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Executive Summary

The need for evaluating the performance of service providers while focusing on aspects of good governance, such as transparency, participation, responsiveness and equity is becoming increasingly emphasized and pronounced, as evidenced by the growing number of Governance Assessments (GAs) supported by donors and international development organizations and endorsed by host governments.

In this light, the implementation of the project entitled "Building the Capacity of the Information and Decision Support Center for Governance Assessment and Monitoring" is opportune. Funded by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and hosted by the Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) through the Social Contract Center (SCC), the project was implemented from 2009 to 2011 with a main purpose of developing governance dimensions and indicators that would not only identify the current gaps in governance within three basic services (primary health care, basic education and drinking water and sanitation) and point to areas that need to be strengthened to better manage service delivery and cater to citizens' expectations.

The purpose of the GA evaluation is to evaluate the project's performance and progress against its planned objectives and activities while determining the lessons learnt and providing guidance for the broader and forthcoming replication of the GA. In light of the objectives of the GA evaluation, the report examines the following parameters of the GA:

- Overall evaluation comments
- Achievement of the intended objectives
- The GA methodology – general comments
- The GA Implementation Steps
- Participation of CSOs and the private sector
- Cooperation with the LDO

For each parameter, the report evaluates the elements of strength and outlines aspects that require further consideration to ensure replicability and sustainability. These are followed by overall recommendations as well as those concerning each parameter. Table 1 summarizes the main points of analysis pertaining to each parameter.

In sum, a GA on its own cannot give rise to good governance, but must be bolstered by an environment of political will that initiates the corrective policy measures that are indispensable for improving governance. The upcoming phase should focus heavily on promoting the need for good governance practices and the utility of undertaking GAs. However, for these awareness activities to be successful, the methodology adopted for the GA must be simplified and facilitated enough for replication and sustainability.
The following steps need to be implemented to promote and institutionalize the achievements made by the project:

- Simplify the GA methodology.
- Undertake an extensive awareness raising campaign on the need for good governance and the benefits of undertaking GAs.
- Undertake an advocacy campaign to encourage buy-in from decision makers and key players for promoting GAs.
- Select one or two stakeholder entities for replication/institutionalization of the GA.
- Organize national conferences that publicize the efforts of good governance and allow for experience sharing between implementing entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Fayoum GA need not be repeated in the immediate future before there is a national buy-in to the importance of assessing governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Orientation and awareness raising efforts should concentrate on acquainting decision makers with: a) the concept of good governance, and b) the benefits of GAs and the risks and obstacles that may occur if they are not adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To gain popular and official support and to ensure adequate understanding of the merits of GAs, it is recommended that the terminology of “governance” be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is important that the feedback of the citizens through a GA is translated into policy decisions by the service provider, and that it addresses their needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The citizens’ satisfaction survey adopted for the GA should be accompanied by an actual performance assessment that analyzes the actual level and quality of basic services delivered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Actual performance assessments can be carried out regularly (annually or bi-annually, depending on the resources of the entity and the nature of the sector) and backed with citizen satisfaction surveys (perhaps every two to five years) to examine the impact of the achievements on those receiving the service, thus completing the GA exercise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of the Intended Objectives</td>
<td>• The GA has complied with the fundamental goal of providing the GOE with well researched evidence that can help in engaging in effective dialogue with the citizens and in improving service delivery to attain good governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project achieved its objective of obtaining baseline data on good governance practice through the GA, which relied on a systematic, objective approach for data collection and analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The GA exercise has led to a deeper understanding of the gaps and problems of governance in the pilot sectors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The objectives should be reformulated to state that the GA analysis will serve the long-term ongoing goal of generating policy dialogue between the service providers and the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project has achieved two distinct objectives which should be clearly stated in its formal documents: development of generic framework for good governance and the pilot activity that took place in Fayoum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, through ongoing activities and lessons learned, the GA team was able to identify the reasons behind the existence of these gaps and problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The GA Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>• The use of survey data to capture public opinion is a valuable tool not only to assess the impact of governance but to strengthen trust and initiate evidence based dialogue between the government and citizens. • The project focused on six of the most vital basic services sectors that affect the livelihood of the majority of the Egyptian population.</td>
<td>• The GA process was lengthy and needs to be shortened in order to ensure better replicability of the assessment in services other than the Basic education, Primary health care, and Drinking water and Sanitation.</td>
<td>The methodology of the GA can be simplified, to some extent, and compiled in a concise toolkit or manual for future replication of the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Implementation Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Generic Framework</td>
<td>The generic framework formulated by the project is capable of spotting the gaps and problems of governance that exist in Egypt and encompasses the main issues and criteria that need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Many of the questions included under each dimension use the same term as the dimension and should therefore be rephrased and elaborated.</td>
<td>To simplify the application of the GA methodology, some of the dimensions and indicators can either be merged or prioritized. The generic and sector based dimensions can be further analyzed and defined in such a way that the risks and dangers of not applying or mis-applying them can be highlighted. The stakeholder entity should identify the significance and weight of each sector based dimension in relation to the rest, thereby deciding on the dimensions that should receive priority attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Sector frameworks and Dimensions</td>
<td>• The sector frameworks and dimensions are proper derivatives of the generic framework and can be applied to a wide range of service sectors in Egypt. • Examining the legal and institutional framework for each sector has added to the strength and credibility of the sector dimensions. • The questions included under each dimension adequately cover the various institutional, technical and organizational elements that exist within each sector.</td>
<td>The formulation of sector frameworks and dimensions is a complex process that requires highly professional expertise which may be rare to find or costly to undertake. Many of the questions included under the sector dimension use the same term as the dimension. Though the questions of the household questionnaire, which were basically derived from the Sector dimensions and their relevant questions, were clear and avoided that problem, it is</td>
<td>The formulation of sector dimensions and survey questions should be undertaken by experts within the stakeholder entity, rather than by external consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Parameter</td>
<td>Elements of Strength</td>
<td>Aspects that Need to be Considered</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The stakeholder consultations that were conducted to discuss the viability of the</td>
<td>highly recommended to revisit the questions pertaining to each dimension to ensure words different to the title of the dimension are being used.</td>
<td>• Rather than including them all in one survey, the sections that request information on household member characteristics and economic situation can be used selectively in GAs for various sectors according to the analysis requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sector dimensions underscore the legitimacy of the GA exercise and add to its</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Instead of asking &quot;to what extent,&quot; sector based dimensions need to be more specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>credibility and participative nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some questions can be extracted by the stakeholder entity from the household survey and used to develop performance indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The questions in the survey can all be traced back to the sector based dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td>A useful exercise would be quantifying and analyzing the responses that state &quot;I don't know.&quot; This provides an indication of the level of knowledge and awareness of the respondents of the services delivered to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and in turn to the generic dimensions, reflecting a thorough breakdown and de-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• When analyzed, the question that assesses the degree of the respondent's cooperation with the researcher can be used to gauge the attitude of the sample population to such a survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stratification process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is noticeable harmony between questions relating to each sector, reflecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compliance with the generic and sector based dimensions, and contributing to a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unified and streamlined analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The simple language and detailed instructions provided in the questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilitate the task of the researcher and reduce the likelihood of interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mishaps or disparities in the questioning technique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The relegation of sensitive topics – such as the income and economic status of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the household – to the end of the questions list is a tactful measure that reduces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feelings of discomfort on the part of the respondents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The key informants' sample for government stakeholders was comprehensive, covering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>officials from the decision making to the implementation level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The key informants' questionnaires were not the same for the different types of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the key informants' opinions could have been obtained from data records and are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The key informants' sample for government stakeholders was comprehensive, covering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>officials from the decision making to the implementation level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The key informants' questionnaires were not the same for the different types of</td>
<td>• Some of the questions required open-ended answers that do not appear in the final results but that are nevertheless insightful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the key informants' opinions could have been obtained from data records and are</td>
<td>• Many of the questions that asked for the key informants' opinions could have been obtained from data records and are best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The sections that include information on the household members (disaggregated by</td>
<td>• Information from key informants could have been obtained more accurately and effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age and gender), as well as the economic status of the household, were not</td>
<td>through a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporated into the final analysis, with the exception of the basic education</td>
<td>• Questions included in the survey that required open ended answers should be grouped and should form the basis for an accompanying qualitative study where participants can elaborate on their opinions and provide greater insight on the issues at hand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the questions that required open-ended answers could not be easily analyzed,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>given the large size of the sample.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the questions may be difficult for the respondents to answer and should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simplified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information from key informants could have been obtained more accurately and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effectively through a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions included in the survey that required open ended answers should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grouped and should form the basis for an accompanying qualitative study where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants can elaborate on their opinions and provide greater insight on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues at hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>key informants even within the same entity. They were differentiated according to the positions and responsibilities of those interviewed.</td>
<td>suited in an actual performance assessment study.</td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At the end of the questionnaire addressed to government officials, the latter are asked to give a grade out of 5 to each of the 9 GA dimensions according to their importance; the analysis would have greatly benefited from a follow-up question asking them to provide reasons for giving such grades.</td>
<td>• Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis process was conducted over a lengthy period, a fact that may discourage entities undertaking future GAs. However, through documentation of the exact steps for data collection and analysis and the lessons learnt, future replication is expected to consume less time and effort.</td>
<td>• A feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The stratified sampling method – while a strong statistical tool – is a complex exercise that may not difficult for stakeholder entities to implement.</td>
<td>• The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The rigorous research validation process ensured the accuracy of the collected data.</td>
<td>• Representatives of local entities should have been involved in the stages of data entry, quality control and generation of frequency tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooperation with the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS) for sampling not only guaranteed efficiency but encouraged institutional cooperation between different entities for promoting good governance.</td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis process was conducted over a lengthy period, a fact that may discourage entities undertaking future GAs. However, through documentation of the exact steps for data collection and analysis and the lessons learnt, future replication is expected to consume less time and effort.</td>
<td>• Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The rigorous research validation process ensured the accuracy of the collected data.</td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• A feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• A feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• A feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.</td>
<td>• The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Collection and Analysis

- Cooperation with the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS) for sampling not only guaranteed efficiency but encouraged institutional cooperation between different entities for promoting good governance.
- The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability.
- The rigorous research validation process ensured the accuracy of the collected data.
- The data collection and analysis process was conducted over a lengthy period, a fact that may discourage entities undertaking future GAs. However, through documentation of the exact steps for data collection and analysis and the lessons learnt, future replication is expected to consume less time and effort.
- The stratified sampling method – while a strong statistical tool – is a complex exercise that may not difficult for stakeholder entities to implement.
- The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened.
- Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability.
- A feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment.
- The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops.
- Representatives of local entities should have been involved in the stages of data entry, quality control and generation of frequency tables.

