Case study 1	**Common Assessment Framework (CAF), Bosnia and Herzegovina**
Developed by	§ European Institute for Public Administration (EIPA), for at all levels of administrations in EU member states and in transition countries.
Applied in	§ 6 mid size municipalities in BiH, supported by the SDC financed Municipal Development Project (MDP) in the Doboj region, total of 140'000 inhabitants
Purpose / Utility of the Tool	• Partners § Self-assessment and quality management tool for local public administrations § Dialogue and learning between LG § Benchmarking between LG (if broadly applied) § Identification of structural gaps for policy discussions (if broadly applied) • Project/SDC § Baseline information § Country programme and project planning § Monitoring and evaluation (progress at partners level, project monitoring, country monitoring)
Outputs/ Reporting	§ Self assessment report with scores for each LG, prepared by CAF team members § Action plan for improvements, officially approved by LG council § Web platform for benchmarking
Dimensions	§ Holistic organisation analysis of local government performance and public service delivery § Clear focus on public administration § Poverty, gender and social inclusion not particularly addressed, but integral part of the CAF § Power relations not particularly addressed § *Combination of hard facts* and *individual appreciations*
Methodology	§ Facilitated self assessment: Introduction to leadership ⇒ establishment of CAF team (4-6 LG staff) ⇒facilitated self assessment and elaboration of action plan ⇒approval of report and action plan § Questionnaire and scoring along 9 dimensions of the Excellence Model of the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM)
Inputs and time required	§ 2 months period for whole exercise in a LG § 10-12 working days for each CAF team member § 10 working days facilitation per municipality § Basic data and information must be available
Beneficiaries	§ Local population (*better services, higher transparency*); local authorities (*quality management and benchmarking tool*); national authorities (*monitoring of LG and D, if broadly applied in LG*); donors/project (*baseline, planning, M&E*):
Most appropriate use	! Public administration with good capacities and management understanding ! Countries with EU integration agenda (EU standard label) ! Atmosphere of trust and free thinking ! Periodical replication for monitoring purpose ! LG benchmarking (if broadly applied)
Remarks	! Commitment of LG leadership to steer the process and endorse action plan as key success factor ! External facilitation is highly recommended
Replication, Sustainability	! High potential, if basic conditions are fulfilled (capacities and resources, basic data available, leadership commitment), national coordination increases chances for broad application and sustainability
Further Info and contact	Snezana Misic: ,snezana.misic@mdpinicijative.ba Website: www.caf.eipa.eu

Case study 2	**Local Governance Barometer (LGB), Southern Africa**
Developed by	§ The Impact Alliance Network made of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), Pact and SNV, Netherlands Development Organization.
Applied in	§ 15 districts of Botswana, Malawi and Zambia (5 per country)
Purpose / Utility of the Tool	• Partners § Facilitated self-assessment tool § Instrument for dialogue between stakeholders at the local level § Identification of local governance and service delivery gaps § Awareness raising and capacity development on local governance standards § Horizontal and vertical dialogue promotion • Projects/SDC § Baseline information + monitoring tool § Input for planning of programmes and/or capacity building activities

Outputs / Reporting	§ LGB report including:
	  - contextualisation (political and legal background)
	  - quantitative expression of citizens' satisfaction with local government's performance
	  - identification and prioritisation of capability development activities
	§ Dissemination through local and national workshops, booklets and newsletters

Dimensions	§ Key dimensions of governance are assessed: effectiveness and efficiency, transparency, rule of law (focus on anti-corruption measures), accountability and participation. § Poverty and social inclusion as an entire cluster of the questionnaire. § Gender equality promotion as a transversal theme. § No mapping of power relations or comprehensive overview of available legislation. • Mainly a perception-based exercise. Collection of objective data to be done in the contextualisation phase of the exercise.

