

PD-ABN-380

91831

**USAID AFRICA DEMOCRACY AND
GOVERNANCE PROJECT:**

FINAL REPORT

Contract Numbers AFR-0542-C-1108-00 (Core)
and AFR-0542-Q-1109-00 (Requirements)

Prepared for:

U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, DC

Prepared by:

Associates in Rural Development, Inc. (ARD) -- Prime Contractor
in association with
Management Systems International, Inc. (MSI) -- Subcontractor

Period:

19 September 1991 - 18 September 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	i
PREFACE	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. General Background	1
B. Project Goals and Expected Results	2
C. Lessons Learned Discussion	3
II. OVERVIEW OF CORE ACTIVITIES	5
A. Policy Development	5
B. Policy Implementation	5
C. Improved Governance Practices	7
D. Strengthening Civil Society	7
E. Promoting Participation of Women in Democratic Development and Economic Reform	8
F. Drawing Lessons From the Results of USAID Democratic Governance Programs in Africa	9
G. Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa	11
H. Improving Assessment Methodology and Process	12
I. Development of Democracy Support Strategies	13
J. Country Briefing Seminars	14
K. Facilitating Dialogue Between Africans and USAID	14
L. Improving Communications Among USG Democracy Advisors	15
M. Coordination with Other USAID D/G Activities and Donors	15
III. SPECIFIC COUNTRY ASSIGNMENTS	17
A. Assessments	17
B. Design Activities	27
IV. LESSONS LEARNED	31
A. General Conclusions and Lessons Learned From Country Studies	31
B. Broad Policy Lessons	34
C. Operational Lessons	36
D. Recommendations	37
ANNEXES:	
Annex A: Table 1—Africa Governance Assessment, Design, and Methodology Reports	
Annex B: Table 2—Reports and Publications	

ACRONYMS

ABIC	Africa Bureau Information Center
AFR	Africa Bureau
ARD	Associates in Rural Development, Inc.
Center	Global Bureau's Democracy Center
CILSS	Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
CPSP	Country Program Strategy Paper
D/G	democracy/governance
DFA	Development Fund for Africa
EEC	European Economic Community
FODEP	Foundation for Democratic Process
FSN	foreign-service national
FY	fiscal year
GCA	Global Coalition for Africa
GENESYS	Gender in Economic and Social Systems
GHAI	Greater Horn of Africa Initiative
IFES	International Foundation for Electoral Systems
MSI	Management Systems International
NGO	nongovernmental organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
ONI	Office of Operations and New Initiatives
ONI/DG	Office of Operations and New Initiatives/Democracy and Governance Division
PID	project identification document
PP	project paper
REDSO	Regional Economic Development Services Office
SD	Office of Sustainable Development
SPA	Special Program of Assistance
USG	U.S. government
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USIA	U.S. Information Agency
WID	Women in Development

PREFACE

This final report was prepared by Associates in Rural Development, Inc. (ARD), to satisfy U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) reporting requirements in relation to the Africa Bureau Democracy and Governance Project's core and requirements contracts, AFR-0542-C-00-1108-00 and AFR-0542-Q-1109-00, respectively. The report covers activities carried out from 19 September 1991 to 18 September 1996.

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT

A. General Background

On 19 September 1991, after a competitive bidding process, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) entered into two complementary contracts with Associates in Rural Development, Inc. (ARD). The core contract was for technical services to assist the agency's Africa Bureau (AFR) to develop a democracy and governance (D/G) strategic framework and program. Under this contract, ARD provided a core team of advisors and support personnel to offer a range of services to USAID/Washington through the Office of Operations and New Initiatives (ONI), which was later folded into the Office of Sustainable Development (SD) in AFR, as well as USAID Missions and governments in Africa. Under the requirements contract, ARD organized and closely supervised short-term D/G technical assistance to USAID Missions in Africa to help with sector assessments and project designs. Because the two contracts were so closely integrated, the core team was able to provide conceptual guidance and preparation for field teams and assure that their reports not only supported Mission objectives, but also built a body of knowledge to refine USAID's D/G strategy and practice in Africa. ARD implemented these activities in collaboration with a designated subcontractor, Management Systems International (MSI).

As a result of re-engineering activities in USAID, both the core and requirements contracts were transferred to the Global Bureau's Democracy Center (Center) in the fall of 1994. While the Center technically managed the two contracts, AFR remained actively involved, both substantively and procedurally.

AFR specified that the contractor would assist the Bureau to refine and apply guidelines articulated in its 1990 democracy background paper. Specifically, they indicated that the program should be African-led, focused on long-term sustainable development, Mission-generated, integrated into overall Mission portfolios, and stress the substance, rather than the form, of D/G reform processes.

During the contract, the core team consisted of a Senior Governance Advisor (Robert Charlick, replaced by Stephen Weissman in February 1995) and a Project Manager (John Rigby, replaced by William Nagle in January 1994 and Steven Dinkin in June 1994). Under the core and requirements contracts, over 100 experts were invited to participate in various field teams, sector studies, and Washington- and field-based programs conducted for USAID/AFR/Center. Approximately one-fourth of these were Africans, reflecting the project's responsiveness to the mandate to involve Africans extensively and promote the inclusion of African perspectives.

B. Project Goals and Expected Results

AFR and the Center have been increasing their capacity to deal with the broad field of D/G in development. The purpose of this project was to mobilize a center of technical excellence for services to meet four critical Bureau objectives:

- to aid AFR and the Center in enriching and refining its policy and program guidance on this subject;
- to provide timely and appropriate technical services to assess individual country realities regarding D/G; design comprehensive and selective strategies, programs, and projects for bilateral cooperation; and evaluate USAID activities undertaken in this field;
- to facilitate and encourage dialogue and networking between and among actors interested or engaged in African public affairs and governance issues, such as Africa-oriented scholars and foundations, U.S. government (USG) policy-makers—USAID, Department of State, U.S. Information Agency (USIA), and Department of Justice—and other donors, through meetings with advisory panels, workshops, and seminars, based largely in Washington, DC; and
- to assist AFR and the Center, through these workshops, meetings, and seminars as well as the work of project field teams, to further inter-donor policy and program coordination on D/G matters.

Numerous results were expected of the project, including:

- a workable, widely agreed-upon concept of governance within the context of the Development Fund for Africa (DFA);
- incorporation of the concept of "democratic governance" into USAID policy, program, and process decisions;
- greater understanding of the whole process of democratization and improved governance in individual African countries as well as throughout the continent;
- a widely agreed-upon policy approach to accelerating and deepening D/G reform, affecting AFR and, where appropriate, USAID-wide policy;
- based on comparative analysis and experience, the formulation and testing of methods for strategizing about D/G support and prioritizing recommended USAID programmatic support;

- acceleration and deepening of the D/G perspective among USAID field-mission personnel in Africa, its incorporation into Washington policy development, and assistance to Missions to formulate more strategic and refined approaches for supporting improved D/G; and
- enhanced dialogue and networking among those interested or engaged in African public affairs and governance issues, such as Africa-oriented scholars and foundations, USG (USAID and Department of State) policy-makers, and donors.

C. Lessons Learned Discussion

Briefly discussed in Section IV of this report are lessons and conclusions from a secondary analysis and synthesis of a series of assessments carried out under the Africa D/G Project. In addition to these lessons, there are a series of critical issues and some tentative conclusions that project staff were able to draw from their experience supporting USAID in promoting D/G in Africa.

Further information concerning country-specific lessons as well as broad policy and operational lessons may be found in many of the documents produced throughout the course of the five-year contract. Listed below are several of these key documents, which provide useful summaries of lessons learned:

- Fox, Leslie. *Civil Society, Democracy and Development in Africa*, Final Report of a Workshop, Washington, DC: ARD, June 1994.
- Mozaffar, Shaheen. *Institutional Analysis and the Assessment of Democratic Governance in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, November 1995.
- Oakerson, Ronald J. *Assessing and Assisting Democratic Governance Reform: A Framework*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1995.
- Somerville, Carolyn M. and Weissman, S. *Gender and Democracy in Africa*, Final Report of a Workshop, Washington, DC: ARD, July 1995.
- Charlick, Robert B.; Fox, L.; Lofchie, M.; Oakerson, R.; Sandbrook, R.; Tripp, A.; and West, T. *Improving Democratic Governance in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, March 1996.
- Peterson, L. *Consolidating Democracy: Lessons We Are Learning from the Results of USAID Democratic Governance Programs in Africa*, Final Report of a Workshop, Johannesburg, South Africa: April 1996.

A full list of delivery orders, workshops, project documents, and personnel may be found in the Annexes of the report.

II. OVERVIEW OF CORE ACTIVITIES

A. Policy Development

At the request of the D/G Division of ONI (ONI/DG), the core team prepared a Working Concept Paper on Governance, which was used to stimulate discussions with AFR, USAID Missions and Regional Economic Development Services Offices (REDSOs) in Africa, other U.S. government agencies, and members of the scholarly community. These discussions helped focus USAID's governance policy and strategy, linking improvements in governance to democratic practice and resulting in positive changes in the policy environment for broad-based, sustainable economic development. A revised version of this paper, *The Concept of Governance and Its Implications for USAID's Development Assistance Program in Africa*, was issued as an AFR Policy Paper in July 1992. It identifies five dimensions of D/G and suggests concrete ways that each can be furthered through USAID-funded projects and activities.

In 1993, the core team contributed significantly to the development of an AFR strategy paper for the promotion of D/G. This eventually resulted in an August 1993 draft titled, *A Blueprint for Sustainable Development through Democratic Governance*, which was reviewed by AFR in the fall of 1993. The project's Senior Governance Advisor, Dr. Charlick, wrote a series of appendices to this report that developed its key argument and provided the structure for several new centrally funded projects. While this paper was overtaken by USAID's strategy development process, the influence of a number of its key ideas is now apparent in agency-wide thinking. During 1993, Dr. Charlick was invited to participate in the development of USAID's democracy strategy paper, and he contributed several *drafts to that process which eventually resulted in the paper, Building Democracy: USAID's Strategy*.

B. Policy Implementation

1. *Indicators and Impact Measurement*

Through the end of September 1994, a major activity of the core team centered on assisting AFR and its field missions to identify D/G impact indicators. Early in 1992, this activity centered on working with AFR's Measurement Committee to develop D/G criteria to be employed in USAID's efforts to identify "focus countries" where assistance resources would be concentrated. By mid-1992, the core team had conducted extensive consultations with other bilateral and multilateral donors on the measurement and evaluation of performance and change in this area, and convened a meeting of an advisory panel of measurement experts for AFR in Washington. Working closely with ONI/DG staff, the core team helped develop a list of indicators drawn primarily from concepts spelled out in its "Concept of Governance" papers. Based largely on this work, AFR's Ad Hoc Committee on Measurement recommended adopting a number of these indicators in its contribution to the Bureau's annual budget-allocation exercise. Also in 1992, the project assisted with the collection and interpretation of preliminary data.

During 1993, the process was further refined with the introduction of "country profiles" prepared by the Africa Bureau Information Center (ABIC). Dr. Charlick participated fully in the review of these and other documents, and contributed technical support to ONI's scoring of D/G performance for a number of African countries in the "focus-country exercise." These scores, together with performance indicators for economic policy reform, largely determined the level of development assistance to those countries for the next fiscal year. In 1995-1996, Dr. Weissman also participated in specific country democracy and human rights performance reviews organized by AFR and the Center.

