

4 January 2011



*REVIEW OF THE RPSA GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME AND DRAFTING
OF MODALITIES FOR THE INTEGRATION OF GOVERNANCE*



*Stéphane Jeannet of Human Solutions Consulting – Geneva
Dr. Chiku Malunga of CADECO, Malawi*

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1. Introduction.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2. Methodology.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.1 Introductory remarks</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.2 Evaluation steps</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>2.3 Limitations of the methodology inferred from the ToRs</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Introduction to the regional strategy, 2005-2010.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>3. Review questions derived from the ToRs.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>3.1 Evaluation of achievements and relevance</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>3.1.1 Introduction: the difficulty of measuring results</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>3.1.2 Assessment of achievements.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>3.1.3 Observations by the consultants</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>3.1.4 Relevance</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>3.1.5 Regionalisation.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>3.1.5 Observations</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>3.1.6 Coherence and adequacy</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>3.2 Consolidation of responsive and accountable public institutions.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>3.2.1 Introduction.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>3.2.2 HRBA</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>3.2.3 Usefulness of governance measurement tools outside their initially-intended purpose</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>3.3 Integration of governance as a transversal theme</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>3.3.1 Justification for moving towards integration</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>3.3.2 Communication to, and understanding of partners</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>3.3.3 Trend: shift from partners to implementing agencies.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>3.3.4 Readiness for change of current partners</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>3.3.5 Success factors: what are some of the likely advantages and disadvantages of this move?.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>3.3.6 Potential entry points of governance issues into the other two domains</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>3.3.7 Possible steps of the integration process</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Annexes.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>List of persons/institutions interviewed</i>	<i>29</i>

Executive Summary

...

1. Introduction

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) commissioned an evaluation and a study for drafting modalities for the integration of its governance domain into the HIV-/AIDS; and food security domains - see textbox below on the connected decision. The assignment was aimed at assessing the performance of the governance domain since its inception with more emphasis on the period after the mid-term review in 2007. Equally important, the assignment was aimed at being a strategic thinking process on the integration modalities.

The Decision

On the 1st of July 2010 the *Comité des Politiques* reconfirmed the continuation of the Regional Program in Southern Africa (RPSA) with two main strategic thematic foci: Food Security and HIV and AIDS. Governance will be integrated in the two priority areas as a transversal element by 2012. For the climate change program (global issue) SDC will concentrate on South Africa. The regional approach through very focused lines of action (seed security and HIV and AIDS focusing on prevention and youth) has been validated.

Source: Annual Report Southern Africa, 2010 with Planning Part 2011

2. Methodology

2.1 Introductory remarks

On the basis of briefings as well as discussions with SDC in Bern and Pretoria concerning the interpretation of the ToRs, the consultants are of the opinion that the word “evaluation” used in the title of the present assignment is somewhat misleading. Indeed, an evaluation implies a certain methodology, in particular the reference to the evaluation criteria accepted by SDC (i.e. those of OECD/DAC), which are not present in these ToRs – see below some of the points made in the section on limitations. Consequently, the evaluators suggested replacing the word “evaluation” by “review”.

As foreseen in the review’s ToRs, an inception report was prepared at the beginning of the mission in RSA. A first draft of this paper was discussed with the Pretoria Swiss Cooperation Office (SCO) on 5 November, and the revised version was subsequently sent to Bern HQ. That same day, the document was discussed in a teleconference with both HQ and SCO, and their comments were incorporated, as appropriate, in the final inception report. It was in particular noted by HQ that the objectives and questions outlined in the paper might have been overly ambitious and too many.

2.2 Evaluation steps

1. Desk study of all relevant reports, prior and during the mission;
2. Briefings by SDC in Bern and Pretoria;
3. Drafting of the present inception report; discussion with SDC SCO and HQ with a view to achieve a common understanding of mutual expectations;
4. Semi-structured interviews with other international donors/stakeholders (at the demand of the consultants);
5. Semi-structured interviews with current governance domain partners as well as with selected partners of the other two domains;
6. At the request of the consultants, roundtable with other international donors;
7. As needed, additional interviews with SCO staff;
8. Preparation of a draft report containing evaluation findings and conclusions as well as proposals for future strategic orientations;
9. Presentation and discussion of initial findings and recommendations (workshop, day one, moderated by an external facilitator);
10. Participation in an internal discussion on future/potential strategic direction of the domain (workshop, day two moderated by an external facilitator);
11. Finalisation of the report on the basis of discussions during the workshops;
12. Presentation of the final report and debriefing in Bern.

The present report will not necessarily attribute statements to the interviewed stakeholders; indeed, the consultants prefer creating an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality more likely to obtain accurate and candid statements. For the same reason, and also with a view to keep the document succinct, the consultants will not include in the report summaries of interviews.

2.3 Limitations of the methodology inferred from the ToRs

The exercise encountered the following limitations, as well as those mentioned in section 3.1.1:

1. Apart from NDI, the consultants met only SDC's current partners (most of which in the governance sector) and were therefore not fully in a position to identify new/potential partners –in particular outside the governance sector. They nevertheless provided SDC with (basic) general guidelines and criteria for selecting future partners.
2. There is a risk of subjectivity for all those involved in the exercise. For instance, when attempting to assess the capacity of partners to adapt to the proposed paradigm shift, the main source of information was reports, the partners' and SDC's own assessment and the consultants' impressions after 2-3 hour meetings. Likewise, partners' readiness to accept the proposed changes was likely to be biased, as they were likely to be favourable since this is a source of potential future funding.
3. Assessing the relevance of current or potential projects and partners to the different contexts was mostly the result from analysis based on reports and the general knowledge of the consultants, as opposed to on an in-depth in-country analysis.

4. Despite the stress put on “regional initiatives”¹ in the “Governance Domain Updated Programme of March 2009”, that aspect was not fully represented in the mission. In particular, there is only limited contact with intergovernmental regional entities, apart from the NEPAD e-governance; e.g. SADC or the APRM secretariats were not included.
5. Finally, the consultants have taken into account the fact that SDC appeared to have already taken decisions on a number of issues contained in the ToRs, namely integration and transversality of governance.

Introduction to the regional strategy, 2005-2010

For the last ten years, since the end of the apartheid regime, SDC has been supporting a cooperation programme with South Africa. The new Regional Programme Southern Africa (RPSA) represents a **shift towards regional priorities**. SDC is following the SADC region's and South Africa's own trend towards regional cooperation, which is also observed with other donors in the SADC region. This shift is based on favourable factors like the existence of a proven potential for partnerships, ongoing regional knowledge sharing, the increasing significance of cross-border challenges and the growing importance of the Southern Africa Region as a framework for policy development and mutual learning.

The RPSA covers the “**SADC**” region (the “**Southern African Development Community**” with approximately 200 million people) consisting of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe. The Democratic Republic of Congo will not be included in the RPSA; Madagascar will be added to the list once it becomes a member of the SADC.

