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### 3.3 Country-specific governance assessments and measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Countries</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Balkans</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ABBREVIATIONS

2 The abbreviations and acronyms listed in one initiative only and not related to its title or producer are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRM</td>
<td>African Peer Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPENAS</td>
<td>National Planning Development Agency, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Common Country Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Conflict-related Development Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>The Coping Strategies Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Fragile States Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSAM</td>
<td>Fragile States Assessment Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVAS</td>
<td>Global Impact and Vulnerability Alert System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IfP</td>
<td>Initiative for Peacebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa's Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPP</td>
<td>Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCNAs</td>
<td>Post-Conflict Needs Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSPs</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSIA</td>
<td>Poverty and Social Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Stability Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGACA</td>
<td>Strategic Governance and Corruption Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPA</td>
<td>United Nations Studies Program at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoD</td>
<td>State of Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIAF</td>
<td>State-Society Analytical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDG</td>
<td>United Nations Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDPI</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme, United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION: ABOUT THIS INVENTORY

1.1 Objectives
This publication aims to provide a representative catalogue of governance assessments and measurements initiatives conducted in conflict/fragile countries and territories. It attempts to give an insight into the scope and breadth of both UN and non-UN initiatives carried out over the last decade (2000 – 2010). In this regard, it is by no means meant as an exhaustive list but rather as a collection of noteworthy methodologies and individual initiatives from which some how-to lessons on the conduct of country-led governance assessments in conflict fragile environments can be drawn.

1.2 Definitions
For methodological purposes only, the following working definitions have been employed in the preparation of this inventory:

OECD’s Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations define fragile states as follows:

States are fragile when state structures lack political will and/or capacity to provide the basic functions needed for poverty reduction, development and to safeguard the security and human rights of their citizens.3

Most of the countries fitting this definition is or has been recently affected by violent conflict and are at risk of falling back into conflict. Their fragility is generally related to three different dimensions:

- Effectiveness – how well the state functions are performed
- Authority – understood as the enforcement of a monopoly on the legitimate use of force
- Legitimacy – public non-coercive acceptance of the state4

Fragility is not a clear characterization but rather a continuum where some states are more fragile than others. The three dimensions above do not necessarily develop in parallel5.

In connection with the preparation of the New Deal for engagement in fragile states6 19 countries in the G7+ group have as part of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding defined themselves as fragile but other states have also been mentioned. The fragility definition is as mentioned above a continuum and as many as 60 countries in the world have some elements of fragility.

---

4 Users’ Guide on Measuring Fragility, UNDP/German Development Institute, 2009, p. 6
5 Recent work is being done by the German Development Institute (DIE) on types of fragile states that emerge from uneven development on the three dimensions.
6 New Deal for engagement in fragile states, Conference document of High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, November 2011
Governance assessments and measurements is a concept that primarily focuses on the measuring the New Deal goal of Legitimate Politics but also relates to the goals of Security, Economic Foundation and Revenues and Services. The term generally refers to methodologies and tools (e.g. surveys, indices, scales, citizen report cards, etc.) on at least one of the following focus areas:

- Civil Society
- Conflict
- Corruption
- Democracy
- E-Governance
- Electoral Systems
- Governance and Gender
- Governance and MDG/Service Delivery
- Justice and Human Rights
- Land Governance
- Local Governance and Decentralization
- Media
- Parliament
- Peace Consolidation
- Political Parties
- Public Administration
- Security
- Vulnerability

1.3 Structure and Method

The main body of the inventory, apart from this Introduction, comprises two sections. The first part lays out the background and rationale for governance assessments and measurements in conflict/fragile settings, as well as summarises the types and elements of prevalent assessment methodologies. The second part is a catalogue of governance assessments and measurements in conflict/fragile settings. This section further classifies the documented approaches into (1) Governance assessment methodologies for conflict/fragile settings; (2) General governance assessment methodologies (i.e. not specifically developed for, but occasionally applied in, conflict/fragile settings); and (3) Country-specific initiatives.

The selection of governance assessment is not exhaustive. Many analyses undertaken in fragile settings contain some elements of governance assessments. Some general governance assessment methodologies may be perfectly applicable for fragile or conflict affected situations but have not necessarily been applied yet. Not all of these are included but efforts have been made to ensure a broad and representative sample.

The presentation of the individual governance assessments are primarily based on desk review but the authors have utilized their experience in applying governance assessment tools at the field level to analyze and assess these tools.

1.4 Reporting card format

- Year developed: The year the current method was first published / the initiative was first attempted.
- Applicability: The regions or country(ies) the method was designed for / the initiative was applied.
- Focus areas: list of focus area(s) covered by the method / initiative.
- Stated Objectives: The objectives of the tool / initiative as stated by the producing organization.
- Methodology: Highlights from the methodology such as topics evaluated and number of indicators.
- Geographic coverage: Whole country – territory, regions, municipalities, etc., especially if it covers the most conflict-affected areas, or if there are areas not covered (and why).
- Time of implementation and frequency: If the initiative was carried out during /after (when) a period of armed conflict, and how often (was it a one-time exercise?)
- Data collection: Method of data collection, sources and types of data. Stakeholders’ involvement (e.g. local and international NGOs, government-organized NGOs, local authorities, national statistical office, national human rights institution, etc.).
- Reporting format: Kind of information generated (narrative report, index, dashboard, etc.)
- Ease of implementation: Level of resources required (financial resources and level of technical expertise) and amount of documentation provided to assist implementation.
- Strengths and Weaknesses: The positive and negative characteristics of the tool related to data collection, resources required, participation (in the design of the tool or/and in data collection) uses and applicability, and gender-sensitivity, pro-poor indicators, conflict-sensitivity, etc.
2. GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS AND MEASUREMENTS IN CONFLICT/FRAGILE SETTINGS: AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE

2.1 The importance of governance assessments in conflict/fragile settings

A plethora of governance assessment methodologies have emerged over the last decade. Nowhere has the variety in terms of scope, purpose, approach and use been broader than in the area of post-conflict and fragile states. The growing and often urgent attention to getting strategies for such situations right and the realization that governance is a key factor in creating peace and stability have led to a number of different actors to initiate governance assessments in post-conflict and fragile countries. The selection of governance assessments in this inventory demonstrates the diversity and complexity of these efforts.

2.2 Purposes of Governance Assessment

Governance assessments have at least five key uses: a) to characterize and follow a highly relevant phenomenon or situation in order to get precise description and better understanding of the situation and its development; b) to compare between nations, provinces, municipalities, or villages longitudinally and spatially trends and developments often with the aim of understanding how different approaches work in different contexts; c) to provide criteria for urgent interventions like in early warning systems and immediate relief or conflict situations, d) to strengthen local capacities, at many different levels including overall planning and strategy capacity at central level, specific monitoring and assessment capacity, democratic and governance watchdogs or the capacity to deal with specific social issues or groups (e.g. the women or the poor) and e) to serve as basis for a dialogue between the state and the people providing an accountability mechanism.

The governance assessment methodologies currently in use in conflict/fragile settings have been applied with a variety of objectives employing a particular combination of the above uses.

The process undoubtedly began with donor countries or organizations wanting to assess the state of affairs in a conflict/fragile country, in order to guide strategic choices related to their own intervention in that country, or to identify the key stakeholders with which they could engage. A further development of this approach led to the second category of assessments which have the predominant objective of informing donor strategies, but which also engage with in-country policy-making or advocacy processes.

---

7 Shipra Narang Suri and Francisco Gutiérrez have provided valuable inputs for this analysis
8 For example Netherlands (FSAM, SGACA), DFID’s Drivers of Change studies, Sida’s Power Analysis, UNDP’s Conflict-related Development Analysis, and the ADB’s Country Governance Assessment
9 For example Early Warning System applied in the Balkans; UNDP’s Mapping Socio-Economic Disparities among Macedonian Municipalities; the UNDP/PAPP Assessment Toolkit for Promoting Integrity, Transparency and Accountability in Palestinian Local Government Units; the World Bank’s Poverty and Social Impact Analysis; and the Minority Rights Group’s Peoples under Threat Index
A third category includes those that are meant mainly to provide information to field missions or transitional administrations. Often undertaken by multilateral or bilateral agencies, they can also potentially influence in-country policies, strategies, investments and governance arrangements\textsuperscript{10}, though this has not yet been effectively undertaken.

Most of these assessment methodologies are country rankings and indices produced by academic institutions, think tanks, international organizations, or bilateral donor agencies, i.e., they are externally-driven, and thus very often disconnected from in-country peace-building and national state-building strategies. While a few assessments include stakeholders in the early steps of the process,\textsuperscript{11} stakeholder participation is not common in mainstream governance assessment and when it is included it is primarily in the form of opinion polls or similar enquiries rather than systematic participation in design, management and application of the survey. Many of these assessment tools keep the results out of public scrutiny, and do not actively seek to strengthen the capacity of countries to assess themselves.\textsuperscript{12} Country owned governance assessments based on broad stakeholder participation are even rarer.

The fourth and slightly different category of assessments are those led by regional or national actors though they may be supported by international donors or think tanks, and conducted with the objectives of generating evidence for in-country policy formulation or to support advocacy initiatives by the civil society\textsuperscript{13}.

### 2.3 The Case for a Country Owned Assessment Approach

In an ideal situation, a wide range of local actors and stakeholders would be involved in determining the scope and methodology of the assessment, and in all subsequent stages – data collection, analysis, dissemination and use. That, however, is not usually the case in conflict and fragile countries, due to the various contextual challenges (e.g. finding legitimate partners, getting access to relevant beneficiaries, etc.)

First of all, engaging with stakeholders needs time, resources, capacities and political will; second, donors tend to assume that any assessments they undertake for internal purposes will remain as such and do not need to be shared with country partners; third, the main actors and stakeholders in conflict/fragile situations may include some unusual players with whom donor countries or international organizations may not wish to engage (e.g. warlords, war criminals); or, finally, the international community may not wish to take sides in a conflict.

---

\textsuperscript{10} For example UN- OHCHR’s Rule of Law Tools, the UN Development Group-led Post Conflict Needs Assessment, the Rights Based Municipal Assessment and Planning project in Bosnia and Herzegovina, UNDP’s ‘The Ties That Bind’ study on social capital in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Assessment of Access to Justice and the Rule of Law (both led by UNDP), UNEP’s Post-crisis Environmental Assessments, AMAN’s Palestine Corruption Report, and the Africa Human Security Initiative’s Crime Victimization Survey in Sierra Leone, and the ICTs for Social Protection of Women in Timor-Leste.

\textsuperscript{11} African Peer Review Mechanism; the National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment in Afghanistan (led by the national statistical organization); UNEP’s Post Crisis Environmental Assessments; the Capacity Assessment Methodology, Early Warning System reports in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, the Rights based Municipal Assessment and Planning Project, and the Assessment of Access to Justice and the Rule of Law (all led by UNDP); the Indonesian Democracy Index; Mapping Palestinian NGOs; and the Mapping of Gender-based Violence in Nepal and the Sudan Crisis Recovery Mapping and Analysis Project.

\textsuperscript{12} UNDP: Governance Assessments in Conflict/fragile environments: Challenges and Opportunities, Oslo February 2011.

\textsuperscript{13} African Peer Review Mechanism; International IDEA’s State of Democracy Assessment Framework and Local Democracy Assessment Guide; Survey of the Afghan people, the National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment in Afghanistan, and the Afghan Perceptions and Experiences of Corruption, Public Services Monitoring; the Arab Democracy Index; the Burundian Election Violence Prevention Program; the Indonesian Democracy Index; Descriptive Statistics from Statements to the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission; Mapping Palestinian NGOs; and A Preliminary Mapping of Gender-Based Violence in Nepal; and the Early Warning Early Response initiative in Timor-Leste.
Unlike external assessments, a country-led governance assessment is initiated, implemented and sustained by national actors, entailing “a country undertaking a reflective and systematic review of its own national governance processes”. Stakeholder participation in governance assessments can take place at different stages in the process. In an ideal situation, a wide range of local actors and stakeholders would be involved from the very beginning, while determining the scope and methodology of the assessment, and in all subsequent stages – data collection, analysis, dissemination and use.

Governance assessments can provide crucial input in relation to at least two of the dimensions of fragility (ref. 1.2 above):

_**State capacity**_ to deliver key services is dependent on solid and scientifically-sound evidence about needs challenges and demands. In post-conflict and fragile countries, as in other contexts, the capacity of the State to respond to the needs of its citizens in an efficient and effective way is determined to a large extent by its diagnostic capacity. A capable State needs to have the capacity to identify priority areas of intervention at the national, regional and local levels, set the agenda for a dialogue with donors, allocate resources based on objective needs, and assess its own functional and organizational capacities and performance. Sound evidence can help State institutions in effectively determining priorities, providing services to those sections of the society that need them the most. Participatory governance assessments contribute to building up State capacity in all these areas.

But with _loss of legitimacy_ the capacity of the state is seriously undermined possibly leading to state failure. A country-led governance assessment can serve as an alternative, non-traditional mechanism to help reconstitute legitimacy from the inside, that is, building on the choices, expectations and aspirations of the people within the country. Improving the level of participation, transparency and accountability in this process can indirectly reducing the potential for conflict. More specifically, a governance assessment provides a means to introduce or reinforce:

Input (process) _legitimacy_ , through the participatory process underlying a governance assessment– for example, reaching consensus on ‘priority issues’ to be monitored might contribute to building agreements on the parameters of a ‘new’ governance system;

Output (performance) _legitimacy_ , through the monitoring of State performance and public dissemination of results - acting as an ‘accountability mechanism’ mechanism for example; and

Shared belief _legitimacy_ , through multi-stakeholders forums as platforms for public debate on the status of governance and dialogue between proponents of different notions and narratives around the State. It is increasingly being recognized that domestically-driven governance assessments can play an important role in building up both the legitimacy as well as the capacity of States that are emerging from conflict. Assessments that involve a broad range of stakeholders, and whose results are disseminated widely, can help in building up the legitimacy of the State. The accountability function is significantly strengthened when decision makers not only receive the judgment of the people but also have to reply to their complaints or even are held accountability for any possible mistakes. The scope for nurturing participation in conflict and fragile countries, however, is constrained to a varying degree by social fragmentation, finding legitimate partners, and the shrinking space for State-society interaction.

### 2.4 Critical Choices

The wealth of valuable information and toolkits gathered in the Inventory, flag the complicated tradeoffs involved not only in the methodological choices open to every assessment administrator, but also in the use of governance assessment conclusions and insight by any agency (individually, or as a set). While proliferation and diversity can be symptoms of health, they pose hard processing and aggregation demands on final users. Key current challenges are information processing, fusion and coordination. In this regard, the following three questions seem critical:
How to evaluate the results of each assessment, in its own terms but also in comparison to others? Since different assessments capture different governance aspects of each country and at the same time have significant overlaps, it is fundamental to understand how they produce their conclusions and how well for each specific purpose.

How to use different assessment results in the decision-making process? E.g. how can and should the information produced by one method be fused with the one produced by another in developing operational interventions? And how should more or less contradictory conclusions by different assessments be reconciled?

How to manage the heterogeneity involved in the results? Governance assessments speak of different things, in different languages, and based on different processes of reasoning. How can all this information be compiled?

The crux of the question seems here to be how to cope with **heterogeneity**. The Inventory shows that governance assessments are characterized by several types of heterogeneity.

Thematic diversity is often great as demonstrated by the number of focus areas in the operational definition provided above (ref. 1.2).

Source-related diversity. Some governance assessments rely on "expert opinion", basically officials of the agency that is making the assessments. Others prefer national sources (or a combination of both). Note that here the notion of tradeoffs comes across very clearly. National sources should have a much richer, nuanced and detailed understanding of the country’s context, but may be at the same time much more involved in the very conflict they are being asked to evaluate.

Governance assessments differ by their unit of analysis. Some are transnational --they intend to cover the evolution of a phenomenon in a continent, using the country as the unit of analysis, like the African Peer Review. Others go down to the village level.

Fourth, the different purposes of governance assessments outlined above (ref. 2.2) present another challenge.

An important distinguishing factor of the assessments reviewed in this inventory is the level of **contextualization** of the methodology, i.e., the degree to which the assessment is based on a specific analysis of the political economy of the country rather than a standardized approach. Solid analysis to understand the complex environment and shed some light on existing power relations and potential scenarios can mitigate the risks associated with participation and dissemination of results. By definition, country-specific initiatives are much more contextualized than those developed at the global level. But even among the global methodologies, the degree of adaptation to the local context varies as some of them to a varying degree allow country implementers to include local parameters as they deem appropriate\(^{14}\).

From the assessment methodologies included herein, it may be concluded that the more qualitative methodologies have been more effectively contextualized and adapted for particular country environments, whereas quantitative assessments and those that emphasize cross-country comparison and ranking have mostly remained standardized, one-size-fits-all approaches. Adoption of mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative),

---

\(^{14}\) E.g. Netherlands’ Fragile States Assessment Methodology is a broad-spectrum qualitative study which can be adapted to suit a particular country context. DFID’s Drivers of Change analysis allows country offices to investigate any of the six standard levels and in any given sequence. The African Peer Review Mechanism but allows flexibility within the process of assessment of the four key areas. International IDEA’s State of Democracy Assessment Framework allows for extensive adaptation.
where priority issues and indicator sets are defined with reference to the local context, are likely to yield the most accurate and widely accepted results.

The issue of contextualization in conflict and fragile environments is also related to the politics of governance assessments, as a governance assessment in itself is an active intervention in the political situation and may have undesirable negative effects. This has both a cognitive and a political impact: measuring something increases the likelihood that it goes into the decision making agenda.

There are also complex issues of methodology. Governance assessments are likely to become an object of heated debate. Methodological fastidiousness is to be recommended in order enhance credibility. There is, however, a tradeoff between quality and completeness of the assessment and the analysis predicated over it, on the one hand, and timing, on the other. If for example according to an early warning system a major humanitarian disaster is looming in country X, then the decision maker would want to be sure only about the main symptoms, not about the nuances, which instead become relevant for follow ups, comparisons, and longer term interventions. Using proven methodologies also protect against criticism. However, by escaping the dangers of the one-size-fits all mentality the governance assessment administrator will win in flexibility and descriptive richness, but will also make any systematic comparison more difficult. Using several methods allows for a much richer vision, but creates serious aggregation issues. Combining quantitative and qualitative methods seems particularly promising, but it always begs the question of how to triangulate the quantitative and qualitative findings.

More fundamentally how will the issue of data collection and treatment be addressed and by whom? There is no perfect, bias-free source. Furthermore, the standard situation in conflict situations is confusion, lack of data, and strategic use of information.

The Inventory shows that governance assessment administrators have used primarily one or several of the following: (a) expert opinion, consisting basically of in-house ratings of different phenomena, (b) opinion polls, (c) archival data, (d) time series and other quantitative data, (e) data coming from in depth interviews (with different actors, ranging from victims to government officials), (f) focal groups and (g) secondary inputs (documents, governmental sources). Combining several sources to overcome the downsides of each suggests itself, but it runs into two objections: a) the way of combining sources should then be clearly specified, because it will typically be problematic, and b) it may be the case that some problems are not solved, but rather accumulated, by the combination.

Selection of indicators constitutes a particular challenge in in conflict affected and fragile settings. Apart from the practical constraints experienced in obtaining quality data on any chosen indicator the selection of indicators should also take into account that the content might very easily be sensitive or even controversial. Questions asked are rarely neutral and could generate reluctance, suspicion or even a violent reaction. It should also be kept in mind that perceptions on State performance are more unstable and can change quickly (as a result of an intervention with immediate tangible results) or slowly (especially regarding interethnic issues in divided societies).

In fragile countries a limited availability of good data should be expected, because of, for example, security concerns, or institutional collapse – often there will be no time series with which to compare. All data, qualitative

\[15\] The Inventory defines fragility as being in conflict or having had a conflict in the immediate past, p. 7.

\[16\] It may be the case that both the process of interviewing and of treating the resulting interview are different for a victim than for a government official.
and quantitative, have to be cleaned, streamlined, and eventually edited. It is frequent that in fragile contexts there is a huge amount of missing data. How to impute the missing data in a database? This step is rarely discussed explicitly, but it is essential, and may have a significant impact in analysis and decision making. Open discussions about common standards regarding different kinds of data treatment and streamlining seem highly commendable. On the other hand, it is a central objective of governance assessments to promote local capacities. It should be a priority to promote the strengthening of state capacities, particularly of statistical offices. Better measurement capacities are an improvement in terms of statehood and policy making. It also increases the probability that key issues go into the policy agenda. If governance assessments produce such effects at every iteration - this might be called the "governance assessment dividend" - this would constitute a major contribution.

