![GSDRC - Governance and Social Development Resource Centre]

**Helpdesk Research Report: Reviews of Decentralisation and/or Subnational Government Support Programmes**
Date: 29.11.08

**Query:** Please identify recent donor/aid agency/think tank reviews of decentralisation and sub-national government support programmes, particularly those that identify lessons learnt, and make policy recommendations for future support.

**Enquirer:** AusAID

Contents:

1. Overview
2. Agency-level reviews
3. Country-level reviews/programme evaluations

## 1. Overview

DFID, the World Bank and GTZ have recently undertaken multi-country reviews of their support to decentralisation and sub-national governance. The EU has also produced a set of guidelines based on its experience. A great number of country-level evaluations are now available online, the majority of which conclude with lessons learned and recommendations.

Recommendations vary from broad-level observations about what makes programmes more or less successful, to highly specific technical recommendations on how to implement such programmes. At the more general end of this spectrum, several recurring lessons/recommendations are notable:

- There is a need for <u>strong national ownership</u>, at both central and local level: Central government commitment is key. DFID support has been most effective where there has been political will. Similarly, the World Bank has achieved better results in contexts where there has been consensus around the need for reform within the country.

- Many reports note the need to assess whether <u>the political context</u> is conducive to decentralisation. Understanding political context also means understanding relationships between different levels of government. It is important not to bypass local institutions, and to be flexible to local and traditional governance structures (e.g. Tuvalu).

- There is a need to focus on <u>both governance issues and technical capacity</u>: Support to decision making should be linked to access to resources.

- There is a need to <u>build inclusive partnerships</u>: Decentralisation and local government projects typically involve multiple institutions and different levels of government in the delivery of project outputs. There is also a need for <u>greater harmonisation among donors</u>; and an effective division of labour.

- There is a need for <u>better monitoring and evaluation (M&E)</u>: good results-based indicators should be developed. If capacity is weak at the local level to take on responsibilities for M&E, technical assistance should be made available to build M&E capability.

- There is a need for <u>greater realism and management of expectations</u>: Several studies note that expectations were high, and project aims were overly ambitious. The World Bank report notes that there is a tendency to think all risks can be mitigated in its programmes. Several studies caution that decentralisation is a long-term endeavour.

## 2. Agency-level reviews

**Newsum, A., 2008, 'DFID's Contribution to Decentralisation and Local Governance (D/LG): A Stocktake', Governance and Social Development Group, Department for International Development (DFID), London**
[not available online]

This report details the results of a stocktake of DFID's contribution to decentralisation and local governance (D/LG) in 27 partner countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. It finds mixed results: "The good performers are where the decentralisation framework adopted is appropriate and pro-poor, the manner in which decentralisation is implemented is sound, there is strong and continued political commitment and there are adequate financial resources and human resource capacity. Long term and well sequenced decentralised country led programmes underpinned by flexible approaches and capacity building are important for achieving successful outcomes." (p.8)

Key findings of the review are:
- DFID's contribution has been most effective where there is political will and a sound decentralisation framework.
- D/LG projects often require complex institutional arrangements and multiple stakeholder groups for implementation.
- Establishing and sustaining good country partnerships for D/LG related projects present particular challenges. The need to engage with all partners during the design stage is always not recognised.
- Sound analysis is required to ensure that DFID support for D/LG, channelled through the sectors and public sector management programmes, contributes to pro-poor forms of decentralisation. For a complete view, Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessments need to be supported by information on the quality of the political, administrative, inter-governmental decentralised arrangements.
- There is a need for sound D/LG indicators for measuring results; stronger and more effective monitoring and evaluation systems; and good knowledge management to support the complex and multi-dimensional nature of decentralisation work in partner countries.

Section 4 (p.35) presents a summary of the findings of annual performance reviews. The following factors are identified as important for D/LG projects:
- <u>Understanding local politics and securing political commitment</u>: It is insufficient to focus on national politics and secure national agreements for delivery of projects involving D/LG. Understanding the politics at all levels and the political relationships between the levels is important. Consider working with smaller chiefs and family heads in cases where powerful chiefs have a vested interest in local assets.
- <u>Building partnerships and securing ownership - country partners and donors</u>: Building trust and managing relationships through regular dialogue and effective

communications is important. There is a need to understand the social, political, cultural and administrative differences at regional and local levels and the different governance challenges in rural and urban settings, as well as to understand and manage local expectations. It is important not to bypass local institutions.