In addition, the core team contributed to AFR's thinking about operational indicators at the strategic level by conducting a workshop that assembled experts in this area from across USAID and its support contractors. During FY 1994, the project also assisted with the development of project-level indicators through the work of its field teams, which designed D/G projects in several African countries and assisted other Missions in their thinking about D/G. In 1995, the project facilitated USAID/Malawi's acquisition of an expert consultant to help draw up D/G indicators for its country strategy.

2. *Timely Approaches to Assisting Civil Society and Governance Reform*

Core project staff worked closely with a distinguished team of experts to conceptualize and develop strategies—substantive and administrative—to meet the needs of USAID to respond more quickly and appropriately to rapidly changing political environments in Africa. This work resulted in two papers that contributed to AFR's and USAID's approach in these areas:

- *An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of African Civil Society, and*
- *An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of Improved Governance in Africa.*

3. *Economic Development and Political Liberalization*

A major activity of the team in 1993 involved developing and conducting a workshop for USAID/AFR on "Economic Reform in Africa's New Era of Political Liberalization." This workshop hosted donor members from the Special Program of Assistance (SPA) to Africa and furthered thinking on how the issues of economic development and political liberalization are connected and affect policy implementation. The workshop contributed to the creation of a new subcommittee of the SPA group to continue exploring this topic. The project's report on this workshop has been widely distributed by USAID throughout donor countries and Africa.

C. Improved Governance Practices

During the second half of 1992, ONI identified the problem of corruption as a major governance concern influencing the process of economic development in Africa. As a result, the core team organized two meetings of its D/G advisory panel on administrative corruption. These meetings examined relevant theories and specific experiences in limiting administrative corruption in the context of democratization and resulted in a publication titled "Limiting Administrative Corruption in the Democratizing States of Africa," edited by Dr. Charlick. It appeared as a special issue of the journal *Corruption and Reform* (VII, 3, 1992-93) and has been widely disseminated throughout USAID and the international development community by AFR. An additional governance activity involved a preliminary effort by the law and justice advisory panel to define the goals of a justice system in newly democratizing states and to examine specific practices and structures.

D. Strengthening Civil Society

During 1993, the core team planned a series of workshops to assist AFR in refining its concept of civil society and thinking concretely about how to assist civil society development with the objective of improving D/G. In June 1993, the project commissioned Dr. John Holm to prepare a paper synthesizing much of the best scholarly thinking about civil society in Africa and to pose key questions to be addressed in developing an effective approach.

On the basis of this report, a preparatory workshop was held in September 1993 to plan a major workshop focused on the organization of civil society and its impact on policy-making and implementation. The workshop on "Civil Society, Democracy, and Development in Africa" was held on 9 and 10 June 1994. During the course of the meeting, participants—including USAID practitioners, academics, and members of the development community—discussed a wide range of conceptual issues, potential actions by USAID and other development agencies, and obstacles to carrying out various actions. Among the issues discussed were:

- the utility of the distinction between the definitions of civil society and civic society, which is defined as more explicitly political;
- the importance of civil society at the national versus local, sub-national levels; and
- how donors should make choices with regard to supporting civil or civic society in Africa.

Participants suggested that USAID and donor organizations should undertake various actions to foster and develop civil society in Africa. It was argued that a thorough analysis needs to be carried out at the country level to identify and, to the extent possible, prioritize civil society status and needs. The results of needs identified in the assessment process should be reviewed by donors, and development agencies should agree on respective roles based on their comparative advantages, policy frameworks, and program strategies. Although there was a

divergence of opinion on numerous issues and topics, the majority of participants recognized the need to be engaged in helping support civil society in Africa.

E. Promoting Participation of Women in Democratic Development and Economic Reform

During 1993, the core team also focused on the issue of gender and democracy. The project held a series of preliminary meetings from April to August 1994 in preparation for the Gender and Democracy in Africa Workshop. After further preparation under the new Senior Governance Advisor, the workshop was held on 27 July 1995. The workshop brought together African women leaders, USAID personnel (both field- and Washington-based), other U.S. Agency and donor representatives, NGO practitioners, policy analysts, and academics to discuss: (1) opportunities for, and constraints on, gender-inclusive democracy; and (2) suggestions for effective USAID interventions. There were two panel sessions, followed by small group discussions to develop recommendations.

The workshop provided specific, practical assistance to USAID personnel, contractors, and experts on more effective inclusion of gender considerations in the Global and Africa Bureaus' democracy and gender strategy, design, and program work. The workshop also provided USAID the opportunity to examine how it could help African women to contribute to the process of building strong, participatory, and sustainable democracies. Participants of the workshop developed a number of recommendations, urging senior-level staff in the field and Washington to make a strong and consistent commitment to gender-inclusive democracy. Participants argued that this commitment should be embodied in activities ranging from strong policy and programmatic directives to an expanded role for both field- and Washington-based Women in Development (WID) personnel.

As a follow-on activity to the Gender workshop, two project short-term experts, Dr. Aili Tripp, University of Wisconsin Professor, and Dr. Georgina Waylen, visiting scholar at Stanford University, with assistance from Dr. Weissman, completed a paper, entitled "The Role of Women's Political Participation in Economic Reform," for a meeting of the SPA for Africa Working Group on Economic Reform in the Context of Political Liberalization. The paper was presented in Paris by USAID on November 10-11, 1995. The paper provided recommendations to USAID and the donor community on how it may be more supportive and responsive to gender issues, an increasingly important element of politically sustainable reform. More specifically, the paper suggested how donors could advance women's participation in economic policy-making through policy dialogue and other tools of policy reform.

An additional follow-on activity to the Gender workshop involved two experts, Henri Josserand, Senior ARD Associate, and James Bingen, Michigan State University Professor in February 1996, commenting upon gender dimensions inherent in the findings and recommendations of an economic management policy document they had written for an SPA working group on Economic Reform in the Context of Political Liberalization. The experts focused on a number of dimensions in the policy document entitled, "A Study of Policy Advocacy in Mali," including the extent to which women have become equal participants—as independent voters and decision-makers—in the Malian reform process; the extent to which the

Malian bureaucracy will engage in policy dialogue with women's interest groups; the extent to which women's groups use the media to stimulate public debate on specific policy issues and the effectiveness of this strategy; and an analysis of the characteristics of women's groups most closely associated with successful political participation in the policy process.

F. Drawing Lessons From the Results of USAID Democratic Governance Programs in Africa

In an effort to draw lessons from the results of USAID democratic governance programs in Africa, the core team organized and held an Africa-wide D/G "Lessons We Are Learning" conference in Johannesburg, South Africa, from April 23-25, 1996.

The intent of the conference was threefold: (1) to take stock of the results that USAID has achieved (and is currently achieving) in D/G programming throughout the African continent; (2) to examine the lessons about environmental context, program planning, and implementation that we are subsequently learning from these results; and (3) to consider the implications of these lessons for future programming in the D/G sector.

The three-day conference, which brought together approximately 75 people, including USAID personnel both field- and Washington-based, African government officials and NGO leaders, donor representatives, and policy analysts and academics, consisted of nine panels, break-out sessions, and discussion. The panels covered the following topic areas: D/G in Africa, assisting democratic governance, USAID implementation issues, civil society, elections and political parties, rule of law, governance, and the role of policy dialogue in D/G planning. Following the first two-and-a-half days of discussions, a list of issues for deliberation was prepared and the conference broke into smaller groups with facilitators to discuss them. Greatest emphasis was placed upon how USAID can prioritize, sequence, and integrate activities in critical democracy and governance sectors for maximal synergistic impact.

Among the many valuable lessons and recommendations that emerged from the conference were the following:

- ***D/G Planning and Programming*** The critical determinant of the results of USAID D/G programs is the state of political will or commitment in the country concerned.

Therefore, in committing increasingly scarce resources to programs, USAID should develop an initial strategy based on an assessment of political reality and then proceed incrementally with ongoing monitoring of political trends. This monitoring should include specific benchmarks for "early warning" of adverse developments in political will, so that programs can be shifted accordingly.

- ***Coordinating Political and Economic Reforms*** While political reform allows nongovernmental actors to enter economic policy debates and can contribute to more sustainable policies, it also makes it more difficult for governments to enforce necessary austerity. And although economic reform disperses political power, it can

also be associated with a measure of socioeconomic disorder with dangerous consequences for democratic stability.

Therefore, USAID should seek ways of increasing the capacity of governments to better coordinate political and economic reforms (e.g., through increased transparency in the economic reform process and greater attention to the timing of reforms and the institutional capacity to implement them). It should also look for synergies in its own projects across D/G and economic and social development sectors.

- ***Measuring the Results of D/G Programs*** In attempting to gauge program results, one needs to differentiate between different levels of impact. For example, a project can be a success while the surrounding political environment "goes down the tube." Also, it should be explicitly recognized that it is difficult to trace the effects of generally small D/G programs on the larger political system. Most fundamentally, evaluators must realize that the qualitative effects of D/G efforts are as important as those that can be measured quantitatively, and that program results will develop only gradually over the long term.

Therefore, USAID should develop qualitative as well as quantitative indicators of the complex process of democratic development, and adopt short-to-medium term indicators that define "success" as movement in the right direction rather than ultimate change. It should also be prepared to make tough decisions in countries where particular program success appears unlikely or the overall political environment is very unpromising.

- ***Civil Society Programs*** The development of countervailing power centers, which are also willing to positively engage governments, is crucial to the process of democratic consolidation. There are a variety of current or potential civic action groups in Africa ranging from small, largely foreign-funded NGOs specializing in D/G issues to generally broader-based interest groups including student, labor, and women's organizations (particularly in relatively "elite" urban areas); parents' and farmers' associations; churches; and traditional community-based groups.

Therefore, USAID should consider the whole range of groups, not only those in the D/G sector, as candidates for capacity-strengthening and coalition-building assistance. Criteria for support should include the potential to contribute to democratic change, a willingness to broaden authentic democratic participation in the organization, and an effort to seek greater financial sustainability. The latter is a particular concern for D/G NGOs, and greater effort should be made to explore ways of expanding self and other donor financing.

- ***Elections and Parties Programs*** Although the field is never completely "level" in the real world of democratic elections, the process must be reasonably representative or opposition political parties are apt not to participate. This is precisely what has occurred in a number of African countries, and it has often helped de-legitimize

newly achieved democracies. Another major obstacle to a good electoral process has been a high level of intolerance among the various political parties.

Therefore, USAID programs should address the basic civil liberties requirements (e.g., freedom of speech and assembly) for parties to freely contest elections. The Agency should set clear criteria in advance for its provision of elections support including—in general—the willingness to participate by opposition parties. It is also important for USAID to work closely with parties, in informal as well as formal ways, to help foster a new culture of tolerance.

- ***Rule of Law and Governance Programs*** The dominant lesson of donor efforts to democratize government institutions—in Africa and elsewhere—is that the results ultimately depend upon the degree of political commitment of the leaders of those institutions.

Therefore, in approaching the reform of executive, legislative, legal, and judicial institutions, USAID should conduct ongoing assessments of political commitment. It should also be attentive to opportunities to assist key stakeholders in these institutions to develop such commitment through two-way policy dialogue and the provision of relevant incentives, including strengthening "demand" for reform from civil society. Furthermore, it should recognize that fostering reform of major foreign institutions with limited resources is a particularly delicate and sophisticated process that cannot be accomplished in blunderbuss fashion. For example, in the area of legislative assistance, the Agency must overcome suspicion that it is trying to Americanize institutions that come out of different political traditions, limit itself to focusing on just a couple of key areas like the budget process, build outward in its program to encompass relations with other institutions like the executive as well as civil society, and maintain necessary flexibility.

G. Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa

1. Kenya

ARD contracted in December 1995 with two experts, Crawford Young, University of Wisconsin Political Science Professor, and Willet Weeks, Food Security Specialist, to assist the USAID/Kenya Mission in reviewing its draft country strategy through the lens of crisis prevention and to recommend ways to better incorporate Greater Horn of Africa Initiative (GHAI) principles related to conflict prevention into its strategies. While conducting their work in Kenya over a two-week period, the experts considered such principles as: (1) instability from natural disasters, ethnic cleavages, political change, etc.; (2) coordination of relief, rehabilitation, and development activities; (3) analysis of the potential for instability and its root causes; (4) a results package that shows how activities contribute to stability, eliminate unequal access, and promote transparency in governance; and (5) early warning and response mechanisms. Upon finishing their field research, the experts provided a report to the field and USAID/Washington

outlining how the proposed Kenya country strategy addressed or did not address crisis prevention issues and recommended steps toward improved responses.

2. *Somalia*

ARD contracted in July 1996 with one consultant, John Prendergast, Researcher at the Center of Concern, to assist the Somalia Mission in reviewing its draft Integrated Country Plan through the GHAI lens, particularly with regard to conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution. After several days of reviewing the Plan in Washington, DC, Prendergast submitted a report that addressed the following issues: Somalia's internal and regional conflict context; particular aid strategies that might be pursued to prevent and resolve conflict; and specific opportunities for conflict resolution of particular relevance at the time of the report.

H. *Improving Assessment Methodology and Process*

1. *Development of an Analytical Methodology*

From 1993 to 1995, at the request of AFR and the Center, the project undertook a series of efforts to improve the design and implementation of country D/G assessments under the requirements contract. To begin the process, the project established a panel to review its previous efforts and assist in structuring upcoming assessments to be conducted in Mali, Ghana, Tanzania, and Niger.

In an effort to provide a common framework for macro-political analysis, a team of experts also completed a series of conceptual papers and presented the framework at two USAID-sponsored workshops held February 7-8, 1995. Papers prepared for the workshop served to: (a) explain the theoretical underpinnings of the framework which incorporates elements of key methodologies, especially institutional and state-society analysis; (b) demonstrate the value of the assessment approach through examining its application in Mali; and (c) provide an African perspective on the value of an assessment approach. During the workshops, experts responded to questions and exchanged views with key USAID personnel. The discussions further developed the macro-democratic governance assessment framework and informed participants of the methods and results of institutional analysis and, in particular, their application in the field and the implications of those results.

Building upon the earlier methodological approach, Dr. Weissman, in 1995, introduced into the subsequent project assessments a greater emphasis on strategy and policy analysis. This new approach was evident in the Kenya Assessment and Design carried out under the requirements contract. In addition to presenting the historic context, the assessment team highlighted a series of policy and strategic options for USAID based on a number of potential political scenarios. The team also highlighted the cost and benefits of alternative policy investments by USAID.

2. *Development of a Manual for Conducting Assessments*

The project produced a guide/manual for the conduct of D/G assessments in sub-Saharan Africa. The guide was based upon field experience as well as upon the principles and methods of institutional analysis and design and related to other relevant methodologies—in particular, state-society and political economy. The guide contains discussion of the following: how to select assessment team participants; how to substantively engage Africans in the assessment process while developing their analytical capacity; how to set an agenda or schedule for conducting a thorough assessment that would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the client; and potential questions one would ask in order to gain a full understanding of the state of D/G within the country.

3. *Donor Coordination and the Development of an Analytical Assessment Framework*

In an effort to collaborate with international donors on the development of an analytical framework and to discuss the possibility of conducting joint macro-governance assessments in Africa, with specific reference to an early exercise in Benin, the Africa Bureau set up a half-day workshop in Brussels, Belgium, with colleagues from the European Economic Community (EEC) during the summer of 1996. Ron Oakerson, a political scientist and consultant to our core staff, developed an outline agenda and presentation for the workshop that maximized participation of EEC colleagues in a discussion of the analytical tools and processes that have been developed by AFR and the Center for conducting macro-political assessments and follow-up actions as well as provided a comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of other assessment models (e.g., political economy). Particular emphasis was placed on ensuring a substantive role of African analysts and planners throughout the assessment/follow-on process.

I. *Development of Democracy Support Strategies*

Under the requirements contract, a team of experts led by Dr. Charlick produced a comparative analysis of democratic governance transitions in a number of African countries based on earlier project D/G assessments in Mali, Ghana, Tanzania, Niger, and Madagascar. The paper provided USAID with a systematic and in-depth basis for prioritizing USAID assistance to sustainable development countries through support of participatory democratic institutions at all levels of contemporary African societies. Moreover, the paper has served to combine implications of earlier assessments, improve the AFR and Center's policy and strategic formulation of how Missions can best develop a successful approach to supporting sustainable democratic governance as a critical part of its entire assistance program, and contribute to the formulation of strategy and programming for the entire agency by providing systematic analysis.

In addition to the comparative analysis study, Dr. Weissman traveled to Ghana and Niger during the first two weeks of May 1995 as a follow-on to assessment studies in Ghana and Niger. Dr. Weissman met with Mission Directors, D/G staff, relevant WID staff, Embassy political officers, and related members of the country team. He also conferred with local contacts, including U.S. and host country NGOs. Upon his return, Dr. Weissman prepared a report for

USAID/Washington and for the Ghana and Niger Missions. The report provided USAID with helpful information conveying possible D/G activities to aid decentralization and civil society in these two countries.

In 1995-1996, Dr. Weissman also contributed to USAID/Washington's review of a number of country strategies: Ghana, Niger, Mali, and Malawi.

J. Country Briefing Seminars

1. Kenya

In anticipation of a strategic analysis assessment in Kenya, ARD held two Kenya Seminars in Washington, DC, in the summer of 1995, bringing in John Harbeson, former REDSO/ESA DG Advisor; Frank Holmquist and Michael Ford, Hampshire College; and Jack Titsworth, former CIDA chief in Kenya; and representatives of human rights organizations to brief the Kenya assessment team as well as other USAID officials on the current situation in Kenya and on suggested strategies for USAID interventions.

2. Uganda

In preparation for a macro-political and economic assessment in Uganda, ARD organized a Uganda Seminar in Washington, DC, during the summer of 1996. Professor Nelson Kasfir, Dartmouth College; Mikael Karlstrom, Ph.D. Candidate, University of Chicago; and James Adams, World Bank Country Director, Uganda and Tanzania, served as panelists presenting an overview of Uganda political and economic developments. Specific topics discussed included the implications of recent elections in Uganda, ethnicity and political culture, and the relationship of economic reform and governance in Uganda. USAID officials and representatives of local democratization institutes joined the discussion after the panelists concluded their presentations.

K. Facilitating Dialogue Between Africans and USAID

Under the terms of the contract, the core team was charged with assisting AFR and the Center to enhance its access to a wide range of "African voices" on issues of political change on the continent. This task was accomplished in a variety of ways, ranging from arranging meetings between groups and small delegations of Africans visiting Washington to attending international meetings and reporting back on African points of view. Several excellent examples of this activity include a meeting with a USIA delegation of African women lawyers in March 1992; a meeting between ONI/DG staff and the African NGO InterAction in May 1992; a Clark Atlanta group workshop led by Professor Guy Martin at the Department of State in July 1993; and a meeting with African lawyers and civil servants to discuss the current political situation in the Republics of Guinea and Niger in August 1995. The core staff has also maintained an extensive series of written and oral communications with African scholars, professionals, and political practitioners in the United States and abroad.

A second activity designed to facilitate this dialogue was initiated in 1993 with a preliminary study of how electronic communications via Internet could assist in linking democratic organizations in Africa with one another and the donor community. A report was delivered to USAID's AFR D/G advisors during a meeting in December 1993, indicating that low-cost applications of this technology may prove very valuable not only for enhancing communications, but strengthening civil society networks as well.

Dr. Weissman in 1995 was involved in a third activity that served to foster discussion between Africans and USAID. Along with Larry Garber, USAID/Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination Senior Advisor, and Ned McMahon, NDI Senior Program Officer, Dr. Weissman participated in a USIA-sponsored WORLDNET Conflict Resolution Series program entitled, "Elections and Conflict in Africa." The program, broadcast throughout Europe and Africa, was in the format of a press conference, with African participants from Johannesburg and Freetown posing questions and receiving answers concerning matters of conflict in Africa.

L. Improving Communications Among USG Democracy Advisors

At the request of ONI/DG, project staff organized and held two meetings of AFR's D/G advisors. These meetings brought together direct-hires and personal service contractors from field locations in Africa with AFR and USAID officials responsible for defining and implementing the agency's new emphasis on democracy. Among other results, the first meeting in July 1993 established the need for improved communications among the advisors and led to the testing of microcomputer and modem connections to Internet and USAID's E-mail system in three field locations in Africa. The second meeting in December 1993 focused on implications of USAID's reorganization and the enhanced emphasis on democracy in the administration's sustainable development strategy for the advisors' work in D/G.

M. Coordination with Other USAID D/G Activities and Donors

Under the terms of its contract, the core team was charged with a number of liaison tasks to help develop a coherent set of activities and policies in the area of D/G. Hence, the Senior Governance Advisor conducted periodic consultations—the first series began in early 1992—with such bilateral donors as the British, French, and German governments and such multilateral donors as the Global Coalition for Africa (GCA), European Community, World Bank, and Development Assistance Group of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Dr. Charlick and Dr. Weissman also attended a number of high-level and scholarly meetings for AFR in order to inform ONI and other AFR personnel of the best current thinking in this area. Further, the core team maintained close communications with USAID's field D/G advisors and related contractor personnel, such as the ABIC and Checchi teams for legal services in the D/G area. To this end, project staff organized and hosted a two-day planning meeting in May 1992 for ONI/DG and these actors at the Africa Governance Project office.

In a further effort to enhance donor coordination, a consultant was sent to Senegal in February 1995 to represent AFR and the Center at a democratization conference sponsored by the GCA. During the conference, GCA country coordinators reviewed GCA reports on the following African countries: Zambia, Uganda, Tanzania, Cameroon, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Mali. The discussion focused on the specific aspects of each country report as well as provided a comparative analysis of democratic transitions in Africa.

III. SPECIFIC COUNTRY ASSIGNMENTS

The project was able to respond in two ways to requests from Africa for assistance with D/G issues. Core-team personnel (principally, Dr. Charlick) were asked by USAID Missions through AFR and the Center to provide short-term assistance with D/G strategy. Project staff have responded to such requests with field visits to Zambia, Tanzania, Niger, Mali, Ghana, and Madagascar. The Zambia activity supported the Mission and country team in deciding on a strategy for promoting D/G linked to economic policy reform. It resulted in a "concept paper" and a proposal for a "needs assessment." The second assignment responded to a request from USAID/Tanzania for assistance with developing a short-term (two-year) strategy leading up to anticipated elections, the governance section of the Mission's five-year strategy statement, and governance aspects of a project in design, the Finance and Enterprise Development Project. The visit to Niger resulted in a paper that helped the country team formulate its democracy strategy using current resources. Missions to Mali and Ghana in 1993 resulted in the crafting of scopes of work for full-scale D/G assessments. The mission to Madagascar was designed to support the conduct of the assessment team and occurred simultaneously with that team's fieldwork.