Most governance assessments in conflict/fragile settings rely predominantly on secondary data and published information, supplemented sometimes by a limited number of 'expert' interviews and/or a validation workshop at the end. There are a few, however, which effectively combine secondary information (desk-based reviews, media analysis) with primary data collection through multiple means (expert or key informant interviews, focus group discussions, surveys and opinion polls). The Post-Conflict Needs Assessment, the Capacity Assessment Methodology and the Arab Democracy Index, have demonstrated that mixed methods studies not only allow triangulation of information from different sources, but also build ownership of the assessment process and its findings at different levels, and among a variety of stakeholders.

There are at least three initiatives which have attempted the ambitious task of collecting and providing real-time information on governance-related issues. These are: the Global Impact and Vulnerability Alert System (developed by UNICEF-SIPA), which aims to link together a range of databases to generate real time information on highly dynamic indicators such as outbreaks of violence, drought or epidemics; and the Election Violence Prevention Program (developed by Burundian Friends Observe Initiative), which aims to identify potential flashpoints of election violence, and build community capacity to monitor electoral processes in volatile regions. The Sri Lanka Centre for Monitoring Election Violence is pursuing a similar exercise. There are a number of challenges, however, in widespread application of these real-time assessment systems – technological capacity is an obvious hurdle, but more importantly, political sensitivities and unwillingness to release real-time data into public domain can be a major impediment, especially in a conflict/fragile environment.

**Dissemination and utilization of results** - the fora, timing and format in which the results of the assessment are disseminated are of key importance, as these parameters can have their own, unforeseen consequences. Dissemination of the findings of any governance assessment depends upon its original objectives and the main target group. Assessments developed by bilateral or international agencies to guide their own interventions and programming are rarely disseminated among national stakeholders – in fact, some of them explicitly state that the findings should be kept ‘non-public’ or be open only to select external stakeholders. Assessments, which aim to influence the national policy environment, are usually widely disseminated.

Very often, governance assessments conclude with a presentation of the findings of the assessment, but without providing any further direction or ideas for strategic interventions or systematic follow-up. The integration of such recommendations within the assessment process and findings can be extremely useful in encouraging international as well as national actors to take action.

---

17 International IDEA’s State of Democracy Assessment Framework, UNEP’s Post-Crisis Environmental Assessments, the Early Warning Systems reports, the Indonesian Democracy Index, Mapping of Gender-based Violence in Nepal, as well as the many of the corruption and transparency assessments (Afghanistan, Palestine, Macedonia). APRM occasionally falls short for financial or political reasons.
2.5 Key lessons

This Inventory of governance assessments in conflict affected and fragile settings brings together a diverse set of initiatives which operate at different levels (global, regional, national or local), have distinct objectives, apply a variety of data collection and analysis methodologies, and use the data in varied ways. Clearly, this is a new area of focus for international and national actors alike, and needs more development. A few key lessons that can be extracted from these initiatives are summarized below.

A necessary first step in doing no harm and ensuring that the process of conducting a governance assessment is not derailed is to understand the particular challenges of a conflict and fragile situation. Solid analysis to understand the complex environment and shed some light on existing power relations and potential scenarios can mitigate the risks associated with participation and dissemination of results. One-size-fits-all assessments which follow a standardized methodology and indicators are increasingly making way for more contextualized approaches. While the methodology and data collection processes may be standardized to a certain extent, focus areas and indicators must reflect local realities and priorities.

Investing in a participatory process, which requires time and commitment, above all, can help in building broad-based ownership of the assessment and its findings, but will only be successful, if stakeholders are involved in all stages of the process. Assessments which aim to provide evidence on governance to both international and national stakeholders are more likely to be accepted in-country, being able to influence in-country policy formulation, and being sustainable. So are also assessments that aim to facilitate comparison over time within the same country, rather than between countries. However, stakeholder participation in governance assessments continues to be very limited. This can be particularly difficult and contentious in conflict/fragile settings.

Approaches that use mixed methods and multiple sources of data are more likely to yield valid results that are taken seriously by all stakeholders. Similarly, methodological techniques (e.g. triangulation of data sources and sampling methods) can lessen some of the constraints regarding selection of indicators and data.

It is often the women and the poor who predominantly bear the brunt of a conflict. Apart from the handful of assessments which have gender or poverty issues at their very core, most of the governance assessments included in this inventory are not explicitly gender-sensitive or pro-poor. It is critical that governance assessments identify fundamental vulnerable groups so that they become relevant stakeholders and manage to deal with the voices of the most vulnerable, including them as one of the central concerns and interlocutors. Gender and poverty focus must be reflected not only in the choice of focus areas and appropriate indicators and data collection methods, but also in the involvement of women and poorer, marginalized stakeholder groups in the design or implementation of the assessment.

---

18 World Bank’s Poverty and Social Impact Analysis, UNDP’s Preliminary Mapping of Gender-Based Violence in Nepal, ICT’s for Social protection of Women and Early Warning Early Response system in Timor-Leste
### 3.1 GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES FOR CONFLICT/FRAGILE SETTINGS

#### Stability Assessment Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by the Clingendael Institute at the request of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Stability Assessment Framework (SAF) aims to help practitioners and decision-makers develop an integrated strategy for sustainable stability.

The SAF seeks to identify factors and trends that contribute to instability and violent conflict, as a basis for stabilisation and peace building strategies.

**Methodology**

The SAF consists of three major parts:

1. Preparatory work of customizing the SAF to the users’ needs.
2. Mapping and analysis work that provide input for a draft Reference Document.
3. Workshop activities and helps the organization assess and translate the findings of Part 2 into the development of a strategy.

The mapping and analysis step includes trends and analysis on 12 indicators, institutional analysis, political actor analysis and overview of own and others policy interventions.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---
The framework is normally carried out during a period of armed conflict or political instability, and so far it has remained a one-time exercise in almost all the countries where it has been implemented.

Only in the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo there has been a second, slightly different, application of the SAF. For the rest, the instrument has fallen victim to the particular strategic preferences of the Dutch minister in charge. That is, the SGACA first and then the FSAM have replaced the SAF as broad country assessment tools.

At a certain point, however, in a last attempt to save the SAF, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs has tried to produce a "quick" SAF, for rapid implementation in situations of sudden political collapse in a given country.

**Data collection**
Data is collected using in-country expert opinions.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report, combined with a quantitative analysis based on the 12 indicators and the resulting trend lines.

**Ease of implementation**
The assessment is very actionable, and the methodology aims to secure an appropriate evidence-base for a strategy.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
No indicators focus in particular on women, or on the poor. A set of socio-economic development indicators address concerns with regard to marginalised groups, such as refugees and internally displaced persons.

**Further information**
# Fragile States Assessment Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2008 | The nine countries on the Security and Development list\(^{20}\) of the MFA: | - Civil Society  
- Corruption  
- Democracy  
- Electoral Systems  
- Governance and Gender  
- Governance and MDG/Service Delivery  
- Justice and Human Rights  
- Land Governance  
- Local Governance and Decentralization  
- Media  
- Parliament  
- Political Parties  
- Public Administration  
- Security  
- Conflict  
- Peace consolidation |
|      | Afghanistan  
Burundi  
Colombia  
Congo, Democratic Rep.  
Guatemala  
Kosovo  
Pakistan  
Palestinian Territories  
Sudan | | |

## Stated objectives

The Fragile States Assessment Methodology (FSAM) has been developed by the Clingendal Institute to help Royal Netherlands Embassies (RNEs) better understand the local context and political processes with which they are engaging when they work in fragile states. The methodology aims to provide an understanding of how strategies work out in fragile states, by providing an assessment of the political context and process in a particular country. It facilitates the formulation of sectoral or thematic approaches that would contribute to increased state resilience.

It is intended as a starting point to structure and analyse existing information through a state-building lens, and to identify areas for more in-depth studies.

\(^{20}\) Characterized by fragility or major inequality blocking poverty reduction.
Methodology

The theoretical underpinning for the framework is similar to that of the general governance and corruption assessment applied by the Dutch MFA, SGACA (ref. link below), but it has been tailored to the specific circumstances of very fragile environments. It is designed to be used, as appropriate, in conjunction with other existing analytical tools including the Stability Assessment Framework (SAF) and different forms of conflict analysis, but is not intended to substitute for them.

The FSAM is structured around four main components:

- A preparatory phase that involves all the main stakeholders (i.e. RNE, MFA, and Consultants) and that leads to the drafting of a concept paper. The concept paper serves as a basis for the Fragile States Analysis (FSA);
- A Fragile States Analysis: Through a process of additional refinement of the concept paper, expansion of the information basis (mainly through interviews), and possibly a specific narrowing of the scope of the FSA to cover those issues that are key to the RNE’s strategic objectives, a synthesis report is produced by the consultants;
- A Workshop, split into 2 days. Day 1 can be planned as an internal exercise or might be open to selected external stakeholders. Day 2 is non-public and focuses on designing an appropriate donor strategy for the Netherlands;
- The formulation of a follow-up strategy by the RNE, together with the MoFA. The whole FSAM exercise has to be considered as a starting point in a longer-term process of analysis and policy engagement.

Geographic coverage

Whole country.

Time of implementation and frequency

The initiative can be carried out before, during, or after a period of armed conflict. So far it has remained a one-time exercise, but there are ongoing discussions within the ministry on how to continue with its development and implementation.

The assessment has been carried out once in the following countries: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi, Sudan and Kosovo. It has not been implemented in the remaining five countries on the Security and Development list of the MFA (see above), because a SGACA had already been carried out the previous year.

Data collection

Data is collected using expert in-country opinions and available written documents.

Reporting format

Narrative report.

Ease of implementation

The analysis is supposed to take place mainly on the basis of existing information, identified through consultation with the responsible RNE, and through a limited number of interviews. An international and a local consultant are hired for a period of up to 45 days. Two missions are also included within the methodology. The lead consultant must have a strong background in political economy analysis, while the local one must have a strong and objective understanding (as much as possible) of the political and socio-economic landscape in which the assessment is conducted. In addition, the consultants must also have good facilitating skills to run the
two workshops included in the methodology. The initial scoping paper is based on a limited number of key analyses of the country, including documents already produced by the embassy.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

The FSAM needs a sharper focus to add value to existing instruments and to keep its scope manageable. The focus should be on the nexus of governance – security – socio-economic development; assessing root causes of state fragility in the domain of state-society interaction and state resilience, by explaining the political context and processes; translating the analysis into strategies for state-building through increasing state resilience, including advice on how to maximize the contribution of governance, security and socio-economic development strategies towards state-building. This sharper focus requires adjustments in the FSAM process.

Already in the preparatory phase (before the first mission to the country) the FSAM should be focused on the nexuses cited above. In addition, more work in-country will be needed to verify, substantiate and enrich the analysis. While planning this mission it is important to allow the RNE to determine the most suitable time for its dispatch, and also to be prepared to substantially adapt plans. Substantial participation of the RNE in the first mission is essential to guarantee its involvement in the analysis as well.

The first mission should make more extensive use of interviews than had been foreseen in the earlier SGACAs, to buttress the initial analysis presented in the concept paper. The local consultant is essential in advising on resource persons. Informants are key state and non-state actors, selected on the basis of the specific context in the country (and therefore knowledgeable about the main topics that need to be addressed). Semi-structured interviews take place almost exclusively in the capital city, or other main urban centres. The first mission should set up a mechanism to check the main lines of analysis against local expertise. Whether this should be done in the form of one local consultant providing feedback, or reliance on one or more local policy research institutions, or a selected group of local peer reviewers, depends on the assessment of the lead consultant (with support from the RNE) and on the availability of local resources.

A follow-up phase should be planned during the FSAM exercise. The follow-up will not be part of the FSAM exercise, but it has been found essential and has to be prepared during the FSAM exercise. The RNE has to be empowered to carry on with the trajectory set out by the FSAM on a long-term basis. In other words, the workshop might still be limited to the two days envisioned by the methodology, but what needs to be put firmly in place is a mechanism/environment that allows for a structural follow-up to the discussions and questions emerging from the workshop. Follow-up might be needed in terms of continuous monitoring of developments in fast changing political contexts. Alternatively, it might be needed in further operationalization of strategies in the domains of governance, security and/or socio-economic development in such a way that they contribute to state-building.

**Further information**

Not available on the Internet.

For a copy, contact the Conflict Research Unit of the Netherlands Institute of International Relations ‘Clingendael’, at: cru-info@clingendael.nl

State-Society Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2008 |           | Global. Applied in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Pakistan, Georgia and Angola. | Civil Society  
Corruption  
Democracy  
Governance and Gender  
Justice and Human Rights  
Public Administration  
Security |

Stated objectives

The State-Society Analytical Framework (SSAF) analysis has been developed by a civil society consortium, Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP), with the support of the European Commission. It is expected to shed light not only on complex power dynamics and the nature of state-society relations, but also on the impact of externally-financed activities (including by western or non-DAC countries, multinational enterprises and/or multilateral institutions) on these relations.

By directing attention at how opportunities could be seized to support more dynamic and institutionalized bargaining between state and society, the SSAF is supposed to draw out lessons for more effective international, and particularly EU, engagement.

Methodology

Inspired by the Dutch Fragile States Assessment Methodology (FSAM, ref above), this framework has tried to strengthen its focus on civil society and external actors, and on gender issues.

The SSAF directs attention towards issues which determine the nature of the challenges shaping state and society and the inter-relationship between them. In particular, it focuses on:

- the Foundational Factors
- the Rules of the Game, and
- the ‘Here and Now’

Although the three dimensions of the analysis should not be used mechanistically (partly because they overlap), they are a guide to structure knowledge and reflection. Each of these dimensions has a set of sub-components and guiding questions. The questions, some of which are very broad, and suggestive need not be rigidly followed. This analysis can then be supplemented by subsequent, disaggregated and more detailed analysis in specific sectors.

Geographic coverage

National and sub-national level, depending on the choice of the specific focus of the framework.
Time of implementation and frequency
Carried out at any time, so far it has remained a one-time exercise.

Data collection
The process of research involves consultations in-country as well as co-ordinated discussions in EU/EC headquarters. No guidelines provided.

Reporting format
Narrative report.

Ease of implementation
The level of resources involved in the implementation of the SSAF is completely dependent on the choices of those in charge of it. Experience in the four countries where it has been implemented to date shows differing approaches to its implementation, especially in terms of financial and human resources involved. The framework can be implemented with minimal resources and still guarantee a satisfactory analysis, but at the condition that its scope is adapted to the resources available.

Strengths and weaknesses
The experience gathered in the four country cases of the IfP’s Democratization cluster shows that the instrument has significant potential in assessing state-society relations in fragile settings. However, the same experience has also shown that there are no shortcuts to its implementation. If the implementing agent uses the framework to further validate on-going work in a given country or territory, the instrument loses most of its analytical and comparative potential. Whatever the scale of the analysis that has been chosen, the SSAF needs to be implemented in full to avoid becoming just an analytical justification of ongoing activities.

Further information
**Fragile States Assessment Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Tested in Burundi only.</td>
<td>Conflict, Democracy, Justice and Human Rights, Peace consolidation, Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

The fragile states assessment framework is designed to help USAID understand the principal dynamic that determines the situation in each fragile state. The key output of the assessment framework is to determine and understand patterns of fragility and resilience created by state-society relationships and which priority programs can change them. The framework is one part of FRAME, USAID’s fragile states assessment methodology\(^2\).

**Methodology**

The fragile states assessment framework has four linked tasks:

- Understand the most important patterns of fragility and resilience within a country;
- Map key actors and their relationships, institutions and trends for the key patterns of fragility and resilience;
- Identify windows of vulnerability and opportunity;
- Recommend measures USAID could take to support stabilization or recovery efforts.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The methodology was developed and tested (in Burundi), but never operationalized and implemented widely.

**Data collection**

---

\(^2\) FRAME was a methodology under development in 2005 and was supposed to include the Fragile States Assessment Framework, a procedures guide for using the Framework, and a variety of tools to support assessment and program development in fragile states. At the moment it is not known what happened to this broader methodology.
Illustrative questions and some guidance is provided. While detailed methodological guidelines are not provided, it is suggested that those conducting this exercise should seek out information from sources (individuals, social groups, institutions) which are “not usually funded or sought out by USAID”, and should also attempt to identify actors and groups which would be able to influence reform.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report, complemented by scorecards (e.g. state performance matrix).

**Ease of implementation**

N/A

**Strengths and weaknesses**

N/A

**Further information**

http://www.irisprojects.umd.edu/ppc_ideas/FS_Assessment/Secure/burundi_pdf/Fragility%20Assessment%20Framework%20FINAL%207.20.05.pdf
## Post-Conflict Needs Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originally developed in 2004 and replaced by the new Joint Guidance Note in September 2007.</td>
<td>As of July 2010, PCNAs have been undertaken or remain on-going in Timor-Leste (not formally a PCNA), Afghanistan (not formally a PCNA), Iraq, Liberia, Haiti, Sudan (North/South), Somalia, Sudan (Darfur), Pakistan, Georgia, Zimbabwe (only preparation) and Yemen</td>
<td>Conflict, Peace consolidation, Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stated objectives

Developed by five multilateral institutions (the UN Development Group, World Bank, European Commission, Asian Development Bank and the African Development Bank), the PCNA is used by national and international actors as an entry point for conceptualizing, negotiating and financing a common shared strategy for recovery and development in fragile, post-conflict settings.

The objective of the PCNA is to produce an actionable, prioritized and sequenced plan (the Transitional Results Matrix, or TRM) where priority is accorded to those results that will help stabilize the peace and lay the groundwork for essential recovery and reconstruction activities.

### Methodology

The assessment process identifies needs, actions and outcomes which are necessary to redress the consequences of conflict, as well as to prevent renewed conflict. It shapes the short- to medium-term recovery priorities, and costs these needs in an accompanying results-based matrix, the TRM.

The PCNA Guidelines are comprised of two documents: The Practical Guide for Multilateral Needs Assessments in Post-Conflict Situations, and The Operational Note on Transitional Results Matrices.

Additional work on the PCNA toolkit has taken place since late 2008. This includes the development of additional practical tools for capacity assessments and conflict analysis, communication protocol within the UN and between PCNA partners within the context of a PCNA- Transitional Results Framework (TRF).

### Geographic coverage

The methodology has been mainly applied to whole countries emerging from conflict, except in the case of Sudan, which had been tested by two separate conflicts.

### Time of implementation and frequency

The assessments are carried out after a period of armed conflict as a one-time exercise.

### Data collection

Wide-ranging consultations with affected communities in the region and with groups representing various sections of the broader civil society (media, NGOs, traditional leaders, etc) and public services (military, bureaucrats, police etc).

### Reporting format

Narrative report.
Ease of implementation
The Joint Guidance Note is accompanied by an electronic PCNA Toolkit (still being finalized), that will be available online and on CDs, with specific guidance to cluster leaders and secretariats, including lessons learned, practical templates and TORs.

Strengths and weaknesses
The PCNA Guidelines have been revised into a common Guidance Note on PCNAs and TRFs, which aims to combine the key elements of the two original documents (the PCNA Practical Guide and TRF Operational Note) to provide a clearer, more articulate link between the assessment process and the strategic and selective results framework that emerges from it.

A review of the PCNAs was completed at the beginning of 2007. Some of the main conclusions and recommendations of that review included:

PCNAs, and their resulting Transitional Results Matrices (TRMs), are conducted in inherently fragile settings with high risk of reversion to conflict. Resulting plans should more clearly articulate the stabilization measures that will address the risk of reversal into conflict and the transformation measures that will serve to re-establish the foundation for achieving MDGs.

PCNAs typically take place in post-conflict countries governed by transitional authorities with two to three year mandates, prior to elections; PCNA/TRMs need more explicitly to address the challenges of ownership, sequencing, prioritization, accountability, and legitimacy that this dynamic entails.

Appropriate balance must be struck between the urgency of producing an actionable plan to lend credibility to a fragile peace, and that plan’s comprehensiveness, inclusiveness, and national ownership. Recognizing that each country setting is different, the aim should be to present an actionable plan in a process that is completed in 4 to 6 months. To the extent this timeframe is insufficient to achieve the degree of comprehensiveness, inclusion and ownership desired, deliberate measures should be built into the TRM implementation plan to address the shortcomings.

An explicit pre-assessment/watching phase should be introduced to include conflict/risk assessment, scenario planning, and analysis of state and non-state institutions and capacity.

A conflict/risk analysis should be an early step in planning future PCNA/TRM exercises.

Critical cross-cutting issues should be identified in the pre-assessment and/or Concept Note stage to assure adequate resource allocation from the outset.

PCNAs should from the outset outline an approach to security stabilization and transformation measures.

