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Abstract

The degree to which the NGO potential is realized depends on many factors. A paramount factor is the nature of the relationship between the NGO sector and the state. Government policies and attitudes have a pivotal influence on the capacity of NGOs to operate and grow. A better understanding of factors affecting the relationship between the two actors at local government level, where NGOs are operational, helps maximize the development inputs by NGOs, the development of policies regulating the sector as well as shape the direction of future action for smooth relation in development discourse. This research work, therefore, endeavors to generate ideas that would be useful for smooth management and incorporation of resources the sector brings into the economy by fostering enabling policy environment. To this end, investigation of policies that regulate the operation of NGOs, major areas of complaint by both parties, other subsidiary factors such as institutional arrangements, economic and political factors inhibiting smooth operation of the sector in the region are dealt with in detail.

The study was undertaken in National Regional State of Oromia. A stratified sampling procedure was employed to collect primary data from government institutions at all levels (federal, regional zonal and district levels) believed to have direct relevance with the issue at hand. Respondents reached include high government officials; professionals working on NGO related posts and NGO project personnel from 35 NGOs, both indigenous and international. The survey result indicated that, though the commitment of the government to regulate, coordinate and encourage NGOs is reflected in various policy documents, adequate effort and due attention has not been given to translate policy statements into action. The government lacked institutional capacity to enforce its own making. Furthermore, the policy regulation and its guiding procedures for legality are found to be tedious, tiresome, bureaucratic, apart from being obsolete to conform to present realities on ground.

Thus, identifying and understanding the various elements that are responsible for lack of smooth relations between the actors in regions like Oromia, where almost a third of NGOs operational in the country are stationed, deserves urgent research undertaking. The research findings, will for sure contribute immense input in guiding policy decisions, and improvement in the management of the NGO sector at sub-regional, regional and national levels.
CHAPTER ONE

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

In developing countries, the issue of poverty is a primary agenda. In 1993, there were ten countries, labeled as the poorest by the World Bank. Out of these, eight of them were found in Africa. In these countries, food production has fallen far short of the population growth. The worst decline in per capita food production have been recorded in Ethiopia, Angola, Sudan, Somalia and Mozambique, mainly attributed to drought, war, and government failures to put "good" policies in place (Bigsten, et al 1999).

In order to get out of this impasse, development theorists have formulated a series of options. From among the various options forwarded, international actors such as the NGOs was one alternative route pursued by various multilateral, bilateral and international banks such as the World Bank (WB) to channel development assistance, especially to local development initiatives to developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, since the last three to four decades. Ethiopia is one of these developing countries that is progressively experiencing NGO involvement in overall national development and poverty reduction endeavors.

As the effort to reduce poverty is a multi-dimensional, multi-sectoral and continuous process, NGOs have been long involved in the development of Ethiopia by investing in various development activities and implementing programs designed for poverty reduction. The PRSP initiative launched in 2001, in particular, has brought a new dimension for NGOs to participate in programs geared towards sustainable development and poverty reduction in the country. Through participation in the country's poverty reduction efforts, NGOs endeavored to increase transparency in resource use and decision-making among actors, citizen's participation in design of development programs and economic efficiency of development activities.
Effective NGO resource input and enhanced local development calls for coordination and management of relationship between all concerned stakeholders, including state governments, other NGOs, and target beneficiaries. This is very important because actor's creativity and efficiency largely derives from the relationships they seek to maintain with a wide range of actors and agencies they interact with in informal and formal networks.

Taking into account the role coordination among various actors has in promoting development activities and fight against the ever-increasing poverty among citizens, state governments is investing huge amounts of resources to guide development activities. In Ethiopia, the government is engaged in huge capacity building programs, institutional arrangements at all levels in almost all sectors of the economy, and formulation of various legislatives, policy guidelines and directives to effect change from the various development interventions underway in the country. One of such policy documents is the National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management (NPDPM), introduced in 1995 to guide the operation of NGOs in Ethiopia. Cognizant of the need for a coordinated action by all NGOs in the country, Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA), which is the sole umbrella organization for NGOs in Ethiopia, also established a NGO PRSP Task Force to voice the concerns of the poor on formulation of SDPRP and coordinate partnership relationship between actors (MoFED, 2002).

Smooth Government-NGO relationship and stakeholders' participation ensures that projects are more efficient, effective and sustainable. Such projects remain efficient as they build on wide knowledge pool of various actors, through transparency in project formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of project activities, eventually gearing towards ensuring their sustainability by empowering target beneficiaries for efficient management afterwards.

There is a huge unearthed wealth in the NGO sector in Oromia. Given the large areal expanse and strategic position of the region, the extent of this unearthed resource could be immense. The realization and transpiration of such huge wealth is deemed possible only under motivating, inviting, accommodating as well as challenging NGO-government relations.
However, like most poverty stricken countries of the developing world, Ethiopia and its subject region Oromia, is not at the position to effectively guide and coordinate endeavors being waged by various development actors. Major problems frequently raised in this regard included lack of coordination among stakeholders, unconducive policy environment for smooth development projects execution, capacity constraints, and unhealthy government-NGO relations in various aspects of NGO programs operation and management.

1.2. Statement of the problem

NGOs became important actors in development in the mid 1980s. These moves by the NGOs gained momentum only recently particularly, in the countries of the south. Unlike in many countries of the north where NGOs have deep historical roots Charlton and May, (1995); Fernades (1994), in most developing countries of Sub-Sahara African countries like Ethiopia, NGOs are only of recent phenomenon. Some researchers, however, confirm that NGOs have been actors on the development stage for several decades, longer than the World Bank (WB), the United Nations (UN) or any other official aid agency (UNECA, 1995).

In Ethiopia, the role of NGOs in development ventures is not adequately investigated before the great famine of 1985/86 (Tegegne, 1994). Before this period, such organizations as the World Food Program (WFP), the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the European Union (EU) have actively participated in development ventures, particularly in areas such as emergency and rehabilitation activities (Solomon and Yeraswork 1985). Although Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) of various types based on social, religious, locality or kinship criteria are a relatively old phenomenon in the country; their overall impact on development interventions is, rather poorly documented.

Enabling change is the essential purpose of NGOs. All NGOs focus on changing the world to make it a better living place, through participating in poverty reduction endeavors, delivery of services, capacity building of local communities, and advocacy works. The attainment of these basics of development requires NGOs assume the roles of resource mobilization, deliverers of
services, builders of capacity and institutions, advocates for the poor, influencers of public policy at local, national and international levels.

Poverty reduction requires, not only the concerted efforts of actors like the state and the NGOs, but also cooperation among them and coordination of resources to effectively reach the needy community. John Clark (1992:153) suggests that both the state and the NGOs reap benefit from cooperation. From an NGO perspective, smooth relationship and cooperation offers possibilities of scaling-up the impact of their projects, rapid processing of registration documents and exemption from import duties, while from the perspective of the state, collaborative relationship offers learning from NGO approaches through interaction with them, smooth coordination of projects thereby securing the service of national priorities, a non-confrontational and effective way of monitoring NGO activities and smooth inflow of donor funding into the country.

Like most developing countries of the world, the development of Ethiopia is currently supported by the NGO sector, in addition to the multilateral, bilateral and regional funding agencies. Since 1991 Ethiopia has been undergoing a series of changes in the system of government and government policy environments. Following the series of changes that was taking place, above all, the new government’s adoption of liberal democratic political system encouraged the mushrooming of NGOs in the country. The number of NGOs, which have been working with the Dergue government, drastically increased from 60 to 458 nationwide in 2001 (DPPC, 2001).

For smooth work relationships, government requires NGOs to register and follow the policy guidelines of the country in their operations. This helps the government to inspect the flow of foreign resources into the country, the operation of NGOs, facilitate the provision of support services to NGOs and incorporate NGO resources into national/regional economy by working in partnership. Furthermore, the formulation of policy guidelines helps to avoid open confrontation with government agencies. Lack of policy framework often creates a situation where political influence rather than the use of empirical information determine where and how NGOs can work (Mungate, 1993:28).
Although many NGOs in Ethiopia have been established recently and have limited experience and capacity, it is necessary to strengthen them and maximize their effectiveness by working on the constraining policy environment in which NGOs operate. UNDAF (2001) perceives that the most serious problem for NGOs working in Ethiopia is their financial resource limitation, while on the other hand; the Ethiopian government perceives NGOs as competitors for resources and some, as being antagonistic to national interests. This suggests that the Ethiopian government has not accepted the full participation of NGOs in development programs of the country, though it has accepted NGOs as partners at least on policy grounds.

Government imposed regulations and reporting requirements do not seem to nurture NGO growth and guard against corruption, management ill discipline and other malpractices. Restrictive laws and procedures designed for the political control of NGOs definitely hamper legitimate NGOs. As a legitimate government, there is nothing wrong with sensitive coordination and regulation of NGOs in the country, unless it ends up in controlling NGOs. Authentic and fair coordination encourages NGOs to avoid duplication, attend to sectoral or geographic gaps, eliminate religious or ethnic biases, and avoid activities which are unrealistic or which contradict state programs.

Government-NGO relations are manifested in different ways in development discourse. Cooperative and collaborative relationship between actors like the state and the NGOs paves the way for smooth project appraisal and approval processes, and participation of target beneficiaries in matters that directly affect subject communities' every day life. This and other related factors will surely help to reduce the costs of development projects, keep the sustainability of project activities and develop sense of ownership among target beneficiaries.

Despite the numerous efforts being made by the government and the NGO sector, the extent of poverty in the country has remained alarmingly high. One salient characteristic of development interventions and poverty reduction endeavors in Ethiopia is the lack of coordination between actors like the government and non-governmental organizations (UNDP, 2002).

This study is confined to NGO-Government relations of NGOs working in Oromia region. Currently about 247 NGOs are working with the regional government of Oromia (Regional
Their involvement is changing over time from mere participation in emergency and rehabilitation works to contributing to development inputs of the region. This research work strives to investigate the relationship between regional government and NGOs operational in the region, the policy environment in which NGOs operate, their place in official development assistance, institutional and personnel capacity to coordinate and enforce the policy regulation as well as the actors' willingness to work in partnership and finally, find out the major challenges to enhanced government-NGO relations in the region.