Methodology	§ Facilitated self-assessment through staff members of a national partner organisation. Facilitators (about 5) are trained by IDASA on LGB.
	§ The LGB is made of a model which needs to be adapted to the specific context of its application
	§ Several phases in the application of the tool:
	  - Contextualisation: identification of stakeholders, adaptation of the LGB to the local context and identification of major local governance related issues.
	  - Data collection through the filling-in of a questionnaire and separate focus group discussions for each stakeholder group.
	  - Data are processed and discussed in a plenary session. Allows the identification of governance gaps and recommendations for capacity development activities.

Inputs and time required	§ Staff per country: about 5 facilitators from partner organisation + 1 in-country project coordination from lead organisation. § Takes about 2 weeks to be conducted in one district (+ adaptation of the tool beforehand at national level) § Focus group discussions + plenary session take place within the same week
Beneficiaries	§ Local population (*increased dialogue on their needs and improved services*); local authorities (*better understanding of governance, dialogue with civil society, identification of intervention priorities, accountability*); national authorities (*limited involvement*); donors/project (*baseline, planning, M&E*):
Most appropriate use	! Adaptability and ability of the tool to translate the complex concept of LG into practical, locally specific and easy to understand indicators and questions ! Can be applied in contexts where limited knowledge on LG is available ! Useful for participatory identification of capacity development activities.
Remarks	! Key role played by facilitators ! Importance of planning sufficient time for the preparation of the exercise and getting the support of relevant central authorities. ! Dissemination of results needs to be planned in advance.
Replication, Sustainability	! High replication potential given its approach. Core model can be adapted to various contexts and applied at different levels (local, regional or central) or to different sectors (health, etc.). ! Key role of the facilitator for adapting the tool and conducting the exercise.
Further Info and contact	Ephrem Tadesse: ephrem.tadesse@sdc.net , Paul van Hoof: pvanhoof@idasa.org.za Website: http://www.impactalliance.org/ev_en.php?ID=12698_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Case study 3	Sistema de Reconocimiento al Desempeño Municipal en Nicaragua (SIRDEM)
Developed by	§ INIFOM (the Nicaraguan Institute for Municipal Promotion / governmental body), and AMUNIC (the Association of Nicaraguan Municipalities) with the support of GTZ Nicaragua (2005). SDC has contributed to the further elaboration of the instrument.
Applied in	§ 153 Municipalities of Nicaragua (about 5.7 mio peoples) in 2005, 2006 and 2007
Purpose / Utility of the tool	• <u>Partners</u> § Performance assessment and identification of governance gaps § Country wide assessment allows for benchmarking between LGs § Inform citizens about performance of their municipalities in absolute and comparative terms and about standards to be attained § Awareness raising and capacity development of municipal officials on LG standards § Promotion of horizontal and vertical dialogue • <u>Project/SDC</u> § Baseline information § Input for programme and/or projects planning § Monitoring and evaluation
Outputs / Reporting	§ SIRDEM report - including a scoreboard of the performance of municipalities for all the dimensions of local governance assessed. § Financial awards granted to best performing municipalities to be invested in capacity development. § Dissemination of results through publication of the reports, booklets and website
Dimensions	§ Basic standards of good governance are addressed § Useful to understand what legislation is in place and what services are provided or not. § Social inclusion and poverty reduction as transversal issues § Not designed to address political realities or power relations • Facts based approach (indicators of performance - what is/isn't available) ≠ processes and interactions
Methodology	§ Indicators organized along 11 thematic clusters. § 2 methods of data collection: 40% through (self-assessed) data provided by municipal authorities – 60% through interviews between SIRDEM team and municipal officials. § Data are processed and municipalities ranked (performance in general, specific fields) § The "Executive Directorate" of SIRDEM grants awards to best performing municipalities.
Inputs and time required	§ SIRDEM relies on a team of 10-12 professionals for its implementation § Technical secretariat coordinates operational issues and trains the professionals (1 week) § Budget for one round: around 100 000$ § 6 months from planning to results (including 3 months for data collection)
Beneficiaries	! Local population (*increased transparency and awareness on local governance through results publication*); local authorities (*main beneficiaries of the tool, increased understanding on governance and standards to be achieved, identification of priority areas of intervention*); national authorities (*monitoring of LG and Decentralization*); donors/project (*baseline, planning, M&E*)
Most appropriate use	! Municipalities with sufficient capabilities to provide the required data ! LGA for understanding what is available or not / fact-based ≠ perception-based survey ! LG benchmarking ! Promotion of vertical and horizontal dialogue
Remarks	! Commitment of LG leadership to steer the process as a key success factor ! One objective of SIRDEM is to increase self-assessment capacities of LG ! No systematic follow-up process of the results was planned. Only municipalities being granted a financial award automatically receive funds for capacity development activities. ! Additional donor support to promote horizontal and vertical dialogue could be useful
Replication, Sustainability	! Need to adapt the exercise and its indicators to the specific context ! Should be repeated over time in order for the reward logic to bear fruits ! Wide coalition of local and international partners as most suitable for applying the tool on such a wide scale
Further Info and contact	Rudi von Planta: rudi.vonplanta@sdc.net Website: http://www.inifom.gob.ni/programas/sirdem.html