Further information
http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=144
Conflict-related Development Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>In all those countries affected by conflict and with a potential for development cooperation. The CDA, so far, has been implemented in Guatemala, Nigeria [Niger Delta Region], Nepal, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Kenya and Tajikistan.</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

The Conflict-related Development Analysis (CDA) is an analytical tool developed by UNDP and targeted at UNDP practitioners and other development agencies working in conflict-prone and conflict-affected situations. In particular, it was designed as a practical tool to better understand the linkages between development and conflict, with a view to increasing the impact of development on conflict.

The CDA aims to integrate conflict assessment into existing programming tools and procedures at all levels, including such planning cycles as the CCA/UNDAF. Alternatively, the CDA can be used in countries where there is an opportunity to build a consensus around key conflict issues.

**Methodology**

The CDA methodology draws on the DFID methodology of Strategic Conflict Assessment and reflects the approach of the Early Warning and Preventive Measures course of the UN System Staff College. The CDA is an extension of normal development analysis, and has been designed in such a way that it is applicable to any type or stage of conflict, Strategic and focused on structural causes of violent conflict, dynamic and participatory, output-oriented and aimed at consensus-building at the country level.

The CDA methodology is based on a set of key assumptions, including:
- Each conflict is unique so that analysis needs to be conflict-specific.
- Conflicts arise from sets of interconnected causes.
- Some actors may have an interest in promoting and driving conflict.
- Development can be a cause of violent conflict, as well as a part of the response to address it.
- Development agencies should aim at ‘doing no harm’.
- Development agencies should maximise their impact on conflict.

Finally, the methodology is organized in three stages:

- **Analysis of Conflict**: it focuses on structural causes of conflict, through the use of a matrix in which security, political, social and economic structural thematic areas are analysed in combination with five levels of interaction (i.e. international, regional, national, sub-national, and local). The conflict analysis is further characterized by a comprehensive mapping of key actors, in order to identify their key interests as well as the possible impacts and reactions that such interests may create in other groups.

- **Analysis of Current Responses**: it begins by mapping on-going interventions and related concerns of the main actors operating in a given setting, in relation to the key issues identified in Stage One. The next step is to
consider the role of development in relation to formal peace processes and negotiations, especially in contexts where such processes currently take place.

Identification of Ways Forward: previous Stages are now drawn together to produce a strategy, in order to identify possible gaps, as well as adequate strategies to address them. The first step thus aims to identify a set of strategic objectives, from which specific conclusions can be derived for UNDP both from a programming and advocacy perspective.

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country and/or conflict-affected areas. Discussions on-going about the opportunity to apply the tool to regional analyses as well (e.g. West Africa).

**Time of implementation and frequency**
The methodology has been designed for implementation during a period of armed conflict. The methodology is still in use and currently being updated.

**Data collection**
Guidance not provided.

**Reporting format**
Narrative reports (often focussed on specific areas or issues, but also consolidated into one final report).

**Ease of implementation**
The CDA process can be adapted depending on the required outputs (e.g. Strategic Conflict Analysis, Conflict-related Programme Planning, Conflict-related Programme Review, Early Warning, Input into the CCA/UNDAF, Input to the national human development reports (NHDR), Input to PRSP processes).

**Strengths and weaknesses**
The most challenging part of the CDA process relates to developing an understanding of conflict dynamics. CDA avoids general models of conflict but leaves open the possibility of modelling the dynamics of a specific conflict.

The value of the Matrix of Conflict Causes (Stage One) is its ability to deconstruct a phenomenon as complex as conflict, by helping think about conflict causes according to both thematic and level-oriented parameters. The Matrix nonetheless provides a static understanding of conflict, and needs to be further elaborated, when looking at conflict dynamics.

While the emphasis is on the identification of structural causes of violent conflict, the process of differentiation between structural and proximate (i.e. more visible/recent conflict manifestations) causes may sometimes prove difficult.

The need to further assess, throughout the process, the extent to which gender and human rights related issues might be identified as structural causes of violent conflict, has been explicitly recognised.

During one pilot case (i.e. Nepal), perhaps the most successful aspect of the process was the application of a strategic analysis to the review of specific development programmes. This resulted in substantial changes to ensure that UNDP followed the principle of ‘Do No Harm’ and moved as far as possible towards maximizing the impact of its development work on conflict.

**Further information**
Political Settlement Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace consolidation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

This methodology has been developed by the Asia Foundation to identify the key elements (actors, interests, institutions) of the current political settlement.

The political settlements framework is a new conceptual approach for international development organizations to better understand and respond to this reality and the challenges that result from political dynamics in developing countries. This framework allows policy-makers and development practitioners to understand how development is driven by competition among elite groups, as an alternative to development approaches that focus on capacity-building or technical assistance.

**Methodology**

This mapping can draw on several commonly used analytical tools, such as political-economy analysis, actor mapping, and conflict audits, but will focus on some additional questions not addressed by these tools. The key questions for a mapping exercise would include:

**Actors:** Who are the primary actors that hold power? What is their basis for influence and legitimacy? Who benefits from the status quo distribution of power? Who is excluded and how do they respond? Are there alternatives to the dominant elite coalition?

**Interests:** What are the primary interests of the elites in the dominant coalition? Are there competing interests? Where are the openings for forming alliances, based on shared interests, between the dominant elites and excluded groups?

**Institutions:** What factors or mechanisms help to sustain the current political settlement? What are the accepted rules that apply to political competition and economic activity? To what extent are these rules shaped by the dominant coalition? What limits are there on elite behaviour? What are the motivations of the dominant elite coalition for establishing and complying with the institutions? How are challengers to the political settlement addressed? How robust is the current settlement?

A mapping exercise should contain the following areas of analysis: Identify elite groups; Plot the political constellation of elite groups; Identify the interests of key actors; Institutional analysis.

**Geographic coverage**

National and subnational level.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The initiative should be carried out after a period of armed conflict, and when a political settlement has been reached. The mapping methodology has not yet been implemented.

**Data collection**

Analytical exercise based on interviews and secondary data.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**
The mapping exercise requires the involvement of one or more political analysts with strong political economy skills.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
The approach seems particularly useful for countries affected by protracted conflict or fragile conditions, but precise strengths and weaknesses are difficult to pinpoint as it has not been applied in any conflict situation so far.

**Further information**
## Global Pulse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global (situations of crisis)</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stated objectives

A technology based, real-time monitoring system developed by UNICEF-SIPA and originally known as Global Impact and Vulnerability Alert System that is intended to enable governments and other actors to identify important changes in vulnerability in a timely manner and raise an alarm to worsening conditions around the world.

Global Impact and Vulnerability Alert System (GIVAS) is also being designed to link together a wide variety of existing databases and early warning systems from a variety of organizations, so that they may be utilized by governments, UN agencies, civil society organizations, academia, the private sector and interested individuals.

GIVAS is also being designed to establish a direct link between those affected by crises and those directing the response. The ultimate goal is to give a “voice to the vulnerable” by not simply collecting information, but also empowering vulnerable communities and providing them with a means to make their needs and opinions heard.

### Methodology

Methodology based on real-time information collection.

GIVAS will track a limited number of indicators on a global scale. However, these will need to be supplemented by a larger number of regionally appropriate indicators decided upon together with national and sub-national governments.

The real-time system will be used only to supplement these more comprehensive surveys with a small selection of indicators that are tracked much more frequently. Highly dynamic indicators, such as those tracking epidemic diseases, outbreaks of violence or drought, are more suitable for immediate transmission than less dynamic information, such as rates of HIV/AIDS or school attendance.

### Geographic coverage

Whole country.

### Time of implementation and frequency

Carried out during situations of crisis, to date limited to two pilot projects in Uganda and Iraq, undertaken by UNICEF in 2010.

Low resource environments are a challenge during any phase of the project, but especially when considering the sustainability of a new technology project.

### Data collection
Once indicators have been chosen, it must be determined how this information should travel from one party in the system to another.

**Reporting format**
Real-time information system/Database.

**Ease of implementation**
In order for such a system to work, an appropriate technical infrastructure would need to be in place. As the complexity of content and volume of reports submitted rise, data cannot be verified and aggregated using basic mobile phones, as are often used in the field. Instead, those parties with Internet access could use online software designed to receive information from mobile phones in the field and facilitate aggregation and verification. In this way, different technological tools would be used at various levels, as appropriate, to create an integrated communication system.

A core team with expertise in global development, data analysis, and emerging technologies, including staff seconded from WFP, UNDP, UNICEF, and UNDPI, is currently being established.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
The hope for real-time systems such as GIVAS is that they will result in more accurate monitoring of vulnerabilities, more efficient planning of logistics, improved capacity for targeted responses and enhanced policy decisions. However, it may not be advisable to begin collecting all types of information in real-time. Considerations must be made regarding what kinds of information most benefit from being received quickly and what kinds of information could realistically be sent at regular intervals. Furthermore, even if information can be sent in real-time, if the consumption (validation, analysis, and use) of this information happens infrequently, there is no net benefit.

Given the sensitivity of some types of information and possible security concerns presented by new technology, some governments may feel hesitant to participate in a real-time monitoring system such as GIVAS. Collecting and publicizing information about vulnerable or marginalized groups could also potentially lead to blame being placed on a government or lead to tensions between a government and outside organizations such as the UN.

Political sensitivities strongly affect the choice of country-specific indicators.

As a real-time system enables information to be presented quickly, one concern expressed is that information could potentially be publicized before it is verified.

**Further information**
http://www.unglobalpulse.org

Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2007 |           | Tested in Afghanistan and Sudan; applied in Haiti and Kosovo | Corruption  
Civil Society  
Democracy  
Governance and MDG/Service Delivery  
Media  
Land Governance  
Justice and Human Rights  
Political Parties  
Parliament  
Security  
Conflict  
Peace consolidation |

**Stated objectives**
The Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE) framework aims to enable policymakers to establish a baseline before intervention and track progress toward stability. Developed by United States Institute of Peace, US Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, its intention is to contribute to establishing realistic goals, focusing government efforts strategically, integrating interagency activities, and enhancing the prospects for attaining an enduring peace. This metrics framework supports strategic and operational planning cycles.

**Methodology**
The MPICE is structured in five sectors: Safe and Secure Environment; Social Well-Being; Political Moderation and Stable Governance; Sustainable Economy; Rule of Law. Each of these sectors or end states is divided into two subsectors, Conflict Drivers and Institutional Performance, which are further subdivided in goal, indicator (i.e. the concept that is to be evaluated) and measures (i.e. the empirical data to be collected). If more than one measure is used per indicator, they are aggregated to produce an indicator score. The indicators inform users about whether or not the goal is being realized over time.

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country (also applied in a shanty town in Haiti)

**Time of implementation and Frequency**
It has been tested or applied during periods of armed conflict (e.g. Afghanistan), as well as in situations of crisis and instability (e.g. Haiti). In Haiti, the project ran over three phases, from March 2008 to June 2010.
The MPICE framework has been applied twice in Afghanistan.

Data collection
Each measure is followed by a suggested data collection methodology. MPICE data collection methodologies include content analysis, expert knowledge, quantitative data, and survey/polling data.

- **Content Analysis:** Involves surveying media publications using key Boolean phrases that represent the indicators in order to track the salience of issues, monitor events, identify perceptions, and determine trends.

- **Expert Knowledge:** Entails creating a panel of independent, knowledgeable, and experienced experts to assess an issue of interest (e.g., the capacity of law enforcement agencies to perform essential administrative and bureaucratic functions). The reliability and repeatability of the findings depend on specifying the evaluation criteria and data-gathering methodology in advance and following them consistently in the field.

- **Quantitative Data:** Utilizes statistics relating to security, standard of living, and economic development, for example, to assess the situation in a country.

- **Survey/Polling Data (S/PD):** Involves conducting public opinion surveys in order to assess how the public views a variety of issues.

In Haiti, focus groups – not in the original MPICE framework - were used.

Once collected, the data can be aggregated and analysed to establish trends over time. In Haiti, the values were normalised applying a utility model, followed by triangulation for cross verification of the findings from each methodology.

Each measure within this Framework also has a tag identifying the preferred trend direction: “+” indicates the preferred trend is increasing or positive; “–” indicates the preferred trend is decreasing or negative; “d” indicates that the preferred trend depends on other conditions.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report - dashboard.

**Ease of implementation**
It requires technical expertise (e.g. for surveying, statistical methods). The international team has been assisted in the data collection phase by a national team.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**
Strengths: There is a great degree of flexibility and adaptability of the tool to agency’s goals and work; it correlates indicators and measures with suggested methodologies and preferred trends.

Weaknesses: There is no guidance regarding the aggregation of qualitative and quantitative data gathered through the data collection methodologies, which poses a great challenge. A full implementation of the MPICE seems to require considerable technical and financial resources. There is no reference to assigning weights to different measures.

**Further information**
Rule of Law Tools for Post Conflict States - Monitoring Legal Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global (post-conflict environments)</td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UN-OHCHR), this tool is meant to provide field missions and transitional administrations with the fundamental information required to develop a legal systems monitoring methodology, in line with international human rights standards and best practices.

**Methodology**

Each tool can stand on its own, but also fits into a coherent operational perspective. The tools are intended to outline the basic principles involved in: Mapping the Justice Sector, Prosecution Initiatives, Truth Commissions, Vetting and Monitoring Legal Systems.

This specific tool addresses human rights monitoring of the justice system. It covers the whole array of issues involved in establishing justice institutions that can function in accordance with the domestic law and in compliance with fundamental international standards of justice. This includes monitoring budgetary and financial allocations, administrative oversight and accountability or disciplinary mechanisms, judicial appointment processes, human resources policies and staff allocation and training, law dissemination to justice officials and general publication, methods for ensuring appropriate interaction between the institutions and actors involved in justice, including the police, prosecutors, defence counsel and judges, as well as with related institutions and groups, such as referral networks for victims and witnesses, hospitals and protection programmes. Four sources of international and regional standards may be used to monitor the legal system: international treaty standards; regional treaty and non-treaty standards; international customary law; and international non-treaty standards.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The tool is supposed to be implemented after a period of armed conflict. No information was found about concrete cases of implementation of this tool.

**Data collection**

Information is to be gathered through effective interviewing and legal analysis. Examples of reference material and knowledge tools that should be collected are:

- Founding documents of the mission, such as Security Council resolutions, mandates and memorandums of understanding (MOUs);
- Background information on the administration of the justice system before and during the conflict;
- International laws in the relevant languages, including non-treaty standards;
- Compilations of relevant jurisprudence of international and regional human rights courts or committees;
- International Commission of Jurists materials, Amnesty International fair trials manual and other monitoring assistance tools, interviewing guidelines and best practices;
• The domestic laws, including regulations and administrative laws;

• Compilation of local court jurisprudence, legal reports, cases or other analyses of the court system in the national context;
  
  • Reports, research or studies on the situation in the country and in particular thematic areas;

• Policies, codes of conduct and regulations of the relevant institutions of the justice sector;

• Media/press reports and articles on the justice system.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report that lays out the basis for the conclusions about any violations of international standards by the justice system or its institutions.

A common type of legal systems monitoring report is a thematic report which centres on a comparison of the conduct of similar cases and draws conclusions about a set of systemic problems or violations (for example, rights in detention, juveniles in serious crime cases, women defendants, the conduct of sexually related cases, the administration of justice, the treatment of property cases concerning returnees, etc.)

**Ease of implementation**

This type of legal monitoring involves investigating cases from a substantive as well as a procedural perspective in order to assess their overall fairness. It means that the monitoring team needs to evaluate, to a limited degree, the extent of the evidence, its sufficiency and the investigative or legal options in the case. The mandate is the starting point for any legal system monitoring programme. Additionally, unhindered or unrestricted access is particularly important with regard to prisons or any places of detention (official or unofficial), as detainees are at heightened risk of torture, inhuman and degrading treatment.

Sound and effective monitoring of the legal system requires an integrated knowledge, experience and skill set:

Knowledge in a range of technical areas relating to the law, in particular the domestic legal framework, the administration of the justice system, particular procedural and substantive laws, the international legal framework and standards, particularly human rights standards, and the ways in which international standards work in practice;

Practical experience with justice systems, in particular of working within a system at some level and with a dysfunctional justice system, experience working in and sensitivity to post-conflict environments and with traumatized individuals and communities, and with the particular relevant communities, cultures and contexts;

Specific skills for gathering information through effective interviewing, legal analysis, coherent writing skills and effective diplomacy and communication skills to appropriately and successfully deal with victims, accused persons and Government or justice officials.

The monitoring programme may have international monitors, national monitors or a combination of both. It is critical to have national lawyers or legal experts within the programme even if there are international monitors too. If the international monitors do not speak the language, language assistants or interpreters are often a necessary and highly critical part of the monitoring team.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Access to investigatory proceedings and related evidence in cases which are otherwise not public can raise particular problems and reasonable exceptions to unlimited access may be expected. Severely limited access can hinder the monitoring programme’s overall effectiveness and may indicate the need for the peacekeeping operation to take a different programmatic approach, for example to target more resources towards a
mentoring programme instead of a monitoring programme, or to develop a more limited legal system observation capacity than a full-fledged monitoring programme.

The success of legal system monitoring depends largely on maintaining regular contacts and relationships with the key actors engaged in and responsible for the system.

Further information
Peoples under Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**
To identify the risk of genocide, mass killing or other systematic violent repression, unlike most other early warning tools, which focus on violent conflict as such. Developed by the Minority Rights Group (MRG), its primary application is civilian protection.

**Methodology**
The Peoples under Threat index is created from a basket of ten indicators, all known antecedents to mass violence, divided into three categories – indicators of conflict, group division, and democracy/governance. The ten indicators are: (Prior) self-determination/conflicts; Major armed conflicts; Prior genocide/politicide; Massive movement (refugees/IDPs); Legacy of Vengeance – Group Grievance; Rise of Factionalised Elites; Voice and Accountability; Political Stability; Rule of Law; and OECD Country Risk Classification. For each of these, data is collected from authoritative sources and the final formula combines the ten factors to yield one final score.

**Geographic coverage**
Global.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
First comprehensive annual report on Peoples under Threat was issued in 2008. The assessment has been repeated annually since then, with 2011 being the latest.

**Data collection**
Secondary (published) data is collected from authoritative sources and compiled into the Peoples under Threat Index. Indicators of democracy or good governance are drawn from the World Bank, conflict indicators from the Center for Systemic Peace and other leading global conflict research institutes, indicators of group division or elite factionalization from the Fund for Peace and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the State Failure Task Force data on prior genocides and politicides, and the country credit risk classification published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (as a proxy for trade openness).

**Reporting format**
The findings are presented in a brief report, accompanied by the People under Threat Table. Highest-ranked countries as well as the major risers are highlighted in the narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**
Since this Index is based on secondary data which is itself updated annually, compiled using a set formula, it is fairly easy to implement.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
It should be noted here that the statistical indicators used all relate to the state, meaning that the state is the basic unit of enquiry, rather than particular ethnic or religious groups at risk, as governments or militias connected to the government are responsible for most cases of genocidal violence. However, some groups may
experience higher levels of discrimination and be at greater risk than others in any given state - these have been identified in the final table.

Furthermore, like in the case of other similar tools, the outcome of the Index will only be as good as the quality of the secondary data is relies upon.

Further information
http://www.minorityrights.org/10744/peoples-under-threat/
3.2 GENERAL GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES

Drivers of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Up to 2004, over twenty DFID country offices had completed or were undertaking a Drivers of Change study.</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed studies are available for Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cambodia, Congo, Georgia, Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, Vanuatu, Zambia.</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Tool developed to improve the understanding of political, economic, social, and cultural forces that inform change in a regional and country context and to link this understanding with an identification of the key policy and institutional “drivers” of change that will impact poverty reduction.

Developed by the UK Department for International Development (DfID), the Drivers of Change approach aims to identify the opportunities, incentives and blockages to pro-poor change at country level.

**Methodology**

The analysis centres around agents (individuals and organisations pursuing particular interests), structural features (history of state formation, economic and social structures), and institutions (rules governing the behaviour of agents).

A single blueprint approach to Drivers of Change analysis is inappropriate. Instead, country offices have been encouraged to ask themselves a structured set of questions about the dynamics of pro-poor change, loosely grouped into six levels: basic country analysis, medium-term dynamics, role of external forces, links between changes and poverty reduction, operational implications, and DFID incentives—but these areas of investigation do not all have to be undertaken and/or applied in sequence.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country. Drivers of change analysis is designed to be conducted at country level, which means that research scope can be focused on country-specific needs and context.