Despite the existing cultural, economic and political diversity, the countries of the region are developing a regional identity through more regional interaction and cooperation between governments and civil society. Today they rely on **SADC** to bring **regional responses to common development challenges**. SADC's main objective is to achieve the levels of policy harmonisation and resource rationalisation required for the complex task of regional economic integration. One important step is the creation of a SADC Free Trade Area, initiated in 2000 and to be completely implemented by 2008. The **new South Africa**, in many ways far ahead of its neighbours in terms of economic and social development, perceived as a “**trailblazer**” of the region and the **continent**, continues to cautiously assert its leading role.

An element relevant to regional programmes in development cooperation is the relatively recent discussion with regard to **Global Public Goods** and, applying the same concept to a region of several countries, **Regional Public Goods (RPGs)**. Regional policies and programmes can **complement national development efforts**, mainly in three forms, in many areas in which

¹ This term is understood by SDC as including projects by NGOs. The workshop further showed that there was not real common understanding of it by involved stakeholders.

externalities and public goods arise: beneficial cross-border spillovers, reduced harmful spillovers and improved national outcomes.

The political situation in the region is characterised by the **diversity of political systems**. These range from absolute monarchy to constitutional democracies on a continuum from de facto one party rule, unclear divisions between legislative, administrative, and judicial functions and state control of the media to decentralised political, fiscal and administrative functions, widespread participation by civil society and media independence. In general, **democracies in the region are young and fragile**.

Poverty, the **principal challenge to development confronting the SADC region**, is widespread, with an estimated 70% of the population living below the US\$2 per day poverty level, and 40% living in extreme poverty. Increasing levels of inequality, adverse political, social and economic governance and a worsening health situation are major causes for poverty. In fact, a number of SADC countries have Gini-Coefficients that place them **amongst the world's most unequal societies**.

Food shortages are recurrent in Southern Africa, causing suffering to millions of people. This phenomenon is worsened by the effect of the **HIV/AIDS pandemic**, weakening the work force and thus exacerbating the situation regarding food security. The HIV/AIDS pandemic has become the **primary threat to economic and social development** in the region. Nowhere is the **epidemic's feminisation** more apparent than in this region, where nearly 60% of infected adults are women and 75% of young people infected are women and girls. HIV/AIDS exacerbates the situation of women who have to bear most of the economic and social consequences of the epidemic.

The **main arguments** making the case for the RPSA are:

- The potential for **scaling up** successful experiences and lessons learned from our cooperation programmes in RSA, Mozambique, Tanzania and other regional initiatives (research partnerships, Natural Resources Unit Projects and REPSSI).
- Experience shows that SDC can play the role of a regional **catalyst and promoter, based on its comparative advantages** (flexible and lean procedures, efficient networking based on presence and experience, working with partnerships, openness to innovation), in strengthening regional public and private partners.
- The RPSA builds on and responds to the development priorities of Southern Africa in a subsidiary way.
- There is potential to build on **existing regional solidarity** to promote joint regional problem solving for selected transnational issues (HIV/AIDS, governance, NRM) through existing **civil society networks** as well as through regional governmental organisations.
- The RPSA seeks to contribute to the **harmonisation** of policies among the countries of the region.
- **South Africa's regional leadership role**, the quality of its human resources, its acceptance in the region and the fact that South Africa has become Switzerland's most important partner in sub-Saharan Africa are favourable factors for the proposed RPSA.

- Increased networking between SDC's Cooperation Offices in Southern Africa and the extent of SDC's regional financial commitment must also be seen from a **prospective** viewpoint in opening up new avenues of cooperation.
- The **regional approach** allows for **overall SOSA programme risk reduction** and adds programmatic flexibility.
- The **Joint Programme Review** completed with the South African Government in November 2003 has confirmed the relevance and the need to continue with our bilateral programme with South Africa.

The **geographical scope** of the RPSA means that **at least two countries** of the RPSA region are involved, but not necessarily SDC priority countries of co-operation ("géométrie variable"). Poverty, HIV/AIDS and conflicts are the principal development challenges confronting the SADC region. Therefore the **overall goal of the RPSA** reads as follows:

Contribute to poverty reduction and conflict prevention in the Southern Africa Region addressing challenges which can only or best be tackled through a regional approach.

The domains of intervention **HIV/AIDS, Governance and Natural Resources Management**, as well as the **Arts and Culture** area, are interlinked and the potential for synergies is important. HIV/AIDS and gender will be mainstreamed as cross cutting issues in all domains.

The Regional Programme will be managed by COOF Pretoria, supported by a "**Cooperative Network**" among the three SDC COOFs in the Southern Africa region. COOF Pretoria will have the lead in this network and will work in close co-operation with Maputo and Dar Es Salaam, each engaging in policy dialogue, assessment and consultation with potential regional partners in their countries.²

Synopsis Result Framework of Cooperation Strategy / Medium Term Programme (MTP)

Regional Programme Southern Africa³

Overall goal:			
The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation supports the regional integration and poverty reduction agenda of the Southern African Development Community in addressing social, economic and environmental challenges.			
Regional Domains			Global Prog. Climate change (GPCC)
Governance	HIV/AIDS	Natural Resources / Food Security	Climate Change (South Africa only)

² REGIONAL COOPERATION STRATEGY SOUTHERN AFRICA 2005 – 2010, April 2005 (executive summary)

³ Regional Programme Southern Africa (RPSA)- Annual Report 2010

Formal democracy responsive and responsible institutions and democratic culture	Prevention and care for the youth and the children	Regional seed security (availability, access and quality)	CC Mitigation in RSA) and Adaptation in SADC (OSA)
SADC priorities			
Promote common political values, systems and other shared values which are transmitted through institutions which are democratic, legitimate and effective. (SADC Treaty, Article 5.1.b)	All Member States demonstrate a 50% reduction in the rate of new infections to half of the 2008 levels and mitigate concomitant impacts by 2015 (SADC HIV and AIDS Framework 2010-2015)	To improve food availability through increased production, productivity and profitability of crops, livestock and fisheries. (SADC, RISDP, Sustainable Food Security)	Final Energy demand reduced by 12% by 2015 compared to projected national energy usage. (South African National Energy Efficiency Strategy)
SDC contributions			
Well being of people improved through equitable delivery of basic services by responsive and accountable public administrations.	Incidence of HIV infection and psycho-social impact of HIV and AIDS on children, youth and other vulnerable groups significantly reduced by 2015	Provision of improved seeds to rural populations in the SADC region improve their nutritional situation and increase their ability to cope with social, economic and environmental fluctuations	Growth in Energy Demand in the Building sector significantly reduced taking into account key social issues including poverty, gender and HIV/AIDS
CHF 2.5 Mio per year	CHF 3.5 Mio per year	CHF 4 Mio per year	CHF 3 Mio per year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Free and fair elections - Accountable institutions and improved service delivery (judiciary, local governance, etc.) - Promotion of democratic processes through dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Mitigating impact of HIV/AIDS on vulnerable groups, children and youth - Mainstreaming of psychosocial care for orphaned and vulnerable children. - Prevention programme focused on the youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harmonised regional seeds policies translated in national legislation - Income generation through seed industries - Skills development in seeds (quality, techniques, post harvesting etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supportive Policy Framework and improved energy monitoring systems (national and local) - Capacity building in implementing energy efficiency policies in municipalities (GPCC); skills development in construction sector (OSA) -Cleaner building materials(bricks)
Transversal themes Gender & Governance			
SDC supports SADC overall goal to achieve substantive equality between women and men in the region through mainstreaming gender into all regional policies, programmes and activities (RISDP). Application of Governance principles will focus on the areas of food security, health and climate change.			