1.3. Objectives of the research

The general objective of the research is to assess the overall factors that enhance or retard NGO-local government relations and the operation of NGOs at a sub-national level. More specifically, the research work endeavors to address the following specific objectives.

- To identify the geographic and sectoral intervention areas of NGOs in the region;
- To explore government policy regulation pursued at different levels (federal and regional) to guide the operation of NGOs, and identify possible policy gaps, if any;
- To identify the common challenges confronted both by government and its agencies to enforce the policy guideline and by the NGO sector to implement the general NGO operations guideline;
- To explore local government-NGO partnership relationship and extent of adherence to the government introduced partnership relationship modalities;
- To investigate the two actors' perception and attitude towards one another, significance of NGO sectors' resource input in the regions' development, extent of NGO resources integration with regional/national economy and recent development in local government-NGO relations.

1.4. Research questions raised in the study

1. What are the major areas of NGO intervention in the region and how significant are they?
2. What is the general NGO regulation guideline under which NGOs are operating? Are there constraining measures in the national/regional government NGO regulation guidelines?

3. Do NGOs and government agencies have the will and the capacity to work in partnership with one another? How good are they in complying with the basic principles of partnership?

4. Are government agencies any good in NGO regulation policy implementation? If not, what factors limit their effectiveness?

5. Are NGO development resources integrated into regional/national development endeavors?

1.5. Significance of the study

Why is this topic so important in the current Ethiopian context? In Ethiopia, and Oromia, in particular, the importance of NGOs in development ventures is not adequately investigated. Therefore, the study will have at least four significant inputs.

- It helps to know the situation better,
- It helps to understand factors determining the relationship between the two actors,
- It helps to design development interventions in such away the two actors complement one another,
- It helps to understand the appropriateness of the existing institutional-set-up to coordinate, monitor and evaluate NGOs and their operations in light of the current dynamic mushrooming of NGOs since the last decade.

1.6. Methodology of the research

1.6.1. Introduction

This chapter shows how the research was executed - the conceptual framework, the research tools and others. It describes the study phases, including the target groups, which were interviewed and to which questionnaires were distributed. It also explains how the interviews and questionnaires
were conducted and identifies problems encountered. Finally, the description of data processing procedures is presented.

1.6.2. Methodology of the research and types of data

Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies are employed in the research. This methodology is preferred because:

- The data and information used were generated using various data collection methods including interviews, observation, and different documents review, which makes it qualitative oriented, and
- Employed structured questionnaires, which supplemented the qualitative data with quantitative figures like statistical data.

This research methodology is chosen for mere reasons of the difficulties surrounding quantification and lack of empirical measurement of policy elements, such as the one governing the operation of NGOs in the country. The quantitative and qualitative data and information used in the research are indicated below.

1.6.2.1. Quantitative data

In the research, periodic and other statistical reports by different government bodies are used. There are three types of periodic statistical reports used in the research. These are:

- Statistical reports by the Central Statistical Authority (CSA).
- Statistical reports by Oromia Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BoFED), and Oromia Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC).
- Apart from statistical reports, there are also other quantitative data used in the research which include:

  - Geographical information of the Oromia Region as well as,
  - The number of NGO investment projects and amount of NGO capital in the region as a whole.
1.6.2.2 Qualitative information

Qualitative data and information are those that are expressed in words rather than numbers. This research explains how the NGO regulation policy framework performs, the possible benefits obtained from the involvement of NGOs in development and the problems encountered. This study used qualitative information including:

i. Theoretical information on the concept of NGO-Government relations and NGO communities' involvement in development. This qualitative information includes the definition, the determinants of NGO-Government relations as stipulated in the general theoretical framework. This type of information, as the name implies, is presented in the theoretical framework of the research.

ii. NGO regulation and policy guidelines of the federal government and the region. Such qualitative information are those particularly, concerned with the operation of NGO programs in the country as a whole. Among the most prominent rules and regulations that are used in the research are the federal NGO regulation and NGO operations guideline, the Oromia Regional State region specific guideline and other regulations which have been provided for the establishment and operations of both international and indigenous NGOs. Some of the guidelines and policy directives are discussed in Chapter five, which includes explanation of the legal frameworks of the operation of NGOs in the region.

iii. Views and perspectives of senior as well as lower level signatory government agencies' workers and officials working at different levels are also highly valued. Information from such sources is important indicators of NGO-Government relations.

iv. Evaluation reports and studies concerning the operation of NGOs in the region. These reports and studies are used to support the findings of the research and to represent an initial observation so that further investigation could be conducted in the research.
1.6.3. Data collection methods

In the research, both primary and secondary data collection methods have been used and these data collection methods are discussed below.

1.6.3.1. Primary data collection methods

Some of the most important primary data collection methods employed was interviews, group discussions and administration of survey questionnaires. The following paragraphs are used to describe these primary data collection methods.

i. Interviews

Interviews were administered with key informants assumed to have particular knowledge on the issue of Government-NGO business, either from experience, political position or professional capacity. Accordingly, 12 relevant persons were interview and their responses were recorded Table 2 presents the profile of key informants.

ii. Group discussions

In the conduct of the group discussion the researcher followed a simple and an easy form. Initially, a preliminary analysis of information obtained from interviewing the relevant key informants and survey of the necessary documents about the operation of the NGO sector in the region was made. Based on an overview of the results collected from the interview and the survey of documents, a number of issues were raised in line with the focus of each particular group in which the discussion were conducted.

The discussions were made with two distinct groups.

Department head and relevant experts of the Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) of Oromia region;
East Showa Zone Administration line offices' officials and relevant experts collectively at zonal DPPD;

Table: - 1 Profile of key informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government concerned officials:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal DPPC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia Region Concerned Officials and experts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oromia DPPC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oromia BoFED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Showa zone Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zonal DPPD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zonal FEDD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zonal Health Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zonal education Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Survey questionnaires

Three sets of questionnaires; one for the Oromia Regional Government at regional and zonal levels, for the NGO sector and another for CRDA was developed. Aspects on which data were collected include:

- Regional NGO regulations guideline;
- NGO programs coordination, project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation issues;
- Partners' institutional and resource capacity,
- NGO programs sustainability and scaling up issues.
Overall 35 NGOs, of which 10 were international and 25 indigenous were surveyed to collect information. The 10 international NGOs were selected purposely, while the local ones were reached on random bases.

1.6.3.2. Secondary data collection methods

One of the most important secondary data collection methods is review of relevant theoretical literatures on the concept of the 3rd sector, particularly NGOs. Books, articles in journals, newspapers, magazines ...etc. are some of the sources of secondary data. Moreover, federal as well as regional reports concerning aspects of NGO participation in the region's socio-economic development process, documents and official papers that exhibit the status of NGO activities, are also used as secondary sources of data.

1.6.4. Data analysis

Quantitative as well as qualitative data were used to conduct the research evaluation reports. Project implementation reports and other quantitative reports were presented in the research so that any body interested can grasp the situation of NGOs operation in the region.

Qualitative data analysis has also been made. Information obtained from written-up field notes, transcriptions, and other forms has been selected, abstracted and transformed into useable data in the research. To conduct the qualitative data analysis, several steps have been made, for instance, in the questionnaire; close-ended 'yes or no' questions were used, which enabled the responses to be coded and quantified. The development of a semi-structured questionnaire with 'yes or no' questions helped not only to quantify responses but also to make initial summaries of the responses of respondents.

1.6.5. Sampling

Primarily, the sampling technique employed in the research is a cluster sampling technique. There are four clusters or groups out of which sampling units have been selected. These clusters are:
At the federal government level:
- The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and

At the Oromia regional government level:
Regional Co-signatory Bureaus including
- The Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BoFED); and
- The Regional Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission of Oromia (DPPC).

At zonal administration level:
- Department of Finance and Economic Development (DoFED);
- Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Department (DPPD);

At district level:
- Adama District Administration office, which is the sole government body responsible for coordination of NGO, related activities.

These samples are being taken as a compromise between the minimum essential and what is desirable.

The zonal administration selected for this study is East Showa zone. Selection of the zone is done purposely for the following main reasons.
- Structurally and administratively, the zone is one of the strongest in the region. It is relatively better endowed with natural resources, administrative capacity and skilled manpower than almost all zones of the regions.
- The existence of relatively numerous NGOs in the zone, both international and indigenous for analysis of the study at hand. East Showa zone could probably be the only zone where NGOs are rapidly increasing in number and amount of capital outlay,
- Ease of accessing the required data from both the NGO sector and coordinating government agencies at all levels (federal, regional, zonal and district levels);
- Availability of transportation facility to the zone, which is considered essential, given the limited time and research fund available,
1.6.6. Drawing conclusions

In order to draw conclusions, several approaches were pursued. First, the data and information collected from the documents had to be analyzed with descriptive statistics and analytical methods. Second, an attempt was made to link the qualitative data analysis with the quantitative data analysis. Third, independent evidence from the statistical abstracts, federal government reports, the regional reports, various NGO reports and published literature were used. Results of these approaches were organized and put into the analysis of the research.

1.6.7. Limitations of the research methodology

The methodology employed in the research has a number of limitations, some of which are discussed below.

1. Selection of key informants
Selection of a key informant requires a prolonged study. It is not enough to pick the top government officials and experts to be the main informants. Key informants are key observers as well. The lowest rural based residents have not been included in the research as key informants.

2. Small size of sampling units
The size of sampling unit intended to study in the research is small. It was not possible to make the samples bigger because of time and fund constraints.

3. Use of secondary sources
These sources, in some cases, could be incomplete or incorrect.

4. Problem of easy access to information
There was immense problem to access information from the NGOs and concerned government institutions. Some NGOs and government institutions have limited attention to exhibit their views and perspectives about the relationship between them.
1.7. The study area

1.7.1. Socio-economic background

Oromia region is the largest of the 10 regional states of Ethiopia. The region is important in terms of population, output levels and resource endowment. It has vast tract of fertile land, large numbers of livestock, wildlife reserves and beautiful tourist attraction areas. However, just like most regions of the country, the level of utilization and mobilization of its resource is at a minimum level.