---

22 Selection of the main methodologies produced and being used by donors and regional or international organizations; not specifically developed for, but occasionally applied in, conflict/fragile settings
Time of implementation and frequency
Up to 2004, over twenty DFID country offices had completed or were undertaking a Drivers of Change study. It is not clear if this tool was fully mainstreamed within DFID’s work across the world.

Data collection
Most offices have commissioned inputs from external consultants in the form of specific studies or literature reviews. Increasingly however, existing contextual knowledge found within country offices is being used more effectively. And studies are increasingly involving national and international staff, often through the use of structured workshops.

The main research methods for DOC analysis are literature and secondary evidence together with key informant interviews.

Reporting format
Narrative report.

Ease of implementation
Generally DOC research produces qualitative data, which needs particular skills and knowledge—notably in political science, political economy, and sociology—to analyze. In-depth country knowledge is also expected.

The cost can vary significantly depending on the scope of the study and methods used. An average cost could be US$ 50,000.

Strengths and weaknesses
The DOC analysis is an effective instrument which can enable donor thinking and practice to be guided by a more nuanced understanding of the political-institutional context in which reform takes place.

DFID evaluations have shown that the influence of Drivers of Change Studies on country programming has been rather variable. Some studies have proven more insightful than others in understanding the incentives facing key actors and identifying practical levers for change. If insufficiently focused, or if too academic in tone, DOC analysis can be perceived to be of limited use for operational purposes.

An ODI evaluation of the methodology has also highlighted other limitations, such as the overly descriptive nature of some of the country studies; focus on large-scale trends rather than dynamic medium-term factors; limited participation and sharing of results; the need for staff training to draw out concrete programme recommendations from the DOC studies; and the need to develop further guidance tools.

Further information
http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/DOC59.pdf
http://www.gsdrc.org/index.cfm?objectid=597A76DB-14C2-620A-2770D688963DF944#doc
Power Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Countries covered so far include: Ethiopia, Kenya, Bangladesh, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Uganda, and Honduras.</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stated objectives

Power analysis, developed by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Authority (Sida), seeks to map the informal political landscape, including its rules and structures. It seeks to understand how development cooperation and donor activities are influenced by this landscape, and how the landscape of power shapes their activities.

### Methodology

The tool analyses actors, interest groups, and structures to uncover where the real power in a society lies and how power is distributed geographically, institutionally, and socially. It might also point to what kind of power is being exercised and how, in addition to how this power is perceived by others. Issues that should be covered are summarized as actors, structures, processes, relations, and hierarchies.

### Geographic coverage

Mainly whole country (society), but occasionally (e.g. Mozambique) starting at the provincial level.

### Time of implementation and frequency

Carried out independently from a period of armed conflict, and as often as each country office would deem necessary.

### Data collection

Desk reviews, often complemented by key informant interviews, questionnaires, and focus group discussions.

### Reporting format

Narrative

### Ease of implementation

While it is a flexible framework, it is important that those using it clearly establish their own working definitions and scope of the research.

The level of resources and time (2 to 6 months) required varies, but with an emphasis on desk research, interviews, and qualitative analysis, the costs (approximately US$50,000) are limited largely to person-time.

The main skill requested is an in-depth country knowledge.

### Strengths and weaknesses

Perhaps the most significant contribution of power analysis is that it can inform the way in which donors and other external actors engage with different groups of stakeholders in any given country context. Strategic and
policy approaches that are informed by this type of analysis can include better political economy risk assessment and risk management, and are often characterized by a more flexible and realistic set of objectives and timeframes.

A possible limitation of the Power Analysis is that it needs to be sufficiently focused to provide in-depth analysis and to be operationally useful.

**Further information**

http://www.sida.se/Svenska/Om-oss/Publikationer/Visa-publikation/?iframesrc=http://www2.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp%3Fd=118%26a=24300andlanguage=en_US
### Strategic Governance and Corruption Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>All the (36) countries on the development cooperation list.</td>
<td>Civil Society, Corruption, Democracy, Electoral Systems, Governance and Gender, Governance and MDG/Service Delivery, Justice and Human Rights, Land Governance, Local Governance and Decentralization, Media, Parliament, Political Parties, Public Administration, Security, Conflict, Peace consolidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by Clingendael for the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to provide a solid foundation for the formulation of the MFA’s aid programmes.

**Methodology**

The first step of the SGACA framework is a ‘Power and Change Analysis’ [PCA] which comprises a list of issues for analysis as well as a set of suggested questions. The PCA is organised around three dimensions:

1. Foundational Factors – including information related to country characteristics that change slowly, if at all, over time, and which have a strong influence on present day affairs in the society concerned such as the history of state formation, state sources of revenue, etc;

2. Rules of the Game – including formal and informal institutions of the State, civil society and the private sector that shape how business is conducted and relationships managed, as well as state-society relations;
Here and Now – including the current context of the country concerned, considering questions related to sources of support and legitimacy of the government, identifying which pro-poor groups have the capacity and the power to make their voices heard, and which groups have narrower, personalized interests.

The second step in the methodology is called “Operational Implications of the PCA”, and it provides a bridge between the PCA and the workshop discussion on operational implications. This section should draw on the PCA:

- To highlight how the political and institutional context of the partner country shapes opportunities and constraints for governance and development, and
- In the light of that to reassess the opportunities and threats for donors, and how they might respond more effectively.

The results of this section will be used during the workshop to direct attention to key factors.

The third and final step of the methodology is represented by a workshop held over two days. Day one as a “validation” workshop, which can be planned as an internal exercise or might be open to selected external stakeholders. Day two should be internal only and focus on elaborating/refining the current donor strategy.

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
So far, it has been one-time exercise, but discussions were taking place after the conclusion of all the SGACAs as to possible follow-up formats.

**Data collection**
A combination of secondary sources and interviews. The analysis is led by an international consultant in cooperation with a local one. The main stakeholder in the process, that is the Royal Netherlands embassy in a given country, is supposed to be actively involved throughout the process.

The initial data collection is represented by a desk study of a selected range of information sources. They might include: the embassy’s own analyses (e.g. the Track Record); research reports; SAF’s reports; NGO reports; Donor reports; Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs); and local sources.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**
The assessment involves the hiring of an international and a local consultant for a period of up to 45 days. Two missions are also included within the methodology. The lead consultant must have a strong background in political economy analysis, while the local one must have a strong and objective understanding (as much as possible) of the political and socio-economic landscape in which the assessment is conducted. In addition, the consultants must also have good facilitating skills to run the two workshops programmed by the methodology. The initial scoping paper is based on a limited number of key analyses of the country, including documents already produced by the embassy.

A PCA can be done as “quick scan” or more in depth, depending on the time and data available (as set out in the country-specific ToR); it can also be updated as necessary, and supplemented with more in-depth analysis at a later date.
**Strengths and weaknesses**

The tool is donor-driven and it does not allow for local stakeholders’ involvement in the process, with the only exception of a validation workshop. On the other hand, if properly implemented, the SGACA can provide the Ministry and its embassy with a comprehensive understanding of the power relations and of the informal networks shaping governance in a given country. SGACA can improve the design of donor interventions through a better understanding of what happens behind the façade of the state and what really drives political behaviour.

**Further information**

Country Governance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific. Reports are available for China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, the Pacific (region), Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Vietnam,</td>
<td>Corruption Governance and MDG/Service Delivery Local Governance and Decentralization Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives
Developed by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to systematically assess the quality of governance of member countries and to strengthen the linkage between the quality of governance and levels and composition of assistance.

The Public Administration section of the Country Governance Assessment (CGA) assesses the policy-making system and civil service management. The Public Financial Management section assesses public financial management. CGAs are used primarily by the ADB, with secondary use by the assessed governments. Governance information and analysis is used for identifying the impact of governance on the poor; conducting policy dialogue with assessed governments on key governance issues; guiding public discussion, information-sharing, or joint projects on country governance with other stakeholders (e.g., donor agencies or civil society organizations); developing strategies and programs to address key governance issues; reaching decisions on the size and composition of ADB’s country portfolios; identifying risks and opportunities from the governance environment in sectors and projects; developing indicators and benchmarks of governance at various levels; identifying the relationship between public governance and the private sector or civil society.

Methodology
The assessment framework is structured in two sections:

1. Public administration, in which the following sub-sections are covered:
   - Government system: To assess the overall policy making and implementation framework.
   - Civil service: To assess the degree to which civil service arrangements are implemented in line with existing laws and to determine whether human resources are managed with reference to accepted public management practices.
   - Local Governance: To evaluate the capacity of local governments to respond adequately to the real needs of their constituencies.

2. Public financial management section, covering the following sub-sections:
   - Revenue administration
   - Public expenditure management
   - Public sector accounting and internal control
• Public sector auditing
• Inter-governmental fiscal relations
• Specific anti-corruption efforts

Each sub-section contains a series of guide questions.

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country or region.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
In the case of a few countries, the assessment has been repeated a second time.

**Data collection**
There is no set of rules on how a governance analysis might be designed, managed, or phased. The CGA Framework provides guidance on the analytical basis for a CGA but not on process, evidence acquisition, or resources. The result has been a good deal of variation in both CGA process and product. Broadly speaking, task managers from ADB have adopted three approaches:

(i) Brief reports by staff based largely on analysing existing documents on country governance, supplemented by short visits to the country;

(ii) Wide-ranging desk research with field visits, a basic level of participation (in the form of interviews and consultation), and selected use of national or international consultants; and

(iii) Participation by government and country stakeholders in the design and execution of the analysis, often involving extensive consultation and workshops.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**
The budgets for CGAs vary according to the process followed. The costs and elapsed time of CGAs rise sharply as fieldwork, consultation, and participation increase.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
Generally, CGAs appear likely to have more impact on strategy and operations when they are properly timed in relation to Country Strategy and Programs (CSPs). However, the impacts of CGAs on actual operations have been variable and are influenced by the process of undertaking CGAs and the scope of the assessment. There is some doubt that CGAs are having much real effect on the “level and sectoral composition” of ADB lending and technical assistance in CSPs.

**Further information**
http://www.adb.org/site/adf/country-performance-assessment
State of Democracy Assessment Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied in over 20 countries or regions worldwide, including Bangladesh, El Salvador, Italy, Kenya, Malawi, Peru, New Zealand and South Korea (pilot test countries); Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the European Union (EU), Ireland, Latvia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, the Philippines, the South Asia region (covering Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka), and the UK.</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by International IDEA to help citizens assess the functioning of their own democratic systems. The assessments are aimed at raising public awareness, sparking discussions and helping identify areas for reform.

**Methodology**

The key democratic principles that form the basis for the assessment framework are popular control over decision makers and political equality of those who exercise that control. The framework derives seven mediating values from the two democratic principles.

The mediating values have certain requirements and institutional means for their realization. The overall structure of the assessment framework is derived from the democratic principles and mediating values to include four main pillars, each of which has further divisions used to organize 90 search questions (15 overarching questions and 75 specific questions) that form the core of democracy assessment.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country and region. The assessments have been carried out in new and old democracies, large and small countries, post-authoritarian and post-conflict countries, and high and low income countries.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

Piloted in eight countries and subsequently implemented in some 20 worldwide, the methodology is presently still a one-time exercise, though the hope is that citizens of a given country will embark on this exercise on a regular basis.

**Data collection**

A domestic team of assessors and stakeholders based in the country of the assessment provides the empirical basis for answering the questions while reflecting on the democratic achievements and deficits for the period being assessed, as well as identifying the obstacles for democratic reform that may exist.

**Reporting format**
There is considerable variety in the balance of the outputs between full assessments, special reports, partial audits and monitoring or follow-up reports, and in the way in which they are published and disseminated. Most of the projects have published a single volume reporting on a full assessment, while some have published additional supplementary materials (e.g. the South Asian team published separate Country Reports and is considering publishing its Case Studies and dialogues separately; and the Mongolians published a Country Information Note, Democratic Governance Indicators, and a National Plan of Action), while still others, such as the Philippines project, published books devoted to each pillar of the framework separately.

**Ease of implementation**

The origins, funding and form of the assessments differ greatly. The pilot assessments funded by International IDEA were all university-based and most of the non-International IDEA assessments so far – nine of the individual country assessments and the South Asian regional assessment – have their roots in universities, but there have been wide variations in the funding and in the process of assessment, ranging from nationally and internationally well-funded assessments (e.g. those undertaken in Australia, Latvia and Mongolia) to those that have been under-resourced and have been carried out in piecemeal fashion (e.g. the assessments in New Zealand and the Philippines).

Three assessments (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ireland and the UK) sprang from civil society, while two (the Netherlands and Mongolia) were mainly government-led.

The breadth of the investigations necessary to conduct full assessments has generally obliged the projects to involve a wide range of contributors. Assessment teams have variously comprised national and international academics, researchers and analysts from intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, members of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, and representatives from civil society and the media. The norm seems to be that projects generally have a small core team which coordinates the research and drafts reports together with a wider set of experts, who have often been recruited from outside the bounds of the institution carrying out the assessment and who usually seem to work independently of each other.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

There is scope in the framework for using existing measures while at the same time incorporating much more context-specific information on the quality of democracy that can then be linked to domestic processes of democratic reform.

All the assessments that have taken place have remained committed to the standard methodology and the central principle of local ownership of the assessment process that encompasses the research, analysis and consultation processes, and the identification of priorities for future reform.

**Further information**

African Peer Review Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Africa. 29 African countries have signed up to the APRM. As of September 2010, 14 member states had been peer reviewed, of which reports are available for Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda.</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Governance and Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Governance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is an instrument voluntarily acceded to by African Union member states meant to function as an African self–monitoring mechanism. Its primary purpose is to foster the adoption of appropriate laws, policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development, and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration. The overarching goal of the APRM is for all participating countries to accelerate their progress towards adopting and implementing the priorities and programs of The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (“NEPAD”).

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) was formally launched by the African Union at its Durban Summit in 2002.

**Methodology**

The APR process is designed so that countries at different levels of development and governance can join—countries will not be judged against a hard pass-fail system. Rather, the review intends to candidly assess the country’s biggest problems, identify needed actions and secure commitments from the country under review for fixing those problems.

To measure performance and progress, key objectives, standards, criteria and indicators have been identified in the four key areas of review: Democracy and Political Governance, Economic Governance and Management, Corporate Governance, and Socio-Economic Development.

The APR process follows five broad phases:

It begins with an initial consultation between the APR Secretariat and the country to be reviewed. This consultation should provide an overview of the process and work out the terms of a memorandum of understanding governing the review. The country under review is required to create an APR Focal Point to coordinate with the APR Secretariat. At the same time, the country must also complete the APR self-assessment questionnaire and gather broad input from civil society. In many countries very extensive consultations are undertaken.

An expert team visits the country, meeting with government, business, academics, parliamentarians, the media and other members of civil society to assess the draft national Programme of Action. Team members are not permanent staff and are appointed only for work on a given country visit and report. The country visit is to last three weeks. The visiting team will consist of one member of the panel of eminent persons, one administrative
person and four experts drawn from partner institutions, including the UN Development Programme, UN Economic Commission for Africa, the African Development Bank and African Union bodies.

The country review team drafts its report, sharing its findings with the government being assessed. Government responses are then appended to the team report and, if needed, the National Programme of Action is modified according to the team’s findings.

The Panel of Eminent Persons writes recommendations for policy reforms based on the s findings. The heads of state in the APR Forum then discuss the panel’s recommendations with the leader of the country under review.

In this stage, which must be completed within six months of the start of the review, the final report is made public and tabled in the African Union, Pan-African Parliament, Peace and Security Council, Economic, Social and Cultural Council and other relevant bodies. The APR Secretariat also follows up on commitments made, holds regional workshops to share best practices identified in the reviews and offers technical support to assist countries in fulfilling their APR plans.

Citizens and organizations must be involved in the process from the moment the country signs up and should be part of the initial planning processes. Citizens and organisations would be active in appointing a governing council and lobby to serve on such bodies. They should play a watch-dog role to ensure the integrity of the process. All groups must make official submissions which can be fed into the country self-assessment report and should use the media to publicise their view.

Geographic coverage
Whole country.

Time of implementation and frequency
Follow-up reviews are supposed to be conducted every three to five years.

Data collection
Self-assessment; secondary data; 3-week country visit; interviews

Reporting format
Narrative report, which is made public six months after it has been considered by the Heads of State and Government of participating member countries.

Ease of implementation
The APR Secretariat must prepare a background document assessing the country to be reviewed, drawing on up-to-date information from national, sub-regional, regional and international organisations. The APR Secretariat also prepares a document outlining the nation’s major issues. For this work, the APR Secretariat will require the country focal point to gather relevant laws, treaty ratifications, budgets and development plans and forward them to the APR Secretariat. In addition, the government must also draft a paper outlining the nation’s big issues and a National Programme of Action containing clear steps and deadlines for how the country intends to conform with APR codes and standards, the African Union Charter and UN obligations.

Based on the above documents, the APR Secretariat then writes a report outlining the central issues upon which the review process will be focused.

Details of its intended implementation have shifted somewhat over time as the process has unfolded. In its present form, APRM is supposed to take six to nine months from inception to completion of the written report.

Strengths and weaknesses
The APRM is a unique mechanism which has the potential to hold leaders and stakeholders accountable, make all forms and levels of government transparent, and seek collective, sustainable and equitable solutions to common problems. In addition, it can encourage and support the process of modernization of Africa’s indigenous mode of governance, putting into motion a strategic re-orientation (Renaissance) towards the validation of universal as well as African values. It can also accelerate the process of intra-Africa technical cooperation through popularising best practices identified in each of the country reviewed.

The implementation of APRM so far has not been perfectly smooth. It has been fraught with a number of challenges, including financial, capacity, procedural, operational and political issues both at the national and continental levels. Two key challenges pertain to the awareness and ownership of NEPAD, and the fact that very often, civil society organisation participation is limited to ‘window dressing’. Furthermore, a number of partners and participating countries consider the process to be too long and the responsibility for follow-up is unclear.

Further information
http://www.aprm-international.org/
http://saiia.org.za/aprmtoolkit
http://www.nepad.org/economicandcorporategovernance/african-peer-review-mechanism/about
3.3 COUNTRY-SPECIFIC GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS AND MEASUREMENTS

Afghanistan

A Survey of the Afghan People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption, Democracy, Governance and Gender, Media, Parliament, Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**
Developed by the Asia Foundation, this nationwide assessment of Afghan public opinion aims to provide policy makers and influential actors in government, civil society, the international community, and the broader Afghan citizenry with useful, actionable information.

**Methodology**

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country – there was a sampling of all regions. In cases in which conflict affected the sampling points, alternate points in the same region were utilized.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
The survey was completed in the midst of a conflict situation. The latest round was conducted between June 17 and July 6, 2009.

This survey has been completed six times, on an annual basis. The 2010 Survey was released in November 2010.

**Data collection**
Fieldwork for the survey was conducted by the Afghan Center for Socio-economic and Opinion Research (ACSOR-Surveys), Kabul, by a team of 648 trained interviewers (300 women and 348 men). The survey consisted of in-person interviews with a random, representative sample of 6,406 Afghan citizens 18 years of age and over. Targets were resident in Afghanistan both rural and urban. The data was weighted to adjust for over and under sampling in particular geographic areas.
Reporting format
This was presented in the form of a narrative report (interview questionnaire as annex).

Ease of implementation
There is an organized methodology and subsequent training program for all individuals involved in the interview process. Since the program was implemented as a partnership between the Asia Foundation, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and ACSOR, it had strong international support.

Strengths and weaknesses
This assessment has consistently measured public perception systematically in each year, making it an important public policy tool and general gauge of public opinion in Afghanistan. It makes use of both male and female interviewers to overcome possible gender issues. When security problems or inconsistencies in village names made it impossible to conduct sampling in the same villages as in previous surveys, replacement sampling points in the same region were used. Supervisors, the ACSOR central office, and the Asia Foundation back-checked interviews to monitor quality control. Experts, stakeholders and donors were consulted during revisions to the methodology before the 2009 implementation.

The biggest weakness of the assessment was demonstrated in 2009: in three southern provinces the deteriorated security situation restricted the freedom of movement, making it unsafe to employ female interviewers. This meant that no women were included in the sample in these provinces.

Further information
http://asiafoundation.org/publications/pdf/627
National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment: Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society, Corruption, Governance and Gender, Governance and MDG/Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by Afghanistan’s Central Statistics Organization with the objective of providing important information for development policies and Afghanistan’s Poverty Reduction Strategy.

**Methodology**

This assessment uses a gender-specific household survey of over 20,000 respondents on key issues of concern in Afghanistan. The key indicators are population structure and change, labor force characteristics, the agricultural sector, poverty incidence and poverty profiling, education, health, housing, position of women, and household shocks and community preferences.