### Validation

- The findings of the GA were presented comprehensively and impartially at the validation workshop.
- Based on lessons learnt at the first validation workshop, the GA team had, accordingly, planned to amend the presentations while ensuring they are simplified and summarized, avoiding terminologies and concepts that may be unfamiliar to the average citizen.
- The duration between data collection and validation is lengthy and needs to be shortened.
- A written agenda outlining the purpose and proceedings of the workshop should have been produced and sent to the participants by fax or communicated through the phone in advance.
- The presentation needs to end with a display of the questions that the GA team needs to direct to the participants on.
- The participants who attended the validation workshop did not all participate in the GA; in this case, the findings must be presented simply with sufficient background on the GA exercise, and discussions need to be steered in such a way that those who did not participate in the questionnaire do not overpower the others who did.
- Validation need not be undertaken for all results; the workshops can be held only to verify results that are especially striking.
- It is recommended that the validation process begin with the household members before the key informants.
- When presenting the findings, it is recommended that the GA dimensions be explained simply since the concept of GA is new and unfamiliar in Egypt.
- In addition to presenting the survey findings, sufficient time needs to be allocated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                      | • A positive outcome of the validation workshop destined for government officials is the opportunity it provides for them to meet and discuss issues of common interest. | results that need to be confirmed or explained. | during the validation workshops to gather the opinions of the participants and their suggestions for improving governance performance.  
• The findings of the household survey and key informants’ questionnaires must be presented and compared with tact, to avoid creating a situation of defensive opposition between the two categories.  
• To provide government bureaucrats and junior employees with greater flexibility and freedom of expression, they should be separated from their superiors during validation.  
• To conserve time and resources, the validation workshops can be held in a series of consecutive days and for all sectors.  
• Some of the researchers can be invited to the validation workshop, to provide feedback from field experience and to acquire ownership in the GA exercise by learning the analysis results. |
| Participation of CSOs and the Private Sector | • The inclusion of CSOs and the private sector as stakeholders in the GA has added strength and credibility to the exercise, acknowledging their role in service delivery.  
• The GA is probably the first attempt by a government sponsored institution (i.e. the SCC) to assess and promote the role of civil society and the private sector in a domain that has been largely monopolized by the state. It is thus a groundbreaking effort.  
• The fact that results pertaining to CSOs and the private sector were not compared to those of government entities, since their role in basic service delivery is not as significant as that of the public sector.  
• GA results should mention extraneous factors that inhibit the performance of CSOs and the private sector in basic service delivery. | • The GA results pertaining to CSOs and the private sector should not be compared to those of government entities, since their role in basic service delivery is not as significant as that of the public sector.  
• GA results should mention extraneous factors that inhibit the performance of CSOs and the private sector in basic service delivery. | • The number and role of the CSOs and private sector is such that these two stakeholders would have better be included in a qualitative study.  
• The GA results can be used as evidence for a bid to strengthen the role and capacity of CSOs and the private sector in basic services delivery.  
• The small number of CSOs and private institutions in the pilot sectors in relation to government institutions can be used in awareness raising activities to emphasize the need to strengthen their role in basic service delivery.  
• CSOs can play a significant role in replicating GAs if they are involved in data collection and analysis as well as advocacy and awareness-raising. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cooperation with the LDO** | • Cooperation with the LDO was a valuable learning experience that added to the legitimacy of the GA as a participatory exercise.  
• In cooperating with the LDO, the SCC partnered with a significant stakeholder: not only does the mandate of the MLD allow it to participate in several service sectors but the LDO's responsibility in the field of monitoring makes it highly eligible to undertake an active role in assessing governance performance in the future.  
• The SCC benefited from the assistance of the LDO, which acted as a liaison in cooperating with the Local Information Centers that supplied the research team for the GA.  
• The addition of 3 other sectors – through cooperation with the MLD - in which the role of local units and civil society is more visible has added depth and variety to the GA. | • The LDO should have been incorporated more intensely in the GA, especially during the formulation of GA dimensions.  
• Conducting a GA assessment in more than one sector at the same time by a government entity is a worthy but heavy task. | • Stakeholder entities should be involved at all stages of the GA.  
• The results generated from the 3 sectors supervised by the SCC and the 3 sectors supervised by the LDO should be compared and analyzed in such a way that they provide insight on improving governance in sectors dominated by line ministries as opposed to others where local government and civil society input is pronounced.  
• It is recommended that future GAs be undertaken with stakeholder entities that have access to a reliable information base on the condition of the services, which can facilitate the process and support the analysis.  
• The LDO can play an instrumental role in awareness-raising on the benefits of undertaking GAs, by publicizing its experience in successfully implementing it.  
• It is recommended that validation workshops for the sectors supervised by the SCC and the LDO be combined as much as possible. |
| **Replicability and Sustainability** | | | • An important initial step is the orientation of GOE decision makers and bureaucrats to the meanings and benefits of good governance.  
• The concept of good governance should be communicated to high-ranking decision makers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>Elements of Strength</th>
<th>Aspects that Need to be Considered</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>makers like the parliament and cabinet, to obtain political will and support for nationwide replication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness raising activities on good governance and GAs must be varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The importance of decentralization should be communicated to decision makers and emphasized as a means to attain good governance, stressing on the need to ensure that its requirements and dimensions (such as fiscal autonomy, devolvement of power, capacity building, etc) are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Future GAs can be implemented by working with only one or two dimensions, in consultation with the stakeholder entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternatively, the 9 dimensions of good governance can be applied to only one or two activities within the stakeholder entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A GA is best done by an external entity, to assure impartiality and avoid sensitivities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building training and on-the-job technical assistance must be provided to the stakeholder entity that will implement the GA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The SCC can use the experience gained from the GA to provide TOT to researchers at the Local Information Centers, IDSC and local universities in order to promote the replication of GAs and other opinion studies, which are very much required in post-revolutionary Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A national conference could be held annually or over longer periods, bringing together stakeholder entities who have undertaken GAs to share their experiences and coordinate activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If sufficient demand for improving governance performance is generated, GAs can be used as a yardstick of support to certain entities over others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The need for evaluating the performance of service providers is becoming increasingly emphasized and pronounced, as evidenced by the growing number of Governance Assessments (GAs) supported by donors and international development organizations and endorsed by host governments.

In Egypt, this need has become too critical to be ignored, and the revolution that took place in January 2011 underscored citizens’ dissatisfaction with government performance in several domains, of which public service delivery was a prime concern. During and after the revolution, protests, sit-ins, strikes and demonstrations highlighted the call by Egyptians for reforms and improvements in basic education, public health, utilities, infrastructure and other basic services.

However, as post-revolution events have revealed, demonstrations, strikes and other methods of opposition – while successful in securing short-term needs like better incentives for those employed by the government – are not a viable means for improving the quality of services and government performance. To be effective, a GA must be undertaken in a systematic, objective and evidence-based manner that can encourage decision makers to adopt reform policies and procedures that give rise to tangible improvements in service delivery.

In this light, the implementation of the project entitled "Building the Capacity of the Information and Decision Support Center for Governance Assessment and Monitoring" is opportune. Funded by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and hosted by the Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) through the Social Contract Center (SCC), the project was implemented from 2009 to 2011 with the purpose of developing indicators that identify the current gaps in governance and point to areas that need to be strengthened to better manage service delivery and cater to citizens' expectations.

For the first time in Egypt, a set of evidence-based indicators have been developed to assess governance in service delivery. Specifically, the dimensions and indicators were developed with the aim of highlighting the shortcomings of governance and their formidable size, with a view to developing an evidence-based strategy that would promote good governance principles through effective and objective dialogue between the service providers and the public.

The project developed applied methods for assessing governance in three basic services (Basic education, Primary health care, and Drinking water and Sanitation) to inform decision makers about the gabs and problems encountered in such services, improve service delivery and contribute to meeting the MDGs. Those three sectors were not chosen randomly but were rather identified as priority for assessments by stakeholders (including civil society, private sector and relevant government line ministries) in 11 key government programs: agriculture, housing, irrigation, health,
Basic education, illiteracy, drinking water and sanitation, infrastructure, poverty, social security and SMEs.

The timing for this intervention was appropriate in light of the set up in early 2007 of the Social Contract Center at IDSC at the Prime Minister’s Office. IDSC is considered one of Egypt’s leading statistical arms besides CAPMAS. IDSC also acts as the Egyptian Cabinet Think Tank. Its mission is to impartially support the government decisions through advice on best policy scenario mix and analytical research to improve the socio-economic well-being of the Egyptian society.

The responsibility of implementation of the project has been accorded to the SCC through its Governance Unit which, in a participatory manner, embarked on extensive consultations with Task Forces comprising of key stakeholders from government, civil society and academia interested or involved in primary health care, basic education and drinking water and sanitation. The value of having this Unit at IDSC through its Social Contract Center is that it can easily liaise and create partnerships with several line ministries in the process of mapping and developing governance assessment frameworks ensuring that the process is inclusive and participatory and serving the needs of a wide group of

**Purpose of the Governance Assessment Evaluation**

The purpose of the GA evaluation is to evaluate the project’s performance and progress against its planned objectives and activities while determining the lessons learnt and providing guidance for the broader and forthcoming replication of the GA.

Specifically, the evaluation aims at addressing the following questions:

- What results have been achieved and how far did the assessments meet the intended end-results?
- What is the probable and likely impact of the assessments and the process in terms of wider dissemination of information to the public, civil society, and local authorities, improved public services, change in legislations or policies on the national or local levels, etc…?
- How can the methodology be revised to make it lighter for the future rollout, scale up or replication of the project?
- How can the methodology be adapted to existing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and efforts of various ministries and authorities?
- How can the findings of the assessments be used in order to improve governance not only within line ministries but also other stakeholders (CSOs and private sector)?
- What kind of capacity building programs are needed for strengthening the “supply side” for governance, i.e. from government, civil society or private sector?
- What other recommendations can be drawn for the future replication and sustainability of the project?
The products and recommendations of the evaluation will be used by both SCC and the Local Development Observatory (LDO) at the Ministry of Local Development to re-organize and plan the future of the assessment and the tools and methodologies needed for that phase.

Summary of the Project Activities

The project was implemented with the purpose of supporting a Governance Unit within IDSC (through the Social Contract Center), responsible for achieving the following outputs:

- Research and monitoring studies prepared, disseminated and discussed
- Communication Strategy prepared
- Governance indicators Mapped
- A set of Generic Governance dimensions identified in the area of good governance
- Governance assessment frameworks and indicators for basic services Developed
- Data collection
- Governance database attained
- Governance evidence used for policy making

To achieve these outputs, the project planned to implement the following activities:

- Develop the capacities of a national Governance Unit in the areas on good governance and anti-corruption, governance indicators and measurements methods
- Map the international and regional governance related indicators
- Design a Generic Governance Framework and dimensions
- Identify sector-based governance dimensions and indicators and Organize national consultative workshops to refine the sector-based governance assessment dimensions and indicators through consensus and dialogue
- Collect data for approved indicators
- House governance indicators in a suitable existing information system that is easily accessible to users
- Test the use of governance indicators in national policy-making
- Organize a series of media consultations for policy advocacy and for instigating a culture of evidence-based policy making
- Organize policy debates and dialogue on governance indicators and facilitate the production of policy recommendations by various stakeholders in the policy process

1 These outputs include activities – such as the establishment of the GAU and formulation of communication strategy - that lie beyond the scope of this evaluation, which seeks to analyze and provide recommendations solely on the GA exercise with respect to the formulation of indicators, implementation of household survey and key informants' questionnaires and cooperation with stakeholders in the 6 chosen sectors.
• Initiate and document national dialogue on governance assessment and measurement
• Strengthen the collaboration and capacity of the national statistical office, namely CAPMAS, for the production and coordination of governance indicators, statistics and data collection.²

The above activities were all implemented with the fundamental goal of developing a system of GA based on practical measurable indicators that can be used to: a) assess the perceptions of citizens and service providers of performance in service delivery and b) foster a constructive policy dialogue between the service providers and citizens on the means to address the gaps in good governance and improve performance in that domain.

The GA is comprised of three main components that were implemented sequentially. These are:

1. Development of **generic dimensions** for good governance, adapted from internationally recognized indicators to suit the conditions of Egypt. These 9 dimensions, which form the basis of the GA are: **accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, participation, responsiveness, equity, rule of law, and combating corruption**. The stakeholders involved in implementing good governance and who are also affected by it, were identified as: the government (high level policy makers), bureaucracy (i.e. civil servants), political society (i.e. legislature, parliamentarians, political parties), civil society (civil society organizations, interest groups, the media, etc), economic society (i.e. the private sector), and the judiciary.

2. Development of **governance dimensions for three pilot sectors**, namely primary health care, basic education, and drinking water and sanitation. These are the same 9 dimensions but their content and questions were reformulated to apply to the situation and characteristics of the three chosen sectors. For practicality purposes and to simplify the methodology and research process, the stakeholders were reduced to: the government (comprising policy makers and civil servants), civil society and the private sector.

3. **Design and implementation of a survey of 5,500 households and [number?] key informants in the governorate of Fayoum**. The survey included all of the governorate's six districts (namely, Fayoum, Itsa, Tameia, Senoures, Abshaway, and Youssef El-Sediq) with focused sampling and data gathering undertaken in the district of Tameia.