3. Review questions derived from the ToRs

According to the ToRs, the exercise has three main objectives, which are reproduced in the yellow textboxes hereafter. The questions listed here below, which have been developed by the consultants, are generic to all partners; specific questions were formulated prior to each interview.

3.1 Evaluation of achievements and relevance

3.1.1 Introduction: the difficulty of measuring results

As will be pointed out later in the report, the donor community is increasingly feeling uncomfortable with its inability, as well as its implementing partners', to convincingly and efficiently demonstrate and quantify results in the governance sector. SDC has itself acknowledged this problem:

*"Governance monitoring, particularly outcome monitoring, have remained a significant challenge for SDC and its partners because it is difficult to measure results in the governance sector. Often improvements in governance can be noticed only after many years of interventions."*⁴

The consultants face a similar challenge in identifying the achievements of the sector's portfolio over the last five years. In addition certain limitations in the present exercise are pointed out:

- No baseline (although context analysis were carried out in 2005 and 2007), against which progress could be measured, was established at the beginning of the review period (2005). The only existing milestone is the report of the 2007 mid-term review of the full RPSA, part of which will serve below as a yardstick with which to measure progress.
- The (evaluation) criteria of success (e.g. effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) are not spelled out in the Review's ToRs. Furthermore, reporting on projects and their activities is mostly descriptive/factual; i.e. focuses more on outputs than outcomes. It will however be noted later in the present report that efforts have been deployed by the SCO over the past months to improve the monitoring and evaluations tools of the RPSA.
- The exercise is mostly based on two main sources of information, i.e. a desk study and interviews with project implementing partners. It must be stressed that the projects' beneficiaries, other SCOs⁵ and partners in targeted countries were not met. The same largely applies to external stakeholders or observers, although the consultants (upon their request) did meet other donors. There is therefore little or no external/independent source of information (apart from 3 or 4 evaluation reports), or third-party perspective and, therefore, few means for verification/triangulation of information.

⁴ Annual report Southern Africa 2010, with planning part 2011, p 7.

⁵ The presence of the Governance NPO from the Maputo SCOSCO did nevertheless mitigate this gap and, more generally, contributed positively to the overall exercise.

3.1.2 Assessment of achievements

Terms of Reference

- I. To evaluate the **achievements** in the governance domain and the **relevance** of the current **three areas of focus** (i.e. formal democracy, responsive and accountable public institutions, and democratic dialogue) from 2005-2010.”

“The evaluation will build on the Mid-Term Review RPSA in 2007. It will assess and present the progress that has been made with the implementation in the governance domain including the achievements and shortcomings, for purposes of learning, providing strategic guidance and recommendations on the way forward. “(section 2 of the ToRs)

The development hypothesis of the governance domain was, *‘capable central as well as decentralised authorities and empowered citizens will contribute to democracy and promotion of accountability, thereby addressing political and social exclusion’*. This would be achieved through working with regional implementing partners. The overall achievements of SDC therefore would be determined through the cumulative achievements of the implementing partners. Based upon this understanding, SDC’s key achievements have been:

3.1.2.1 Strengthening the process of formal democracy in the region

Development and application of tools like the “Principles of Election Management, Monitoring and Observation” (PEMMO) to improve election processes, which is increasingly being used as a basic manual during national and local elections in the region. It is available in English, French and Portuguese.

Another achievement was the training and deployment of election observer groups and technical assessment missions to Swaziland, Malawi, South Africa, Angola, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Madagascar, as well as the publication of peer reviewed African elections journal and other key publications, and also the contribution towards the idea to form the SADC elections advisory council and domestic networks on elections

The above activities have generally strengthened electoral monitoring bodies, civil society and political parties in their capacity to manage electoral processes, e.g. in voter tabulation, voter registration, audits, communication and IT strategies. As a result capacities have been built to engage in free and fair elections. For example, in Mozambique 8 civil society organisations carried out Parallel Voter Tabulation (PVT) through deployment of 1,850 election observers. The PVT played a vital role in improving the transparency of the electoral process as recorded by the European Union Observer Mission to Mozambique. In Malawi the promotion of Multi-party Liaison Committees at national and local levels facilitated communication among political parties and helped to resolve electoral conflicts during election campaigns.

3.1.2.2 Promotion of responsive and accountable public institutions

Among the achievements, we should note the development and promotion of governance tools, e.g. the local governance barometer and the social accountability system by IDASA and CSA respectively. These tools are being used with a level of success in the region.

IDASA has made a significant contribution towards participation of civil society in the decentralisation process. The previous trend was ‘decentralisation without participation of civil society’. A number of governance practitioners from across the region have gone through the CSA fundamental course on social accountability. The social accountability approach has been adopted by a number of organisations within South Africa and outside, including EISA-APRM, the Centre for Social Concern in Malawi and the Mwanza Fish Market Association in Tanzania – see textbox below.

An example of achievement attained through use of one of the tools

“Using CSA tools, the Mwaloni Fish Market Association with support of the Policy Forum discovered that it contributes 14% of the local income of the Mwanza local council to rehabilitate water and sanitation infrastructure at the fish market. Using this evidence, the Association staged a no-tax civil disobedience, which led to the inclusion of the Association in the list of civic actors invited to participate in participatory planning and budget processes and the allocation of budget in 2009/10 financial year to rehabilitate the fish market.”

Source: Annual Report Southern Africa, 2010 with Planning Part 2011

Demonstration e-schools by e-Nepad (information and knowledge) have been established and are being scaled up in a number of countries, e.g. in South Africa, Kenya and Rwanda

The implementing partners and, to a lesser extent SDC, have managed to build relationships with local government ministries, local leaders and other key stakeholders for enhanced sustainability and ownership of the programme.

3.1.2.3 Consolidation of democracy and development of democratic culture

There is continuing and regular dialogue among different and conflicting political groups including traditional authorities, government officials and opposition parties in Lesotho and Swaziland and also in South Africa facilitated by CCR. This is resulting in better understanding among the groups involved and some perceptible movement towards consensus. CCR has gained acceptance and recognition to intervene in the said countries with key stakeholders. EISA has also been facilitating ‘social dialogue’ between civil society and elected officials in DRC on issues of deforestation and governance.