The second mechanism for meeting requests for assistance was through the requirements contract with AFR and the Center. Under its terms, ARD—in conjunction with its subcontractor, MSI—could provide technical assistance personnel for centrally funded D/G assessments and evaluations as well as Mission buy-ins for designs at the project identification document (PID) and project paper (PP) stages (after USAID re-engineering PIDs and PPs became results frameworks and packages). In 1993 and 1994, Dr. Charlick participated in some of these assessments as part of the effort to improve their quality and comparability, and to facilitate relations between the assessment and country teams. In 1995 and 1996, Dr. Weissman worked to improve the strategic quality and thereby the usefulness of assessments and design. In doing so, he traveled to the field (Ghana, Zambia, Niger, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Ivory Coast), in part, to inquire into the results of past assessments. He also carefully monitored the selection of consultant teams, provided background material and expert discussions for the teams before they went into the field, and reviewed draft reports with the teams.

A. Assessments

The project has conducted 15 D/G assessments in 13 countries:

- Zambia--May-June 1992,
- Burundi--June 1992,
- Mali--July-August 1992 and November 1993-April 1994,
- Ghana--November 1993-May 1994,
- Tanzania--February-March 1994,

- Madagascar--February-March 1994,
- Chad--December 1993-March 1994,
- Namibia--July 1994,
- Niger--October 1994,
- Guinea--September 1994-March 1995,
- Mali/Burkina Faso/Senegal--September 1995-September 1996, and
- Kenya--September-December 1995.

While each assessment was unique in its response to country and Mission needs, the project progressively evolved and refined a systematic, comparative framework that incorporates insights from institutional analysis and state/society analytic methodologies.

1. Zambia

The Zambia assessment grew out of Dr. Charlick's preliminary visit to Zambia in March 1991. On the basis of this visit, and in conjunction with USAID Mission, USIA, and embassy personnel, he drafted a scope of work for an assessment. This scope was subsequently approved by the Mission and forwarded to ONI/DG for action. Within six weeks, the project fielded a highly qualified, three-person team consisting of Dr. James Wunsch (Team Leader), Michael Bratton, and Peter Kareithi. The assessment focused primarily on how USAID could support governance in ways that would promote the legitimacy of the democratic regime and its ability to maintain and expand its commitment to economic policy reform.

Three key components were identified during the assessment:

- the need to improve public sector governance in policy formulation and implementation;
- the need to strengthen key segments of civil society to act as a better demander of policy; and
- mechanisms for managing linkages between the two.

The resulting report, *Democracy and Governance in Zambia, An Assessment and Proposed Strategy*, not only identified crucial areas for action, it specifically identified strategic choices that USAID/Zambia could make in deciding on a course of action to support D/G and a series of proposed project activities. The assessment had a significant impact on project development (see Section B.1 below).

2. *Burundi*

Burundi was a case where a USAID Mission decided to conduct a broad-based assessment of the political context for development in a highly dynamic situation, with an eye toward determining where it could best affect the development environment, with no prior decision to undertake a major D/G commitment. The Burundi D/G assessment was initiated by the Mission in the spring of 1992. ONI/DG responded affirmatively and instructed project staff to recruit a team (Lucie Colvin Phillips and Steven Tucker) under its requirements contract. The assessment was conducted in an unusually participatory manner, involving four Burundian experts and extensive rapid-reconnaissance fieldwork. The study gathered important information that can be used in the future development of country democracy plans, Mission strategy statements, and program-level decisions.

The assessment presented information on political culture and traditional rule relationships as well as their bearing on economic management. It went on to identify important elements in the Burundian political liberalization process, underway since 1987, and carefully examined both the 1992 constitution and the debate it occasioned. The assessment focused on the military and the courts as forces dealing with ethnic conflict and the protection of human rights, respectively. A major portion of the assessment was devoted to examining civil society, in terms of emerging political movements and the capacity for political action of such institutions as the church, unions, and media. It also concentrated on the relationship between state and nongovernmental actors in economic governance and examined issues relating to the privatization of public enterprises, regulation, property rights, and corruption as elements in the potential growth of the private sector. The assessment concluded with the view that the process of liberalization underway in Burundi was real and was improving the context for economic development and private sector investment and growth. It was cautious, however, about the sustainability of these reforms, as subsequent events have tragically proven.

3. *Mali*

Mali has gone through revolutionary political change in the past few years and is attempting to consolidate its democratic development. To assist in this process, the USAID Mission in Bamako requested two separate assessment activities. The first, conducted in September 1992, responded to the Mission's wish to understand the dynamics of specific governmental and political institutions with an eye toward providing modest, short-term assistance to these institutions as quickly as possible. The institutions studied in this assessment were the judiciary, legislature, political parties, and decentralized administrative structures. Project staff were able to recruit a highly experienced assessment team (Richard Vengroff, Benoit Ngom, Tessa Bakary, and Sheldon Gellar), who employed participatory methods to solicit the input of Malians at various levels.

After Mali underwent a number of significant political and economic crises in 1993 and 1994, USAID/Bamako requested additional support from ONI/DG in formulating a democracy strategy for its CPSP. Accordingly, project staff organized a team in November 1993 to conduct a broad assessment of unfolding political developments in Mali, especially as manifested in two

very important and sensitive political issues: the financing of education and the processing and marketing of agricultural commodities. African members of the team—experts in local governance (Cheibane Coulibaly), public sector management (Mamadou Kante), and an institutional analysis (Abdoulaye Niandou-Souley)—were joined by an American specialist in political interest group analysis and political economy (Barbara Lewis) and an institutional analyst and former USAID Mission Director (Harlan Hobgood). By focusing on governmental and legal institutions as well as the processes linking civil society to public institutions, the team was able to identify key constraints to effective governance and opportunities for intervention to assist the consolidation of D/G in Mali. Preliminary versions of the report were used in inter-donor planning and led to discussions of coordinated assistance to support D/G consolidation in Mali. Moreover, based partly on the first and second assessments, the USAID Mission began to design a democracy project, drafting a PID that focused on decentralization and civil society development.

4. *Ghana*

Ghana is a case where the USAID Mission and country team had a very specific focus defining the Mission's request for an assessment. Based on prior analysis, the country team had determined that the key constraint to consolidation of democracy in Ghana was improvement of the electoral process, particularly the electoral register. While the country team asked the project to concentrate its assessment on this activity, ONI staff encouraged a broadening of the scope of work to include the overall governance context. ONI maintained that the team would not be able to fully understand the electoral issue without comprehending the broader institutional implications. Thus, in conjunction with the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), which provided a small team of electoral specialists under a separate contract, the project assembled a highly qualified team of analysts to examine the broader political and administrative context for Ghanaian electoral reform. The team included specialists in public sector management (Tina West), political parties (Richard Sandbrook), interest groups and NGOs (Jon Kraus), and legal and constitutional reform issues (Shaheen Mozaffar). The team's work was complemented by separate reports from Ghanaians on local governance, political party organization, and judicial review. Phase I of the assessment recommended that USAID support the democratic transition through election aid as well as by promoting "more information, more dialogue, stronger civil society and linkage institutions to carry out the dialogue and enforcement of the democratic rights laid out in the Constitution and the body of Ghanaian Law."

In March 1994, the project assisted the USAID Mission with preparing a PID for electoral assistance by providing Jim Holtaway, a public administration specialist. The second phase of the assessment in May 1994 focused on issues identified in the PID as needing further development. This analysis contributed substantially to the political and technical analysis in the PP, completed in the fall of 1994.

5. *Madagascar*

During the summer of 1993, USAID/Madagascar asked the Regional Democracy Advisor in Nairobi (Joel Barkan) to recommend a strategic approach for its D/G support activities. This request led to a D/G assessment conducted by a project team in February and March 1994. The

team consisted of an NGO specialist (Leslie Fox, Team Leader), a political economist (Maureen Covell), a Malagasy law professor and journalist (Jean Eric Rakotoarisoa), and a Malagasy public administration specialist (Charles Rabenarivo).

The assessment found that the Malagasy people have made tremendous progress. Nonetheless, despite having successfully completed a first round of free, competitive elections, Madagascar still has a long way to go in establishing the institutions and operating procedures necessary to complete the transition to effective D/G. At a formal level, the Constitution of the Third Republic contains many ambiguities, notably in specifying the distribution of power between the president and prime minister. Significant work remains to be done to complete the establishment of the legislature, judiciary, and local governmental institutions, and institutionalize new governance behaviors. Civil society actors, suffering from the effects of their earlier history, have little experience in working together to resolve policy issues across lines of kinship, ethnic groups, and regions. Building civic groups that have the capacity for broad membership and participation and can effectively play a role in political arenas will take time. The team's report concluded that USAID can support the transition process by enhancing civil society capacity-building and selectively supporting a few promising state institutions through a strategic emphasis on governance in its existing project portfolio and possibly a new, modest D/G program.

6. Tanzania

Following up on Dr. Charlick's preliminary assistance to USAID/Tanzania in May 1992, the project designed a study, in conjunction with the country team to thoroughly assess D/G progress in Tanzania since then and identify opportunities to support further democratic reforms. The team included an institutional analyst (Tina West), a political economist (Michael Lofchie), and an NGO specialist (Aili Tripp), and was supported by Dr. Charlick of the project's core staff, the Regional Democracy Advisor (John Harbeson), and several Tanzanian experts.

The Tanzanian assessment demonstrated the unevenness of the change process, particularly in the early phases of a transition. Tanzania has made significant progress in liberalizing its economy and political process, and accepting the principle of open, multiparty, political competition. It has been able to undertake these changes while generally maintaining a high level of political order and managing potential religious, regional, and ethnic conflicts exceptionally well. Nonetheless, it is still early on in the transition process, particularly in the areas of legal reform and development of public sector accountability and responsiveness. Civil society, however, has been very dynamic with the expansion of associations in size and variety, the flourishing of an emboldened free press, revival of the cooperative movement, and emergence of self-help organizations in villages and development associations at the district level. Still, these associations confront limitations, especially to their effectiveness in civic life. Even the formal business community complains that while they have access to top leaders, they are not heard and much of their agenda remains unaddressed. Political parties have yet to emerge as important channels for popular demands. Only the media has shown significant progress in linking people to government.

The assessment concluded with the recommendation that USAID use its existing programs and a proposed new D/G project to help improve the legal/regulatory environment for D/G by strengthening civil society associations and assisting their capacity for action, including civic action, and by enhancing the capacity of political parties and the media to link civil society actors to governmental policy-making.

7. *Chad*

In Chad, the USAID Mission believed it was important to have a clear and complete analysis of political developments and their short-term implications in order to better support D/G in Chad over the near and medium term. To this end, in December 1993, USAID/Chad requested that the project provide a governance expert (William Miles), under its requirements contract, to work with a team of Chadian experts in preparing a political assessment.

The assessment determined that the transition toward a democratic system of governance in Chad remained incomplete and unstable. The report concluded that USAID could play a critical role in strengthening sectors where democracy was struggling to take root. Further, it stated that vulnerable institutions—the performance of which is a prerequisite for good governance—could also be greatly aided by a series of low-cost, high-impact, long-lasting interventions by USAID/Chad. These interventions are of three types:

- top-down, focusing on key leadership cadres in civil associations and political parties;
- bottom-up, emphasizing majoritarian rural populations; and
- intermediate, affecting and linking both top and bottom levels of the democratizing populace.