The following table summarizes the project's activities in these three domains, along with the duration of implementation of each component.

² Source: Project Proposal: *Global Programme on Capacity Development for Democratic Governance Assessments and Measurement*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Preparing research and monitoring studies         | The Governance Team prepared and disseminated plenty of research and studies through workshops and seminars, among which are the following studies:  
- Between Corruption and Good Governance  
- Reforming the Governance of Development in Egypt  
- Citizen's perception on corruption in the Judiciary System and the Quality of Public Services in Egypt  
- The Legal and Institutional framework of fighting corruption in Egypt  
- Egypt's profile in light of international Governance indicators  | 2009- early 2011      |
| 2  | Development of Generic Framework                  | • Review of international governance models: World Governance Indicators, USAID, indicators, EU, CGP, UGI, UNDP governance framework, UN University's WGA.  
• Analysis of the international models and identification of the major shared components and areas of governance with respect to Egypt's situation. | October – November 2010 |
| 3  | Development of Sector Specific Dimensions         | • Review of the legal and institutional background of the 3 pilot sectors;  
• Formulation of the sectoral governance dimensions (guided by the generic framework);  
• Consultation with stakeholders from the pilot sectors (i.e. representatives of government, civil society, private sector and academia);  
• Modification of the indicators according to feedback from the stakeholders. | December 2010 – April 2011 |
| 4  | Design and implementation of household survey and key informants' questionnaires |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                      |

Table 2: Summary of the Project Activities

In addition, the SCC cooperated with the Local Development Observatory (LDO) within the MLD and as a result, the GA was expanded to cover three additional sectors: roads, lighting and waste management. Data collection for the household survey and key informants' questionnaires was undertaken by both the SCC and LDO, selecting Fayoum as one of the poorest governorates in Egypt to carry out the GA.
As the table above indicates, the total sampling size for the household survey was 5500 with 3000 representing the six districts in Fayoum and 2500 representing five local units in Tameia district.

**Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation of the GA project has relied on three main approaches:

1. **Desk review of the project's methodology and components as well as other pertinent documents:**
   In-depth examination was made of: a) documents produced by the SCC within the framework of the project, including the objectives, methodology, GA generic and sector based dimensions, household survey questionnaires, key informants' questionnaires, and draft analysis reports; b) literature pertaining to GAs (see References).

2. **Meetings and brainstorming sessions with experts from the project as well as external experts:**
   Specifically, meetings were held with the members of the SCC Governance Assessment Unit as well as consultants that had participated in the project. In addition, interviews were held with representatives from the UNDP, OGC, LDO and external experts including the former Minister of Drinking water Resources and Irrigation.

3. **Observations gathered from attendance of one of the project's field activities:**
   The consultants attended the validation workshop organized by the SCC to present the findings of the drinking water and sanitation key informants' and household surveys with representatives from the Fayoum Drinking water and Wasted drinking water Company, to obtain their feedback and opinions on the GA and the way forward.

**Organization of the report**

In light of the objectives of the GA evaluation, the report examines the following parameters of the GA:

- Overall evaluation comments
- Achievement of the intended objectives
- The GA methodology – general comments
- The GA Implementation Steps
- Participation of CSOs and the private sector
- Cooperation with the LDO

For each parameter, the report evaluates the elements of strength and outlines aspects that require further consideration to ensure replicability and sustainability. These are followed by overall recommendations as well as those concerning each parameter.
Readers who are interested in a quick review can refer to Table 1 that summarizes the main evaluation points pertaining to each parameter.

**The GA Evaluation**

**General**

One of the leading organizations in the field of good governance, the UNDP has undertaken GAs in several countries and has adopted a set of criteria for evaluation of these assessments. These criteria are: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, innovation, catalytic effect and sustainability. These criteria have also been adopted for the general evaluation of the GA undertaken by the SCC and are outlined below.

**Relevance:**
This indicator asks the following questions: "How relevant is the assessment to the country’s priority needs, and was the right strategy applied within the country’s specific political, economic, and social contexts?"

One of the main problems confronting the Government of Egypt – and one that has become especially manifest during and after the revolution – is lack of proper service delivery and poor satisfaction of citizens’ demands with respect to basic needs like primary health care, basic education and utilities. For the most part, citizens’ satisfaction surveys in Egypt are conducted by private entities to assess the quality of their products; a survey that explores issues of national interest and questions governance is almost a novelty and very much required. Given the decades of citizen dissatisfaction with government performance in service delivery, the need for a GA that highlights citizens’ concerns and suggests ways to adopt good governance practices is primordial. With respect to relevance, therefore, this GA addresses the country’s priority needs and fulfils a much needed demand for economic and institutional development.

**Effectiveness:**
This indicator is defined as "a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives."

Although this indicator is analyzed in greater detail below (See Achievement of the Intended Objectives), it is important to emphasize that insofar as the GA reflects the perceptions of citizens and government officials of governance practices and the compilation of baseline data with which to generate a climate of good will to adopt good governance strategies, the project has attained and fulfilled its stated objectives. For the first time in Egypt, a solid information base derived from internationally recognized and tested indicators is available and paves the way for a...

---

3 Source: UNDP Governance Assessments in China, Montenegro and Paraguay, 2011.
constructive dialogue between the service providers and the Egyptian public to improve the level of performance in this critical domain.

**Efficiency:**
"Efficiency measures the outputs in relation to the inputs. Were activities cost-efficient and were objectives achieved on time?"

Although a detailed analysis of the utilization of project funds for the execution of the GA lies beyond the scope of this evaluation, it is significant to point out that the resources and time that were allocated to the project – while justified and required – make replication by local entities (especially government institutions) cumbersome and need to be curtailed.

The steps that involved formulation of the generic framework, the technical dimensions of the sector based indicators, training of researchers, data entry and generation of statistical reports required the recruitment of external consultants, an expense that local entities may not be able to handle. To be sure, certain activities like formulation of dimensions, indicators and technical assistance and training are essential and, given the novelty of the GA exercise, require professional expertise. However, while some activities (like the development of generic dimensions) do not need to be repeated and others (like training of researchers) can be re-implemented through TOT or roll-over methods, the strategy for replication of the GA needs to be implemented in a manner that requires fewer resources so that the GA can be adopted by local institutions.

With respect to time, certain activities were implemented in durations that need to be shortened when the GA is replicated. For example, the preparation of questionnaires and sampling (which took place from May to November 2011) and data gathering and processing (December 2011 to August 2012) can be implemented over shorter durations given the acquired experience and the need to make the methodology less complex.  

**Innovation:**
The UNDP GA reports provide the following definition of this indicator: "Innovative projects address recognized critical democratic governance issues that, if resolved, may lead to substantial improvements in democratic governance. They are initiatives, in terms of the problem addressed or the approach taken, that have never before been attempted in a given country. And although they may be potentially risky or less certain of success than traditional projects, they will position UNDP as a key player in democratic governance, one that ‘pushes the frontier.’"

This project is highly innovative. Not only does it address critical issues (such as poor service delivery, lack of incorporation of citizens' perceptions and feedback on governance and the need to adopt improved practices) that have manifested themselves through popular discontent that has culminated in the January 2011

---

4 It is also important to point out that certain extraneous factors beyond the control of the project impeded the smooth progress of the GA activities. For example, the January 2011 revolution took place during the development of the sector specific indicators and thus this activity was implemented over a longer period than intended. In addition, the need for verification and updating of CAMPAS data (i.e. the 2006 population census) with respect to household sampling also prolonged the latter activity.
revolution, but it has adopted a strategy that has never before been attempted in Egypt – namely, a GA based on internationally recognized and tested governance framework and dimensions. Specifically, the innovativeness of the project appears through its adoption of the following approaches:

- Formulation of generic dimensions that make use of internationally recognized guidelines and experiences but that are adapted to the political, economic and social context of Egypt. In other words, the Egyptian GA model is not a replica of others that have been applied elsewhere. Rather, it is a unique and independent approach in its own right, taking into account experiences and lessons learned from previous exercises.
- The development of sector specific dimensions that allow for in-depth focus on the institutional and technical problems particular to the different service sectors in Egypt.
- Cooperation with a partner entity that is also representative of a prime stakeholder (i.e the LDO, representing the MLD which is the ministry responsible for providing services to local governorates) in implementing the GA. Given the tendency of most projects to undertake exclusive responsibility for conceptualization and implementation and to then hand over expertise to local counterparts, the element of strength in this GA is the inclusion of these entities as partners during the duration of the project cycle.
- Cooperation with a national entity – i.e. CAPMAS - in the implementation of the household survey. Again, such cooperation not only encourages national ownership and fosters cooperation between stakeholders but it also promotes sustainability of the project activities by entities that can carry them through after the project cycle ends.

Catalytic effect:
An important measure of the success of the project is support by external entities for its continuation. As defined by the UNDP GA reports: "A catalytic project has a high likelihood of receiving support from government or other governance institutions (including other donors) for scaling up or following up, if the project is successful."

The project has been very successful and catalytic in the following manner:

1) SCC’s efforts in assessing good governance within sectors (education, health and water and sanitation) have encouraged the Ministry of Local Development (MLD) to carry out a similar assessment to another three sectors: roads, lightening and waste management. SCC took the initiative to approach the local Development Observatory (the representative of MLD) and shared its sectoral governance assessment frameworks, indicators, tools (Questionnaires) and methodology with the. Together, they both carried out the data collection for the 6-sectors’ assessments in one pilot governorate (El-Fayoum). While MLD covered the cost of the researchers who carried out the data collection, SCC covered the supervision, data entry and data cleaning costs. This catalytic partnership can be further replicated in other governorates.

2) In addition, UN Women showed interest in supporting the assessment initiative in Fayoum. As a result, a $ 40,000 grant from UN-Women were made available to the assessment activity to capitalize on the SCC efforts in engaging women from the start in the consultative workshops (as representative to CSOs, government and private sector) and producing gender
disaggregated data and carry out further gender related activities. The grant shall cover gender analysis and the gender report publishing costs.

3) On the other hand, the SCC succeeded to win the 2011 DGTTF finance for a project that opens national and sectoral evidence-based dialogues on corruption reasons, issues, ramification, measurement and eradication. The project has been so far very successful in producing diagnostic and assessment studies for corruption on the national level and opening a evidence based dialogue in that regard.

Given the need for improvement of governance practices and the fact that GAs have never before been conducted in Egypt, there is a strong likelihood for support of the project from government and donor institutions provided that an environment of political will is generated through advocacy and awareness campaigns and if the methodology of the GA is adapted to suit the capacities of the stakeholder entities.

**Sustainability:**
This is perhaps the most significant indicator, since any activity, no matter how successful, cannot be replicated if it is not sustainable. According to the UNDP evaluations, "Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects also need to be financially sustainable."

The project has conducted a GA that is recognized as a pressing need. A nationally owned GA such as this not only serves to strengthen democratic governance, but provides a scientific evidence based approach for decision making. The GA provides an accountability mechanism and solid information base that enables the GOE and citizens to engage in constructive dialogue to address gaps in public service delivery.

All these are benefits that are highly likely to continue even after donor funding ends. There are three obvious reasons for this: a) the critical situation that post-revolutionary Egypt is undergoing which calls for effective dialogue between the government and citizens as one of the strongest means to emerge from the current state of instability and turbulence; in this sense, therefore, the timing of the GA is highly opportune and GAs are very much needed; b) the endorsement by the GOE of the concept of assessing governance practices in basic services delivery, which makes it likely to continue supporting the concept of undertaking GAs; and c) the implementation of the GA by the SCC, an entity supported by the GOE and mandated with tasks that promote citizens' trust and dialogue and coordination between governmental and non-governmental institutions.