- Working effectively with civil society organisations: Involving civil society in the management structure of the delivery of the project can contribute to breaking down the barriers between local government, civil society and the institutions responsible for service delivery. It is important to have good information on the capacity and capability of CSOs and an understanding of the institutional incentives.

- Managing institutional complexity: Many D/LG projects involve multiple institutions and different levels of government in the delivery of project outputs. It's important to ensure different levels participate in the design, field visits and monitoring. Also to establish appropriate feedback links to ensure the experience at local level is feeds into policy formulation.

- Ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E): Effective M&E requires careful design and use of good results-based indicators. If capacity is weak at the local level to take on responsibilities for M&E, technical assistance should be made available to build M&E capability.


**World Bank, 2008, 'Decentralization in Client Countries: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 1990-2007', World Bank, Washington DC**
http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2008/09/16/000333037_20080916044226/Rendered/PDF/454080PUB0Box311PUBLIC10Aug07102008.pdf

This review assesses the effectiveness of Bank support for decentralisation between 1990 and 2007 in 20 countries. It finds that better results were achieved where there was consensus around the reform within the country prior to Bank engagement and when its support was combined with incentives for institutional reform at the subnational level. The review recommends:

- More timely and coordinated analytical work to underpin interventions, based on an integrative understanding of economic, political, and institutional factors at different levels of government and across sectors affected by decentralisation.

- Decentralisation to be underpinned by genuine country commitment.

- A more results based approach to monitoring and evaluation that focuses on local outcomes (such as enhanced accountability, greater citizen participation, and improved service delivery) rather than on just the process of decentralisation.

- Better coordination of fragmented sector-by-sector interventions, and support for policy reform with technical assistance to strengthen local government capacity.

Chapter 2 (p. 13) details the results of an assessment of the quality of Bank support in the 20 countries over the evaluation period. It finds that until recently the understanding and treatment of political economy issues and risks has been weak. This has given rise to overly ambitious objectives in Bank lending: "Bank lending documents typically acknowledge and address these risks. However, they also tend to assume that the Bank can mitigate virtually any relevant risk. Even serious risks (high-probability and/ or high-loss events) are considered to be contained by various mitigation measures" (p.18). There is also a need for major development partners to harmonise their procurement guidelines and financial reporting requirements with the central government.

*See also*:

**World Bank, 2008, 'Decentralization in Client Countries: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 1990-2007' Powerpoint presentation**
[not available online']

This presentation highlights that Bank support delivered better results when it was designed and implemented within a broad country-led decentralisation framework. It was most successful in implementing top-down reforms with the support of central government but less successful at empowering local citizens to hold government accountable.

**OECD DAC, 2004, 'Lessons Learned on Donor Support to Decentralisation and Local Governance', OECD, Paris**
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/46/60/30395116.pdf
[NB: although this report isn't recent, it remains the most recent report by the OECD DAC on decentralisation and is widely cited.]

This report presents a synthesis of evaluation studies of decentralisation and local governance support programmes from OECD countries. A key recommendation is the need for long-term support, since successful decentralisation may take more than a decade in a context of financial and political instability.

The main recommendations are:

- Improve co-ordination between donors and partner governments: In order to make donor support in this area more effective and sustainable, the donor community needs to:
    - Integrate programmes more effectively with partner governments' own policies and plans.
    - Support partner governments in preparing implementation plans that outline prioritised areas needing donor support.
    - Establish joint government-donor forums for reviewing and implementing reforms.
- Enhance co-ordination between donors: Donors and partner governments should examine obstacles to effective donor co-ordination and endeavour to ensure that donor programmes in this field are better co-coordinated. Donors should take the initiative to:
    - Establish forums for co-ordination and dissemination of information.
    - Establish systems for basket funding when appropriate.
- Ensure sustainability of donor support: Short-term and long-term sustainability concerns should be built into donor programmes supporting decentralisation and local governance. Donors should:
    - Formulate exit strategies and plans for up-scaling or institutionalisation of programme activities in the early stages of a programme.
    - Provide effective feedback from programme activities to national policy-makers.
    - Ensure that support to other areas (*e.g.* to SWAPs) is not undermining support to decentralisation.
    - Design programmes in a holistic way taking into consideration LGs relations with the central government as well as civil society.
- Strengthen poverty focus: The poverty focus of programmes needs to be strengthened. The poverty orientation of local government transfer systems should be increased. For donors who provide support to civil society organisations interacting with local governments there is a particular need to:

