplication. It was recognized that many individual projects posed unrealistic demands on developing countries’ limited economic and human resources. In response, the international community began to reform its methods of aid delivery and the SWAP emerged. Under the SWAP, project funds contribute directly to a sector-specific umbrella and are tied to a defined sector policy under a government authority. In essence, a SWAP calls for a partnership in which government and development agencies change their relationships (to clearer government leadership). They interact more together in the formulation of policy, and less on the details of its implementation.

The defining characteristics of the SWAP for the purposes of this Report are that the sector-wide programs aim to cover all relevant policies, programs and projects within a sector in order to address implementation problems, such as: insufficient government ownership, high transactions costs of aid, and poor coordination and lack of consistency across donor-funded interventions within that sector.

The SWAP therefore seeks to address some of the problems encountered in the planning and management of individual aid and development projects. The SWAP is a means for all development partners operating in a sector and the relevant government ministries and agencies to plan and implement a joint and integrated approach to supporting the development of the sector. The aim of the SWAP is for the government to take the lead in the management and implementation of the sector development, and for development partners to fund a commonly agreed set of activities, sometimes also using common funding, reporting and management systems. Thus, this approach is intended to ensure that all resources are focused on achieving commonly agreed objectives and also to reduce the burden on government in terms of managing a number of donors, each of whom may have their own reporting requirements.
There are six core elements that are commonly accepted as the key building blocks for the SWAP:

1. Government leadership of the sector through sustained ownership.

2. A clear, nationally-owned, sector policy and strategy that is derived from broad-based stakeholder consultation with the support of all significant funding agencies.

3. A (medium term) budget and expenditure framework which reflects sector policy.

4. Shared processes and approaches for planning, implementing and managing the sector strategy.

5. A sector performance framework monitoring against jointly agreed targets.

6. Commitment to move to greater reliance on government financial management and accountability systems.

In addition to the above six core elements, cross-cutting issues such as institutional capacity building and decentralization also tend to be included in the SWAP framework. However, there is no SWAP blueprint. The structure and shape of the SWAP and the pace of progress are determined by the nature of the sector; the composition of stakeholders; and the political, social, and economic framework conditions in the country concerned. Even the most advanced SWAPs are still in the process of broadening support from different sources of funding.

The creation of sectors and the use of sector wide approaches are regarded as having the following key advantages:

- Harmonizing sector policy development, planning, budgeting, execution, and monitoring and evaluation;

- Increasing the efficiency of resource use by deepening consultation in the prioritization of activities and resource allocation, compared to when each spending agency operates independently;

- Making funding clearer and more predictable. Stand-alone projects are not set within an overall expenditure framework. Overall funding flows, therefore, tend to be unclear and can be highly unpredictable. When there is a single expenditure plan all stakeholders can clearly see where their money is going;

- Reducing transactions costs. Projects often make significant demands on the time of senior policy makers through project review missions, evaluations, and so on;
Improving transparency through a single expenditure plan that allows all stakeholders to assess whether the allocation of resources is consistent with stated national priorities. Under projects this is not the case, so there is little clarity on overall funding flows – nor is it possible to compare overall funding flows with priorities;

- Yielding greater visibility of traditionally marginalized sub-sectors such as sanitation; and

- Assisting government and development partners to agree on a better Division of Labour (DOL) among donors, and between donors and government.

**Table 1: Comparison of the SWAP and Conventional Project Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The SWAP</th>
<th>The Conventional Project Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country-wide holistic view on entire sector</td>
<td>Focus on projects to support narrowly defined Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with mutual trust and shared Accountability</td>
<td>Recipient accountable to donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partner coordination and collective dialogue</td>
<td>Bilateral negotiations and agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased use of local procedures and systems</td>
<td>Parallel implementation arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term capacity/system development in Sector</td>
<td>Short-term disbursement and success of Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-oriented approach through learning by doing</td>
<td>Blueprint approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWAPs are found exclusively in highly aid-dependent poor countries. The vast majority of these are in sub-Saharan Africa. These SWAPs are most commonly used in key development sectors, particularly health and education, but also for infrastructure and agriculture. A handful of sector programs are being implemented in energy, environment, urban development, and water and sanitation in some developing countries.

The experience of the SWAPs has varied across governments and over time. Some SWAPs started very successfully and then have faced difficulties in subsequent years. SWAPs are not possible in all cases: certain preconditions in the macroeconomic, policy and institutional environment are necessary as discussed below. Poverty reduction strategies (PRS), including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), present both a challenge and an opportunity for the SWAPs. Consistency between what is planned within-sector and across sectors (PRSP processes) is important, as is consistency in arrangements for stakeholder buy-in, implementation, monitoring and improved accountability. PRS processes may help to attract greater donor interest in the SWAPs than would otherwise occur, while the SWAPs can become a mechanism for ensuring implementation of the PRS.
On the negative side, it has also been found that:

- SWAPs have proved time- and energy-consuming and difficult to negotiate, such that management costs are perceived to have increased rather than fallen with the SWAPs and this has led to SWAP fatigue. Planning processes tend to involve the development of strategies and instruments. Development partners often require time-intensive prerequisites, prior actions and pre-conditions before funding is disbursed. Transactions costs, including time spent in meetings, are especially high at the beginning of the SWAP processes. Consequently, the focus on the SWAP process itself rather than on the policy outcomes can result in national stakeholder ‘SWAP fatigue’;

- Commitment and ownership has proved to be fragile and dependent on key individuals in some cases;

- Planning and implementation of complex SWAPs presents additional challenges to organizations and emphasizes existing capacity constraints. A limited number of government departments are often responsible for driving the SWAP process forward. These are often externally funded or supplemented. This limits further the breadth of support and the chances of broadening SWAP ownership beyond individual institutions and can put the sustainability of capacity development measures at risk. Stakeholders still tend to view a SWAP as merely an innovative way of funding rather than an opportunity for reform of institutional structures and systems;

- Governments are still finding it difficult to answer the most contentious of sector problems, for example, how to respond to the fact that they cannot afford to provide free universal access to services (all health SWAPs);

- Donors are still too involved in the detail of implementation and monitoring, and some donors have been unable to harmonize their procedures;

- Participation by non-governmental service providers, and other stakeholders, including civil society, in policy development and implementation is limited. The SWAPs create a platform for policy dialogue, but do not automatically overcome limited genuine participation of civil society and private sector in strategy formulation and implementation. Non-governmental actors need both technical and financial support to engage as equal partners in the SWAP processes;

- Monitoring and evaluation systems tend to be weak. The SWAPs need to develop integrated and cohesive systems to measure their results effectively and to utilize the information efficiently for improving SWAP planning and implementation. The SWAP systems often need to be harmonized with the monitoring frameworks of national PRSPs and National Development Plans;
- SWAPs have been slow to shift their focus from the processes of donor coordination towards the achievement of service improvement and poverty alleviation and monitoring of performance has often been weak; and

- Coordination and information management between SWAPs is limited. Only some SWAPs invite organizations with a cross-cutting portfolio to participate in their decision-making panels.

Moreover, it has been suggested in the recent development literature, as well as practice, that instead of aiming to establish a single unified policy framework (with one program and one budget) it may be more useful for a SWAP process to build on the diversity of existing policy instruments and programs while ensuring that different processes in the sector, whether by government, donors, NGOs, or other players, do not undermine each other. According to this argument, rather than embarking on ambitious and expensive policy formulation exercises what is essential is to establish a common set of policy principles which should include the clarification of roles and division of responsibilities across sector players.

In addition, recent development practice suggests that the concept of the SWAP has been replaced by the broader notion of the Program-Based Approach (PBA). Similarly to the SWAP, the PBA is a development cooperation approach based on coordinated support for a locally-owned development program. This program can be a national multi-sectoral program (such as a poverty reduction strategy), a sector program (as with the SWAP) or a thematic program (possibly cross-sectoral or sub-sectoral). Although most PBAs focus on government-to-government cooperation, the approach can also be used to support a program of a non-governmental organization or a private sector actor. The added value of the concept of the PBA is that it offers a higher degree of institutional flexibility. Rather than focusing on a governmental institutional structure (i.e. a sector ministry) as is the case with the concept of the SWAP, it focuses on a program that can be multi-sectoral, sectoral or sub-sectoral, and can be managed or not by a government agency. Sector PBAs are also called sector-based approaches.

Based on the foregoing, it is easy to conclude, and for developing countries to be aware, that: The sector-wide approach is neither a dogma nor a blueprint. Rather it is one working method. It is an organizing principle based on a reallocation of responsibilities and therefore involves fundamentally different roles for the various stakeholders compared with project aid. It is neither a necessary or sufficient condition for a strong partnership between a government and development partners.

3.2 Sector Working Groups

Sector Working Groups emerged along with the SWAPs and have become somewhat institutionalized as a mode of implementing development assistance strategies, and attaining
the results of a nation’s economic development strategies and plans. SWGs are generally expected to provide a forum for negotiation, policy dialogue, and agreement of plans and undertakings among government and its development partners at the sector level. In addition, they provide a mechanism to monitor the attainment of the sector development results in view of their objectives. They therefore generally present government and development partners with an unprecedented opportunity to move forward collectively in order to live up to the commitments of the High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness (HLFAE) and their Agenda for Action. The main attraction of the Agenda for Action of the HLFAE is that although they were crafted to increase aid effectiveness, their principles are the same as those required to enhance the effective utilization of national resources. The operationalization of the SWAPs would thus apply to both local and external resources.

Generally, the SWGs bring together central and local government institutions, development partners, civil society, and the private sector involved in a particular sector or with an interest in the sector’s development. Members of each SWG include but are usually not confined to the following:

- The lead Ministry and other participating line Ministries and agencies
- The lead donor and other donors
- Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Planning and Development
- Representatives from the Office of the Head of State and/or the Head of Government
- Civil society
- Private sector institutions
- Local government representatives

The objectives of SWGs tend to be framed around, but not limited to:

1. **Ownership:** Articulate a sector strategy, with a prioritized program of work, that is aligned to the national development strategy and/or the MDGs;

2. **Alignment:** Implement activities to deepen alignment of the national budget to the NDS/MDGs, and alignment of donors to nationally-owned policies and strengthened Public Financial Management (PFM), and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems;

3. **Harmonization:** Implement activities to strengthen harmonization of stakeholder (local and donor) procedures, missions, studies, and technical assistance;
4. **Managing for Results:** Oversee the implementation of the sector’s result-oriented M&E, and reporting mechanisms to promote results-oriented program implementation across government; and

5. **Mutual Accountability:** Enhance mutual accountability by initiating and organizing Joint Sector Reviews, and managing all sectoral aspects of the review process.

In the SWGs framework and process, key roles and responsibilities are also usually assigned within their respective terms of reference (TOR), particularly for the Lead Ministry and Lead Donor. For the most part, it is the responsibility of the Lead Ministry to:

- Convene SWG meetings, this includes setting the agenda, and Chair the SWG meetings;
- Ensure all relevant government institutions participate in the SWG or sub-group;
- Prepare progress reports on the status of sector strategy implementation;
- Prepare Joint Sector Review meetings in coordination with the Lead Donor;
- Prepare and update the Sector Strategic Plan and present it to the SWG for validation;
- Develop, operationalize and update the sector M&E framework and present it to the SWG for validation;
- Develop and update the sector log frame and present it to the SWG for validation;
- Organize Public Expenditure Reviews (PER) whenever necessary;
- Communicate all relevant information concerning the SWG to all members; this may include strategic documents, reports, meeting agenda and schedules;
- Establish technical and drafting teams wherever necessary and appropriate; and
- Assign to member institutions of the SWG any other relevant work as deemed necessary and appropriate.

For the Lead Donor, their responsibility tends to revolve around:

- Co-Chairing the SWG meetings. Some SWGs may opt to rotate the co-chairmanship of the SWG among the various donors in the sector with the approval of the government;
Assisting the lead ministry with the coordination of the SWG and to ensure the donor community is fully represented in every SWG meeting;

Supporting the Lead Ministry in preparation of Joint Sector Reviews;

Participating in drafting and technical teams set up by the SWG;

Approving the update of various policies, strategies and reports produced by the sector; and

Mobilizing resources for the sector in collaboration with the Lead Ministry and Line Ministries.

Most SWGs require, and do have, a Secretariat that facilitates their work. The goal of the Secretariat is to ensure the effective functioning and coordination of the SWG. Specific tasks of the Secretariat tend to include:

- Developing agendas for the SWG meetings;
- Recording meeting activities;
- Ensuring monitoring and follow-up of decisions taken in the meetings;
- Ensuring coordination and coherence within the SWG;
- Circulating/publishing information to all SWG members including through their e-mails; and
- Managing logistics for the SWG.

