DONOR APPROACHES TO GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

2009 SOURCEBOOK

OECD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Governance has gained prominence within donor agencies and among country partners, evolving from narrow concerns with public-sector management to encompass a broad set of interconnected issues, including the role of formal and informal institutions, security, human rights, and corruption.

2. As a result, aid agencies have sought ways to assess governance. Donor-initiated governance assessments have become important tools for planning, due diligence and risk management in agencies.

3. Over the last decade, an ever growing number of tools and methods for governance assessments of various types have been developed by researchers, the private sector, noon-governmental organizations (NGOs) and aid agencies. In mid-2007 the OECD-DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET) therefore agreed to explore ways and means to increase harmonisation and alignment of approaches, and to promote peer learning between agencies and practitioners.

4. This Sourcebook forms a key part of these efforts. It builds on earlier work in this area, a survey conducted in the second half of 2007, a conference held in London in February 2008, and a set of Guiding Principles for enhanced impact, use and harmonisation of donor approaches to governance assessments. The records of these events and links to other relevant sites are available at www.oecd.org/dac/governance/govassessment.

5. The Sourcebook is intended to help agency staff, partner country stakeholders and practitioners in their work and in dialogue about governance assessments in which aid agencies are actively involved. It has been compiled for a general audience and does not require specialist knowledge.

6. This introduction is followed by a typology of donor approaches to governance assessments. The Sourcebook is divided in two parts:

- **Part I** is structured according to the Guiding Principles which are quoted as entry points to each of the five sections. It explains why donors assess governance, what they assess and how they assess.

- **Part II** provides a succinct overview of the tools and methodologies that aid agencies have reported during the survey carried out in 2007or later. It is therefore not complete. The new tools that were being developed at the time of the survey are not all included. Some agencies also chose not to include tools that are used by partner countries but not by the agencies themselves.

7. The Sourcebook complements other efforts to assist practitioners in relation to governance assessments. In particular, it was inspired by and is complementary to the United Nations Development Programme's "Governance Indicators: A Users' Guide", which provides an overview of the broader field of governance assessments and information on 35 assessments tools (http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs07/undp_users_guide_online_version.pdf). The UNDP guide also includes a concise introduction covering data types, data collection and the limitations of governance assessments, which is not repeated here.

8. Comments on the Sourcebook and suggestions for future editions and electronic updates are welcome and should be sent to dac.contact@oecd.org.

A TYPOLOGY OF DONOR APPROACHES TO GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

What is a "governance assessment"?

9. *Do governance assessments have a common set of attributes?* An assessment can vary from a highly systematic, rigorous measurement of predefined variables to a qualitative description of a set of issues and factors. There is no agreed minimum level of rigour or comparability that allows a sharp delineation of what is considered a governance assessment and what is not. That said, most approaches applied by aid agencies are fairly clear in defining what they want to assess and how they are going to assess it.

10. *Assessing, analysing, measuring – what are the differences?* This Sourcebook uses the generic term "assessment" for the various tools and approaches that donors use. Some agencies avoid this term. Box 1 shows the terms that are used by agencies for measurement, assessment, analysis or for describing governance. The actual balance in assessment approaches between descriptive, analytical and judgmental elements can only be evaluated through a detailed look at the methodologies and how they are applied.

Box 1. Thirteen alternative terms for approaches to governance assessments

- Governance analysis

- Governance assessment

- Governance benchmarking

- Governance diagnostics

- Governance evaluation

- Governance fact sheet

- Governance indicators

- Governance measurement

- Governance monitoring

- Governance performance measurement

- Governance profile

- Governance scorecard

- Governance survey

What types of governance assessments are donors using?

11.   *There is no perfect typology:* Donor approaches to governance assessments cannot be neatly pigeon-holed into a small number of categories. The pragmatic typology used here classifies the approaches according to three criteria:

Box 2. A typology of governance assessments based on three criteria

1.   What is being assessed: general governance or specific aspects?

2.   What are the approaches taken to assess data and analysis: quantitative, qualitative and/or political economy approaches?

3.   What role do country partners play in the assessment process: little or no role; some role; or full partner role?

---

12.   *First criterion: What is being assessed* – general governance or specific aspects?
Of the 33 tools included in this Sourcebook, 18 assess governance at a general level, while 15 assess a specific theme, such as public financial management, anti-corruption, conflict or human rights (see Table 1).

In Part II, the general governance assessment tools are listed first.

13.   *Second criterion: What are the approaches taken to assess data and analysis?*
Three categories are used and one tool can apply one or several of these approaches:

1. Quantitative indicators, enabling cross-country or in-country comparison

2. Qualitative/narrative description and analysis drawing on various sources

3. Focus on political economy/power issues underpinning the current situation

In Part II, the order in which the two main classifications – general and specific – appear, starts with the most "pure" indicator-based approaches, followed by those which also apply to other approaches, and ends with those which are most oriented to political economy approaches.

14. *Third criterion: What role do country partners play in the assessment process?* Three categories are used here:

1. *Performed by aid agencies with little or no role played by partner country actors.* In these cases, the assessment results may well be shared, and partner government officials and other actors may provide inputs for the assessment, but the results are developed solely by the donors (or consultants contracted by the donors).

2. *Performed by aid agencies with some role played by partner country actors.* In these cases, partner country actors play an active role with regard to i) if and when the assessment is carried out, and ii) the framing and detailing of the results. The role played may be minimal but goes beyond just "being consulted" after the assessment has been completed. See also Section 4.

3. *Performed jointly by partner country actors and the aid agency or agencies.* In these cases, the governance assessment approach is specifically designed to be conducted jointly by the donor and country stakeholders.

This third category is included in Part II but it has no influence on the order in which the tools appear. Since the survey only covers donor approaches to governance assessments, there is no category for partner-performed assessments.

15. *Graphic symbol for each tool:* The three categories under the second criterion are summarised graphically for each tool as in these two examples:

Name of tool: **Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Scorecard**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•			•		

Name of tool: **Joint Venture for Procurement – Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•				•

Table 1 provides an overview of the general and the specific tools included in Part II.

Table 1. Overview of the governance assessments tools included in Part II

Tool	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country officials		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assesment
General governance assessment tools						
France, Institutional Profiles	•			•		
United States, MCC Scorecard	•			•		
World Bank, CPIA	•			•		
World Bank Institute, WGI	•			•		
EC, Incentive Tranche Methodology	•	•			•	
United Kingdom, CGA	•	•	•	•		
Switzerland, MERV	•	•	•	•		
Inter-American Development Bank, DGIA	•	•	•		•	
World Bank Institute, GAC Country Survey	•	•				•
African Development Bank, CGP		•		•		
Germany, Criteria Catalogue		•		•		
ADB, Governance Risk Assessment and Risk Management Plans		•			•	
Switzerland, Key Questions		•	•	•		
Switzerland, Governance as transversal		•	•	•		
United States, DGSAF		•	•	•		
Netherlands, SGACA		•	•	•		
Sweden, Power Analysis			•	•		
United Kingdom, Drivers of Change			•	•		
Specific/thematic governance assessment tools						
IMF, Assessment of AML/CFT	•	•		•		
IMF, Central Bank Safeguards	•	•		•		
IMF, Fiscal ROSC	•	•		•		
PEFA Programme, PEFA	•	•		•	•	•
World Bank, Public Expenditure Review	•	•				
World Bank, CFAA	•	•				
OECD/DAC JV on Procurement	•	•				•
UNODC checklist on the implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption	•	•				•
Germany, Conflict Prevention/Early Warning		•		•		
Germany, Security Sector Reform Assessment		•		•		
World Bank, CPAR		•			•	
World Bank, Upstream Problem-Driven Governance Diagnostic		•	•			
EC, Human Rights Fact Sheet		•		•		
Netherlands, Stability Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
United Kingdom, Strategic Conflict Assessment		•	•	•		
United States, Conflict Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
United States, Anti-Corruption Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
EC, Sector Governance Analysis Framework		•	•		•	

Sources: Survey of Donor Approaches to Governance Assessments, February 2008, OECD/DAC and additional submissions [ADB, EC (Sector Governance) and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime].

PART I:
DONOR APPROACHES TO GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

Why, what and how?

1. Nationally driven governance assessments

2. Purposes of donors' governance assessments

3. Different perspectives on governance

4. Harmonisation of and participation in governance assessments

5. Making assessments results public whenever possible

1. NATIONALLY DRIVEN GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

Guiding Principle
Building on and strengthening nationally driven governance assessments

1.1 *Drawing on, and aligning with, nationally driven or peer-based assessments.* Donor governance assessments are legitimate and important for many reasons, but they cannot be used to drive domestic dialogue about governance at general, thematic and sectoral levels in the same way as nationally driven and peer-based assessments. Therefore, it is important to draw on, and align with, domestic or peer-based assessment processes.

1.2 *Engaging in strengthening domestic capacity to assess and debate governance issues.* A healthy governance debate needs to be fed by different but credible and evidence-based assessments, as well as analysis owned and produced by country stakeholders. Aid agencies can harmonise their support to different actors (such as statistical offices, universities, think-tanks, social and political movements) to ensure coverage, diversity and pluralism.