The majority of the population of the region is engaged in primary sector activities, where the margin of return is low that it is a little more than subsistence level. Like in many other places in the region, there is a wide prevalence of poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy and other social disadvantages in the region.

There are also wide economic and social disparities among the zones and districts in the region. There are places that are relatively better in the availability and access to basic infrastructure facilities than in other places in the region itself. There are zones like Guji, Borena, Bale, West and East Wollega, where basic provision of social services and availability and access to resources are poorly developed.

The region extends from extreme East to extreme West dissecting the country into north and south, extending to the south eastern with extensive protrusion to the south of the country. It covers the majority of the Great East African Rift Valley System. Geographically, it extends from 3°40'-10°46'N latitudes and 34°08'-42°55'E longitudes. According to the Central Statistical Authority (CSA) 2005, the region has an estimated population of 26.55 million (35.92 percent of the population of the country) and an estimated area of 353.01 thousand km². The region is surrounded by seven regional states, including the Federal and regional capital of Oromia, Addis Ababa and shares boundary in the north by Benishangul-Gumuz, Amhara and Afar, in the east by Somali, and in the south SNNP region. Internationally it shares boundary with Sudan in the west and Kenya in the south. The region embraces fourteen administrative zones, 180 districts and 375
urban centers. Table 3 shows the area, number of districts and urban centers in the region (CSA, 2005). Annex 3 provides map of the regional state of Oromia.

1.8.1. Demographic characteristics

In July 2005, the population of the region was estimated at 26.55 million where 23.47 million were rural and 3.08 million urban based (CSA). This makes the region the most populous in Ethiopia. The average family size per household is estimated at 4.8 (4.6 for urban and 4.9 for rural). The crude population density was 75.2 persons/km², varying from 27 persons/km² in Bale to 312.9 persons/km² in Shashemene district of East Showa zone (CSA, 2005). For detail information refer to Annex 2.
CHAPTER TWO

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 What are NGOs?

Defining NGOs is not a simple task. NGOs are diverse in their nature, origins, structures, purposes they pursue and the varied interest groups and ideologies they represent. Thus, different scholars are seen defining NGOs as it appeared to them, depending upon the specific situation they are confronted with. The following are some definitions given by different scholars.

Charnovitz (1997:185): According to Charnovitz there are two strands to the attempts to define NGOs. The first strand relates to NGOs as groups of individuals organized for the myriad of reasons that engage human immigration and aspiration. He suggests that the term NGO usually refers to organizations, which play an international role in environment, human rights, or disaster-relief. Writers like Charnovitz documented the emergence of NGOs as actors on the international stage from anti-slave-trade movements to peace groups in the League of Nations era and the growth of the formal NGO role as recognized by the United Nations Charter.

The second type of definition is focused more broadly on the idea that NGOs are organizations concerned with social and economic change—an agenda normally associated with the concept of development. This emphasizes NGOs as an agency engaged in development or relief work at local, national and international levels.

Salamon and Anheier (1992): According to these researchers any not-for-profit organization has to qualify the following five key characteristics in order to be considered as NGO:

i. It is formal, that is, the organization is institutionalized in that it has regular meetings, office bearers, and some organizational permanence;

ii. It is private in that it is institutionally separate from government, though it may receive some support from government;
iii. It is non-profit, distributing and if a financial surplus is generated it does not accrue to owners or directors;
iv. It is self-governing and therefore, able to control and manage its own affairs;
v. It is voluntary, and even if it does not use volunteer staff as such, there is at least some degree of voluntary participation in the conduct or management of the organization, such as in the form of a voluntary board of directors.

**Courier, as cited by Tegegne (1994:8):** For an organization to be an NGO in the true sense, it must fulfill the following criteria.

i. Autonomous: that is, it must be neither dependent substantially on the state for its funds nor be holden by the government in pursuit of its objectives;

ii. Non-profit making, i.e., the funds it acquires must be destined exhaustively for the project it undertakes;

iii. The major part of its fund should come from voluntary contribution; and

iv. Out-reach focus, that is, its activities are intended to benefit non-members.

**OECD, 1988:14 as cited in Campbell W. (1996):** NGOs are organizations established and governed by a group of private citizens for a stated philanthropic purpose, and supported by voluntary individual contributions.

**CRDA, (1999):** NGOs are voluntary, not-for-profit, non-self serving, non-governmental, non-partisan and independent organization or association involved in the promotion of social justice and development.

As can be understood from the various definitions cited, definitions offered to the term vary from researcher to researcher and from context to context depending on specificity of situation under which they were conceived. Whatever the appropriate definition of the term may be, throughout this research paper, wide reference is made to the definition provided by Salamon and Anheier (1992).
2.2 Categories of NGOs

NGOs vary significantly in their structure, and in the nature of their operations. The category of NGO includes (David L. 2001) large, bureaucratic organizations with multi-million dollar budgets as well as small, informal, local initiatives. Some NGOs are engaged in long-term community development work, others provide short-term emergency relief in response to natural disasters or human calamities created by conflict.

In the field of development, NGOs range from large, and Northern1 based charities such as CARE, Oxfam and World Vision to Community Based Self-Help groups in the South2 (World Bank, 2001). The World Bank group identifies two major categories of development NGOs.

i. Operational NGOs: These are NGOs whose primary purpose is the design and implementation of development-related projects. These NGOs include Community Based Organizations (CBOs), which serve a specific population in a narrow geographic area; national organizations, which operate in individual developing country and international organizations, which are typically, head quartered in developed countries and carry out operations in more than one developing country.

ii. Advocacy NGOs: These are NGOs whose primary purpose is to defend or promote a specific cause and seek to influence the policies and practices of both the Bank and host countries policies. Korten (1990) sees advocacy as a mature and developmentally sound NGO activity.

2.3 NGOs in development discourse

The growing stature of NGOs in development is related to the decline of the state as the dominant development actor. There has been paradigm shift since the 1970's in the attitudes of donors and development policy-makers, away from state-centered development models towards participatorier, bottom-up approaches. In this regard, NGOs have been praised, for the role they can play in development. The paradigm shift away from the state towards NGOs has created a set
of oppositional views of NGOs and governments. (Sanyal, 1994) asserts that NGOs are small and thus, less bureaucratic. He further asserts the advantages NGOs have over the public sector in development discourse as under.

- NGOs operate closer to beneficiaries and have greater knowledge of local resources and indigenous technology;
- They are neither coercive nor profit-seeking, focusing rather on empowerment and economic well-being;
- Have a holistic, cross-sectoral view of development and,
- They work in opposition to state policies through solidarity with the poor.

Apart from this Korten, (1990) and Clark, (1991) outline several reasons for the increasing visibility and influence of NGOs in development spheres. To mention some, first there are a number of ‘success stories’ illustrating the potential of local organizations to provide innovative, participatory and 'sustainable' solutions to rural development problems. Those who criticize mainstream development efforts see NGOs as a means through which 'alternative development, which involves the "empowerment" of disadvantaged groups can be effected (Friedman, 1992).

There are also reports that explain the "retreats of the state" within developing countries. These reports argue that local areas, especially local NGOs are in a position to fill the space left by the states withdrawal from production of services and organizational activities (Nugent, 1993).

Currently, these processes are influenced by both internal and external factors. Edwards and Hulme, assert that there is disillusionment among many development donors accustomed to working only with governments in many parts of the world. Since the last two decades there is a growing evidence of poor results of government projects and programs, which motivated donor to search for alternative channels for development assistance (Edwards and Hulme 1995).

Even then however, these same literatures suspect NGOs accountability to resources channeled through them. Studies undertaken by such searchers as Riddell (1999) for donor agencies were frequently less than flattering about the realities of the claims made by and on behalf of development NGOs. The studies found that many of the taken-for granted advantages and
achievements attributed to NGOs could not be uncritically assumed, and showed that the positive press which NGOs often received was in some cases based more on wishful thinking than on hard facts (Riddle, 1999).

Scholars like Rahnema et al. (1985) assert that because of issues related with NGO accountability, legitimacy to act on behalf of the poor, effectiveness and their eventual sustainability, there is an obvious danger of trusting NGOs simply because they are different from the state. Clark (1990), contend that one should be cautious in evaluating actors such as NGOs. Still some others note that a substantial majority of NGOs, working with the poor are committed to relieving the immediate consequences of poverty giving little attention to issues related to development theory. Thus, many question NGOs success in tackling poverty as they claim. As a report by UNDP (1993 in UNO 1995) shows, poor communities helped by successful NGO projects, remain poor, and what NGOs end up doing is weakening government in the long run and perpetuating its inefficiencies. (UNDP 1993 in UNO 1995) and quoted by David L. (2001).

One of the most hard-hitting critiques in the discussion of NGO-Government relations centers on the problem of accountability and NGO efficiency. NGOs are seen relatively as unaccountable to local citizens (Sanyal, 1994). He further asserts that, NGO accountability usually shifts towards foreign governments and Northern NGOs, and away from local people and local structures.

David suggests that NGO projects often have poor cost - benefit ratios, are not sustainable in the long run and are not very replicable within the wider society. He argues that NGOs usually spend far more in their service delivery than governments do. Besides, since NGOs have far more resources than governments, it is not surprising if NGOs claim better results (David L. 2001).

Kate Wellard and James G. Copestake, (1993) point out that almost all NGO activities tend to be descriptive and qualitative. This implies that most of the time NGO activities lack a quantitative approach and analysis that enables their integration into government programs or planning systems. Government claims that NGOs cannot quantify their assistance and their projects future
trends so that the government can accommodate these projections in the country’s long and short-
term development plans of action.

