African Peer Review Mechanism

**"AFRICA'S BOLD MARCH TO CAPTURE THE 21st CENTURY –
THE ROLE OF THE APRM"**

**APRM – CONFERENCE
8. – 10. 5. 2007
ACCRA / GHANA
Hosted by the
National African Peer Review Mechanism Governing Council (NAPRM-GC),
Ghana**

_____

**Summary
of outcomes of previous conferences
on the
exchange of information and experiences
regarding the**

"APRM journey so far"

Compiled and edited by

Introduction, Purpose and how to use the summary

This paper has been prepared specifically for the APRM Conference, hosted by the National APRM Governing Council, Ghana, held in Accra 8-10 May 2007.

The African Peer review Mechanism [APRM] is a mutually agreed instrument voluntarily acceded to by the Member States of the African Union [AU] as an African self-monitoring mechanism. The APRM is an African owned and managed process. It is voluntary in nature and participation in the process is open to all member States of the AU. The core guiding principles of the APRM are that every review should be: technically competent, transparent, credible and free of political manipulation.

The overarching goal of the APRM is for all participating countries to accelerate their progress towards adopting and implementing the priorities and programmes of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), achieving the mutually agreed objectives and compliance with best practice in respect of each of the areas of governance and development.

The APRM process consists of four stages, namely:

Stage 1:	Preparation of background materials, including the Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) and the National Programme of Actions (NPoA);
Stage 2:	Country Review Mission;
Stage 3:	Preparation of Report on Country;
Stage 4:	Submission of Report to APR Panel and APR Forum of Heads of State and Government for Peer Review
Stage 5:	The report is formally and publicly tabled at key regional and sub-regional institutions.

To date, three countries, namely Ghana, Keya and Rwanda, have completed the APRM process and have been peer reviewed. South Africa and Algeria are near completion. In addition a further 8 countries have received support missions and are in the process of carrying out their peer review.

This paper has been compiled from the findings outcomes and recommendation of discussion held in exchange of experience seminars and workshops that have taken place over the last year, namely

- **AGF VI - Implementing the African Peer Review Mechanism, Challenges and Opportunities**, convened by UNDP and held in Kigali Rwanda, 9-11 May 2006

- **Expert Conference on APRM Implementation and Monitoring: Making the APRM Work**, convened by The Haans Siedle Foundation and held in Nairobi, 25. – 27.4.2006

- **APRM Lessons Learned, For Civil Society, Practitioners and Researchers,** convened by the South African Institute for International Affairs and held in, Johannesburg, 12-13 September 2006

- **APRM Inter-Country Experience Sharing Seminar for West Africa** convened by APRM Nigeria in association with GTZ South Africa and held in Abuja, Nigeria, 1 – 2.November. 2006

- **Workshop of APRM *"pioneer"* countries on the design of an M&E framework for the implementation of APRM PoA** convened by the APRM Focal Point Rwanda in association with GTZ South Africa and held in Kigali, Rwanda, 11 December 2006

- **Consultations on Support to the Implementation of APRM NPoA, convened by the African Development Bank and held in** Tunis, Tunisia 12-13 March 2007

The paper is an attempt to capture the key discussions and outcomes that have taken place around the implementation of the APRM. The reports used in the compilation of this paper are listed at the end of this document and the actual reports have been compiled in a CD as an additional resource for participants. Please refer to these reports for more indepth discussion on each topic.

Issues have not been specifically prioritised or directly attributed or refer to a specific country experiences but present objectively the discussions and emerging issues captured in pervious fora. It must be noted that through a process of compilation, by nature there may be some contradictory issues. while this is the case it is necessary that all issues are given equal priority such that through discussion further clarity may be reached.

For those that have been present in one or more forum, the intention of this paper is to remind participants of the key issues discussed. For those who have not been involved in these discussions to date the intention is to inform those participants of ongoing discussions. In both cases the purpose is to facilitate the joint discussion to establish a common understanding on the issues and challenges being faced by countries such that progress towards meeting the highlighted recommendations shall be substantially advanced.

Participants are asked to familiarise themselves with these key issues such that discussions can be guided by what has already been discussed, and where possible, common positions can be quickly reached. Focus, during the course of the Conference. should then be on taking the conclusions and recommendations forward and seeing what measures and efforts are needed for these to be remedied.

The paper is structured into two sections, dealing with issues related to the ***APRM Self Assessment*** and the ***National Programme of Action*** respectively. Within each section a number of topics have been highlighted and at the beginning of each section is a summarised presentation of conclusions under each of those topics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSION
TO EACH TOPIC

It is recommended that:
- **Continental APRM institutions (Forum, Panel, Secretariat) should:**
  - **Continuously politically reinforce the APRM as a support instrument to enhance governance reforms;**
  - **Strengthen their capacity to provide better and more frequent information, research and specific advice;**
  - **Facilitate a dialogue (Workshop) on structures, roles and functions of the National APRM oversight body vs. the engagement of the respective governments.**
- **National APRM institutions (Governing Councils/Committees and Focal Points) should:**
  - **Be established as adequate and credible institutions within a structural and organizational framework to guide the process efficiently and to ensure results of high quality;**
  - **Consider inclusivity of the process but need to ensure that the work is carried out efficient and effective;**
  - **Be independent from undue government's influence but at the same time, retain professional leverage and government's political and administrative engagement;**
  - **Enjoy the highest possible level of political support and a strong link to the Head of State or Government.**

Institutional Framework ◄

- *Integrity, credibility, inclusivity and independence are essential preconditions for the composition and for the role and function of the national APRM structures and the individuals tasked with leading the process as well as for the process itself.*
- *Technical Research Institutions rather support than drive or even own the process but need to meet the utmost highest standard of competencies and credibility.*
- *Although valid databases from credible sources need to be seen as most critical for the quality of the outcome a balanced mix of research methodologies including surveys and opinion polls is required to achieve tangible results.*
- *The APRM needs to be carried out in an utmost decentralized, transparent and inclusive manner.*
- *APRM needs to be rooted in the realities and specialties of countries to promote and deepen country ownership.*

Quality and credibility ◄

- *APRM national structures need to effectively plan the self-assessment project by addressing all requirements for the operations including resources (human, financial, technical, and informational) and necessary measures for capacity development.*
- *The APRM continental structures, in particular the APRM Secretariat, can contribute to a more efficient implementation by providing guidance, templates and prototypes for the process management and the methodology including the research design and the revision of the questionnaire in the light of experiences.*
- *A successful self-assessment depends on the support of the stakeholders and development partners but even more on the commitment and preparedness by government institutions which shall be motivated by the political leadership and constantly monitored.*