1.3 *Involving partner country stakeholders in tool development.* Assessment tools which are intended to benchmark specific government processes (public financial management, fiscal decentralisation, auditor-general functions, judicial case processing) will benefit in terms of pertinence and legitimacy when stakeholders in developing countries participate in their development.

16. *Other assessment tools and processes are very important to donors:* Donor approaches to governance assessments – the subject of this Sourcebook – serve important purposes, but donors are aware that there are other tools and processes that could be equally or even more important to enhance governance processes. This Sourcebook therefore begins by reminding readers about the importance of looking beyond a narrow view of what donors are doing.

17. *Country-driven and peer-based processes are of particular interest:* Assessments conducted by country partners or by peers in reciprocal arrangements (such as the African Peer Review Mechanism) can provide powerful input for domestic debates about governance and governance reform. Several agencies already support such processes, and draw on the results also for their own purposes. Country-driven governance assessments thus have the potential to replace donor assessments.

18. *An emerging joint community of practice around governance assessments:* Countries and aid agencies in several of them are working together to include governance issues, for example in household surveys conducted by the national statistical body. Joint development of tools has taken place in relation to the assessments of procurement capacity in the OECD/DAC Joint Venture on Procurement, and much practical work is being done to integrate governance aspects in mainstream donor-partner co-operation. There are several comprehensive portals on governance and governance assessments issues on the internet. OECD/DAC has established a simple entry point that provides a first set of links to key sites. The web link is www.oecd.org/dac/governance/govassessment.

2. PURPOSES OF DONORS' GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

> **Guiding Principle**
> **Identifying a clear key purpose to drive the choice of assessment tools and processes**
>
> 2.1 Separating governance assessments intended for an agency's internal purposes from those for impact on partner country processes. Agencies assess governance for legitimate internal purposes including aid allocation; due diligence and risk management; preparing for dialogue; designing operations to take account of country context; and to avoid over-ambitious programmes and projects. The tools and processes suitable for such internal approaches are not likely to be appropriate for purposes where country leadership and ownership are essential.
>
> 2.2 Limiting the number of purposes of a single governance assessment, and rely on various types of governance assessments. The same assessment tool and process are not likely to be useful for e.g. overall aid allocation decisions and agency risk management, as well as decisions about whether and how to support governance projects or reforms in specific sectors. Having clear, limited and operational purposes will facilitate the choice of a relevant assessment tool and process and enhance their impact and use. Indicator-based benchmarking and analytical, political economy-informed approaches can be usefully combined to ensure that assessments are sensitive to the context-specific constraints and opportunities.

2.1. What are the purposes and uses of governance assessments?

19. *Governance assessments broadly serve three different sets of purposes:* Those related to donor decisions and concerns, to general donor-partner co-operation and to the promotion of or support for governance reform.

1. Purpose and use mainly related to donor decisions and concerns

Specific purposes include informing decision-making about:
- overall allocation of aid to and between countries
- country strategies and allocations to sectors
- incentive-based aid allocation linked to the outcome of a governance assessments
- risk management (country procedures versus donor procedures)
- general accountability to donor constituencies

2. Purpose and use related to general donor-partner co-operation

Specific purposes include informing dialogue and joint decisions on:
- aid allocation to sectors, programmes and projects
- performance assessment frameworks
- aid delivery modalities
- management set-up, supervision and monitoring

3. Purpose and use related to the promotion of domestic governance reform processes

Specific purposes include informing:
- own or country stakeholders' advocacy of governance reform
- policy/political dialogue at general, sectoral or thematic levels
- design of support to governance enhancement

2.2. How do purposes and use link to the types of tools?

20. *No direct link between purpose and the approach to data and analysis:* Quantitative, qualitative and political economy approaches to data and analysis may all serve the three sets of purposes listed above.

21. *Link between the purpose, use and role of partner country officials:* The more the purpose of a governance assessment is related to specific donor-partner dialogue and co-operation, the more important it is that the assessment used to inform dialogue and decision-making is perceived to be legitimate by all partners involved in the dialogue. In most cases, legitimacy is likely to be enhanced when country officials participate or when assessments are conducted jointly. See also Section 5 on process aspects of governance assessments that influence the actual use of assessments.

3. DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON GOVERNANCE

Guiding Principle
Assessing and addressing governance from different entry points and perspectives

3.1 *Embracing diversity and further development of governance concepts.* Governance is a broadly used concept. It can be used normatively or analytically. Relative emphasis may vary between, e.g. public administration, the political system, social or economic governance. The focus may be on governance processes, formal rules or governance outcomes; governance may be examined on a general country level or in sectoral or thematic programmes. While this diversity is positive, there is still work ahead in terms of refining the understanding of governance processes and their links to development, as well as improving indicators and other assessment approaches.

3.2 *Making assumptions, use of concepts and methodologies explicit and publicly available.* This will clarify discourse and encourage informed dialogue with partners, other agencies and academia about the pros and cons of different approaches to governance assessments. This will enable end users to ascertain what assessments are actually saying - and what they are not.

3.3 *Promoting joint governance assessments integrated in diagnostics for sectoral and thematic programmes.* Every sector and thematic programme features a governance set-up which, to a greater or lesser extent, may be conducive to development. When they are targeted, jointly agreed and conducted, specific assessments are more likely to have an impact on shaping agendas for actions in sectoral and thematic programmes.
opportunities.

3.1. What is governance?

22. *A concept about complex issues:* Governance is an ambiguous term for complex social phenomena, linked to other terms including "State", "institutions" and "government" which also escape universally agreed definitions. There are multiple schools of thought emphasising different perspectives on governance and with varying hypotheses about the links between governance and general development, another ill-defined term.

23. *OECD country donors and multilateral agencies use multiple definitions:* Part II includes definitions of governance or good governance from 17 different bilateral and multilateral agencies. Though they share many elements, they also display a wide degree of diversity.

24. *A prescriptive or a non-prescriptive approach to governance?* Prescriptive governance definitions establish a clear norm or standard on how governance should be ("good governance") and measure against this standard. They often focus on measuring or describing the gap between the current governance reality and the prescribed reality, as well as identifying the problems associated with attaining this prescribed reality (e.g. "binding constraints"). Non-prescriptive approaches focus on describing and understanding how governance actually functions and why it functions as it does in a country or sector.

25. *There are assumptions behind all assessment approaches:* While prescriptive approaches clearly make their case for a desired future, non-prescriptive approaches also make a choice that is linked to a hypothesis. For instance, a focus on current participation patterns or on the issue of state legitimacy is based on an explicit or implicit hypothesis that participation or state legitimacy is important –- otherwise there would be no reason to assess it.

3.2. Five different perspectives

26. There are *five different perspectives on governance* which, in one combination or another, are likely to be implicit in governance assessment methodologies:

- Variants of *traditional public administration* (associated with the writings of Max Weber) dominated in OECD countries in part of the 19th and most of the 20th centuries.

- This was challenged by *New Public Management* in the 1980s when traditional public administration appeared to be inefficient, inflexible and unresponsive to citizens' demands and expectations in a post-industrial era.

- *Network governance* has come to the fore in the new millennium and focuses on the increasingly complex webs of actors in and across states, where power is no longer concentrated in a central government or authority, but increasingly vested in formal and informal networks.

- *Power and political economy perspectives* have gained ground as particularly relevant for societies where informal governance is still strong or even dominates. They have largely focused on explaining why the governance paradigms from OECD countries have not been easy to apply in many developing countries.

- *Historical perspectives* challenge cross-country comparative studies which link governance and growth. They do so by pointing to the less-than-good governance that accompanied the transformation in OECD countries from rural to diversified industrial economies. While power and political economy perspectives often argue that "good governance" is unlikely to be achieved in the short run in many settings, historical perspectives will often argue that good governance is not necessary to reduce poverty.

27. *Implications for governance assessments:* Most assessments explicitly or implicitly measure or assess against standards that represent some combination of the first three perspectives described above. Some also have elements of the other two. The choice of assessment tool is therefore not a trivial matter: if the assessment measures against standards of New Public Management governance, for example, for objective-based budgeting, then it is likely that the result will point to an agenda of change towards these standards. If power and political economy issues are assessed, then the result will point to an agenda working to influence or, as a minimum, to acknowledge politics and power.

28. *Impressive research efforts, but still much to do:* Recent decades have witnessed an impressive search for evidence to underpin assumptions and hypotheses about governance, and considerable development of concepts about and perspectives on governance. It is however, fair to say that this research is still in its infancy. This is illustrated below, where some of the underlying assumptions of the three first perspectives listed above are detailed in Table 2, while Table 3 lists the assumptions of the last two perspectives.