*In sum, therefore, the pressing situation in post-revolutionary Egypt together the benefits of the GA in promoting GOE-citizen dialogue and addressing governance performance increase the likelihood of sustainability of the project's activities.*

The question of financial sustainability, however, requires further analysis since – as will be pointed out below – some activities require external expertise that may or may not be affordable according to the resources of the stakeholder entities that are to implement GAs.
Achievement of the intended objectives

The principal output of the project is a governance assessment (GA) carried out in three basic services sectors in a pilot governorate. The objectives of the GA are:

1. Assess the degree to which all stakeholders in basic education, primary health care and drinking water and sanitation (and later the local development sectors) apply principles of good governance.
2. Provide greater understanding of the gaps and problems the three sectors suffer from and offer policy advice on how to improve good governance while encouraging best practices.
3. Acquire baseline data on good governance practices of all stakeholders in the three sectors.

The long-term expected impact of the GA is to:
- Improve service delivery;
- Regain trust between stakeholders (especially government and citizens);
- Contribute to meeting the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals) related to the selected pilot sectors.

Elements of Strength

A major purpose of governance assessments is to improve the supply side of governance by identifying gaps in a government's capacity to deliver services and by defining areas that can assist it in being more responsive to the needs of its citizens. All these objectives have been recognized and promoted by the project. In other words, the GA has complied with the fundamental goal of providing the GOE with well researched evidence that can help in engaging in effective dialogue with the citizens and in improving service delivery to attain good governance.

The project achieved its objective of obtaining baseline data on good governance practice through the GA, which relied on a systematic, objective approach for data collection and analysis. Given the lack of reliable evidence and feedback from citizens and government officials on the status of governance in the basic services sector, this aspect of strength is not to be undermined. The GA also highlighted the major gaps and problems that undermine the delivery of services in a manner acceptable to the citizens, and the degree to which good governance practices are applied.

Overall, the GA exercise has led to a deeper understanding of the gaps and problems of governance in the pilot sectors. Moreover, through ongoing activities and lessons learned, the GA team is able to identify the reasons behind the existence of these gaps and problem. Since the methodology depended on a quantitative approach, in-depth probing into the factors that contribute to governance problems cannot be fully attained, as respondents are mostly confined to "yes" and "no" answers with little room for maneuverability. This shortcoming has been addressed through a number of open-ended questions in the questionnaires, and
during the validation workshops, stakeholders were asked to elaborate on their answers and provide reasons for the stated problems.

**Aspects that need to be considered**

One of the stated objectives of the project is offering policy advice on good governance. This has not been achieved during the formal duration of the project and is an ongoing activity. Therefore, *the objectives should be reformulated to state that the GA analysis will serve the long-term ongoing goal of generating policy dialogue between the service providers and the public.*

**The GA Methodology**

The methodological approach adopted by the GA forms the main focus of this evaluation since it is the main and most fundamental parameter that assesses the efficacy of this exercise.

General elements of the methodology are discussed below, outlining elements of strength and aspects that require consideration. These are followed by an analysis of the specific steps that have been adopted for the GA.

**General**

Overall comments regarding the GA methodology are discussed in this section.

**Elements of Strength**

*The use of survey data to capture public opinion is a valuable tool not only to assess the impact of governance but to strengthen trust and initiate evidence based dialogue between the government and citizens.* The methodology used for the Fayoum GA has adopted scientific steps with concerted attention provided to validation and objectivity. All this adds legitimacy and logical strength to the GA, paving the way for effective dialogue based on well researched information that convinces the service provider of the need to improve governance performance.

*The project focused on six of the most vital basic services sectors that affect the livelihood of the majority of the Egyptian population.* Lack of proper primary health care, basic education, drinking water and sanitation, lighting, roads and waste management services are issues that are frequently voiced in the media, development reports, and field observations. In selecting these sectors for a GA, therefore, the project addresses a crucial demand for better governance in sectors that are undermined by poor service delivery and have an impact on citizen satisfaction with government performance.
Aspects that need to be considered

The GA process was lengthy and needs to be shortened in order to ensure better replicability of the assessment in services other than the Basic education, Primary health care, and Drinking water and Sanitation. Commencing at October 2010, the GA has taken almost 2 years\(^5\), a duration that local stakeholder entities in new sectors may not be able to uphold. To be sure, some steps like the formulation of generic dimensions do not need to be repeated, and others like the development of sector specific dimensions were impeded by the events of the January 2011 revolution. Moreover, GA exercises are a new practice in Egypt and required time for conceptualization and testing. Nevertheless, certain activities such as the preparation of questionnaires need to be reconsidered and shortened to suit the limitations of the local stakeholder entities. (In any case, this problem can be overcome if the methodology is simplified. See section entitled Recommendations - Methodology below).

The Implementation Steps

This section analyzes the specific steps that have been adopted for implementing the GA, discussing elements of strength as well as points that require consideration.

Elements of Strength

Formulation of Generic Framework

The generic framework formulated by the project is capable of spotting the gaps and problems of governance that exist in Egypt and encompasses the main issues and criteria that need to be addressed. Together, the 9 dimensions highlight the major shortcomings and obstacles confronted in basic service delivery. They are comprehensive enough to span the range of problems in each sector, yet specific enough to point to the nuances and day-to-day issues that undermine performance. In particular, some of these dimensions – such as rule of law and control of corruption – have heretofore been avoided and not examined by decision makers due to political sensitivity but are nevertheless crucial for a well-rounded strategy that seeks to improve governance practices. The fact that these dimensions have been included in the GA and are being openly investigated through stakeholder discussions and surveys adds to the strength and viability of the GA as a valuable tool for promoting good governance.

---

\(^5\) The validation workshops are ongoing during the time of writing of this report.
Formulation of Sector-Based frameworks and Dimensions

The sector frameworks and dimensions are proper derivatives of the generic framework and can be applied to a wide range of service sectors in Egypt. A comparison of the generic and sector dimensions reveals a smooth streamlined process where the analyst can closely relate the general questions raised in the generic framework with those that are particular to each sector. Moreover, the questions that are asked under each sector dimension provide a strong reference framework for other sectors to build on.

Examining the legal and institutional framework for each sector has added to the strength and credibility of the sector dimensions. An analysis of these elements enables the assessor to be acquainted with the conditions that influence good governance and makes the GA practical and applicable to the sector.

The questions included under each dimension adequately cover the various institutional, technical and organizational elements that exist within each sector. By addressing these questions, the GA analyst is able to examine the major and most critical issues that affect governance practices in a comprehensive manner.

The stakeholder consultations that were conducted to discuss the viability of the sector dimensions underscore the legitimacy of the GA exercise and add to its credibility and participative nature. Although such consultations are time consuming and require strong moderation skills, they are nevertheless indispensable in ensuring ownership of the GA and applicability of the dimensions to the conditions and limitations of the sector. Indeed, as has been reported by the SCC, the stakeholder consultations in many cases led to a refinement of the dimensions, as some questions were revised, others added and others taken out. This, of course, ensures that the following steps (survey design and analysis) are reflective of the actual situation and based on the active input of the parties involved.

Design of household survey

The questions in the survey can all be traced back to the sector based dimensions and in turn to the generic framework, reflecting a thorough breakdown and de-stratification process. Each question bears a direct link to its respective dimension and contributes to the analysis.

There is noticeable harmony between questions relating to each sector, reflecting compliance with the generic and sector based dimensions, and contributing to a unified and streamlined analysis.

The simple language and detailed instructions provided in the questionnaire facilitate the task of the researcher and reduce the likelihood of interview mishaps or disparities in the questioning technique.
The relegation of sensitive topics – such as the income and economic status of the household – to the end of the questions list is a tactful measure that reduces feelings of discomfort on the part of the respondents.

Design of key informants' questionnaires

The key informants' sample for government stakeholders was comprehensive, covering officials from the decision making to the implementation level. Undersecretaries, heads of departments and managers were interviewed along with engineers, technicians, teachers and doctors. This has added depth and credibility to the GA methodology, making the results representative of the different tasks and levels of responsibility within each sector. In addition, the key informants' questionnaires were designed in different types and using the “skips” system in order to fit the different types and roles of key informants even within the same entity. They were differentiated according to the positions and responsibilities of those interviewed which has resulted in a more accurate and higher validity data for personnel directly involved in areas and issue where they are directly involved.

Data collection and analysis

Cooperation with CAPMAS for sampling not only guaranteed efficiency but encouraged institutional cooperation between different entities for promoting good governance. Enlisting the participation of a government entity officially mandated with statistical sampling has strengthened the validity and credibility of the GA. Moreover, the project in this respect succeeded in promoting inter-governmental cooperation (between the SCC and CAPMAS) in a joint effort that leads to the improvement of governance practices.

The recruitment of researchers from the Local Information Centers (LIC) added legitimacy to the GA, promoted institutional cooperation, and provided elements for replicability and sustainability. The research team was comprised of 50 data gatherers from the Fayoum LIC; these researchers were trained on data collection techniques in an 8-day intensive course provided by an external entity. The added advantage of engaging local teams to undertake data collection is that they are more familiar with the conditions and people in the area and can thus approach them with greater ease and quickness than external teams.

The rigorous research validation process ensured the accuracy of the collected data, thereby strengthening the credibility of the data collection stage. This was achieved by appointing a supervisor as well as a validator for every 5 researchers, in addition to a validation process after the results are analyzed.
Validation

The findings of the GA were presented comprehensively and impartially at the validation workshop. The cumulative results for each dimension were clearly outlined and objectively presented.

Based on lessons learnt at the first validation workshop, the GA team had, accordingly, planned to amend the presentations while ensuring they are simplified and summarized, avoiding terminologies and concepts that may be unfamiliar to the average citizen.

A positive outcome of the validation workshop destined for government officials is the opportunity it provides for them to meet and discuss issues of common interest. As the attendants themselves acknowledged, such meetings are infrequent, especially when they involve representatives of different entities within the same sector. In themselves, therefore, the validation workshops are orientation platforms where awareness on good governance can be promoted.

Aspects that need to be considered

Formulation of Generic Framework

Many of the questions included under each dimension use the same term as the dimension and should therefore be rephrased and elaborated. For example, the dimension of accountability is defined as: "clear and effective course of action to practice accountability."7 Here, it would have been practical to elaborate on the definition of the word "accountability" and its different dimensions (i.e. the right of the public to question the performance of the service provider) rather than use the term to define itself. In addition, instead of re-using the dimension term in asking questions (eg. "To what extent is policy making participatory at the highest levels of policy making?" under the dimension of Participation), the questions can be rephrased in more specific terms (eg. to what extent does high level policy making include the opinions and input of all stakeholders in decisions?).

Formulation of Sector-Based Frameworks and Dimensions

The questions asked under each sector based dimension required the input of technical experts as well as experts knowledgeable in the field of governance assessment (namely the SCC team) and this combination is hard to come by within governmental

---

6 The evaluators attended only one validation workshop during the time of the assignment. The workshop was held on October 9, 2012 for officials from the Fayoum Water and Wastewater Company and NOPWASD and discussed the results of the household and key informants' questionnaires in that sector.

entities or even CSOs and the private sector unless there are funds to hire external experts. In other words, the formulation of sector based dimensions and hence indicators is a complex process that requires highly professional expertise which may be rare to find or costly to undertake. To some extent this was proven in difficulties encountered by the LDO in formulating indictors for their three chosen sectors.

Many of the questions included under each dimension use the same term as the dimension and should therefore be rephrased and elaborated. Though the questions of the household questionnaire, which were basically derived from the Sector dimensions and their relevant questions, were clear and avoided that problem, it is highly recommended to revisit the questions pertaining to each dimension to ensure words different to the title of the dimension are being used.

Design of household survey

The sections that include information on the household members (disaggregated by age and gender), as well as the economic status of the household, were not incorporated into the final analysis, with the exception of the basic education sector. If analyzed, such data can provide insight on the characteristics of the sample and their influence on the responses of the citizens. However, if the objective is to quantify the responses and opinions of the sample on the services delivered, irrespective of their characteristics and conditions, then it may be practical and time saving to shorten or do without these sections altogether, since they not only lengthen the questionnaire but may be uncomfortable for the respondents.