Efficiency and effectiveness ◄

THE APRM SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS (1)

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSION
TO EACH TOPIC

- *Broad based participation in the APRM requires proper sensitization, continuous information and interaction between the stakeholders, as well as a sound feedback on results and obstacles.*
- *Credibility requires transparency and focused dialogues and at the same time preparedness for pragmatic resolutions so that common ground can be found.*
- *The process must not be dominated by one group over another.*
- *Sensitization and information is not only about the people. Government and its administration as well as parliament need to be addressed and motivated to engage in the process.*
- *In addition, external partners need also to be included in the sensitization and need to be informed what the country would like to achieve. Some development partners have shown some reluctance to participate or contribute to the process as they saw it as duplication of efforts already undertaken in the context of multilateral or bilateral cooperation. But since the APRM process is and needs to be understood as a process solely owned by the country and its people development partners have to accept that there is a border they should not cross.*
- *A constructive dialogue between all stakeholders is crucial. Space must be given and resources need to be allocated for this to happen regardless of any tense relationships which might often be experienced, particularly between civil society and government.*

- *Funds for the entire self-assessment process need to be secured before start by considering sources from government, stakeholders and the Diaspora etc.*
- *Development partners should support the APRM in a harmonized and coordinated way.*
- *Funding agreements shall be flexible and manageable.*
- *Funding must not undermine the ownership of the process by the APRM stakeholders.*
- *Strategic partners and continental APRM Structures are requested to provide consultancy and direct support on funding.*

- *The time needed for the APRM process shall be realistically planned in view of the country's specificities*
- *The schedule of the continental APRM structures for support and review missions need to be considered*
- *The quality of the outcome is more important than the time needed*

PUBLIC AWARENESS, STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

MAGEMENT OF RESOURCES — **FUNDS** — **TIME**

THE APRM SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS (2)

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSION
TO EACH TOPIC

THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION (1)

NPOA VS. OTHER NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

- *The NPoA needs to be integrated to the extent possible into the country's main / general development strategies and budgets allocated to these plans need to consider the additional actions from the NPoA*
- *The value added to existing development strategies through the APRM/NPoA must remain visible*
- *NPoA activities, which cannot be integrated into the development strategies need to be carried out and followed up separately*
- *Overarching issues addressed in the country report and the NPoA require separate attention*
- *The donors need to be engaged in dialogues and negotiations to provide further and additional support to ensure that the NPoA can be implemented (either through increased support of the existing development plans and/or through separate support for NPoA-activities not included in these plans)*

IMPLEMENTTION FRAMEWORK

- *The political will to implement the NPoA needs to be sustained including clear political directives to government institutions to support the implementation process.*
- *Stakeholders, who have participated in the self-assessment, need to be encouraged and capacitated to actively contribute to the implementation of the NPoA and to continuously consult with the government as the main responsible institution for implementation.*
- *Roles and functions of the national APRM Structures in the post-review phase specifically or in the implementation of the NPoA need to be clearly defined and agreed upon.*
- *The Continental Structures of the APRM need to provide leadership, guidance and active support with regard to the implementation of the NPoA.*

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

- *The implementation of the NPoA requires additional resources, which primarily need to be allocated by the government (either from the own budget or support from development partners)*
- *Stakeholders of the APRM process and the Diaspora are requested to allocate resources to its implementation.*
- *Donor support should be seen as complimentary and not as the core resource.*
- *New mechanisms for coordinated and harmonized support of the NPoA implementation through continental and regional funds, harmonized donor support and engagement of the Diaspora need to be established.*

CAPACITY DEVELOMENT

- *A framework for capacity building for the APRM should be developed and implemented at country level according to specific requirements and possibilities.*
- *A joint programme for enhanced leadership in the public sector, the private sector and civil society needs to be utilized to improve leadership skills throughout the society in line with the governance reform processes in Africa*

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSION TO EACH TOPIC	.

- *Broad guidelines on monitoring and evaluation should be developed and endorsed, incorporating a clear framework and template for both capturing and reporting on progress in implementation of the National Programme of Action.*
- *The Monitoring and Evaluation framework should as a necessity incorporate all key stakeholders including institutions with technical research capacity and should, where possible, rely on established structures at national and local levels.*
- *The proposed guidelines should be taken into consideration when countries are developing the National Programmes of Action to ensure that the plan can be easily translated for M&E requirements*

M & E PRINCIPLES

- *Careful consideration needs to be given to the institutional structures within which monitoring and evaluation should be carried out including consideration of the roles and responsibilities of all key stakeholders and the autonomy of the authority delegated this responsibility.*
- *The focus on participatory processes, which is one of the cornerstones of the APRM ethos, shall be maintained throughout the implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the NPoA. In order for this to be adequate there may be a need to build capacities to ensure all stakeholders can effectively contribute at this stage of the process.*

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

- *Key technical competencies in monitoring and evaluation must be considered during the development and drafting of the NPoA to ensure that outlined indicators are realistic, scientific, credible and independent. Where NPoAs have already been drafted flexibility must be allowed to ensure that NPoA may be redrafted to better take into account of M&E requirements*
- *M&E methodologies must take into account the views of all stakeholders.*
- *The value added of the APRM must be demonstrated. As a result it is necessary to make a clear distinction between those actions that had already been planned and those that have been proposed as a direct result of the APRM process*

METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

- *Indicators reflecting progress on actions must be complimented by outcome indicators focusing more specifically on the overarching issues identified in the Country Review Reports. Monitoring of actions should be kept as simple as possible and emphasis must be given to the monitoring of outcomes to ensure that the value added of the APRM process can be adequately captured.*

INDICATORS

- *Reporting through the course of the year should be rationalized and differentiated according to whether it is progress on actions or outcome reporting. More in-depth outcome reporting should be conducted on an annual basis.*
- *It may be necessary to stagger reporting for some indicators such that in one reporting cycle some indicators are focused on and another set in the next reporting cycle. Not only does this simplify reporting requirements in the 6 month period, it also allows for the different cycles of change to be taken into account.*

REPORTING / TIME FRAME

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION (2)

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Challenges

- Institutions and structures mandated to execute the APRM – on the continent and at the national level - need to be capacitated to manage the APRM process competently, effectively and efficiently in a reasonable period of time.
- APRM Institutions need to be representative, independent, credible and responsive to stakeholder's requirements.