**Table 2. Underpinning of governance perspectives: Traditional public administration,
New Public Management and network governance**

Governance ..	.. in a traditional public administration perspective	.. in a new public management perspective	.. in network governance perspective
Focus	Rule-based governance and management; accountability for inputs and outputs; hierarchical control from politicians to front-line providers; transparency and predictability. Focus inside the public system	Results-based governance and management; accountability for outputs; sanctions and rewards; performance-based contracts; outsourcing	Networks between organisations inside and outside the public sector; at national and international levels; co-operation between and governance by multiple partners pursuing partly shared objectives in loosely coupled coalitions
Basic assumptions:			
- Role of the State	The State as a steering and control mechanism	The State provides an enabling environment	The State as facilitator of network governance
- Key governance actors	Politicians and administrators	Politicians and managers	Politicians, civil servants, citizens, customers, producers and providers
- Efficiency	Through the bureaucratic hierarchy	Secured through competition	Secured through partnerships and co-operation
- Power	Visible, regulated, located in centre of government	Dispersed in the market place	Fragmented and/or shared in consensus building networks
Likely direction of change	"Basics first" approach; strengthening input control and accountability; audits; formalisation of processes; stabilising civil service through career and merit-based system	Introduction of results-based budgeting and management technologies; use of agencies or outsourcing of state functions through performance-contracts; drive civil service performance through incentives linked to results	Creation of policy and implementation networks, partnerships and task teams across organisational boundaries; knowledge-sharing networks; flattening of hierarchies and increasing actors' autonomy and options to network
Likely mode of change	Technocratic, incremental, long-term horizon	Technocratic; reformist; short- to medium-term horizon	Communicative and persuasive; learning-oriented and experimental; change as permanent operational mode

Table 3. Underpinning of governance perspectives: Power and political economy, and historical perspectives

Governance ..	.. in power and political economy perspectives	..in an historical perspective
Focus	Formal and informal power and interests, and formal and informal mechanisms by which they articulate themselves and bargain in and beyond state institutions. Focus on loyalty-based informal systems; assumes that private and public affairs are not fully separated	Context-specific and path-dependent trajectories through which governance has developed in a country. As a reference, often specifically juxtaposed with notions of "good governance"; focus is also on the governance conditions in which today's OECD countries and the "Asian tigers" took off
Basic assumptions: **- Role of the State**	Vehicle primarily for elite interests and preserving power	Limited to core functions needed to preserve power and maintain a minimalist social contract in recently formed states/nations. Functions and governance develop as and when the economy diversifies
- Key governance actors	Political, economic, military and social elites	Political, economic, military and social elites; popular movements
- Efficiency	Through personal networks and loyalty systems	Seen primarily as a product of a long process of state formation rather than the effect of any specific mechanism
- Power	Vested in individuals	Considered as an outcome of history; institutionalised and deeply embedded in everyday norms; expectations and behaviour
Likely direction of change	Strengthening voice and demand- side pressure for services and regulation. Gradual strengthening of rule-based governance, transparency and accountability are possible within dominating political system; building on existing capacities	Departing from and building on existing governance patterns; change resulting from a myriad of events and decisions rather than by grand design.
Likely mode of change	Politically informed; gradual; opportunistic; targeting reformers; long-term	Appreciative, opportunistic, patient and non-prescriptive; very long-term

3.3. What do donors focus on when assessing governance?

29. *Focus areas of governance assessment tools:* Table 4 summarises the focus of the general and specific governance assessment tools included in Part II. It shows the number of tools for assessing a particular area. Tools which focus exclusively on political economy issues could not be classified under these categories because of their flexible framework.

Table 4. Focus areas of governance assessment tools

Focus areas		General tools	Specific tools
Political system	Elections	9	
	Human rights	12	1
	Conflict	9	5
	Rule of law	13	
	Decentralisation	9	
Public administration	Corruption	15	3
	Public administration	12	1
	Public financial management	12	3
	Public procurement	3	2
Social and cross-cutting governance issues	Revenue mobilisation	7	
	Service delivery	10	
	Gender	7	
	Environmental sustainability	5	
Market governance	Business/trade environment	10	

30. *Governance perspectives and focus areas:* Most of the governance assessment approaches which focus on the areas included in Table 4 clearly fall under the first three perspectives on governance: traditional public administration, new public management and network governance. The traditional public administration perspective predominates. There is also a strong focus on democracy and human rights, while social and other governance issues relating to gender and environmental sustainability, for example, feature less prominently.

31. *Emerging focus areas:* A number of agencies are developing assessment tools aimed at the sectoral level. Some of these emerging approaches focus on the identification of sector-specific vulnerabilities in sectoral governance and the related risks of leakages and waste of resources; others focus on mapping existing governance actors in a sector, the relations between them and the mix of governance mechanisms in use. The approaches are intended to serve dialogue and due diligence purposes.

4. HARMONISATION OF AND PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENTS

4.1. When and how to harmonise governance assessments?

Guiding Principle
Harmonising assessments at country level when the aim is to stimulate dialogue and governance reform

4.1 *Harmonising when there is a clear added value.* This is particularly important when the primary purpose of donor assessment is to engage domestic stakeholders, stimulate dialogue and promote governance reform. In such cases, multiple and unco-ordinated donor assessments may do more harm than good. However, if assessments are mainly intended to serve internal purposes, then the costs of harmonisation may be greater than the benefits.

4.2 *Drawing on ongoing processes and limiting transaction costs for partners.* In some countries there may be robust domestic assessment processes under way, numerous recent governance assessments to draw on, or the potential for joint assessments to be carried out with other aid agencies. If yet another assessment mandated by an individual agency is unlikely to offer much added value, transaction costs can be kept low, particularly for partners, if the agency uses the available data and fits them to the agency's specific formats.

32. *How can harmonisation add value?* Harmonisation is not an end in itself and the value it brings to an assessment should be carefully weighed against the costs that it implies. Several donor approaches cannot, by their nature, be harmonised. Box 3 gives examples of the potential added value and costs of harmonisation.

Box 3. Potential value and possible costs of harmonisation of donor governance assessments

Potential added value:
- Positive spillover effects of wider harmonisation efforts around, for example, poverty reduction strategies or sector-wide approaches
- Better quality through concentration on one rather than many processes
- Clearer message, reducing the "clatter" that different presentations and formats introduce
- Reducing overall transaction costs, or shifting them from partners to donors.

Possible costs:
- Poorer quality if a lowest common denominator approach is the result
- Donors "speaking with one voice" may give governance issues more prominence than they deserve and disenfranchise partners
- Transaction costs for donors may increase without a significant reduction for partners.

33. *How can harmonisation take place?* As outlined in Section 1, alignment with and use of partner-led governance assessments so that these replace donor approaches form the ultimate harmonisation measure. When this is not feasible or desirable, harmonisation can take place in various other forms. Box 4 provides an overview of some of the options.

4.2. Participation in donors' governance assessments

34. *Governance assessment processes matter.* The manner in which assessments are conducted affects the relationship between different groups of staff in the agency, as well as the relations with in-country stakeholders, and hence the impact.

35. *Link between the use and the role of different donor staff categories:* The actual use of the results of governance assessments by donor officials engaged in country-level programming and dialogue processes is likely to depend on their level of participation in the assessment exercise. Field-driven demand for field-based staff and their involvement in the assessment process are likely to enhance subsequent use of the results.

36. *Involvement of domestic actors may be crucial for impact:* The more the purpose is to promote governance enhancement, the more important it is to involve domestic actors, both government and non-government actors.

37. *Unpacking participation:* Part II demonstrates that the majority of the tools included in this Sourcebook only involve partners to a limited degree. Participation can range from formal notification that an assessment will take place to fully joint processes. Table 5 illustrates some of the options that agencies can consider when deciding on whether and how partner country actors will participate in governance assessments. The matrix can also serve to map actual practice. It expands on the typology of roles introduced in Box 2 by distinguishing five levels of possible participation, and identifies four main tasks in the preparation and four in the implementation of governance assessments.

Table 5. Possible roles of partners in donors' governance assessments

Tasks	Partners' role				
	Little or no role	Consulted	Limited participation	Considerable participation	Jointly led and/or decided
Preparation • Decision to conduct assessment • Timing of assessment • Terms of reference for assessment • Staffing of assessment team					© OECD 2009
Implementation • Setting up logistics • Daily supervision • Review of draft results • Dissemination of results					

5. MAKING ASSESSMENTS RESULTS PUBLIC WHENEVER POSSIBLE

Guiding Principle
Making results public unless there are compelling reasons not to do so

5.1 *Making assessments results public whenever possible.* While transparency is to be preferred, it is important to recognise that sometimes results may be sensitive and could create conflict rather than constructive engagement.

5.2 *Clarifying and agreeing on what transparency means beforehand.* Disclosure of results is not a matter of either/or: parts of an assessment may be kept confidential, while other parts may be suitable for broader dissemination. It is important to agree in detail on the principles for dissemination before the assessment is made in order avoid tensions subsequently.

38. *Disclosure is not a matter of either/or.* Assessments results can be kept in-house by an agency, assuming that the agency can enforce confidentiality. Results can also be shared with government partners only, and/or with other donors. They can be made selectively available on demand, passively available on a website, or they can be published with more fanfare (press releases, press conferences, etc.). In the latter case, the presentation can be by the donor alone or jointly with partners.

39. *When and why may full transparency be counter-productive?* There are a number of factors that should be considered when deciding that there are compelling reasons not to disclose some or all of the results of governance assessments:

- *The specific purpose of parts or all of the governance assessments.* If the purpose is to enable an agency to define its own position towards a country, then full or even partial public disclosure may seriously diminish the value of the assessment. If, on the other hand, the purpose is to generate broad debate about governance issues in the country, then transparency will be the right choice.