3.3 Desirability and Feasibility of the SWAP

Experiences with SWAPs in some developing country contexts show that they can contribute to improved national ownership and leadership; donor harmonization and alignment; and greater coherence, transparency and accountability along the policy-result chain. Working with SWAPs, however, has not proved consistent with a rational linear model. It is, rather, characterized by iterative processes – a ‘trial and error’ approach. Even now the design and success formulas have varied across countries. Working towards a SWAP therefore requires continued commitment by all partners and persistent capacity building along the continuum of the core SWAP elements.

There are a number of circumstances under which the SWAP may be desirable and feasible and most developing countries working with the SWAP comply with most of these conditions. They include:
- Public expenditure being a major feature of the sector;
- There is basic agreement on a sector strategy (plan) between government and development partners;
- There is a supportive macro-economic and budget environment to permit sector authorities to plan with reasonable confidence;
- Donor contributions are large enough for coordination to be a problem;
- Institutional relationships are manageable; and
- Incentives are compatible with the lead role of the sector Ministry for SWAP implementation, for example, no major budget, staff, or responsibility cuts.
The SWAP was launched in Swaziland in 2008, although at least one document indicates 2009, and was initially adopted for four priority sectors: agriculture, education, health, and water and sanitation. All of these four SWAPs were to, subsequently, establish SWGs. The introduction of these four SWAPs was, among other things, to allow for a phased-approach of the SWAP implementation in other sectors. The PRMES is responsible for the coordination of these four priority sectors that have been selected under the SWAP for implementing the PRSAP.

The overall objective of the SWAP in Swaziland, through the SWG which is to be permanently chaired by the Principal Secretary of the lead ministry, is to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of coordination amongst all stakeholders in support of the attainment of national development objectives through implementation of the PRSAP and the annual national and sector budgets. The co-chair (on a rotation basis) of an SWG is to be a senior representative of a non-government agency designated by consensus by the members of that SWG. The establishment of the SWGs was intended to create the necessary framework for the involvement of key stakeholders in coordinated planning, implementation, and monitoring of development initiatives. The UNDP supports this process as part of its assistance to the Government in the implementation of the PRSAP.

The core roles and responsibilities of the Chair and Co-Chair were stated to be the following:

1. Convene and manage SWG meetings, ensuring that they are convened with sufficient lead time and with agendas and background documents disseminated well in advance;

2. Ensure that the minutes of the meetings are prepared and circulated among the members with sufficient time for review by the subsequent meeting;

3. Ensure effective participation and collaboration of all relevant authorities, donors, and implementing partners in the activities of the SWG; and

4. Ensure the effectiveness of the decision-making process and implementation of the recommendations and activity plans of the SWG.

The membership of each SWG is to comprise representatives of all the Heads, Activity Centers, and parastatals involved in the sector and the central agency sectoral team, and other key stakeholders in the sector, including NGOs, development partners, and representatives of the private sector and/or consumer organizations. In fact, membership of the SWGs is open to all stakeholders, as it should be, who are or should be significantly active in furthering the development goals in the sector, including government agencies, parastatals, bilateral and multilateral donors, NGOs and other civil society organizations representing both providers and recipients of services in the sector.
Depending on the size of the SWG and its workload, members could agree to establish a Secretariat. Otherwise, the Chair of the SWG can appoint a senior official to assist him/her with the basic secretarial activities such as note-recording of meetings, preparation of draft agendas, dissemination of documents, and so on.

To facilitate the implementation of the decisions taken by the Government through the PBC, the MEPD produced generic terms of reference (a Guideline) for the SWGs. Its purpose was to assist the SWGs in establishing themselves, and to provide them with a template to guide in their crafting of their more specific sector TOR. Thus, the SWGs were free to define for themselves any additional issues that they wanted to include in their own TOR, and to define whatever structure they wanted within their sector.

Within the guideline set by the PBC, the SWGs are to be responsible for all planning and budget activities affecting their sector. At a minimum, this was to include the preparation of all inputs required for the annual planning and budgeting process. The SWGs are also to be responsible for providing input to all national planning initiatives, such as updating the NDS and the PRSAP. The SWGs are also expected to facilitate the development of sector strategies; setting out the objectives, the role of key stakeholders, and priorities; and develop proposed activities and a resource mobilization plan covering a period of 5-10 years.

The specific responsibilities of the Swaziland SWGs include:

- Providing a forum for policy dialogue and coordination within and between the government and other stakeholders;
- Facilitating the development of sector strategies;
- Facilitating the development and implementation of instruments and practices for monitoring and reporting to stakeholders on progress made in the sector;
- Strengthening government leadership and ownership over the sectoral strategies and priorities;
- Promoting alignment of donor activities with government priorities; and
- Promoting harmonization and simplification within the sector.

The Cross-Sectoral Division of the MEPD has been assigned the responsibility for the coordination of the SWGs under the SWAP. This Division, which includes the PRMES, has as its main functions: (1) to serve as the Ministry's focal point for the coordination, formulation and updating of poverty reduction strategies and programmes; (2) initiate and facilitate the preparation of specific poverty diagnostic studies, analyses and research to increase knowledge and understanding of the nature and extent of poverty; (3) coordinate the
implementation of the PRSAP through regular consultations with the SWGs, ensuring that sector programmes and projects are in line with the PRSAP, pro-poor and eligible for inclusion in the national budget; (4) facilitate the formulation of specific poverty reduction initiatives; (5) assist in the establishment of the information requirements of the national planning system and in the formulation and implementation of the strategies for data collection, analysis and dissemination and design; and (6) implement a national monitoring and evaluation system to assist in tracking progress in the implementation of national, regional and sectoral policies and programs.

4.1 Agriculture and Food Security Sector

The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) is responsible for overseeing development policy, projects and programs in the agriculture sector. Following the consultations with stakeholders, the following sub-sectors were originally established with each one to be represented in the SWG to address the priority areas within each sub-sector. The rationale for creating these various sub-sectors was to enhance the focus of specialization in these areas: (1) Forestry; (2) Fisheries; (3) Food Utilization and Nutrition; (4) Research and Extension; (5) Land, Water and Irrigation; (6) Agribusiness Development, Trade and Marketing; (7) Livestock; and (8) Crop Production. Going forward it has been proposed that there will be only four subsectors: (1) Agricultural Production; (2) Research and Extension; (3) Agribusiness and Marketing; and (4) Post Harvest Technology and Nutrition.

Nonetheless, there does not currently exist an agriculture and food security sector development plan in the context of the SWAP. Also, the SWG, which was launched in 2009, is not functional. Consequently, although the MOA professes to be committed to the SWAP process, it has done very little to become a part of this approach by the Government of Swaziland for implementing the NDS and the PRSAP. This is so, despite the fact that, since 2008, agriculture was identified by the government as one of the priority sectors and the MOA is the Lead Ministry in that regard.

In fact, the Government's responsibility in the agricultural sector lies primarily within the MOA. The obligation of the MOA is to ensure household food security and increased sustainable agricultural productivity through diversification and enhancement of commercial agricultural activities. The Ministry is also responsible for the development and promotion of appropriate technologies and efficient extension services while ensuring stakeholder participation and sustainable development and management of natural resources in the country.

4.2 Education and Training (Education Sector)

The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) is responsible for overseeing projects and programming in the education sector. The education sector is defined by government as being responsible for provision and coordination of education and training at all levels. An
Education and Training Sector Policy has been launched. In addition, a National Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Policy as well as a National Curriculum Policy are also in place.

The education SWG is not yet in place. One decision emerging from the Swaziland Aid Effectiveness Retreat (SWAER), held in July 2012, was that the EU, in its role of co-chair, will work with the MOET to develop a specific terms of reference for the SWG and an action plan.

4.3 Health Sector

The Ministry of Health (MOH) is responsible for overseeing projects and programs in the health sector. The guiding policy frameworks for the establishment of this SWAP were: (1) the National Health Policy, 2007; (2) the National Health Sector Strategic Plan (NHSSP): 2008-2013; and (3) the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the National Health Sector Strategic Plan. This health sector constitutes three thematic areas: Clinical (Treatment); Preventive; and Health Systems Strengthening. It also has a sector specific work plan in the form of a SWAP work plan. Undoubtedly, and as will become clear from the information below, this sector has the most advanced SWAP arrangements of the four sectors that this report is concerned with.

The stakeholders in this sector are the following:

1. Ministry of Health
2. Policy and Program Coordination Unit, Prime Minister’s Office
3. Government Central Agencies
4. Government Ministries executing Health activities
5. Development Partners/Donors
6. Implementing Partners (International NGOs, National NGOs, CBOs – Total of 45)
7. Institutions of Higher Learning
8. Professional Bodies
9. Private Sector
10. Parastatals

The guiding force SWG behind this health SWAP is the Swaziland Health Partners Coordinating Consortium (SHPCC). Its membership is comprised of representatives from the MOH, other government departments, development partners, the private sector, and international and local non-governmental organizations (NGOS) and it is co-chaired by the World Health Organization (WHO) with support from the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) of the United States Government. It meets regularly with the direct
assistance of a government-employed Health SWAP Coordinator for sector coordination capacity. Its working structure includes a Technical Committee, Technical Working Groups (TWGs), Lower level Coordinating Groups, and a Secretariat. The SHPCC is expected to meet twice a year and has a mandate to make policy decisions. The Technical Committee is expected to meet quarterly with a mandate to provide oversight and facilitate the implementation of the policy decisions of the SHPCC and SWAP activities. The TWGs are expected to meet quarterly with a mandate of technical support for the implementation of the thematic area activities as per the Strategic Plan. The Lower Level Coordinating Groups are subject/issue-specific committees that seem to meet as required to provide technical support in their areas of intervention.

The objective of the Secretariat for the health SWAP is to provide essential administrative and logistical support for the SWGs for health both in the Policy and in the Operational Levels and the different TWGs of the Sector Coordination Mechanism in order to facilitate the achievement of their objectives and specific tasks in close collaboration between the MOH and its development partners. The Secretariat serves as a hub for information sharing for the various levels of the Sector Coordination Mechanism for health. The responsibilities of the Secretariat are the following:

- Support the logistics of the Sector Coordination Mechanism under the supervision of the SWGs by providing facilities and services for: Coordination of agendas and work-plans of the SWGs and the TWGs; translation and interpretation; publishing and dissemination of documents; secretarial support to meetings (scheduling, preparing of agendas, distribution of invitations, taking minutes and records, etc.); and maintenance of a database of members of the Sector Coordination Mechanism;

- Assist the SWGs in developing/drafting: (1) Program Management Matrixes, which enable the SWGs to jointly and transparently plan, coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate projects and activities under agreed Programs; (2) a Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, which provides logistical and technical support for the implementation of planned joint-missions; (3) a Draft Capacity Development Framework; (4) a Project Implementation Arrangements Action Plan; and (5) Sector Plans;

- Update the database of overseas development assistance (ODA) and national initiatives, projects and activities for health;

- Ensure sharing of minutes of SWGs and TWGs meetings among the MOH and development partners;

- Disseminate evidence and information among national stakeholders and Development Partners as mandated by the SWGs.
For Swaziland’s health sector, the policies and action programs outlined in the PRSAP are operationalized through the NHSSP which is, in effect, the Sector Development Plan. The SWAP mandate reinforces the health sector’s own attempts to promote a Sector Coordination Mechanism to oversee the implementation and improvement of aid effectiveness in support of the NHSSP. Through implementation of the SWAP, partner activities within the health sector are to be coordinated and harmonized so that they are aligned with the NHSSP.

4.4 Water and Sanitation

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy (MNRE) is responsible for overseeing projects and programs in the water and sanitation sector. There is no Sector Development Plan as defined in the context a SWAP. However one is being prepared and will draw on the policy instruments currently in place. A Draft National Water Policy has been finalized but not yet approved by Cabinet. A National Sanitation Policy has not yet been prepared. The guiding policy instruments currently supporting this sector are: (1) The Water Act, 2003; and (2) The Integrated Water Resources Master Plan (IWRMP). The IWRMP has four distinct strategic focus areas that can enable the strengthening of Technical/Sector Working Groups:

- Water Supply & Sanitation
- Management Information Systems
- Water Resources Management
- Water Resources Development

The water and sanitation SWG was established in 2009 to implement the SWAP approach. Stakeholders were identified and terms of reference were developed, approved and adopted. There are two sub-sector working groups: (1) Water Resources Development and Management that provides an oversight on the overall utilization of water resources; and (2) Potable Water and Sanitation Group that brings together all key players in the water and sanitation sector (NGOs, parastatals, private sector, development partners, and the government). The Planning Unit of the MNRE is the Secretariat for the Water and Sanitation SWG. The Chair is delegated to the Director of the Department of Water Resources. However, there is no identified Lead Donor.
5 AID COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT

The Swaziland Aid Policy clearly identifies the MEPD as being responsible for development partner coordination and resource mobilization including through the SWAP mechanism. The MEPD has established an Aid Coordination and Management Section (ACMS) to undertake these functions. The ACMS has responsibility for the coordination of donor assistance programs and for the mobilization of all ODA received in the form of grants to Swaziland. Development partners are therefore requested to work with government in respecting the mandate of the ACMS to, among other things, introduce all development partners and project concepts to responsible line ministries (i.e. the ACMS is the first entry point for development partners). In this regard, all new projects should be directed through ACMS. The actual program and project activities are generally implemented by line ministries, quasi-state institutions and non-state actors. In this regard, the ACMS also plays a monitoring role.