Experiences

a)   Continental Institutions

- Although from a logistical point of view, it is well understood that APR Forum meetings are regularly held back-to-back with the AU Summits, it bears the risk that on the continent the APRM is rather seen as part of the "normal HSG business" than as the outstanding instrument for supporting African governance reform processes as envisaged.
- National APRM structures, governments, civil society and researchers strongly desire a more continuous and more frequent communication with the APR Secretariat and the APR Panel of Eminent Persons.
- In particular, a more proactive and responsive leadership from APRM continental institutions including greater
- Responsiveness to information requests and more advanced planning and warning of intended visits is required.
- It is generally perceived that the APR Secretariat would be better able to respond in time and to improve the quality of research and services if its capacity would be enhanced on the basis of a needs assessment, which should address the emerging issues and challenges arising from implementation experiences.
- Countries acceding to the APRM would wish to have a single "entry point" at the APR Secretariat for advice and
- Information, especially with regard to the key success factors the country is expected to deliver on.

b)   National institutional set-up

- Allowing National APRM Oversight Bodies (Governing Councils Commissions or management committees) to be chaired by a government minister may seriously undermine the independence of the national APRM oversight body and the integrity of the APRM process.
- Inclusiveness of the process and broad representation of stakeholders in the national APRM oversight body is not necessarily dependent on the number of members but rather on the way such a body ensures satisfactory participation and engagement.
- However, a representative national APRM oversight body would be most recommendable

Recommendations

- Importance and attractiveness of the APRM to be continuously emphasized and re-enforced by the APR Forum (need for separate meetings, intense discussions on overarching issues, advocacy for the process and feed back to the public)
- Clarification and principle agreement to be reached with regards to the most appropriate institutional framework as well as roles and functions of national APRM structures indicating the role of governments in the process. The agreement should contain a set of criteria on how the APRM can be carried out without undue state influence but at the same time ensuring government's engagement to retain significant professional leverage and provision of valid data and information.
- Structures and processes established by National APRM institutions should consider the need for broad participation but at the same time workability, efficiency and effectiveness in a balanced way.
- Criteria for identification and selection of national stakeholder representatives (i.e. government at all levels including parliament and judiciary, private sector, women and youth associations, minority and disadvantaged groups etc.). to be clearly defined and motivated.

Summarized conclusions
It is recommended that:
- **Continental APRM institutions (Forum, Panel, Secretariat) should:**
  - *Continuously politically reinforce the APRM as a support instrument to enhance governance reforms;*
  - *Strengthen their capacity to provide better and more frequent information, research and specific advice;*
  - *Facilitate a dialogue (Workshop) on structures, roles and functions of the National APRM oversight body vs. the engagement of the respective governments.*
- **National APRM institutions (Governing Councils/Committees and Focal Points) should:**
  - *Be established as adequate and credible institutions within a structural and organizational framework to guide the process efficiently and to ensure results of high quality;*
  - *Consider inclusivity of the process but need to ensure that the work is carried out efficient and effective;*
  - *Be independent from undue government's influence but at the same time, retain professional leverage and government's political and administrative engagement;*
  - *Enjoy the highest possible level of political support and a strong link to the Head of State or Government.*

THE SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS

QUALITY AND CREDIBILITY

Challenges

- Self-assessment reports need to be accurate, fair, representative credible and objective.
- Qualitative outcomes need to be ensured even if a country lacks expertise/ technical ability.
- The quality of the outcomes of the self-assessment is significantly dependent on the quality of Technical Research Institutions utilized.
- A common 'National Vision' for the APRM is needed to ensure that the country's united voice, patriotism and nationalism will not be threatened or that the process will not be 'hijacked' by contending groups and for specific political interests'.

Experiences

- Countries with limited credible research institutions face the risk of not producing technical sound self-assessment reports;
- Research institutions are different in orientation and with regards to efficiency, commitment and professionalism, which altogether impacts on the quality of their work.
- Technical Research Institutions play a primary but rather supporting role in carrying out the research methodology; the inputs of other institutions and structures need to be considered.
- The APR Secretariat was perceived to not share its knowledge about various national survey instruments or provides guidelines, which would allow countries to better address challenges of planning, carrying out and analyzing results of surveys and integrating with data from other sources.
- There are generally weak national data systems for purposes of conducting high quality national assessments as required by the APRM process. Many APRM countries currently have poor statistical information and inadequate personnel to interpret raw data.
- Institutional capacity building at the level of data processing is considered to be an important element towards the improvement of quality and credibility of the APRM process.

Recommendations

- Terms of reference and criteria for selection of Technical Research Institutions ought to be carefully described, and the quality and performance of the TRI's needs to be closely monitored throughout the process.
- Credible national databases need to be used or, if not available, to be established as being essential for the generation of policy-relevant information. These include the National Long-Term Perspective Studies (NLTPS), National Visions, National Development Plans, UNDP Human Development Reports, ECA database, etc..
- The analyses of statistics and databases must be complemented by surveys on public opinion and perceptions not only for participatory purposes but also to legitimize the process and its outcomes.
- Involvement and commitment of governments as preconditions for the political buy-in and thus success of APRM must be ensured. In this respect, the APRM must not be perceived as being in the interest of the NEPAD ministry/department only; it needs to be ensured that the ownership of the doctrine, objectives and mechanism of APRM lies with the government as a whole.
- Since the ultimate test of the credibility of the APRM process lies in the extent to which it is seen by all stakeholders in the respective country to be objective and inclusive, the process must, therefore, meet stringent standards of objectivity.
- While the external review is a key component of APRM it needs to be ensured that this review is undertaken professionally, is non-partisan and that the draft reports on external views should mandatory be commented upon by the country (not only government) prior to its submission to the Heads of State and Government (APR Forum) for review.
- During Country Review Missions credible national experts should be relied upon to fill information gaps and provide added perspective to key issues as invariably, the external mission has insufficient time to comprehend all national issues. All experts fielded need to be given appropriate orientation to understand the philosophy and dynamics of APRM, costs involved and should not compromise the quality of the review mission.

