

# **Policy Coherence for Development in Austria**

building a policy-advocacy evaluation tool

## **Proposal**

submitted for the OMLC Research Awards 2009

## **Theme addressed**

A) Integrating OM with other tools and approaches

## **Submitted by**

Bernhard Hack, [RE4D.net](http://RE4D.net)

## **Contact**

Bernhard Hack  
[bernhard.hack@gmail.com](mailto:bernhard.hack@gmail.com)  
+963 940469536  
[www.re4d.net](http://www.re4d.net)

# 1 Background and aims

## 1.1 Background

Policies other than development cooperation have a strong impact on developing countries. The European Union (EU) concept of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) aims to build synergies between those policies and development objectives to increase the effectiveness of development aid (EC 2007). Failing to implement the EC's ambitious PCD agenda will mean failing to reach the Millennium Development Goals (EC 2005). The EU aims to maximise the positive effect of non-aid EU policies while minimising their negative impact on developing countries' progress towards the MDGs. The European Consensus devotes considerable attention to PCD and takes a series of strong commitments (European Consensus).

Yet, there is no M&E framework conceptualized for PCD and there are no ready tools available. Even in countries following a 'whole government approach' to PCD (Picciotto 2004, OECD DAC 2006) such as Sweden, assessment of actual coherence is limited to an annual report to parliament. In its recently released PCD report the EC states that "the analysis of the degree of PCD remains both analytical and empirical" and that establishing a measurement system of a country's coherence is proving difficult. "None of the existing ones have achieved a degree of maturity that provides a sufficient level of reliability and credibility (EC 2007)."

Achieving greater policy coherence demands sustained efforts to improve the integration of sectoral policies, to ensure policy integration across levels of government, and to ensure consistency in the choices made by the various stakeholders (OECD 2002). NGOs play a key role in driving the debate forward by holding government players accountable. They also need to take part in dialogue, working towards consensus by presenting evidence-based arguments. Approaches to coordination mechanisms rely to a large extent on importing best practices (Ashoff 2005, Obrovsky 2007) without actually assessing effort towards PCD. From a campaigner's perspective there is a window of opportunity to impact the policy debate when the next PCD report will be released by the EC in autumn 2009.

## 1.2 Aims of the study

This study reviews the emerging debate on PCD evaluation (Picciotto 2004, OECD 2005, CEPS 2006, ECDPM 2005, 2007) and aims to lay the methodological foundations for building an innovative evaluation tool for NGOs to assess PCD in Austria in order to inform knowledge-based governance for sustainable development. Taking clues from the literature on Environmental Policy Integration the study emphasizes learning across frames. (Lafferty & Hovden 2002, Hertin & Berkhout 2003, Nilsson & Persson 2003). It problematizes the tension between accountability and learning and seeks to develop a utilization-oriented tool (Patton 2008).

## 1.3 Main research question

The study seeks to answer this main research questions:

How can NGOs assess government efforts towards Policy Coherence for Development?

## Addressing the theme

The study addresses theme 'A) Integrating OM with other tools and approaches'. It emphasizes the importance of a systems approach and network analysis to understand the relationships between key players and their influence on the policy process. It seeks to combine Social Network Analysis and Outcome Mapping into a simple tool that can be used, both, by NGOs to assess government efforts towards PCD as well as by government departments to evaluate progress made towards development policy integration. The main focus of the tool is on policy learning manifested as behaviour change (Smutylo 2003).

## 2 Outline of research methodology and schedule

This study builds on previous work done for a presentation at the EASY-ECO Conference in Vienna January 2008 and some research in the summer of 2008 for a Vienna-based non-profit focusing on development cooperation (GEZA). This research resulted in a chapter in a booklet on PCD that was distributed to parliamentarians (Hack & Schuster 2008). An initial desk study in May will update the literature review done previously.

A loose network of civil society actors with an interest in the topic has been formed last year. By presenting them with the opportunity to capitalize on three months of research work, I hope to mobilize additional in-kind resources and alliances particularly from one NGO (GEZA), one umbrella-body for poverty-advocacy (Globale Verantwortung), one development think-tank (ÖFSE) and the Green Party. Drawing on the collective expertise of these activists, researchers and parliamentarians I will map the influence of key actors over the policy integration process using Eva Schiffer's Network Mapping approach (<http://netmap.wordpress.com>). The semi-structured interviews informing this work will take place in June in Vienna.