Some of the questions that required open-ended answers are best raised and analyzed in a focus group discussion, given the large size of the sample. Examples of these questions are: in your opinion what are the types of corruption that exist in the sector? (q. 236 for Drinking water and Sanitation); how does the school respond to the needs and problems of the students? (q. 522 for Basic education); what are the reasons for your dissatisfaction with the primary health care services in your area? (q. 632 for Health); what are the ways through which we can hold officials accountable? (q. 429 in Roads, Lighting and Waste Management). The responses to these questions, while extremely valuable, cannot be quantified, and reviewing all 5,500 of the household questionnaires to note them is a cumbersome and time consuming task.

Some other questions may best be asked in focus group discussions. The quantitative nature of the survey does not provide room for respondents to offer details on issues that can add valuable dimensions to the GA. Some questions required open-ended answers that could have better been provided in focus group discussions. Examples of these questions are: have you experienced a problem related to the school during the past year? (q. 524 for basic education); in your opinion, what are the means through which service providers can be held accountable? (q. 429 in Roads, Lighting and Waste Management); do you know of or have you heard of cases in your area where service providers have been held accountable for malpractices? (q. 430 in

---

8 Interview with Dr. Khaled Abdelhalim, Manager of LDO.
Roads, Lighting and Waste Management); to what extent can local entities (such as the media, religious institutions, LPCs, NGOs, etc) help in fighting corruption? (q. 437 in Roads, Lighting and Waste Management); and why are you dissatisfied with the service? (q. 632 in Health).

Some of the questions may be difficult for the respondents to answer and should be simplified. Examples of these are: have you or any of your family members faced any primary health care problems because of drinking water? (q. 220, Drinking water and Sanitation): household members may not be familiar with the connection between primary health care problems and drinking water contamination; do you think the school abides by the laws of the MOE regarding school fees/curricula? (q. 532, Basic education): the respondents may not know of these laws in the first place.

Design of key informants' questionnaires

The key informants' questionnaires were not the same for the different types of key informants within the same entity; this may complicate analysis and make a unified conclusion difficult. Granted, some questionnaires had to be tailored in accordance to the positions and responsibilities of the key informants. However, the end result is a set of questionnaires that may have few common denominators for a comprehensive analysis. Coupled with difficulties involved in comparing the key informant results with those of the households, this may create bottlenecks when generating conclusions and recommendations for good governance and may best be tackled by obtaining the perceptions of key informants through qualitative methods (see Recommendations – Design of Key Informants' Questionnaires below).

Some of the questions required open-ended answers that are best analyzed in a focus group discussion. Examples are: how are teaching jobs advertised? (q. 120, Basic education, Government Bureaucrats); how are tenders advertised? (q. 122, same); how does your entity respond to the needs and complaints of the public? (q. 153, same); what are the means through which the drinking water company has tackled the problem of leakages in new networks? (q. 20, Drinking water and Sanitation – Government); in your opinion, what are the causes of corruption and the means to address them? (q. 154-5, Health, CSOs); in your opinion, what are the main problems of drinking water and waste drinking water and how can they be solved? (q. 30-31, Drinking water and Sanitation, CSOs).

Many of the questions that asked for the key informants' opinions could have been obtained from data records and are thus better suited in an actual performance assessment study. Examples: to what extent do CSOs publish information about their activities and expenditure in drinking water and wasted drinking water? (q.6-8, Drinking water and Sanitation, CSOs); what is the turn-over rate at private hospitals? (q. 7, Health, Private Sector); what is the number of projects in which CSOs participated with the MOE (q. 108) and what are the number of contracts that the MOE has made with the private sector? (q. 111, Basic education – Bureaucracy). Questions such as these would have had more valid meaning had they been included
in an actual performance assessment or analyzed separately, rather than being included in a questionnaire.

At the end of the questionnaire addressed to government officials, the latter are asked to give a rate out of 5 of each of the 9 GA dimensions according to their importance; the analysis would have greatly benefited from a follow-up question asking them to provide reasons for their ranking for giving such grades. These responses would have shed greater light on the gaps existing in the sector from the point of view of the service provider.

Data collection and analysis

The data collection and analysis process was conducted over a lengthy period, a fact that may discourage entities undertaking future GAs. These entities – especially if they are government institutions – may not possess the time, resources and monitoring capacity to undertake this step in the same duration that was required for the GA. However, through documentation of the exact steps for data collection and analysis and the lessons learnt, future replication is expected to consume less time and effort.

The stratified sampling method – while a strong statistical tool – is a complex exercise that may be difficult for stakeholder entities to implement. Future GAs can rely on simpler methods for random selection; while such methods may not guarantee the same degree of accuracy and impartiality, they would be practical, quicker to adopt and affordable to the stakeholder entities.

Representatives of local entities should have been involved in the stages of data entry, quality control and generation of frequency tables. To be sure, the engagement of an external private firm contributed to the validity and accuracy of data collection, validation and analysis. However, this procedure cannot be adopted by stakeholder entities that lack the necessary resources. Besides, the involvement of local entities such as universities and research centers – while time consuming and requiring technical assistance – assures the sustainability of the exercise and promotes multiple ownership.

Validation

The duration between data collection and validation is lengthy and needs to be shortened. A six-month time lag elapsed between the termination of data collection and analysis and the organization of the first validation workshop. By that time, most of the participants had forgotten the survey contents and objectives and needed to be reoriented.
A written agenda outlining the purpose and proceedings of the workshop should have been produced and sent to the participants by fax or communicated through the phone in advance. This not only adds credibility to the validation workshop but also reminds the participants of the GA and prepares them for the discussions.

Given the principal objective of the workshop of validating the GA results, the presentation needs to end with a display of the questions that the GA team needs to direct to the participants on results that need to be confirmed or explained. Although these questions were indeed raised by the GA team, they need to be documented and allocated an independent slot in the workshop agenda.

Participation of the CSOs and the Private Sector

A distinguishing element of the GA is the inclusion of CSOs and private sector entities as stakeholders along with the government, not only in the conceptualization phase but in implementation as well. This unique and all-embracing approach merits an analysis of the extent to which the inclusion of these two stakeholders has contributed to the strength and credibility of the GA, as well as a discussion of factors that need to be considered for replicability and sustainability.

Elements of Strength

The inclusion of CSOs and the private sector as stakeholders in the GA has added strength and credibility to the exercise, acknowledging their role in service delivery. Although their role is not as significant as the government in the services sector, their influence is growing and they are also influenced by government performance. It is thus important to include them as stakeholders in governance and to involve them in awareness raising and advocacy activities.

The GA is probably the first attempt by a government sponsored institution (i.e. the SCC) to assess and promote the role of civil society and the private sector in a domain that has been largely monopolized by the state. It is thus a groundbreaking effort in that respect and should be publicized in a bid to encourage the participation of these two entities as partners with the government in addressing the needs of Egyptian citizens.

The fact that results pertaining to CSOs and the private sector were not compared to those of the government has added to the professional credibility of the GA, since the role of the former two institutions in basic service delivery is not as significant as that of the public sector. An exception to this is the primary health care sector, where CSOs and the private sector have played a visible role in service delivery. In general however, and
compared to government institutions, civil society and private entities are hampered by legal, organizational and policy restrictions that prevent them from taking a leading role in that domain. Basic service delivery in Egypt continues to be monopolized by the government. This phenomenon has been attested by the paucity of their numbers in the questionnaires in comparison to key informants from government institutions. The numbers and weights of the responses, therefore, are not comparable.

The GA has offered CSOs and private sector institutions with a valuable tool with which they can assess and monitor their own performance and role in governance. Given the assumption that CSOs and private institutions are better positioned than government institutions to obtain funds and secure resources and skills, active managers can build on the experience provided by the Fayoum GA to undertake their own follow-up GAs and strengthen their achievements by improving their performance in one or more of the 9 good governance dimensions.

Aspects that need to be considered

GA results should mention extraneous factors that inhibit the performance of CSOs and the private sector in basic service delivery. Legal and policy restrictions, the predominance of the public sector, financial obstacles and other limitations all combine to marginalize the role of these two entities vis-à-vis the government in basic service delivery. To be sure, similar limitations are also confronted by the public sector. However, while these limitations impede the performance of government, they have not prevented it from playing a leading role in basic service delivery. In the case of CSOs and the private sector, these obstacles have greatly impinged on their input and capacity to assume a noticeable role and they must be acknowledged when presenting the GA results.

Cooperation with the LDO

A noteworthy accomplishment of the GA is the integration of a government institution in the GA exercise. This practically unprecedented approach (where a stakeholder participates in a pilot exercise as an equal partner along with the implementing agency) is examined below, with an analysis of the elements of strength and a discussion of the aspects that require consideration for replicability and sustainability.

Elements of Strength

Cooperation with the LDO was a valuable learning experience that added to the legitimacy of the GA as a participatory exercise. Through the LDO, the SCC incorporated
a major government stakeholder (i.e. the MLD) in the GA, rendering it interactive and promoting institutional cooperation. By involving the LDO, the SCC dispels the image of the GA being undertaken in isolation by an independent entity that is not a service provider. The involvement of the LDO also provided solid experimental ground to test and monitor the efficacy of the methodology adopted for the GA. Moreover, the input of the LDO provides firm evidence on the benefits to a stakeholder entity of undertaking a GA, motivating other stakeholders to partake in the process as well.

In cooperating with the LDO, the SCC partnered with a significant stakeholder: not only does the mandate of the MLD allow it to participate in several service sectors (of which roads, lighting and waste management were selected) but the LDO's responsibility in the field of monitoring makes it highly eligible to undertake an active role in assessing governance performance in the future. The MLD is not a conventional line ministry responsible for only one sector like primary health care, basic education and drinking water but is mandated (through its executive councils) to participate in the planning and implementation of a wide range of basic services. This makes it a unique stakeholder and has allowed it to engage in assessing performance in more than one sector. Moreover, the experience gained by the LDO can be directly utilized to fulfill its mandate in guiding the MLD in the domain of monitoring. In this respect, therefore, cooperation with the LDO is an effective step towards ensuring sustainability of the project's activities.

At the same time, the SCC benefited from the assistance of the LDO which acted as a liaison in cooperating with the Local Information Centers that supplied the research team for the GA.

The addition of 3 other sectors – through cooperation with the MLD - in which the role of local units and civil society is more visible has added depth and variety to the GA. Besides the 3 main pilot sectors (primary health care, basic education and drinking water and sanitation) that are mainly dominated by their respective line ministries, the GA included 3 others (roads, lighting and waste management) in which NGOs, small contractors and private efforts have leeway to participate in service delivery. This allows the GA results to be diversified, providing more comprehensive insight on the performance of various suppliers in basic service delivery.

Aspects that need to be considered

The LDO should have been incorporated more intensely in the GA, especially during the formulation of governance dimensions. Due to organizational and logistical factors, the involvement of the LDO began after the generic and sector based dimensions were developed. Although the LDO was oriented to the process, it could have greatly benefited from participation in the conceptualization of the GA dimensions, especially the formulation of questions pertaining to the sectors and in moving from the dimensions to the sub-dimensions. As a result, the questions
pertaining to the sectors supervised by the LDO do not clearly compare with the sector dimensions outlined in the local governance index. This, in turn, hampered progress in data collection and analysis, requiring advice from external expertise.

Conducting a GA assessment in more than one sector at the same time by a government entity is a worthy but heavy task. Given the lack of sufficient and reliable basic data and the number of GA dimensions, the addition of 3 sectors added to the length of the questionnaires and the variants and dimensions of the study increased in such a way that analysis became difficult. Instead, the project could have decided on selecting only one of those sectors to simplify the methodology and facilitate the analysis.

Recommendations

This section outlines overall recommendations for the replicability and sustainability of the GA exercise, as well as others pertaining to its various components that were analyzed above.