- *The broad country context.* Disclosure of assessments results could contribute to positive dynamics in a country where the government is keen on improving governance. In poor or deteriorating governance contexts, disclosure may have the effect of disenfranchising governments and making dialogue more difficult –- while confidentiality may disenfranchise civil society groups.

- *The current level of tension or conflict.* In a country where tension and the conflict potential are high, full disclosure of a critical governance assessments may fuel the conflict.

- *The trade-offs and possible middle ground available:* If disclosure is a principle, this may lead agency staff to produce polished public governance assessments with informal notes giving a much bolder version of the story. This may be a relevant middle ground choice, but it will obviously undermine the moral argument for the principle of transparency and disclosure.

PART II:
GOVERNANCE DEFINITIONS AND TOOLS

Governance definitions used by aid agencies

**Overview of governance assessments tools
and methodologies used by aid agencies**

GOVERNANCE DEFINITIONS USED BY AID AGENCIES*

1. Selected OECD member countries' definitions

Australia	"Governance is the exercise of authority – political, economic, administrative or otherwise – to manage a country's resources and affairs. It includes institutions, mechanisms and processes through which citizens and groups state their interests, exercise their legal rights and mediate their differences." Australian Aid: *Approaches to supporting governance*, 2006
Austria	"In the context of a political and institutional environment that upholds human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law, good governance is the transparent and accountable management of human, natural, economic and financial resources for the purposes of equitable and sustainable development." Austrian Development Cooperation, 2006. *Governance. Policy Document*, p.5`. *Cotonou-agreement, article 9, paragraph 3*
Canada	"Governance encompasses the values, rules, institutions, and processes through which people and organizations attempt to work towards common objectives, make decisions, generate authority and legitimacy, and exercise power." CIDA, *Governance*, on http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/JUD-111883426-HX4
Denmark	"The transparent and accountable management of human, natural, economic and financial resources for the purposes of equitable and sustainable development, in the context of a political and institutional environment that upholds human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law." *Danish Support for Good Governance, Effective and Accountable Public Sector Management, p. 14*
France	"Art of governing, articulating the management of public affairs at various levels of territories, regulating relationships within society and co-ordinating the interactions of the various actors." Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2006. Governance Strategy for French development assistance, on http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/IMG/pdf/StrategieAngMAE.pdf
Germany/GTZ	"Good governance implies effective political institutions and the responsible use of political power and management of public resources by the State. Essentially, it is about the interaction between democracy, social welfare and the rule of law. Good governance thus extends beyond the public sector to include all other actors from the private sector and society. Good governance is guided by human rights and by the principles of the rule of law and democracy, such as equal political participation for all." GTZ, *Good governance*, on http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/politische-reformen/882.htm
Ireland	"Governance is essentially understood as the way in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development." IrishAid, Governance, on http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/development_governance.asp.htm
Netherlands	"In the context of a political and institutional environment that upholds human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law, good governance is the transparent and accountable management of human, natural, economic and financial resources for the purposes of equitable and sustainable development" *Cotonou-agreement, article 9, paragraph 3*, see also http://www.minbuza.nl/en/developmentcooperation/Themes,poverty-reduction/Good-governance.html
Sweden	"On the whole, good governance implies an efficient and predictable public sector incorporating participation and the rule of law, i.e., with the characteristics of democratic governance. In the concept of democratic governance, a stronger emphasis is placed on central democratic institutions like a democratic constitution, a parliament, general elections, participation and an active civil society, as well as human rights." SIDA, 2002, *Good Governance*, p. 6 http://www.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp?d=118&a=2843&language=en_US&searchWords=governance

Switzerland	"By governance, we understand the diverse and complex mechanisms, resources and institutions through which groups and individuals in society articulate their interests, find compromises in a maze of differing interests, and exercise their legitimate rights and obligations. Originally, the term was applied in development co-operation work primarily to governments, but today it includes all actors in a society: government, the private sector, civil society and international organisations." SDC, *Creating better framework conditions*, on http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Themes/Governance
United Kingdom	"Governance is about the use of power and authority and how a country manages its affairs. This can be interpreted at many different levels, from the State down to the local community or household. Governance analysis considers all the mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests and exercise their rights and obligations. It concerns the way that people mediate their differences, make decisions and enact policies that affect public life and economic and social development." DFID, 2007. Governance, Development and Politics. DFID's work in building more effective states, p. 7, on http://www.dfid.gov.uk/News/files/governance.asp
United States USAID	"Governance issues pertain to the ability of government to develop an efficient, effective, and accountable public management process that is open to citizen participation and that strengthens rather than weakens a democratic system of government." USAID, Office of Democracy & Governance: *Governance*, on http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/technical_areas/dg_office/gov.html

2. Selected multilaterals' definitions of (good) governance

Asian Development Bank	"Among the many definitions of "governance" that exist, the one that appears the most appropriate from the viewpoint of the Bank is "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development." On this meaning, the concept of governance is concerned directly with the management of the development process, involving both the public and the private sectors. It encompasses the functioning and capability of the public sector, as well as the rules and institutions that create the framework for the conduct of both public and private business, including accountability for economic and financial performance, and regulatory frameworks relating to companies, corporations, and partnerships. In broad terms, then, governance is about the institutional environment in which citizens interact among themselves and with government agencies/officials." http://www.adb.org/Documents/Policies/Governance/gov200.asp
European Commission	"Governance concerns the State's ability to serve the citizens. It refers to the rules, processes and behaviour by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in society. The way public functions are carried out, public resources are managed and public regulatory powers are exercised is the major issue to be addressed in that context. Governance is a basic measure of the stability and performance of a society. As the concepts of human rights, democratisation and democracy, the rule of law, civil society, decentralised power-sharing and sound public administration gain importance and relevance, a society develops into a more sophisticated political system and governance evolves into good governance". EC, 2003. *Communication on Governance and Development*, COM 2003 615, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0615:FIN:EN:PDF also cited in EC, 2006. *Communication on governance in the European Consensus on Development*, COM 2006 421, p. 3 on http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COM_2006_421_EN.pdf
IMF	"Governance: The process by which decisions are made and implemented (or not implemented). Within government, governance is the process by which public institutions conduct public affairs and manage public resources. Good governance refers to the management of government in a manner that is essentially free of abuse and corruption, and with due regard for the rule of law." IMF, 2007. *Manual on Fiscal Transparency*, IMF: Washington DC, p. 128, onhttp://imf.org/external/np/pp/2007/eng/051507m.pdf
UNDP	"Governance is the system of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interactions within and among the State, civil society and the private sector. It is the way a society organizes itself to make and implement decisions — achieving mutual understanding, agreement and action. It comprises the mechanisms and processes for citizens and groups to articulate their interests, mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations. It is the rules, institutions and practices that set limits and provide incentives for individuals, organizations and firms. Governance, including its social, political and economic dimensions, operates at every level of human enterprise, be it the household, village, municipality, nation, region or globe. UNDP *Strategy Note on Governance for Human Development*, 2000, quoted from UNDP: *Governance Indicators, A User's Handbook*, 2006
World Bank	"Governance refers to the manner in which public officials and institutions acquire and exercise the authority to shape public policy and provide public goods and services." World Bank, Strategic Document March 2007 "Strengthening the World Bank Group Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption?" http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/comments/governancefeedback/gacpaper-03212007.pdf

*Compilation of definitions was done in April 2008

Overview of governance assessments tools and methodologies used by aid agencies.

Index

Page	Tool	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country officials		
		Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
	General governance assessment tools						
26	France, Institutional Profiles	•			•		
27	United States, MCC Scorecard	•			•		
28	World Bank, CPIA	•			•		
29	World Bank Institute, WGI	•			•		
30	EC, Incentive Tranche Methodology	•	•			•	
31	United Kingdom, CGA	•	•	•	•		
31	Switzerland, MERV	•	•	•	•		
32	Inter-American Development Bank, DGIA	•	•	•		•	
33	World Bank Institute, GAC Country Survey	•	•				•
34	African Development Bank, CGP		•		•		
35	Germany, Criteria Catalogue		•		•		
36	ADB, Governance Risk Assessment and Risk Management Plans		•			•	
37	Switzerland, Key Questions		•	•	•		
38	Switzerland, Governance as transversal		•	•	•		
39	United States, DGSAF		•	•	•		
40	Netherlands, SGACA		•	•	•		
41	Sweden, Power Analysis			•	•		
42	United Kingdom, Drivers of Change			•	•		
	Specific/thematic governance assessment tools						
43	IMF, Assessment of AML/CFT	•	•		•		
44	IMF, Central Bank Safeguards	•	•		•		
45	IMF, Fiscal ROSC	•	•		•		
46	PEFA Programme, PEFA	•	•		•	•	•
47	World Bank, Public Expenditure Review	•	•			•	
48	World Bank, CFAA	•	•			•	
49	OECD/DAC JV on Procurement	•	•				•
50	UNODC, Implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption	•	•				•
51	Germany, Conflict Prevention/Early Warning		•		•		
52	Germany, Security Sector Reform Assessment		•		•		
53	World Bank, CPAR		•			•	
54	World Bank, Upstream Problem-Driven Governance Diagnostic		•	•	•		
55	EC, Human Rights Fact Sheet		•		•		
56	Netherlands, Stability Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
57	United Kingdom, Strategic Conflict Assessment		•	•	•		
58	United States, Conflict Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
59	United States, Anti-Corruption Assessment Framework		•	•	•		
60	EC, Sector Governance Analysis Framework		•	•		•	