Summarized Conclusions
- *Integrity, credibility, inclusivity and independence are essential preconditions for the composition and for the role and function of the national APRM structures and the individuals tasked with leading the process as well as for the process itself.*
- *Technical Research Institutions rather support than drive or even own the process but need to meet the utmost highest standard of competencies and credibility.*
- *Although valid databases from credible sources need to be seen as most critical for the quality of the outcome a balanced mix of research methodologies including surveys and opinion polls is required to achieve tangible results.*
- *The APRM needs to be carried out in an utmost decentralized, transparent and inclusive manner.*
- *APRM needs to be rooted in the realities and specialties of countries to promote and deepen country ownership.*

THE SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Challenges

- Although the APRM guiding documents provide a lot of information and the APR Panel and the Secretariat undertake Country Support Missions each country has to evolve its own structures, processes, communication etc. based on its history and uniqueness.
- Since the APRM Questionnaire is a guiding document, countries need to adapt the questionnaire to suit their own peculiarities in a way, which does not compromise the overall objective of the APRM and the quality of the assessment.
- The APRM Self-Assessment process needs to be seen as a complex project and to carry it out effectively and efficiently accordingly requires a sound project plan to be approved by all stakeholders, and, in terms of the budget, in particular by the government, potential contributors and development partners.
- A speedy and at the same time efficient implementation of the APRM requires a flexible and innovative utilization of instruments and institutional arrangements, which need to be constantly adjusted, strengthened and simplified according to country specificities.
- Sufficiently capacitated and competent national actors rendering support to the process (government institutions, Technical Research Partners) are required.
- Government departments and individual office holders need to accept the principal political decision to embark on the APRM and to respond to the requests of the national APRM structures in a supportive way.
- The questionnaire should be of three fold, firstly the generic questionnaire that captures good governance comparable standards, the second that relates specifically to countries emerging from conflicts and thirdly a questionnaire that takes into consideration countries that have enjoyed relatively long standing stability..

Experiences

- The APR Secretariat does not provide advice and best practices with regards to the customization of the questionnaire, the development of business plans (Master plan) and other related processes.
- The APRM questionnaire is difficult to use and considerable effort is necessary to customize it.
- Some key concepts are not addressed yet (such as freedom of media) other areas require more specific and improved questions (i.e gender, local governance), some repetition could be avoided.
- The questionnaire does not distinguish between areas which require expert work and those which should be addressed by civil society or the general public.
- APRM Focal Points often do not have the appropriate capacity and experiences to draft a project plan without being assisted by strategic partners or donor agencies..
- Government institutions and agencies are often weakly capacitated or over-stretched because of other tasks and are not easy to motivate to additional requests for work on the APRM.

Recommendations

- The APR Panel and Secretariat should provide specifically trained staff to effectively provide leadership and technical advice to the countries.
- The APR Secretariat shall provide at least a master business plan, a prototype research design and guidance on which instruments and procedures have proved to be useful in self-assessments so far.
- Based on experiences from the first reviews the APRM Questionnaire should be revised in terms of content, practicability, ways for customization and with regard to its applicability in broad participatory process with the general public.
- Together with the political decision for the APRM the government should commit to provide support to the process. It is advised that in this context the work on the APRM and the work of the domestic development agenda institutions shall be strongly linked.
- The standardization of country self-assessments should be avoided while there are common and internationally accepted benchmarks that should remain standard frames of reference for guiding country actions and to facilitate comparability of experiences as well as monitoring and evaluation.
- Needs for capacity development shall be identified as early as possible and to be addressed by appropriate measures.

Summarized conclusions

- *APRM national structures need to effectively plan the self-assessment project by addressing all requirements for the operations including resources (human, financial, technical, and informational) and necessary measures for capacity development.*
- *The APRM continental structures, in particular the APRM Secretariat, can contribute to a more efficient implementation by providing guidance, templates and prototypes for the process management and the methodology including the research design and the revision of the questionnaire in the light of experiences.*
- *A successful self-assessment depends on the support of the stakeholders and development partners but even more on the commitment and preparedness by government institutions which shall be motivated by the political leadership and constantly monitored.*

THE SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS

PUBLIC AWARENESS, STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Challenges

- Inclusiveness to the utmost possible extent needs to be ensured. The general public and all key stakeholders need to fully understand the key principles and value added of APRM.
- Gaps between the political view on the APRM and actual public engagement need to be bridged.
- Results of the assessment will only be judged as credible if participation is managed appropriately.
- People need to understand what the APRM is meant for not only in general but for their individual life and have a right to know its outcomes (feed back).
- Awareness on the APRM as a measure to initiate governance reform processes in the country on the continent and in the international community must be sustained.

Experiences

- Sensitization of stakeholders for information, motivation for engagement and feedback is one of the most critical elements of the APRM process, technically very difficult and resource demanding, too.
- In this context: Media presence and infrastructure for broadcasting is often low and above that it is not sufficient to rely on media for communication or for awareness and motivation campaigns.
- Civil society raises concerns that key decisions on the process – such as budget, staffing, and time frames – are taken before the national APRM oversight bodies have been established and without giving them the opportunity to provide their inputs/comments. As a result this often causes limited engagement.
- It is noted that while government dedicated staff to APRM full time on on a full time basis, representatives of civil society are not in a position to engage their staff to a similar extent. This becomes an even greater disadvantage if the national APRM structures are not independent from government and/or even physically hosted by government.
- Civil society, even if appropriately represented in a national APRM oversight body, faces great difficulties in keeping up with the demands for attending meetings and reviewing texts, providing relevant inputs etc.
- There is a lack of communication between the continental and the national APRM structures on best practices, how inputs, opinions and perceptions can be gathered appropriately and at reasonable costs.

Recommendations

- The continental APRM structures shall support the respective countries through an African wide and coordinated communication strategy (e.g. a unique mobilization campaign "What's in it for me and for us?"), which may also serve to attract more countries to embark on the APRM.
- The website of the APRM shall be enhanced and continuously updated.
- Media should be encouraged for more engagement and coverage.
- Budget provisions shall be made in the project plan to provide own resources for stakeholders who usually have no or limited access to research like Civil Society Organizations or at least to monitor the work of the TRIs or the Technical Research Teams through dedicated experts.
- To make broader communication easier the questionnaire shall be rewritten by using language that can be understood by the general public and should also be translated into vernaculars languages.
- Measures to be taken in close cooperation between the continental and national structures of the APRM to enable a constructive dialogue between all stakeholders (utilization of available networks of CSO, gender organizations, youth organizations etc.).
- Setting out the APRM vision, rules and procedures through mass communication approaches would help to reduce disputes and delays over contentious aspects of the process that are presently ambiguous and would also serve to attract further countries.