While it is too early to comment on the impact of the Small Claims Courts, their work has so far produced tangible results. Furthermore, the concept appears to be getting regional recognition and demand (e.g. from Uganda, Zambia and Botswana). Small Claims Courts have expanded beyond townships to rural areas and ensure access to justice by many. The number of cases addressed has increased from 18, 227 in 2007 to 51,713 in 2009. Training manuals for commissioners and clerks have been developed and launched. The quality of the commissioners and clerks has improved through training. Their numbers has also increased.

AWEPA is supporting oversight capacity of parliaments and is working closely with the SADC Parliamentary Forum. In addition, they are sending South African parliamentarians to the region to share experiences with their fellow elected officials in the region.

3.1.3 Observations by the consultants

The achievements were mostly reported at output level. The actual changes happening as a result of the outputs were generally not made evident at the levels of outcomes and impact. In addition, the results were mostly reported at national and local levels – see however below the efforts by the SCO to improve monitoring tools over the past months. There were no clear mechanisms to demonstrate how the results achieved could be used to consciously contribute at regional level. No specific or dedicated mechanisms or fora existed to document those at regional level, for instance with a view to replicate and disseminate best practices and lessons learned. It must nevertheless be pointed out that partners such as IDASA and EISA did have workshops at the regional level, but the implications of these were not clear.

3.1.3.1 Factors helping and hindering achievement

The main helping factors included a generally healthy relationship between SDC and the implementing partners; as well as a good understanding of the regional context enhancing the relevance of the initiatives implemented and the technical competence of the implementing partners.

The main hindering factors included:

- Inadequate appreciation of the long term nature of governance initiatives and the length of time needed to demonstrate tangible results;
- Governance organizations not working together for synergy and the general slowness of the regional bodies constraining the speed of implementing partner activities;
- Difficulty in establishing a close relationship with regard to APRM institutions;
- Insufficient coordination between SDC's regional and in-country projects.

3.1.3.2 Lessons learned by implementing partners and SDC

It is not easy to demonstrate significant results or achievements in governance programs within short time limits like in a project cycle. As it aims towards systemic change, it is a process that takes time.

It is important to have a baseline against which to measure progress. But we realise it is not easy to do this in governance programs and at a regional level - e.g. in which countries to do the baseline in and on what issues? It is practically and methodologically difficult, as well as resource-intensive. Furthermore, governance results cannot be measured only in quantitative terms.

To produce optimal results, it is important to work with both the supply and demand sides (as suggested by the Rights-based approach) of governance stakeholders in a neutral and supportive way. Organisations are usually too busy to reflect on their work and do not allocate sufficient resources for this purpose. Organisational reflection and learning ought to be planned and budgeted for.

3.1.3.3 Improve results-based management (RBM)

Most current logframe reporting systems are limited in their capacity to report governance results especially at outcome and impact levels. Currently, many of the implementing partners face this challenge. The argument that it is difficult to demonstrate tangible results in governance may have partly to do with the monitoring and evaluation systems and tools used. There is need to explore more innovative ways for demonstrating results in governance initiatives. One possible mean was suggested by a participant in the Feedback Workshop on 23 November:

"I think there is good work being doing on the ground, but translating that into compelling contribution stories is a weakness. And that requires a lot more work and different work practices."

Developing new monitoring tools for the RPSA

"- The overall SDC RPSA Cooperation Strategy, developed in 2004 and updated in 2007, originally covered the period 2005 to 2010. In 2008, it was extended by two years until the end of 2012 to match the duration of the "Message". The Strategy was designed to orient the work of the programme, but with limited elements to effectively measure progress.

- As regards RPSA specific sectors strategies, the Strategic Framework for the Food Security programme (2009-2013) has a clear set of objectives and relevant corresponding indicators, which have been taken over in the proposed RPSA Monitoring System below. Similar strategic frameworks were however not available for the other RPSA sectors (Governance, HIV and AIDS).

- At RPSA project level, even though every project document and credit proposal studied did have a Logframe in annex, in many cases not enough attention seems to have been paid to the cause and effect relationship in elaborating development hypotheses. This often leads to confusing strategies with unclear priorities, in the absence of clear hierarchy of objectives.

- In addition, project level objectives formulation is often complicated, with a frequent mix of objectives, strategy and activities in the same sentence, thus making the objective quite difficult to clearly identify and therefore to measure.

- Finally, selected indicators often lack relevance and/or measurability. Some are impossible to aggregate or synthesise (p. 4)

6.2 Transversal Themes

.In future, it is planned to deal with Governance and Adaptation to Climate Change (?) as Transversal Themes within RPSA. To successfully introduce a Transversal Theme in projects that have a sector focus (e.g. Governance issues in the Seed Security Network) the COOF should:

- Develop with concerned partners, a set of objectives, strategies and activities for the Transversal Theme within each project;*
- Develop a system to Monitor the implementation of the Transversal Theme, as an integral part of each project; and then*
- Set aside in each project a budget to fund all the activities related to the Transversal Theme, including its Monitoring.*

In my experience, this is the most effective way to ensure that Transversal Themes will be dealt with seriously. (p. 6-7).⁶ (...)

RPSA Cooperation Strategy Monitoring Workshop, 14 Sept.2010

1. Background & Objective

As part of a world wide effort to strengthen its ability to demonstrate results achieved and improve effectiveness of its programmes, SDC has redesigned the monitoring system of its cooperation strategy and projects in Southern Africa.

The workshop under reference was organized by SDC in the framework of this important exercise, with the objective to agree with its main partners and implementing agencies in the region on key features of the monitoring systems developed by SDC for its four areas of intervention (Governance, HIV/AIDS, Food Security and Climate Change) to measure the effectiveness of projects on the ground, and to assess their contribution to national and regional strategic objectives in each area. (...)

2. Decisions:

- *SDC Cooperation Office will revisit and adjust the monitoring systems taking into account the suggestions made by the groups;*
- *SDC Programme Managers will work with each partner to ensure that the project level monitoring systems are finalised and implemented, and deliver the data required by SDC to assess the contribution the projects and programmes it supports make to regional and national sector goals and objectives;*
- *If and when necessary, SDC will support building its partners' capacity for monitoring and provide financial resources in project budgets to cover cost of monitoring.*

3.1.3.4 Follow-up to the recommendations of the 2007 Mid-term Review

SDC has implemented most of the recommendations through updating the governance domain. They have decided to make governance an integrated issue and have decided to concentrate on promoting responsive and accountable institutions with the aim of sharpening focus. Challenges remain with harmonisation of work with other donor agencies. It is not clear how SDC is working with organisations outside South Africa to enable them to benefit more from their engagement with their South African counterparts. Engaging intergovernmental institutions has been limited to e-Nepad. More details are given in the section on regionalisation.

3.1.3.4 Suggestions for improvements

SDC and implementing partners need to think through and conceptualise a more effective results reporting mechanism that speaks to or at a regional level and can help track changes at this level. This implies getting some sort of a benchmark and an agreed set of performance indicators. One way this could be done is through the use of case studies and impact stories and demonstrating how these stories can be used to engage with policy makers at national and regional levels.