Name of tool: **Institutional Profiles**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•			•		

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

Focus of analysis
The Institutional Profiles database presents a set of indicators on the institutional characteristics of developed and developing countries. It covers nine areas: functioning of political institutions; public governance; law and order; operating freedom of markets; security of transactions and contracts; regulation (capital and labour market, social dialogue, etc.); openness to the outside world (freedom of circulation of goods/services, capital, people and information); social cohesion; and co-ordination of actors/strategic view of the authorities

Stated purposes
Research, awareness-raising

Where to find it
For the set of indicators and country assessments, see:
http://www.cepii.fr/francgraph/bdd/institutions.htm

Assessment type/data used
Set of quantitative indicators drawing on expert opinion and factual data

Coverage
85 countries, see:
http://www.cepii.fr/francgraph/bdd/institutions.htm

Time coverage
Data available for 2001 and 2006

Methodology
Countries are ranked by experts and measured against more than 120 indicators based on a predetermined scale. The indicators are broken down into 356 variables to reduce subjectivity in the expert opinions

Format of results
Cross-country comparable set of indicators

Name of tool:	Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Scorecard					
	Approach to data and analysis			**Role of partner country actors**		
Scope	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•			•		

Agency   **Millennium Challenge Corporation, United States**

Focus of analysis   MCC indicators cover three dimensions: *i)* Ruling justly (rights/liberties, rule of law, control of corruption, government effectiveness, voice/accountability); *ii)* Economic freedom (inflation, trade and fiscal policy, land rights and access, natural resources management); *iii)* Investing in people (public expenditure on health/primary education, immunisation rate, girls' education completion rate)

Stated purposes   Aid allocation, performance assessment framework

Where to find it   For the set of indicators and country assessments, see: http://www.mcc.gov/

Assessment type/data used   Set of quantitative indicators drawing on third-party indicators

Coverage   108 countries for 2008, see: http://www.mcc.gov/selection/scorecards/index-2008.php

Time coverage   Annual assessments since 2004

Methodology   Countries are measured against 17 publicly available third-party indicators. These indicators are assessed in terms of whether they perform above the median in their respective income peer group (low income and lower-middle income) for at least half of the indicators in each of the three dimensions and above the median on the corruption indicator. Countries may be deemed ineligible for MCC funding if they perform below average on any indicator and have not taken appropriate measures to address their shortcomings

Format of results   Cross-country comparable set of indicators

Name of tool:	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)					
	Approach to data and analysis			**Role of partner country actors**		
Scope	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•			•		

© OECD 2009

Agency   **World Bank (WB)**

Focus of analysis   The CPIA covers 16 criteria, grouped in four clusters: A) Economic management (macroeconomic management, fiscal and debt policies); B) Structural policies (trade, financial sector and business regulatory environment); C) Policies for social inclusion and equity (gender equality, equity in use of public resources, human resources, social protection and labour, and environmental sustainability); D) Public-sector management and institutions (property rights and rule-based governance; quality of budgetary and financial management; efficiency of revenue mobilization; quality of public administration and transparency; accountability, and control of corruption in the public sector)

Stated purposes   Aid allocation, performance assessment framework

Where to find it
- For the assessment framework 2007, see: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/CPIA2007Questionnaire.pdf
- For CPIA scores for IDA countries, see: http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:20948754~isCURL:Y~menuPK:2607525~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154,00.html

Assessment type/data used   Stated purposes Country performance ratings which underpin International Development Association's (IDA) Country Performance Ratings (but are not its only determinant). A governance rating (currently weighted at 0.68) is calculated using cluster D of the CPIA

Coverage   All countries receiving World Bank assistance

Time coverage   Annual assessments, in use since late 1970s

Methodology   Country ratings depend on the level of performance in a given year assessed against the 16 criteria. A benchmarking phase aims to set the ratings at the right level

Format of results   Cross-country comparable set of indicators

Name of tool: World Governance Indicators (WGI)

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•			•		

Agency	**World Bank Institute (WBI)**
Focus of analysis	The World Governance Indicators cover six dimensions: *i)* voice and accountability; *ii)* political stability and absence of violence; *iii)* government effectiveness; *iv)* regulatory quality; *v)* rule of law; *vi)* control of corruption
Stated purposes	Aid allocation, performance assessment framework
Where to find it	Raising awareness, programming, policy dialogue, performance assessment framework
Assessment type/data used	Set of quantitative indicators drawing on third-party indicators
Coverage	212 countries, see: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/resources.htm
Time coverage	Every other year between 1996 and 2002, yearly since 2003
Methodology	The six aggregate indicators are based on a large number of underlying variables (310 for the 2006 exercise) produced by over 30 sources. A statistical model is used for data reduction.
Format of results	Cross-country comparable set of indicators

Name of tool: **Methodology to allocate the Governance Incentive Tranche**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•		•		

© OECD 2009

Agency	**European Commission (EC)**
Focus of analysis	The governance profile covers nine dimensions: democratic governance; rule of law; corruption; government effectiveness; economic governance; social governance; security, regional integration/trade /migration; quality of political dialogue/programming; participatory approach to development
Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see : http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2006:1020:FIN:EN:HTML. • The country governance profiles are confidential. The action plans are publicly available as an annex to the EC Country Strategy Papers
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	All African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries
Time coverage	Annual assessments, in use since 2006
Methodology	On the basis of the governance profile drawn up by the EC, the partner country is requested to develop a governance action plan. All countries are scored according to the relevance, ambition and credibility of their action plan to facilitate cross-country comparability and decide on the allocation of an incentive tranche.
Format of results	Descriptive narrative based on a standardised questionnaire

Name of tool: **Country Governance Analysis (CGA)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•		•		

Agency	**Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom**
Focus of analysis	National focus, one sub-national analysis (Nigeria)
	The country governance analysis covers 15 criteria, grouped in three clusters: *i)* state capability (stability/security, economic/social policy management capability, government effectiveness, revenue mobilation/public financial management, conditions for investment, trade and private-sector development); *ii)* accountability (political freedoms/rights, transparency/media, political participation, rule of law/access to justice, civil society); *iii)* responsiveness (human rights, pro-poor policy, (gender) inequality/discrimination, regulatory quality, corruption)
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue, performance assessment framework, accountability to donor constituencies
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/how-to-cga.pdf • Depending on the country, assessments can be made publicly available. For the Mozambique assessment, see: http//www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mozambique-country-gov.pdf
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and on a mandatory set of third-party indicators
Coverage	All 15 countries with a Country Assistance Plan, including: Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Vietnam, and Zambia
Time coverage	A mandatory set of cross-country comparable indicators has to be included in every country analysis
Methodology	A mandatory set of cross-country comparable indicators has to be included in every country analysis
Format of results	Descriptive narrative complemented by a cross-country comparable indicator set

Name of tool: **Monitoring of development-related context changes (MERV)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•	•	•		

© OECD 2009

Agency	**Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)**
Focus of analysis	MERV covers seven dimensions: political, economic, social, security, environmental, cultural, and humanitarian
Stated purposes	Risk management, accountability to donor constituencies
Where to find it	Neither the assessment framework nor the country assessments are publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and third-party indicators
Coverage	All countries receiving Swiss development assistance, see: http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Countries
Time coverage	Annual assessments, in use since 2001
Methodology	Countries are assessed against a checklist of indicators for the seven assessment areas. For each of the areas, a trend analysis is performed over the period since the last assessment
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment (DGIA)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•	•		•	

Agency	**Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)**
Focus of analysis	The DGIA consists of two governance assessments , one "static" and one "dynamic". The static assessment covers five dimensions: democratic system; rule of law; public management; decentralisation; and market institutions. The complementary dynamic analysis focuses on the historical, social, economic and other factors that explain the current state of the five dimensions.
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue, operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
Where to find it	When the partner government agrees, the assessment is made publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and third-party indicators
Coverage	Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru
Time coverage	Dependent on the country strategy cycle, in use since 2004
Methodology	Each of the five static dimensions is disaggregated into different components that are linked to a large number of publicly available cross-national indicators produced by different data sources
Format of results	Descriptive narrative complemented by an online cross-country comparable indicator set (www.iadb.org/datagob)

Name of tool: **Governance and Anti-Corruption (GAC) Country Survey**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General	•	•				•

© OECD 2009

Agency	**World Bank Institute (WBI)**
Focus of analysis	The GAC country surveys consist of three questionnaires that cover three dimensions of governance and corruption: *i)* institution-specific determinants of corruption, discretionality/ informality, performance and governance; ii) the effects of corruption and public-sector governance on private-sector development; iii) citizens' experience and perceptions of corruption in the public and private sectors
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	For the assessment framework and the publicly available country assessments, see: http://go.worldbank.org/LZNFXK5LZ0
Assessment type/data used	Quantitative data generated through representative surveys
Coverage	20 countries: Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Paraguay, Peru, Sierra Leone, Zambia
Time coverage	Dependent on demand from government
Methodology	The perception and experience-based data are generated through a set of three questionnaires: a public officials' survey, an enterprise survey and a household survey. In some cases the analysis is complemented by a specialised sector survey
Format of results	Quantitative survey results complemented by a descriptive narrative