The primary role of the ACMS, as reiterated in the Report of the SWAER, is to act as Swaziland’s “coordinator of external assistance”. As such, “it is responsible for the mobilization and management of the country’s external assistance for the implementation of various programs and projects within and outside government. The MEPD has an aid policy which is the legal framework that underpins the work of the ACMS. All external resources are to be channeled through the ACMS which will ensure that they are used in accordance with government’s national development policies and that there is no duplication of efforts. The ACMS is the main communication channel between government and its development partners.”

The key functions of the ACMS include:

- Preparing updated Aid Policies;
- Preparing development assistance frameworks;
- Maintaining development partner profiles and undertaking resource mobilization;
- Appraising programs and projects to be funded by development partners;
- Participating in the drafting of financing agreements and other contract documents;
- Assisting in preparing work plans for development partner funded projects;
- Maintaining a database of all external funding;
- Ensuring development partner funds are used in accordance with development partner procedures;
- Monitoring progress on the implementation of development partner funded projects and programs;
- Monitoring evaluation and audit of development partner funded projects; and
- Reporting development partner commitments and disbursements.

The Report of the SWAER has also noted that the Government of Swaziland has a policy of maintaining open dialogue with its development partners and is not seeking to restrict the relationship of development partners with line ministries. However, the Government is also insisting that the ACMS must be the formal entry point in order for projects and activities to be recognized in government planning and to enable greater ownership and alignment. The role ACMS plays in formally introducing development partners to line ministries is particularly important for projects or programs that require government to absorb capacity or maintain infrastructure after implementation is completed. As part of the MEPD, ACMS can steer development partners to appropriate government authorities and insist on the long-term planning needed to ensure assets are maintained after implementation. The ACMS also works closely with the Ministry of Finance which plays a primary role in managing loan financing. The MEPD acts as Swaziland’s contracting authority on grants but this function is performed by the Ministry of Finance for lending. Line ministries are responsible for implementation at the sector level.

In addition, the MEPD has Planning Officers responsible for sector issues and specific projects. These officers provide planning support for all resources to sectors and coordinate directly with line ministries. They also act as project supervisors on behalf of the contracting authority with regard to the administration of grants. The ACMS supports the work of the Planning Officers who are directly responsible for determining the feasibility of development partners’ support in a particular sector.
6 ASSESSMENT OF THE SWAPs

All of the information for this section of the Report was obtained directly and entirely from each of the Lead Ministries for each sector during the consultation and interview process pursuant to the Terms of Reference for the assignment. The senior personnel who represented each Ministry in that process and provided the information are listed in Annex I. Annex II provides the sample questions. During a Validation Workshop held in early November 2012, some further information was provided and incorporated here taking into consideration the conceptual framework of what constitutes a SWAP and the need to maintain both internal consistency and coherence in the Report.

6.1 The Agriculture and Food Security SWAP

This SWAP suffers from some of the same challenges that afflict almost all agriculture SWAPs globally as discussed in the development literature. It is widely agreed that agriculture poses particular challenges to any attempt to build an integrated policy framework, particularly one which has the state at its core, as has been the case with SWAPs. These challenges explain why agricultural SWAPs have encountered problems in implementation. But they also help to illustrate how important the SWAP principles are in a sector like agriculture where stakeholder coordination is a major obstacle for sector development. Moreover, unlike other SWAP sectors, in agriculture many of the most important government actions which influence it are concerned with policy rather than service delivery.

6.1.1 Ownership and Leadership

There has been little to none, in terms of ownership and leadership, demonstrated in this SWAP. Although endorsing and claiming to be committed to the SWAP process, there has been insufficient demonstrated enthusiasm to comply with the government’s efforts to own and lead the SWAP implementation process. In fact, the Ministry of Agriculture blames its shortcomings on the MEPD for not providing resources and for not coordinating the process.

6.1.2 Sector Development Plan and Policies

There is no sector development plan for this sector and there is much uncertainty about when one will be produced. Consequently, agriculture programming implementation is undertaken on an ad hoc basis by each of the currently existing seven program implementation departments of the Ministry.

6.1.3 Alignment of the PRSAP Pillar Matrices and SWG Mechanisms

The lack of a SDP (Sector Development Plan) as well as the non-existence of other SWAP activities suggests that there is currently no alignment of the PRSAP pillar matrices with SWG mechanisms.

30 | P a g e
6.1.4 **Resource Mobilization, Funding Arrangements and Predictability**

In the absence of the pursuit and implementation of the SWAP framework by the Ministry of Agriculture, there are also no resource mobilization and funding arrangements in place pursuant to a SWAP.

6.1.5 **Institutional Framework**

The institutional framework for this SWAP is non-existent, the SWAP and the accompanying SWG being non-functional.

6.1.6 **Terms of Reference of the SWG**

Generic terms of reference were provided at the inception of the adoption of the SWG principle. No sector specific terms of reference were developed thereafter.

6.1.7 **Documentation and Recording Practices**

No documentation and recording practices exist. With the non-existence of the SWAP and the SWG, there is essentially nothing to record and document.

6.1.8 **Stakeholder Coordination and Policy Dialogue**

There is no stakeholder coordination and policy dialogue.

6.1.9 **Use of Country Systems**

There is no use of country systems.

6.1.10 **Delivery of Results**

The non-existence of both a SDP and an agriculture SWAP indicate that there are no SWAP-related delivery of results.

6.1.11 **Other Challenges and Constraints**

The MOA has identified the following as challenges and constraints to their implementation of the SWAP:

- The process is not fully embraced within government planning systems and, hence, there is invisible ownership.

- Promised funding from the MEPD for SWAP activities has not materialized.
The need to capacitate and train staff on the SWAP initiative and to learn from the experience of other countries.

The lack of information flow and harmonization and coordination of the process and from the MEPD.

The lack of championing of national planning frameworks by the MEPD.

The heavy workload imposed by the SWAP process on the Principal Planning Officers (PPOs).

The need for integration of the SWAP into the country programming framework of one of the lead partner organizations.

The need for stakeholder commitment and willingness to support the MOA’s engagement in sectoral activities.

Table 2: SWOT Analysis of the Agriculture SWAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None discernible</td>
<td>• Lack of a sector development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inadequate committed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited understanding of the SWAP initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of a coordinated approach to program design and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities:</th>
<th>Threats:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A professed commitment to the SWAP initiative by the senior management and some senior staff</td>
<td>• Another potential loss of interest in the SWAP initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sector remains a priority in the development agenda</td>
<td>• Limited organizational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness to be assisted with a SWAP re-launch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of some development partners with a strong interest in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 The Education SWAP

Although there was a SWAP kickoff in the education sector in 2010, there has been no formal establishment of a SWAP and the stakeholders with some interest in the sector, that meet on an ad hoc basis, pursue and discuss specific projects and other issues of interest in the education sector.
6.2.1 Ownership and Leadership

Ownership and leadership of government education and training policy is very good. This augurs well for implementation of a future SWAP framework.

6.2.2 Sector Development Plan and Policies

There is an excellent education and training sector policy which, despite its title, is currently regarded and formulated as the sector’s SDP as defined in this Report. It is also gender-mainstreamed. This SDP is dated April 2011, was launched in August 2012, and states that: “The Education and Training Sector Policy shall be reviewed every five years to integrate and implement inputs from stakeholders”.

6.2.3 Alignment of the PRSAP Pillar Matrices and SWG Mechanisms

The education and training SDP is aligned with the Human Capital Development Pillar of the PRSAP but it has not yet been translated into annual plans and budgets and the SWG mechanisms. However, the SDP is the guiding framework for engagement with stakeholders in the sector on a project basis.

6.2.4 Resource Mobilization, Funding Arrangements and Predictability

Resource mobilization and funding arrangements currently take place in the context of projects and not yet in a SWAP framework. There is some predictability in that regard.

6.2.5 Institutional Framework

There is currently no formal SWAP and SWG as stated above. However, the EU has agreed to fund a SWG Coordinator and the recruitment process will begin soon.

6.2.6 Terms of Reference of the SWG

The generic terms of reference is in use. However, the intent is to adapt it to the specifics of the sector and this is targeted as one of the priority actions for the Ministry.

6.2.7 Documentation and Recording Practices

No documentation and recording practices currently are in place vis-à-vis the work and meetings pertaining to this sector. Information is not being shared among stakeholders.

6.2.8 Stakeholder Coordination and Policy Dialogue

There is no SWG as also previously noted. However, there are ad hoc meetings with stakeholders to discuss policy issues and assistance for particular projects.
6.2.9 *Use of Country Systems*

There is no use of country systems as contextualized in the SWAP framework discussed above. For example, development partners do not utilize country (Swazi) procurement or budget or financial management systems.

6.2.10 *Delivery of Results*

The MOE has been delivering results related to its SDP. However, this is not technically being done in the context of a SWAP which has not been formally established. This delivery occurs through departmental activities at the sub-sector level.

6.2.11 *Other Challenges and Constraints*

The MOE has identified the following as some of the other challenges and constraints in the implementation of the SWAP nationally and as a Ministry:

- Inadequate information sharing among stakeholders and between the MEPD and the MOET.
- The time-consuming nature of the SWAP.
- Inadequate understanding of the SWAP and its advantages.
- Lack of a Secretariat to coordinate and manage SWAP activities.
- Inadequate training before the SWAP was launched.

**Table 3: SWOT Analysis of the Education SWAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Strong sector development policy that is gender mainstreamed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Committed senior management</td>
<td>- Inadequate understanding of the SWAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inadequate capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inadequate information sharing among stakeholders and between the MEPD and the MOET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities:</th>
<th>Threats:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EU funded Coordinator to be recruited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good project level working relationship with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Champions stakeholder consultations</td>
<td>- No predictability in availability of development partner resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of effective sector coordination mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 The Health SWAP

Undoubtedly, this SWAP is the most advanced in its structures and functioning compared to the other three discussed in this Report and is so recognized by the development partners. This SWAP has benefited not only from the experience development partners have gained from establishing SWAPs in this sector (health and education were the first two sectors to have SWAPs globally) but also from the emphasis and funding placed on health issues for human development by donors, and as well the leadership and commitment demonstrated by the senior management team of the MOH. Moreover, it can also be observed that successful SWAPs are most commonly found in social sectors in part because SWAPs in non-service delivery and/or “green” sectors such as agriculture, energy, land, water, environment and natural resources, for example, are more complex and dynamic, making them challenging to design, organize and manage. Nonetheless, the elements of leadership and commitment by the MOH loom large in the accomplishments of this SWAP.

6.3.1 Ownership and Leadership

There is clear and convincing evidence of demonstrated and effective ownership and leadership in this sector. For example, the MOH has taken greater initiative in the strategy formulation process and in articulating prioritized actions for improved performance in the implementation of the SWAP.

6.3.2 Sector Development Plan and Policies

An excellent SDP (the NHSSP) is in place and covers the period 2008-2013. The SDP is pro-poor, gender-mainstreamed, and conveys the prospects and activities for improving the health status of all Swazis. In addition, there are other guiding policy documents such as the National Multisectoral Strategic Framework (NSF) for HIV and AIDS 2009-2014, for example. The purpose of the NSF is to bring together stakeholders to scale up and mainstream decentralized and effective response strategies to contribute to the NSF results, based on the comparative advantage of each stakeholder or sector.

6.3.3 Alignment of the PRSAP Pillar Matrices and SWG Mechanisms

Undoubtedly, the SWG mechanisms are aligned with the PRSAP Pillar Matrices including thematic areas technical teams and coordinating structures. The NHSSP covers the respective sub-pillars of Basic Health and HIV/AIDS under the Human Capital Development Pillar.