General

The Fayoum GA need not be repeated in the immediate future before there is a national buy-in to the importance of assessing governance. An important outcome of a GA is to create a shift in mind set, whereby state institutions recognize their vital role in serving citizens, where the latter have a right to ask the government whether it is doing a good job, and where dialogue can be fostered between the two parties in a democratic fashion. The Fayoum GA, it is highly believed, has provided the necessary tools for this mind shift and needs to be publicized with great intensity before embarking on other GAs.

The Fayoum GA adopted a methodology that was intensely systematic and implemented with rigorous professionalism and scrutiny. In its own right, it stands as an effective model that can be used for advocacy and awareness campaigns to promote the notion of GA. Moreover, the Fayoum GA required time and expertise that may not be accessible to local stakeholder entities. Furthermore, due to the centralized nature of governance in Egypt where services are provided and managed by line ministries, it is not expected that GAs in different areas within the same sector will yield varying results. Rather, GAs are best performed and compared between sectors.

Therefore, similar GAs in other areas are not recommended, unless the political will of the GOE is such that it endorses the replication of the Fayoum studies for national policy making.

99 Given the centralized nature of service delivery in Egypt, it can safely be argued that geographical differences within sectors are not considerable enough to warrant a separate analysis. This has also been proved by the results of the household survey, which revealed negligible variations between the districts and between urban and rural areas. The differences manifest themselves when comparing between sectors and not geographical locations.
Orientation and awareness raising efforts should concentrate on acquainting decision makers with: a) the concept of good governance, and b) the benefits of GAs and the risks and obstacles that may occur if they are not adopted.

To gain popular and official support and to ensure adequate understanding of the merits of GAs, it is recommended that the terminology of “governance” be avoided. The unfamiliarity of officials with the concept of good governance, coupled with the environment of political instability that has followed the January 2011 revolution, may make decision makers sceptical about this notion. Instead, awareness efforts can concentrate on the components of a GA – namely the dimensions – and to concrete goals like improving service delivery.

A GA serves as a direct link between citizens and service providers, where citizens' views and experiences are captured and recorded. However, it is important that the feedback of the citizens through a GA is translated into policy decisions by the service provider, and that it addresses their needs. Without policy and institutional reform, a GA risks ending up as an opinion poll; moreover, citizens may grow skeptical of continuous surveys and develop survey fatigue if their opinions and input do not lead to policy change. In this respect, therefore, it is primordial that the entity undertaking the GA and providing technical assistance reach a precise agreement and modus operandi with the stakeholder entity on the practical reform measures that can be carried out to respond to the GA results.

The citizens' satisfaction survey adopted for the GA should be accompanied by an actual performance assessment that analyzes the actual level and quality of basic services delivered. The methodology applied by the GA has relied on surveys that measure the impact of services delivered in the pilot sectors on the recipients. However, while the perceptions of the public and those working in the public sector, CSOs and private sector are important, a GA would not be complete unless updated data and site observations are obtained on the actual status and quality of services that exist. From these data, performance indicators can be formulated and measured side-by-side with citizens' perceptions.

Thus, for example, feedback from the citizens on the condition of the services – such as the functioning drinking water meters, the number of sewage floods, the availability of material in schools, the quality of the curriculum and teaching, the availability of medication and equipment in the primary health care clinics, etc. – can be compared with monitoring data generated by the stakeholder entity as well as field observations on these same topics. All these data can be used by the entity to assess whether it has achieved its planned objectives. They also provide evidence that supports the fulfilment of the GA dimensions to measure good governance.

This method has two advantages: a) it supports the opinions and perceptions of the survey respondents with actual data and evidence of the quality of services provided (since sometimes, respondents may not provide objective answers when asked their opinions); b) it assists the stakeholder entity in monitoring its own performance over time.

Performance indicators can be extracted from many of the questions that have already been included in the survey (see section on Recommendations: Methodology below). Once these indicators are incorporated into the internal monitoring system of the stakeholder entity, actual performance assessments can be carried out regularly.
(annually or bi-annually, depending on the resources of the entity and the nature of the sector) and backed with citizen satisfaction surveys (perhaps every two to five years) to examine the impact of the achievements on those receiving the service, thus completing the GA exercise.

**Achievement of the Intended objectives**

The project has achieved two distinct objectives which should be clearly stated in its formal documents: development of generic dimensions for good governance and the pilot activity that took place in Fayoum. Thus, the objectives should include: a) formulating generic dimensions for good governance applicable to all service sectors and b) testing and confirming the applicability of these dimensions by applying them to the six pilot sectors selected for the GA. Specifying these two objectives underscores the important achievement of the project in that it not only developed a set of good governance dimensions but also put them to practice through a pilot exercise that has generated ideas and approaches for broader application.

The project objectives should include "cooperation with the LDO as a representative of a governmental entity to test the applicability of the GA with a main stakeholder and derive experiences and lessons learned for future replicability and sustainability."

**Methodology**

This section outlines general recommendations for the GA methodology as well as others regarding its specific steps.

**General**

The methodology of the GA can be compiled in a concise manual that explains the steps clearly, with instructions and tips for trouble shooting and suggestions for shortening sub-steps. In particular, the transition from sector based dimensions to sub-dimensions and survey questions must be clearly delineated. To the uninitiated, this process may seem complicated and the transition from one stage to the other may be a difficult exercise. For this methodology to be replicated, therefore, the manual must be designed in simple format with clear guiding points. It must be simple enough that the methodology can be applied by entities with limited resources and skills. It should also include expected obstacles and limitations, as well as means for addressing them, based on the Fayoum experience.

**The Implementation Steps**

The survey methodology applied for the GA must be bolstered with qualitative approaches that provide deeper insight of citizens' opinions and recommendations for good governance. While the importance of quantitative surveys as a solid scientific tool for acquiring evidence cannot be denied, qualitative approaches serve to
corroborate the data and provide it with depth by allowing respondents to think of the broader dimensions of the issue at hand. The combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies not only increases the validity of the data – and hence the credibility of the GA – it also engages the stakeholders in the GA and therefore in the collective ownership of its results.

**Formulation of Generic Dimensions**

*To simplify the application of the GA methodology, some of the dimensions can either be merged or prioritized.* Depending on the acceptance by the stakeholder entity and according to its capacities, level of skills, resources and limitations, the 9 GA dimensions can be reduced by pairing some of them and merging their sub-dimensions. For example, the dimensions which have similar elements can be merged as follows: efficiency and effectiveness; participation and transparency; equity and responsiveness; accountability and control of corruption.

Alternatively, future GAs can begin by tackling only those dimensions that have been highlighted by the surveys and identified by the stakeholders as representing the most pressing issues for that entity. The other dimensions can then be considered at a later stage, depending on the readiness and resources of the entity and taking into account results and feedback obtained from working with the priority GA dimensions.

By pointing out gaps and shortcomings in service delivery, the GA results may be viewed unfavorably by the service provider. There is a risk that government officials would feel threatened by the results and perceive the entire exercise as a means to place further pressure on them. To allay these fears, the generic and sector based dimensions can be further analyzed and defined in such a way that the risks and dangers of not applying or mis-applying them can be highlighted. That way, decision makers and other stakeholders on the supply side can be made aware of the need to apply and institute measures for good governance to preempt and avoid problems that can occur for them if these measures are not in place. Together with awareness efforts that point to the benefits of good governance, these risk factors can contribute to motivating service providers to improve performance.

The stakeholder entity should identify the significance and weight of each GA dimension in relation to the rest, thereby deciding on the dimension(s) that should receive priority attention. With the appropriate technical assistance – as well as experience provided by the Fayoum GA results – the stakeholder entity can decide on the dimensions that are weakest or that are critical or easier to tackle. This exercise not only assists in deepening the familiarity and knowledge of the entity with good governance dimensions, but assists it in planning governance interventions that improve its performance.

**Formulation of Sector Based Dimensions**

As much as possible, *the formulation of sector based dimensions and survey questions should be undertaken by experts within the stakeholder entity, rather than by external consultants.* It is a recognizable fact that many local entities may not possess the internal expertise to undertake such an exercise. This, however, should not be regarded as a deterrent factor but can be overcome by enlisting the advice of
external consultants as technical assistants, trainers and mentors to local staff, not as implementers. This not only reduces expenses but ensures the relevance of the GA to the conditions of the stakeholder entity if it is done by local staff, and allows for internal capacity building.

**Design of Household Survey**

*Rather than including them all in one survey, the sections that request information on household member characteristics and economic situation can be used selectively in GAs for various sectors according to the analysis requirement.* For example, questions on the work status of family members can be valuable when working with the Ministry of Manpower, questions on transportation for the transportation sector, questions dealing with the economic status of the household can shed light on issues such as cost recovery and willingness to pay for services.

*Instead of asking "to what extent," sector dimensions need to be more specific.* For example, in place of the question, "to what extent do the government directorates and departments make their data available?" (question # 6, primary health care, dimension of Transparency), it would be more practical to ask: "Do the government directorates and departments make their data available?" Similarly, the question that asks about the degree of participation by users in all the sectors can be made more precise by specifying whether this participation takes the form of knowledge of decisions made, expression of opinions or direct participation in the sector activities. Replacing phrases like "to what extent" with more specific contents has the following advantages: a) it forces the formulator to think of the tangible dimensions of governance in the sector that can be measured; b) it facilitates the development of dimensions, sub-dimensions and questions; c) it avoids ambiguities in the analysis, since "the extent" of the existence of an element can differ from one respondent to another; this is all the more required given the absence of general standards that specify scores or degree of importance of one dimension or sub-dimension over another.

*Some questions can be extracted by the stakeholder entity from the household survey and used to develop performance indicators.* Examples of these questions from the household survey are:

- Does the drinking water meter work? (q. 208, Drinking water and Sanitation);
- Do you have problems with the taste, color, smell and pressure of the drinking water? (q. 210, Drinking water and Sanitation);
- How many times have there been sewer pipe breaks in your area in the last 3 months? (q. 311, Drinking water and Sanitation);
- Are materials, textbooks, chalks, etc. sufficient at the school? (q. 502, Basic education);

10 Sub-questions that can be asked for this indicator may be: "Do these data concern the internal organization and decisions of these departments?" "Do these data take the form of regular information required by users of this service?"
- What were your experiences when visiting the Ministry of Basic education headquarters, directorates or departments? (q. 562-570, Basic education);

- Questions on quality of primary health care services received from institutions owned by the government, private sector and CSOs (q. 604-624, Health);

Other examples from the key informants’ questionnaires\(^\text{11}\) are:

- Availability of medication, equipment and services at the primary health care clinics (q. 22-26, Government, Health)

- Teachers or administrative staff who were penalized for malpractice (q. 132-135, Government, Basic education)

A useful exercise would be quantifying and analyzing the responses that state “I don't know.” This provides an indication of the level of knowledge and awareness of the respondents of the services delivered to them. If their level of knowledge is found to be low, then this should be taken into account when analyzing their perceptions of the quality of services and of issues related to the sector. It may also be an indicator of the need to simplify certain questions and re-state certain topics that they may be unfamiliar with (example: do you think the school makes the best use of its available funds? Q. 520 in Roads, Lighting and Waste Management).

When analyzed, the question that assesses the degree of the respondent's cooperation with the researcher can be used to gauge the attitude of the sample population to such a survey and their readiness to express their opinions freely. For example, if, upon examination of the responses to this question, most respondents were found to be uncooperative, this could provide an insight to the degree of knowledge or apathy or even skepticism of the Egyptian public to citizen satisfaction surveys and this analysis should be taken into account when evaluating their survey responses. Another useful exercise in this regard would be a feedback session held with the GA researchers to acquire their opinions and observations on the level of knowledge, awareness cooperation of the respondents in an assessment of the services delivered to them.

**Design of Key Informants' Questionnaires**

*Information from key informants could have been obtained more accurately and effectively through a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach.* Rather than asking them to list their preferences or opinions in a quantitative grid, interviews, focus group discussions and other qualitative methods could have generated more profound answers and allowed the informants to provide their suggestions and recommendations on the way forward. Moreover, since key informants are clusters of employees or representatives of 3 stakeholders (the government, CSOs, and private

\(^{11}\) In the case of water and sanitation, water companies have compiled their performance records and these are more or less regularly updated. They are also unified geographically: each company has its headquarters at the governorate and their district branches report regularly to the company.
sector), their numbers will vary according to the size of the entity and that in turn would create a bias when quantifying the responses and cumulating them.