Case study 4	**Local Governance Self Assessment (LGSA), Bangladesh**
Developed by	§ Intercooperation and Care Bangladesh in the frame of the SDC financed Sharique local governance programme in the Sunamganj and Rajshahi regions § *2 types were conducted: a) Union Parishad (UP) LGSA and b) Community LGSA*
Applied in	§ 128 Union Parishads (lowest LG level, average 30'000 inhabitants), involvement of 2400 CBOs and direct participation of 90'000 citizens; conducted on a bi-annual basis
Purpose / Utility of the Tool	• <u>Partners</u> § Awareness raising & education of citizens and LG on tasks, special reference to transparency, downward accountability, pro-poor service delivery and the inclusion of women and poor; § Identification of LG gaps and needs and monitoring of progress § Promotion of dialogue between citizens and local authorities in rural areas § Elaboration of priorities in a "Union Parishad Governance Improvement Plan (GIP)" • <u>Project/SDC</u> § Baseline information on LG in a broad area § Input for programme and/or projects planning, monitoring and evaluation
Outputs and Reporting	§ a) UP Governance Improvement Plans (GIP), officially approved by the UP councils and integrated in their annual plan of operation and annual budget 　b) Identified priorities, integrated in local CBO action plans and/or transmitted to the UP § Assessment results reports for each LGSA (incl. scoring) prepared by facilitator § Results were used for the elaboration of manuals and handbooks (e.g. training manual for UP planning, training manuals on roles and responsibilities, tax revenue training manual) § Results provided key information for a report on "the state of local governance in Rajshahi and Sunamganj", disseminated to raise awareness among government and donors
Dimensions	§ Status of local governance in rural areas, framed around the legally defined rights and responsibilities of the demand (citizens) and supply (local government) side § Focus on the daily governance-related problems of people in rural areas, special consideration of *social inclusion questions* (gender, extreme poor, ethnic minorities) § Not designed to capture power relations • *Mostly relying on qualitative data and perception of participants, few hard facts*
Methodology	§ UP LGSA: half-day meetings of 35 participants (UP officials, local government committees selected line departments, CBOs, private sector and traditional leaders) § Community LGSA: half-day public meetings of 40 participants from different sections of the civil society, UP officials as guests § Organized around 24 (UP LGSA) / 29 (community LGSA) questions, facilitated by 1-2 trained NGO representatives, supported by 3-4 community volunteers § 5 steps: 1. Introduction and agreement on the objectives and rules by the UP chairman/community leader; 2. Identification and understanding of main local governance actors and their roles; 3. Facilitated self-assessment along the LGSA key questions; 4. Agreement on six priorities for improvements; 5. Elaboration of action plan
Inputs and time required	§ Mainly opinions of the participants, complemented by data from UP offices § Project: tool elaboration, testing/adaptation, training of NGO facilitators § 1-2 facilitators 1 day per LGSA § Material (papers, pens, posters etc), average cost of 7 US$ per LGSA
Beneficiaries	§ Local population (*education and awareness, transparency, voice*); local authorities (awareness, *dialogue with citizens, monitoring, accountability, GIP*); national authorities (*limited, only if it would be applied country wide*); donors/project (*baseline, planning, M&E*)
Most appropriate use	! Assess the status of local governance in rural areas at a grass roots level, with a specific pro poor and social inclusion focus ! Awareness raising of citizens and local government officials on their rights and responsibilities
Remarks	! Basic commitment of the local government leadership is required ! Meetings must be well organized with good facilitation
Replication, Sustainability	! High replication potential (user-friendly, low cost, number/nature of questions adapted to context) ! National coordination for country wide application (benchmarking, monitoring, policy inputs)
Further Info and contact	info@intercooperation-bd.org (Tirtha Sikder, Jens Engeli) Website: www.intercooperation-bd.org/publication.php,