Because of these shortcomings of NGO programs, governments often need to regulate their
activities (Eddie Adiin Y. and Barbara H., 1997). Ideally, NGOs claim that the services they
provide (which governments have neglected or have been unable to meet) are carried out in a
highly professional manner. Governments, on the other hand, suspect such perfect
professionalism acclaimed by NGOs in resource utilization. As a result, governments wish to
introduce mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation of NGO works to control and monitor the
funds NGOs raised from voluntary contributions in the name of the general public of the
recipient country. However, bureaucracies governments establish to ensure that standards are met
are usually over burdened or inefficient due to limited capacity.

There is, however, complaint by many NGOs for the lack of a clear picture of ‘who does what
when’ concerning coordination. Although the resource base, particularly, of local NGOs could be
poor, as part of the larger country depending on foreign resources (both aid and loan) for
execution of development activities, government has good reason to be concerned about the
resources NGOs are mobilizing. Given that NGOs are becoming conduits for international
assistance, governments feel that they have a right to know the sources and the amount of money,
which are being brought into the country and the purposes for which they are put.

Although researchers like Bratton assert that from government perspectives, it has overall been
political factors in many developing countries, which have influenced state attitude of NGOs;
state governments on their part accuse NGOs on several grounds (Bratton 1989). Some of these
accusations include:

- Fragmentation of efforts and weak collaboration with government counterparts,
- Wide information gap and duplication of efforts,
- Poor phasing-out strategy and sustainability as well as
- Difficulties associated with scaling-up of patchy NGO programs to the wider community.
In addition, David L. (2001) asserts that even when the quality of services provided by NGOs is high, most NGOs offer limited, piecemeal or patchy provisions, which can never compete with the state in terms of coverage.

2.4. Determinants of NGO - government relations

The relationship between state governments and NGOs is determined by various factors, among which the following are some of the prominent ones.

2.4.1. Types of regime

John Clark (1992) identifies three types of regime, which offer distinct environments in which NGOs normally operate.

i. Dictatorship, autocratic and authoritarian functioning state: This is the most difficult environment for most NGOs including the service delivery ones. In such environments, most NGOs seem to be outside the preview of any legitimate activity, and are seen as a part of the political forces opposing the state.

ii. The single party state: States with such type of regime seem to tolerate some NGOs, particularly, those engaged in service delivery and those whose activities and projects complement the government's development philosophy. There is, however, as indicated by (Campbell W. 1996) a greater risk of NGOs falling out of favors by following program independently of government and, especially, by opposing and criticizing government policies.

iii. Settled liberal multi-party democratic state: In theory NGOs are accepted as an integral part of civil society and provide little hostility to government. In practice, however, most NGOs are seen as a threat to those running the state. State officials see NGOs as occupying political space, which is not captured by the state and its agents (Korten, 1990).
While summarizing the possible relationship that may exist between NGOs and the state, (Clark, 1992) asserted that the relationship between NGOs and the state depended on the character of the state on the one hand, and character of NGOs, on the other. Even then, however, irrespective of the nature of the state, certain types of NGO work is bound to be discouraged, disliked and delegitimized by many governments in the countries of the south.

2.4.2. Type of functions served by NGOs

Isolated examples of NGO-State antagonism arises usually from an NGO being two overtly political in its work, particularly, when it is identified with a minority or when NGO’s success threatens the established bureaucratic interests of government (David L., 2001). Welfare – provisioning NGOs, engaged in humanitarian relief (First Generation NGO’s) according to Korten, 1990), are the least likely to experience conflict with the state, while third Generation NGOs, engaged in policy advocacy, question the very model of development, the strategy of development program prepared and implemented by the state are not accepted or appreciated. Thus, most governments are likely to closely monitor and attempt to control NGO activities of this type; and some may even ban or opt to expel them (Clark, 1992). In general according to Siddartha S. (1999: 327-355):

- Welfare and modernization oriented NGOs, particularly those NGOs whose activities substitute or supplement the states efforts are favored;
- Empowerment NGOs with differing development theory from the state are challenged and confronted;
- Healthy relationship exists when actors in both institutions have common objectives and benefits about development,
- Governments feel distrustful of NGOs if the sector saws seeds of political discontent, it provides an institutional home for individuals who fall foul of the prescribing regime and is used for popular mobilization against the state by other political parties;
- Governments are likely to scrutinize NGOs carefully when issues of national sovereignty are felt to be at stake,
2.4.3. Transparency of NGOs

Lack of transparency on the part of NGO activities regarding budgets, work plans, resource use...etc tends to make state governments furious against NGOs. (Cannon, 1996):

2.4.4. Lack of secured financial sources on the part of state governments

Most developing country state governments rely on external loan or aid to finance development activities. Sometimes governments realizing their weaknesses, allow NGOs to fill the gaps they have left behind. NGOs can thus be sources of funding, providing resources to governments. Such circumstances, according to Bebbington, are assumed to lessen the friction between NGOs and state Governments (Bebbington, 1992).

2.4.5. Provision of fiscal incentives for NGOs

Provision of ‘fiscal environment’ by the government, which promotes charitable giving and tax relief and contributions to such organizations, through advertisement on T.V and on the press, etc promotes/retards NGO-Government relations, (Eddie A. and Barbara, 1997).

2.5. Forms of government-NGO relations

NGOs performance in development discourse depends to a large extent on the type of relationship the two actors establish initially. Tandon describes three major forms of relationship that can possibly exist between NGOs and government (Tandon, 1991). (This could be dependency in terms of money, ideas or resources).

I. Dependent–client position vis-à-vis the government, in which case NGOs implement state prepared program and/or receive funding through the state;

ii. Adversarial relationship in which case there are no common starting points and no wish from either side to search on areas of agreement;

iii. Collaborationist relationship in which both actors develop a sense of a genuine partnership among themselves to tackle mutually agreed-upon problems, accompanied with energetic but constructive debate on areas of disagreement. This is the type of GO-NGO
relationship most evident in countries having liberal democratic government system like Brazil and India.

2.6. Barriers to government-NGO relations

I. Government policy and regulation

NGOs often fall in the opposition camp while the government or ruling party may see itself as the sole legitimate voice of the people (Fowler, 1992). In such tense politicized policy environment neither party would have sufficient trust in the other to be able to work together, nor would they desire to do so.

ii. NGOs over reliance on foreign sources of funding

This often fosters suspicion among government agencies. In most cases, NGOs largely funded by their members tend to have maximum authenticity. When the NGO sector is dominated by foreign or international NGOs, problems can arise between the government and the NGO if the government feels that it is being squeezed out of development decision-making.

iii. Insufficient information and networking system between NGOs and government agencies and among NGOs themselves.

iv. NGOs distinct preference for isolation

Such NGOs may not only be unwilling to engage in dialogue with government but often coordinate poorly with one another. For some NGOs isolationism is a means for escaping attention, and therefore, on bad interference by government agencies.
2.7. Sources of funding for NGOs

Financial security with a broad and diverse funding base is extremely important if organizations are to respond effectively and flexibly to the challenges they face. Multiple funding avoids the risk of a sudden decline in finances since it is unlikely that all sources will dry up at once. According to Bannet and Gibbs (1996:69) obtaining flexible funds and retaining relatively independent decision-making over expenditure are two of the most important aims of any organization. It is the means of breaking dependency on lending institutions, aid agencies and governments. The following are the alternative sources of financing for NGOs projects.

1. Northern NGOs: Mobilize funds both from the general public and government sources.
2. Direct funding from donor government embassies: These funds are relatively new and an increasingly attractive options to southern NGOs.
3. National government funds: These are funds from national governments who themselves receive through national taxes and bilateral aid. Access to these funds clearly depends on the type of programs and projects designed by NGOs, and on whether or not the projects are in line with government priorities.
4. Local sources of funding: These are funds that organizations themselves raise.

Locally there are a wide range of sources of funding that require a variety of techniques and skills. Bannet and Gibbs categorized them into three major groups (Bannet and Gibbs 1996:69).

- **Earned income**: - money that is generated from the sale of services or goods that are provided as part of an organization's program related activities.

- **Venture income**: - income earned through the sale of goods and services that do not bear any relation to the organization's mission. These are established with the sole purpose of generating income.

- **Local fund raising activities** that include credits, loans, grants, guarantees, gifts, ... etc.

Within the diversity of world cultures and religion, each NGO will have its own unique fund raising possibilities. It could be structured or unstructured charitable giving. NGOs must
establish useful collaboration with the business community through annual subscriptions and collections using targeted campaigns. They should also work with professional associations that create linkages with donors and religious and political organizations engaging in charity projects.

2.8. Government-NGO partnership relationship

Much of the interest in partnership in development circles during the 1990's has been affected in seeking to build links between the work of government agencies and NGOs in development projects. The World Bank referred to such partnership between the two actors as, 'Pursuing Common Goals', (World Bank, 1996). In broad terms, the creation of partnerships is seen as a way of making more efficient use of scarce resources, increasing institutional sustainability and improving beneficiary participation. Calls for partnership, along with such words as collaboration, accompaniment, coordination, cooperation and complementarity are all becoming important ingredients in development discourse.

Though partnership may mean different things to different development actors, in a broad sense one can use the term partnership to refer to an agreed relationship based on a set of links between two or more agencies within a development project. This usually involves division of roles and responsibilities, sharing of risks and the pursuit of joint objectives.

Partnership between two or more actors could be active or dependent. Active partnerships are built through on-going processes of negotiation, debate, occasional conflict and learning through trial and error, involving risks. Dependent partnership, on the other hand, have a blueprint characters constructed at the project planning stage based on assumptions made about comparative advantage and individual agency interests.

Building partnership entails extra costs, new lines of communications, straining/demanding staff time, vehicles and telephones, new responsibilities for certain staff. Therefore, building partnership is likely difficult. This is so because partnerships are usually formed between unequal development actors. Partnership is also highly dependent upon important personality or
authority in charge of governments' unit moving to another post, altering the balance of NGO-Government relationships.

Active partnerships are one way for NGOs to open up space for themselves to move away from service delivery roles to the areas of networking, campaigning and policy advocacy. It may also be a way in which government can increase its effectiveness through the generations of private/public synergies. However, active partnership is only to emerge under a condition of shared risk, joint commitment and negotiated roles, which are linked to clear set of purposes.