8. *Namibia*

The United States has been involved in democratization and governance activities in Namibia prior and subsequent to the country's first free elections in 1990. Most of this assistance, funded primarily through 116e, the Africa Regional Electoral Assistance Fund, and central funding sources, has been on an ad hoc basis. Realizing that the ad hoc nature of programming was limiting the Mission's ability to mount a highly focused initiative that would identify and strengthen the key institutions critical to sustaining a responsive government and active civil society, USAID/Namibia decided to commit sufficient resources to develop an extensive bilateral democratization and governance program with the government of Namibia. To accomplish this objective, the Mission required the assistance of a technical team with prior exposure to Namibia's unique history, cultural norms, and socioeconomic situation. This team was comprised of a senior D/G advisor (Joel Barkan), D/G consultant (Gretchen Bauer), and researcher/consultant (Carol Martin).

The Namibian assessment concluded that there is a serious institutional gap between central political authorities and the population they purport to govern, so much so that the state is

virtually "suspended" over Namibian society. This problem is exacerbated by the team's second principal finding: a widespread lack of advocacy capacity on the part of Namibian citizens and local and regional leaders, as well as the leaders of major interest groups and NGOs, to articulate and lobby for their needs vis-à-vis the state. The Namibian political system is sufficiently open that most groups and associations have opportunities to assert their interests, but they are unable to take advantage of these opportunities. The assessment made recommendations clustered in five interrelated realms of activity—building advocacy capacity, facilitating decentralization, enhancing the transparency and accountability of parliament, strengthening the rule of law and human rights, and supporting the media. USAID/Namibia is currently conducting a project with a strong emphasis on the parliament that is based partly on the assessment's findings.

9. Niger

The USAID Mission in Niger recently developed a new set of "strategic objectives" that, for the first time, included D/G as an explicit objective in its plans for the next eight years. As a result, USAID decided to arrange for a technical assessment of the political situation and opportunities for future funding. The assessment team was comprised of five individuals: Political Scientist/Institutional Analyst (Sheldon Gellar), Political Scientist/Public Administration Specialist (Tina West), two Political Scientists (Dr. Charlick and Pearl Robinson), and Political Scientist/Political Economist (Leslie Fox).

As a result of its political analysis of the democratic transition in Niger, the team recommended modifying the Mission's proposed strategic objective to concentrate on supporting the development of civic and self-governance capacity in non-state associations, particularly in the specific domains where USAID conducts sectoral activities (health, rural credit, environmental management, famine moderation). Following discussions with AFR in Washington, USAID/Niger eliminated its D/G strategic objective and opted to treat democracy promotion as a "target of opportunity."

10. Guinea

Despite such political achievements as a constitution approved in 1990 and its first free and open presidential election in December 1993, the government of Guinea's standards of management, performance, and integrity have been deteriorating from the early years of the First Republic through the present Second Republic. To understand this increasingly complex political and economic situation, USAID/Guinea called for an assessment in an attempt to improve their capacity to help the Guinean people in their pursuit of sustainable economic development and empowerment, while furthering democracy and creating a system of effective governance. The following four individuals undertook this task: Sheldon Gellar, Political Scientist/Institutional Analyst; Robert Groelsema, Participation/Civil Society Specialist; Mamadou Kante, Political Scientist/Institutional Analyst; and Mary Reintsma, Political Economist.

Among a number of findings, the D/G assessment team identified three major constraints to democratization and good governance which they believed could be addressed by a USAID/Guinea stand-alone D/G Strategic Objective. The first was the lack of political dialogue

and absence of a mechanism for bringing representatives of the state, political parties, and civil society together to discuss public policy and mechanisms for establishing rules and procedures for resolving political conflicts. The second was the prevalence of the "tutelle" mentality on the part of government officials. The third was the weakness of legal institutions in general and the Court of Accounts in particular.

As a means of reducing these constraints, the D/G assessment team recommended that USAID/Guinea support:

- the establishment of a national public forum that would bring together representatives of the state, political parties, and civil society to promote political dialogue, frank discussion of public policy issues, and ways of creating a pluralistic democratic system adapted to Guinea's specific political, social, and cultural environment;
- a broad-based campaign that would focus on changing the "tutelle" mentality and bring about rule changes that now block effective decentralization. USAID/Guinea would work closely with the Decentralization Directorate to change attitudes; and
- direct financial support to strengthen the capacity of the Court of Accounts to fulfill its mission to audit public accounts.

To promote D/G from the ground up and build horizontal and vertical linkages between civil society groups, the assessment team also recommended incorporating D/G components into USAID/Guinea's sectoral strategic objective programs, especially in the areas of primary education and public health at the local level. These programs would attempt to rally broad community support and participation in programs to improve the quality of primary education and health care at the local levels. USAID/Guinea is currently reviewing both changes in the political environment as well as ongoing Mission activities in an effort to develop new programming.

11. Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal Decentralization Case Studies

The Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), the Club du Sahel, USAID, and other donors held a conference in Praia, Cape Verde, on land tenure and decentralization in 1994. ARD was involved extensively in the conference preparation and also prepared the principal background documentation on decentralization. Following the conference, USAID and CILSS decided to provide follow-up support on conference recommendations. Consequently, USAID tasked a team of two governance/decentralization experts, Michael Winter and Tom Painter, to help CILSS and the member states in implementing the recommendations of Praia by preparing case studies in Mali, Burkina Faso, and Senegal.

The objective of these case studies were as follows:

- to identify experiences in managing the decentralization of natural resources while taking into account specific groups such as women's organizations, pastoralists, and farmers;
- to analyze constraints and opportunities to adopting better methods of managing natural resources at the local level;
- to examine what changes in the overall organizational, institutional, legal, and legislative structures would be necessary to improve management of natural resources; and
- to propose recommendations for improved decentralized management of natural resources.

The following are a few of the provisional recommendations proposed by the experts:

- In Burkina Faso, the state should place greater emphasis on developing partnerships with natural resource users and NGOs and ensure greater equity in relationships where actors of unequal strength are engaged in natural resource use and management. With a view toward more effective state-local partnerships, it is important that the roles and responsibilities of different actors be clearly recognized, understood, and accepted; government services change their typical intervention mode, having a control and policing emphasis, to one of supporting and facilitating local processes for more effective, locally controlled natural resource management; and local groups have the authority to initiate and follow up actions relative to natural resource management without waiting indefinitely for the agreement or reaction of a given government technical service.
- In Mali, the state should give local institutions more latitude to tax resource use, provide a fiscal framework favorable to the emergence of a private technical support sector capable of advising local communities on decentralized natural resource management, and find a way of officially recognizing local-level mechanisms for conflict resolution related to natural resource management. Local populations should also establish their own conflict resolution mechanisms and apply the principle of subsidiarity to their management of natural resources, rather than concentrating all functions and responsibilities at higher levels (e.g., village chiefs).
- In Senegal, the state needs to appreciate its limited ability to successfully manage natural resources, rigorously apply the principle of subsidiarity, and commit itself to creating a legislative framework within which local institutions are empowered to manage natural resources.

12. Kenya

Following the multi-party elections of December 1992, which saw President Moi retain the presidential seat on a KANU ticket, Kenya, for a short period, became a relatively open society compared to the Kenya of the early 1990s and late 1980s. However, the holding of multi-party elections did not create meaningful structural changes in Kenya's body politic. Against this background USAID/Kenya developed a scope of work with a twofold purpose: (1) to survey, analyze, and assess Kenya's relevant systems, institutions, and organizations that strengthen or impede the process of democratization in Kenya; and (2) to develop a five-year strategy for USAID/Kenya that recommends new and/or continuing areas for USAID/ Kenya intervention.

The following three experts, Gary Hansen (Team Leader/Social Scientist—USAID direct hire), Judith Geist, and Jennifer Widner (political scientists with extensive Kenya experience) spent approximately five weeks analyzing the governance institutions in Kenya. The following three priorities emerged from the team's assessment of Kenya's governance institutions:

Legal and Constitutional Reform

- Advocate temporary suspension in the enforcement of key laws that restrict political activity.
- Strengthen constituencies for serious legal and constitutional reform.
- Provide training to enhance legislative/constitutional drafting skills.

Protection of Citizens' Legal Rights

- Expand the flow of accurate information about instances of lawlessness, through support of NGO-based monitoring.
- Support public interest litigation and para-legal assistance.
- Make both the law and dispute resolution more transparent by assisting the production of law reports and by providing continued support for magistrates' training.

Capacity to Administer Free and Fair Elections

- Support a technical review of the tasks confronting the electoral commission.
- Assist NGO-based monitoring of the campaign period.
- Help build institutional capacity in the extensive, rural church network.

The team arrived at a strategy for sequencing and integrating these priorities. The team advocated conditioning election assistance to the government upon the government repealing or suspending enforcement of key provisions of the electoral law restricting political party activity. If the government refused to open up the enabling environment, assistance should be directed primarily to the nongovernmental sector.

In an innovative change from past assessments, the team largely focused on exploring specific program strategies through the evaluation of intervention potential, constraints, and risks as well as other donor strategies and assistance.

B. Design Activities

1. Zambia

The Zambia assessment described above served as the basis for a design activity, commencing in July 1992 with a PID. This document was reviewed in Washington and the Mission gave authority to design a project. The project was then asked to provide a design team for the PP. An innovative team was assembled, combining resources from the Mission buy-in (Michael Bratton, Jesse McCorry, and Peter Kareithi), with experts made available through the Implementing Policy Change Project (David Gordan and Tina West) and complemented by Jennifer Windsor from ONI/DG. The PP was completed by mid-September 1992 and involved extensive consultation with Zambian citizens and government agencies. The goal of this project is to enhance governmental accountability and responsiveness, thereby contributing directly to the Mission's strategy of promoting broad-based economic growth.

The project's key components were strongly influenced by the prior assessment and include:

- improving the civil rights of Zambians by assisting in the revision of the constitution to enhance individual rights and legislative powers, and supporting a nationwide civic educational activity through the Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP), a Zambian NGO;
- enhancing the independence and competence of Zambian journalists to report on economic-policy issues through studies, establishment of a media resource center, and support for the training of journalists and media managers;
- improving legislative capability and performance through studies, staff training and salary support, and support for lawmaking research; and
- facilitating policy formulation and implementation at the national level through the creation of a Policy Analysis and Management Unit in the Cabinet Office.

Prior to start-up, D/G project staff continued to be active in providing the Mission with technical assistance to refine the design and begin initial implementation of specific aspects of the project.

2. *Rwanda*

Previously, the project undertook two design activities in Rwanda to support the Mission's development of a Democratization and Governance Project. In March 1992, a team assisted USAID/Rwanda with preparing a PID, followed by a PP in July 1992. The PID team identified key barriers to D/G in Rwanda: three centuries of authoritarian rule controlled by self-perpetuating elites with minimal accountability, and the mass and elite political culture this history has produced. The focus was on the problem of accelerating and reinforcing "a process of social learning for self-governance that had begun during the recent period of economic and political liberalization." This, the team recommended, could be ameliorated by providing assistance to state institutions, principally to strengthen the legislative process, as well as local elected officials and civil society to enhance the capacity of citizens to make political demands. An additional form of proposed assistance, linking civil societal demands to state policy and providing citizens with the capacity to know and understand governmental decisions and performance, was provided in the form of support for the print media.