Case study 5	Good Governance for Local Development in Afghanistan (GOFORGOLD)
Developed by	§ UNDP and the Afghan Independent Directorate of Local Governance (IDLG – ministry level body) in the framework of the Afghanistan Sub-national Governance Programme (ASGP). The project is supported by multiple donors (Canada, the European Commission, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland).
Applied in	§ All 34 provinces (regional level) of Afghanistan in 2010 - application at district, municipal and village levels was planned but could not be carried for security reasons.
Purpose / Utility of the tool	• Partners § Allows IDLG to dispose of an easy to use tool to monitor regional and local governments' performance. § Awareness raising on decentralisation and good governance principles at all levels § Allows for informed choices on priority policies and resources allocation • Project/SDC § Provides an overview of the governance situation at sub-national level § Baseline data for monitoring progress of the ASGP § Input for the second phase of the programme
Outputs / Reporting	§ Report presenting provinces' performance along 7 clusters of governance indicators. § Data are aggregated and presented in quantitative terms (for instance in the form of an easy to read dashboard) – some data gender disaggregated § Baseline data for ASGP
Dimensions	§ Basic principles of good governance are addressed § Specific focus on security (forms one cluster of indicators) § Gender as a transversal theme + social inclusion / pro-poor policies addressed through a specific "equity" cluster. § Not designed to analyse political realities or power relations • Collects both facts and perceptions through direct interactions with regional/local actors

Methodology	§ Indicators organized along 7 thematic clusters (*representation, accountability, efficiency-effectiveness, participation, transparency, security, equity*)
	§ 2 different sources of information:
	  - Data collected directly by performance measurement teams recruited by the ASGP through on site surveys (interviews + focus group discussions)
	  - Available literature and reports on Afghanistan (mainly: "Asia Foundation Annual Survey – Afghanistan" + World Bank Report on Worldwide Governance Indicators)

Inputs and time required	§ Data are to be collected by "performance measurement teams" recruited and trained by ASGP. § The difficult context in which it is applied (unstable political environment + limited knowledge on governance) implies that sufficient time needs to be planned for all activities (including preparation, training of performance measurement teams). § First round of the exercise carried in 8 months for the 34 provinces
Beneficiaries	! Local population (*directly consulted, increased awareness on role and duties of regional/local governments*); regional/local authorities (*main actor consulted, increased understanding on governance standards and identification of gaps*); national authorities (*monitoring of LG and decentralization, needs identification for planning*); donors/project (*baseline, planning, M&E*)
Most appropriate use	! Tool designed with a simple methodology to be applied in fragile contexts and post-conflict states ! Provides an overview on the governance situation of nascent institutions with limited information available ! Useful to gather data on security situation ! Provides baseline data
Remarks	! The tool has been applied for the first time in 2010 at provincial level only. The report is not yet available. Some observations therefore remain to be confirmed, especially as concerns the range of applied indicators and nature of data collected.
Replication, Sustainability	! GOFORGOLD provides an easy-to-use methodology. It addresses governance through concrete issues. The model can be adapted and replicated at all government levels ! Of specific relevance for fragile and post-conflict states ! Importance of close cooperation with central level that should develop leadership/ownership
Further Info and contact	Abdul Bari: abdul.bari@sdc.net Website: IDLG: http://www.idlg.gov.af/IDLG