2.9. NGO code of conduct

The past decades have witnessed important changes with regards to attempts by NGOs to improve their general performances and accountability. Currently many NGOs from around the world are seeking to achieve these objectives, through self-regulation arrangements.

There are many self-regulation schemes, that is, schemes that are designed to enable NGOs to play a role in regulating themselves. The code is defined as a set of norms, principles and values to standardize the conduct, action and behavior of NGOs. NGO Code of Conduct, therefore, seeks to ensure that the activities of NGOs are "people centered", i.e., that NGOs adopt strategies that would promote effective participation by the intended beneficiaries in development projects.

The notion of "a people centered" and "participatory development" are of course, not new. Development "from below", "bottom-up" development, "grass-roots" development, and "development" as if people mattered have been some of the slogans that were coined in the 1970's to advocate an alternative development model that would shift the emphasis away from the state to the people (Sanyal, 1994). The assumption behind was that with the assistance of NGOs, these activities would empower the people, culminating in a system of self-governance (Frantz 1987).

A criticism, which is often leveled against NGOs, is that they are insufficiently or not at all accountable to their beneficiaries or host governments. In general, NGOs are also said to regard themselves as primarily accountable to their donors (Edwards and Hulme 1995). The code of conduct for NGOs however, aims at imposing upon NGOs the obligations to account not only to
donors, but also specifically to beneficiaries, and if NGOs take to themselves, according to Sanyal, this marks the beginning of a promising relationship between NGOs and beneficiaries for fashioning the developmental process (Sanyal, 1994).

Scholars researched on the third sector out line numerous elements as important component of self-regulatory scheme. According to (Sanyal, 1994) the following are some of the most important ones.

- Openness, transparency and accountability in their dealings with government;
- Public confidence;
- Statement of values and standards of behavior;
- Beneficiary participation;
- Moral and ethical integrity;
- Sound financial policies and systems;
- NGO autonomy and independence;
- Communication and collaboration;
- The promotion of gender equity;
- Environmental consciousness;
- Mechanisms to monitor and evaluate NGO programs and activities with clear and measurable indicators.

Hence adherence to these code of conduct would, thus enable NGOs to answer the accusation of double standards and enable them to head off the imposition of compulsory codes of conduct by regional or national governments (Fowler, 1990).

On the other hand a code of conduct would enable NGOs to enhance their legitimacy by demonstrating their accountability, their openness to public scrutiny, their adherence to acceptable ethical standards of behavior, and their commitment to a democratic approach to members and supporters.

Taking such a step would enhance the credibility of NGOs and strengthen their claims to legitimacy. Given their special status and power within the political process, NGOs need to
subject themselves to the same level of scrutiny, as they demand of others. NGOs that seek to make a virtue out of highlighting the failures of governments, and other institutions should be subjected to the same degree of scrutiny that everyone else faces. They too need to be accountable for their actions. Failure to do so would leave them open to the charge of hypocrisy (David L. 2001).
CHAPTER THREE

III. THE EMERGENCE AND GROWTH OF NGOs IN ETHIOPIA

3.1. The origin and growth of NGOs

There are only limited number of studies relating to NGOs in Ethiopia. The few existing ones by and large focused on the activities of the organizations, especially in the area of relief and rehabilitation and their unhealthy relations with the government (Dessalegn, 2002).

Many scholars attribute the emergence and growth of NGOs in Ethiopia to various socio-economic incidences that occurred in the country. CRDA (1998:4-5) believes that NGO-like civil society organizations based on social, and locality has long existed in the country. Missionary, usually religious based organizations with a humanitarian agenda were believed to enter the country in 1960s.

Costantinos and Haddas (1997:2) also share the idea that NGOs started appearing in Ethiopia at about late 1940s and early 1950s, and that they were mainly missionaries and religious based organizations concerned with welfare activities. Church organizations such as the Ethiopian Orthodox Church affiliated charity organizations; Ethiopian Evangelical Churches, Catholic Relief Secretariats, Society of International Mission and the Adventist Development and Relief Agency were significant early providers of health care, education, clothing and food to the poor along with their religious teachings in most parts of the country. CRDA (1998:4-5) believes that these missionary humanitarian organizations have laid the foundation for the current Ethiopian development, particularly, in the health and education systems.

Others including Campbell, (1996) and Tegegne, (1994) agree that NGOs in its modern sense started their operation in Ethiopia in the second half of the twentieth century. However they assert that their infiltration and expansion in large numbers is tied up with the outbreak of the 1973/74 and 1984/85 famines in Ethiopia. The famine claimed the attention of many western NGOs particularly, those concerned with humanitarian services. Thus, a massive operation
involving more than a hundred NGOs was launched during the 1973/74 food crises in Ethiopia. Later on, most of these humanitarian organizations shifted from humanitarian relief service provisioning to community based development programs. Most of these NGOs however, are seen carrying both relief and development activities side by side to date.

The natural and man-made disasters of the past decades that the country has experienced and their aftermath have contributed to the growth in the number of NGOs in the country. Recurrent droughts, environmental degradation and civil unrest which used to be the major challenges of the country in the 1980s' and early 1990s still continue to have their negative effects although to lesser degree of severity.

The inability of the state to provide the basic necessities and essential services to its constituencies was one major factor behind the emergence of NGOs in the country. Dessalegn, (2002) asserts that the growing involvement of NGOs in the country, is related with the inability of the state, that the capacity of successive Ethiopian governments was limited to deliver the benefits of development programs to the population, particularly the rural poor due to financial crises, war and civil conflict, which was almost a common incidence in the country for the last four or so decades. This has opened cavil for NGOs to search for space left behind unoccupied by the country's state machineries.

It is against this background that most of the NGOs have evolved. Relief and welfare provision for affected segments of the population was the common entry point for NGOs established especially prior to the 1990s. Post 1990 Ethiopia saw a tremendous increase in the number of NGOs compared to earlier times.

Consensus has never been reached as to the number of NGOs operational in the country. Many scholars are seen citing different figures. Costantinos and Haddas (1997) for example, indicated that in 1997 there were 307 NGOs of which 145 were international and 162 were indigenous. Abraham (1995:22) on the other hand cited the total figures to be 248, out of which 145 were international while the remaining 114 were indigenous, engaged in a variety of activities in the country.
Though there seems to be inconsistency and disagreement on the number of NGOs operating in the country, recent research finding made public by CRDA, (March, 2005) shows that as of 2004, there were 1406 NGOs of both international and indigenous origin. Table 1 shows the growth of local and international NGOs in Ethiopia in time series (1994-2004).

Table 2: - Growth of local and international NGOs in Ethiopia, 1994-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Though the inconsistency in the number of NGOs operating in the country is still there, as can be seen from the tabulated figures, after the overthrow of the military government in May 1991, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of NGOs in the country. The expansion was made possible by a more liberal political and economic environment that followed the establishment of the new government and the end to armed struggle. Campbell, (1996) points out that the ever increasing needs of the liberated population has played a decisive role for further expansion of the sector in the country.

Crane W, (2000) on the other hand outlines several reasons for this sharp increase in the number of NGOs, some of which are outlined below.

- The shift of INGOs from direct implementation to working through local 'partner' NGOs, encouraged local initiatives to seize the opportunity and form NGOs;
- Following the policy shift, INGOs increased support to national staff to form NGO that carry out the same or similar activity, ideologically with the INGO;
- A similar policy from the government that discouraged the direct operationalization of INGOs;
- The wide scale social and economic challenges the population is facing;
As data obtained from CRDA (2005) confirms, in 2004 there were 1406 NGOs, of which 905 (64.4 percent) were indigenous and 501 (35.6 percent) were international NGOs. New organizations are being established every year. CRDA, (2006) which is the main umbrella organization for NGOs in the country, now has over 258 members, of which over 45 percent are indigenous. However, most local NGOs are small in size, and are involved in health and social welfare services provision. In general, as indicated by Dessalegn, (2002), the NGO presence in Ethiopia is much less visible and less assertive and the scope of their work is more restricted than in many African countries, despite the greater population size of the country and the greater extent of poverty and food insecurity.

In terms of regional spread most NGOs (67 percent) and NGO resources were spent in Oromia (20.3 percent), Addis Ababa (17.6 percent), and Amhara (23.4 percent) and 20.6 percent in SNNR. While these figures are preliminary and their reliability is questionable, they give some credence to government complaint of NGO activities concentration in areas where they are not most needed. Regions with a limited government capacity such as Gambella and Benishangul-Gumuz receive only 1.0 percent and 0.3 percent of NGO funds respectively. This contradicts with the widely acknowledged strength of NGOs reaching and representing the poor, (Fowler, 1990), and coincides with Riddle's assertion of NGOs tendency of not reaching the very poorest section of the population (Riddle, 1999).

3.2. Development of NGO regulation in Ethiopia

As cited, most NGOs in Ethiopia came into being in response to the call made by the government to save famine victims. The government designated the then Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC), the current Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) as the sole coordinator of NGOs involved in famine relief (RRC, 1992). However, because of the limited management experience of the RRC, to coordinate the relief operation of NGOs, at this initial period most NGOs were, literally allowed to operate and function without first complying with the legal requirements, of the country, including registration.
Principally, the RRC failed to effect its obligation mainly because of the commission's limited qualified personnel to carry out appraisal of NGO project proposals, which requires expertise in many fields. The attempt made to overcome the challenge by creating a pool of experts, recruited from all ministries thought to have the required expertise, though, served the purpose to some extent, lastly it ended-up to be highly bureaucratic, time consuming and inefficient. As a result, the administration of NGOs was scattered ones again without affecting the RRC's role as a focal point. Although, the coordination of NGOs was beyond the commission's managing capacity (RRC, 1992), NGOs were made to conclude basic agreement with the RRC to authorize their operation in the country and identify specific project agreement with one or more government agencies that has the mandate and the expertise in the specific field of operation of the NGOs.