**Geographic coverage**

The 2007/08 assessment covers the whole country of Afghanistan with representative statistics generated for 34 provinces, 11 urban centers, and the nomadic pastoralists.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The assessment was conducted amidst active conflict. The fieldwork started in mid-August 2007 and lasted up to the end of August 2008.

**Sustainability**

The NRVA has been implemented three times, in 2003, 2005, and 2007/08.

**Data collection**

Mainly done through a questionnaire data collection took place at individual/household, district and Shura levels in a total of 20,576 households in 2007/08. It involved 156 field staff trained for 17 days, managed by the government Central Statistics Organization (CSO) and Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD). Stakeholders were consulted in survey design and questionnaire development through two consultative sessions. The draft questionnaires were tested twice in the field and a pilot test of the questionnaires took place in five regions for further and final improvements. Questionnaires had male- and female-specific sections administered by corresponding male and female interviewers. The questionnaires were translated into Dari and Pashto.

**Reporting format**

The results of the assessment were reported in both a narrative report and a summary brochure, both of which incorporate related charts. The summary brochure was released in multiple languages.

**Ease of implementation**
The survey was jointly conducted by MRRD and CSO, and with co-operation and funding from the European Commission (EC) and ICON Institute (a German consulting group). It was heavily reliant on the EC for funding of a food security monitor, and for a requested one year extension. The EC, the UN’s World Food Program (WFP), UNICEF, the World Bank (WB), the Asia Development Bank (ADB) and UK’s Department of International Development (DFID) all contributed to field data collection and funding. The assessment also relied on a number of international consultants.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

The NRVA, as it stands today, is the only comprehensive nationwide multi-purpose household survey in Afghanistan, enabling a large amount of cross-section analysis. The survey builds upon lessons from past surveys. For example, it was conducted year-round to reduce seasonality bias experienced in past surveys. It is also conducted by the same project team to ensure consistency. A process of stakeholder consultation provided input into the survey design and especially the development of the questionnaire.

The ongoing conflict forced interviewers to come up with creative ways to access households and collect high-quality data while avoiding insurgents and other violent situations. There was one incident of kidnapping, as well as cases of looting, frostbite, and a fatal road accident.

**Further information**


and


Public Services Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and Service Delivery, Corruption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by Integrity Watch Afghanistan (IWA) to monitor the quality of public services, mainly focusing on issues of integrity, transparency and corruption, identify areas of corrupt practices and inefficiencies that hinder the delivery of public services, and provide recommendations and solutions to decision-makers in order to simplify public service procedures and improve access to public services.

For the survey on corruption (see methodology section below), specific objectives are to assess the impact of corruption on the relationship between Afghan citizens and the state, the trust in state and non-state institutions, the perceived support of the international community for anti-corruption efforts, and the links of corruption and perceptions of corruption with insurgency and conflict.

**Methodology**

At least two separate initiatives fall within the Public Services Monitoring (PSM) arm of Integrity Watch Afghanistan. The first one is a national survey on Afghan perceptions and experiences of corruption, first initiated in 2006 and repeated in 2007, 2008 and 2010. This survey is focused on petty or administrative corruption, particularly in the provision of public services. Issues related to grand corruption and political corruption, as well as organized crime, are only partially addressed. A Provincial Integrity Index is produced as an aggregate indicator formed from five sub-indicators (the reported amounts of bribes paid by households; the reported number of service bribes paid by households; the individual integrity; the anti-corruption performance of state officials, and the support of the international community for honest officials).

The second initiative under the PSM focuses more broadly on assessing the challenges of public service delivery, including, but not limited to, transparency and corruption. Initiated in 2009, this monitoring process is divided into three stages comprising ten steps. The first stage focuses on Mapping and Survey in order to identify reform-minded organisations and includes (1) Pre-Assessment (to assess and identify reform minded ministries/municipalities and viable public service delivery procedures based on a set of predetermined criteria); (2) Mapping (to visualise the current delivery mechanism); (3) Focus Group Discussions (with civil servants and end-users, in order to identify some of the problems and potential solutions related to accessing the relevant public service); (4) Design of Survey Questionnaire (including general, technical and demographic questions); (5) Survey of 1000 end-users and collection of data in a centralised database for analysis. The second stage focuses on Policy Decisions, and involves (1) Development of a final report that highlights the problems, inefficiencies and vulnerabilities to corruption within each given procedure, major causes and consequences, inefficiencies and problems that affect public service delivery, and provides recommendations for change; (2) A workshop to share the report and its recommendations with relevant government bodies and; (3) Public Release of the report whereby it is shared with civil society, relevant stakeholders, unions and public service users; (4) Implementation of Reforms, including those that can be implemented without assistance, and those that require external financial and technical support. The final stage involves assessment of the Policy Impact, which is done through a feedback survey, conducted six months to a year after procedure simplification.

**Geographic coverage**

Various iterations of the corruption survey have covered virtually the whole of Afghanistan (32 of the 34 provinces). The broader PSM initiative has been initiated only in pilot ministries and municipalities.
**Time of implementation and frequency**

The corruption survey has been carried out in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2010. The frequency of other PSM assessments is unknown.

**Data collection**

The corruption survey covered 6,500 respondents. Data was gathered using paper and Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) by the surveyors. Surveyors always operated in teams of two, one male and one female. The numbers of respondents selected were determined in proportion to the relative population in the provinces. The urban and rural composition of the country was also represented in the survey sample - one quarter of the respondents came from urban centres, while three quarters came from rural areas. The survey also captured a diversity of groups based on age, marital status, socio-professional status, income and literacy. It was, furthermore, based on the ethnic breakdown of the country.

The PSM assessment covers 1000 respondents (end-users) and data is collected using PDAs by the surveyors. In addition, Focus Group Discussions are conducted in order to elicit the views of civil servants and service providers. The results are combined in the narrative report.

**Reporting format**

Both surveys result in narrative reports which highlight the results, findings and propose recommendations.

**Ease of implementation**

The corruption survey was conducted by 58 surveyors. Many of them took the risk of conducting interviews in insecure areas. In five provinces with multiple security challenges, surveyors conducted interviews in in specific places known for the gathering of people from rural districts, such as bus stations, truck depots, fresh vegetable markets, camps for IDPS, labour market sites for skilled or unskilled manpower, hotels, university dormitories, etc. In areas where the presence of the Taliban was stronger, the use of PDAs was seen as dangerous by some surveyors and was therefore abandoned.

Information on specific implementation issues relating to PSM assessments are not yet known.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

The advantages of Public Service Monitoring as well as the corruption survey are that they contribute to administrative reform through the evaluation of citizens’ perceptions and experiences, and bring integrity and simplification to public service procedures, eventually contributing towards an improved relationship between citizens and the state.

A particular weakness or challenge with the corruption survey was that due to a mix of security and logistical challenges at the time of data collection (2010), two provinces had to be dropped. For the same reasons, the surveyors did not get access to remote districts in a few provinces. Because of the limited scope of the survey, the links with organized crime, grand corruption and the drug economy were not explored.

**Further information**

http://www.iwaweb.org/public_services_monitoring.html

http://www.iwaweb.org/corruptionsurvey2010
Arab Countries

Arab Democracy Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Index covers ten Arab countries (Egypt, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, occupied Palestinian territory, Lebanon, Syria, Algeria, Yemen and Kuwait), with the mission to eventually cover all the countries in the Arab world</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives

Developed by the (Arab Reform Initiative (ARI) and the Palestinian Centre for Policy and Survey Research) to provide a regular Arab evaluation of change in the region. This Index is an extension of the experience of the Palestinian Centre for Research and Studies, and the Palestinian Centre for Policy and Survey Research, for the preparation and publication of the “Palestine Democracy Index”.

The Index seeks to play a leading role in the battle to win free access to information as a basic right of citizens. It offers detailed findings that can be used for survey based research and a set of recommendations for policymakers. Further, to provide a tool to measure change over time and to compare situations among different countries.

Methodology

The study measures forty indicators to gauge four major values and principles relevant to the democratization process: strong and accountable public institutions, respect for rights and freedoms, the rule of law, and equality and social justice. The selected indicators measure daily political, economic and social issues, and reflect the entire democratic decision-making process.

The Arab Democracy Index takes into consideration both impressions and patterns of behaviour, and measures their impact on citizens’ daily lives. It revolves around the centrality of the notion of citizenship, instead of political authority.

Geographic coverage

Whole country.

Time of implementation and frequency

The initiative has been carried out twice in two years for all the countries originally listed.

The methodology is in its second year and is showing signs of vitality, as the number of countries assessed has increased and is expected to increase as well in the following years, to cover the whole region.

Data collection

Data gathered for the Arab Democracy Index cover three different dimensions: the legal aspect, public opinion, and practices of regimes. Measurement is therefore based on monitoring performance and behaviour rather than just examining intentions and structures. Data relevant to the forty indicators is collected annually.
As much as possible, basic sources of information are utilised, and the necessary information is obtained from independent and varied sources. The Index also pays special attention to public opinion, and allocates a quarter of the indicators to it. In cases where precise information could not be obtained, or the results reached did not provide a clear-cut result (due to contradictory information, or because of obvious disparities between official data and data from the field), evaluation of experts from the countries concerned has been used.

Information used in the Index comes from both government and non-government sources. Government sources include ministries, intelligence and security agencies, central statistics departments, parliamentary committees, parliamentary secretariats, higher judicial councils and court administrations, as each case required, as well as local government centres, like regional, tribal and municipal councils; non-governmental sources include civil society organisations, unions and relevant professional associations, local newspapers and the internet. In order to capture citizen's impressions and assessment of the situation, opinion surveys especially designed for the Index were carried out by technically qualified teams.

**Reporting format**
Annual narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**
Information is not available

**Strengths and weaknesses**
This Index has its own advantages, restrictions and limitations; it shows the status of democratic transition in the Arab world, and a number of important relevant details, in a quick and coordinated manner. It also gives the reader the opportunity to easily monitor change on a yearly basis, and to pinpoint obvious areas of political change or stagnation. The ability of the chosen indicators to monitor the process of democratic transition is no doubt limited, and a numerical score, to a certain degree, simplifies it and takes it out of context.

The Arab Democracy Index falls short of capturing some complex phenomena which are critical in order to understand the political realities of Arab countries. The four qualitative analyses included in the Index are successful in shedding some light on these realities. However, transition processes require multi-track monitoring and analysis of key issues, such as the relationship between the business community and the government as well as the role of the private sector as a player in the reform process; the composition and evolution of the security sector and the potential for reforming it; women's visions of reform and their aspirations; or the changing strategies of political movements and the experiences of dialogues and coalition-building between various ideological currents which are underway in several countries. These and other fields of reform are studied through specific research projects and policy papers conducted by the ARI's network.

**Further information**
http://arab-reform.net/spip.php?article2990andlang=en

http://arab-reform.net/IMG/pdf/annual_rep_010_english.pdf
## Post-crisis Environmental Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territory, Lebanon, and Sudan</td>
<td>Conflict, Governance and Gender, Governance and MDG/Service Delivery, Land Governance, Peace Consolidation, Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stated objectives

Developed by the United Nations Environment Programme, each assessment has its own objectives.

In the occupied Palestinian territory, the purpose of the project was to assess the environmental impact of ongoing conflict on the areas of waste management, biodiversity and institutional capacity.

In Lebanon there were three key objectives:

- To obtain baseline data on the environment in Lebanon after the conflict;
- To identify issues of concern constituting a threat to public health and requiring urgent remediation measures; and
- To identify other issues of concern that should be taken into consideration during the post-conflict reconstruction process, and to develop recommendations for addressing those issues in a sustainable way.

In Sudan the goal was to develop a solid technical basis for medium-term (1-5 years) corrective action in the field of environmental protection and sustainable development. This goal was expanded into five objectives:

- Provide neutral and objective information on the most critical environmental problems facing the country, and on the potential risks to human health, livelihoods and ecosystem services;
- Recommend strategic priorities for sustainable resource management and identify the actors, timelines and costs necessary for implementation;
- Facilitate the development of national environmental policy and strengthen the capacity for national environmental governance;
- Raise awareness and catalyze financial support for environmental projects by national authorities, UN actors, NGOs and donors; and
- Integrate environmental issues into the recovery and reconstruction process.

### Methodology

The UNEP assessment uses a set of investigative technical procedures to identify, evaluate and mitigate the physical, social and other relevant impacts of a given event or project on the environment, with specific
attention given to land and water. The process comprises four main phases: (1) Reconnaissance, (2) Soil and Water Sampling, (3) Laboratory analysis and Reporting.

The Lebanon assessment investigated issues relating to solid and hazardous waste, industrial contamination, coastal and marine contamination, water resources, asbestos and weapons used.

Geographic coverage

In the occupied Palestinian territory, the assessment specifically includes soil and water samples collected in Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip. In Lebanon, a visual prescreening was conducted at 75 sites of particular interest due to critical damage sustained in conflict. Later, samples were taken from 100 sites throughout the country. In Sudan all states were covered; the geographical scope extended to the coastline and included territorial seas.

Time of implementation and frequency

In the occupied Palestinian territory the desk study was completed in 2002-2003 during conflict. The follow-up sampling was completed in 2005 post-conflict.

Data was collected in Lebanon between September 30, 2006 and October 21, 2006 in a post-conflict environment.

In Sudan, fieldwork, analysis, and implementation of the assessment were completed between December 2005 and March 2007, in the post-conflict phase.

Data collection

Upon request from national governments, UNEP conducts detailed post-crisis environmental assessments based on fieldwork, laboratory analysis and state-of-the-art technology.

In the occupied Palestinian territory, data was collected through a desk study phase including a survey of the region by satellite imagery, a review of the findings of previous reports and the collation of local anecdotal information. This was followed by field observation and a preliminary evaluation of potential environmental impacts through collection and analysis of soil and water samples by UNEP teams. Local researchers were used including a Palestinian research institute and Israeli and Palestinian labs in addition to the independent international laboratory.

In Lebanon, in addition to international experts, samples and data were submitted to local agencies (e.g. Ministry of Environment.) Students from local university environmental science programs participated as volunteers.

The assessment in Sudan involved ten fact-finding and field missions and over 2,000 interviews. Consultation with local and international stakeholders formed a large and continuous part of the assessment work. Parties consulted included representatives of federal, state and local governments, NGOs, academic and research institutions, international agencies, community leaders, farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and business people.

Reporting format

The assessments are presented in the form of a web dashboard that includes links to common topics within the UNEP environmental assessment initiatives. They include links to relevant desk studies and results of sampling in narrative form.

Ease of implementation

The assessment requires highly trained experts as well as an internationally accredited laboratory. Both international and local experts were used.
**Strengths and weaknesses**

Results can serve as a baseline of the environmental situation, which can be compared to internationally recognized screening values and end-user standards for purposes of intervention planning or resource usage. The wide range of data types and high degree of scientific testing make results highly credible and comprehensive. Results are gathered to create a tool for government, civil society and others to use.

On the other hand, assessments faced some challenges related to sampling, sometimes due to security concerns that limited access to some sites, but also seasonal and other reasons. They also faced time-lag problems, where certain conclusions could not accurately be drawn due to when field work was conducted compared to satellite image analysis and disengagement. In some cases pre-conflict satellite imagery was not available. The assessments did not take gender or poverty issues into account.

**Further information**

The Balkans

Early Warning System Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)</td>
<td>Security, Conflict, Peace consolidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives
Creation of system that monitors essential crisis indicators and avert potential conflicts and crises. As a management tool, Early Warning, together with forecasting and prediction, aims to inform about a conflict or crisis stemming from instability or tension, and thus enable strategic policymaking. Developed by UNDP, it aims to be a key operational and policy tool by deriving prescriptions from trend analysis and monitoring indicators.

Methodology
In Kosovo, the methodology includes four main sections: political and institutional stability, the socio-economic situation, interethnic relations, and personal and public security. In addition, the last report (April-June 2010) also includes a special chapter on the Kosovo environment. Indicators are monitored on a periodic basis, thus allowing trend analysis. However, the total number of indicators used is unclear from available documentation.

In BiH, the methodology addresses the following topics: Political stability; Institutional stability; Economic stability; The business environment; Income and social welfare; Social inclusion; Ethnic relations; Public and personal security. The topics are analysed through 5 EWS indices monitored through 37 researching waves in BiH.

Both methodologies (and reports) have clearly originated from the same regional initiative by UNDP. The major topics evaluated are also similar. The only difference, however, could be identified in the format of the reporting. The reports produced by UNDP BiH seem to be more detailed and as they further disaggregate the four main categories.

Geographic coverage
Whole country.

Time of implementation and frequency
Since its inception, the methodology has been applied more than twenty times in either country, usually on a quarterly basis.

Data collection
In BiH, primary data is collected through quarterly public surveys across the country using the method of face-to-face interviews (sample size was between 1750-1950 households per quarter) plus quarterly business oriented surveys with the sample size not less than 150 companies.

In Kosovo, mixed methods are used - national opinion poll surveys, with a sample assuring impartial representation of the attitudes of all residents of Kosovo regardless of their ethnicity, age or geographical location; along with Expert Group meetings or Focus Group workshops with some 10-20 local experts for each
polling cycle (a mix of UNDP Kosovo) staff and civil society). Local experts, think tanks, government advisers, security institutions, journalists and independent analysts are actively involved.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report, presenting also quantitative data, indices, and trends analyses. In Bosnia, the report is produced in English and Bosnian. In Kosovo, the report is produced in Albanian, Serbian, and English, and includes an additional chapter summarising the focus group discussions.

**Ease of implementation**

UNDP EWS Project staff provided managerial, administrative and logistical support to the EWS process. Teams of local experts, led by the EWS Team leader and the Editor, had substantive role in analysing primary and secondary data and making the EWS quarterly, annually and ad-hoc publications.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Early Warning System Report remains one of the most trusted, accurate, objective and credible systems for the identification, prediction of crises in and their monitoring across the region. The quality of the reports in terms of complexity and usefulness of the data has dramatically improved, demonstrating a substantial improvement in the independent indigenous analytical and forecasting capacity of the socio-economic, political, and security factors. The recommendations from focus groups also allow continuous improvement of the methodology.

**Further information**


http://www.ks.undp.org/?cid=2,169
Rights-based Municipal Assessment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-8</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina (though derived from a global assessment framework)</td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives

The overall objective of the original Rights-Based Municipal Assessment Project (RMAP 2002-4) was the improvement in the enjoyment of human rights in the local population through municipal development programming. It originated from a concern that grassroots human rights information was either undocumented or publicly undisclosed, thereby inhibiting action to effectively overcome problems faced by vulnerable groups.

Although RMAP initially only planned to conduct human rights-based assessments it was supplemented by additional planning and implementation stages during which the assessment methodology became an integral part of a Municipal Development Programme.

Methodology

The main steps for assessment and analysis identified in the initial RMAP are:

- Identify problems and the human rights affected;
- Set the priorities (prioritise problems to assess/analyse through participatory approaches and based on the importance of the problems for the population as a whole and the vulnerable groups in particular);
- Identify actors (identify claim holders, and specifically vulnerable groups; identify duty bearers at all levels of authority; identify “forces at work”, i.e. other non-state actors which influence claim holders and duty bearers, such as religious communities, media, international donors, etc.);
- Information collection (develop rights based indicators and identify sources of information);
- Analysis (causal analysis/capacity analysis/Vulnerability analysis/ identification of entitlements and obligations under international HR law);
- Report drafting.

The RMAP Project has not developed its own set of rights-based indicators but provides the teams with a number of tools. A Tools Synergy Table explains the tools developed and clarifies which tool needs to be used at which step of the assessment and analysis.

The primary tool was a ‘Human Rights Checklists’, which compiled relevant extracts of international human rights law and accompanying interpretation and set out human rights standards, principles, normative contents of rights, obligations of duty bearers, entitlements of claim holders and relevant case law from the European Court of Human. It provides an essential reference guide on international rights standard underlying all assessment and analysis. Rights covered a wide selection of rights or sectors.

To supplement the checklists and help the teams identify particularly vulnerable groups and the specific issues they might have, RMAP has developed a number of other tools:
• ‘Domestic Legal Framework Checklists’ compiling relevant national laws formatted along the same lines as the HR checklist.

• ‘Vulnerable Groups List’: questions based on international human rights standards and related specifically to vulnerable groups that exist in BiH (e.g. victims of domestic violence, female heads of households, people with disabilities, children, national minorities, in particular Roma, and those in detention).

• ‘Civil Society List’: questions and baseline indicators based on international standards related to civil society.

• ‘Basic Gender Indicators list’: basic indicators to assess gender equality and equity and mainstream gender in the analysis.

• ‘Human Rights-based Quality Assurance Checklist’: summarises all the main elements of a human rights based analysis.