Also in June, I will consult the network above to develop progress markers of desirable behaviour that they can then use to assess efforts made by the actors that the network analysis identified as key-stakeholders. Ideally this will result in an easy-to-update checklist that extra-parliamentarian players with little resources can use on a regular basis to judge advances in the debate and demonstrate their contribution to those advances.

During July the study will be written up at the RE4D.net office in Italy.

My overall time-commitment envisaged will grow from part-time in May to full time in June and then again part-time in July.

### Timeline

Activity	May	June	July
Desk study	✓		
Influence mapping		✓	
Developing PMs		✓	
Write up			✓

### 3 Involvement of OM community

**Before:** Before launching into the desk study I hope to call on the OMLC to point me to resources referencing similar work to ensure the progress markers will be SMART.

Additionally, it would be of great added value to this work and to me personally, to recruit a volunteer-mentor from the OMLC for the duration of the study who would occasionally check in with me, review progress made and adjust overall direction if necessary.

**During:** If a mentor representing the OMLC can be found, a continuous involvement of the community throughout the study would be guaranteed.

**After:** The results of the study will be made available to the OMLC for further discussion of out-scaling possibilities. It is hoped that the study in itself will provide a significant impetus to move the debate on PCD forward in Austria, generating additional momentum. If follow-up activities result from this work, I will keep the OMLC abreast of any developments.

### 4 Deliverables & outputs

- Network Map of key stakeholders gauging policy influence
- Simple checklist-type tool based on progress markers for NGOs to evaluate efforts towards policy integration
- Paper writing up the process and results

#### **Potential additional output:**

- Brief first-person experience report of a short-term mentoring experiment from, both, a mentor and a mentee perspective

### 5 Budget

Line item	Context	Cost in €
Return train ticket	Ascoli Piceno (Italy) - Vienna	500
Stay for 4 weeks in Vienna	Accommodation	600
	Living expenses	1200
	Public Transport	150
Network mapping equipment	Markers, paper, figurines, etc	150
<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>2600</b>
Overheads 15%	incurred by RE4D.net*	390
<b>Total</b>		<b>2990</b>

\*RE4D.net is my research company, which will provide the infrastructure and equipment for the study. Together with my wife I run RE4D.net from our home office in Ascoli Piceno, Italy. See [www.re4d.net](http://www.re4d.net) for more on Research & Evaluation for Development.

## Sources:

Ashoff, Guido (2005) *Der entwicklungspolitische Kohärenzanspruch: Begründung, Anerkennung und Wege zu seiner Umsetzung*. Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik

CEPS (2206) *Policy Coherence for Development in the EU Council Strategies for the Way Forward*, 2006

'The European Consensus on Development' December 2005 (OJ 2006/c 46/01)

EC (2005) "Policy Coherence for Development – Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals" – COM(2005)134 final of 12 April 2005.

EC (2007) 'Commission Staff Working Paper accompanying the *EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development*'. COM(2007)545 final

ECDPM (2005) 'Assessment of the EC Development Policy': DPS Study Report

ECPDM et al (2007), *Evaluation Study on the EU Institutions' & Member States' Mechanisms for Promoting Policy Coherence for Development*, 2007, p. 6

Hack, B & N. Schuster (2008) 'Instrument zur Umsetzung von Politikkohärenz auf Parlamentsebene' in: *Politik-Kohärenz im Dienste der Entwicklung*. GEZA, Vienna

Hertin, Julia and Frans Berkhout (2003) 'Analysing Institutional Strategies for Environmental Policy Integration: The Case of EU Enterprise Policy' in: *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 2003, 39–56

Lafferty, William M. and Eivind Hovden (2002) 'Environmental Policy Integration: Towards an Analytical Framework?'. ProSus, Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo

Nilsson, Mans and Asa Persson(2003) 'Framework for Analysing Environmental Policy Integration' in: *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, Vol. 5, No. 4, December 2003, 333–359

Obrovsky, Michael (2007) 'Entwicklungspolitische Kohärenz: Zu den erweiterten politischen Rahmenbedingungen für mehr Wirksamkeit in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit'. ÖFSE Working Paper

OECD (2002) 'Improving Policy Coherence and Integration: A Checklist': OECD Policy Brief

OECD (2005) 'Policy Coherence for Development: Promoting Institutional Good Practice', The Development Dimension, Paris

OECD DAC (2006) *Whole-of-Government Approaches to Fragile States: DAC Guidelines and Reference Series*

Patton, M (2008) *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*, 4<sup>th</sup>ed, Sage Publications

Picciotto, Robert (2004) *Policy Coherence for Development: a Background Note*