Summarized Conclusions

- **Broad based participation in the APRM requires proper sensitization, continuous information and interaction between the stakeholders, as well as a sound feedback on results and obstacles.**
- **Credibility requires transparency and focused dialogues and at the same time preparedness for pragmatic resolutions so that common ground can be found.**
- **The process must not be dominated by one group over another.**
- **Sensitization and information is not only about the people. Government and its administration as well as parliament need to be addressed and motivated to engage in the process.**
- **In addition, external partners need also to be included in the sensitization and need to be informed what the country would like to achieve. Some development partners have shown some reluctance to participate or contribute to the process as they saw it as duplication of efforts already undertaken in the context of multilateral or bilateral cooperation. But since the APRM process is and needs to be understood as a process solely owned by the country and its people development partners have to accept that there is a border they should not cross.**
- **A constructive dialogue between all stakeholders is crucial. Space must be given and resources need to be allocated for this to happen regardless of any tense relationships which might often be experienced, particularly between civil society and government.**

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES
FUNDS

Challenges

- Secured funding for the entire process and all related activities including costly activities measures/campaigns for popularization before starting the process.
- The engagement of Governments and commitment to provide sufficient funds for the self assessment process and the preparation and publication of the country review report.
- Lack of harmonization of donor support (conditions, various modes of delivery, different reporting requirements etc).

Experiences

- The utilization of the UNDP APRM Trust Fund is restricted to the continental structures (APR Panel, APR Forum, APR Secretariat).
- The responsibility for the national peer review is with the countries (the system of countries trust funds is complemented by individual financing support).
- The budgeted project plan needs to be approved by all stakeholders of the process.
- The funding problems (negotiations with Government, acquisition of donor funding, financial management) are hugely underestimated in many cases and national APRM structures need to consider the workload related to funding accordingly.
- Costs of the process are a deterring factor to countries to embark on the APRM.
- The following major elements for the budget planning need to be considered (not an exhaustive list):
  - Sustainability of the National APRM Structures including administrative staff (salaries, allowances etc)
  - Funding for Technical Research Institutes
  - Popularization, communication and dissemination of documents, brochures etc.
  - Consultation workshops, conferences and validation exercises
  - Publication of the final report
- In summary three complementary types of facilities currently coexist:
  - Bilateral and joint financing programmes: These could be used to finance NPoAs' implementation to the extent that they are integrated in the national development programmes;
  - National multi-partners trust funds: These funds are more flexible and could be used to finance the gap between NPoAs and national agendas, especially decentralized civil society programmes (the demand side of good governance);
  - Regional multi-donor Trust Fund: The regional facility is could be used to finance cross-cutting activities. It should be dedicated to building capacities at the Pan African level, to promote APRM as a collective African process. The existing fund supports the Forum, Panel, and Secretariat activities, including the review missions (up-stream activities), but not the national processes (downstream activities).

Recommendations

- The national APRM structures shall ensure funding for the whole process before starting it.
- Main financial sources to be considered are funding by government, establishment of Basket or Trust Funds, Direct Financial and Technical Assistance by donors.
- The funding agreements shall be flexibly and pragmatically determined but shall not undermine the ownership of the process.
- Strategic Partners of the APRM (ADB, UNECA, UNDP) together with the APR Secretariat shall provide consultancy on how to acquire additional resources and should also support the countries directly
- Through PPP, the private sector could also be challenged to supplement government effort.
- Enhanced coordination and communication links between the APRM countries shall be cultivated in order to open up more opportunities for inter-country collaboration, including the exchange of personnel.
- Donors should support strong, experienced research institutions/African think tanks and involve them at the start of the process.

Summarized conclusions:
- *Funds for the entire self-assessment process need to be secured before start by considering sources from government, stakeholders and the Diaspora etc.*
- *Development partners should support the APRM in a harmonized and coordinated way.*
- *Funding agreements shall be flexible and manageable.*
- *Funding must not undermine the ownership of the process by the APRM stakeholders.*
- *Strategic partners and continental APRM Structures are requested to provide consultancy and direct support on funding.*

THE SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES / continued

TIME

Challenges

- Realistic time planning
- Identification of milestones
- Encourage the countries to establish an efficient but realistic road map for implementation.
- "Don't rush, but don`t drag"
- Delays in the process and time-gaps between the submission of the report and its publication

Experiences

- A six-to-nine month period for the report is definitely to short but may be appropriate if the process as outlined in the APRM basic documents would be re-designed.
- The time planning is not only on the country's side. The time-schedule of the continental APRM structures (Support Mission, Country Review Mission) needs to be considered.
- The duration of the process depends on various factors, e.g. size and population, centralized or decentralized structure, infrastructure for communication etc.
- Particularly the larger and more populous countries require much more time-consuming efforts not only for the national APRM structures but also for the APRM support and review missions of the continental structures to get a sufficient picture of what is on the ground, particularly the constraints under which country teams operate.

Recommendations

- The period of time given to a country too complete the Country Self-Assessment Reports and NPoA shall be calculated by considering the particular circumstances, environment and conditions of each country.
- The Peer Review reports should be released simultaneously to the public and to the APRM Heads of State and Government so as to both minimize negative speculations and to satisfy the "transparency and ownership criteria.
- A comprehensive review of the process is recommended in order to establish an ideal timeframe.
- Implementing a realistic roadmap for the APRM process should takes into account the potential variability in the content, duration, and speed of undertaking country assessments from one country to the other.

Summarized conclusions:

- *The time needed for the APRM process shall be realistically planned in view of the country's specificities*
- *The schedule of the continental APRM structures for support and review missions need to be considered*
- *The quality of the outcome is more important than the time needed*

NPOA VS. OTHER NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Challenges:

- The overlap of the NPoA as the outcome of the review with existing national development frameworks, in particular Poverty Reduction Strategies needs to be dealt with.
- Additional workload for national development institutions (departments, agencies) to be considered
- Capacity to implement the NPoA to be developed
- The impact of a NPoA on the commitments of donors to bilaterally support a single and coherent development strategy, especially if basket or budget funding applies, is to be considered.
- While most of the national development strategies represent a rather socio-economic developmental approach the APRM as a reference document for improving governance must not loose its unique identity through integration in such strategies.