The fully developed Rights-based Municipal Development Programme (RMDP) contained a separate assessment and analysis stage which undertook community assessment and drafting of community profiles. It took as its point of departure that a local development strategy must be based on accurate information on the present condition of the local community. It is based on secondary statistical data supplemented if necessary by collection of qualitative data.

The assessment used the conceptual guidance of human rights (Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) analysis to widen and deepen the analysis of local development shortcomings and potentials and introduced accountability analysis in human rights terms. A development and human rights perspective was integrated into the scope of data collection, the analysis of data as well as the provision of capacity development for local partners. The project applied human rights as a mapping device for specific sectors in defining targets, indicators and methods of data collection.

Application of these tools ensured avoiding analytic gridlock, lessening the complexity and transferring the methodology to partners.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country – initially 25 municipalities are selected covering all geographic areas and urban and rural settlements. The approach is now being rolled out on a national basis.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The original initiative has been carried out in 25 municipalities, with a report produced for each. The assessment has now become an integral part of the development planning process when local development plans are drawn up. Monitoring of implementation by local partners has been foreseen but not planned in detail.

**Data collection**

RMAP operated through municipal-level assessment and planning teams. All field team members are all BiH citizens with different educational backgrounds. Each team has three or four members who live in the municipalities for four to five months.

RMAP teams talked with representatives of municipal, cantonal and entity governments, civil society and various citizens’ groups. Administrative data was collected and multiple indicators aggregated. Focus groups, interviews and secondary sources are also used to gather a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. This requires practitioners to acquire a deeper understanding of inequalities in the development process, human rights norms and mediation and communication skills.
Reporting format
Narrative report.

Ease of implementation
The implementation of a human–rights based approach demands adequate tools and a balance of analysis and process. Tailoring the approach to local development planning in BiH it proved pertinent to engage an interdisciplinary project team reflecting different perspectives, methods and skills. Building the capacity of stakeholders can take significant amounts of time, however, it can take even longer to produce visible results.

Strengths and weaknesses
Originally intended only as an assessment project the programme developed over the years into a fully-fledged municipal development programme reflecting the challenges and opportunities identified in the process. Application of a human-rights based approach functions best as when used as a complement to conventional best practice for development planning but does not in itself secure the realization of human rights.

Further information
The programme structure and the associated website has been closed but the UNDP office in Bosnia-Herzegovina has additional information and can be contacted at registry@undp.ba.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bosnia - Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**
Developed by UNDP to provide a much greater understanding of the ties that bind members of society together in Bosnia-Herzegovina – informal familial and local neighbourhood relations as well as formal associations, clubs and organizations. In addition, the report demonstrated the links between social capital and human development. It included reporting of the standard Human Development Indices for BiH based on the accepted UN definitions: the Human Development Index (HDI), the Human Poverty Index (HPI), the Gender Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM).

**Methodology**
Approximately 125 questions for public opinion survey on social capital, supplemented by focus groups

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country

**Time of implementation and frequency**
2009, one-time exercise

**Data collection**
Survey (sample size: 1623 interviews). Questionnaire elaborated by UNDP and adapted by a local social research company. The quantitative research component was complemented by nine focus groups discussions, considering three categories: (1) Marginalized groups among which we expected higher levels of network poverty (minority returnees, residents in collective centres, isolated elderly people), (2) Groups at risk of social exclusion and network poverty (unemployed women, young people wishing to work abroad), and (3) Groups that can report on examples of both inclusive and exclusive social capital in BiH.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report

**Ease of implementation**
UNDP NHDR Project team provided managerial, administrative and logistical support to the NHDR making process. A group of international and local experts, led by the UNDP NHDR Team leader and the author with support of local researching agency and statistician, had substantive role in analysing quantitative and qualitative data and making the report.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
Participatory data collection, including triangulated data between public opinion survey and CSO focus groups; results disaggregated by gender. Socioeconomic information collected but results not disaggregated by most marginalized groups; no formal participatory process for method design; method does not give explicit attention to poverty

**Further information:**
Mapping the Socio-economic Disparities among Macedonian Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Macedonia FYR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and MDG/Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

The ultimate goal of this UNDP project was to strengthen democracy in the country, improve local governance and economic prospects recognized as vital to peace-building efforts. The objective of the mapping exercise is to obtain substantive and accurate data on socio-economic variables in all 124 municipalities. Information collected from the mapping exercise would serve as an input to the preparation on the Law on Municipal Boundaries by providing indicators necessary for defining economically viable administrative units. Further, the findings from the mapping exercise will indicate the financial capacities of the municipalities, including their ability to raise revenues locally, which will be crucial for choosing the most appropriate model for financing. These indicators will also affect policy decisions on reallocation of budget funds for economically depressed areas.

**Methodology**

The proposed mapping was expected to include general information related to the profile of the municipality as well as in-depth sectoral analysis which was to reveal the level of social, economic and human capacities of municipalities.

Broadly the mapping provides the following information:

- **General Country Profile**
  - General indicators (macroeconomic and other vital statistics)
  - Decentralization reform update

- **Common profile of municipal environment**
  - Basic operational conditions, division of tasks between local authorities and the Government
  - Overview of the range of capacities of local governments to provide public services

- **Characteristics of municipalities**
  - Basic data (population, ethnic structure, land area, official contacts)
  - Public services (organization of public utility services, coverage of urban and rural areas; assets and infrastructure in water supply, waste collection, public transportation, sewage, road maintenance etc.)
  - Security and emergency response (local police, fire department, civil defense etc.)
• Economic indicators (labour base, employment, major industries, unemployment, GDP per capita etc.)
• Fiscal arrangements (annual budgets, local sources of revenue, government subsidies, municipality property, structure of expenditures etc.)
• Local Civil Service Capacity (management arrangements, number and structure of public sector employees, skills base in the public sector, equitable representation)
• Communications network (roads, public transport, telephone network)

• Sectoral profiles
  • Education (facilities, enrolment, faculty capacity, access, student retention)
  • Health service (facilities, health practitioners, coverage, localized health risks, preventive care, reproductive health)
  • Social welfare (facilities and institutions – elderly, children, special needs, shelters, social services practitioners, availability)
  • Culture, Leisure, Sports (theaters, museums, libraries, concert halls, sport facilities, tourism, events)
  • Urban development and housing (planning and zoning, housing characteristics)

The methodology and the resulting data were meant to be shared with the National Statistics Bureau and integrated into the regular statistical surveys. This project was considered to be fully in line with the Government’s commitments related to monitoring of progress towards achievement of MDGs in general, and in terms of recommendations for obtaining disaggregated data on municipalities and overcoming the existing data gap, in particular. The output of this project was to be used as a baseline for development of facts-based projects in the country.

Geographic coverage
124 municipalities.

Time of implementation and frequency
One-time exercise. There is no information available as to the length of the project and on whether the initiative has been sustained. Only the original intentions attached to the project and its methodology are known.

Data collection
Every effort was made to obtain data disaggregated by gender, ethnic affiliation, age, urban/rural, etc. Data collection and reporting formats was to be consistent with nationally established MDG tracking standards.

In addition to factual and quantitative data, an assessment of the quality and satisfaction with the provision of public services was to be conducted as part of the field survey.

The project was to be implemented in close cooperation with the Ministry of Local Self Government and the Ministry of Finance. In addition, selected number of staff from the Agency for Development of Underdeveloped Regions and the National Statistics Office were to be actively involved in the mapping process, through the receipt of full-scale training in the newly developed mapping methodology.

Reporting format
A series of (narrative) report, available online.

Ease of implementation
The mapping exercise was expected to be implemented for a period of ten months.

Strengths and weaknesses
The developed methodology and the resulting data were to be shared with the National Statistics Bureau and integrated into the regular statistical surveys. At the end of the process, the methodology and the database were to be handed over to the National Statistical Office. It was expected that the Statistical Office would utilize this exercise to identify the most easily obtainable data and augment its regular surveys as well as propose a methodology for obtaining disaggregated data at annual intervals.

Further information
http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/show/DB5525BB-F203-1EE9-B50DCE335180928C
Index of Responsibility, Transparency and Accountability at local level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Macedonia FYR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption, Governance and MDG/Service Delivery, Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives

Developed by UNDP to make measurable assessments of the capacity of a given institution to combat corruption, by identifying those ‘points’ most vulnerable to corruption, the specific mechanisms that can be used to prevent corruption, indicators measuring the effectiveness of these mechanisms, and criteria to score these indicators.

Methodology

The Index of responsibility, transparency and accountability (RTA) at local level covers the areas of: public procurement, urban planning and financial management. The Methodology is a guideline for the creation of a tailor-made instrument for measuring the level of RTA for the countries where it will be implemented. It is designed to be used in virtually any transition country.

Perceptions from experts and users of municipal services have been used as an important source in the design of the tool, namely to identify corruption “hot spots” which need to be monitored. For each of the three focus areas, the Index identifies four aspects:

1. 10 to 15 “hot-spots” or “critical points” for corruption in local government,
2. the corresponding anticorruption mechanisms that can prevent the appearance of corrupt practices
3. the corresponding indicators of the existence and proper functioning of such mechanisms.
4. The scoring of indicators based on well-defined criteria

The final RTA Index value is obtained by the simple arithmetic average value of the indicator scores.

Geographic coverage

Municipalities. The methodology was implemented as part of a pilot project in four municipalities of the FYR of Macedonia (Tetovo, Veles, Bitola and Gevgelija), and in 2008 it was expected to be scaled up through a wider second phase.

Time of implementation and frequency

So far a one-time exercise. A second phase was expected in 2008, but no confirmation is available.

Data collection

Identification of hot spots rely to a large extend on expert advice, but the collection of data that are used for compilation of the index is based on objective information, including available administrative data on budgets, procedures and functions related to the local public administration.

Reporting format

Index
Ease of implementation

Simplicity and user friendliness of the Methodology and the Instrument are of high importance for their acceptance by the stakeholders and their sustainability. Hence it is designed in a way that does not require highly specialized skills for implementation. At the same time, it would be more convenient, if the Methodology is implemented in the beginning by a specifically trained professional implementation agency, before local government units start their self-evaluation.

One of the main challenges the project faced was to identify national experts who (in partnership with international experts) would facilitate the development of a methodology for tracking the level of corruption at local level.

In order to avoid problems in the initial implementation of the instrument and not to jeopardize its capacity to combat corruption, it should be initially implemented by a specifically trained agency. In the process of initial implementation, the team of the agency would include officials, which would allow them to become familiar with the Instrument and its implementation. These skills would be useful for future self-evaluation.

Strengths and weaknesses

The methodology can be used as a mechanism for self-evaluation by the local government or identification and monitoring by independent agencies. It is designed to be used in the local administration but its approach is also very suitable for implementation in the institutions of the central government, too.

The Methodology and the Instrument are designed in a way to be easy to implement, without room for subjectivity. Their implementation has already been tested in four municipalities (Tetovo, Veles, Bitola and Gevgelija) and has proven them to be user-friendly both for the agency that applied it and for the municipalities themselves.

An approach of informing and training all relevant local stakeholders for the implementation of the Methodology and the Instrument is recommended for the sustainability of measuring the level of RTA. Once trained, municipalities, together with local stakeholders, could implement the Instrument themselves for regular self-evaluation.

Further information

http://www.undp.org.mk/content/Publications/EN%20UNDP%20Methodology%20RTA%20local%20level.pdf

http://gaportal.org/resources/detail/index-of-responsibility-transparency-and-accountability-macedonia
Burundi

An Assessment of Armed Violence in Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed under the Geneva Declaration, the aim of this assessment was to provide an analysis of the situation that may inform violence reduction programming.

**Methodology**

The survey questionnaire covers three main areas: security (including perceptions of the level of security and degree of victimization), weapons, and disarmament. Media analysis used the Taback-Coupland method, which uses a data analysis grid in which incidents of armed violence reported in the media are recorded and broken down per type, perpetrator, victim, and context to reveal patterns and changes in armed violence.

**Geographic coverage**

This assessment covered 1,500 households in six provinces. These provinces were the same as those surveyed in a light arms survey conducted in Burundi in 2005.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

Officially the survey was conducted in 2008, when the war had ended. However, in fact it was conducted in an environment transitioning from conflict to post-conflict. The survey was conducted during two months; focus groups were held during one month.

This is the second arms survey completed in Burundi; the first can serve as a loose basis for comparison. The results are intended to be used for further work.

**Data collection**

The assessment made use of household surveys, interviews with experts, focus groups, an analysis of media coverage and statistical reports. The survey was conducted by a Burundian human rights organization. Ten Burundian researchers, bilingual in French and Kirundi, were employed and 10 surveyors (two women and eight men) plus 2 substitutes.

**Reporting format**
The research was presented in the form of a narrative report with incorporated charts and graphs.

**Ease of implementation**

The variety of methods used requires a range of technical expertise in survey methods, conducting interviews, etc. A statistician was recruited for logistical support and to manage the sampling, the researchers, and the data entry personnel. The researchers and data entry personnel were trained by a statistical analyst with the Small Arms Survey, who also analyzed the survey data. Researchers had 33 hours’ training over five days, and data entry personnel had 25 hours’ training over 3 1/2 days.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

This report systematizes data on the impact of armed violence, which otherwise is scarce and very scattered. It uses different data collection methods to obtain a comprehensive view of violence in Burundi. The report has clear international goals tied to the Geneva Convention, which should help facilitate implementation of the final recommendations. The government had an immediate stake in the project, which helped facilitate cooperation. To reduce development time, the methodology incorporated established methods such as the Small Arms Survey and the Taback-Coupland method. Separate focus groups were held with men and women to improve discussion on sensitive topics.

The various sections of the questionnaire were each translated by groups of three people, in order to encourage a discussion and thereby arrive at the most appropriate and accurate translation possible. The accuracy of the final questionnaire in Kirundi was then checked by a reverse translation into French by a bilingual Burundian who was not familiar with the project and not affiliated to the Small Arms Survey or its partners.

The survey only focused on 6 of 17 national provinces. Also, in an environment that is extremely patriarchal and still experiencing high levels of armed violence, it is difficult to obtain accurate results on issues such as rape and domestic violence. Most of the results of this part of the report are supplied by NGOs supporting victims instead of from the household survey. The surveyors’ access to the female participants was limited for cultural reasons and due to tradition, particularly when their husband or the head of the household was present. In consequence, the distribution of male and female respondents was distorted: instead of a ratio close to one man for one woman, it was closer to three men for every woman (408 women, 1,075 men, and 4 unidentified participants were interviewed). The majority of women interviewed were either heads of a household or widows.

**Further information**


http://www.utoronto.ca/ois/armed_violence/code.htm
Colombia

Índice de Transparencia Municipal [Municipal Transparency Index]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption, E-Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**
Developed by Transparencia por Colombia to identify areas of institutional weakness that can generate potential risks of administrative corruption and signal where municipal governments can make plans and take action for improvement.

**Methodology**
The 2008-2009 index covers three areas of measurement: visibility (9 indicators on the visibility of municipal policies, procedures and decisions), institutionality (5 indicators on capacity to follow established norms and procedures for management), and control and sanction (5 indicators on capacity for control and sanction). Based on the results, municipalities are rated between low and very high risk for corruption.

**Geographic coverage**
Whole country: 148 municipalities.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
Data for the 2008-2009 index was collected during 2009 and the first half of 2010. Armed conflict was ongoing in some areas during this time. The index has been produced four times since 2004.

**Data collection**
Transparencia por Colombia gathers data through a number of methods. Some indicators are based on desk review of municipal websites and other secondary information. Some data is gathered through a form given to municipal employees that submitted through an online or offline system. A telephone survey is also conducted. Reports, videos, photographs and/or supplementary material are accepted in addition to the form. Transparencia por Colombia reviews all information and groups municipalities into three categories to facilitate comparison and interpretation of results.

**Reporting format**
Quantitative indicators on the three focus areas, plus narrative report on findings.

**Ease of implementation**
Exact budget not available, but implementation requires a high level of expertise as well as resources for reaching many municipalities all over the country.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
The index allows for comparison between different parts of the country in order to create competition for improvement. Transparencia por Colombia has formed alliances with regional organizations as well as donors in order to facilitate dialogue with the municipalities under evaluation. Open communication with local government promotes use of the findings. Online data collection facilitates collection, storage, and analysis.

At the same time, the Index requires considerable technical and financial resources. While the Index covers municipalities that are experiencing armed conflict, it does not particularly focus on these regions. No particular attention is paid to gender or poverty. Due to changes in the methodology, the results are not comparable across years. A final constraint is that the Index is only available in Spanish.

Further information
Access to Justice and the Rule of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 - 2006</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by UNDP to provide a typology and comparative analysis of specific access to justice problems in conflict affected and non-conflict areas; identify strategies and entry points to improve access to justice at the local level and to improve the quality of the justice system; and address the existing information gap on the impact of conflict on formal and informal justice systems.

**Methodology**

The assessment included three stages:

1. **Selection of Assessment locations:** Provinces selected were amongst the ten priority provinces for UNDP in Indonesia, having low human development indices, high poverty rates and a proneness to crisis (whether in the form of conflict or natural disasters). Two districts were identified in each province, selected to ensure variety in terms of the intensity of conflict that each had previously experienced; their ethnic or religious homogeneity or heterogeneity; the strength or weakness of traditional adat justice systems; their proximity to or distance from the provincial capital, and; their levels of poverty and development. Two sub-districts were then selected within each district, and two villages within each sub-district, again according to the criteria mentioned above. Eight villages were thus selected in each province as the focus of the assessment, giving a total of 40 villages.

2. **Qualitative Research:** Conducted by five inter-disciplinary teams of local researchers in each province and based in the Faculty of Law at the state university of that province. The research teams reflected religious, ethnic and gender diversity, and included academics and CSO workers. While conducting a general socio-economic mapping exercise in each village, the research teams endeavoured to identify particular groups in the community who were poor or disadvantaged by virtue of:

   a. the non-fulfilment of basic rights to food, healthcare, education and other government services;

   b. discriminatory treatment by government or other community members, or;

   c. the inability to participate in decision-making affecting their futures.

Villagers were grouped by geography, type or mode of employment, gender or ethnicity, but did not necessarily identify themselves as members of that group. One ‘disadvantaged group’ was selected in each village to be the primary respondents in the qualitative phase. Approximately 200 focus group discussions were conducted, supplemented by almost 700 in-depth interviews. The research teams also collected administrative data. After the research was completed, two villages in each province were revisited by a separate team to verify the integrity of the data. Further verification at a more general level was carried out through a seminar in each province.

In addition, the assessments were approached in a manner that enhanced transparency and representation of all relevant stakeholders. This was done through:
• Ensuring inclusiveness in the design of the assessment framework through a multi-stakeholder workshop involving local legal professionals, court personnel, adat leaders, legal departments of universities, women, media and other relevant NGOs operating at sub-national level.

• Establishing ad-hoc Provincial Advisory Groups (PAG) in each Province (following the initial mapping exercise) reflecting a mix of professional, ethnic, gender and geographical diversity.

• Quantitative Survey: To complement the qualitative research, a survey of approximately 4500 respondents was conducted across the five provinces, focusing on community attitudes towards the formal and informal justice systems, and priority access to justice issues.

**Geographic coverage**

Initially planned to be conducted in 2-3 provinces (conflict-affected and non-conflict), eventually it was expanded to five provinces (West Kalimantan, Maluku, North Maluku, Central Sulawesi and Southeast Sulawesi), covering ten districts in all.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The initiative was carried out (once) in post-conflict and non-conflict zones, and was completed after approximately two years (the majority of the assessment was carried out between January and September 2005). However, the same model was later repeated in other provinces, such as Aceh.

**Data collection**

Focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, review of secondary sources, validation seminars, surveys.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**

Provincial Team Leaders were appointed in each province to coordinate and supervise implementation of activities. They worked within the university legal department or NGO with a team of local researchers (5 in each province) and were supported by a Provincial Advisory Group (PAG) of 5 members, PSPK and UNDP. Two facilitators were appointed in each province to work with communities. An assessment advisory team included staff from the Governance Unit and the CPRU, PSPK and Bappenas, advisers from the Oslo Governance Centre, the Asia-Pacific Access to Justice Practice Network and SURF.

A total of US$ 15,000 was budgeted for 2005 in order to produce and distribute a guide/tool kit to undertake access to justice assessments in conflict affected areas in English and Indonesian.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Justice and rule of law assessments of conflict affected areas as part of broader governance strategies had not been conducted. This project was expected to develop tools and enhance understanding of conflict (particularly horizontal) and social tensions.