6.3.4 Resource Mobilization, Funding Arrangements and Predictability

According to the MOH’s First Quarter Performance Report (July 2012), the health sector continues to implement the SWAP towards planning and budgeting. As such, development partner support has been included in the budget request for fiscal year 2012/2013. Partners
continue to cooperate with the Ministry in providing indicative budgets in the three clusters elaborated in the NHSSP i.e. Preventive Services, Curative Services, and Health Systems Strengthening which is 62%, 19%, and 19%, respectively, of US$78,883,286.28 for grants expected in the financial year. Over and above financial support, technical support is also received from health sector partners in various disciplines.

The sector is therefore able to mobilize significant resources and with a great degree of predictability in that regard.

6.3.5 Institutional Framework

There is an extensive institutional framework in place for the SWAP implementation including SWG structures (such as a Secretariat) and various coordinating mechanisms. Some are necessary structures to meet the requirements of various funding arrangements and to maintain transparency and accountability. However, that also entails that considerable time has to be spent on adherence to those requirements which increases transactions costs. To alleviate that problem some development partners have set up their own project implementation offices, or they are funding staff positions related to coordinating and funding oversight.

6.3.6 Terms of Reference of the SWG

The SWG has its own TOR for its structures.

6.3.7 Documentation and Recording Practices

There is extensive recording and documentation of meetings and so on. However, the Ministry itself is of the view that there needs to be better custodial arrangements for, and dissemination of, such information.

6.3.8 Stakeholder Coordination and Policy Dialogue

There are very impressive arrangements in place to ensure effective and necessary stakeholder coordination and policy dialogue. From inception, the NHSSP and the NSF are good examples of the broad-based participatory process that was deployed in that regard through the use of technical working groups, regional consultations, and program consultations. In addition, there are many other mechanisms for coordination and dialogue across a wide range of projects, activities and prioritized actions with stakeholders. For example, there is a Donors Forum, the Swaziland Partnership Forum, and other Project Coordination Teams. The strategic direction for coordination is to improve and harmonize coordination modalities among the key stakeholders in order to ensure effective and efficient implementation.
6.3.9 Use of Country Systems

Country systems are not currently being used in the SWAP framework. However, it is hoped that the country may be able to get to a point, in the near future, where it will be possible to have common arrangements with respect to such things as procurement and budgeting. In some individual projects, such as the World Bank-managed Health, AIDS and TB Project, some implementation arrangements have been aligned with country processes and systems.

6.3.10 Delivery of Results

There are data, including from the Mid-Term Review Report on the NHSSP, that suggest that the health system will soon show improvement in some of the overall health indicators. For example, the excellent partner support for HIV/AIDS has led to declining infection rates with lives being saved or prolonged. Similarly, partner support for tuberculosis (TB) program activities has resulted in higher TB case detection rates and reductions in infection rates.

6.3.11 Other Challenges and Constraints

The following are the additional challenges and constraints to the implementation of the SWAP that have been identified by the MOH:

- Too many activities.
- Inadequate indicators.
- The lack of a common M&E framework.
- Fragmented coordination mechanisms.
- Duplication of efforts within some SWGs.
- The need for a phased approach by all SWAPs to conform to the principles/elements of the SWAP framework. However, it must be noted here, and as discussed elsewhere in this Report, that there are constraints to this possibility given some of the conditions imposed by development partners. For example, unless and until there is significant improvement in the Kingdom’s governance environment (especially with respect to public financial management) there will be no use of a common budgeting framework or of common procurement systems. In fact, development partners such as the World Bank, for example, have established separate Project Implementation Units, and in the health sector too, to ensure that development finance is not squandered nor gets pocketed.
**Table 4: SWOT Analysis of the Health SWAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A well-articulated vision for health sector development that is also sufficiently pro-poor and gender-mainstreamed</td>
<td>• Numerous and fragmented coordinating mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated government ownership over policy, resources and implementation</td>
<td>• Weak procurement processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broad-based consultation that engages a wide spectrum of stakeholders</td>
<td>• Limited participation from lower levels in the development of annual operational plans in line with the NHSSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priorities are generally well supported by major donor agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective sector coordination mechanisms are in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities:</th>
<th>Threats:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of committed development partners</td>
<td>• Large number of stakeholders and coordinating mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of a strong stakeholder network</td>
<td>• Weak commitment to internal joint actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing budget and technical support from partners</td>
<td>• Too many activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.4 The Water and Sanitation SWAP**

This SWAP is somewhat inactive. However, it has the advantage of identifiable development partners, such as the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the African Development Bank (AfDB), that want to play key partnership roles. In fact, according to the Report of the SWAER, it has been proposed that this water and sanitation SWG be co-chaired by the AfDB in cooperation with UNICEF.

**6.4.1 Ownership and Leadership**

The demonstration of ownership and leadership has not been consistent. There was initial enthusiasm but that soon disappeared due primarily to a lack of understanding of the SWAP and inadequate support from the MEPD. However, the sector is eager for a re-launch.

**6.4.2 Sector Development Plan and Policies**

There is no sector development plan, as defined in the context of a SWAP, but one is being produced and may be ready by the end of 2012. As previously noted, there are a number of documents guiding the work in this sector. The identified priority sector issues are: (a) Expanding access to water; (b) Improving water quality; (c) Equitable distribution of water resources; and (d) Sector coordination.
6.4.3 **Alignment of the PRSAP Pillar Matrices and SWG Mechanisms**

The lack of a sector development plan (again as defined in the context of a SWAP) suggests that there is no clear and direct alignment of the PRSAP pillar matrices and the SWG mechanisms. However, the two sub-sector groups of the SWG – Potable Water and Sanitation and Water Resources Development and Management – do fit under the safe water and sanitation sub-pillar of the Human Capital Development Pillar of the PRSAP.

6.4.4 **Resource Mobilization, Funding Arrangements and Predictability**

There is no resource mobilization in the context of a SWAP framework. However, some funding has been provided by development partners to facilitate some of the SWG meetings previously held and there are sufficient funds available to facilitate meetings through the end of 2012.

6.4.5 **Institutional Framework**

There is a SWG in place with two sub-sectors as previously discussed. However, the SWG is not functioning strictly in the context of the SWAP, since there is no SDP from which annual plans are derived to implement, but more as a coordinating mechanism for stakeholder participation in the water and sanitation activities of the Ministry. It has been proposed that the SWG be co-chaired by the AfDB in cooperation with UNICEF. The latter is to play a special role in supporting coordination aspects related to the delivery of potable water and sanitation.

6.4.6 **Terms of Reference of the SWG**

The generic terms of reference is being used with a sector-specific TOR to be completed by the end of 2012.

6.4.7 **Documentation and Recording Practices**

Some documentation and recording of the sector coordination meetings seem to take place. However, there exists a problem of information and sharing between and among stakeholders.

6.4.8 **Stakeholder Coordination and Policy Dialogue**

There are some stakeholder meetings where sector policy is discussed particularly with respect to water and sanitation. UNICEF is playing a special role in supporting coordination in the water and sanitation areas. However, in the absence of a recognized SWAP, there is not much real sector wide coordination and policy dialogue that is currently taking place. Again, the lack of a sector development plan influences this state of affairs.
6.4.9 Use of Country Systems

There is no use of country systems. For example, development partners do not use the Government of Swaziland’s procurement system nor do they use common budgeting and financial management arrangements for this sector.

6.4.10 Delivery of Results

There are no SWAP-related delivery of results due to the absence of a SDP (again as defined in the context a SWAP) and related annual plans in that regard.

6.4.11 Other Challenges and Constraints

The following have been identified by the MNRE as some of the other challenges and constraints to both their implementation of the SWAP and to the implementation of the SWAP as a national initiative:

- Insufficient financial resources.
- Lack of information sharing.
- Inadequate understanding of the SWAP framework due to insufficient and inadequate training to date.
- No cross linkages with other sectors such as agriculture.
- Poor coordination from the MEPD and lack of a SWG coordinator.
- The low level of representation at stakeholder and coordination meetings and the frequent turnover of the personnel attending those meetings which prevents commitments from being made and results in considerable delay in decision-making.

Table 5: SWOT Analysis of the Water and Sanitation SWAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A dedicated staff</td>
<td>• The SWAP concept not fully understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good working knowledge of the water, sanitation and hygiene sub-sector</td>
<td>• Inadequate capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of a sector development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inadequate resource mobilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities:</th>
<th>Threats:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Water, sanitation and hygiene sub-sector continues to be an essential services sector and a priority in the development agenda</td>
<td>• Inadequate championing of ownership by the senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of committed development partners especially for water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
<td>• Limited attention to results and action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness to re-launch and revitalize the SWAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Cross-Cutting and Other Issues

**Capacity Deficits:** The deficit in technical capacity related to the knowledge and understanding of the SWAP has been frequently cited in all sectors. Moreover, some concern has been expressed about the capacity of the MEPD to effectively coordinate the SWGs and the four priority sectors. In fact, this issue of capacity was also a topic of discussion as noted in the Report of the SWAER.

Where capacity is lacking it affects readiness and preparedness to participate in the SWAP processes and leads to less than optimal outcomes from those processes. It also undermines the country’s attempts to claim and display ownership and leadership, to negotiate effectively, to implement agreements, and to live up to key aspects of the decisions agreed to at the HLFAE. Encouragingly, some of the sector development plans, such as for the education and health sectors, recognize and identify, as strategic priorities, the need to take appropriate capacity building measures and to strengthen systems of human resource development to improve efficiency and institutional performance.

**Gender Equality:** The 2005 National Constitution recognizes women’s equal status in the economic, political and cultural spheres of life and stipulates that the state shall take all necessary steps to ensure the full integration of women into the mainstream of economic development. Furthermore, the Government of Swaziland has endorsed the importance of gender equality as a means to reducing poverty, enhancing justice and promoting sustainable development in a number of other policies, protocols and conventions, including the PRSAP. The SDPs for the education and health sectors extensively promote inclusive and equitable delivery strategies that target the vulnerable and promote gender fairness. Consequently, it can be concluded that gender mainstreaming is indeed well integrated into those two SDPs and in their implementation process.

All SWAPs must be fully responsive to the needs and interests of both women and men and help to promote gender equality. Because sector wide approaches involve shaping an entire sector with the objective of enhancing long-term development, attention to gender equality is critical if the SWAP is to be successful in meeting the goal of equitable and sustainable development. In that regard, the donor community has adopted a gender mainstreaming approach to development co-operation in which underlying differences in women’s and men’s resources, power, constraints, needs and interests are explicitly recognized and acted on in all situations, so as to reduce gender inequality. This approach is consistent with the SWAP, in which a range of policy and programmatic priorities are considered within the sector.

Moreover, the goals of national programs, particularly the PRSPs and sectoral programs, are to combat poverty and improve the different dimensions of human development (literacy, mortality, etc.). Research has shown that greater equality between women and men and the emancipation of women contribute to the accomplishment of these goals. Many readily
available studies at micro level show that greater gender equality and women’s emancipation lead to higher human and economic development and to decreases in poverty. For example:

- Education of mothers around the world leads to healthier children with a higher level of education;
- More control by women over agricultural inputs significantly increase the agricultural output and income; and
- A higher income in the hands of women usually implies an increase in the well-being of all family members.

**Data Availability and Data Sharing:** Currently, data availability and data sharing are not optimal. The availability of accurate data on aid generally (current budgets, disbursements, and planned for the future), and all aid projects, and their sharing between government and development partners needs to dramatically improve. More specifically, development partners need to live up to their obligation to ensure that the ACMS is provided with accurate data and in a timely manner. It makes for enhanced partnerships when such data are routinely made available to a government and results in more effective government planning and budgeting which, in turn, can only lead to better SWAP outcomes.

**Good Governance Reforms:** The existing sector development plans have said basically nothing about critical good governance issues such as corruption and anti-corruption measures. Yet, corruption remains a major cross-cutting issue with significant negative development impacts in all sectors of the Kingdom. The government is fully aware of the problems regarding corruption in the country, especially related to tenders and procurement, and is currently considering adoption of a National Anti-Corruption Policy that was recently developed to combat corruption and improve the governance environment and indicators in the Kingdom. Hopefully, when that Policy is adopted it will be mainstreamed into all development policy initiatives including the SWAP implementation process. Among other things, it will encourage development partners to become much more comfortable and amenable to the use of country systems, for example, which is an important element of the SWAP framework.