- Ensure that service delivery support targets underprivileged groups, including the poor.
- Stimulate bottom-up, grassroots-based governance (*e.g.* citizen-based budget watch and citizen-based service delivery monitoring).
- Enhance LG-civil society interaction at the lowest echelon of the LG system.
- Financial development and sustainability of local governments:
  - Strengthen local government capacity, exercise economic autonomy and ensure incentives for improved local government performance are not restrained by intergovernmental fiscal transfer systems.
  - Ensure a holistic design which takes into account reforms of LG tax systems, assignments, types of taxes and tax sharing arrangements.

**European Commission, 2007, 'Supporting Decentralisation and Local Governance in Third Countries', EC-Europa, Brussels**
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/governance-democracy/documents/decentralisation_local_governance_refdoc_final_en.pdf

These guidelines are based on EC experience of supporting decentralisation and sub-national governance. They propose an 'open systems perspective' on decentralisation; which entails viewing fiscal, administrative and political processes as linked and embedded in a political and societal context, and influenced by regional and international trends. "To enhance the effectiveness and impact of their support, donors should adopt a holistic approach, which enables them to see (and act upon) the linkages between these different parts of the system." (p.13)

Several 'guiding principles' for the design and implementation of support programmes are proposed:

- Country specificity: Donor interventions in the area of decentralisation are still often designed based on 'models' from other places.
- Ownership and partnership: Country processes should provide the 'starting point' for donor interventions. Promoting an ongoing national dialogue as well as a dialogue between national stakeholders and the donor community to define partnership principles, to identify relevant support strategies and to jointly ensure proper monitoring and evaluation, is essential.
- Legality and legitimacy: Support should be consistent with the 'legal' framework for decentralisation (to avoid parallel 'routes' or structures) and seek to respect the 'legitimate' role division between the different actors in the development process.
- Flexibility and pragmatism. Decentralisation and local governance are 'stop-and-go' processes and agencies need to use instruments and modes of cooperation that are sufficiently flexible to adapt to changes in the political and institutional environment.
- Alignment and harmonisation. A single donor is seldom in a position to influence all of the different dimensions of the decentralisation and local governance 'system'. There is a need for building strategic alliances and complementarities with other development partners.
- A long-term and gradual process. Assistance for decentralisation should focus on 'soft issues' (such as effecting changes in the political culture and building new relations of trust between citizens and their elected representatives, and among a wide range of actors). Donor support modalities need to be based on longer time horizons and incremental action. (p.34)

The following sector-specific reviews also make recommendations:

**WaterAid, 2008, 'Making decentralisation work for the poor: effective financing of local governments as an essential first step', Wateraid, London**
http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/governance-conflict-and-humanitarian-retreat/GR10.doc

This research reviewed 12 countries where WaterAid and local partners work in Africa and Asia to assess how decentralisation in the water sector could work more effectively. The paper notes that local government budgets and plans are consistently by-passed by those funding development - donors, NGOs and central government. Finance is fragmented and piecemeal, resulting in a bewildering number of actors funding investments at the local level. It concludes that "it is necessary for national governments and donors in particular to step back and allow local governments to make decisions (and mistakes) in response to local pressures. Stronger performance at local level of course requires the strengthening of local capacity, but this will not develop until local governments have control of a critical mass of resources." (p.1)

The main findings/ recommendations are:

- Predictability of funds in terms of timeliness of releases is a problem and leads to non-utilisation of funds. There are major problems relating to the amount of funds released. Actual receipts are frequently lower than expected.
- A 'predictable critical mass' of resources is necessary to ensure the credibility of local governments and to enable them to develop meaningful plans to meet local targets.
- Governments need to improve the design of intergovernmental transfers to provide more freedom at local levels and enable efficient use of funds.