Country Governance Profile (CGP)

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•		•		

Agency	**African Development Bank (AfDB)**
Focus of analysis	The Country Governance Profile covers five dimensions: *i)* accountability (political accountability, public-sector management, corporate governance, etc.); *ii)* transparency (information disclosure, public expenditure reviews, public policy analysis); *iii)* participation (elections, NGOs, gender, decentralization, etc.); *iv)* legal and judicial system; *v)* corruption
Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, policy dialogue, accountability to donor constituencies, operational set-up of aid delivery/ monitoring mechanisms
Where to find it	• The assessment framework is under review • When the partner government agrees, the assessment is made publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	27 countries, including Benin, Botswana, Burkina-Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia
Time coverage	When needed, in use since 2002
Methodology	Before the field phase, the various public and private administrations and services as well as civil society are asked to fill in a questionnaire
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Criteria Catalogue**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•		•		

<div align="right">© OECD 2009</div>

Agency	**Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany**
Focus of analysis	The Criteria Catalogue covers 15 criteria, grouped in five clusters: *i)* pro-poor and sustainable policies (orientation towards the Millennium Development Goals; sustainable, broad-based economic and financial policy; support for ecological sustainability); *ii)* respect for, protection and fulfilment of all human rights (implementation of human rights treaties, promotion of women's rights, observance of human rights standards by state actors); *iii)* democracy and the rule of law (democratic participation and a responsible parliament; limitation of state power through justice and the law; peaceful resolution of internal conflict); *iv)* efficiency and transparency of the State (government willing and able to act effectively; corruption-free state institutions, transparent, efficient, people-oriented public administration); *v)* co-operative stance in the international community (constructive participation in regional co-operation mechanisms, in international processes and bodies and pro-peace stance in crisis and conflict situations)
Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, performance assessment framework
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.bmz.de/en/principles/rules/determiningFactors/index.html • The country assessments are not publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	All countries receiving German development assistance, see: http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/partnercountries/laenderkonzentration/tabelle_neu .html
Time coverage	Annual assessments, in use since 1990
Methodology	No information available
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Governance Risk Assessment and Risk Management Plans**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•			•	

Agency	**Asian Development Bank (ADB)**
Focus of analysis	The Risk Assessment (RA) and Risk Management Plans (RMP) focus on ADB's three governance thematic priorities: public financial management, procurement, and combating corruption. RA/RMPs are prepared for national/sub-national government systems in which ADB is engaged, and priority sectors for ADB operations
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	Findings of the Risk Assessment reports, including Risk Management Plans, are incorporated in country partnership strategies which can be found on ADB's website at www.adb.org/Documents/CSPs
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and primary research for updating
Coverage	All countries receiving ADB assistance
Time coverage	Dependent on the country partnership strategy cycle
Methodology	Risks to development effectiveness in areas of public financial management, procurement, and combating corruption are identified and classified to determine unmitigated major risks. Risk Management Plans are prepared for major risks in national/subnational government systems in which ADB is engaged, priority sectors for ADB operations, and projects in priority sectors
Format of results	Risk Assessment Report and Risk Management Plan as outlined in Appendix 8 of Guidelines for Implementing ADB's Second Governance and Anticorruption Action Plan (GACAP II) which can be found at www.adb.org/Documents/Guidelines/GACAP-II-Guidelines.pdf

Key Questions for Context Analysis

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•	•	•		

© OECD 2009

Agency	**Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Switzerland**
Focus of analysis	The key questions for Context Analysis cover six dimensions: might and right; crisis and conflict; poverty; exclusion and gender; sustainability and management of natural resources; HIV/AIDS. Ongoing social processes and challenges are analysed for each of these dimensions, as well as the forces and actors that drive them
Stated purpose	Programming
Where to find it	Neither the assessment framework nor the country assessments are publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	*No information available*
Time coverage	When needed, in use since 2004
Methodology	*No information available*
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•	•	•		

Agency	**Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Switzerland**
Focus of analysis	National, sectoral and programme/project focus
	The implementation guide covers five governance principles: accountability, transparency, participation, non-discrimination, and efficiency
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://162.23.39.120/dezaweb/ressources/resource_en_156840.pdf • The country assessments are not publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert analysis drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	*No information available*
Time coverage	When needed, in use since 2007
Methodology	For each of the five principles, a series of questions is formulated related to each of the four different levels of governance (global, national, local, and institutional) and for two aid categories (programmes/projects/sectors and new aid modalities). Depending on the purpose and level of the assessment, part or all of the questions can be answered by the expert
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Democracy and Governance Strategic Assessment Framework (DGSAF)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•	•	•		

Agency	**United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United States**
Focus of analysis	The Democracy and Governance Strategic Assessment focuses on: *i)* an analysis of the country and its politics based on five variables (consensus, rule of law, competition, inclusion and good governance), and a characterisation of the type of regime; *ii)* identification of the key players, their interests, resources, alliances, and strategies; *iii)* an analysis of four institutional arenas (legal arena, competitive arena, governance and civil society); *iv)* an assessment of donor resources and interests
Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnach305.pdf • Depending on the country, some country assessments are made available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	More than 70 countries
Time coverage	Generally every 3 to 5 years, in use since 2000
Methodology	The DGSAF is a flexible framework for analysis. Particular attention is given to the donor environment and constraints, and the implications of the assessment for subsequent donor interventions
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Strategic Governance and Corruption Analysis (SGACA)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General		•	•	•		

Agency	**Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands**
Focus of analysis	The Power and Change Analysis –– the central element of the SGACA framework– covers three dimensions: i) foundational factors (history, territory and context); ii) rules of the game (extent to which State, civil society and private-sector institutions work according to formal/informal rules (distribution of power, political competition, relationships between State and society); iii) context and key actors/stakeholders
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.minbuza.nl/binaries/pdf/dossiers/goed-bestuur/sgaca-framework-october-2007.pdf • Country assessments are only made available on request and with the consent of the Dutch Embassy in the country
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	13 countries: Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina-Faso, Colombia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen
Time coverage	On an ad hoc basis, in use since 2007
Methodology	The findings of the Embassy's standard monitoring work (Track Record) and other available reports serve as a basis for the Power and Change Analysis. The analysis is complemented by a two-day workshop discussion on operational implications and on designing an appropriate donor strategy
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Power Analysis**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General			•	•		

© OECD 2009

Agency	**Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Sweden**
Focus of analysis	National and sub-national focus
	Power Analysis focuses on the distribution of power across different actors, as well as on the institutions and structures that shape the opportunities of these actors
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp?d=118&a=24300&language=en_US • Depending on the country, some assessments are made publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and a series of closed/open workshops with key stakeholders at various levels of society
Coverage	Bangladesh, Burkina-Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Tanzania
Time coverage	On an ad hoc basis since 2003
Methodology	Power Analysis is based on a flexible analytical framework
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Drivers of Change**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
General			•	•		

Agency	**Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom**
Focus of analysis	National and sub-national focus
	Drivers of Change cover three dimensions: agents, structures, and institutions. The new generation of Drivers of Change analyses will highlight four elements of a political decision-making process: the wider historical, socio-economic and cultural environment; pressures from groups and interests; formal/informal processes through which decisions are taken; and the politics of implementation
Stated purpose	Programming
Where to find it	For the assessment framework and the publicly available country assessments, see: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/topic-guides/drivers-of-change
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cambodia, Georgia, Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
Time coverage	On an ad hoc basis, in use since 2003
Methodology	The Drivers of Change analysis is based on a flexible analytical framework
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Assessment of Anti-Money Laundering (AML) and Combating the Financing of Terrorism (CFT) regimes

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•		•		

Agency	**International Monetary Fund (IMF)**
Focus of analysis	The assessment covers *i)* the legal framework; *ii)* the measures to be taken by financial and non-financial institutions to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism; *iii)* institutional measures; *iv)* the country's national and international co-operation in the field of AML/CFT
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.fatf-gafi.org/dataoecd/14/53/38336949.pdf • The country assessments are not publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	• Conducted by IMF: Bahrain, Belarus, Bermuda, Denmark, Djibouti, Gibraltar, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Latvia, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, and Uruguay. • Conducted by the World Bank: Botswana, Cambodia, CEMAC (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon), Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Madagascar, Mauritania, Namibia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, and Uganda
Time coverage	Approximately every five years, in use since 2004
Methodology	The methodology is designed to guide the assessment of a country's compliance with the international AML/CFT standards as contained in the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Recommendations. For each recommendation there are four possible levels of compliance: compliant, largely compliant, partially compliant, and non-compliant. Countries are assessed against both essential criteria (those elements that should be present in order to demonstrate full compliance with the mandatory elements of the recommendations) and additional criteria (desirable options that can further strengthen the AML/CFT system)
Format of results	Descriptive narrative based on the structure of the 40 FATF Recommendations

Name of tool: **Assessment of Central Bank Financial Safeguards**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•			•	