**Transactions Costs:** Transactions costs in ODA can be defined simply as all the extra costs implied and incurred in the delivery and management of that ODA – beyond that of the ODA itself. It may cover, for example, the money; time; and the inconvenience of identifying, negotiating, implementing, monitoring and evaluating aid delivery. Of course, there are transactions costs in ODA to both the recipient government and the development partners (donors). The implementation of a sector wide approach has led to some new costs that did not exist with the project approach. For example, the harmonization costs: these costs occur when the development partners work together to harmonize their procedures; and the coordination costs: these are related to the efforts of the development partners and the
recipient government to work together within a same sector or program. In some of the
development policy literature it is argued that these harmonization and coordination costs
should not be considered as transactions costs since they can have a positive impact on the
aid transaction. Nonetheless, however considered or regarded, undoubtedly, aid effectiveness
depends strongly on the minimization of these costs and particularly so given that the notion,
that ODA transactions costs are high, has become conventional wisdom.

The transactions costs for Swaziland in pursuing the SWAP were, undoubtedly, high at the
initial stages of the implementation of the SWAP. This resulted primarily from the time-
consuming and large number of meetings, accompanied by the lack of knowledge about the
SWAP framework and demands made by development partners. This, in turn, may have put
off some government officials, some temporarily and, unfortunately, some permanently.
However, although marginal transactions costs have been declining, as more SWAP
coordination structures come on stream, there is some evidence that costs have been
redistributed and concentrated, with an increasing burden falling on senior staff at central
ministry level. This concentration of transactions costs have exposed capacity constraints in
the government, which now requires a further donor response with technical assistance for
capacity development. Therefore, what began as an effort to enhance country ownership can
ironically end up significantly eroding it.

One other aspect relative to transactions costs is the lack of a clear division of labour for
development partners in the Kingdom. When DOL is clear, and agreed to, it can considerably
reduce duplication of efforts and transactions costs, as harmonization and coordination efforts
become much more streamlined.
Given the current state of affairs vis-à-vis the SWAP in Swaziland, as discussed above, and based on further information gleaned from the relevant documents, consultations and interviews; and further bearing in mind best practices in SWAPs policy, the following key actionable recommendations and accompanying rationale have emerged. The implementation of these recommendations will augur well, in turn, for the strengthening and successful enhancement of the implementation of the SWAP process in the Kingdom if the SWAP continues to be the government’s preferred option for implementing its PRSAP.

**Recommendation 1:** Stronger national ownership and leadership needs to be exerted by the Government of Swaziland in all aspects of the SWAP process.

To put it quite bluntly, no initiative in pursuit of country or even regional development, no matter how well-crafted and internationally accepted, can and/or will be successful if it is not owned by the nationals themselves. The lessons of the failure of past initiatives points to an experience which shows that nationals must lead their countries out of poverty, and that the most effective policies and programs are those based on domestic processes of consultation and decision-making. This conclusion has been further substantiated by published research showing a significant positive correlation between the ownership of policy reforms and development outcomes.

Ownership is often used by donors to mean *commitment* to policies, regardless of how those policies were chosen. This contrasts with ownership defined as the degree of *control* recipient governments are able to exercise over policy design and implementation. Ownership must always be defined in the context of control. If defined otherwise it does not and will not be catalyzed as real country ownership.

Ownership matters because it directly affects program acceptance and implementation at both the national and local levels. Domestic ownership generates political support and buy-ins by relevant stakeholders who are much more likely to view initiatives such as the SWAP as a worthy indigenous one rather than immediately dismissing it as a foreign imposition.

This emphasis on domestic ownership is a key value-added of the SWAP and a significant one that sets it apart from most previous initiatives in support of development, although the development problems being addressed remain largely the same. Moreover, country ownership signals country control of projects, programs, and processes for better development outcomes.

However, for country ownership to be demonstrated as control, over the long-term, a number of elements need to be in place and that is the case for Swaziland. These include, but not limited to:
Good macroeconomic management to be able to approach donors with a much less subservient posture;

Strong state institutions with the capability to set the policy agenda and maintain ownership, for example, a professional civil service, capable state institutions, a strong planning system, and insistence on a centralized aid management system; and

Clear development visions about where the country is going (emphasis on the NDS, PRSAP, and ERS), and about the contribution of public policies to achieving those outcomes.

**Recommendation 2:** There should be developed a program of SWAP capacity development for all public sector personnel with any responsibility for the SWAP activities and with appropriate sourcing and partnerships built for covering the costs. Some of these trained-up personnel should then be identified as trainers whom can then conduct across Ministry training for others.

*Ownership without capacity must be regarded as meaningless.* There are acknowledged significant capacity deficits in the Swaziland sector institutions charged with implementing the SWAPs. This can only lead to further bottlenecks and work backlogs over the long-term. Capacity development is a cross-cutting issue. It is therefore imperative that a program of capacity development be developed for these institutions to enable them to undertake their SWAP mandates more expeditiously and effectively. This capacity development program must be related to: (1) hiring appropriate numbers of staff with the appropriate skills; and (2) the provision of technical skills training for improving expertise and professionalism in the SWAP. The SWAP training workshops that have been conducted so far have been regarded as both inadequate and insufficient. Ideally, each Ministry should develop a capacity development plan related to the SWAP in coordination and collaboration with the MEPD.

Capacity is defined here as the competency of individuals, public sector institutions, private sector entities, civil society organizations, and local communities to engage in activities in a sustainable manner that permit the achievement of beneficial goals such as poverty reduction, efficient service delivery, good governance, economic growth, effectively facing the challenges of globalization, and deriving the greatest possible benefits from such trends as rapid changes in information technologies and science.

Capacity development or capacity building is the enhancement of the competency of individuals, public sector institutions, private sector entities, civil society organizations, and local communities to engage in activities in a sustainable manner for positive development impacts such as poverty reduction, better service delivery, improvements in governance quality, or meeting the millennium development goals, for example. Capacity development is therefore not a stand-alone training intervention but rather a strategically coordinated set of activities aimed at individuals, institutions, and sectors. It is much more than improving the
abilities and skills of individuals. Far too often it is simplistically regarded as just training, mentoring, or organization restructuring. It is also about strengthening the performance capabilities of individuals, organizations, and societies.

Looked at in this comprehensive way, such capacity development would also improve the functions related to monitoring and evaluation including such things as the production of monitoring and evaluation manuals and guidelines for the required monitoring and evaluation processes associated with the various SWAPs. In summary, by the end of the capacity development activities participants should be able to improve their work performance in relation to the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of the SWAP processes by, among other things:

✓ Working towards increased harmonization and alignment of aid to nationally-owned policies, processes, and accountability mechanisms;

✓ Sharing a language and build a common understanding of the key components of a sector development program and promote joint assessment of those components as a basis for decision-making about scope and modalities of donor support;

✓ Taking the key advantages and disadvantages of different offers of support into account;

✓ Understanding the typical joint instruments used to make support to sector programs operational;

✓ Dealing with typical risks, difficulties and dilemmas which occur during the preparation and implementation of sector programs; and

✓ Participating in the preparation of the next steps of the ongoing SWAP processes in their sectors or nationally.

**Recommendation 3:** The need for institutional strengthening seems to have been a perennial refrain in Swaziland. It needs to be heeded given the institutional demands of the SWAP in partnering with donors as well as other development delivery requirements.

Institutional strengthening, sometimes referred to as organizational development, can be regarded as the reform of existing management systems, practices, and processes found in an institution/organization to improve effectiveness with respect to how efficiently the organization’s goals and objectives are being attained. Institutional strengthening involves an analysis of the strategy, structure and culture of the institution. It analyses both the formal and informal parts of the institution.
Institutional weaknesses are key bottlenecks for any program, such as the SWAP, hoping to achieve sustainability. Leaders, managers, and staff therefore must be able to recognize the need to strengthen their institutions in order to respond to the many external challenges confronting them. This is particularly so for the strengthening of the Ministries to execute their functions with respect to the SWAP.

**Recommendation 4: Documentation and reporting systems need to considerably improve.**

There needs to be agreed reporting systems to ensure regular and timely dissemination of information to various audiences both internally and externally. Reporting intervals need to be agreed upon and adhered to for the various SWAP structures. Reporting formats to suit different audiences and stakeholders also need to be identified. In fact, the starting point here needs to be basic information on each SWAP that can be readily accessed by any public sector employee or any member of the public. For example, a simple document, in brochure form, needs to be prepared on each SWAP (and updated every 6 months) that contains such information as: (a) when was the SWAP established; (b) who are the stakeholders (organizationally identified and what do they contribute); (c) which is the Lead Ministry; (d) who is the Lead Donor; (e) what are the sub-sectors covered if any; (f) when was the SWG or SWGs established; (g) who chairs each SWG and who are its members (titles and affiliation only); (h) what are the functions of the SWG; (i) how often are meetings held; (j) what reports are produced; (k) how can these reports be obtained; (l) how is monitoring and evaluation conducted. In addition, and of absolute necessity also, each SWG should produce and submit periodic donor alignment and harmonization reports to relevant institutions.

Also central to this documentation and reporting system is the distribution and flow of information among stakeholders and to the public. This, in turn, will improve communication among stakeholders and lead to better coordination and a more informed and accepting public of what is being done on their behalf and for their benefit. All of the reports should be transparently accessible on-line.

**Recommendation 5: Sector Development Plans must be developed and adhered to.**

Sector development plans or strategies are essential parts of the SWAPs framework. Where they do not exist, as in agriculture, they need to be produced and must be a part of the process going forward in any future extension and use of the SWAP mechanism in Swaziland. In the Swaziland SWAP and planning and budgeting framework, the SDPs lead to the annual plans for which budgets are developed. Consequently, the SWAP will fail where the SDP link is missing.

A sector development plan is a comprehensive vision and strategy for an entire sector, which informs all support to that sector, and is implemented through a common framework and a public expenditure program. The key thing about SDPs is that they go beyond ministerial
boundaries to take into account all strategic, planning and budgeting issues that are relevant to the sector. SDPs take their overall orientation from nation-wide planning documents such as the NDS or the PRSAP, in the case of Swaziland, and normally adopt up to a ten-year planning horizon.

SDPs are therefore strategic input documents for all sector stakeholders and for the annual planning and budgeting process. They can be produced for the overall sector as well as for sub-sectors. Among other things, they are intended to provide a clear statement and rationale for the Lead Ministry’s role in the sector; to define sector development objectives; to indicate the sustainability framework of the policies to be implemented through the sector-wide inclusive approach; to show linkages to other programs as well as other sectors; to spell out the institutional roles, challenges, and any reforms required; and to describe the methods and process for financing, monitoring, and the evaluation/assessment of performance.

Any SDP should cover at least the following topics:

1. AN INTRODUCTION – Detailing context and purpose of the SDP and the process of its development.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE SECTOR – Including an institutional overview, review of progress to date in the sector and the policy context.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT OR STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – This details the focus areas in which interventions are planned, together with proposed targets, strategies and priorities that will underpin sector development.

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Discusses the institutional framework through which the sector plan is implemented and the budget structure.

5. MONITORING AND EVALUATION – Details the targets for measuring performance, together with the precise definitions of the indicators.

6. COST AND FINANCING OF THE SDP – Details the estimated costs of the plan and the (expected) available resources.

Recommendation 6: Credible and precise indicators for monitoring and evaluating progress in the implementation of the SWAP need to be agreed and applied.

Pursuant to monitoring and evaluation and performance assessment of the SWAPs, the SDPs (as well as the annual plans), including for the health sector, must include indicators against which targeted progress can be measured. Indicators can be generally defined as something observed or calculated that is used to show the presence or state of a condition or trend.
Economic indicators are statistical measures which reflect the overall health of an economy. Social indicators reflect societal issues and governance indicators depict the state of governance. Performance indicators are measures of impacts, outcomes, outputs and inputs that are monitored during project or initiative (such as a SWAP annual plan) implementation to assess progress towards the previously determined objectives. They are also later used to evaluate success or failure. Performance indicators are useful for: strategic planning, performance accounting, forecasting and early warning during project/program implementation, measuring program results, program marketing and public relations, benchmarking, and quality management.

Indicators are important because they suggest to any observer how well a program, project, an economy or society is doing at a given point in time and can be used for tracking progress or targets in comparison to a previous point in time. Based on this knowledge, important economic and public policy decisions can be made, which affect all members of society. Indicators can also provide an early warning to prevent economic, social and environmental setbacks, for example. They are also useful tools to communicate ideas, thoughts and values.