⁶ *Design of a Monitoring System for SDC Cooperation Strategy and programmes in Southern Africa, François E. Binder, Mission Report, May 18th 2010*

SDC needs to find ways of ensuring that lessons learnt at country or local levels are effectively shared across countries and at regional level. This means there is need to develop a more effective learning and knowledge management system.

SDC needs to find ways on how to engage more with intergovernmental organisations and other donor agencies for better harmonisation of efforts and synergy.

3.1.4 Relevance

3.1.4.1 General assessment of relevance

The general background of the region bears the following characteristics:

1. Increasing need for consolidation of democracy, need for more effective intergovernmental institutions including SADC and NEPAD, slow decentralisation processes; and the 'China effect' – economic development at the expense of political or governance development in terms of regional politics;
2. Slow but steady economic growth, continuing vulnerability of economies –relying on narrow and non-processed products, growing 'Chinese influence' (taking over space of local small businesses), increasing roles and challenges of agriculture and high levels of unemployment especially among the youths in terms of the regional economy;
3. Given social development factors, deteriorating public institutions and poor service delivery, key challenges with HIV and AIDS, likely failure to meet most of the MDGs, competition of priorities between poverty reduction and other priorities e.g. security; and high levels of migration especially among the youths in terms of the social development factors, it can be concluded that the current governance domain is very relevant to the political and social context of the region.

The IDASA evaluation report for example states that all the stakeholders agreed on the programmes relevance – *with some caution regarding timing and capacity*. All the three sub-themes of the governance domain (formal democracy, responsive and accountable institutions, and entrenching a democratic culture) focus on social and political development. The domain has not been directly responsive to the economic factors in the region.

3.1.4.2 Assessment by the partners of their partnership with SDC

The relationship between SDC and the implementing partners is rated highly. The partners appreciate, "the adult to adult rather than the adult to child nature of the relationship". One respondent said that, "with SDC, we work together, they review our progress and we discuss how to improve performance as we strive to achieve our mission. They don't dictate. They allow us to forge on our own trajectory".

It must be pointed out that the support provided to partners so far has been through core contributions. Such a modality was obviously much appreciated by partners, and discussions during the workshop showed that some of them would be reluctant to move away from this (rather comfortable) type of financing.

Currently the relationship and contact between SDC and partners is mostly through management. It appears that the boards are generally excluded from the partnership. Including them would most probably bring the value of better engagement with the partners and ease in resolving issues when they arise as the board is responsible for financial oversight, performance monitoring, ensuring sustainability and overall organisational development. It would also provide SDC with increased opportunities for networking with influential personalities and representatives of institutions.

3.1.5 Regionalisation

Reference Framework for RPSA

“SDC's effort to develop the Governance domain of the RPSA takes place within the following reference framework:

- i. **NEPAD**, the New Partnership for Africa's Development which aims at creating the conditions for sustainable development, i.e. peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights and good economic management;
- ii. **SADC**, the Southern African Development Community, which targets regional integration; SADC provides the overall institutional framework for policy dialogue and coordination for SDC's regional programme in the region.”

“The Programme is based on the Medium-Term Strategy 2000 – 2010 for Development Cooperation in East and Southern Africa, where the principle for a regional co-operation was established. Its goal is to support the promising new forms of regional co-operation between countries or in supra-national institutions and forums.”⁷

The following table presents some of the main relevant recommendations of the 2007 Mid-term Review, as well as the consultants remarks thereon.

⁷ Annual report Southern Africa 2010, with planning part 2011, p 3.

<i>Recommendations of the RPSA 2007 MTR Report</i>	<i>Consultants' observations</i>
<p>Benefits to partners elsewhere in the region can be increased, and there is scope for improving co-ordination between SDC's regional support and national or bilateral support provided in other countries. p.4</p> <p>There appears to be limited co-ordination and alignment between Swiss national and regional support. The regional programme clearly adds value, but not specifically to SDC's national programmes in other Southern African countries. The Regional Programme has been designed and implemented without much attention to how such a programme can add value to the SDC programmes in Tanzania and Mozambique. p. 23</p>	<p>No clear mechanisms have been designed to improve coordination and synergies (or merely exchange of information).</p> <p>In addition, there is no evidence that any significant changes have taken place to balance benefits between South African partners and their national beneficiary organisations in the targeted countries.</p>
<p>Improving harmonisation with the regional support programmes of other donor agencies, sharpening the focus of the programme, and putting more emphasis on support to capacity development of partners outside South Africa. p. 4</p> <p>There is scope for improvement when it comes to harmonisation with other donors (...) supporting the same or related interventions, p. 22</p>	<p>More could have been done to improve harmonisation with other donors at policy level.</p> <p>Focus is being achieved by reducing the governance areas to concentrate on accountable and responsive institutions.</p> <p>The intended integration of governance into the remaining two sectors may require additional capacity building inputs.</p>
<p>SDC – like other donor agencies – have found it difficult and demanding to work with SADC and inter-governmental institutions. The transaction costs have been high. This has led to a situation where a large share of the funding is allocated through NGOs. In some areas, most notably in the governance (...), this has led to insufficient attention to how public institutions can and should play a role in these interventions. p. 23</p> <p>A challenge is the relation between regional support to NGOs and other non-state actors and support provided to SADC institutions and other intergovernmental and public bodies. With the exception of the Nepad-project, all SDC support in this domain is provided directly to NGOs. Support to non-state actors is particularly important in the governance domain, but it is critical important to also consider how and when support can be provided directly to regional public institutions. A notable feature of regional projects in the governance sector is that public institutions tend to be very weak and operate with a skeleton staff while NGOs in comparison in many areas are very well resourced and staffed. In the SDC portfolio the discrepancy between public and private resources is perhaps most strongly evident in the support provided under the heading “strengthening of</p>	<p>SADEC and NEPAD are still perceived as being largely ineffective, inefficient and uncooperative. This is forcing SDC and other donors to work with “regionalised” (largely South African-based) NGOs, sometimes creating a perception of being “demand biased.” At present, it is therefore difficult to find a convincing link between the supported activities and the SDC's strategic goal of supporting “regional initiatives.”</p>