Agency	**International Monetary Fund (IMF)**
Focus of analysis	The Assessment of Central Bank Financial Safeguards covers five key areas of control and governance within central banks: *i)* external audit mechanism; *ii)* legal structure and independence; *iii)* financial reporting framework; *iv)* internal audit mechanism; *v)* internal control system
Stated purposes	Programming, risk management
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2006/103106.pdf and http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/safe.htm • The country assessments are not publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Questionnaire and qualitative expert perceptions
Coverage	143 countries, see http://www.imf.org/external/np/tre/safegrds/complete/index.asp
Time coverage	Annual assessments/monitoring, in use since 2000
Methodology	Central banks provide information — including financial statements, internal and external audit reports, and summaries of central bank controls — to the IMF on the above five areas. IMF staff review this documentation, and hold discussions with the bank's external auditors. Once all the necessary information is gathered and a report produced, country authorities have the opportunity to comment on the report before it is finalised
Format of results	The outcome of a Safeguards Assessment is a report identifying vulnerabilities, if any, and proposing measures to address them

Name of tool: **Fiscal Transparency Module of Report on Standards and Codes (Fiscal ROSC)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•			•	

Agency	**International Monetary Fund (IMF)**
Focus of analysis	The Fiscal Transparency of ROSC is one of 12 reports on standards and codes, covering assessment areas related to policy transparency, financial sector regulation and supervision, and market integrity. Topics that are covered relate to the legal fiscal framework, the structure and working of fiscal institutions (government, legislature, audit authority, etc.), budget processes, provision of information to the public, and assurances of integrity
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.imf.org/external/np/fad/trans/question/quest.htm#question • For the publicly available country assessments, see: http://www.imf.org/external/np/rosc/rosc.asp and http://www.worldbank.org/ifa/rosc.html
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	Over 120 countries, see: www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/fiscal.htm
Time coverage	Generally every 5 years, in use since 1999
Methodology	The assessment is based on a questionnaire designed to gather structured information on fiscal institutions and practices. This facilitates cross-country and in-country comparison over time
Format of results	Descriptive narrative based on a standardised questionnaire

Name of tool: **Public Financial Management Performance Measurement Framework**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•		•	•	•

Agency	**PEFA Programme (Joint endeavour of multi- and bilateral agencies)**
Focus of analysis	National and sub-national focus
	The Performance Measurement Framework (PFM) covers six dimensions: *i)* credibility of the budget; *ii)* comprehensiveness and transparency; *iii)* policy-based budgeting; *iv)* predictability and control in budget execution; v) accounting, recording and reporting; *vi)* external scrutiny and audit
Stated purposes	Policy dialogue, performance assessment framework
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: www.pefa.org • For the publicly available assessments, see: http://www.pefa.org/assesment_reportmn.php
Assessment type/data used	Set of indicators drawing on expert opinion and factual data
Coverage	More than 80 countries, see: http://www.pefa.org/assesment_reportmn.php
Time coverage	Generally every 3 to 5 years, in use since 2005
Methodology	The assessment is based on a set of 28 indicators (known as the PFM high-level performance indicator set). Each indicator seeks to measure performance of a key PFM element against a four-point ordinal scale from A to D, which allows cross-country comparison and monitoring over time. A specific methodology has been developed on what performance would meet each score for each of the indicators
Format of results	Cross-country comparable set of indicators with a descriptive narrative

Name of tool: Public expenditure review

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•			•	

<div align="right">© OECD 2009</div>

Agency	World Bank
Focus of analysis	Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs) are core diagnostic studies which assess macro and sectoral issues in the use of fiscal resources and which provide a systematic analysis of public sector issues
Stated purposes	Assist countries in establishing effective and transparent mechanisms to allocate and use available public resources in a way that promotes economic growth and poverty reduction.
Where to find it	http://go.worldbank.org/2NYPVF0QT0
Assessment type/data used	Analysis of fiscal/budgetary data; interviews
Coverage	Most WB client countries, updated on an as-needed basis
Time coverage	Although started in the 1970s, only became a regular feature of Bank work in the 1990s.
Methodology	To analyze macro and sector issues in public expenditure allocation and management. PERs may include institutional aspects more or less explicitly. Public expenditure reviews typically analyze macro-fiscal developments, composition of public spending by functional and economic classification with emphasis on intersectoral and intrasectoral allocations (e.g. agriculture, education, health, roads), revenue mobilization, fiscal decentralization as well as review the performance of financial and nonfinancial public enterprises, the structure of public finance governance, and the functioning of public institutions pertaining to expenditure management.

Name of tool: **Country Financial Accountability Assessment (CFAA)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•			•	

Agency	**World Bank (WB)**
Focus of analysis	Country Financial Accountability Assessments (CFAAs) are prepared by the World Bank's Financial Management staff and identify the strengths and weaknesses of financial accountability arrangements in the public sector and the risks that these may pose to the use of Bank funds.
Stated purposes	There are two objectives: the first, development objective, helps to facilitate a common understanding among the government, Bank, and development partners on the performance of institutions responsible for administering a country's financial management systems. This in turn helps to identify priorities for action and informs the design and implementation of capacity-building programs. The second, fiduciary objective, is narrower – to identify the risks to the use of Bank loan proceeds posed by weaknesses in borrower PFM systems and supports the improvement of PFM and procurement arrangements of Bank programs and projects.
Where to find it	http://go.worldbank.org/M3MCU5ZHT0
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert analysis drawing on primary documents and secondary sources and interviews
Coverage	Most WB client countries, updated as needed
Time coverage	Since 1999
Methodology	CFAAs assess budget development, budget execution and monitoring, accounting and reporting, internal and external auditing, and legislative scrutiny of budget execution as an integrated whole, as set out in guidelines to staff. The assessments review stated policies as well as actual practice. CFAAs are not audits; also, they are not indicator based. CFAAs do not provide assurance that all funds are being used for intended purposes.

Joint Venture for Procurement – Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•			•	

Agency	**OECD/DAC**
Focus of analysis	National and sub-national focus

The methodology covers four dimensions of public procurement: *i)* the existing legal framework that regulates procurement; *ii)* the institutional architecture of the public sector within which procurement is carried out; iii) the operation of this system; *iv)* the competitiveness of the national market and the integrity of the public procurement system

Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, risk management, policy dialogue, accountability to donor constituencies, performance assessment framework, international benchmarking
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.oecd.org/document/40/0,3343,en_2649_19101395_37130152_1_1_1_1,00.html • Country assessments are available when partner governments decide to make them public
Assessment type/data used	Set of indicators drawing on expert opinion and factual data
Coverage	• 22 pilot countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burkina-Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mongolia, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam and Zambia • Countries receiving assistance from WB, IADB and ADB have been subject to the Baseline Indicators since 2005
Time coverage	When needed, in use since 2007
Methodology	The methodology is based on two types of indicators. The Baseline Indicators (BLIs) present a "snapshot" comparison of the actual system against the international standards that the BLIs represent and are scored on a three-point ordinal scale. The Compliance and Performance Indicators (CPIs) address how this system is actually performing by examining data samples which represent the performance of the system. The application of the BLIs is based on a review of the existing regulatory framework and the institutional and operational arrangements, while the application of the CPIs relies on data gathered from a representative sample of contracts and information obtained through interviews or surveys with stakeholders in the procurement system

Self-assessment checklist on the implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption

	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
Scope	*Quant*	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific	•	•				•

Agency	**United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)**
Focus of analysis	The self-assessment checklist on the implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption is a computer-based information-gathering tool designed to enable States to report on their implementation efforts, implementation gaps and ensuing needs for technical assistance. At present, it covers 15 selected articles from all chapters of the Convention
Stated purposes	Review of implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption, identification of technical assistance needs
Where to find it	The computer-based application is available from: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/index.html
Assessment type/data used	Quantitative and qualitative information obtained from official governmental sources
Coverage	Over 120 countries that have signed/ratified the UN Convention against Corruption, see: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/signatories.html
Time coverage	In use since 2007, States can provide/update their self-assessments at any time
Methodology	The self-assessment is designed to gather structured information on States' compliance with selected articles of the UN Convention against Corruption. In case of reported full compliance, States are requested to cite relevant legislation and substantiate their answers. The tool places considerable emphasis on the identification of technical assistance needs. In case of reported partial compliance or non-compliance, States are requested to identify the type of technical assistance that, if available, would facilitate the adoption of the measure under review. To promote co-ordination among assistance providers, States that request technical assistance are urged to specify whether such assistance is already received, and if so, from whom
Format of results	Narrative national self-assessment reports, statistics on global/regional full, partial or non-compliance with selected articles of the Convention and on technical assistance needs.