The subsequent PP design team fielded by the project represented a creative synthesis of resources, combining an expert on public administration (Harlan Hobgood), an NGO specialist (Leslie Fox), a media expert (Louise Bourgault), a scholar with an in-depth understanding of local governance (Alison Des Forges), and a gender/soundness analyst (Deirdre LaPin), contracted through the Gender in Economic and Social Systems (GENESYS) Project. Following the guidance of the PID, the project team produced a flexible, multifaceted design, capable of being adjusted to Rwanda's complex political environment, where a single activity might well have to be curtailed or delayed.

The project components involved strengthening Rwandan civil society through:

- selective support to a new umbrella "civic organization";
- local governance and local participation training assistance to the Ministry of Interior and Community Development and possibly a new nongovernmental association of local government officials;
- support for the national legislative process through equipment and training for deputies and National Assembly staff; and
- support of independent media and improved journalism through technical assistance and equipment for a newly created Rwandan Press Center.

However, as a result of the tragic political upheaval and mass genocide in Rwanda, this project is no longer operational.

3. *Tanzania*

The Tanzania assessment described above served as the foundation for one of the assessment team members, Dr. Robert Charlick, to provide additional analyses and recommendations in support of USAID/Tanzania's development of a PP.

While conducting his analyses in Tanzania, Dr. Charlick highlighted the following developments which confirmed that progress in democratic governance was possible:

- the judiciary, particularly the High Court and Court of Appeals, issued a series of rulings asserting the independence of the judiciary;
- civic education had become a major theme in Tanzanian society among not only NGOs but also schools that were adopting obligatory civic programs;
- the capacity of civil society to play civil roles had been growing with a new-found capacity to coordinate; and
- new associations of journalists and increasing numbers of private media sources had begun to make an impact on the public and "mass organization" media.

In this progressive environment, Dr. Charlick suggested that USAID could play a role in assisting Tanzanians to further consolidate democracy. Working with USAID/Tanzania, Dr. Charlick developed the following focal points:

- facilitating Access to Dispute Settlement—Strengthening the Judiciary Through Alternative Dispute Resolution (AUTRE);
- improving media reporting of political news;
- building a rule of law society through civil society: support to women's legal rights; and
- developing a civic education program, stressing democratic values and processes.

4. *Rwanda Rule of Law*

The civil war in Rwanda over the last several years, together with the genocidal events that began in April 1994, caused grave consequences for the country resulting in, among other things, a total breakdown of the judicial system and the rule of law. Realizing that the judicial system was central to providing the population with a sense of both justice and security, USAID/Rwanda instructed project staff to recruit a team of experts to design a program that would assist the government of Rwanda to restart the justice system. The team was comprised of the following four experts: Leonardo Neher, Team Leader/Public Administration Specialist;

Ana Maria Linares, Rule of Law Administration Specialist; Paul Mathieu, Property Rights/Land Tenure Specialist; and Laurel Rose, Alternative Dispute Resolution Specialist.

Several weeks of information-gathering, consultations with U.S. and Rwandan officials and private citizens, discussions with the donor community, and travels within Rwanda, allowed the team to examine the justice system at several levels, from the smallest, least formal dispute resolution practices at the community level to the formal system, with its legal basis and its institutional evaluation.

The examination enabled the team members not only to identify many of the problems and bottlenecks within the system, but more importantly to develop a comprehensive design to support the rule of law in Rwanda:

- The Rule of Law Administration Specialist developed a framework matrix of the judicial process from the arrest through imprisonment, investigation, and trial. Each of these four stages was presented in five main aspects: the prescribed procedures, the problems and bottlenecks, the remedial actions indicated, and the identification of potential or actual donors and the legal issues involved.
- The Property Rights Land/Tenure Specialist proposed: (1) a survey of the communal lands and lands available for temporary occupation at the commune level, and establishment of a records system for the allocation of lands by local officials; (2) a new system of registration of people; and (3) information, communication, and training activities of local women's groups in their struggle for property and other rights.
- The Alternative Dispute Resolution Specialist proposed a variety of actions aimed at strengthening the local-level justice system, including, but not limited to, the following: institutional building and coordination among ministerial representatives at the commune level; coordination of local-level initiatives at the national level; training of bourgmestres, both in administration and mediation skills; formulating policy that would permit surveying and allocation of land in communes as well as registering persons and land/housing occupation in communes; and financial support to women's associations, organized to defend their rights, especially to land and property.

The design team concluded that the most difficult task for USAID would be to refine its priorities in coordination with other donors and create integral, coherent projects that could be monitored.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED

The ARD/MSI core team on African governance undertook to conduct a secondary analysis of a series of assessments it had carried out in five African countries—Ghana, Madagascar, Mali, Niger, and Tanzania, with additional information from a shorter study conducted in Zambia. The purpose of this study entitled, *Improving Democratic Governance in Africa, D.O. 25*, was to produce “a comparative analysis of democratic governance transitions in a number of African countries” leading to an approach to “prioritizing USAID assistance to sustainable development, and to some empirically-based lessons learned.” The following points listed in summary form under Section A have been extracted from this study. Listed under Sections B and C are several broad policy and operational lessons as well as recommendations which project staff have been able to draw from their experience supporting USAID in promoting D/G in Africa.

A. General Conclusions And Lessons From Country Studies

1. Risks of failure or of significant reversal in democratic development are considerable. Expectations in any particular programmatic cycle should be modest. Success should be measured against prior practice, over a range of processes of democratization, in terms of to what extent governments are more accountable and participatory.
2. Progress has been uneven in different democratic processes. The greatest progress has been made in the enabling environment, providing greater de facto and de jure freedom of expression, communication, and association. This includes the de facto opening of political space for local and non-elite associational life to operate and to participate in some forms of governance (chiefly self-governance or local-level governance).
3. Observing the pattern that results from uneven progress among processes helps us understand how governance is currently functioning and what opportunities may exist to further aspects of democratic governance in a particular country.
4. Although general patterns emerge from the cases, understanding the status of governance reform and planning effectively to assist in this process requires a considerable amount of country-specific information. No boilerplate approach can capture the situation or point to consistently useful assistance strategies.
5. Initial reforms of the political system were dominated by elites, often incumbent elites. This left in place and still operational much of the political behavior of the predecessor authoritarian regimes, and provided only limited incentives to alter rules governing a variety of political processes which could expand participation and improve accountability.
6. Where elite civil society actors played a significant role in the initial transition, they too tended to be dominated by actors whose political behavior generally followed the patterns displayed by incumbent elites.

7. State dominance of the political system has changed very little with democratization, reflecting the continued dominant position of national and state-oriented elites. State actors and formal governance institutions continue to dominate both the broader civil society and local political actors, limiting their capacities for institutionalized participation and influence.
8. Intra-elite accountability has improved somewhat as courts and legislatures have re-emerged from decades of dormancy. Yet neither these institutions nor formal constitutions yet provide sufficient checks on the exercise of power by elites controlling executive power to give counter-elites much assurance of the viability of the democratic pact.
9. Improving democratic governance involves, above all, altering behavior, but behavior is linked to institutions that structure incentives and sanctions and to attitudes. Behavior can be altered when actors perceive sufficient incentives to change, and/or when strong disincentives for maintaining behaviors exist. Given the elite-dominated character of most emerging African democracies, the most important changes required for sustainable improvement in democratic governance are:
 - modification of “winner-take-all” behavior, making it possible to resolve conflicts without resort to force or to non-democratic means; and
 - modification of patronage (neo-patrimonialism) as the dominant form of political allocation and of participation in a political system, through the growth of other, more group-interest based means of influencing allocation of public resources.
10. Formal associations of civil society played significant roles in the collapse of the old regime, and can be expected to become increasingly important with further economic liberalization. Although they have been fairly ineffective thus far in influencing governmental policies or in holding governmental officials accountable, they must be seen as a linchpin to efforts to negotiate and stabilize elite pacts.
11. Assisting elite civil society associations is important in the medium term, but should emphasize finding common ground between government and civil society rather than stressing contestation and resistance. For example, it may be possible to formulate an explicit deal that could benefit both government and business, such as an agreement that business support taxes in exchange for greater economic reforms and less control.
12. In the short to medium term, supporting counter-elite civil society as a way to improve accountability and participation has limitations, particularly if the goal is to promote broad-based and environmentally sound economic growth and popular empowerment. Counter-elite associations do not broaden participation very much, and hence do not alter political behavior or norms significantly.

13. Support for women's associations, even for elite associations, is a particularly important way to foster broader participation and changes in political behavior and attitudes.
14. Support for local-level associational life and for intermediary organizations that help coordinate and aggregate the interests and activities of local-level actors is an important supplementary way of helping to consolidate democratic processes beyond the elite level. However, assistance at this level poses some serious problems:
 - It takes considerable time, particularly where the density and diversity of local associations have been most negatively affected by decades of statist policies. To operate at this level requires a long time horizon and considerable tolerance for failure or reversal in the short term.
 - Local-level associations are not necessarily democratic in terms of the practices and norms of their leaders. Many local-level associations are neither democratically governed nor inclusive. They must be encouraged to be more so. Support for women's local-level associations is a particularly useful way not only of building local organizational capacity, but also more participatory and democratic values and structures.
 - Local-level associations may relate to government chiefly with suspicion or resistance. Strategies for broadening participation and accountability by working at the local level should combine efforts by donors to maintain and improve the legal and political space for local associations with approaches to finding common ground between government and these associations that both will consider beneficial. One example would be to promote an agreement under which local people would support payment of taxes in exchange for guarantees of rights of association and self-governance over specific resources.
 - Working with local associations can only rarely involve "working on democracy" directly. People alter their behavior most readily when they confront and try to address specific problems. This is particularly true of women's involvement at the local and community levels. Donors can best promote democratic governance through assistance to resolving specific problems, such as providing for education, health, and the management of natural resources. Assistance programs for promoting democratic governance at the local level should be woven throughout the country assistance program and into all of a Mission's strategic objectives.
15. External involvement and assistance was critical to the first phase of transition. External assistance is likely to continue to be vital, if not sufficient to further improvements in democratic governance in Africa.

16. External actors must improve their assistance to supporting democratic governance in Africa by adopting a more strategic approach to their assistance. External assistance in this domain has proven very uneven and ad hoc, and thus less effective than it might be.

B. Broad Policy Lessons

1. The project has helped illuminate a number of governance constraints which have operated not only to discourage foreign investment, but distort growth in ways that limit the benefits of growth to broad segments of national populations. Without doubt, corruption and overcentralization of decision-making discretion has proved to be a key constraint of sustained growth in Africa. By focusing on elements of D/G that provide mechanisms and incentives to limit overcentralization or encourage public accountability and transparency, the project has contributed to an empirical understanding of sustainable development in Africa and concrete support that can encourage better governance behaviors in the context of democratizing states. This emphasis provides clear linkages between understanding the role of competitive elections, designing technical management and accounting systems for governments at various levels, and meaningful decentralization.
2. The effectiveness and extent of USAID's D/G activities in Africa has suffered from an ambiguous legislative mandate. At least until mid-1993, there was a lack of clarity and agreement within AFR, among the agency's various bureaus, and between USAID and other actors (e.g., the Department of State) regarding what was lawful and unlawful activity under DFA language and how, as a consequence, AFR should conceive of D/G activities in terms of its overall mission. As a result, considerable confusion existed among policy-makers and program/project personnel as to what types of D/G support activities could be financed using DFA funds and even whether USAID missions should undertake "democracy" activities as part of their strategic portfolios.
3. Activities have also been limited by the long-standing competition within USAID over policy program development between field missions and the Washington regional and functional bureaus. This has meant that the demand for project expertise depended more on local conditions and missions' bureaucratic and programmatic concerns than shared field and Washington-based priorities for assistance in an area considered both difficult and important to the overall USAID program.
4. Differences in the perspectives and perceived competencies of USAID and the Department of State (particularly between missions and embassies) has also proved to be a significant, though not necessarily insurmountable, barrier to the development and implementation of coherent D/G support activities in Africa. For this project, it has meant that deeper, longer-term issues of democratic transition and consolidation and the integration of concepts of governance support, which could help build citizen networks and self-governance capabilities, have often been stressed less strongly than de jure rule changes, with the adoption of new constitutions and conduct of founding competitive elections. A great deal of the energy of embassies and missions was concentrated on these short-range activities during the project's first three years. As of the end of Phase I,

too little attention was being given to those elements of civic society—intermediate, non-state, governance/advocacy structures—that are most critical to the achievement of sustainable improvements in democracy.