Experiences:

- The integration of the NPoA into existing development strategies through government needs to be carefully observed whether all issues addressed by the self-assessment are appropriately addressed
- The rationale for the NPoAs integration into existing development initiatives is clear, however, in practice, from the few existing examples it has been found that not all activities outlined in the NPoA could and should be integrated into existing frameworks.
- Donors are often too much focused or even explicitly concentrate on national development strategies and do not appropriately recognize the meaning of priority actions of the NPoA as requirements for more or additional support

Recommendations:

- The NPoA shall as far as possible be integrated in and harmonized with existing development planning processes plans under one single framework for development thus to ensure that synergies between all existing initiatives are fully exploited and that greater cohesion in national planning is secured.
- This can be done either by integrating the NPoA ex-post in updated strategic plans or the NPoA can be used as reference document for the preparation of national development plans, budgets and frameworks.
- Activities which could not be integrated into development strategies need to be addressed and implemented as a separate process including the overarching issues outlined in the NPoA.
- Follow-up reviews (after the base review) shall be planned to coincide with other development planning process periods e.g. PRS, Country Medium Term Strategy preparations process etc.
- The NPoA shall be institutionalized and mainstreamed into the national planning and budgetary processes to ensure there is a governmental emphasis on implementation.
- NPoA shall remain a full reflection of activities related to issues as addressed in the Self Assessment of the APRM and shall meet the recommendations of the review regarding governance reform processes
- Independent from the scope of integration into other developmental strategies the real value added by the APRM must remain visible / demonstrable.
- Since the government is to be seen as the primary implementer of the NPoA it is of critical importance that the government is included in the development of the NPoA and shall be even a determining factor in the extent to which the activities outlined in the NPoA can be mainstreamed into ongoing government's development initiatives.
- The NPoA shall identify ongoing or planned activities and those that already appear in other development strategies and shall indicate which synergies can be used for a coherent implementation
- A dialogue with donors shall lead to clarification of the meaning of the NPoA in relation to other development strategies they have committed to support and additional requirements with regards to implementation of additional activities and initiatives shall be tabled for donor consideration

Summarized conclusions:
- *The NPoA needs to be integrated to the extent possible into the country's main / general development strategies and budgets allocated to these plans need to consider the additional actions from the NPoA*
- *The value added to existing development strategies through the APRM/NPoA must remain visible*
- *NPoA activities, which cannot be integrated into the development strategies need to be carried out and followed up separately*
- *Overarching issues addressed in the country report and the NPoA require separate attention*
- *The donors need to be engaged in dialogues and negotiations to provide further and additional support to ensure that the NPoA can be implemented (either through increased support of the existing development plans and/or through separate support for NPoA-activities not included in these plans)*

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

NPOA – INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Challenges

- Sustained political will to enforce implementation of the NPoA.
- Engagement of government ministries who will Invariably be charged with implementation of the NPoA.
- Understanding of the role of stakeholders other than the government as active role-players not only in the assessment phase but more important in the implementation.
- The position, role, perceived influence and capacity of the APRM national structures in the post-review phase.
- Maintaining the consultative approach in the implementation phase/processes and that it undergoes a broad-based validation by all stakeholders to ensure that remedies for those recommendations captured during the self-assessment are captured in the NPoA.
- Leadership for the NPoA implementation process to be supported by continental structures.

Experiences

- In some cases it remains unclear the roles assigned to National APRM Structures in the post review phase (coordinative, oversight, consultative role) in relation to institutions carrying out the implementation.
- Limited influence the APRM structures can exert over the ministries to ensure implementation and reporting.
- limited to coordination of the implementation and the monitoring and evaluation; sustaining dialogue with stakeholders.

Recommendations

- The political will to implement the NPoA and to encourage stakeholder's engagement in its implementation needs to be continuously re-emphasized.
- The collaboration that the APRM process establishes between state and non-state actors during the country assessment stages should continue to provide an avenue for building synergies during the implementation of the NPoA and mobilizing the required resources from all fronts.
- Government together with the National APRM Structures, as the main implementers of the NPoA, need to ensure that the commitment of all relevant stakeholders to the implementation process is not compromised.
- Roles and functions of the National APRM Structures during the post review phase should be clearly defined, preferably in the NPoA..
- Adequate capacity and resources should be deployed to the National APRM Structures to sustain the momentum and enhance the sustainability of the implementation process,
- Activities, which are required for the sustainability of the process even if not explicitly indicated in the NPoA should be identified and supported as integral parts of the implementation of the NPoA.
- As with the review process, APRM Continental Secretariat and the Panel of Eminent Persons should provide leadership and guidance to participating countries implementing the APRM NPoA.

Summarized conclusions:

- *The political will to implement the NPoA needs to be sustained including clear political directives to government institutions to support the implementation process.*
- *Stakeholders, who have participated in the self-assessment, need to be encouraged and capacitated to actively contribute to the implementation of the NPoA and to continuously consult with the government as the main responsible institution for implementation.*
- *Roles and functions of the national APRM Structures in the post-review phase specifically or in the implementation of the NPoA need to be clearly defined and agreed upon.*
- *The Continental Structures of the APRM need to provide leadership, guidance and active support with regard to the implementation of the NPoA.*

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Challenges

- Capacity and resource gaps regarding the implementation of the programmes and projects outlined in the NPoA
- Engagement of the government in general and the Ministers of Finance as well as Planning and Development in particular to commit to the objectives and activities of the NPoA in terms of budget allocation and Medium Term Financial Planning
- Costing of the NPoA can be challenging especially for activities that span a considerable period of time. This calls for national capacities to plan and budget for NPoA activities bearing in mind, nevertheless, the financial stress that many of the member countries continue to face.
- Motivation of all stakeholders involved, including the Diaspora, to support the implementation of the NPoA by allocating resources to the process.
- Motivation of development partners to recognize and additionally support the efforts of the respective country to improve governance and accelerate reform processes.

Experiences

- Minister of Finance or Planning and Development are involved in budgeting for the NPoA prior to submission of the country review report but the governments often raise concerns with regard to budget constraints during its implementation.
- Although stakeholders participated actively in the self-assessment, their preparedness to engage in the implementation process is often limited.
- Donors are yet to sufficiently recognize the NPoA as country efforts to embark on reform process which requires and deserves additional support.

Recommendations

- NPoA should attempt to prioritize activities into short, medium and long-term phases to facilitate ease of implementation.
- Countries should assume the responsibility of funding the NPoA to enhance it's credibility as an African initiative. This will require the strengthening of domestic resource mobilization, including stakeholders outside government and even other diasporas.
- Own efforts of the country must be seen as means for improved credibility in the context of the APRM philosophy and external funds shall rather be used as complimentary rather than as core resources for implementing the NPoA.
- New mechanisms for coordinating external support for the NPoA should be developed. In that context, the continental APRM (UNDP) Trust Fund may be expanded and made accessible to countries that are facing resource constraints during NPoA implementation.
- In general a harmonized and better coordinated technical and financial support for the implementation of the NPoA from continental and regional institutions but also from international institutions and donors, is needed
- Where possible the PoA should be integrated into the National priority programmes and implemented within the general national framework.