In order to resolve the regulation and coordination problem of NGOs in Ethiopia, the government introduced a national policy, entitled "National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management (NPDPM)" in 1993. Details will be dealt with in chapter four.

3.3. Other complementary key policy measures

Because of the diversity of NGOs in Ethiopia, the government has realized the problem of coming up with a comprehensive guideline for all types of NGOs. However, the following are worth mentioning.

- Due to the persistence of drought related problems in the country, the policy guideline issued the need for promoting self-reliance and sustainable economic development by giving priority to and building the capacity of forgotten, backward areas,
- Encouraged NGOs to mobilize additional resources from external sources and make efficient use of them,
- Allows NGOs to get involved in income generating activities the implementation of the implementation of their projects,
- Urges NGOs to be cost conscious, efficient in resource use,
- Urges them to be gender sensitive,
Create employment opportunities for Ethiopian nationalities and limit the number of expatriate workers to a maximum of three, including the country representative, unless the nature of the project warrants,

When expatriates are allowed to work in the host country, they can import their personal effects free of duty. On the other hand, the government imposes taxes on resources flowing into the country through NGOs for the agreed upon programs. This has discouraged many international NGOs and has become the cause for the delay of projects starting date, extension of the duration of the program, discontinuance for some time, and even abandonment altogether.

It requires that all available documents and accounts (including project agreement documents) to be audited by local and chartered accountants. But this is usually conditioned by donor's preference. Therefore, in order to increase accountability to the government, the selection of auditors is done jointly by donors and the government representative/or its agencies and a system involving the beneficiary communities be established to control the embezzlement, corruption, and generally the poor performance of NGO projects.

It also encouraged complementarity and inter-sectoral integration of projects and programs.

Furthermore, more decentralized patterns of development work, particularly in regional and local development planning offer important opportunities both to government and NGOs for appropriate administration and institutional strength for managing local development initiatives.
CHAPTER FOUR

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. The NGO profile in OROMIA

Zonal distribution of NGOs and NGO projects was highly skewed in favor of five central zones of the region, namely, East Showa, (69) Arsi (23), South West Showa (29), West Showa (25) and North Showa zones (24), altogether housing 170 (68.8 percent) NGOs and 254 (63.82 percent) projects. The remaining nine zones of the region accounted for only 77 (31.2 percent) NGOs, and 144 (36.2 percent) projects funded by NGOs. In East Showa zone alone, there were 69 NGOs and 102 projects, having a budget outlay of Birr 392.3 million (21.8 percent). This makes the zone the most privileged in terms of area preference by NGOs. Conversely, distant zones such as Guji, Borena East Wollega, West Wollega, Illubabor, East and West Harerghe zones altogether had only 65 (26.32 percent) NGOs (Refer to table 5).

The figures cited in the table indicate that the distribution of NGOs and their projects among the 14 zones of the region was not fair and a balanced one. Given the current socio-economic situation of the region, where the inputs of NGOs are badly needed at all levels, rural and urban and distant and near-by places, most NGOs in the region, however, tended to gravitate in very proximate areas to the national capital, Addis Ababa. These area preferences by NGOs appear to be an issue that demands the concerted effort of all stakeholders, particularly, the NGOs, to avert and correct the existing biased NGO project distribution.

As far as area preference of NGOs is concerned, from the previous observation of regional level, NGOs preferred to intervene in localities that have good proximity to either large town or in areas well endowed with infrastructure facilities like road, health and education. On government-NGO forum organized by the regional DPPC, and a press release made by the regional DPPC head, NGOs were accused against unfair spatial distribution and concentration of NGOs and their projects in the central zones of the region.
Table 3: Zonal distribution of NGOs, NGO projects and budget in Oromia by zone (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>No of NGOs</th>
<th>No of Projects</th>
<th>Budget in Million Birr</th>
<th>Per cent share of budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsi</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>128.35</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borena</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Harergha</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>200.90</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Showa</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>392.26</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wollega</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guji</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94.67</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illubabor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91.55</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Showa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>134.07</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/W/Showa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>145.67</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harergha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>125.72</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Showa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91.30</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wollega</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.04</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>1797.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated and compiled from raw data obtained from Oromia DPPC, 2006.

In an interview held with one NGO senior worker as to why NGOs exclusively tended to agglomerate within or near-by urban centers, the respondent spelled out four distinct reasons.

i. Unwillingness of professionals to go far away even if offered attractive salary;

ii. Lack of services such as bank, infrastructure facilities like roads, schools and health services in remote areas;

iii. The difficulties of coping-up with local government officials and employees;

iv. Poor logistics base of most NGOs, especially local NGOs.

Head, NGO coordination team at Oromia DPPC attributed the uneven geographic distribution of NGOs in the region to the following.
Limited availability of infrastructure facilities in peripheral zones;

Lack of interest on the part of NGOs to work in far away localities;

Inefficiency of local authorities to provide all the necessary technical and administrative supports required by NGOs;

The extent of emergency needs prevailing in the particular zones; and

The need to work with religious people with whose name the fund is raised.

The sectoral distribution of NGOs in the region was also far from being fair and even, though it is not as skewed as their spatial distribution.

In most cases they were engaged in such diverse activities as attending to the needs of unprivileged groups of the society (Children, the disabled, the elderly, women), health, education, HIV/AIDS, water, gender and others. As elsewhere, their most frequent involvement was in the fields of health, non-formal education and vocational training. Since recent years the number of NGOs engaged in Integrated Rural Development Projects (IRDP) is tremendously increasing. Of the total 398 NGO projects operational in the region, 190 (47.7 percent) projects were IRDPs and health-oriented projects. Sectoral preference of one over the other by NGOs is the reflection of the need for these services, which for sure varies in space and time. Table 4 shows sectoral distribution of NGO projects in the region.
Table 4: Sectoral distribution of NGO projects in Oromia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated rural development</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health service</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS prevention</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare oriented</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral focused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from raw data obtained from Oromia DPPC, 2005.

* Includes projects in micro finance, urban development and relief.

4.2. Legal procedures for NGOs operation

4.2.1. General

The early years of the EPRDF government is marked with the mushrooming of NGOs, particularly, indigenous ones, and the emergence of "short delivery NGOs," which are different in nature from the usual relief-development continuum NGOs. Such NGOs include advocacy NGOs, whose activities revolve around the dissemination of legal and human rights information, civic education, good governance, conflict resolution, human rights monitoring and the like (ACTIONAID, 1997).
Another development that took place was the issuance of a directive in March 1992 (ACTIONAID, 1997) by the Prime Ministers' office to resolve the increasing demands of the NGO sector. The core essence of the directive revolved around distinguishing between relief and rehabilitation versus development NGOs for the purpose of exempting NGOs under taking relief and rehabilitation activities from tax payment. Thus, from then on wards, while relief oriented NGOs were coordinated by the then RRC, and the current DPPC the coordination of development oriented NGOs shifted, though temporarily, to the then Ministry for External Economic Cooperation (MEEC) now merged with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (ACTIONAID, 1997).

However, the directive did not clearly identify the landmark between relief vis-à-vis development NGOs, which later on lay, the foundation for the formulation of a comprehensive government policy document in 1993 (RRC, 1993). This policy document entitled 'National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management' (NPDPM), as stressed by the DPPC, was acted upon to resolve the confusion that surrounded the coordination of NGOs operating in the country on legality and procedural issues. The NPDPM has devoted one whole chapter to the administration of NGOs at the federal, regional, zonal and district levels.

As exhibited by the survey findings and scholars opinion, NGO regulation policy environment in general, and NGO registration regulation in particular, was indicated as the most restrictive of NGO operations and source of continued conflict between NGOs and the government in Ethiopia. Although there has been a marked improvement in NGO-state relations during the last few years of the EPRDF government, NGOs in the country have been operating in a hostile policy environment, particularly during the military government. Since then, the new government has made immense policy improvements to accommodate the needs of the sector as well as to harness the resources that flow into the country through the sector. As indicated above, these are reflected in the various directives and regulatory policy documents issued during the last decade. The directive issued in March 1992 (ACTIONAID, 1997) by the Prime Ministers' office, government NGO regulation policy document issued in 1993 (RRC, 1993) and NGO operations guideline issued in 1995 are some of the most important landmarks in this regard.
In the following paragraphs major constraints encountered by NGOs as a result of the NGO regulation policy guideline are discussed. Policy constraints as related to the operation of NGOs is reflected in carrying out registration formalities to secure legal personality, unlawful interpretation and implementation of policy guidelines, actors institutional, managerial, personnel and resource capacity constraints to enforce and implement the particulars of the policy guideline.

4.2.2. The registration regulation

The registration regulation was issued by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) by Article 479 of the civil code of Ethiopia. This regulation has 21 articles and two model formats, one for registration application and another for certifying registration (The Association's Registration Regulation, 1966). The articles provide details about the contents of the registration application including the by-laws relevant to registration, the time framework within which the application should be processed, notification procedures, amendments and election to the Office of Associations, audits and accounts, submission of reports, supervision of management of associations, dissolution of association, fees for registration, and penalties for failure to comply with the policy regulation.

Since the introduction of the NPDPM in 1993, the registration of associations, including NGOs is handled by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Before this landmark, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIA) was the institution, which is responsible for registration as well as scrutinize NGOs that wish to operate in the country (ACTION AID, 1997).

4.2.2.1. Legal provisions on registration

The Civil Code and the registration of Association's regulation provide the following as purposes of registration.

1. To ensure the objectives and activities of association are lawful and moral (Article 462 of the civil code and Article 8 (1) (b) of the Regulation).
2. To verify whether the statements and information contained in the registration application and by-laws of associations are accurate and reliable (Article 7 (1) of the Regulation).
3. To verify compliance with legal provisions provided in the Regulation (Article 475 of the Civil Code and article 7 (2) of the regulation).

In addition to the above outlined core provisions, article 7 and eight of the Regulation orders the office of association to register all applying associations, except where:

1. The particulars contained in the application or in the accompanying by-laws are false or misleading in any material aspect;
2. The purposes of the intended association are unlawful or immoral, and
3. The purposes of the intended association are against national unity or interest.