The assessment of community needs and perceptions was expected to be the foundation of the project, given that insufficient attention had been given to the legal needs of the victims of conflict, disaggregated poor, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and to their perspectives of economic and recovery rights, compensation and impunity. There was an urgent need to understand who were the most affected and who was in a position to bring about improved performance; what the obstacles to seek justice were, and existing and potential strategies to overcome these.
In each participating province, one researcher was a gender specialist and would primarily focus on issues such as women’s and men’s perceptions of access to justice, women’s specific access to justice needs and the gender dimensions of relevant regulatory frameworks, i.e., whether certain laws and policies affect women and men differently.

Some important limitations of the quantitative survey included, first and foremost, the fact that the survey is based almost entirely on perceptions of the formal and informal justice systems, as only a small percentage of respondents had actual experience of them. Considering the education level of respondents and the subject-matter of the survey, it is possible that some respondents did not understand all of the questions in the survey and therefore provided answers that did not directly correspond with the questions asked.

**Further information**

http://www.undp.or.id/projects/projDetail.asp?ItemID=32

http://www.undp.or.id/archives/prodoc/ProDoc-A2J.pdf

http://www.undp.or.id/pubs/docs/Justice%20for%20All_.pdf
Indonesian Democracy Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2007 (start of the project) | Indonesia | Democracy  
Electoral Systems  
Justice and Human Rights  
Local Governance and Decentralization  
Parliament  
Political Parties  
Public Administration |

Stated objectives

The Indonesian Democracy Index (IDI) provides support to a nationally owned process for assessing and monitoring democratic governance within Indonesia. Developed by UNDP-Bappenas, the underlying principle of the Index is to move focus from (international) ranking-based indices towards measuring against nationally owned indicators.

Methodology

The index measures democratic progress and setbacks within all 33 provinces, and provides a policy planning tool for government agencies.

The measurement tool was developed focusing on three aspects - civil liberties, political rights, and democratic institutions - with 11 variables and 30 indicators. The 11 variables are: freedom of assembly and organizational rights; freedom of expression; freedom of religious affiliation; freedom from discrimination; right to vote and be voted; people’s political participation in decision making processes and government’s watch; free and fair elections; role of the local parliament; role of political parties; role of local government; independent judiciary.

The refinement of indicators and methodology was conducted through a series of consultative meetings with provincial stakeholders and academicians.

Geographic coverage

Whole country – all 33 provinces.

Time of implementation and frequency

Started in Spring 2007, the Project now has entered its second phase. The first phase in 2007-2008 focused on development of indicators and methodology and trial on data collection to confirm the measurement tool. In the second phase in 2009-2011 the focus was on refinement of indicators and methodology, production and utilization of the index, and preparation for handover to government.

As part of handover strategy, the construction of IDI 2007 involves BPS as the government agency that will be responsible for the construction of IDI after the project ends. BPS staff are trained on data collection as well as index construction.
BAPPENAS has indicated its commitment to institutionalise the relevant functions of the IDI as part of its regular functions, i.e. to co-ordinate and align relevant programmes and policies pertaining to democratic consolidation. Furthermore, state budget has been allocated to fund data collection starting from 2011.

**Data collection**

Data from all 33 provinces were collected through four different data collection methods: newspapers review, official document review, focus group discussion, and in-depth interview.

**Reporting format**

Index.

**Ease of implementation**

The IDI is used by BAPPENAS as an integrated feature of the planning process and a firm framework for evidence based policy formulation is thus provided. The index has not to the same extent been used as an accountability tool.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

The nationally owned governance indicator system serves as a critical accountability mechanism for Indonesian citizens and non-state actors. The nationally owned system provides upward internal rather than external pressure for reform. And through the transparency of information stemming from it, it also provides a catalyst for greater citizen engagement in democratic governance processes and for demanding greater government effectiveness.

Buy-in from provincial stakeholders will be one key factors of IDI success. To this end, provincial working groups (PWG) have been established.

**Further information**

Lebanon

Post-Conflict Social and Livelihoods Assessment in Lebanon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and MDG/Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by the Consultation and Research Institute at the instance of the World Bank and the Lebanese Ministry of Social affairs, to inform strategic planning processes that are related to post-conflict reconstruction. As such, it is aimed at eventually identifying orientations for social policies and interventions to assist those impacted by the conflict and the vulnerable segments of the society.

**Methodology**

This assessment has two key components: a background study to provide a picture of pre-war social situations and emergency and recovery responses, and a participatory rapid assessment to survey the changes in livelihood indicators and within vulnerable groups. The livelihood indicators included: physical capital, human capital, natural capital, financial capital, and social capital. The indicators were compiled from stakeholder responses; a simple average was taken for each livelihood indicator and sub-indicator. The percentage change in these indicators was calculated to evaluate the impact of war.

This assessment was formulated to be used for further study and evaluation. Its protocol can be amended to extend the framework to assess new developments (e.g. the progress of reconstruction programs). The methodology was designed so that it can be extended in order to assess new developments, such as the progress in the reconstruction programs, the implementation of new social programs or the impact of the peace conference. Thus this study can serve as a baseline for future work.

**Geographic coverage**

The assessment covered 26 villages, which were selected based on the severity of the damage due to the conflict, poverty clustering, and diversity.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

This initiative was implemented 6 months after the conclusion of the wartime conflict with Israel in 2006. It was only conducted once.

**Data collection**

Data was collected through focus groups with stakeholders and interviews with members of vulnerable groups. Stakeholders are representatives of the following groups: municipal sector, NGOs, education sector, those with special high social standing in their communities, business sector, health sector, political sector, religious sector.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report with tables and charts
Ease of implementation

The methodology was relatively simple and did not require a high degree of technical expertise. The assessment utilized an unspecified number of field officers and assistants. Each focus group included 8 to 12 stakeholders, for a total of 227 stakeholder representatives. The amount of time and money spent on the assessment were not indicated.

Strengths and weaknesses

The survey is relatively simple to conduct and provided a useful picture of the post-conflict situation. The framework is designed to be used for future evaluations as well. It gave particular attention to poverty by focusing on villages in poor clusters. It also focused on vulnerable groups including women.

There was some difficulty in obtaining updated and published historical data on the topics, and the lack of a national definition of “vulnerable groups” led to confusion in differentiating between notions of vulnerability and poverty. There were difficulties in setting up focus groups, which in some cases had to be replaced by individual interviews with stakeholders. Additionally, there was some trouble convincing representatives of vulnerable groups to trust in the practical benefits of participation with no immediate return.

Further information

Liberia

Descriptive Statistics from Statements to the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives
Developed by Benetech, a company that provides technology solutions for social causes, for the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission to magnify the voices of victims and to provide a body of empirical data that can help in processes of acknowledgement, accountability, understanding and closure.

Methodology
The assessment collected information on 23 types of violations, such as abduction, assault, cannibalism, extortion, forced displacement, and looting.

Geographic coverage
Whole country

Time of implementation and frequency
This was a one-time assessment implemented between 2005 and 2009. It was implemented post-conflict. The assessment has not been repeated in Liberia, but many of the tools provided by Benetech have been successfully used in other assessments.

Data collection
The data in this assessment was collected by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission from statements made by victims and participants of the violence in Liberia for use in the Liberia Truth and Reconciliation Commission. 17,160 statements were made based on violence that occurred throughout Liberia between January 1979 and October 2003. Statements were classified and coded and then entered into a database for analysis.

Reporting format
Narrative report with incorporated statistical charts.

Ease of implementation
The assessment used many tools created and adapted by Benetech. It involved 15 teams in the statement collection process, as well as a coding team, data entry team, and analysis team. Some technical expertise was required. Benetech provided training and support to help the Truth and Reconciliation Commission develop the capacity to undertake the necessary steps to accurately and defensibly quantify information about human rights violations.
**Strengths and weaknesses**

The assessment was a unique use of truth and reconciliation tribunal data to monitor trends and draw conclusions. Liberia’s commission documented many tens of thousands of violations, more than any previous truth commission. Equal numbers of female and male statements were utilized as data. It also used a controlled vocabulary to ensure that coding of various violent acts would be consistent. The impact of the conflict on poverty was also a focus.

Because of the reliance on statements there is a probability of duplication of reported violations by multiple respondents. The assessment used a matching principle that, according to their summary, likely resulted in a conservative quantitative report. However, this could have caused errors in data. The sample was not representative but rather based on voluntary statements, and therefore may not reflect patterns of violence in Liberia as a whole. Some victims of violence may feel ill, fearful or intimidated, they may be in areas too remote to have been contacted, or they simply may not have come in contact with a statement-taker.

**Further information**


Nepal

A Preliminary Mapping of Gender-based Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by the Asia Foundation to expand the knowledge base and understanding of the problem, players and interventions on gender-based violence (GBV) in Nepal, identify strategic interventions and recommend future strategies to obtain more comprehensive knowledge about GBV.

**Methodology**

This mapping exercise mainly comprised secondary research through a desk review conducted by Saathi, an NGO that partners with the Asia Foundation and that conducted the first study of violence against women in Nepal. Saathi’s study team began by reviewing major studies/research available on GBV in Nepal. The team then assembled information obtained from respondent NGOs on their activities into various formats, including a tabulation of geographic coverage and a listing of objective-wise activities. The assembled information was then clarified and verified through a facilitated workshop with members of the National Network Against Domestic Violence, who incorporated the final recommendations and suggestions.

**Geographic coverage**

The assessment covered the geographic areas with GBV-focused NGO representation. It covered all five key regions of Nepal.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

This study was conducted as part of the implementation of legislation in the Nepali Parliament to curb gender-based violence, even as violence against women continues unabated. It took place between February and March 2010.

This project is meant to be a preliminary study which will ultimately set the broad parameters for more comprehensive research, supported by the UK Department for International Development in Nepal, to be undertaken later in 2010. The new research will examine GBV-related problems, policy and implementation gaps and mitigating capabilities in Nepal more thoroughly.

**Data collection**

Data collection was conducted in cooperation with 36 Kathmandu-based NGOs who work on GBV issues in different parts of Nepal.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report with maps, charts and tables
Ease of implementation
While the assessment required a lot of cooperation from other organizations and the national government, it did not need high degrees of technical expertise. It relied upon reports and communications with partners, who had common goals and a stake in cooperation.

Strengths and weaknesses
The assessment is being conducted at the request of the government in conjunction with legislation concerning gender-based violence, giving it strong political buy-in. This assessment had extensive stakeholder involvement including local and international NGOs, national offices, national human rights institutions, and local authorities. Since conversations are conducted with NGOs and not individual victims there may be more opportunity for open discussion. Finally, there is a huge NGO presence in Nepal, particularly in Kathmandu, so there was a large respondent pool.

Some key weaknesses of the study are:

- Only those NGOs working out of or based in Kathmandu could be contacted because of the short duration of the project.
- Intentional power outages to ration electricity were a major obstacle in collecting information from NGOs with whom the information grid had been shared electronically.
- In the absence of a data management system in almost all NGOs, several appointments had to be made to meet the appropriate representative who had the information about the organization’s activities.
- A significant number of NGOs were reluctant to provide donor information. Hence, the information collected does not give a clear and complete picture of donor support.

Further information
http://asiafoundation.org/publications/pdf/753
Assessment of Village Development Committee Governance and the Use of the Block Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and MDG/Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by UNDP to assess the performance of Village Development Committees (VDCs), in particular the effectiveness of their handling of VDC block grants to enhance local governance and service delivery.

**Methodology**

The assessment methodology was expected to focus primarily on the fund flow mechanism and related procedures of block grants and VDC governance (participation, decision making, social and gender inclusion, ownership, transparency, etc.) with reference to VDC block grants and their use.

A four-step process formed the structure of the assessment:

1. Selection of Districts: The 25 districts were selected as being representative of Nepal’s three main ecological zones, five development regions, accessibility and remoteness, ethnic and caste make up and population densities. This represents a 33% sample of Nepal’s 75 districts.

2. Selection of VDC: Identification of a roughly equal number of VDCs from across the parliamentary constituencies in the 25 districts with an equal number classified as socially mobilised VDCs and non-socially mobilised VDCs according to a previous study. At a secondary level the study VDCs were identified by their socioeconomic status and level of internal revenue generation.

3. Selection of Ward and project: In consultation with VDC secretaries and other key informants, one of each of the following three types of wards were identified:
   - VDC block grant project implementing ward.
   - VDC block grant project requesting (but not awarded) ward.
   - VDC block grant project non-demanding ward.

---

23 Social mobilisation was taken as meaning where local people had organised for their self-reliant planning and implementation of local development under development projects and programmes.
Then, in consultation with VDC secretaries and other key informants, one physical infrastructure and one non-physical infrastructure project was selected from amongst the block grant project implementing wards. The study then gathered the views of the wards’ project user committee members, beneficiaries, and nonbeneficiaries about how VDC block grant money was allocated and used and also to gather perceptions on VDCs planning and decision making.

4. Selection of Household: The 3,526 sample households were selected from across the 606 wards in the 202 VDCs by judgment sampling in consultation with VDC secretaries and key informants representing community organisations, women groups, local line agencies and local leaders.

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country – a representative sample of 25 districts and 202 VDCs covering all regions.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The initiative was carried out after a period of armed conflict and the signing of the 2006 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), and the first and so far only report was brought out in 2009.

The project ended in 2009, with the publication of the assessment report, and there are no indications of a repetition being planned (for instance, covering other VDCs/districts).

**Data collection**

Questionnaire, focus groups.

A structured questionnaire was designed, field tested, finalised and then administered to 3,526 household heads. A separate questionnaire was administered to all the VDC secretaries asking them about VDC governance, project planning and implementation, financial management and other issues.

Half-day focus group discussions were held in all 202 study VDCs with representatives from community organisations, women’s groups, local politicians, project user committee members, disadvantaged group people and the VDC level government staff.

Two key informants from each study VDC were selected in consultation with the VDC secretary and focus group discussion participants.

The data was compiled and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

**Reporting format**

Narrative report.

**Ease of implementation**

The study was carried out by a local counterpart, the Institute of Local Governance Studies (Inlogos) in association with the Centre for Empowerment Innovation and Development-Nepal (CEMID). The central study team was made up of the team leader plus governance, planning, gender and inclusion, financial management and monitoring experts and a statistician. The team drew on the advice of a senior development advisor.

The field research teams were made up of:

- Five associate researchers in each development region who supported the district teams’ field work.
- 25 research assistants in each project district, who organised district meetings, facilitated the focus group discussions, collected information from VDC secretaries and supported the field survey enumerators; and
96 enumerators, who administered the household and secretary questionnaires, collected case studies, did key informant interviews and helped in focus group discussions. The study team reviewed relevant literature including the LSGA and the block grant guidelines to guide the design of the study.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
Specific gender focus included in the assessment methodology.

**Further information**
Occupied Palestinian Territories

Assessment Toolkit for Promoting Integrity, Transparency and Accountability in Palestinian Local Government Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territory</td>
<td>Corruption, Local Governance and Decentralization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives

Developed by UNDP/PAPP to identify and measure the degree of integrity in the Local Government Units (LGUs), in order to enable them to upgrade their tasks and functions, which will have a direct effect on the lives of citizens.

The toolkit serves to enhance the performance of the LGUs through identifying their strengths and weaknesses, and thus work on their reform, and improve their quantitative and qualitative competence to provide services to citizens effectively and consistently. It can also be regarded as a means to deepen and strengthen the principle of community participation in public affairs, through accountability and transparency values, and fighting cronyism and corruption.

Methodology

It identifies the strengths and weaknesses of each municipality in six main areas of municipal performance: Administrative Regulations and Human Resources, Council (chairman/mayor and members), Finance, Engineering and Planning, Supplies and Procurement and Community Participation.

The toolkit aims at measuring:

- the quality of performance of the LGU with reference to integrity, transparency and accountability, as well as its relations with citizens;
- the level of responsiveness of the LGU to the needs and rights of citizens;
- the availability of procedures and mechanisms to promote integrity and fight corruption and abuse, as well as to promote transparency;
- the extent to which the public is able to question the LGU and evaluate its performance;
- the degree of the compliance by the LGUs with prevailing laws and regulations.

---

24 Part of the analysis from 'Integrity Index Toolkit in the occupied Palestinian territory, case study prepared for the UNDP Voice and Accountability training, Cairo, 3 – 5 October 2010.
Through the examination of the above parameters, for any given LGU, it is possible to measure a significant number of indicators related to transparency - most importantly good behaviour, impartiality, integrity, confidentiality of information, ideal use of both financial and human resources, appointment, professional and correct recruitment, fighting of corruption, fairness and equality in providing services, preventing conflict of interests, prioritizing the public interest over personal interests, as well as compliance with laws and regulations.

**Geographic coverage**
Municipalities.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
Over a period of four months in 2008, the tool was tested for validity and reliability and piloted in 15 municipalities.

The sustainability of the project, including creating continued capacity to adjust and adapt the tool, can only be assured if the project interventions are closely integrated within a longer-term UNDP anti-corruption and transparency governance strategy.

Anti-corruption measures are currently one of the six pillars of agreement between the Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) and UNDP, as designated in an MOU signed in March 2009. The MOLG has officially requested UNDP/PAPP to design a second phase for the project (2010-2012) to apply the toolkit to 133 municipalities. This is an important achievement and would significantly strengthen the sustainability element.

**Data collection**
The compound toolkit consists of: questionnaires targeting the municipality and its employees (weight 35%), focus group discussions of municipal officials and of citizens and civil society organizations (weight 20%), revision and verification of public documents and records (weight 20%), interviews (weight 10%), questionnaire for citizens and public audience (weight 15%). Thus, in total, citizens’ opinion of the performance of the LGUs accounts for 35% of the total points.

**Reporting format**
Narrative report. The toolkit allows for both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the LGU performance. Each question of the toolkit carries a range of responses with value from 0 to 10. The results are marked on an Excel Sheet. This makes it simple for any reviewer of the performance of the piloted municipality to understand the results from applying the toolkit. In addition to that, a qualitative analysis report is usually attached to the quantitative findings to help the reviewer to understand the municipality strengths and weaknesses, and help develop an intervention ‘reform’ plan for each weakness.

**Ease of implementation**
An independent consultancy firm was hired by UNDP to pilot the toolkit in 15 municipalities. In each municipality, the firm tested questionnaires on the above mentioned six areas of municipal performance with relevant departments. It also organized focus group discussions with municipal department staff to discuss performance and identify bottlenecks in service delivery. Depending on the size of the municipality, the firm organized one or more focus groups discussions to discuss the performance of LGUs with the citizens and civil society organizations. The consultancy firm also held separate focus group discussions with contractors (like engineers, suppliers and others) of the municipality to assess the availability of mechanisms and procedures to ensure transparency and accountability.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
Due to quantitative and qualitative nature of the analysis, the toolkit is useful for objectively measuring the performance of LGUs and presenting it in a manner that is both accessible and unbiased. This unbiased presentation of performance results is particularly valuable for strengthening democratic values and fighting
corruption in a politically and socially sensitive environment where political loyalties are dictated by other factors.

The role of citizens and civil society organizations during the pilot phase was limited to responding to the questions on the quality of service delivery. However, the long term objective of this project was to involve CSOs as watchdog organizations to monitor the performance of the municipalities using the results of the index and bring advocate for better performance and adoption of strategies that meet the needs of the citizens.

Specific considerations were included in the toolkit methodology to ensure participation of youth and women (both women LGU officials and ordinary citizens).

**Further information**

Palestine Corruption Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td>Civil Society, Corruption, Local Governance and Decentralization, Media, Parliament, Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives
The report aims to help decision-makers and civil society organizations to be acquainted with the overall performance in order to take the necessary measures and steps to combat corruption and restrict its manifestation. AMAN -Coalition for Integrity and Accountability, which has developed this methodology, also seeks to enhance the national political will of the leaders of political factions and civil society organizations as well as officials of the legislative, executive and judicial authorities on the fight against corruption for the purpose of developing effective methods, measures and procedures and enact legislation, laws and regulations.

Methodology
The report brings together various corruption research. Tools adopted for data collection include:

1) Objective data: exemplified by concrete facts verified by various documents, evidence and actual practical experiences – including experiences of people in responsibility and records of public and private institutions including laws, decisions, public policies, and the records of performance of targeted institutions in the corruption index
2) Opinion polls in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and Jerusalem to disclose the perceptions of the Palestinian public
3) Perceptions of the elite probed through workshops, forums or meetings to reveal opinions of experts acquainted with the various aspects of the public life including politics, economy, media, etc.

Geographic coverage
The assessment covered both the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Time of implementation and frequency
The assessment was completed in 2009 in the midst of ongoing conflict.

The study is intended to be updated annually.

Data collection
The index of measuring integrity, transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs, was developed by AMAN. No details are given on data collection. However, stakeholders were among those interviewed and consulted.