Summarized conclusions:

- ***The implementation of the NPoA requires additional resources, which primarily need to be allocated by the government (either from the own budget or support from development partners)***
- ***Stakeholders of the APRM process and the Diaspora are requested to allocate resources to its implementation.***
- ***Donor support should be seen as complimentary and not as the core resource.***
- ***New mechanisms for coordinated and harmonized support of the NPoA implementation through continental and regional funds, harmonized donor support and engagement of the Diaspora need to be established.***

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Challenges

- The NPoA, like the self-assessment, requires significant additional and specific capacity (both institution and individuals are saddled with the responsibility of managing the process.
- The harmonization / integration of NPoA with the existing national development plans and processes is highly complexity and could pose a challenge especially in APRM countries with limited institutional and human capacities;
- Inadequate financial, human and institutional capacities, which vary among countries, have the potential to hamper the effective implementation of the NPoA
- Specific capacity needs to be developed to ensure sound monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes/impact of the NPoA

Experiences

Various capacity building initiatives have been developed and implemented by countries and through donor support, but they do not sufficiently address the real challenges and opportunities provided by the vision and the principles of governance reforms envisaged in the APRM process.

Recommendations

- Enhanced coordination capacity of National APRM structures is critical; however capacity building for other stakeholders, particularly for civil society, to enhance their participation in the process is also necessary.
- A capacity building initiative based on broad continental and international experiences needs to be developed for in APRM countries.
- Leadership across all sectors (public, private, civil society) needs to be improved based on the vision of better governance as precondition a for accelerated and sustainable development.

Summarized conclusions:

- *A framework for capacity building for the APRM should be developed and implemented at country level according to specific requirements and possibilities.*
- *A joint programme for enhanced leadership in the public sector, the private sector and civil society needs to be utilized to improve leadership skills throughout the society in line with the governance reform processes in Africa*

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

Challenges

- There is no generally applicable solution for all countries; different contexts and environments in the different countries are to be considered.
- Transparency and independence from (political) manipulation need to be ensured.
- Broad participation in and popularization of the M&E is desired.
- Risk to perceive the M&E as technical rather than political.
- The understanding of the impact of overarching issues (risk to lose sight if only activities are monitored)
- Methodological approach to be credible and based on scientific principles
- Wide range of actions/activities in the NPoA

Experiences (rather based on first impressions and assumptions than on actual lessons learned)

- Tendency that Government strives to monitor and to evaluate its own activities
- The requirements for M&E including the identification of indicators and measurable objectives not appropriately considered at the very beginning of the development of the NPoA.

Recommendations (rather requirements as defined by APRM countries)

- Although M&E is rather complex a simplified framework including a template should be provided.
- Besides Government, all stakeholders engaged in the review (Civil society, private sector, traditional authorities etc) must be incorporated in the M&E system (Stakeholder analysis to be undertaken).
- Established local structures should be utilized to gather information including local government structures and other institutions with a broad local network;
- The Technical Research Institutions that participated in the self-assessment should be maintained (and the costs of covering these services hence must be considered).
- Requirements for Monnitoring and Evaluation need to be identified in the process of developing the NPoA to ensure the indicators chosen are specific and measurable and can provide relevant information.

Summarized conclusions:

- ***Broad guidelines on monitoring and evaluation should be developed and endorsed, incorporating a clear framework and template for both capturing and reporting on progress in implementation of the National Programme of Action.***
- ***The Monitoring and Evaluation framework should as a necessity incorporate all key stakeholders including institutions with technical research capacity and should, where possible, rely on established structures at national and local levels.***
- ***The proposed guidelines should be taken into consideration when countries are developing the National Programmes of Action to ensure that the plan can be easily translated for M&E requirements***

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Challenges

- The broad participation to be maintained.
- Validity of M&E results vs. limited capacity and requirements for efficiency.
- Harmonisation of reporting requirements and the suppliers of reports.
- Lack of methodological skills and experiences.
- Lack of clarity with regards to responsibilities for reporting.
- Ownership of the M&E process.

Experiences

- No sufficient assistance / guidance from the continental structures on institutional framework for M&E
- While there is some level of broad based participation in the preparation and validation of the M&E report government tends to take the lead because of their enhanced role in implementation and also it is the Head of State who presents the report.
- Lack of capable institutions, and of M&E experience in government is still evolving.

Recommendations

- The M&E framework and processes need to be designed to be consistent with the ethos of dialogue with citizens.
- The M&E system should compliment other monitoring that is done by government and other institutions to improve validation and to carry it out efficiently.
- Reporting requirements (e.g. of the continental APRM structures) shall be harmonised and agreed upon with APRM countries reporting.
- Learning experiences across countries need to be shared continuously.
- Capacity to monitor the NPoA to be provided / built, including institutional and individual capacity and this should go beyond training.
- Broad agreement on who should collect data, collate information, ensure quality and validity and submits reports needs to be reached.
- Degree of responsibility for the delivery of reports to be clarified - Who should be held accountable?
- Institutions, agencies and technical research institutions should all be relief upon for the collection of data,
- Each country should set-up an independent oversight body to manage the process and take responsibility for the final submission of reports. The autonomy of that body – from government, civil society and the private sector should be guaranteed.. The body should also be representative of all stakeholders including an emphasis on gender.

Summarized conclusions:

- ***Careful consideration needs to be given to the institutional structures within which monitoring and evaluation should be carried out including consideration of the roles and responsibilities of all key stakeholders and the autonomy of the authority delegated this responsibility.***
- ***The focus on participatory processes, which is one of the cornerstones of the APRM ethos, shall be maintained throughout the implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the NPoA. In order for this to be adequate there may be a need to build capacities to ensure all stakeholders can effectively contribute at this stage of the process.***

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

Challenges

- Identification and selection of measurable indicators
- Collection and validation of data to reach robust conclusions
- M&E must be scientific and credible, while maintaining simplicity.
- NPoA must consider the M&E requirements from the start including the means of verification.
- Realistic underlying assumptions for outcomes/impact.
- Availability and accessibility of data.
- Quantitative data and qualitative data
- Variety and applicability of methodological and instrumental options

Experiences

- NPoA so far do not sufficiently address the requirements of M&E on outcomes/impact
- Progress reports currently focus actions rather than on outcomes
- Uncertainty whether a reviewed NPoA can be modified with regards to the requirements of an M&E system (re-definition of objectives, assumptions, indicators when it is realized that the ones in the NPoA are not measurable).

