

Civil Society Engagement in PSIA Processes: A review

Kate Bird
Stefanie Busse
Enrique Mendizabal

February 2007

Overseas Development Institute
111 Westminster Bridge Road
London
SE1 7JD
UK

Executive Summary

Since the first wave of pilots commissioned by DFID and the World Bank/IMF in 2001, Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) has become more widely used as an analytical tool in policy-making processes. Some are concerned about the lack of involvement of civil society in the design, formulation and implementation of PSIA.

This study was commissioned by the Bratislava Regional Centre of the UNDP and was undertaken by a small team of consultants in a tight timeframe.

The paper draws on a review of the international literature to introduce PSIA processes and it then reviews civil society's experience of engagement with PSIAs, and presents three case studies (Uganda, Armenia and Bolivia) as examples¹. The paper then goes on to identify entry points for future civil society engagement and propose a range of tools that civil society actors might draw on to maximise the effectiveness of their future engagement.

How PSIAs came about

Poverty and Social Impact Analyses (PSIAs) are generally *ex-ante* studies examining the likely social and poverty related impacts of a particular policy change. Drawing on a broad toolkit of methods, they attempt to predict the distribution of benefit and loss that will be generated by a proposed policy change. This form of *ex ante* analysis is particularly important to those groups who are likely to be adversely affected by the policy change as it enables policy makers either to change or modify the policy choice, or to supplement it with mitigating measures.

Recent shifts in aid architecture have boosted the need for evidence-based policy-making. The introduction of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the increased proportion of aid channelled through general budget support have increased donor focus on the quality of the governance structures. The new aid architecture places greater emphasis on national ownership of development strategies and on the management of national resources and finances. Many donors are keen to support improved national policy formation and budgetary processes as a way of improving the development outcomes of the aid delivered and also reducing levels of fiduciary risk. In many countries, there is evidence that these new aid modalities, particularly PRSPs, have opened up policy debates to national stakeholders. They have provided an opportunity for a national cadre of experts to be developed that are capable of good quality poverty and policy analysis. In this context it is hoped that PSIAs will support good policy formation and implementation which will maximise the poverty reduction impact, or support the identification of measures to mitigate negative impacts on specific groups.

¹ The UNDP and ODI team selected the countries for these case studies, and conducted the analysis through email-based questionnaires and telephone interviews (see Annex 2 for a list of respondents). In Uganda and Armenia, local consultants have also been involved in liaising with civil society organisations in support of this study. Due to time constraints, respondents were largely self-selecting interviewees who responded positively to an invitation from the UNDP to participate in the study.

Challenges of implementing PSIAs...

This paper highlights a number of issues connected to the implementation of PSIA processes: the nature and quality of in-country capacity to carry out PSIAs; problems accessing quality data; and the rapid production of PSIAs if they are to provide real-time policy analysis.

The role of civil society...

Experience has shown that civil society organisations (CSOs) have had limited opportunities to engage in PSIA processes and in places where they have been active, their influence on policy has been limited. This is due to a range of reasons. Many PSIAs have been inaccessible to national CSOs due to their complex and highly technical content. In addition the nature of civil society engagement has been influenced by differences around the perceived audiences for, and purposes of, PSIAs (i.e. a tool to stimulate national debate or for internal consumption by donors), and in some countries civil society has been excluded from PSIA processes to a lesser or greater extent.

This paper shows that where a proposed policy change is highly contentious, civil society has commonly been kept at arms length, arguably to enable government to implement the policy change they desire while limiting public debate. However, in contrast, there are cases where civil society has been invited to participate in highly charged PSIA discussions in order to widen understanding of the government's rationale for the proposed policy change.

PSIAs do create opportunities for CSOs to improve their own ability to engage effectively in policy discussions. Similarly, donors can take advantage of this opportunity to find and support CSOs to engage in future PSIAs. However, ensuring meaningful civil society participation also relies on the design of a particular PSIA (and surrounding processes), and donors and PSIA consultants need to be sensitive to a number of issues:

- power differences in each society
- the political nature of PSIA
- the political context

Conclusions and recommendations for the international community to strengthen civil society engagement in PSIA...