**Reporting format**

The assessment’s results are presented in a bilingual narrative report with charts and graphs.

**Ease of implementation**

Data included require technical expertise for collection, and breadth of knowledge given the range covered.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

The assessment covers many different aspects of corruption, which help in the understanding of this complex topic. It is supported by a strong library of resources and materials to promote cooperation and the value of transparency. It was carried out despite challenge conditions due to occupation and conflict between political factions in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Full data collected are not published. No attention is given to gender issues and minimal mention is made of poverty. The measurement of corruption can be subjective and difficult to quantify. Although it was carried out in a conflict situation, there is minimal mention of the conflict in the report.

**Further information**

Mapping Palestinian Non-Governmental Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by the Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, to provide the basis for studying the role and efficiency of Palestinian NGOs, in addition to providing guidance on what can be done to move the sector forward.

**Methodology**

Three main stages:

1. Literature review, based on available international, regional, and local writings which deal with the subject of Palestinian NGOs, drawing of a geographical and sectoral map of PNGOs, and creation of a general database.
2. Preparation of a technical questionnaire. The questionnaire for NGOs includes: general objectives and domain of operation; programs, and local and international relationships; an evaluation of work, programs, performance, and obstacles; administrative conditions; financial situation; role in society and the benefit presented to its target group.
3. Field work for collecting the primary framework data.

**Geographic coverage**

West Bank and Gaza Strip

**Time of implementation and frequency**

2000, updated in 2007

**Data collection**

In addition to filling out the questionnaires of the organizations that were included in the primary framework, which is done by the staff, the fieldwork aimed to identify organizations that were not included in such framework in order to fill out their data sheet. Fieldworkers were instructed to question the organizations they visit and the residents of the complexes that they were working on, in order to establish the existence of any organizations that were not included in the primary framework.

**Reporting format**

Qualitative report

**Ease of implementation**

Information not available

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Very well-developed method for assessment in a context of considerable obstacles; part of a series of studies that present a complete picture of the NGO landscape; shows trends over time; participatory data collection (NGO survey); method gives some consideration to gender and poverty.
The method surveyed NGOs about changes in programmes, strategies and objectives resulting from the second Intifada. It asked about the impact of restrictions imposed by the occupation, and the unique role of NGOs in development in the occupied territories.

No formal participatory process for methodology design; although it might be adaptable to other contexts, the complete methodology is not published in English. Also, the scope of the study was circumscribed by an inability to reach all target NGOs, especially those in the Gaza Strip.

Further information
http://www.pal-econ.org/
## Sierra Leone

### Crime Victimization Survey Sierra Leone 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Stated objectives

The main objective of the survey, conducted by the African Human Security Initiative, was to generate information on the prevalence of crime in this post-conflict country as well as to make an assessment of the criminal justice system, which is still under reconstruction.

#### Methodology

The assessment addressed crime, perceptions of crime, corruption, individual and community responses to crime, interaction between residents and community cohesion, and courts and tribunals.

#### Geographic coverage

The study covered all areas of Sierra Leone. Similar studies have subsequently been completed in Tanzania, Benin, Zambia and Mali.

#### Time of implementation and frequency

The data was collected between May and June 2008. The assessment has not been replicated in Sierra Leone.

#### Data collection

The assessment used face-to-face interviews and a questionnaire translated from English into the five indigenous languages of the country.

#### Reporting format

Narrative summary report with charts and tables

#### Ease of implementation

This project required the assistance of many external organizations in funding and technical assistance. The NGO network that implemented the assessment partnered with another NGO to carry out the survey.

#### Strengths and weaknesses

This survey publicizes information about crime victims that would be otherwise unavailable, which will help in development of high-crime regions, improve police effectiveness and concentrate police efforts. It also systematizes definitions of what constitutes crimes. More importantly, it reveals citizens’ fears concerning crime and insecurity, which can impact negatively on the socio-economic and political well-being of the public. It effectively used a network to maximize its implementation capacity.
Weaknesses include a reliance on the memory of the interviewees, which can be selective in that people tend to remember more heinous acts, but not milder incidents. Also, interviewees may not always be willing to reveal all their encounters with crime, in particular their own involvement in corrupt acts. As interviewees likely set the current more secure environment against the chaos of the war, the survey findings require cautious interpretation. The survey findings give minimal attention to gender and poverty.

**Further information**

http://www.africanreview.org/countries.php

http://www.africanreview.org/docs/sierraleone/CrimeSurveySierraLeone.pdf

http://www.africanreview.org/docs/sierraleone/crimevicsurveymay08.pdf
Sri Lanka

Qualitative Assessment of the Local Enabling Environment for Private Enterprise in the Eastern Province of Sri Lanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society, Corruption, Land Governance, Local Governance and Decentralization, Public Administration, Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stated objectives

The primary objective of this study, conducted by the Asia Foundation, was to obtain the Eastern Province business community’s views, opinions, and attitudes towards the local enabling environment for private enterprise and to provide both the business community and public officials with relevant information that can be used to inform and support a reform agenda to aid in overall post-conflict national recovery. The study acts as a qualitative complement to the comprehensive, quantitative 2007 Sri Lanka Economic Governance Index.

Methodology

The study is qualitative, based on opinion data gathered from focus group discussions. The key objectives of the focus groups are:

1) Identifying key issues and themes;
2) Generating hypotheses;
3) Obtaining feedback; and/or
4) Corroborating other research findings.

The study gathered data around ten indices that mirror those used in the 2007 Sri Lanka Economic Governance Index. The focus areas are business registration, access to land and property rights, transparency and participation, regulatory environment, compliance and cost, infrastructure and services, tax administration, burden and services, legal institutions and conflict resolution, government attitude, informal charges, favoritism and discrimination, and crime, security and disasters.

Geographic coverage

This specific assessment was conducted in Sri Lanka’s Eastern Province, which is slowly emerging from 25 years of civil war. Government security forces took full control of the entire Eastern Province in July 2007.

Similar assessments have been conducted by the Asia Foundation in countries throughout South and Southeast Asia including other parts of Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Cambodia and Indonesia.
Time of implementation and frequency
This assessment was conducted in a post-conflict setting, although some violence is ongoing. The focus groups were conducted in the first half of 2008.

Data collection
The assessment uses qualitative opinion data gathered through 36 focus group discussions comprising a total of 215 respondents to shed light on constraints to economic growth and assesses the influence of economic governance on business confidence and expectations. Respondents were purposefully recruited through an initial questionnaire, administered in collaboration with the Traders Association and Chambers of Commerce in the respective localities. The discussions were facilitated by professional focus group discussion moderators with the use of a focused discussion guide. Ultimately, the discussions were analyzed, grouped by focus topic, area, and sector, and summarized.

Reporting format
The assessment was presented in the form of a narrative report with incorporated charts and tables.

Ease of implementation
The assessment was conducted by the Asia Foundation, which has extensive experience conducting assessments of this kind. Focus group discussions require less technical knowledge than a quantitative index. The project had the support of local government and civil society.

Strengths and weaknesses
In Sri Lanka, limited focus had previously been placed on how governance shapes the enabling environment for investment and enterprise in urban areas. This study focuses on qualitative data in a context that was seen as too challenging for systematic quantitative data. In this way, it supplements a previous survey that was unable to cover conflict areas. As part of a series of related surveys by the Asia Foundation, it benefited from past experience and being part of a broader project.

On the other hand, focus groups are less representative than a survey, and leave room for more error. The results will be difficult to compare to other surveys because they are only qualitative. Limited attention was given to gender and poverty. Of 215 respondents, only 4 were women, with women participating only in the Batticaloa focus groups.

Further information
Monitoring Election Violence in Sri Lanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Electoral systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**
The Centre for Monitoring Election Violence, CMEV, was formed in 1997 as an independent and non-partisan organization to monitor the incidence of election related violence.

**Methodology**
CMEV records incidents of murder, attempted murder, assault, abduction, arson, robbery, grievous hurt and threats and intimidation as ‘major’ incidents, while damage to property, threats, mischief and violation of election law are recorded as ‘minor’ incidents. It deploys monitors at all polling stations on election days and also tracks pre- and post-election violence.

**Geographic coverage**
The methodology is applied across Sri Lanka, during every election.

**Time of implementation and frequency**
CMEV has monitored every election – local, provincial and national (parliamentary as well as presidential) – since its inception in 1997.

**Data collection**
Data is collected through monitors deployed in the field who report on major and minor incidents as described above. They also send audio-visual information such as photographs and videos.

**Reporting format**
The reports are shared extensively in print and electronic formats. The results are also reported on a real-time basis using blog updates (http://cmev.wordpress.com), Twitter (http://www.twitter.com/cmev) and Facebook (http://www.facebook.com/home.php#/pages/Centre-for-Monitoring-Election-Violence-CMEV/16641995425). They are also mapped on Google Maps along with photos, video and audio reports from the field. The incidents of violence are represented on downloadable maps as well, which are available online on http://cmev.wordpress.com/maps.

**Ease of implementation**
The ease of implementation has been affected adversely by the general security situation in terms of safety of monitors - some have been threatened and assaulted. It has been that the cooperation of the Election Commissioner and Police has been good - apart from few incidents in the case of the latter. Speed of communication is also an issue, especially in the sending and receiving of information and on election day in particular, from more remote areas.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
Monitoring of election related violence has been a pioneering exercise and is being emulated in terms of reportage by other actors including state media. It has also attracted attacks by government since invariably it is the parties in government that are the worst offenders. A major lacuna is the absence of an independent election commission and election law which recognizes the role of civil society monitors. Currently, monitors
can be stationed in polling centers at the discretion of the Commissioner of Elections. They are not allowed into counting centers.

Further information

http://cmev.wordpress.com/about/

http://cpalanka.org/
Sudan

Sudan Human Security Baseline Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Governance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed and implemented by the Small Arms Survey to investigate international, regional, and domestic transfers of arms, assess domestic small arms stockpiles and inventories, map and assess origins, motivations, and distribution of armed groups, measure the scale and distribution of mortality, morbidity, and victimization; and examine local security arrangements and demand for weapons.

**Methodology**

The project utilized 3 victimization surveys of Southern Sudan. The report had four sections focusing on:

1) Tracing the experience and outcome of disarmament
2) Reviewing conventional methods and innovative local interventions post-conflict
3) The methods and challenges undertaking victimization surveys in Sudan; and
4) Findings from surveys in Eastern Equatoria and northern Kenya

**Geographic coverage**

The surveys were conducted the Lakes state, Jonglei state, Eastern Equatoria state, and the northern Kenyan district of Turkana. These states were selected owing to the perceived security challenges faced by key informants, the recent or planned disarmament of other armed groups and civilians and their geographic distribution and size in relation to other smaller states in the south. Populations in the three states are highly stratified according to ethnic groups with multiple and varying experiences and levels of vulnerability and exposure to armed violence.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

The victimization surveys were completed between 2006 and 2007. They were implemented while transitioning from conflict to post-conflict in an effort to measure the outcomes of disarmament campaigns. Sudan is in a state of volatile peace since a comprehensive peace agreement signed in 2005.

Three dozen supplementary reports have been produced since 2006.

**Data collection**

Clusters of urban, semi-urban and rural communities were selected semi-randomly and the selection of respondents in each cluster was randomized. Interviewers were selected in consultation with local partners and following communication with local leaders. The surveys were conducted by the Sudan Human Security
Baseline Assessment, a project designed to shed light on the production, distribution, demand and effects of arms in Sudan.

**Reporting format**
The assessment is presented in a web dashboard format, a multi-page website that includes results in the form of reports, narrative summaries, charts, tables and maps. The key parts are the working papers and issue briefs.

**Ease of implementation**
The project is labor-intensive. It employs a team of researchers, analysts, editors, and staff. The surveys required 35-50 interviewers and the cooperation of local non-profits and community leaders.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
A strength of the survey is that by interviewing households it offers an important entry-point to diagnosing risk factors and symptoms of armed violence in Southern Sudan.

A weakness is that data must be treated cautiously, as there are a range of underlying factors that condition resort to arms and exposure or vulnerability to victimization. Another weakness is the challenge of recruiting and training high-quality enumerators in a semi to non-literate society. Also, despite an effort to find women interviewers less than half were ultimately female, so in some cases interviewers had to bring female relatives with them on surveys. The work is very labor intensive as well.

**Further information:**
http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/project.html

Sudan Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis Project (CRMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by UNDP to build local capacities for crisis mapping, conflict analysis and strategic planning; institutionalizing evidence-based and conflict-sensitive planning across the UNDP portfolio; enhancing knowledge management and coordination; and using innovative GIS-based platforms and participatory methods for early warning and conflict prevention.

**Methodology**

The project has a three-pronged approach. First, an Information Management Working Group (IMWG) has been established at the UN Country Team level to share and consolidate available information. Second, participatory consultative mechanisms are established involving government and community actors, to capture community perceptions of priorities and emerging risks. These are grouped along socio-economic and security criteria to generate information pertaining to specific thematic and/or geographic areas. Representatives from the widest spectrum of the community are engaged. This community-level process serves to link the local population and the state as the findings feed into State policy. The third strand is the systematization of this information which is then used by State governments in the development of their State Situation Analyses and the State Strategic Plans.

**Geographic coverage**

Across the country

**Time of implementation and frequency**

N/A

**Data collection**

Data collection is done in a variety of ways. First, available secondary data is compiled through the activities of the IMWG. Next, participatory workshops are held with community and governmental actors. The information generated through these two processes is systematized, analysed and shared with policy-makers.

**Reporting format**

N/A

**Ease of implementation**

N/A

**Strengths and weaknesses**

A key strength of the CRMA approach is that its implementation process brings together UNDP staff other actors with experience in a range of data collection, processing and analysis techniques – from traditional GIS to participatory community security workshops. A combination of new and established data processing and mapping technologies are utilized. The end result is a tangible product that supports ongoing planning
activities. A useful set of GIS-enabled information management support tools has also been developed, which are compatible with DevInfo, OCHA’s ProMIS and other GIS platforms, allowing for full interoperability with key partners’ internal databases and tools.

**Further information:**
**Timor-Leste**

**Early Warning Early Response –Timor-Leste**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 (Monitoring since 2009)</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Conflict, Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Developed by BELUN and the Centre for International Conflict Resolution (CICR) at Columbia University), this tool aims to contribute to national stability and promote overall human security by increasing early responses to conflict and preventing the escalation of violence at the national and community level; strengthen state and civil society preparedness for conflict and advance early responses that serve to prevent the escalation of violence and minimize its impact across communities; and empower communities to take concrete steps to reduce violence, thereby increasing perceptions of security and stability.

**Methodology**

Local monitoring is undertaken to measure 63 indicators of socio-economic, political and external indicators of situational change as well as incidents of violence, gauging the level of community tension. Both quantitative and qualitative indicators are used. The indicators are based on the salient conflict factors (distributed across economic, political, social and external issues) and peace capacities identified through Belun’s previous work. 23 indicators measure peace capacities. Many of the indicators are comparable with the indicators included in other early warning systems, and the CICR/Belun system is pioneering in its integration of gender-specific indicators and explicit inclusion of inter-family and sexual violence among other conflict-related issues monitored. These indicators are weighted to produce an analysis of ‘Conflict Potential’ in each sub-district and nationally. While this Conflict Potential Index (CPI) is not intended to provide an accurate and targeted prediction of the type or location of violence that may occur, it does provide a comprehensive examination of the underlying conditions in each geographical context, allowing for a deeper analysis of trends over time and identification of vulnerabilities in the local peace capacity as well as potential for broader civic unrest. As much as possible, data and scores are compared with previous trimesters in order to identify trends.

**Geographic coverage**

42 sub-districts across the country. The latest report (February – May 2011) includes, for the first time, all six sub-districts within the capital district of Dili.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

Trimesterly conflict analysis monitoring reports published since EWER monitoring began in February 2009. Seven reports have been produced so far.

**Data collection**

Data for EWER monitoring is collected by a network of sub-district-based volunteer monitors, one male and one female for each sub-district. There were 78 EWER monitors in 2011 (based on the sub-district count of 39 until 2010). Monitors are all established members of these communities, with many in a pre-existing civil society position. Monitors receive ongoing conflict analysis and transformation training, and are directly supported by BELUN’s thirteen district coordinators. They engage constantly with a wide range of local stakeholders, relying heavily though on police and local officials when validating their reports.
The monitoring system seeks to limit the subjectivity of responses as much as possible. When reporting an incident, monitors are asked to select from a list of possible actors, respondents, methods and impacts (among other measures) to describe the event. A minimum of two sources are required to confirm an incident, preventing the reporting of rumors. Situation reports include some questions using a 'yes/no' format and others that require an indication of whether an indicator has increased, decreased, stayed the same or is unknown in comparison to previous months. Incident reports are collected weekly and situation reports monthly. Data is verified by reference to other local and national information where possible, and entered into a National Peace and Conflict Database. Incident features are tallied and ranked for analysis and particular events referred for action. Indicators from the situation reports are scored for their conflict potential. This allows for a broader sense of whether the situation in target communities is improving or worsening.

**Reporting format**
The trimesterly reports present an analysis of each sub-district and an overall national assessment of whether conflict potential is on the increase or decline.

**Ease of implementation**
The EWER monitoring system seems to be quite well-established, except for the high turnover of volunteers which seems to affect data collection intermittently.

**Strengths and weaknesses**
The EWER monitoring system uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative indicators to assess the conflict potential in each of the 42 sub-districts chosen for the study, as well as nationally. The use of multiple sources allows triangulation and verification of the data in order to get a realistic assessment of the situation. An observation-based model is used (as opposed to an investigative approach), which uses local networks of contacts and an understanding of community dynamics to inform responses. Reporting occurs in two forms – one capturing incidents of violence (extending from threats and intimidation to property destruction and physical harm) and the other examining a range of social, economic, political and external factors linked to community tension. Peace and development activities are also captured in monitor reports. Gender-based violence is a particular focus area.

**Further information**
http://www.cicr-columbia.org/?page_id=183
http://belunl.org/index.php
ICTs for Social Protection of Women in Timor-Leste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and MDG/Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stated objectives**

Development of a web-based database for the coordination and delivery of services/transfers to the vulnerable; a single registry/database of potential and current beneficiaries (with a focus on vulnerability mapping).

Developed by UNDP to better facilitate the more effective delivery of social protection through e-governance mechanisms in support of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program of the Ministry of Social Solidarity in Timor-Leste as well as enabling transparency and interaction with citizens/beneficiaries.

**Methodology**

The establishment of a comprehensive central data-base system at the Ministry of Social Solidarity enabling the cross-checking of other beneficiaries across the different social protection programmes of the Ministry (no further information on the methodological approach available, as the project is currently being developed).

**Geographic coverage**

Whole country.

**Time of implementation and frequency**

Being a new project, to date it can be considered as a one-time exercise.

The sustainability of the project will have to be ensured through strong commitment and continued ownership by the Ministry of Social Solidarity. At the end of the project, the IT equipment and the staff who have been trained will remain at the Ministry and will be specifically responsible for the continuation of the programme management.

**Data collection**

This project will also propose a new participatory method of identification of beneficiaries through a Suco (village) Council review of beneficiaries to ensure that beneficiaries are really meeting the established criteria. Currently the beneficiaries are only identified at the discretion of local leaders.

**Reporting format**

Information not available, as there has not been any reporting yet (the project just started).

**Ease of implementation**

The initiative will require capacity development/training coordination across programmes. An expert in database management particularly related to beneficiaries of social protection programmes will be identified and recruited to deliver training on data collection, data entry and data updating according to the defined vulnerability criteria that is in the relevant policy of the Bolsa Mae programme. Training will also be delivered on related topics such as monitoring and evaluation.
An IT expert will also be recruited to deliver training on IT related issues and provide orientation to the management of IT based facilities to the technical staff of the programme. Staff will also be trained on monitoring and evaluation and the process of identification of beneficiaries. These technical staff will be responsible for data management at the national level and ensure accuracy of data through regular updates from all levels of government. District Information Centres can be also used for the dissemination of information related to gender focused poverty reduction programme, Bolsa Mãe.

Total resources required for the project: US$ 200,000.00, of which the establishment of the database, will represent one of the three outputs.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

This will be the first ever central data base system to be established in the entire Ministry and that will consolidate the beneficiaries of the three programmes into one central database system. This project also has a very high likelihood of scaling up to include the Ministries of Education and Health. The Ministry of Social Solidarity has demonstrated its ownership and leadership by allocating state budget for the actual transfer of the programme and by housing the project staff at the Ministry. There is also a specific focus on gender issues.

**Further information**

http://www.tl.undp.org/undp/democratic_ongoingproject.htm (but this project is not listed yet).