**Scott, T., 2006, Decentralization and National Human Development Reports, UNDP**
http://www.pogar.org/publications/other/undp/decentralization/Decentralization-Guidance-Note-06e.pdf

This report presents a review of approaches to understanding decentralisation and determining policy solutions to achieve effective decentralisation processes motivated by human development goals as set out in Human Development Reports. It notes that over the last few years, thinking on decentralisation has evolved and the following key concepts have come to be seen as increasingly important:

- Access to information: A critical factor influencing the behaviour patterns of individual actors in any system, including decentralisation, is their access to information. Transactional costs stemming from imperfect information availability drive a market economy. Similar imperfections in public sector knowledge management can generate behaviour referred to as 'free riding', 'rent-seeking', 'principle-agent conundrum', 'moral hazard' and 'unintended consequences'.
- Non-reductionist perspectives: The division of decentralisation into political, administrative and financial components can sometimes undermine efforts to understand its overall impact.
- Complex social systems: A polycentric view recognises that many actors influence decision-making and their relative power is constantly changing.
- Long-term change in institutions and individual behaviour: Changes to existing institutions can be introduced in a short period, but transformation of behaviour and thinking among individuals can take much longer. The diversity of agents involved in decentralisation processes typically makes rapid change difficult, but not impossible.
- The importance of unique, local conditions: decentralisation affects different processes and places in different ways.

| 2. Country-level reviews/ programme evaluations |
| --- |

Afghanistan

**The Asia Foundation, 2007, 'An Assessment of Sub-National Governance in Afghanistan', The Asia Foundation, San Francisco**
http://www.asiafoundation.org/pdf/AG-subnationalgovernance.pdf
GSDRC summary available at: http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Document&id=2826

This study by the Asia Foundation suggests that while the government and the international community recognise the importance of developing governance at the sub-national level, they have failed to develop a strategy and provide the funding to put a system in place. The Afghan government needs to formulate, communicate and effectively implement a policy that respects the cultural, linguistic and geophysical reality of Afghanistan. The delivery of services and the development of local infrastructure have had more impact than any other factor on sub-national governance and on people's attitudes towards the government. However, infrastructure at the sub-national level is a legacy of previous governments and is organised only down to the provincial level. Furthermore, the government's failure to develop and articulate a policy for sub-national governance makes it difficult to communicate what it is trying to do.

Cambodia

**Asian Development Bank, 2008, 'Cambodia: Commune Council Development Project: Project Completion Report', ADB, Manila**
http://www.adb.org/Documents/PCRs/CAM/35274-CAM-PCR.pdf

This evaluation report offers a detailed assessment of the ADB's support to the decentralisation and deconcentration (D&D) process in Cambodia. The project included facilities, capacity building, digital photomapping and civil registration components. The paper makes very specific technical recommendations, but concludes overall that: "given the impressive progress in decentralization vis-à-vis reforms in other areas and the positive achievements under the CCDP, ADB is recommended to provide long-term support for D&D reform—including for implementation of the organic law to devolve service responsibility to subnational levels". (p.15)

Indonesia

**USAID, 2006, 'Stock Taking on Indonesia's Recent Decentralization Reforms', Report of the Democratic Reform Support Program (DRSP) for the Donor Working Group on Decentralization**
http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH311.pdf

This stocktaking of decentralisation reform in Indonesia finds that decentralisation reforms have been progressive in principle, but incomplete and not sufficiently realised on the ground. The anticipated reform progress has not been met and may not have the sound foundation that it needs. Findings are grouped under the following headings:

- The legal framework: There have been glaring weaknesses in the legal framework and process, lack of coordination among relevant agencies, and insufficient consultation with stakeholders and experts.
- Intergovernmental relations: With the fragmentation of districts it is unlikely that the new regions will be able to adequately fulfill their service functions as expected.

Functional assignment was not clearly defined for the district/ city level in the 1999 decentralisation reforms. Even where there was clarity, some ministries/ agencies resisted the assignment of important or income generating functions, leading to tensions between levels of government.

- <u>Civil service reform</u>: In short, regional governments have few incentives and discretion to right-size and make their civil service efficient. The remuneration system is complex, lacks transparency and provides no incentive for performance.
- <u>Regional governance reform</u>: The state of service delivery may improve if measures to improve service accountability are put in place: i) enabling citizens to monitor the extent to which regional government fulfills its responsibility in providing adequate service; and (ii) promoting transparency in regional government planning and budgeting.
- <u>Third party support</u>: NGOs have coalesced in networks for greater impact in advocacy work to influence government regulation, laws or ministerial decrees related to regional autonomy.