The selection of indicators should, to a large extent, be determined by the purpose of the indicator set. For example, there can be performance indicators for inputs, for outputs/outcomes, and for measuring impact. In addition to using indicators to assess overall progress towards a development goal, they can also be successfully used to measure success within the framework of a national development strategy or a PRSAP as in the case of Swaziland. There are important criteria for selecting indicators for measuring progress through the SWAP. These criteria include, but are not limited to, being:

- Primarily national in scope;
- Relevant to assessing development progress;
- Limited in number, but remaining open-ended and adaptable to future needs;
- Understandable, clear, and unambiguous;
- Conceptually sound, valid, and reliable;
- Quantifiable;
- Timely or available on a regular basis and without undue delay;
- Representative of an international and/or stakeholder consensus to the extent possible;
- Within the capabilities of the government to develop; and
- Dependent on data of known quality.
**Recommendation 7:** All SWGs now and in the future should refrain from using the generic terms of reference and develop and adopt sector specific TORs consistent with their SDPs.

While the generic terms of reference have been useful as a guide for the SWGs in Swaziland, they are less useful to the functioning of the SWGs and the overall coordination and implementation process in sector-specific situations. It is up to a SWG, through its stakeholders, to decide on the exact scope and contents of its TOR. However, it is recommended here that each SWG adopt comprehensive terms of reference or terms of operation in relationship to their SWAP. Moreover, it is further recommended that where applicable, depending on scope and size, each SWG should also establish technical working groups based on the straightforward rationale that technical issues are sector specific and the use of TWGs would save time in the fleshing out of technical issues, in providing updates on on-going activities and developments, and give credibility to the resultant policy decisions that may emerge from their recommendations. In addition, the TWGs can provide expertise and best practices to support a line ministry in addressing current and emerging challenges in their sector.

These TORs should also be crafted and observed to ensure that development partners work together under government leadership and ownership to support government priorities and country systems, including monitoring and evaluation systems. To achieve these objectives, each SWG should be expected to develop an annual program of work and a budget with a view to articulating and costing the needs of their activities. Such work programs must always include an element of capacity development for effective ownership and leadership and aimed also at safeguarding the sustainability of the SWAP.

The TORs of the SWGs must also be clear enough to facilitate effective alignment and harmonization by providing a platform for regular information sharing and consultation to enable development partners and government itself to adhere to the principles of the HLFAE. In this regard, for example, the SWGs must play their role in reviewing new sector and sub-sector programs and projects for inclusion in their work plans. In addition, the SWGs must play a responsible role in guiding the prioritization of donor aid at the sector level, whilst ensuring that both ODA and government resources are aligned to a mutually agreed plan of work.

Finally here, the TORs of the SWGs must ensure that the SWGs will provide oversight for the effective management of resources in a results-oriented manner and that both development partners and the government are held to account for development results (mutual accountability) through a harmonized M&E and reporting system. This would also allow for the evaluation of performance in the framework of Joint sector Reviews.
Recommendation 8: All SWGs in Swaziland need to have in place the support structure of a Secretariat.

This recommendation is being made because of the future demands that will be placed on the SWGs, as per other recommendations in this document. Given the already heavy workloads (although some prioritization and planning of work may help ease the burden) of those government employees, such as Principal Secretaries, PPOs and others, that are currently in the forefront of the SWAPs process, it is considered necessary that all SWGs be afforded a Secretariat. The existence of a Secretariat will, among other things, enable the SWGs to remain a necessary part of the process and not an event.

To avoid adding new layers to the existing structure, each Secretariat should be an integrated part of the lead ministry and should also be designated as the contact point for all SWG members on behalf of the Co-Chairs. To maintain ownership and leadership, the funding of the Secretariat should be the responsibility of the Government. Nonetheless, some funding can also be solicited from development partners. However, development partners should not solely fund any SWG Secretariat.

Each Secretariat must have a senior official as its full-time Coordinator. He/She should be appointed by the Principal Secretary as the Permanent Chair of the SWG, or through the established public service mechanisms for effecting such appointments. Each Coordinator will work closely with the respective Chair to ensure that the TOR of the SWG is being adhered to. In addition, a Coordinator, among other things, will: (1) through the Chair, ensure that there is regular reporting, as required, to the MEPD on the implementation of relevant national sector plans; (2) ensure that members are kept informed through the dissemination of minutes, reports, and other documents; (3) work closely with the Chair in the preparation of different reports, documents, meetings agendas, and so on; (4) report on changes that may be provided by donors on progress related to donor commitments and disbursements and indications of new and future commitments; and (5) engage in any other SWG Secretariat-related activities assigned by the Chair.

Recommendation 9: All SWGs in the Kingdom should have a structured regular schedule of meetings.

Notwithstanding that ad hoc meetings can be called for if determined to be necessary by the Chair and Co-Chair, there must be a schedule of meetings determined in advance to allow for other schedules to be met, documents to be prepared, and so on. It would also help to influence stakeholders to have their right representatives at the right level present at the right time. Timely and reliable reporting is important for effective planning, optimal allocation of resources, and performance assessment.

This then brings the discussion to the frequency of meetings. It is recommended that the SWG meetings be held on a quarterly basis with at least one of those meetings being
convened as the Joint Sector Review. In several countries, including Rwanda, the practice has been to have two Joint Sector Reviews per fiscal year. One Review (the first) looks backward focusing on sector performance and budget execution for the previous year while identifying key priorities for the preparation of the budget for the following fiscal year. The other Review is mainly forward-looking focusing on the mid-year sector strategy progress report and updating of results and the policy matrix for the upcoming fiscal year. That’s one model that can be adopted by Swaziland. However, given the current size and scope of the SWAP in the Kingdom, and all other issues related to capacity and workloads, it would seem that one annual Joint Sector Review is sufficient to allow for policy guidance, budget and performance assessment; allowing a broad spectrum of stakeholders in a sector to get an insight into, and discuss and influence sector developments with conclusions and recommendations drawn and made.

The TWGs, on the other hand, will need to meet in a time-bound manner as required to feed into the meetings schedule of the SWG. The frequency of any TWG meetings will be influenced by the scale of their activities including SWG issues submitted to them for technical input.

**Recommendation 10: An accurate and current database of all ODA received by Swaziland needs to be established.**

It would seem that the primary source of information on ODA to Swaziland is the on-line data extracts of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). While the OECD remains an excellent and accurate source for such data, it tends to have a two-year lag and does not include some sources such as the Republic of China (Taipei, Taiwan). There is, therefore, an urgent need for the ACMS to establish a database that provides a complete record of ODA received by Swaziland and disaggregated by source and sector based on the intervention areas of the PRSAP. **It is understood that such an initiative is now underway.** However, until it is in place and fully functional, there will be urgent need for such a database.

In accordance with that, a management information system also needs to be developed to record development partner commitments and disbursements as well as support incorporation of all ODA (loans and grants) into the national budgeting process. In fact, what is required is the establishment of a Development Assistance Database (DAD) for the Kingdom which should be administered by the ACMS.

The DAD is a widely used Aid Information Management System (AIMS) for aid management, public investment, and national budgeting. It has been established in more than 30 countries world-wide (including Kenya, Rwanda, Zambia, and Sierra Leone) in close cooperation with UNDP and respective governments to promote transparency and accountability of funds, results-driven decision-making, and aid effectiveness. The DAD is a web-based information collection, tracking, analysis and planning tool for use by national
governments and the broader development assistance community, including bilateral donors, international organizations, and NGOs. The proven DAD package of solutions offers a number of key advantages to user countries, including the following:

- Analytical reporting tools;
- Data visualization;
- Results-based aid management;
- Online and offline capabilities; and
- Integration with financial management and other third party systems.

The DAD serves to enable the effective management of international assistance, to provide a consolidated overview of aid flows, and to expand public information and awareness on development. It is used to collect, track, analyze and plan the use of ODA. Each DAD can be customized according to the needs of the country. Although each DAD is unique, there is a common user interface, and a similar foundation of data, including detailed information on projects, financial commitments, and disbursements. Comprehensive analytical tools are also included, which empower users to effectively query through data, dynamically create reports, and charts and easily export items to commonly used formats such as word, pdf, and excel.

The DAD has been widely endorsed (by governments, UNDP, and development partners) and promoted, including at the Fourth HLFAE held in Busan, South Korea in November-December 2011. This is so, in part, because it offers a solution to the growing consensus (including in Swaziland) that better alignment of aid with national priorities largely depends on better coordination between donors and partner countries. Effective coordination in turn depends on the availability of timely and reliable aid information.

However, in many countries, such as Swaziland, a key challenge to aid effectiveness has to do with a lack of critical information on “who is doing what, where, and how”, which impedes the ability of both government and development partners to achieve sustainable development results. With the advent of the DAD, it is now possible to address the enduring challenge of aid information. It is generally administered by a central government ministry, with donors (donor cooperation required), NGOs, and line ministries providing data online through secure access. Importantly, citizens, civil society organizations, and researchers can access the DAD to see how aid money is being spent and what results are being achieved. The DAD stores detailed organizational, financial, and monitoring and evaluation data on development projects. Managers and decision-makers can also utilize the DAD to turn this data into actionable, policy-relevant information, and powerful and user-friendly analytics and reporting.
**Recommendation 11**: Development partners must discontinue the practice of bypassing the ACMS and instead work through the ACMS for the delivery of all ODA.

In concert with the previous recommendation for a DAD entailing and requiring data input from development partners, it is also essential that those partners stop bypassing the ACMS to go to work directly with other State organizations without sharing information in recognition of the ACMS mandate and role to ensure, on behalf of the government, a coordinated approach to the receipt and disbursement of ODA in the national interest.

Whatever the reasons for the bypassing of the ACMS, and they are all plausible and understandable, it is better for the development partners to attempt to provide assistance to neutralize and/or moderate those reasons, than create an environment of fragmented ODA which undermines sustainability due to the fact that such ODA tends not to be incorporated into government planning, for example.

What is required is a National Development Assistance Policy or National Aid Policy that is endorsed by the Cabinet. Such a Policy would hold sway over all development partners since it would indeed be the Policy of the government and, hence also, all State organizations would be made aware of it and would not dare to contravene it. The Policy must, among other things, set out clear structures and guidelines for the mobilization and management of external assistance with a commitment to increasing the effectiveness of the assistance received.

It should, for example, make it clear that the ACMS mobilizes ODA but works cooperatively with other all government agencies to determine the best distribution of that ODA. For example, the use of the SWAP framework to implement the PRSAP, requires that the ACMS work through the Cross Sectoral Division of the MEPD which will determine through which line Ministries SWAP funding will be distributed and/or channeled even when that determination is obvious from the source or the nature of the funding. The role of the Cross Sectoral Division, with its responsibility for the SWAP and the PRSAP, must be duly respected.

**Recommendation 12**: The MEPD must strengthen its coordination role pursuant to its mandate vis-à-vis the SWAP.

Consistent also with the recommendation on the need for exerted stronger national ownership and leadership, the MEPD must also strengthen its coordinating activities. This mandate lies primarily with the Cross Sectoral Division and its PRMES. Line Ministries have had a lot to say about the inadequate support and guidance they receive from the MEPD and development partners have voiced concerns about inadequate information flow. This gives the impression of a lack of strategic drive and, whether real or just perceived, it must change if the SWAP is to continue to be the modality through which the PRSAP will be implemented now and in the future.
Better coordination by the government (represented by the MEPD) are critical aspects of demonstrating to both domestic and international stakeholders that the SWAP initiative is being taken seriously and that the government is fully aware of its role and responsibilities in that regard. In other words, the current irregular and *ad hoc* coordination must be terminated. The temperature on the government side needs to rise considerably from its current lukewarm state. This would also serve as an example and set the correct tone for all other SWAP structures such as the SWGs and their Secretariats. The required outcome is to have better SWAP performance in the context of the NDS framework and the PRSAP.

It would seem that the coordinating role given to the Cross Sectoral Division and its PRMES entails the task of ensuring ministerial coordination of the relevant institution(s) with regard to planning, programming, monitoring and reporting on the SWGs and the SWAPs, respectively. Nonetheless, this would need to be carefully spelled out in a set of functions vis-à-vis these coordinating roles. Moreover, it is being recommended here that these functions must be directly overseen by the Head of the Cross Sectoral Division and not handed off or delegated to other staff.

With better coordination comes better policy coherence, harmonization, and alignment with both domestic and international stakeholders. There are generally three levels of coordination required here: (a) The management of relationships at the ministerial level; (b) Between government and development partners; and (c) Between central and peripheral actors in support of sector inclusiveness or even decentralization.

**Recommendation 13: Donor coordination also needs to significantly improve.**

As noted in the Report of the SWAER, development partner coordination also needs to markedly improve. The development partners had failed to meet quarterly as agreed although they have now re-committed to hold those meetings. These meetings are an important aspect of the overall coordination mechanism for the SWAP process and observing the principles of the HLFAE to which the development partners (donors) have committed themselves.