Name of tool: **Internal Assessment on Conflict Prevention Need (Early Warning)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•		•		

Agency	**Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany**
Focus of analysis	The assessment covers four dimensions of conflict: *i)* structural conflict factors; *ii)* conflict-escalating processes; *iii)* strategies for dealing with conflict and the use of force; *iv)* crisis potential in post-war countries
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue, risk management, operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
Where to find it	Neither the assessment framework nor the country assessments are publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	All countries receiving German development assistance, see: http://www.bmz.de/en/countries/partnercountries/laenderkonzentration/ tabelle_neu.html
Time coverage	Annual assessments
Methodology	In addition to a standardised questionnaire, the assessment also incorporates: *i)* an overview of changes in the crisis potential in co-operation countries evaluated by an independent unit within the German Overseas Institute; *ii)* an elaborate matrix overview of the latest country ratings arranged by geographical scope and conflict phase classified by level of "prevention needs"
Format of results	Qualitative questionnaire in the form of a multiple choice checklist

Name of tool: **Security Sector Reform Assessment**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•		•		

Agency	**Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Germany**
Focus of analysis	*No detailed information available*
Stated purpose	Programming, aid allocation, monitoring and evaluation
Where to find it	Neither the assessment framework nor the country assessments are publicly available
Assessment type/data used	*No information available*
Coverage	*No information available*
Time coverage	When needed
Methodology	*No information available*
Format of results	*No information available*

Name of tool: **Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•			•	© OECD 2009

Agency	**World Bank (WB)**
Focus of analysis	National and regional focus of analysis
	The CPAR covers different dimensions of a country's procurement system, such as the legal and organisational framework; procedures; decision-making, control and complaints systems; existence of anti-corruption programmes and private-sector participation in the system; and system performance in different sectors. Factors underlying the quality of the procurement system are also analysed (culture of accountability, absence of political interference, honest and capable staff, and clear written standards)
Stated purposes	Programming, aid allocation, risk management, policy dialogue, performance assessment framework, accountability to donor constituencies, operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
Where to find it	For the assessment framework and the publicly available country assessments, see: http://go.worldbank.org/RZ7CHIRF60
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	All countries in receipt of WB assistance
Time coverage	Generally every 3 to 5 years, in use since the 1980s
Methodology	The CPAR should be undertaken in agreement with the government to ensure ownership of the proposed reform programme. The draft report is further subject to a mandatory peer-review process involving experienced WB staff and external participants selected from within the region, from sectors that are related to procurement and from development partners that have an interest in the product
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool:	Upstream Problem-Driven Governance Diagnostic					
	Approach to data and analysis			**Role of partner country actors**		
Scope	*Quant*	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•	•		

Agency   World Bank (WB)

Focus of analysis   A problem-driven tool, focused on specific issues and challenges, such as difficulties with progress in sector reforms/improving sector performance (e.g. health, transport, agriculture), particular challenges of natural-resource dependent countries, and governance and political economy risks to strategies and operations.

The tool addresses governance, institutional arrangements and political economy drivers of the problem or challenge being analyzed.

Stated purposes   Informing the design of WB strategies and operations with a view to supporting development effectiveness; policy dialogue

Where to find it   Good Practice Framework will become available in spring 2009. Currently not a standardized product but an approach being piloted and promoted.

Assessment type/data used Variable

Coverage   To date, pilots in Zambia and Mongolia, further applications ongoing (Lebanon, Cambodia) and planned.

Time coverage   Since 2007

Methodology   To analyze governance, institutional, and political economy dimensions of specific development challenges, using a menu of tools and approaches tailored to the specific challenge being analyzed and to the time and resources available. The aim is to define feasible interventions and/or strategies for developing greater support for progressive change.

Name of tool: **Human Rights Fact Sheet**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•		•		

© OECD 2009

Agency	**European Commission (EC)**
Focus of analysis	*No detailed information available*
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue
Where to find it	Neither the assessment framework nor the country assessments are publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	All developing countries
Time coverage	Annual assessments
Methodology	The EU Presidency is responsible for initiating the review of the human rights fact sheets. The assessments are shared with all EU member states
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Stability Assessment Framework (SAF)**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•	•		

Agency	**Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands**
Focus of analysis	The Stability Assessment Framework consists of four levels of conflict analysis: *i)* a trend analysis which assesses 12 indicators of (in)stability (governance, security and socio-economic development indicators); *ii)* an institutional analysis assessing the effectiveness and legitimacy of institutions such as the police, judiciary and civil services; *iii)* a stakeholder analysis mapping the various political actors' interests and activities; *iv)* a policy analysis that outlines the activities of international organisations
Stated purpose	Determined on a case-by-case basis
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050200_cru_paper_stability.pdf • The country assessments are not publicly available
Assessment type/data used	Expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources and a set of indicators for trend analysis
Coverage	Burundi, Rwanda, Pakistan, Bolivia, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Afghanistan
Time coverage	Annual assessments, in use since 2002
Methodology	The methodology combines a qualitative analysis with a trend analysis of a set of 12 indicators. These are rated by experts on a scale that allows comparison and monitoring over time. The four levels of conflict analysis are furthermore complemented by a multi-stakeholder workshop to validate and amend the draft assessment

Name of tool: **Strategic Conflict Assessment**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•	•		

Agency	**Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom**
Focus of analysis	National and regional focus
	The Conflict Assessment as such covers three dimensions: *i)* structures (long-term factors underlying the conflict); *ii)* actors (their interests, incentives, capacities, relations); *iii)* dynamics (trends, triggers, future scenarios). It is complemented by an analysis of international responses to the conflict (from development and other actors)
Stated purposes	Programming, policy dialogue, risk management, operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms
Where to find it	• For the assessment framework, see: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/conflict-assess-guidance.pdf • Depending on the country, some assessments are made publicly available. For the assessment of Mozambique, see: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/strategic-conflict-assessment.pdf (web link for others to be provided)
Assessment type/data used	Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources
Coverage	Non-exhaustive list: Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia & Azerbaijan, Balkans, Burma, Georgia, Iraq, Israel & Palestine, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mozambique, Nagorno Karabakh, Nepal, Nigeria, North Caucasus, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uganda, and Yemen
Time coverage	Often a one-off exercise, in use since 2001
Methodology	The Strategic Conflict Assessment is a flexible framework that can be adapted as needed. The methodology gives particular attention to the development of strategies/options for programming interventions
Format of results	Descriptive narrative

Name of tool: **Conflict Assessment Framework**

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•	•		

Agency

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United States

Focus of analysis

The framework covers five dimensions of conflict: *i)* the incentives for violence; *ii)* access to conflict resources; *iii)* institutional and social capacity for managing violence; *iv)* regional and global dynamics; *v)* opportunities and vulnerabilities

Stated purpose

Programming, policy dialogue; operational set-up of aid delivery/monitoring mechanisms

Where to find it

- For the assessment framework and publicly available country assessments, see:http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/publications/index.html
- Only the reports of Bulgaria, Georgia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, and Uzbekistan are publicly available

Assessment type/data used   Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources

Coverage

Over 20 countries

Time coverage

When needed, in use since 2003

Methodology

The framework is flexible and variables can be added or removed to fit the specific context

Format of results

Descriptive narrative

Name of tool:	Anti-Corruption Assessment Framework					
	Approach to data and analysis			**Role of partner country actors**		
Scope	*Quant*	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•	•		

© OECD 2009

Agency

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United States

Focus of analysis

National and sub-national focus.

The Anti-Corruption Assessment Framework focuses on three levels of analysis: *i)* the legal institutional framework (status of anti-corruption-related laws, institutions, programmes, stakeholders, donors, and government and donor priorities); *ii)* political economy analysis (how power and wealth are used, by whom, within what institutional context, and with what effect); *iii)* detailed assessments for the most risky sectors (such as health care, education, etc.), institutions (legislature, regional/local government, political parties, etc.) and cross-cutting issues (budget and financial management, public procurement, etc.).

Stated purposes

Programming, policy dialogue

Where to find it

• For the assessment framework, see: www.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/USAIDCorAsmtHandbook.pdf
• Depending on the country, some assessments are made available (web link to be provided).

Assessment type/data used

Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources

Coverage

Ukraine, Mongolia, Mozambique, Senegal

Time coverage

On an *ad hoc* basis, in use since 2006

Methodology

To describe fundamental corruption patterns and dynamics, countries are classified according to four corruption syndromes (mature state corruption, elite network-state corruption, weak transitional state corruption, weak undemocratic state corruption). A corruption checklist and a series of 17 diagnostic guides (on sectors, institutions, cross-cutting issues and functions) have been developed as tools for structured information gathering. The methodology also gives specific attention to the integration of sectoral/functional recommendations in an anti-corruption programme

Format of results

Descriptive narrative

Scope	Approach to data and analysis			Role of partner country actors		
	Quant	*Qual*	Political economy	Little or no role	Some role	Joint assessment
Specific		•	•		•	

Agency   **European Commission (EC)**

Focus of analysis   The sector governance analysis framework covers three dimensions: *i)* context (wider governance framework and public sector set-up; local, regional and international context); *ii)* key actors (their power, resources, authority, linkages, interests and incentives); *iii)* governance and accountability relations (prevailing mix of governance mechanisms, accountability set-up, capacity, information on governance,…)

Stated purposes   (Sector) programming, policy dialogue

Where to find it   The assessment framework is not yet publicly available

Assessment type/data used Qualitative expert perceptions drawing on secondary sources

Coverage   *Not yet implemented*

Time coverage   *Not yet implemented*

Methodology   The analysis should be seen as a continuous process that builds on ongoing domestic processes. Depending on the results of the analysis, operational guidance is provided on possible actions to promote governance at sectoral level. These can focus on the supply side of governance, the demand for improved sectoral governance, or on governance constraints outside the sector.

Format of results   Descriptive narrative