<u>Malawi</u>

**ECI Africa, 2008, 'Malawi: Final Evaluation of UNDP and UNCDF's Local Development Programme, submitted to: United Nations Capital Development Fund**
http://erc.undp.org/index.aspx?module=ERC&page=EvaluationShow&EvaluationID=3567

The key programme lesson arising from this evaluation is that capacity building without the appropriate investment does not work: "The causal connection between capacity building, service delivery and poverty reduction is broken" (p.10). Accordingly, one of the main programme lessons is the importance of placing capital investment in development and services and its link with poverty reduction at the centre of the programme. Other recommendations are made in relation to institutions and capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, and national and local sources of impetus.

<u>Papua New Guinea</u>

**Whimp, K., 2006, 'Fiscal decentralisation reform in PNG', Unpublished paper presented at IDS in 2006**
[see attached PDF entitled 'PNG Whimp']

This paper discusses AusAID's support to reforming intergovernmental financing in Papua New Guinea. It argues that provincial governments are not delivering because of inadequate funds for even basic service delivery and large differences in the availability of funding at provincial government level. "Much of the failure of service delivery can be attributed to confusion over which level of government is responsible to pay for various components of service delivery. This confusion exacerbates lack of funding, lack of capacity and poor accountability…there is a lack of understanding at national government level about what is required to improve service delivery at local level" (p. 2).

<u>Tuvalu</u>

**Ortega, M, 2008, 'Support for Local Governance (SLG) for Enhanced Island Development Project', Evaluation Report, Fiji Multi Country Office, Suva**
http://erc.undp.org/index.aspx?module=ERC&page=EvaluationShow&EvaluationID=2930

This evaluation of UNDP support to local governance and outer island development in Tuvalu finds that a key contribution of the project was to support increased harmonisation between unwritten laws grounded in the customs and traditions of the people and formal laws as prescribed by the constitution. It is also noted that the project reinforced the concept of decentralized democracy alongside local traditional governance systems. Another factor contributing to the project's success was the full ownership of the project by the GoT. One of the main lessons learned was that the projects flexibility and adaptability to the local context enhanced project outputs.

Uganda

**UNCDF, 2007, 'Final Evaluation of UNCDF's Local Development Programme Submitted to: United Nations Capital Development Fund' Executive summary of main report, ECI Africa, Woodmead**
http://erc.undp.org/index.aspx?module=ERC&page=EvaluationShow&EvaluationID=3568

This evaluation of a 3-year UNCDF district development programme finds that the programme performed well against its objectives and that there is some evidence that the approach could be successfully replicated elsewhere. A number of factors contributed to successful implementation, including: policy commitments to participation; a positive role played by the MoLG in implementation; and sensitisation of the people of the need for them to participate in planning (p. 9). The project also performed well on gender mainstreaming and building local capacity of gender actors in gender analysis.

Yemen

**United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), 2008, 'Yemen: Decentralisation & Local Development Support Programme', Executive Summary of Final Evaluation Report, UNCDF, New York**
http://erc.undp.org/index.aspx?module=ERC&page=EvaluationShow&EvaluationID=3570

This evaluation finds that the decentralisation and local development support programme in Yemen effectively strengthened local governance and built institutional capacity. The evaluation notes the importance of strong mutually supportive relationships and a division of labour among donors. In relation to country ownership, it is important to establish clear milestones for the transfer of programme activities to the government partner.

Zimbabwe

**Mellors, R., et al., 2008, 'Capacity Building for Decentralised Local Governance in Zimbabwe: Lessons of Experience from PDSP & RDCCBP', Development in Practice Ltd, Nottingham, UK**
[not available online]

This paper reviews DFID's experience with capacity building for local governance in Zimbabwe between 1989 to 2001.  The overall conclusion is that that "this experience demonstrates that major organisational and institutional improvements can be achieved through a participative, practical, process approach to capacity building using facilitators, capital grants and experiential training, all of which contribute to generating practical

understanding of local government roles and how they can be fulfilled" (p. 4). The report notes one of the main lessons from the experience in Zimbabwe is there must be strong ownership and commitment by the central political leadership. Development agencies need to ask: "Is the political, economic and legal environment conducive to democratic/participatory development?"

Specific lessons are presented in relation to strengthening local ownership and assessing whether the conditions are appropriate for promoting local government development as well as designing and operating capacity building processes. Maintaining a low donor profile, adopting a learning-by-doing approach, and avoiding autonomous, donor-funded project management units are some of the recommendations for managing capacity building.