This study shows that the main barrier for civil society engagement is lack of awareness of PSIAs and their relevance for CSOs, followed by capacity constraints and a lack of access to information and to PSIA processes. The international community can assist CSOs by providing information and training about the PSIA process. CSOs that seek to engage in PSIAs need to have a thorough understanding of the policy context, the role of evidence in policy-making, as well as technical skills. Networks and partnerships between CSOs, research institutes, and development agencies working with civil society can help CSOs to develop technical skills and to acquire access to information.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Nune Yeghiazaryan and Oceng Apell who supported data collection for the Armenia and Uganda case studies, respectively. We would also like to thank Sarah Hague (Save the Children UK), Lucy Hayes, (Eurodad), Renate Kirsch, John Newman, Mesky Brhane (World Bank), Juan-Carlos Requena, and all other respondents (listed in Annex 2). These people gave generously of their time and provided invaluable insights into PSIA-related processes.

We would also like to thank Alison Evans, Geoff Prewitt and Craig Fagan for their useful comments on an earlier draft and Sarah Wooldridge for her practical support.

(Please note that the authors' names are presented in alphabetical order, and do not necessarily represent the weight of their contribution to this report).

Disclaimer

Any errors in the evidence, analysis and the argument presented here are entirely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Overseas Development Institute or UNDP.

Acronyms

CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DFID	Department for International Development
EU	European Union
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
IFI	International Financial Institutions
IMF	International Monetary Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDBS	Multi-Donor Budget Support
MDF	Multi-Donor Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Assessment
PRSC	Poverty Reduction Support Credit (World Bank)
PRGF	Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSC	Poverty Reduction Support Credit
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Assessment
TIPS	Tools for Institutional and Political Social Analysis
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WTO	World Trade Organization

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Structure of the report	1
1.2	Our approach	2
2.	PSIAs in Context	3
2.1	What are PSIAs?	3
2.2	The emergence of social impact assessment and the PSIA approach	3
2.3	PSIA in the policy process.....	4
2.4	Steps in PSIA-selection process, implementation and dissemination of.....	5
2.5	Actors in the PSIA process.....	10
2.6	PSIA pilots and current PSIA activity	10
2.7	Challenges in the implementation of PSIAs	15
3.	Civil Society and the PSIA process	19
3.1	What is Civil Society?	19
3.2	Civil society engagement in policy change.....	19
3.3	Using power-analysis to help to understand the limited role of CSOs in the PSIA .. process.....	20
3.4.	Civil society participation in PSIAs	22
4.	Country case studies	32
4.1	Methodology.....	32
4.2	Uganda.....	32
4.3	Armenia	34
4.4	Bolivia.....	36
5.	Key findings from the country case studies.....	38
6.	Main Conclusions and Recommendations	40
6.1	Conclusion.....	40
6.2	Recommendations for the International Community in promoting CSO involvement in PSIA	41
	Bibliography	44

List of Boxes and Diagrams

Figure 1: PSIA in the policy process	5
Figure 2: Linking policy change to impact at the household level	8
Figure 3: Sectoral distribution of PSIAs	11
Figure 4: Geographical spread of PSIAs	11
Box 1: Key elements of the PSIA approach	6
Box 2: Criteria for selecting reforms for PSIA	6
Box 3: Institutional analysis	9
Box 4: Designing and implementing PSIA – the example of Ghana	12
Box 5: PSIA activity: The World Bank	13
Box 6: PSIA activity: EUROWAD	13
Box 7: PSIA activity: The IMF	14
Box 8: PSIA activity: Bi-lateral donors	14
Box 9: Summary: The key principles of good PSIA process	18
Box 10: Gaventa's Power Cube	20
Box 11: PSIA and the Power Cube	21
Box 12: Civil society participation in PSIA – some examples	23
Box 13: Shaping the policy agenda	24
Box 14: CSOs and policy engagement: an example from Kenya	25
Box 15: Skills necessary for research-based engagement in PSIAs	25
Box 16: CSOs and research: the case of ESRF, Tanzania	26
Box 17: Improving understanding of Policy Processes: Context Assessments	27
Box 18: Case study: Policy process mapping and SME policy development in Egypt	27
Box 19: Entry points and vehicles for stakeholder participation	29
Table 1: Typology of civil society organisations	22
Table 2: Opportunities for and the barriers to CSO involvement	30
Table 3: PSIA in Uganda	33
Table 4: PSIA in Armenia	34
Table 5: PSIA in Bolivia	36

Annexes

Annex 1: Interview questionnaire	47
Annex 2: List of informants	48
Annex 3: RAPID Framework	50

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_12742