It is also clearly stated that the examination and investigation of associations to take place within sixty days of submission of a completed application. It also states that any denial of registration must be made in writing, specifying the reasons for the denial. The registration office is obliged to provide a certificate of registration, provided that the investigation reveals no defect in association's application.

4.2.2.2. Identifying the gaps

The first most important issue that comes to fore as regards NGOs operational in Ethiopia is the lack of an enabling law for NGOs operation. The reference to the establishment of NGOs in the country is made with regulations enacted for establishment of associations, but not for NGOs as distinct actors in civil society. This devoid NGOs reference to a law or an act about their identity, rights and even obligations as well as their role in society, which has subjected them to mechanism lesser than the rule of law, denying them the stability and security of due process. The lack of standing law governing the sector and their relationship with various stakeholders has made NGOs victims of constant changes in regulation and administration of the sector, as the government shifts their regulation from ministry to ministry. This is one basic problem that has limited the sectors' autonomy and complicated their operation in the country.

Until the adoption of the NPDPM and its policy regulations in 1995, the registration of associations was attended to by the MoIA, whose basic duty was closely linked to the security
division of the country, keeping an eye on potential threats to the country, than actually, acting as focal point for coordination of all associations, including NGOs. This has of course, greatly improved with the introduction of the national policy on disaster prevention.

The NPDPM itself and NGO operations guideline themselves are very much relief oriented, with little attention paid to NGOs role in development of the country. The issue of NGOs and their role in the country's socio-economic development is treated in a document to manage disaster prevention. Disaster prevention was the crucial issue the upcoming rulers of the country paid due attention, because of the food crises the country was confronted with. NGOs are seen as crusaders against disasters, forgetting the reality that NGOs do not solely stand for disaster prevention, but something greater and decisive. The Ethiopian policy environment has left much that is wanting for NGOs in the country.

Scholars like Minas. H (1996) argues that the NPDPM is rather a well worked out policy on disaster management, one of the few in the world we, as citizens should be proud of. But it could not serve the whole voluntary sector and thus, a NGO Act is overdue.

The fact that the policy guideline was introduced when the government was not neither good at all in professional competence to come up with standard policy document, was another basic factor for the systems failure to come up with such disaster oriented policy document. The policy document rather focused on relief assistance than on efforts required to up-root the causes of the emergency situation and persistent food crises. In addition to these factors, the following are also identified as hindering the smooth operation of NGOs in Oromia region as it is in the country.

4.2.2.2.1 Tedious and bureaucratic licensing procedures

The initiation and operational processes required in Ethiopia leaves much to be desired. Processing a single formality continuous to be tiresome for most NGOs. NGOs obligation to conclude general agreement to secure registration certificate and submission of plan of operation as well as renewal of registration every year gave the government overriding power to bully the sector (CRDA, 1997). The numerous government agencies, starting from the federal down to the district level with which, NGOs are expected to enter basic agreement in the process of
registration to get legal personality, project appraisal and approval, monitoring and evaluation of project activities and transparency with regulating government and its agencies is seen exacerbating the relation between the two.

Apart from this, in government-NGO relations the requirements to fulfill the necessary formalities, is related to the problem of signatures leading to few higher officials in the hierarchy, delaying completion of formalities, as well as crowding the working hour of the officials more important than signing simple documents that can be handled by lower staff.

Government registration procedures and processing work permit license for international staffs are complicated and tiresome. Furthermore, frequent conflicts faced as a result of NGOs engagement in income generating activities, particularly by local NGOs, even when it is on a not-for-profit basis, were indicated as major causes for the continued unhealthy relationship.

Delays encountered with licensing NGOs varied from sector to sector and from project to project. Health and water sectors as well as other single sector-specific or non-integrated projects were identified as taking the shortest (up to 30 days) processing time. Obtaining work permit for foreign staffs, challenges confronted in project appraisal and approval processes as well as government agencies' employees reluctance to accomplish their duties and responsibilities as per the time framework stipulated in the general NGO operations guideline were also some of the major issues indicated to have complicated the legalization of NGOs and widening of the rift between government and NGOs. (Dessalegn, 2002) Figure: 1 and table 5 show licensing procedures NGOs wishing to operate in Oromia are expected to go through, while the figure on annex 2 provides schematic representation of licensing procedures at the federal level.
Figure: 1 SCHEMATIC REPRESENTATION OF LICENSING PROCEDURE FOR NGOS WISHING TO OPERATE IN OROMIA
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### Table 5: Legal Procedures for Accessing Entry Point by NGOs

**Registration, Licensing and Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Parties involved /Signatories/</th>
<th>Inputs required</th>
<th>Time table</th>
<th>Document received and deadline</th>
<th>Renewal Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>MoJ</td>
<td>NGO memorandum of Association and a detailed project proposal</td>
<td>Not more than 30 days</td>
<td>Certificate of registration that will be renewed annually</td>
<td>Annual performance reports according to the project agreement (Local NGO-audit report and minute of the general assumedly. INGO-audit report signed by the representative).</td>
<td>NGOs that generate revenue in one region alone are registered at regional Justice Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>DPPC and the NGO</td>
<td>Certificate of registration, memorandum of association and operation</td>
<td>Operation agreement signed for period not exceeding three years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should record good performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Regional DPPC, line bureaus and the NGO</td>
<td>The above documents, project idea and a detailed proposal that has been developed after undertaking needs assessment at project site</td>
<td>At least within six months of registration</td>
<td>Project agreement document signed for three to five years</td>
<td>Should be renewed annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Regional sector bureau</td>
<td>Project agreement, proposal indicating the human and material inputs (Backed by regional sector bureau and zonal sector department check-ups)</td>
<td>Before starting operation</td>
<td>License</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to the aforementioned shortcomings, detailed analysis of the overall regulatory procedures pursued by the government has one way or the other limited the sector’s autonomy and efficiency in resource use (Campbell, 1996).

4.2.2.2.2. Voluntarism vs. government withdrawal from tax exemption

The fact that the policy regulation has withdrawn the government from tax exemption has limited the sectors' effectiveness in its voluntary action. As confirmed by the survey findings, beyond paying tax on donated humanitarian supplies from scarce NGO resources, processing of clearance formalities consumed much of the time that should have been used for implementation of project activities, for which the imported supply were ordered. Implementations of project activities often delay due to reasons associated with long duty clearance processing time required. When NGOs fail to implement agreed upon projects within the time framework indicated in the project document, and as a result, were forced to revise the project document, starting the whole process of project approval afresh. This was one of the mechanisms with which the regulating government agencies delay implementation of NGO project activities. Sometimes, as a result of the highly elongated duty clearance processing time, there were instances under which some NGOs refund back resources to donor agencies for not being able to utilize the advances as per the agreement reached with donor agencies.

On issues related with tax exemption, the federal government wants regional governments to cover taxes on imports by NGOs working in their respective regions. The regional government of Oromia for that matter has been applying this principle. However, while the idea was a valuable principle, it should not have been applied too rigidly. It needs to consider the resource base and paying capacity of regions as many regions, including Oromia do not make budget allocation in their annual budgets for such purposes. Consequently, donated NGO supplies particularly, medicines often expire before reaching intended beneficiaries because of the unnecessary delays NGOs usually encounter in collecting the necessary custom documents.

The clause in existing policy of handling over everything to government when a project or a NGO winds up its functions is another policy constraint identified. This clause is an impediment
to NGO emergence as well as expansion. In legal terms, the NGOs like a person or a company with its rights to keep what it gained over the course of its operation and to decide whom to give its assets to. Because donors give what they decide to donate to NGOs, making them trustees of their resources both during operation and termination. Therefore, government should have no role except to make sure that the assets go to similar efforts of public benefits.

If government takes over NGO resources at termination, as stated in the policy guideline, a donor who knows that the assets that it bought will eventually end-up in government hands will certainly have reservations in funding NGOs. NGOs assert that under the present condition where government is not at the position to pay tax on imported goods, it does not have moral grounds to even enforce the regulation.

4.2.2.2.3. Voluntarism vs. difficulties encountered in securing land for NGOs premises

Another complaint, particularly from NGOs active in health and education sector, was the difficulty to obtain land for construction of NGO premises. This has led to delays in the expansion of NGO-operated services, even though there is a marked demand in almost everywhere in the region. Furthermore, governments' stringent health and education policy constrained the sector's contribution of these services for not qualifying government set standards. While the governments' policy of keeping these services to standard is acceptable, the policy should have left provisions for education and health projects of the NGOs, which aim at reaching the needy community with meager resources. Such schools for sure operated where government provisions were lacking. For instance, students enrolled at NGO operated schools almost always faced problems when they wanted to transfer to government schools, and even obliged to start afresh, especially at lower grades. Thus, the stringent policy gave government not only the power to adjust NGO programs to government norms, it also played decisive roles in shaping constituents mentality not to trust NGO operated premises.
4.2.2.2.4. Misinterpretation and/or wrong implementation of policy provisions

Although the provisions given in the policy oblige the office of association to register all applicant associations, except where the particulars contained in the application or in the accompanying by-laws are false or misleading in any material aspect and/or the purposes of the intended association are unlawful or immoral, and are against national unity or interest, these laws are misinterpreted intentionally or unintentionally by the regulating government agencies. For instance, while the law does not require any prior authorization for formation of indigenous NGOs, in practice, interested groups in this regard are asked to produce a letter of support from other governmental agencies to qualify registration (ACTION AID, 1997:6).

Such misinterpretation and wrong implementation of policy provisions are either done intentionally to limit the rapidly proliferating indigenous NGOs, thereby minimizing donor resource inflow to the sector, or unintentionally from lack of adequate knowledge of the policy guideline by regulating government agencies' employees and higher officials, as a result of frequent personnel turn-over. This is particularly evidenced at lower level government structures, where personnel turnover, including higher officials is very frequent through the 'gimgema'/evaluation/ system of public officials' performance appraisal. This evaluation methodology, though good in promoting public accountability, is prone for misuse of resources. The frequent coming and going of public officials disrupts communications and continuity in the implementation of development plans. Furthermore, the sense of insecurity generated by 'gimgema' also made officials hesitant to make decisions, often leading to paralysis of NGO operations due to official sanctions.