<i>Recommendations of the RPSA 2007 MTR Report</i>	<i>Consultants' observations</i>
formal democracy". p. 29	
<p>Many of the projects are small with limited ability to make a direct impact in the medium term. Such approaches can more easily be justified in country support, but it is far more demanding and difficult to manage such support at the regional level. With limited funds and limited management capacity SDC would be ensured of greater impact if its support was limited to a smaller number of interventions in fewer areas. pp. 28-29</p>	<p>SDC has reduced its number of partners to seven in order to ensure more focus and concentration. However, the analysis of the governance portfolio (see next section) reveals a lack of coherence among the different goals.</p>
<p>A challenge evident from the SDC portfolio is to ensure that the strong support provided to South African-based NGOs and South Africa-led regional networks translates into benefits for partners in other Southern African countries. Knowledge cannot just be transferred – it also needs to be acquired. (...) all governance interventions through non-state actors are channelled through South African-based organisations. Furthermore, most SDC-funds to these organisations, and all funds for salaries, stays in South Africa with funding for partners being mainly confined to project expenses such as participation in workshops and seminars. The team believes it to be vitally important that more attention is paid to how partners outside South Africa can benefit more from SDC-supported interventions. (...) Failing to do this will reinforce existing imbalances between South African NGOs and NGOs in other Southern African countries and runs the risk of undermining efforts to strengthen regional co-operation. p. 30</p> <p>SDC intends also to support further initiatives for developing peer-learning, knowledge sharing and also gain from the resulting effect of peer-pressure. updated 2010 strat, p. 6</p>	<p>SDC support is still South African-dominated (all partners are RSA-based), undermining efforts to strengthen a truly regional cooperation/integration. It can nevertheless be noted that a number of SDC's partners have gradually increased their numbers of non-South-African staff.</p> <p>The move to regionalisation of some of the partners was mostly initiated and encouraged by SDC – it was therefore not always endogenous. In some instances this created confusion between the meanings of regional and multi-country.</p> <p>Cases such as that of CCR can nevertheless be noted; indeed, this partner sub-contracted local NGOs in Swaziland and Lesotho.</p>

3.1.5 Observations

The SDC portfolio seems to be constituted of a collection of projects, being designed and implemented in a multi-country approach, rather than being the intended regional programme. This seems to deviate from the stated regional approach, aimed at supporting regional initiatives. There is therefore a disconnect between the strategy and how it is being implemented.

As stated in the table above, there is no clear vision or strategy (beyond statements on principles) to ensure that regional projects be complementary and harmonised with the SCOs' own projects. Not only did this create missed opportunities in terms of potential synergies, but it also ran the risk of competition, duplication or even incompatibility between the two. Clearly, this situation calls for increased communication and coordination between SCOs and, where necessary, policy inputs from SDC HQs.

3.1.6 Coherence and adequacy

3.1.6.1 Internal coherence

The current portfolio of the governance sector (excluding small action project) includes the following partnerships/programmes/projects:

- 1) **IDASA Local Government Barometer (LGB):** SDC supports the application of IDASA LGB in five Southern Africa countries i.e. Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Tanzania and South Africa.*
- 2) **CSA Social Accountability:** SDC supports the regional project of Centre for Social Accountability in 10 Southern African Countries.*
- 3) **EISA APRM:** SDC supports the APRM project of the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA) in five Southern African countries, i.e. Tanzania, Zambia, Mauritius, South Africa and Mozambique.*
- 4) **EISA ECEP:** SDC supports EISA project on Enhancing the Capacity Election Practitioners (ECEP) in Southern African countries.*
- 5) **CCR Conflict Transformation:** SDC support the conflict transformation project of the Centre for Conflict Transformation (CCR) in three Southern African countries, i.e. South Africa, Swaziland and Lesotho.*
- 6) **NEPAD e-Africa Commission:** SDC contributes to the secretariat costs of the NEPAD e-Africa Commission.*
- 7) **South Africa Department of Justice - Small Claims Courts:** SDC supports the Small Claims Courts strengthening project of the South African Department of Justice.*

- 8) ~~**DRC Decentralisation Tripartite:**~~ SDC is considering a tripartite decentralisation for the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in partnership with the South African Department of Provincial and Local Government.⁸
- 9) In addition, SDC contribute to the **UNDP Trust Fund for the APRM**, which was initially managed directly from HQ in Bern.
- 10) **AWEPA** is funded directly by QQ.

It appears clearly that SDC's governance portfolio is diverse and far-reaching. In fact, one SDC official considered that this portfolio was sometimes regarded as the place to put projects that SDC wanted to support without fully knowing under which sector they fell. In other words, the fact that the concept of "governance" was perceived as sufficiently vague and elastic served to take on board projects that would normally not have been supported by SDC under the stricter definitions of the other two sectors. This approach, while it may have seemed at the time to be expedient and harmless, currently does appear to have further diluted or eroded the definition of "governance" and, consequently the means and methods necessary to demonstrate tangible achievements.

The consultants are therefore brought to the point of concluding that the governance portfolio was gradually made heterogeneous and insufficiently coherent which, in turn, made it resource-intensive to manage while rendering it difficult to draw clear evidence of tangible results. This diversity of themes, projects and partners made the whole endeavour quite cumbersome and difficult to grasp as a whole. It must nevertheless be noted that the regional strategy under which these projects were fitted was, in itself, vague enough to allow for the present situation to occur, whereby it has become (practically and politically) expedient to scrap the sector rather than to try to fix it.

3.1.6.2 Coherence with the regional strategy

Strategic Approach

*"In line with RPSA, the strategic approach for the governance domain is centred on the identification, consolidation and expansion of **regional public goods** in the three governance focus areas. It will support knowledge sharing and application on **policies, strategies and practices that have regional value**, with the view to support the emergence of a regional identity. The strengthening of regional exchanges and applications is seen as critical to address regional and shared governance challenges.*

The following three criteria will be applied in the identification and provision of support:

1. *Initiatives has a clear **regional perspective and cross border nature**; this ensures that the programme covers only issues that are best treated regionally;*
2. *Initiatives have to contribute to the development of **regional cooperation or institutions**; the initiatives thus contribute to the overall goal of the RPSA;*
3. *Initiatives have a clear **pro-poor** design. Outcome assessments are made to ensure positive effect on poverty reduction.*

Apart from support to the e-Africa Commission and to the APRM, the portfolio of projects has not, from a conceptual point of view, been a perfect fit with SDC's strategy for the region, in particular the

⁸ This potential project was recently scrapped.

support it was meant to bring to “regional initiatives” – indeed, the latter, in its spirit was meant to further regional integration, something that South African-based NGOs having multi-county projects were unlikely to achieve in and by themselves. (See also above the comments on the follow-up to the 2007 Mid-term Review)

3.2 Consolidation of responsive and accountable public institutions

Terms of Reference

- II. To assess the relevance of the intention to consolidate the governance domain⁹ on issues of responsive and accountable public institutions.

3.2.1 Introduction

It seems logical that only the promotion of responsive and accountable public institutions may fit the decision to integrate governance in the other sectors. The same applies to the issue of decentralisation, which is also part of this focus area.

Furthermore, it would seem that this focus area, coupled with the more technical aspects of the other sectors, is more likely to enable implementing partners and, in turn, SDC to demonstrate or quantify achievement.

Focus Area 2: Promotion of Responsive and Accountable Public Institutions

*“Democratic governance in Southern Africa depends on the development of responsive and accountable public institutions at central and local levels. Specifically, SDC will support initiatives related to **decentralisation** and social accountability. Support for decentralization focuses on regional initiatives that promote the devolution of power and help strengthen the capacities of decentralised authorities. Support for social accountability **focuses on regional initiatives** that create mechanisms and develop tools for governance monitoring and encourage the fulfilment of the socio-economic rights of citizens and enhance public participation in decision making processes”.¹⁰*

Finally, the two main tools (see below eponymous section) developed by SDC’s partners, i.e. CSA and IDASA, are processes or approaches geared towards accountability (e.g. governance monitoring) and

⁹ The word « domain » does not seem appropriate since the governance domain, as such, will cease to exist.