## 2. Additional resources

**Commonwealth Local Government Forum and ComHabitat, 2007, 'Financing Decentralisation and Local Government to Meet the MDGs', Commonwealth Secretariat, London**
[not available online]

This paper discusses the issue of financing local government in the developing countries of the Commonwealth, particularly in the context of human settlement development and strategies for achieving the MDGs. It argues that local government must be "hardwired" into the overall governmental system, and not be considered just as an adjunct to central government. Policy options are discussed in Section 3, p. 11. These include strengthening institutions that monitor CG and LG relations, and the importance of alternative mechanisms including the role of private finance.

**GSDRC Helpdesk Report August 2008: Demand Driven Technical Assistance**
Query: Please identify literature and lessons learned on demand-driven technical assistance/ training - in particular to local governments in the context of decentralisation programmes.
http://www.gsdrc.org/go/display&type=Helpdesk&id=457

This report found that the most common demand-driven technical assistance (TA) mechanism discussed in the literature is the Capacity Building Grant (CBG) or Capacity Building Fund (CBF) - a form of discretionary budget support which gives local authorities the flexibility to determine, finance, and manage training and technical assistance according to their needs. This assistance has thus far usually been conditional on local governments meeting certain performance benchmarks. Whilst some argue that this system promotes a coherent institutional development strategy and provides strong incentives for local governments to build up capacity, others criticise it for preventing genuine comprehensive training and assistance needs assessments.

The following academic papers present policy recommendations:

**Beall, J., 2007, 'Decentralisation, Women's Rights and Development', Development Studies Institute, London School of Economics, London**
http://www.crdi.org/uploads/user-S/11878092661Jo_Beall_Decentralization_Women's_Rights_Development.doc

This paper argues that whilst decentralisation is often regarded as an important vehicle for increasing women's representation and advancing women's rights, the reality is not so clear-cut. There is reason to believe that effective voice and distributive policies are better

exercised at national level. Even where the benefits of decentralisation can be clearly demonstrated, it is not guaranteed that these are extended to women. "There are three prerequisites if decentralisation is to be positively associated with women's rights. First, women need to be organised and represented politically, otherwise decentralisation remains nothing more than an administrative exercise, and one that invariably ignores their interests and priorities. Second, decentralisation is best pursued through well-lubricated inter-governmental relations in the context of a strong state and women's organisation has to engage across the full terrain of government. It is at national level that women have made most gains politically. If their voice is to be sustained and reinforced across all levels of government, then women's political participation at the local level requires support and integration into broader political processes. Third, international support to decentralisation policies has to be monitored to ensure it does not ignore or undermine local democracy and women's rights, through over-emphasis on administrative decentralisation." (p.18)

**Romeo, L., 2003, 'The Role of External Assistance in Supporting Decentralisation Reform', Public Administration and Development, Volume 23 Issue 1, Pages 89 - 96**
http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/102529099/abstract?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0

This article briefly reviews modalities of external aid to decentralisation, highlighting key limitations and contradictions. It finds that: "In spite of much rhetoric, decentralisation remains marginalised in a donor-government policy dialogue dominated by macro-economic and sectoral issues. Compartmentalisation within major aid organisations of the expertise and respon-sibilities to support administrative reforms, sectoral assistance programmes and community development projects, produces fragmented and competing interventions that do not address and even retard the systemic changes needed to advance decentralisation. New and more effective partnership arrangements between decentralising governments and their external partners are necessary to link 'downstream' assistance to local governments to 'upstream' development of the national decentralisation reform framework and to help manage a gradual and strategic approach to implementation of the reforms." (p.1)

| **Authors and contributors** |
| --- |

**Author**
This query response was prepared by **Claire Mcloughlin**: claire@gsdrc.org

**Contributors**
Diana Conyers, Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
Johannes Jutting, Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) - Development Centre (DEV)
Claudia Buentjen, Asian Development Bank (ADB)
Lucy Slack, Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF)
Marit Haug, Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research
Shiladitya Chatterjee, Asian Development Bank (ADB)
Albrecht Stockmayer, GTZ

| **Websites visited** |
| --- |

World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), African Impact Evaluation Initiative, Inter-American Development Bank: Office of Evaluation and Oversight, UNDP: Evaluation Office (EO), UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre, Asian Development Bank: Operations Evaluation Department, DAC Evaluation Resource Center, JICA, Australian Development Gateway, Google, Commonwealth Local Government Forum