In all questionnaires, the key informants are asked to assess the degree of efficiency of their respective institutions; a valuable contribution would be an actual performance assessment, the outputs of which can be compared to the perceptions of the key informants. If their opinions regarding efficiency are revealed to be more positive than the actual situation, this would highlight the need to acquaint them with the gaps and problems that they may not be aware of or acknowledge. If, on the other hand, their opinions are found to be more negative than the actual situation, this would point to the need for the stakeholder entity to motivate its staff and communicate achievements to them on a regular basis.

Questions included in the survey that required open ended answers should be grouped and should form the basis for an accompanying qualitative study where participants can elaborate on their opinions and provide greater insight on the issues at hand.

Data Collection and analysis
The data collection and analysis time frame must be shortened. This can be achieved by reducing the sample size, focusing on one or two GA dimensions only, and/or focusing on one or two sectors only. Shortening the duration of this step reduces the work load and pressure on resources, in addition to making the survey results timely and allowing for easy replication.

Training programs at this stage should also focus on TOT for the researchers, to facilitate replicability. The TOT can be provided to those researchers who exhibit good performance during the data collection process and they can receive this training after the field work is completed.

If time and resources allow, a feedback meeting could be held with the researchers to gain their views on the attitudes of the respondents, obstacles they faced, and site observations of the services that can feed into a actual performance assessment. This meeting would not only motivate the researchers and provide them with a sense of ownership in the GA, but it would also help in selecting the most promising candidates for TOT and replication of the research.

The results of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires should be compared with caution and this comparison should preferably not be presented during the validation workshops. There are several reasons for this:

a) The perception frames of the two categories are different and hence their interpretations of the GA dimensions. Thus, for example, officials at the drinking water company may regard efficiency in terms of adhering to implementation plans and schedules, while the household member views efficiency as the availability of drinking water during the day and with adequate pressure.
b) The number of respondents for each set of questionnaires is not comparable. Inevitably, the number of key informants is fewer than that of household members since the former depends on the size of the entity and its staff base.

c) If a comparison of the two sets of questionnaires shows a visible schism, this may pit one side against the other. Key informants may become defensive and household representatives critical; therefore, rather than generate a dialogue between the two parties, the GA results may give rise to animosities.

Validation

The participants who attended the validation workshop did not all participate in the GA; in this case, the findings must be presented simply with sufficient background on the GA exercise, and discussions need to be steered in such a way that those who did not participate in the questionnaire do not overpower the others who did.

Validation need not be undertaken for all results; the workshops can be held only to verify results that are especially striking. Given the rigorously methodical approach applied for the GA and the validation that was undertaken during the data collection process (through the supervisors and validators), post-research validation is not essential for all of the 6 chosen sectors. Only those results that raise questions or point to gaps in the research can be validated with the respondents. This way, time and resources for the validation stage can be reduced.

It is recommended that the validation process begin with the household members before the key informants. This would allow the GA team to obtain an accurate and well-rounded view of the citizens' opinions, which can then be communicated to the service providers in order to acquire their feedback on them. This is especially important if the citizens' feedbacks are negative or if they raise questions, which the key informants can shed light on.

When presenting the findings, it is recommended that the GA dimensions and indicators be explained simply since the concept of GA is new and unfamiliar in Egypt. This recommendation is especially important for household members who may not be acquainted with policy strategies and terminologies. Thus, for example, when presenting findings on the dimension related to Transparency, a simple explanation would revolve around practical issues and terms related to information sharing, the availability of data on the service, etc.

In addition to presenting the survey findings, sufficient time needs to be allocated during the validation workshops to gather the opinions of the participants and their suggestions for improving governance performance. In this respect, the validation stage for the Fayoum GA can also generate qualitative data that can support the survey analysis. For future GAs, these discussions can also serve to add further information that would be more solid and insightful after the survey results are publicized to them.
The findings of the household survey and key informants' questionnaires must be presented and compared with tact, to avoid creating a situation of defensive opposition between the two categories. Of course, such opposition will be an inevitable outcome if awareness-raising campaigns are conducted. However, at the validation stage and before full-fledged awareness activities on good governance are implemented, it is recommended that comparative results be presented in a way that does not make either side feel threatened. For example, results that the team estimates will stir controversy can be presented with the acknowledgement that differences in opinion are inevitable and with remarks such as "each side is justified in their opinion according to their circumstances," and "the fact that there is an opposing point of view does not mean that your opinion is wrong" and "the differences in opinion that we have noticed are a healthy indicator of the need for both sides to sit together and discuss the situation and management of the services with the other parties concerned, in order to reach agreement on the way forward," etc.

To provide government bureaucrats and junior employees with greater flexibility and freedom of expression, they should be separated from their superiors during validation. This can either be achieved by holding separate meetings for each category or by dividing them into discussion groups where they can express their opinions comfortably.

To conserve time and resources, the validation workshops can be held in a series of consecutive days and for all sectors. For example, the workshops can be held over a three to four-day period, beginning with household members and followed by key informants. Inviting key informants from different sectors on the same day not only acquaints them with results pertaining to other domains, thereby enriching their experience, but allows for inter-sectoral coordination as service providers enter into dialogue on governance issues that are applicable to all sectors.

Some of the researchers can be invited to the validation workshop, to provide feedback from field experience and to acquire ownership in the GA exercise by learning the analysis results. These researchers can be selected from those who have exhibited good performance in data collection. Their attendance of the validation workshop would be a practical TOT session in which they obtain feedback from the respondents on the data collection process and the nature of the results.

Following are recommendations for validation workshops for household representatives:

- **The household representatives can be gathered through key people in the area** (e.g., the omdah, religious personality, respected village elder, etc). These key people would also be able to assist the GA team in selecting the timing and location of the workshop.
- **Given the logistical difficulty in mobilizing household representatives for several workshops, it is recommended that the validation workshop presents the findings of more than one sector (or perhaps all sectors, in summary form) on the same day.** In this respect, the presentation could focus on an inter-sectoral comparison of results rather than delving into the details of each sector. The discussions can be strictly moderated to avoid straying from the workshop objectives; here, moderation is essential, given the brevity of time allocated for the workshop and the discussion of results from more than one sector.
sector. Although this procedure limits discussions and does not allow for in-depth focus on all issues, it conserves time and resources and facilitates replicability.

- **In conservative areas such as Upper Egypt, it is recommended that validation meetings be held separately for men and women.**
- **Equipment such as data shows should not be relied on for presentation, given the high degree of illiteracy amongst rural citizens.**

**Participation of the CSOs and Private Sector**

*The number and role of the CSOs and private sector is such that these two stakeholders would have better be included in a qualitative study.* In comparison to the public sector, which continues to monopolize basic service delivery in Egypt, CSOs and private sector entities are small in number and their roles are only significant insofar as the legal system provides them with maneuverability to engage in this domain. As a result, the number of key informants representing these two categories in the questionnaires was small for some sectors like drinking water and sanitation, roads and lighting. For future surveys, it is recommended that they are included in a qualitative analysis that relies on interviews and focus group discussions to gather their opinions.

*The GA results can be used as evidence for a bid to strengthen the role and capacity of CSOs and the private sector in basic services delivery.* Judging the performance of these two entities is a premature exercise given their weak role and marginal input. Rather, the GA dimensions constitute an effective tool in deciding on areas with gaps that need to be addressed in order that they are able to play a more effective role. Thus, for example, if the GA results point to lack of transparency or accountability as the most critical dimensions, then they should be the main focus of support to these entities.

*The small number of CSOs and private institutions in the pilot sectors in relation to government institutions can be used in awareness raising activities to emphasize the need to strengthen their role in basic service delivery.* Since facts speak louder than words, the GA results provide strong evidence to call for a greater input of these two entities as partners with the government in addressing the basic service needs of the population.

*CSOs can play a significant role in replicating GAs if they are involved in data collection and analysis as well as advocacy and awareness-raising.* With proper technical assistance, these entities are well-poised as participants in future GAs since they are connected to the people and in principle possess a stronger motivation compared to government employees to partaking in activities for community benefit.
Cooperation with the LDO

In future, stakeholder entities should be involved at all stages of the GA. Notwithstanding the risk of flaws that may occur due to the limited skills and capacities of some institutions, their participation in the entire process from the initial to the final phases ensures their full ownership and buy-in and obliges them to share full responsibility in the GA.

The results generated from the 3 sectors supervised by the SCC and the 3 sectors supervised by the LDO should be compared and analyzed in such a way that they provide insight on improving governance in sectors dominated by line ministries as opposed to others where local government and civil society input is pronounced. This analysis could take the form of a brief comparative report (compiled by both the SCC and LDO) that sheds light on performance by different service providers and provides recommendations for coordinating their efforts and improving governance.

One of the main obstacles confronting the LDO was the lack of appropriate updated data on the services condition in their 3 pilot sectors. This shortcoming not only delays the sampling and data collection process but inevitably impacts the analysis. Such problems were not felt in the other three sectors (primary health care, basic education and drinking water and sanitation) that are managed by line ministries and in which data are available and updated. To reduce such obstacles, it is recommended that future GAs be undertaken with stakeholder entities that have access to a reliable information base on the condition of the services, which can facilitate the process and support the analysis.

The LDO can play an instrumental role in awareness-raising on the benefits of undertaking GAs, by publicizing its experience in successfully implementing it. This would add a considerable measure of credibility and legitimacy to the GA, as stakeholders are more motivated by the experiences and lessons learned from their own counterpart.

To save time and resources and to promote discussions that compare the performance of different service providers, it is recommended that validation workshops for the sectors supervised by the SCC and the LDO be combined as much as possible. This would not only intensify coordination and experience sharing between the two entities, but would serve in amalgamating the GA results and avoid separate analyses and conclusions.

Replicability and Sustainability

An important initial step is the orientation of GOE decision makers and bureaucrats to the meanings and benefits of good governance. As attested by GOE officials themselves, there is no agreement within government ranks at all levels on the meaning of good governance. This void must be addressed as a first step in promoting GAs. Government officials need to realize that: a) their main role is to serve the citizens; b) the aim of GAs is to help them achieve better results and not to
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criticize their performance; and c) without good governance, service delivery will further decline, public resentment will escalate, and service providers will encounter greater difficulties in performing their tasks effectively.

The concept of good governance must be explained in such a way that government representatives at all levels (from the uppermost ranks to the civil servants in the villages) perceive an incentive to adopt good practices and that they do not feel threatened or placed under criticism by adopting this strategy. This step is essential before any GA activities are implemented, to obtain the buy-in of the stakeholder entities so they can endorse and support them.

The concept of good governance should be communicated to high-ranking decision makers like the parliament and cabinet, to obtain political will and support for nationwide replication. This step is essential for replicability and must go hand-in-hand with cooperation with stakeholder entities. Without buy-in from central authorities, the GA may never surpass the stage of piloting and its impact may only be sector or area specific.

Awareness raising activities on good governance and GAs must be varied. Thus, information can be spread through print and audio-visual media, CSOs, national or regional conferences, panel discussions, a web site and/or face book page, etc.

The importance of decentralization should be communicated to decision makers and emphasized as a means to attain good governance, stressing on the need to ensure that the optimal requirements for decentralization (such as fiscal autonomy, devolvement of power, capacity building, etc) are in place. In principle, decentralization is recognized as an approach that contributes to better governance, through the devolvement of decision making authority and financial and other resources from central to regional and local bodies. It is not an end in itself and therefore was not included amongst the 9 GA dimensions. However, the performance of central authorities in Egypt and the dissatisfaction with this performance – which has culminated in the January 2011 revolution – underscore the need to promote this concept as an essential tool without which the achievement of the GA dimensions can be difficult. It needs to be mentioned and emphasized in awareness activities and must be incorporated when applying the GA dimensions to service sectors.