Recommendations

- Need for dialogue (see also institutional framework)
- Seek technical assistance / specific competencies on M&E when drafting the NPoA.
- Identify capacity needs for M&E and existing institutions, agencies to collect data
- Establish dialogue (focus group discussions) to validate quantitative data.
- Modifications of Self Assessment reports and NPoA should be allowed if reports have not appropriately considered the objectives, underlying assumptions and related indicators especially in terms of outcome monitoring.
- NPoA should differentiate between actions already planned or in progress and *additional* actions that are needed and indicate to what extend data are available or need to be collected

Summarized conclusions:

- *Key technical competencies in monitoring and evaluation must be considered during the development and drafting of the NPoA to ensure that outlined indicators are realistic, scientific, credible and independent. Where NPoAs have already been drafted flexibility must be allowed to ensure that NPoA may be redrafted to better take into account of M&E requirements*
- *M&E methodologies must take into account the views of all stakeholders.*
- *The value added of the APRM must be demonstrated. As a result it is necessary to make a clear distinction between those actions that had already been planned and those that have been proposed as a direct result of the APRM process*

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators (results, impact)

Challenges

- Distinction between actions and outcomes
- Overarching issues
- 25 Objectives and related indicators under the 4 Self Assessment themes – this may be dependent on country specifics.

Experiences

- Progress monitoring on actions often confused with outcome monitoring

Recommendations

- Keep monitoring of progress of actions as simple as possible and evaluate whether plans have been achieved.
- Clearly identify implementing agencies, stakeholders etc. as specified in the NPoA and agree on regular reporting.
- Indicators for measuring outcomes shall use the same framework used in the Self Assessment report but can be reduced by focusing on "overarching issues" and the related objectives in which the biggest improvements are required.
- Since outcomes require a base line survey and a monitoring over a longer period of time issues discussed in the Self Assessment report shall be turned in desired outcomes and to be used for a time series assessment of progression the specific area.
- Indicators shall have target values attached to provide information on the extent of changes over a period of time. On that base cross-reference should be made in the overarching issues.

Summarized conclusions:

- *Indicators reflecting progress on actions must be complimented by outcome indicators focusing more specifically on the overarching issues identified in the Country Review Reports. Monitoring of actions should be kept as simple as possible and emphasis must be given to the monitoring of outcomes to ensure that the value added of the APRM process can be adequately captured.*

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

Monitoring and Evaluation - Reporting format/timeframes

Challenges

- It is time consuming to prepare reports
- Cycles of countries' regular data collection not the same like APRM reporting cycles

Experiences

- Monitoring is often limited to progress of activities and does not sufficiently address the outcomes/impact of the actions outlined in the NPoA

- The continental structures of the APRM do not provide sufficient guidance and assistance with regards to Monitoring and Evaluation

- The 6 month's frequency of progress reports can be accepted for activity-monitoring but is not appropriate for outcome-monitoring

Recommendations

- Reports on outcomes should be compiled on an annual basis. But not all indicators will show changes Thus some indicators might be subject to a longer cycle of reporting. Some staggering of reporting also makes sense to reduce the workload and enable in-depth reporting.

- Reports on actions should be compiled on a six-monthly cycle. However, only the report that is in synch with the outcome report would be for full public consumption. The report produced midway between the outcome reports would be provided to the APR secretariat and Panel of Eminent Persons and, for information purposes only, also circulated to other national APRM secretariats.

Summarized conclusions:

- ***Reporting through the course of the year should be rationalized and differentiated according to whether it is progress on actions or outcome reporting. More in-depth outcome reporting should be conducted on an annual basis.***
- ***It may be necessary to stagger reporting for some indicators such that in one reporting cycle some indicators are focused on and another set in the next reporting cycle. Not only does this simplify reporting requirements in the 6 month period, it also allows for the different cycles of change to be taken into account.***

NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

Documentation on CD-Rom
Reports, Presentations, Press Statements and Papers on the APRM

- **Press Statement Hanns Seidel Foundation: Making the APRM Work**
  Expert Conference on APRM Implementation and Monitoring - Nairobi, 25. – 27.4.2006

- **Implementing the African Peer Review Mechanism, Challenges and Opportunities**
  Report of the Sixth Africa Governance Forum (AGF-VI) - Kigali, Rwanda, 9-11 May 2006

- **APRM Lessons Learned: Report on the South African Institute for International Affairs Conference; For Civil Society, Practitioners and Researchers**
  Held at the Avianto Conference Centre - Muldersdrift, Johannesburg, 12.-13.9. 2006

- **Report on the APRM Inter-Country Experience Sharing Seminar for West Africa**
  Hosted by APRM Nigeria, Held at Le Meridien Hotel - Abuja, Nigeria, 1. – 2.11. 2006

- **Workshop of APRM** *"pioneer"* **countries on the design of an M&E framework for the implementation of APRM PoA**
  Kigali, Rwanda, 11 December 2006

- **Planning an Effective Peer Review: A Guidebook for National Focal Points, South African Institute for International Affairs©,** prepared for the APRM Best Practices and Lessons Learned Workshop for Peer Review Focal Points in Eastern, Central and Southern Africa, on 20-21 February 2007 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
  Publication included here with the kind permission of the copyright holder

- **Report of the Consultations on Support to the Implementation of APRM NPoA** / Tunis 12.-13.3.07

  - **Consultations on Support to the Implementation of APRM- National Programmes of Actions**
    Tunis, Tunisia, 12 – 13 March 2007

  - **The APRM: The journey so far and lessons learned**
    Consultations on support to the National APRM Programmes of Action - Tunis, Tunisia, 12 March 2007

  - **Integrating the APRM with the PRS and MDGs, Prepared by ECA**
    MDGs, Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Section and the APRM Support Unit Tunis,12–13.03.07

  - **Perspectives of the African Peer Review Mechanism**
    Consultations on Support to the Implementation of APRM PoAs - Tunis, 12.-13.3.2007

  - **The APRM: Presentation To the Consultation on the Support to National APRM Programmes of Actions -** UNDP/RBA - Tunis, Tunisia, 12 – 13 March 2007

  - **World Bank Support for APRM**
    From Reviews to Implementing Action Plans

  - **Germany's support to the African Peer Review Mechanism**
    Consultations on the support to the implementation of APRM Programmes of actions
    Tunis, March 12th – 13th, 2007

  - **Experience of DFID in supporting the APRM**,
    Pan Africa Strategy Department - Tunis, Tunisia, 12th – 13th March, 2007

  - **Implementing the APRM PoA: Lessons from Rwanda**
    Tunis, Tunisia, 12th – 13th March, 2007

  - **Ghana's PoA: Progress of Implementation**
    Tunis, Tunisia, 12th – 13th March, 2007

  - **Implementing the APRM Programmes of Actions; Kenya's Experiences**
    Tunis, Tunisia, 12th – 13th March, 2007