¹⁰ Annual report Southern Africa 2010, with planning part 2011, p 5.

not towards elections and conflict resolution.¹¹ In addition, both these tools are relatively easy to grasp, and the two organisations that developed them offer training on how to put them in practice.

It must nevertheless be pointed out that such a move may encounter challenges (e.g. corporate culture, resistance or inability to change) within the organisations currently partnering on the other two domains. Similarly, it may take some adaptation efforts for the partners working in the current governance domain to adapt to the more technical aspects of HIV/AIDS, food security and climate change. Whereas the consultants met with representatives of the latter organisations and are fairly confident in their capacity and willingness to adapt, they are not fully in a position to appraise that question with regard to organisations working in the remaining two sectors, as they did not meet during the mission in RSA.

In conclusion, the decision to consolidate accountability is in line with the option taken with regard to integration of the governance sector. SDC will nevertheless have to resist the urge to stretch the concept of accountability in order to fit desired (but unrelated) projects into it. Indeed, whereas conceptual expediency may in the short-term look attractive, it is ultimately likely to result in dilution of strategies and incoherence of portfolios. Furthermore, during the workshop, some participants expressed concerns that the proposed move may risk perverting the identity or mission of partners.

3.2.2 HRBA

The Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) is mentioned in passing in the review's ToR. SDC adopted in 2006 its "Human Rights Policy: Towards a Life of Dignity – Realising rights for poor people"; since then, this policy appears to be floating in limbo. At least two of SDC's partners, namely MIET and CSA) have nevertheless fully integrated it in their approach. In fact, rights have become the starting point for their theory of change. The consultants in fact believe that most of SDC's other partners have followed a similar path, even if they may not necessarily realise it. Whereas the HRBA may not be well received or understood in some circles, it does remain, whether a reference to it is made explicitly or not, a useful conceptual and operational model. In the two cases mentioned above, the adoption of the approach and its incorporation in all stages of the projects has proved not only theoretically sound but also a helpful tool in terms of operations.

If only one thing had to be retained from the HRBA, it would be the fact that development interventions must work on both sides of the equation, i.e. rights holders and duty bearers. Ignoring this basic tenet is indeed likely to create a situation of imbalance. SDC's governance portfolio was deemed overly geared towards non-institutional/governmental partners.

3.2.3 Usefulness of governance measurement tools outside their initially-intended purpose

¹¹ The other two areas were: Focus Area 1: Strengthen the Process of Formal Democracy in SADC Countries; and Focus Area 3: Consolidation of Democracy and the Development of Democratic Culture

CSA has developed the social accountability system governance tool while IDASA has developed the local governance barometer. These tools have been experimented with and used for a number of years now. There is evidence of increasing uptake of the tools by many organisations in the region. One implementing partner noted that the CSA course helped them to better evaluate government departments and their own methodology. A key strength of the tools is that they provide a means to link the ‘intangible nature of governance’ with concrete thematic issues like water, food security and HIV and AIDS. As SDC is planning to regroup its focus on HIV and AIDS and food security, they will need a tool box and these two instruments could definitely form a foundation. In addition, it is important to explore other tools available. For instance, CIVICUS has developed a comprehensive online toolkit for governance practitioners, which could be relevant to SDC and its partners.

It should go without saying that the tools mentioned above should be thoroughly tested/assessed **prior** to expanding their use to other projects/domains. In particular, the tool developed by CSA should be subjected to scrutiny, as the organisation itself has so far never been externally evaluated.

3.3 Integration of governance as a transversal theme

Terms of Reference

- III. To assess the potential of integrating governance as a transversal theme into the two other domains (HIV/AIDS and Food Security) and indicate ways and 2-3 partners to do so.

It must be borne in mind that, in accordance with the decision to consolidate on only one governance area, reference to “governance as a transversal theme”, in effect, merely concerns “accountability and responsiveness of public institutions.”

The Decision

On the 1st of July 2010 the *Comité des Politiques* reconfirmed the continuation of the Regional Program in Southern Africa (RPSA) with two main strategic thematic foci: Food Security and HIV and AIDS. Governance will be integrated in the two priority areas as a transversal element by 2012. For the climate change program (global issue) SDC will concentrate on South Africa. The regional approach through very focused lines of action (seed security and HIV and AIDS focusing on prevention and youth) has been validated.

Source: Annual Report Southern Africa, 2010 with Planning Part 2011

3.3.1 Justification for moving towards integration

Two main reasons have been given for integration of the governance domain. These are: the need to focus more and the difficulty in demonstrating tangible results in governance work. Interviews with the implementing partners gave a mixed view on the decision. A few agreed that integration would help in addressing the problem of difficulties in demonstrating concrete results. The rest, while generally agreeing with this view, were of the opinion that not all aspects of governance work can be integrated and therefore wondered what would happen to those aspects or components of governance that cannot be integrated but nevertheless remain pertinent to the region.

In summary, it was generally agreed that during the workshop that ‘integration is the way to go but we should not let the other important aspects of governance that cannot be integrated, fall through the cracks’.

3.3.2 Communication to, and understanding of partners

Most of the partners knew about the decision to integrate the governance domain but felt the decision was not well and adequately communicated to them. The general understanding is that, “governance has ceased being a ‘project’ it has now become a mainstreamed issue.” What is not clear, though, is how exactly will the “mainstreaming be done and what are the implications on the work of the individual implementing partners?” There are also questions around, “how to integrate governance and at the same time make it a fundamental tool for socio-economic development in the region. The presentation of the advantages and disadvantages below suggest that there is a lot of work to be done to ensure a common understanding and appreciation of the integration decision and its practical implications.

This demonstrates, among other things, that a potential exists for SDC to improve its communication with partners with regard to such crucial information.

3.3.3 Trend: shift from partners to implementing agencies

Until recently, SDC placed much importance in developing a solid relationship with its partners, including by building their capacities over the years – on average, the relationships have existed for approximately 5 years; for some it has lasted for over a decade. Currently, two somewhat divergent trends seem to coexist within SDC: on the one hand, the golden days of capacity building are decreasing (particularly within RSA) and the tendency is rather to condition the partnership on the delivery of tangible results; on the other hand, there is a realisation that the very sizable amounts of resources provided to partners over the year means that the relationship cannot be ended because SDC’s strategy has changed or, possibly, simply because the partner is still unable to show tangible achievements.