As noted in a manual of one development partner, donor coordination is quite simply development partners working together to maximize aid effectiveness. It is a means to an end. It is used to advance development objectives by addressing relational issues, circumstances, and intangibles that technical design and implementation alone cannot resolve. Secondly, as a means, donor coordination is intensely process-oriented and puts a priority on relations and linkages. It is participatory and requires establishing a rapport with other actors, learning about their strategic and programmatic objectives, dialogueing about ideas and problems, etc. It is also crucial to the forging of linkages to other political processes and development issues to ensure that coordination efforts effect changes that are consistent with the desired changes to the larger development picture.
There are four major types of donor coordination: (a) Information Exchange; (b) Division of Labor; (c) Common Framework; and (d) Harmonization:

- **Information Exchange** – The most basic type of coordination, usually involving regular meetings of donor representatives working in a particular sector. Types of information exchanged include programmatic information, economic and political analyses or forecasting, or evaluation findings. It may include representatives of the host government. Policy differences often persist with this type.

- **Division of Labour** – Coordination moves beyond talking about programs already in place to some sense of shared planning, however *ad hoc*. Donors benefit from comparative advantage and specialization. The host government may or may not be engaged. This type of coordination is essentially static and preventive. The purpose is to avoid duplication of efforts.

- **Common Framework** – The host government and donors agree on development policy and program objectives and specific activities are planned to improve aid effectiveness, not just to avoid duplication. Furthermore, the host government is working to actively manage aid resources and coordination (perhaps in a limited number of sectors), by selecting and working with a lead donor or leading the effort itself. The move to a common framework is enhanced by strong country leadership of its development process and sufficient capacity. A common framework allows donors to identify key constraints and gaps. Examples of common frameworks include country sectoral strategies (e.g., in SWAPs and PRSPs). It is not uncommon for donors to devise a framework amongst themselves but this is second-best to a host country-led framework.

- **Harmonization** - Donors align their practices and procedures to reduce transactions costs and strengthen host country capacity. Harmonization theoretically occurs at the implementation phase although it is always possible for donors to harmonize amongst themselves, independent of a framework. Activities include donor alignment around a common framework, harmonizing procurement practices (e.g., aid untying), financial management, joint monitoring and evaluation, etc. The HLFAE, for example, call for standardized monitoring of progress. Obviously, not all of these procedures will be harmonized in every case.

Pooling of resources and general budget support are viewed by some donors as a logical means of harmonization. Some donors (Nordic countries, CIDA, and DFID) have experimented with “delegated cooperation.” In this model, a donor has effectively granted decision-making authority to another donor with the appropriate resources. A possible outcome of delegated cooperation is greater specialization among donors in technical sectors or perhaps countries.
It should be emphasized that the types of donor coordination are not naturally successive. Engagement in each type is highly dependent on the proper country conditions, political will, and the efforts of all relevant actors. Thus, it may be the case that only information exchange or a division of labor is possible in a certain country. However, in a donor coordination strategy, the types are all ideally components of the strategy. That is, if all the proper country conditions are in place, all types would be utilized. Figure 1 below refers to the intensity of coordination where information exchange is the easiest while harmonization is the most complex.

**Figure 1: The Donor Coordination Spectrum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Basic</th>
<th>Most Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Exchange</strong></td>
<td><strong>Division of Labour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informational</td>
<td>- Some shared planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ad hoc</td>
<td>- Static and preventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Static</td>
<td>- May or may not involve the host government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May or may not involve the host government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 14:** Development partners in Swaziland are urged toward exploring opportunities to improve Division of Labour.

As noted above, one primary purpose of DOL is to avoid duplication of efforts. The HLFAE commit partner countries and donors to a more effective division of labour and burden sharing among donors in order to overcome excessive fragmentation of aid and overlapping donor activities at country or sector level. These impair aid effectiveness, overburden partner countries, create high transactions costs, and hamper effective poverty reduction.

However, in advocating and discussing DOL, different levels of “maturity” of the process to implement the outcomes of the HLFAE and of experience with aid coordination have to be taken into consideration. On the one hand, countries like Swaziland are only now getting involved in actively promoting efforts for more DOL and complementarity. On the other hand, other countries like Rwanda are very much aware of the DOL agenda at the global level and actively manage relevant activities in their countries. Rwanda, for example, has strong ownership of her development agenda and is in a position to decide on DOL by itself.
Development practice demonstrates that the implementation of DOL does not require an extensive and bureaucratic exercise. The underlying motive behind the exercise (and which has to be demonstrated and driven home to development partners) must primarily be to make aid or development assistance more effective by reducing its administrative burden (transactions costs) on Swaziland. Basic considerations must include the desire to:

- Reduce congestion in some of the disproportionately favoured sectors;
- Bring some level of equity and balance in sectoral coverage (for example, by encouraging more development partners to support under-funded sectors and thematic areas, like Gender and Environment);
- Respect the program and regional or geographical priorities of development partners, to the extent possible; and lastly
- Respect government’s assumption of leadership and ownership of the development process.

The approach thereafter should be two parallel but mutually supportive processes in developing the DOL through the development partners and through the Government side. The development partners should conduct a self-assessment designed to establish each partner’s sectoral preferences, internal capacities, preferred roles and the perceived comparative advantages in those roles. This process of “self re-positioning” can then be subjected to a peer review against other submissions.

The government should simultaneously undertake an internal review of its experience over time with partners in various sectors, the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the various partners, the history and quality of the association, and the level of investment in a particular sector as a proxy for commitment to the sector.

Following these baseline exercises, the government should then issue its initial preferred DOL. The next step is that of consultations, negotiations, and old-fashioned horse-trading among and between development partners and government, following which a new and final DOL will emerge.

Lessons of experience have suggested that the following are some key prerequisites for a good and rapid process of achieving DOL and complementarity which Swaziland needs to keep in mind:

- The existence of awareness, perception, political will, mutual commitments and top “champions” at both country and development partner level as well as mutual trust (“enabling atmosphere”, openness, non-dogmatic approach, preparedness to delegate);
- Clear goals and agreement on priorities and on the results of the DOL exercise;
The government’s capacity and resources to lead, coordinate and manage ODA;

The Policy Infrastructure: operationalized and prioritized national (aid) policies and strategies with results frameworks, Joint Assistance Strategies, institutionalization of the HLFAE outcomes;

The Institutional Infrastructure: formal coordination and dialogue platforms for more transparency and exchange of information among government, development partners and civil society organizations (sector working groups, for example);

A good information system and donor mapping with matrices of all active development partners and their aid flows (amount of aid resources, donors, sectors); and

Comparative advantages at technical and procedural levels (assessment and agreed methodology for measuring comparative advantages are important).

One final point needs to be reinforced here. DOL is not about forcing development partners to exit certain sectors. The intent is to essentially prevent duplication, and improve coordination and the development partners’ working relationship with government.

**Recommendation 15:** Development partners must make every effort to meet their financial commitments for SWAP-related activities and do so in a timely manner.

Although, in the context of ownership and leadership, the government needs to do more to fund some of the basic SWAP-related activities such as coordination offices, for example, that may not be something that the government can sustain over the long-term. Swaziland is an aid-dependent nation and significantly cash-strapped. Ministries lack the bare necessities to function as government offices. Donor partners are fully aware of these facts and should act accordingly but from a partnership perspective. However, it is also the responsibility of the Lead Ministries and the MEPD to identify clear domestic financial commitments for coordination and other SWAP-related activities in their budgets.

**Recommendation 16:** The representation at coordination meetings should be at a higher level than it is presently.

Currently, the representation level at coordination meetings is too low. This applies primarily to development partners whose representatives are usually not at the level to make decisions and commitments. They are essentially note-takers who have to report back. Moreover, there is a rapid turnover of these low level representatives such that there is no institutional memory and continuity as new personnel have to be brought up to speed which further delays progress. This suggests that development partners themselves may not be taking the SWAP initiative seriously.
**Recommendation 17:** The SWAP initiative in the Ministries of Agriculture, Education and Training, and Natural Resources and Energy needs to be urgently re-launched.

If the SWAP is to remain the preferred mode through which ODA is channeled in the implementation of the PRSAP and development effectiveness is achieved in the Kingdom of Swaziland, then the Ministries of Agriculture, Education and Training, and Natural Resources and Energy must be brought back into the process. It is difficult to fathom why these three sectors were allowed to fade away from the SWAP scene especially in the context of being named priority sectors. Nonetheless, it is time to move forward and the MOA, in particular, will have to be nudged in that direction.

The MOA’s leadership has stated that they had embraced the SWAP from the inception, and that they are still committed to implementing the SWAP, but that the promised funding for its SWAP activities, through the MEPD, did not materialize and that led, in turn, to the gradual disappearance of the SWAP process in the Ministry. The MNRE has cited both a lack of financial resources and a lack of information sharing from the MEPD, while the MOET has cited the lack of a Secretariat to handle the work.

The reasons, whatever they may be for the lack of the SWAP in these three Ministries, notwithstanding, the MEPD now needs to thoroughly and sincerely re-engage with them. This has to be done, however, with some recognition and appreciation of the special case of agriculture in the SWAP process. Moreover, there is an urgent need to define a clear and realistic SWAP framework for the MOA specifically to avoid future misjudgement and frustration. Among the elements that must be carefully discussed and agreed upon, preferably through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), are the following:

- Assistance for the development of sector development plans and the operationalizing of the SWGs.
- Demonstrated evidence that the SWAP is fully embraced within government planning systems.
- Modalities and time lines for accessing funding, through the MEPD, for SWAP activities.
- The development of capacity enhancement and training plans for building expertise in the SWAP process including for the operations of the SWGs.
- An improved framework for coordination and information flow between the three Ministries and the MEPD.
### 7.1 Summary Matrix

For ease of reference, a summary of the recommendations – indicating the proposed policy measures and the stakeholders/institutions with primary responsibility – is provided below in matrix format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Policy Measures</th>
<th>Stakeholder Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exert stronger national ownership and leadership in all aspects of the SWAP process</td>
<td>Cabinet, Ministers, Senior Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop capacity building programs for all public sector personnel with responsibility</td>
<td>Ministries and Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the SWAP activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional strengthening through organizational reform</td>
<td>Cabinet, Ministers, Senior Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve documentation and reporting systems</td>
<td>SWGs, Ministries, Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SDPs must be developed and adhered to where they do not now exist</td>
<td>Lead Ministries, Sector Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Credible and precise indicators for monitoring and evaluating progress in the</td>
<td>MEPD, SWGs, Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of the SWAP need to be agreed and applied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All SWGs using a generic TOR should develop and adopt a sector specific TOR</td>
<td>SWGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with their SDPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All SWGs need to have the support structure of a Secretariat in place</td>
<td>Lead Ministries, MEPD, Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All SWGs should have a structured regular schedule of meetings</td>
<td>SWGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. An accurate and current database of all ODA received by Swaziland needs to be</td>
<td>ACMS of MEPD, Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Development partners must discontinue the practice of bypassing the ACMS for the</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivery of ODA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The MEPD must strengthen its coordination role pursuant to its mandate on the SWAP</td>
<td>Cross Sectoral Division of the MEPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Donor coordination needs to improve</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Development partners need to embrace and explore opportunities to improve Division</td>
<td>Development Partners, MEPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Development partners must make efforts to meet their commitments and do so in a</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Higher level representation at coordination meetings required</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The SWAP initiative in the MOA, MOET, and MNRE needs to be re-launched</td>
<td>MEPD, MOA, MOET, MNRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the relatively good implementation process of the health SWAP, progress in general has been slow and there are still a number of challenges faced by the SWAP process in Swaziland as addressed in this Assessment Report. As also indicated in the SWAER Report, at the heart of the challenges can be found non-existent or ineffective SWGs and irregular coordination and alignment between development partners and with, as well as within, government structures, for which there are many reasons.

Thus far, the SWAP process, as a whole in Swaziland, has not lived up to its full potential and intended results. There are challenges related to, among other things, the following:

- A lack of enthusiasm for the SWAP among senior government officials particularly demonstrated in the non-prioritization of the importance of the SWAP process and its activities;
- Establishment and structure of the SWGs;
- The functions of each distinct SWG;
- The role of development partners in the SWGs;
- A seemingly lack of acceptance of the role and importance of sector development plans in the SWAP framework;
- Reporting, monitoring and evaluation;
- Non-existent or non-applied indicators for monitoring and tracking targeted progress related to inputs, outputs/outcomes, and impact;
- Inadequate, and delayed, funding from the development partners for the facilitation of SWAP-related activities which result in unnecessary delays in the implementation of the SWAP work plans. Some of this manifestation from the development partners may have something to do with the government's weaknesses in public financial management and its lack of commitment to comprehensive and sustainable good governance reforms including adoption and implementation of a robust anti-corruption policy;
- The time-intensive nature of the SWAP activities which generally require extensive consultations and interactions between the required participants;
- Capacity deficits in terms of knowledge and expertise related to the SWAP process;
- The lack of Secretariat support;
The lack of understanding and/or acceptance of the division of labour concept especially by the development partners;

- The lack of a focused approach to the required and necessary inclusion of cross-cutting issues in all SWAP activities including capacity development and anti-corruption measures; and

- The lack of meaningful progress on mutual commitments to implementing the agreed outcomes of the HLFAE.