5. Despite the fact that, beginning in mid-1993, the new administration attempted to clarify the role of democracy support within the overall foreign-assistance program and more broadly among various actors in the federal government (notably, the Department of State, USAID, and USIA), central guidance has been insufficient at the operational level to assure consistent, effective programming. This is due mainly to confusion and conflict over the legislative mandate, central versus decentralized policy development, the specialized roles and competencies of bureaucratic actors, and aversion to the risks associated with undertaking programs for which impact measures are less concrete and less likely to be observed in short (three-to-five-year) time frames.
6. Due to some of the above factors, the project and AFR were less effective in using the learning processes undertaken to promote internal African democratic processes than they might have been. A good example involves the manner in which USAID missions conceived of the process of undertaking and utilizing "democracy assessments" (see below). These assessments could have been designed to foster significant local participation from conception to review and analysis, and as catalysts for public discussions in Africa that might have been difficult for host-country nationals to initiate. However, mission and embassy concerns over short- and medium-term objectives, political sensitivity with sitting regimes, and other issues sometimes operated to limit the participation of host-country nationals in the conduct of assessments and, in most cases, public diffusion of these assessments.
7. It is now increasingly obvious that virtually all of Africa's new democracies must be considered at risk, primarily because the prevailing environment across the continent is one of economic crisis and they are not finding that the regime change has yielded much of an investment or growth bonus, at least in the short run. This fact has led project staff to three conclusions:
 - Democratic consolidation will require a long period of time and considerable change at many levels in Africa—thus, there is little value in being involved in the process only for the short term.
 - Macro-political rule changes and greater public accountability at the national level are important contributing factors to improved political and economic governance in Africa, but are insufficient to create the conditions for sustainable growth.
 - USAID and other donors must strategically target D/G resources on societies where they have reason to believe that other important dimensions of change, which can reinforce and deepen competitive, plural politics, can also effectively be supported. In Africa, these dimensions must include a growing

public climate of intolerance of gross human-rights abuses and a concretely expressed willingness to free local governmental authorities and non-state actors, including private sector enterprise, from undue central control and constraint.

C. Operational Lessons

1. Missions need a wide range of technical support on a variety of country- and program-level issues related to D/G. Having a single mechanism that can provide such assistance through the recruitment and preparation of consultants has proven very useful. Under this project, ARD was able to develop a group of highly qualified experts to undertake similar assignments in a number of countries as well as a roster of specialized experts to address such specific issues as the media, nongovernmental associations, and parliamentary structures.
2. It has also proven very valuable to have had this project develop and apply a broad-gauge political assessment methodology, using a rigorous comparative approach and testing it in a variety of political environments in the project's second and third years. Not only has this approach been helpful in identifying specific D/G opportunities and constraints and making recommendations to USAID Missions for priority actions and strategic perspectives, it has begun to develop the basis for a truly comparative analysis, leading to a more empirically based theory of political change and democratization in Africa.
3. Support for project design, however, has been much more limited during this period, generally reflecting the limitations of using traditional bilateral project modes to respond fully to critical political/governance opportunities and problems in a timely or flexible manner. In places where the project had the opportunity to provide design assistance (i.e., Zambia, Rwanda, Ghana, and, in 1995, Tanzania), issues of timely, effective project management and start-up have plagued each effort. In addition, these projects (usually initiated by missions with considerable embassy input) have not always drawn on a "macro" or broad-gauge understanding of the governance issues, at times focusing resources in ways that were more finely tuned to the particular stage of political development or country-specific institutional conditions.
4. Washington-based workshops on specific aspects of D/G have proven most useful when they have been linked to a specific, clearly felt programmatic or policy need within USAID. This was most notably the case for the workshop on economic liberalization and democratization conducted in the context of USAID's proposal for a new commission of the SPA group. Workshops addressing important governance issues that were not linked to existing or clearly perceived programmatic initiatives within USAID, even when they were in response to the interest of particular agency officials or offices, had less impact. While these were interesting and generally well attended and received, there was little internalized incentive to follow up, disseminate workshop reports broadly, and incorporate workshop reflections into policies or programs in any obvious way. Also, the dissemination of workshop results to the field (to Mission-level personnel who might have had a direct or related interest) was inadequately supported by USAID/Washington.

As a result, these workshops consisted largely of educating "Washington," rather than influencing USAID at the operational level.

5. Continuity in consultant personnel and full-time core-staff support and guidance is very important in the success of USAID's D/G activities. USAID's D/G work was based on a learning model—concepts and best-practices had to be developed over time in an iterative process. Without the core of full-time support from project staff and a group of experts who could apply lessons from their experience in one country to work in the next, this would have been very difficult, if not impossible. Changes in technical officers at USAID in combination with their workload, which all but precluded their devoting much attention to long-term substantial issues or conceptual development, made it all the more important to have a core of senior advisory services available. Core support to D/G must come from people who have broad expertise in political development and democratization, if these activities are to provide useful learning experiences with increasing probabilities of success. Although technical management is critical to the success of any complex activity, without significant subject-area competence and experience, it will produce limited results. Based on the first three years of this project, it would appear that the only alternative to having a substantively strong core staff for a project would be to recruit and train equivalent full-time direct-hire personnel within USAID and relieve them of enough technical management so they can make use of their specialized knowledge and experience.

D. Recommendations

In discussing these lessons, project staff have raised a number of problems encountered in their experience with supporting D/G in Africa which, if unresolved, will continue to limit the effectiveness of USAID's D/G activities. In conclusion, several modest suggestions with regard to addressing these problems are offered below.

1. Broad-gauged assessments should continue to be conducted where missions believe there is a significant prospect for contributing to democratic consolidation through a better understanding of issues and targeting assistance as well as use of the assessment process to support an important host-country national dialogue (including rural people, if possible) on improving governance.
2. To reduce the political risks associated with such assessments, they should be characterized as products of an independent assessment team, not as studies endorsed by USAID. As such, the mission and country team should interact forcefully with the assessment team, but should not attempt to constrain its conclusions in terms of analysis or programmatic recommendations. The Mission should endeavor to correct what it believes to be errors in the analysis and then release reports with the broadest possible dissemination, engaging host-national and other donors, as well as its own diverse personnel, in serious discussions of the work. The outcome of this process would be significantly more useful to the Mission than either the views of the assessment team or the Mission (including its foreign-service nationals—FSNs), alone. It should be noted

that this recommended approach makes it problematic for USAID (for example, the Center) to conduct assessments with its own personnel.

3. Workshops and formal information-sharing meetings can still be useful devices, given the fact that many issues are still highly debatable, and argumentation and evidence need to be publicly exposed for better policy and programs to result. However, workshops will produce much greater results when they address significant "felt needs," including bureaucratic needs, within USAID and the foreign-policy community. Under these conditions, follow-up and dissemination is much more likely to occur.

ANNEX A

**Table 1—Africa Governance Assessment,
Design, and Methodology Reports**

and

**Table 2—Workshops Sponsored
by the Africa Governance Project**

ANNEX A

Table 1

AFRICA GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT, DESIGN, AND METHODOLOGY REPORTS

Delivery Order No.	Country	Report Title	Personnel
D.O. 1	Niger	The Mass Media and Democratization in Niger	Allan Kulakow
D.O. 2	Rwanda	Democratic Initiatives and Governance, Project Identification Document	Harlan Hobgood, Thomas Kelly
D.O. 3	Burundi	Burundi's Road to Democracy: An Assessment	Lucie Phillips, Steve Tucker
D.O. 4	Zambia	Democracy and Governance in Zambia: An Assessment and Proposed Strategy	James Wunsch, Michael Bratton, Peter Kareithi, Robert Charlick
D.O. 5	Rwanda	Democratic Initiatives and Governance, Project Paper	Harlan Hobgood, Leslie Fox, Alison des Forges, Dierdre Lapin
D.O. 6	Zambia	Democratic Initiatives and Governance, Draft Project Paper	Michael Bratton, Jesse McCorry, Peter Kareithi, (David Gordon, Tina West, Jennifer Windsor)
D.O. 7	Mali	Democratic Governance and the Party System in Mali: A Preliminary Assessment and Recommendations	Richard Vengroff, Sheldon Gellar, Tessa Bakary, Benoit Ngom
D.O. 8	Mali	Democratic Governance in Mali: A Strategic Assessment	Richard Vengroff, Sheldon Gellar, Tessa Bakary, Benoit Ngom
D.O. 9	Chad	Mirage or Reality? Democracy Comes to Chad	Fred Quinn
D.O. 10	Zambia	Post-Design/Pre-Implementation	Leslie Fox
D.O. 11	Madagascar	Decentralizing for Democracy in Madagascar: The Beginnings, The Process, The Unfinished Agenda	Harlan Hobgood
D.O. 12	Regional	Democracy/Governance Assessments: A Review of Their Design Implementation and the Underlying Framework	Andree Wynkoop, James Thomson
D.O. 13	Tanzania	The Transition to Democratic Governance in Tanzania: An Assessment and Guidelines for Near-Term Action	Aili Tripp, Tina West, Michael Lofchie, Robert Charlick
D.O. 14	Ghana	The Consolidation of Democratic Governance in Ghana: How Can USAID Respond?	Jon Kraus, Richard Sandbrook, Shaheen Mozaffar, Tina West, David Green, Robert Charlick