3.3.4 Readiness for change of current partners

It seems that some governance organisations have already given thought (or actually initiated projects) related to HIV and AIDS, and therefore have developed some relevant capacity. Some of the governance partners including IDASA and CCR have some experience of doing HIV and AIDS work within a governance framework. MiETA, an HIV and AIDS partner are experimenting with a governance approach to their work. None of the current partners has experience of doing food security work within a governance framework. Those doing HIV and AIDS felt it is easier for them to embrace a governance approach as compared to those in 'pure governance' to incorporate HIV and AIDS; and food security into their work. SDC can build on the experiences of those that are already experimenting with integration.

3.3.5 Success factors: what are some of the likely advantages and disadvantages of this move?

3.3.5.1 Advantages

One of the potential positive factors of the integration shift is the possible improvement in terms of monitoring, reporting and evaluation. Clearly, all involved stakeholders increasingly need to demonstrate/show concrete/tangible results. It would nevertheless be illusionary to believe that the shift, in and of itself, will be sufficient to drastically improve that situation. Whereas efforts have been made over the past year to improve the M&E mechanisms of the RPSA, they cannot be deemed sufficient to address all of the current concerns. Earlier in the present report, the consultants pointed to SDC's trend of requiring improved management (including M&E) capacities from its partners. Clearly, the dual shift of moving governance to the other two sectors, and inversely, will need capacity building and coaching to have a reasonable chance of success.

The mutual penetration of governance and the other two sectors is likely to yield cross-fertilisation in a number of ways – e.g. lessons learned best practices. These will hopefully have a greater regional reach than is currently taking place. In the best case scenario, such lessons can be dissemination, transferred and possibly replicated in SDC programmes across the continent and, why not, at the global level.

3.3.5.2 Disadvantages

Several points were made earlier this report, mostly in the section consolidation, which point to the potential difficulties of bringing together the somewhat different approaches and culture of organisations dealing respectively with governance, HIV and AIDS and food security.

It was also pointed out earlier that to reconcile or link the scope, focus and approaches of partners dealing respectively with current *focus area 1 (Strengthen the Process of Formal Democracy in SADC Countries)* and *focus area 3 (Consolidation of Democracy and the Development of Democratic Culture)*, with those dealing with HIV and Aids and with food security. Among other things, monitoring in terms of performance and attribution would be difficult, if not impossible, both from a conceptual and a practical point of view. Here again, finding adequate skills and competences in food security or HIV and AIDS, as well as in governance in the same organisation would seem challenging.

In the name of integrating governance, there is a danger that it may fizzle out as is the case with most gender mainstreaming efforts. This is aggravated in the situation where there are no clear indicators that capture both the governance and, respectively, HIV and AIDS or food security performance measures.

Finally, the consultant, despite their best efforts, must point out the fact that, at that stage, clarity on the practical meaning of “integration” (e.g. what does doing food security from a governance perspective represent) will mean both for current and future partners, as well as for SDC. Indeed, the actual implications of the shift remain at this stage uncomfortably elusive and will therefore need further thinking. The next section will nevertheless suggest a number of potential entry points for the integration.

The participants in the workshop developed the following points, which largely confirm the analysis presented by the consultants in this report:

Implications for integration	
<p>Loss of integrity of partners/ mandate...?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abrupt change could imply lose of integrity of partners • Partners perceive that they move to shift what they are already doing • Stretching the partners mandate too far to fit SDC priorities • Loss of identity by an NGO • Real needs not met anymore (priorities of SDC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SDC is not in tune with the reality in the field –real need not met anymore Opportunity for SDC) 	<p>Define governance issues and outcomes/ impact pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly understand governance short comings in both sector (HIV/AIDS and food security) • Define the impact that SDC is looking for • Conduct a theory of change and baseline analysis of these two sector (HIV/AIDs food security) • We should look at integration both ways. Governance can be integrated into HIV/AIDs, but the opposite is also true • The importance of the initial explanation of the relation HIV/governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The beginning to convince people that there is a relationship between governance and HIV/AIDs - Looking at the principles of governance and unpack them

<p>Engage with SADC/ regional organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues can be dealt with at SADC level-move down to national level- Develop specific country plan based on needs- feedback to SADC level to develop SADC plan/ response 	<p>Collaboration among selected parties difficult?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of partners, one several, coalition What is the right mix of partners? Collaboration between NGOs?
<p>Governance disappearing- budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain governance budget Disappearance of Governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration should not follow the example of mainstreaming- with a ticking box

3.3.6 Potential entry points of governance issues into the other two domains

The consultants determined that there might be at least three main potential entry points for governance into the other two domains. These are:

- 1) **Supply side:** facilitating, through a governance approach/lens, the formulation and support of parliamentary response and strategic plans on HIV and AIDS as well as on food security plans. At a regional level, experiences and lessons learnt can be discussed at the SADC Parliamentary Forum, as can potential regional plans of actions or harmonisation of policies.
- 2) **Demand side:** Building on the experiences of the implementing partners and others with regard to using a governance approach to deliver HIV and AIDS and food security at a regional level. The instruments developed by CSA and IDASA could be used, for example, to track transparency and budgetary processes, as well as to promote the role/participation of communities in decision making.
- 3) Facilitating government and CSO interactions on issues of HIV-AIDS and food security, e.g. by participating and/or monitoring intra-governmental and parliamentarian committees – most likely by supporting partners in this endeavours. For instance, one SDC manager suggested that SDC could identify an NGO (e.g. WWF) to monitor the work of such committees with regard to energy-related issues.

3.3.7 Possible steps of the integration process

- In thinking about the possible sequencing of the integration process, it will be important to appreciate the complexity of the change and the fact that it will take some time.
- It will be crucial to ensure a common understanding (both within SDC and with its partners) of integration as a concept and practice, as well as of the concept of regionalisation.
- CSA has developed the social accountability system governance tool while IDASA has developed the local governance barometer. It should go without saying that these tools should be thoroughly

tested/assessed **prior** to expanding their use to other projects/domains. In particular, the tool developed by CSA should be subjected to scrutiny, as the organisation itself has so far never been externally evaluated.

- Build a governance toolkit and training the HIV and AIDS; and food security partners on how to use the toolkit.
- Based on the regional strategy to be developed and on supply and demand criteria, decide on which partners to work with. SDC will need to decide who the strategic partners for this change are. It will be good to give preference to the partners SDC is already working with, especially those that already have forms of integration initiative. SDC will also have to decide on which partners to work with and determine selection and funding modalities.
- Assess and facilitate the integration of capacity building needs of the identified implementing partners.
- Do a best practice documentation on achievements in all the three domains and draw lessons that may be useful in the integration process.
- Do a baseline and have a mutually agreed targets and performance indicators that satisfy both the HIV and AIDS, as well as food security and governance aspects. Think through the outcomes at the outset. Articulate a theory of change for SDC that links activities to outcomes in the monitoring and evaluation system.
- Critically think through the governance aspects that cannot be integrated and find ways of addressing these.
- Conduct regular joint reflection sessions with the implementing partners to draw lessons for improvement of practice at both national and regional levels.

Annexes

List of persons/institutions interviewed

To be incorporated...