8.1 The Health SWAP Experience

Despite the foregoing challenges, the health SWAP has made some gains. It is therefore useful to again summarize and reflect on what has worked well in the Kingdom’s health SWAP process, and for the Government of Swaziland to use those lessons of experience for the debate on future implementation if the SWAP continues to be engaged as national policy for achieving the outcomes of the PRSAP. The key factors influencing performance in the health SWAP process are the following:

- The existence of a well-articulated vision for sector development that is also sufficiently pro-poor and gender-mainstreamed;

- Demonstrated government ownership and leadership over health policy, resources and implementation;

- Broad-based consultation that engages a wide (perhaps too wide) spectrum of stakeholders;

- Clear mapping of priorities and resources based on assessed needs;

- National priorities that are generally well supported by major donor agencies, and were so supported even prior to the introduction of the SWAP;

- Effective sector coordination mechanisms are in place although some development partners are of the view that there are now too many coordination mechanisms that result in fragmentation and increase transactions costs and are therefore untenable; and

- The existence of transparency and accountability mechanisms for results, some of which have been imposed by development partners.
8.2 When is a SWAP not a SWAP?

It is also further helpful to detail what the SWAP is not, as a means of promoting some reflection by all stakeholders in Swaziland, and also to assist in the future decision-making process on how to go about expanding the SWAP into other potential sectors of the economy.

8.2.1 When it is a Sector Investment Program

Sector investment programs (SIP) have been used for many years as a means of coordinating different investments in a particular sector. Typically, they have comprised menus, offering different, usually capital investment projects, towards which funding agencies might wish to contribute. For instance, an education sector SIP might have the following components: school infrastructure; textbooks and teaching/learning materials; teacher training; and so on. As is the case in Swaziland, different funding agencies could select their respective components, either funding that menu item or redesigning it to fit the particular intervention in that area in which they are interested. What doesn’t get funded in the particular component or menu, it is hoped would be picked up by another funding agency. Assistance to the particular components or sub-components, are typically run as projects, with earmarked funding, tracked in separate accounts, with or without independently financed project staff and regulations. Recurrent expenditure, typically, are not covered.

What distinguishes a SIP from a SWAP is that the former is run as a multitude of independent projects, albeit on a coherent capital investment program, but one which does not necessarily project nor cover recurrent costs, where the absence of funding for one component does not result in a recalculation of priorities across the components, and whose project control does not necessarily contribute to the institutional development and sustainability of those institutions tasked with its management.

8.2.2 When the Funding Agencies Lead the Process

If one places on a continuum the independence of the government in managing a sector, development partners could be said to be leading the process when they:

- Meet separately and plan their contributions to the sector in the absence of government;
- Lay down the procedures and timing of their involvement in the sector;
- Hire their own personnel to manage independently of government staff;
- Earmark their funds for specific priorities, whether or not these priorities are shared by the government;
- Require separate funding agency missions, which collect their own information independent of government; and

- Engage in processes which are predominantly parallel to those of the government.

### 8.2.3 When There is Little Institutional Development Despite Considerable Technical Assistance or other Expenditure on Capacity Development

This underlines the principle of using country systems. Thus, if technical assistance is directed at learning a funding agency’s procedures, such as is often done regarding procurement practices, for instance, then what is left in place when the funding agency is no longer providing assistance? Are government institutions being strengthened to enable them to be in control and to have the necessary competencies to manage the sector when the funding is no longer in place? Furthermore, technical assistance, itself, which is packaged with funding, is often in the control of the funding agencies, their identification of the areas requiring further development, their designs, their consultants, and their modalities. Not only is it important for government institutions to be strengthened, where necessary, it is also important for government to manage technical assistance and define capacity building requirements.

### 8.2.4 When Project Implementation Units (PIUs) or Such Other Institutions Have Their Own Management Hierarchies, Lines of Communication, and Sources of Funding, Run in Parallel with Ministries

PIUs are found in the health sector, for example, in Swaziland. They may develop professional and management expertise, but unless they are incorporated integrally within a Ministry itself, such expertise is unlikely to contribute to the institutional development of the Ministry, and can be easily excised, not least when project funds dry up. PIU staff, if paid outside normal Ministry channels and above normal rates, are also likely to develop separate allegiances. It is possible to conceive of PIUs as transitional bodies, just as projects can be used to test innovative practices. If their integration is not foreseen and managed, however, they are likely to remain as appendages.

### 8.2.5 When it Does not Encompass the Entire Sector

There are programs, which encompass only a sub-sector. However, the internal coherence of sub-sectoral programs is not matched by the prioritization and trade-offs necessary between the different sub-sectors in a SWAP.

### 8.3 The Way Forward

This Report, with its assessment and recommendations, provides information for the Government of Swaziland to understand the application and experience of the SWAP in the
Kingdom. It therefore also offers a platform from which the Government can consider its decisions with respect to the SWAP. The contents of the Report suggest that there is need for a rethink/regroup to determine the current desirability, feasibility, and framework of the SWAP in Swaziland. In that regard, it needs to be re-emphasized that the SWAP represents one design in development practice for organizing and managing ODA. It is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for a strong partnership between a government and development partners and should never be regarded as such. Moreover, unless all of the fundamental principles of the SWAP are adhered to, the SWAP process will be fraught with challenges and frustrations. One key aspect in that regard revolves around any government’s ability to influence development partners to comply with those fundamental principles. Swaziland has not yet been able to do that.

That ability, in turn, is influenced by a government’s own priorities (reflecting its own interests) and the willingness and capacity of its officers to undertake the time-consuming functions of government ownership and leadership in a SWAP framework. In those African countries, such as Rwanda, which have been regarded as successfully implementing the SWAP, there exists both government forceful commitment and capacity to do so.

Indeed, among the conclusions of successive SWAP reviews and assessments around the globe is that governments need a broad and high level of commitment to a strategy to which donors can broadly agree and this remains true today. To be meaningful, this needs to be linked to hard choices and backed up by control. Linkage to a credible medium-term budget process and other reform processes in some countries (Uganda, Tanzania, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and Ghana) has helped to ensure this vision has some basis in reality.

However, policy change happens through consultation, persuasion, and alliance formulation and may take time. A SWAP needs to reflect this. To develop dialogue and capacity among partners to address policy issues, there is a need for a permanent analytical capacity to support government, an effective policy process, a focused annual review process with good concentration on the important problems and the immediately feasible solutions, plus a process for how the important, but not immediately feasible, solutions will be addressed in the future.

As a general rule, different partners and stakeholders in Swaziland appear to have different expectations for the future development of the SWAP. However, if the SWAP remains the government’s preferred option for implementing its NDS, PRSAP, and ERS, then one would expect the SWAP to be one step towards full direct budget support. That is, alignment or integration into the budget process where government ownership and the coordination of resources would be increasingly emphasized. This development, however, does not seem likely since interviews, as well as informed observation, indicate that a number of development partners are not able or willing to move in this direction. National and/or institutional constraints, as well as a lack of trust in monitoring and auditing systems and
issues related to corruption still loom large. Consequently, various development partners indicate that if the SWAP should move towards full direct budget support, major institutional and governance reforms are first required from the Government of Swaziland.

In conducting the consultations and interviews for this assessment, both on the record and off the record, it became clear that there is no groundswell of support for the SWAP among public servants in Swaziland. Except for the health sector that has gained some traction for the reasons discussed in this report and summarized above, government officials are lukewarm to the SWAP. Some have indicated that they are not sure that the SWAP was endorsed by Cabinet. Others have said it was imposed by development partners. Yet, others are concerned that they lack knowledge about the SWAP and it will take up too much of their time since it seems to represent a duplication of their already time-intensive planning and budgeting process.

Also of concern is the government’s lack of financial capacity to engage in the basic SWAP-related activities. This has a significant negative impact on the claim to ownership and leadership since it deepens dependence on ODA. However, one can also argue that there may not have been the need for a PRSAP and the SWAP in the Kingdom if the government and country had certain financial capacities.

**If it is determined that the SWAP shall remain the framework for implementation of the PRSAP and meeting the objectives of the NDS and the ERS, then there has to be a regroup with the horse being put now before the cart in its rightful place. That means that the following would need to first take place in pursuit of a re-launch of the SWAP initiative and for the latter’s further expansion to other sectors:**

**Demonstrated National Ownership and Leadership**: It would need to be made clear and communicated to the Government Ministries, Agencies, development partners, and the nation that the SWAP is indeed government policy as adopted by the Cabinet. Furthermore, the Government should confirm that decision by signing a MOU with development partners for adoption and implementation of the SWAP. That, in turn, will cascade downward to Ministry management and staff and be, accordingly, embraced for national ownership and leadership, and thereby derive across the board government commitment.

Country ownership also needs to be more inclusive. That means that civil society engagement in policy and planning processes has to increase. Moreover, there needs to be consistent and systematic engagement with national stakeholders including Parliament and the private sector.

**Capacity Development**: The exposure of public sector personnel, as recommended in this Report, to capacity enhancement in the SWAP. This can be accomplished in a cost-effective manner through education and training modules, seminars, and workshops; study tours; and the accessing of online courses. Technical assistance will, obviously, be required. This
education and training must cover, in a linked manner, all of the issues related to the evolution and history of the SWAP; the definition and principles underlying a SWAP; the prerequisites for a SWAP; the key elements of a SWAP; how to develop a SWAP; the steps and processes; management structures; planning and budgeting within a SWAP; monitoring and evaluation; selection and use of indicators; and so on.

**Development and Cabinet Endorsement of a National Aid Policy:** As recommended above, a National Aid Policy (endorsed by Cabinet) is required which, among other things, spells out the roles and responsibilities for the government and development partners. It must also be clear about lines of responsibility between the ACMS and the rest of government (such as the Cross Sectoral Division of the MEPD) as also recommended above.

A National Aid Policy will further afford the government one other avenue to assert genuine ownership and leadership in development activities, and the external resources on which those activities rely, by mobilizing development assistance in forms that do not undermine its autonomy. Moreover, the Kingdom is a very long way off from non-dependence on external aid, if indeed that were possible. Consequently, it also needs to have an ordered and orderly way of mobilizing high quality aid which will remain crucial to the country’s development needs over the long-term.
### Annexes

#### Annex I: Consultations and Interviews Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Title</th>
<th>Institution/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEPD</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Secretary</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator/Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Economist</td>
<td>Deputy Resident Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, PRMES</td>
<td>Program Specialist, Program Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head, PRMES</td>
<td>Program Analyst, Poverty and Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Advisor, PRMES</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist, ACMS</td>
<td>Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>United States Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Secretary</td>
<td>Deputy PEPFAR Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Agricultural Economist</td>
<td>Program Assistant, PEPFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Sociologist</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNRE</td>
<td>Deputy Resident Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Secretary</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Planning Officer</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Water Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Principal Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Support to Education &amp; Training Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II: Sample Interview Questions

1. What date was the SWG established
2. When was the MOU signed and who signed
3. Do you have an SDP
4. What is the structure and membership of the SWG
5. Is there an identified Lead Ministry and Lead donor
6. What are the functions of the SWG
7. What are the priority actions for the SWG
8. How often are meetings held
9. Are the minutes of meetings recorded
10. Who records the minutes. Is there a Secretariat. If so, what role does it play
11. Is information shared among stakeholders or with the MEPD
12. What are the Key achievements and the specific dates achieved
13. What are the principal challenges of the SWG and the SWAP in general
14. Are there any issues with respect to capacity and skills to undertake the functions of the SWG
15. Are there any workload issues for the PPOs or others
16. Are there any concerns/issues with government ownership and leadership of the SWAP
17. Are there any concerns/issues with relevance/completeness of the TOR for your SWG
18. Are there any concerns/issues with the PRSAP pillar matrices and their alignment with your SWG
19. How about alignment or integration into the budget process
20. Are there any delivery results that are attributable to the SWAP
21. Do you have any concerns/issues with the current division of labour in your SWAP
22. Do you have any concerns/issues related to transactions costs (may need to explain transactions costs)
23. Are you satisfied with the current level of resource mobilization for your SWAP
24. What do you see as the way forward in dealing with the challenges
25. What is your future strategic direction