Delivery Order No.	Country	Report Title	Personnel
D.O. 15	Mali	Governance in Democratic Mali: An Assessment of Transition and Consolidation and Guidelines for Near-Term Action	Mamadou Kante, Barbara Lewis, Abdoulaye Niandou-Souley, Cheibane Coulibaly, Tiémoko Diallo, Harlan Hobgood, Robert Charlick
D.O. 16	N/A	N/A	N/A
D.O. 17	Regional	Draft Documents--Institutional Analysis Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing and Assisting Democratic Governance Reform: A Framework Institutional Analysis and the Assessment of Democratic Governance in Africa 	Ron Oakerson, Shaheen Mozaffar, Harlan Hobgood, James Thomson, Sheldon Gellar, Tina West, Leslie Fox, Mamadou Kante, Tjip Walker, Robert Charlick
D.O. 18	Regional	An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of African Civil Society	Leslie Fox, Michael Bratton, Peter Kareithi, Jonathan Otto, Kim Clark, Aili Tripp
D.O. 19	Regional	An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of Improved Governance in Africa	Leslie Fox, Tessy Bakary, Mamadou Kante, Melanie Wasserman, Nicolas van de Walle, Benoit Ngom, Richard Vengroff
D.O. 20	Chad	Political Assessment: Chad After the National Conference	William Miles
D.O. 21	Madagascar	An Assessment of Politics and Governance in Madagascar	Leslie Fox, Maureen Covell
D.O. 22	Namibia	The Consolidation of Democracy in Namibia: Assessment and Recommendations	Joel Barkan, Gretchen Bauer, Carol Martin
D.O. 23	Niger	Improving Democratic Governance for Sustainable Development: An Assessment of Change and Continuity in Niger	Pearl Robinson, Sheldon Gellar, Tina West, Leslie Fox, Robert Charlick
D.O. 24	Guinea	An Assessment of Democratic Governance in Guinea: With a Transition to Democracy, Governance Implications and Strategic Democratic Options for USAID/Guinea	Sheldon Gellar, Mamadou Kante, Robert Groelsema, Mary Reintsma
D.O. 25	Regional	A Comparative Analysis of Democratic Governance Transitions in Africa: Toward a Strategic Approach to Assisting Sustainable Development	Robert Charlick, Tina West, Richard Sandbrook, Michael Lofchie, Ron Oakerson, Aili Tripp, Leslie Fox

14

Delivery Order No.	Country	Report Title	Personnel
D.O. 26	Regional	Macro-Political Assessments: The Framework and Its Application	Robert Charlick, Harlan Hobgood, Cheibane Coulibaly, Ron Oakerson, James Thomson, Tjip Walker, Tina West
D.O. 27	Rwanda	<p>Rwanda Rule of Law Design: Introduction and Technical Reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing and Assisting Democratic Governance Reform: A Framework • Governance in Democratic Mali--Edited, Revised Abstracts from the Final Draft Report • Utility of the Analytic Framework in Analyzing Democratic Governance in Mali • A Guide for the Conduct of Democracy and Governance Assessments in Sub-Saharan Africa • Institutional Analysis and the Assessment of Democratic Governance in Africa 	Ana Maria Linares, Leonardo Neher, Laurel Rose, Paul Mathieu
D.O. 28	Tanzania	<p>Tanzania Democratic Governance Initiatives Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the Sector of Capabilities of Potential Partner Organizations • Proposed Activities, Benchmarks and Issues 	Robert Charlick
D.O. 29	Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decentralized Natural Resource Management in the Republic of Mali: Summary of Case Studies and General Conclusions • La Gestion Décentralisée des Ressources Naturelles au Mali • Toward Decentralized Management of Natural Resources in Burkina Faso: Summary of Case Studies and General Conclusions • La Gestion Décentralisée des Ressources Naturelles au Burkina Faso • Decentralized Natural Resource Management in the Republic of Senegal: Summary of Case Studies and General Conclusions • La Gestion Décentralisée des Ressources Naturelles au Senegal • Conception d'un Systeme d'information pour le projet PADLOS 	Thomas Painter, Michael Winter, Joy Hecht

49

Delivery Order No.	Country	Report Title	Personnel
D.O. 30	Kenya	Kenya Assessment and Strategy	Gary Hansen (Global Bureau), Judith Geist, Jennifer Widner
CORE	Regional	The Concept of Governance and Its Implications for AID's Development Assistance Program in Africa	Robert Charlick
CORE	Regional	<i>Workshop on Macro-Governance Assessment in Africa</i> . Paper presented to the Commission of the European Communities Directorate General VIII - Development, Brussels, Belgium, July 3, 1996.	Ronald Oakerson
CORE	Somalia	Review of Integrated Strategic Plan for Somalia	John Prendergast
CORE	Kenya	Impact of Greater Horn of Africa Initiative Elements on USAID/Kenya Strategic Plan	Willet Weeks, Crawford Young

Table 2

WORKSHOPS SPONSORED BY THE AFRICA GOVERNANCE PROJECT

Workshop Title	Date	Location
Corruption and Reform: An International Journal	September 11, 1992	Washington, DC
Economic Reform in Africa's New Era of Political Liberalization	April 14, 1993	Washington, DC
Civil Society, Democracy and Development in Africa	June 9-10, 1994	Washington, DC
Gender and Democracy in Africa	July 27, 1995	Washington, DC
Consolidating Democracy: Lessons We Are Learning from the Results of USAID Democratic Governance Programs in Africa - A USAID Conference	April 23-25, 1996	Johannesburg, South Africa

4

ANNEX B
Reports and Publications

ANNEX B

REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Barkan, Joel D., Bauer, Gretchen, and Martin, Carol L. *The Consolidation of Democracy in Namibia: Assessment and Recommendations*, report to USAID/Namibia. Washington, DC: ARD, July 1994.

Charlick, Robert B. (ed). *Limiting Administrative Corruption in the Democratizing States of Africa, special issue of Corruption and Reform, An International Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1992/93, pp 173-295.

Charlick, Robert B. *Governance and Democratization in Zambia: A Needs Assessment*, report to USAID/Zambia. Washington, DC: ARD, March 1992.

Charlick, Robert B. *The Concept of Governance and Its Implications for USAID's Development Assistance Program in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, June 1992.

Charlick, Robert B. *Report of Field Mission to Support the Development of a Mission Strategy for Democracy and Governance*, report to USAID/Tanzania. Washington, DC: ARD, June 1992.

Charlick, Robert B. *Improving Democratic Governance For Sustainable Development: An Assessment of Change and Continuity in Niger*, report to USAID/Niger. Washington, DC: ARD, October 1994.

Charlick, Robert B., Fox, L., Lofchie, M., Oakerson, R., Sandbrook, R., Tripp, A., West, T. *Making Democracy Work in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, December 1995.

Charlick, Robert B. *Tanzania: Analysis of the Sector and of Capabilities of Potential Partner Organizations (Report 1)/The Proposed Tanzania Democratic Governance Project: Proposed Activities, Benchmarks and Issues*, report to USAID/Tanzania. Washington, DC: ARD, April 1995.

Coulibaly, Cheibane. *Utility of the Analytic Framework in Analyzing Democratic Governance in Mali*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1995.

Democratic Initiatives and Governance (PID), report to USAID/Rwanda. Washington, DC: ARD, April 1992.

Democratic Initiatives and Governance (PP), report to USAID/Rwanda. Washington, DC: ARD, August 1992.

Democratic Governance Project (PP), report to USAID/Zambia. Washington, DC: ARD, September 1992.

Economic Reform in Africa's New Era of Political Liberalization, Proceedings of a Workshop for SPA Donors, April 14-15, 1993. Washington, DC: USAID, 1993.

Fox, Leslie, Bratton, M., Kareithi, P., Tripp, A., Otto, J., Wasserman, M., and Mahling-Clark, K. *An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of African Civil Society*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, January 1994.

Fox, Leslie. *Civil Society, Democracy and Development in Africa, Proceedings of a Workshop for Development Practitioners*, Washington, DC: ARD, June 1994.

Fox, Leslie, van de Walle, N., Kante, M., Bakary, T., Ngom, B., Vengroff, R., Otto, J., and Wasserman, M. *An Assessment of USAID's Capacity for Rapid Response in Support of Improved Governance in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, January 1994.

Fox, Leslie, Covell, M., Rakotoarisoa, J., Rabenarivo, C., Charlick, R., and West, E. *An Assessment of Politics and Governance in Madagascar*, report to USAID/Madagascar. Washington, DC: ARD, April 1994.

Gellar, Sheldon, Groelsema R., Kante, M., Reintsma, M. *Democratic Governance in Guinea: An Assessment*, report to USAID/Guinea. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1994.

Hobgood, Harlan H. *Decentralizing for Democracy in Madagascar: The Beginnings, the Process, the Unfinished Agenda*, report to USAID/Madagascar. Washington, DC: ARD, May 1993.

Kante, Mamadou, Hobgood, H., Lewis, B., and Coulibaly, C. *Governance in Democratic Mali: An Assessment of Transition and Consolidation and Guidelines for Near-Term Action*, report to USAID/Mali. Washington, DC: ARD, May 1994.

Kenya Democracy and Governance Strategy Summary. (Edited Version of Unreleased Document written by Hansen, G., Widner, J., Geist, J., report to USAID/Kenya. Washington, DC: December 1995)

Kulakow, Allan M. *The Mass Media and Democratization in Niger*, report to USAID/Niger. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1992.

Miles, William. *Political Assessment: Chad after the National Conference*, report to USAID/Chad. Washington, DC: ARD, March 1994.

Mozaffar, Shaheen. *Institutional Analysis and the Assessment of Democratic Governance in Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, November 1995.

Neher, Leonardo, Linares, A.M., Rose, L., Mathieu, P. *Rwanda Rule of Law Design*, report to USAID/Rwanda. Washington, DC: ARD, August 1995.

Oakerson, Ronald J. *Assessing and Assisting Democratic Governance Reform: A Framework*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1995.

Painter, Thomas, *Decentralized Natural Resource Management in Burkina Faso--Case Studies and Synthesis Report*, report to USAID/CILSS. Washington, DC: ARD, May 1996.

Phillips, Lucie Colvin, Tucker, S., Ndimurukundo, N., Kururu, B., Ndiokubwayo, C., and Bizimana, B. *Burundi's Road to Democracy: An Assessment*, report to USAID/Burundi. Washington, DC: ARD, September 1992.

Quinn, Frederick. *Mirage or Reality? Democracy Comes to Chad*, Central African Country Debates Constitutional Future, Twelve Jurists, Four Desks, report to USAID/Chad. Washington, DC: ARD, March 1993.

Somerville, Carolyn M., Weissman, S. *Gender and Democracy in Africa*, Final Report of a Workshop, Washington, DC: ARD, July 1995.

Thomson, James, Wynkoop, A. *Democracy/Governance Assessments: A Review of their Design, Implementation and the Underlying Framework*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, August 1995.

Vengroff, Richard, Gellar, S., Ngom, B., and Bakary, T. *Democratic Governance in Mali: A Strategic Assessment*, report to USAID/Mali. Washington, DC: ARD, October 1992.

West, Tina, Charlick, R., Kraus, J., Mozaffar, S., and Sandbrook, R. *The Consolidation of Democratic Governance in Ghana: How Could USAID Respond?*, report to USAID/Ghana. Washington, DC: ARD, January 1994.

West, Tina, Charlick, R., Lofchie, M., and Tripp, A. *The Transition to Democratic Governance in Tanzania: An Assessment and Guidelines for Near-Term Action*, report to USAID/Tanzania. Washington, DC: ARD, March 1994.

West, Tina. *A Guide for the Conduct of Democracy and Governance Assessments in Sub-Saharan Africa*, report to USAID/Washington. Washington, DC: ARD, November 1995.

Winter, Michael. *Decentralized Natural Resource Management in the Republic of Mali-Case Studies and Synthesis Report*, report to USAID/CILSS. Washington, DC: ARD, May 1996.

Winter, Michael. *Decentralized Natural Resource Management in the Republic of Senegal-Case Studies and Synthesis Report*, report to USAID/CILSS. Washington, DC: ARD, August 1996.

Wunsch, James, Bratton, M., and Kareithi, P. *Democracy and Governance in Zambia: An Assessment and Proposed Strategy*, report to USAID/Zambia. Washington, DC: ARD, June 1992.

Young, Crawford and Weeks, W. *Impact of GHAI Elements on USAID/Kenya Strategic Plan*, report to USAID/Kenya. Washington, DC: ARD, February 1996.