Future GAs can be implemented by working with only one or two dimensions, in consultation with the stakeholder entity. The need to instil political will and endorsement of GAs, coupled with limitations of resources, capacities and skills within local entities, make it difficult for the 9 GA dimensions to be instituted at the same time within an individual entity. For practicality purposes and to ensure viability, the stakeholder entity can identify one or two dimensions that it deems as priority issues or which it can tackle given its resources and potential. In this respect, the Fayoum GA results can be used as a guide to highlight dimensions that were identified by citizens and key informants to be the most pressing.

Once the initial dimensions are agreed upon and assessed, the stakeholder entity can build on them and take up other dimensions in a gradual assessment process.

Alternatively, the 9 dimensions of good governance can be applied to only one or two activities within the stakeholder entity. Therefore, instead of addressing the organization's entire performance, reform measures can concentrate on a pilot activity
within the organization that can be replicated. So for example, a GA exercise can be applied solely to activities such as curriculum development, extension of sewerage networks, vaccination activities in primary health care clinics, etc. This method has two advantages:

- It provides a testing ground from which lessons can be learned for future expansion of assessment activities within the entity;

- It allows for the entity's efforts and skills to be focused on a limited activity rather than an array of measures that may be difficult to follow up.

**A GA is best done by an external entity, to assure impartiality and avoid sensitivities.** While internal performance monitoring can be undertaken by the stakeholder entity to examine the achievement of its objectives, a GA delves into issues like control of corruption, equity and rule of law that may cause officials to feel threatened and placed under scrutiny. It is therefore recommended that an external entity – such as the SCC, IDSC, a national university, a task force within the Peoples' Assembly or commissioned by the Cabinet – undertake the GA, working closely with the stakeholder entity.

The GA can be undertaken by a single entity. It can also be a combination of multiple efforts, with, for example, the SCC being responsible for technical assistance and coordination, the IDSC providing training, and a national university or research center providing the researchers and the Peoples' Assembly advocating for legal reform that takes into account good governance dimensions. Although this approach requires intense coordination skills and time, it strengthens the likelihood of sustainability and promotes ownership and buy-in from multiple stakeholders.

Whatever the case, a successful GA can best be undertaken by an entity working with the stakeholder, and that the latter not be obliged to assess itself. Table 2 below outlines the possible entities that can be considered, with the advantages and shortcomings related to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Entity</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Shortcomings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research Centre   | • Institution specialized in survey research, opinion surveys, interview techniques and data analysis.  
• A GA exercise would in turn upgrade the capacity of the research centre employees in this domain and/or offer employment opportunities for researchers. | • Weak credibility as a GA entity compared to institutions with executive authority.  
• Sustainability may not be guaranteed if funds are not available. |
| National University | • Available capacity specialized in survey research, opinion surveys, interview techniques and data analysis.  
• Once institutionalized, GA techniques can be carried out in a sustainable fashion.  
• Government institution that can communicate and cooperate with similar government stakeholder entities. | • Weak credibility as a GA entity compared to institutions with executive authority.  
• Regular capacity building may be necessary given the turnover and graduation of students.  
• Sustainability may not be guaranteed if funds are not available. |
| NGO               | • Independent entity with citizen representation that affords it with the credibility to undertake a GA. | • Weak credibility as a GA entity compared to institutions with executive authority.  
• Sustainability may not be guaranteed if funds are not available. |
| Private Firm       | • Possesses skills and know-how to | • May charge fees that are not affordable to |
Table 2:
Options for GA Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity under the authority of an executive government body (eg. office of the Prime Minister)</th>
<th>Possesses executive authority to suggest and supervise the implementation of recommendations for good governance.</th>
<th>Can compare between GAs of several governmental entities and act as a catalyst in finding common solutions.</th>
<th>Possesses the authority to allocate funds for a GA.</th>
<th>Credibility may be undermined if GA is to be undertaken for a similar governmental entity (i.e. government assessing government).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peoples' Assembly</td>
<td>Independent body representing the people and hence a credible entity in assessing good governance.</td>
<td>Can compare between GAs of several governmental entities and act as a catalyst in finding common solutions.</td>
<td>Can undertake GAs in a sustainable and institutionalized manner.</td>
<td>Cannot undertake a GA exercise in the short term given the instability of political affairs in the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the availability of funding and other resources, capacity building training and on-the-job technical assistance must be provided to the stakeholder entity that will implement the GA. Following are suggestions for topics on which stakeholder representatives can be oriented and trained:

- Good governance (the principles, benefits, application in other countries, impact on improving service delivery, and indicators);
- Internal governance and organization (delineation of tasks within the entity, importance of organizational charts, inter-departmental coordination and communication, internal accountability);
- Decentralization (main elements, benefits, strategies for application);
- Monitoring and Evaluation (main elements, benefits, techniques, trouble shooting tips);
- Civic participation (benefits, role of civil society as a catalyst between the service provider and public, the rights and duties involved in civic participation);
- Survey techniques and data collection;
- Communication skills (how to engage in regular and meaningful dialogue with different stakeholders, the techniques through which service providers can effectively address the public);
- Team building (principles, benefits, and exercises);

The SCC can use the experience gained from the GA to provide TOT to researchers at the Local Information Centers, IDSC and local universities in order to promote
The replication of GAs and other opinion studies, which are very much required in post-revolutionary Egypt. This exercise has already been initiated by the SCC during the Fayoum GA research and has reaped tangible benefits. However, such efforts need to be institutionalized through mutual protocols and funded activities that encourage further cooperation between the SCC and these entities. Through these formal agreements, SCC experts can provide technical assistance and training to researchers in the implementation of opinion surveys, rapid assessments and other techniques that these researchers can then pass on to others in an expanding exercise that can promote the culture of evidence based dialogue and decision making. Such cooperation would not only serve to sustain the project's activities in promoting GAs, but would contribute to spreading the concept and benefits of opinion surveys to gauge the public's opinion and promote trust between them and the government. Given the politicization of the Egyptian people following the revolution and the need to promote constant and effective dialogue between them and decision makers, this institutional cooperation would add considerable input to the democratization process in Egypt.

Given the availability of funds and other support, a national conference could be held annually or over longer periods, bringing together stakeholder entities who have undertaken GAs to share their experiences and coordinate activities. This conference would help in entrenching demand for assessing governance performance and would provide a platform for assessors to share lessons learned and recommend measures for improving strategies and methodologies.

If sufficient demand for improving governance performance is generated, GAs can be used as a yardstick of support to certain entities over others. For example, greater funds can be allocated to the ministry or CSO that undertakes a GA and works best to implement the required reforms. This incentive system can also be used within the ranks of a single entity. For example, an institution such as the Holding Company for Drinking water and Wasted drinking water can encourage its subsidiary companies in the governorates to undertake the GA and provide greater endorsement to the company that adopts the required reform measures seriously. Similarly, a line ministry can accord priority in its five-year plan to projects serving regional departments that exhibit the best performance.

Conclusion

The GA exercise has been a groundbreaking effort in Egypt, questioning for the first time the performance of government, private and non-profit institutions in addressing the basic needs of the citizens. It is also one of the first attempts to provide solid, evidence-based research that constitutes a catalyst for promoting dialogue between the citizen and the service provider. It is thus a long-awaited undertaking for which demand has been made all the more manifest by the demonstrations that led to the January 2011 revolution.

This noteworthy effort, however, is only a first step and on its own cannot lead to good governance. For one thing, the GA depended on a citizens' satisfaction survey and a study of the perceptions and opinions of service providers of the situation. For governance to improve, policy and institutional measures need to be implemented,
and these must also be based on factual actual performance assessments that corroborate the perceptions gathered in the GA studies.

Moreover, certain extraneous factors also come into play, affecting the outcome of good governance measures. Some of these are: the political stability of the country in the post-revolutionary era, the willingness of the GOE to adopt decentralization measures that lead to and facilitate good governance, the availability of reliable updated data that provide an indication of actual performance, and the degree of planning and coordination between sectors.

In sum, therefore, a GA on its own cannot give rise to good governance. It must be bolstered by an environment of political will that initiates the corrective policy measures that are indispensable for improving governance. Nevertheless, the project has succeeded in establishing the first and fundamental steps required to proceed onto that path. Through the GA results, the project has sown the seeds for constructive dialogue between the service provider and the recipient. Moreover, if the methodology is simplified, the project can generate demand and contribute to a culture of democratic management of resources, enabling it to become a growing trend.

It is also important to note that the formulation of good governance dimensions applicable to the situation in Egypt is on its own a major achievement. A common bottleneck recognized by most service institutions is the lack of overall principles that can provide a framework for monitoring and evaluating their performance. In that respect, the 9 dimensions developed by the project are of considerable value and if explained and promoted clearly, provide a reference guide with which service providers can improve the performance and outputs of their institutions.

Accordingly, the upcoming phase should focus heavily on promoting the need for good governance practices and the utility of undertaking GAs. However, for these awareness activities to be successful, the methodology adopted for the GA must be simplified and facilitated enough for replication and sustainability. This report has attempted to provide recommendations for rendering the methodology less complex. A simpler, lighter approach will undoubtedly encourage decision makers to promote and spread the concept in such a way that a conducive environment is gradually created in Egypt for good governance.

Suggested next steps:

Following are recommendations for forthcoming steps that need to be implemented to promote and institutionalize the achievements made by the project:

**Simplify the GA methodology.** The GA steps should be reviewed in light of the recommendations made in this report (and corroborated by most of the individuals interviewed) and simplified in such a way that future entities who do not possess the same skills, resources and capacities can undertake the GA without major difficulties.
Once the elements that need to be simplified are agreed upon, the resulting methodology can be explained in a brief hands-on manual that guides future assessors to replicate this exercise with minimal external support.

**Undertake an extensive awareness raising campaign on the need for good governance and the benefits of undertaking GAs.** The GA results need to be widely publicized and to a diversity of recipients, ranging from high ranking decision makers to the average citizen. Awareness messages should not only cover the study results but should place them in a broader perspective that underscores the need to adopt good governance measures and that highlights the benefits of GAs as a tool in this regard. Information and awareness messages could be disseminated through stakeholder workshops, panel discussions, media campaigns, and internet options such as a website and facebook page. The campaign requires formulation of precise and clear messages, identification of target groups and communication channels, and devising a non-complicated system to measure feedback.

**Undertake an advocacy campaign to encourage buy-in from decision makers and key players for promoting GAs.** One-on-one meetings with top-ranking policy makers, brainstorming workshops and networking activities need to be implemented to garner support for good governance and create the will to implement corrective measures in this regard. The campaign requires a clear identification and prioritization of the key players, formulation of concise messages, and follow-up on commitments and reform measures.

**Select one or two stakeholder entities for replication of the GA.** These entities should not only exhibit readiness and motivation to undertake a GA but should also have access to baseline information that can assist in data collection and provide a concrete base for actual performance assessment. Building on the experience of the LDO, the selected entities could coordinate closely with the latter and with the institution providing the technical assistance in such a way that they become trendsetters, assisting other entities to undertake GAs in turn. For this activity to take place, a guiding entity should be selected (preferably the SCC) and a technical assistance plan with clear goals and expected outputs formulated.13

**Organize national conferences that publicize the efforts of good governance and allow for experience sharing between implementing entities.** These conferences should include policy formulators as well as representatives of the different stakeholders and citizens. They should not only provide a platform for dialogue

---

13 It is not recommended that sizeable budgetary allocations be made for this activity, to ensure easy replicability and sustainability of the activities. If the methodology is simplified, the formulation, data collection and analysis steps can be shortened. In addition, instead of hiring external consultants, technical experts or outstanding employees from the stakeholder entity can be identified to participate in the conceptualization and management of the activities, with occasional guidance from the institution providing technical assistance. While this may be a long-winded process requiring intensive supervision, it promotes ownership and sustainability and is a better option than the recruitment of external expertise.
between the related parties, but should lead to recommendations for tangible steps and policy reform to improve governance in service delivery.
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