In addition to the aforementioned shortcomings, the NGO operations guideline of the federal and regional governments is characterized by the following major limitations.

4.2.2.2.5. Fixed and blueprint nature of the particulars of the guideline

The NGO regulation policy was formulated at the time when the country was under intense structural adjustment program, during which time the government and its agencies were poorly equipped with requisite technical professionals to come-up with standard policy framework. In
fact, at the time of the policy document preparation, the governments' political direction itself was not well defined as to which ideology the state adopts and thus, NGOs complained that the government institutionalized the policy document to limit the rapidly infiltrating local NGOs and minimize the resource that possibly flow to the sector (Campbell, 1996).

Given the dynamic socio-economic situations the region and the country as a whole are undergoing, of which the NGOs are also a part, the policy is obsolete to cope-up with the rapidly changing needs and demands of the sector. Although at the regional level there are formal government-NGO dialogue forums that take place ones a year, such forums mainly focused on monitoring and reporting issues than dealing with the shortcomings of the policy and the general guideline.

The particulars identified in the policy document are not process oriented, but fixed for an indefinite time once and for all with no provisions for improvement. In almost all their dealings, NGOs are obliged to pursue policy guideline made operational before a decade, despite the rapidly changing working environment, even within government institutional settings.

4.2.2.2.6. Static and rigid nature of roles assigned to actors

In NGO-government partnership relationship arrangements made in the NGO operations guideline, areas for NGOs involvement, support services meant for the sector, reporting formats, the duties and responsibilities, penalties for failure to comply with policy provisions...etc are identified as static elements, without the slightest provisions for improvement. Whatever activity an NGO might think of, should side by side consider this static policy elements, which given current situation of the sector, are unresponsive and in fact acted as an obstacle to success. Government still expects NGOs to operate with these static assumptions and guidelines. These policy elements are not responsive to changing circumstances from both sides, specificity of project activities, environmental peculiarities of intervened areas and needs of target beneficiaries.
4.2.2.2.7. Domination of individuals over institutional interests

In the region individual interests than the particulars of the policy document dominated NGO-government partnership relationship. NGO performance and effectiveness was strongly influenced by support or obstruction of key government personnel. In most instances, high government officials tended to have fixed hostile attitude towards the sector, thereby weakening the already hardly functioning partnership relationship.

Although in partnership relationship both actors were equally entitled to face challenges, share risks and appear accountable to unintended outcomes, NGOs expressed their grievance that they were always held responsible and criticized for lack of accountability and unsustainability of the projects they run in partnership with government agencies, while both parties should have been held responsible, whatsoever the outcome of the intervention may be.

4.3. The adoption of the region-specific NGO guideline

As indicated in the previous sections of this report, one of the basic requirements for NGOs to become operational was fulfilling the formalities outlined in the general NGO operations guideline (NPDPM), prepared and implemented in 1995 for NGOs wishing to operate in the country. As in the national level guideline, the regional NGO operations guideline addressed in detail issues related with NGOs definitions, activities and sectors for NGO involvement, the overall procedure starting from registration, signing project agreement, project extension, monitoring and reporting, timely project commencement; establishment of project office on project site, maintenance of records and project-related documents on project site, submission of quarterly, annual, inventory and terminal evaluation reports by NGOs, feedback on reports by government agencies, conformity of executed projects with initially agreed upon project ideas, community participation in all phases of the project cycle, efficiency in resource management and utilization, project monitoring and evaluation as per the agreed upon reporting format and conditions for engagement in income generating activities.
The document has been taken up as a model by Oromia regional government DPPC to draft a region-specific NGO operations guideline in 1999 (Oromia DPPC, 1999) with the objective of making the operations of NGOs more efficient and effective, at least at operational level. Specifically, the guideline aimed at addressing the following major objectives.

1. Clarifying uncertainties in accessing entry points for NGOs interested to operate in the region;
2. Ensuring efficient utilization of NGO resources;
3. Addressing needs of communities as efficiently as possible,
4. Facilitating regular exchange of information;
5. Strengthening community participation in project appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
6. Indicating areas of support and encouragement to NGOs by pertinent regional government agencies, and
7. Formalizing the establishment of a joint forum that oversees the progress of their partnership.

The regional government also identified the following as opportunities and pillars for implementation and realization of the particulars of the guideline.

- Arrangement of annual review meeting forum between NGOs and government line departments;
- Provision of services required by the sector,
- Commitment and readiness to integrate NGO financed projects into regional development endeavors to ensure their sustainability and continued service to target beneficiaries,
- Assignment of 'contact persons' in all concerned government line agencies,
- Standardization of project preparation formats and appraisal methods,
- Institutionalization of zonal project planning, monitoring and evaluation committee, recruited from all co-signatory line departments, and
- Opening-up of NGO coordination desks at regional, zonal and district levels;
Afterwards, the regional government institutionalized the formation of separate departments for relief and development NGOs coordination body as a full-fledged entity at regional level and coordinating department at the zonal level with 10 technical staff and 9 supporting staff. Although the government has done its' best to implement the arrangements as desired, the efforts made however, did not bring a meaningful change in the bureaucratic procedures pursued at the federal level, due to various factors some of which are the following.

4.3.1. Lack of participation by NGOs in the adoption process of the guideline from federal to region-specific realities

In the process of adopting the guideline to region-specific realities, the regional government represented the numerous NGOs operational in the region by a handful of government selected few NGOs (eight in number) (Regional DPPC, 2003) to make the process of adoption participatory. The fact that few NGOs were made to participate on the process does not and cannot represent a fare participation, and incorporation of views and desire of all concerned NGOs. It is hardly possible to think relief and development oriented as well as service delivery and income-generating NGOs will have similar concerns.

4.3.2. Reliance of adoption process on the national NGO operations guideline

The fact that the adoption process was allowed to revolve strictly within the national NGO operations guideline norms and values, forced the region-specific guideline to come up with all the short-comings of the federal level, ending-up in replication of the national level policy guideline with all its limitations. In fact, the NGO operations guideline adapted at the regional level further complicated and elongated legal procedures NGOs are supposed to go through. Many of the arrangements made and commitments confessed were not adhered to properly. Technical supports desired by the NGO sector, which the government also committed to supply were not attended to or neither party had adequate knowledge of where to start processing the desired services.
4.3.3. Lack of region-specific power in NGO management

The region-specific guideline did not give any special power that can enable the region to facilitate NGO infiltration into the region, apart from the policy granted and specified in the federal level guideline. The power entrusted in regional authorities of the region is no different from those regions, which do not have a region-specific guideline of their own. Thus, the initiative taken by the regional government in drafting a region-specific guideline, might have given the impression that the region is pro NGOs, and well coming. However, the gain from the guideline in facilitating conducive working environment for the sector is very minimal. It appears that the region is not autonomous enough to come up with its own NGO regulating policy.

4.4. Appraising the consequences

4.4.1. Poor government-NGO partnership relationship

It is the duty of the government to ensure that the house is in order. In line with these premises, there is nothing wrong with the government's attempt to regulate the overall operations of NGO programs. For that matter, for a country like Ethiopia that depends on foreign funding for provision of societal needs, there is good reason to be concerned about every penny that flows into the country. The government stance, principally, therefore professed from the desire to improve efficiency, increase effectiveness and avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts. While these appear to be sensible objectives, the means whereby the government tried to achieve them has mounted to cramping of NGO space.

Although the government has shown its commitment to work in partnership with NGOs on various NGO regulating policy documents and directives, the design of the partnership rather focused on controlling and inspecting how NGOs went about the implementation of project activities and resource utilization. Apart from the constraining policy environment and hostility of government higher officials towards the sector, the two-development actors' partnership is constrained by institutional, including personnel and logistics as well as resource capacity limitations of each actor.
In the current context of the region in relation to Government-NGO partnership relationship, numerous essential components stipulated in the guideline are either overlooked or ignored. In addition to the policy constraints, the following are also some of the basic factors that challenged the smooth operation of government-NGO partnership relationship in the region.

4.4.1.1. Actors capacity constraints

At the regional level, in Oromia, the regional DPPC is the official government agency in charge of facilitating entry point for NGOs wishing to operate in the region. With this huge assignment on hand, the commission was not at the position to fully expedite its obligations and responsibilities due to capacity limitations in terms of personnel and logistics. At the time of this survey for instance, as shown on table II, Oromia DPPC had only six technical staff, working on NGO related issues, who in addition to developing and coordinating NGO activities were also responsible to guide NGOs which sector to contact, facilitate the whole process for tripartite agreement signing, monitor, evaluate and attend to annual reviews of all NGOs operational in the region.

Table 6: - Number and educational attainment of employees working on NGO related posts at regional DPPC and East Showa zone DPPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Regional level</th>
<th>East Showa zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPPC</td>
<td>DPPD**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Degree and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade complete</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Less than 12th Grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey result, April 2006.

* These were drivers, storekeepers, cleaners, and guards.

** There were of course, 9 other employees who work on relief and early warning system within the department.
As evidenced by the survey findings, the commission is woefully ill equipped for the NGO management duty. The Commission's concerned professionals did not even have the time to read the annual reports of NGOs, let alone effectively monitor and review their activities. The situation at the zonal and district levels was even worse. Almost all regional bureaus and zonal departments had such limited human resources that they could not dedicate a single full time staff member to NGO related works.

The weak logistics base of the regional and zonal NGO coordinating bodies confirmed not only government agencies weak institutional capacity to guide and coordinate such a huge sector (247 NGOs and 398 projects at the regional level, and 69 NGOs and 163 projects at zonal level in East Showa zone), but also unfair government commitment to the sector. At the time of this survey, the regional DPPC had only two cars for both inter and intra urban use, 6 computers (4 desktop and two laptop) one photocopy machine and two motor bicycles. At the zonal level, the department had only one field vehicle for relief and development coordination purpose, one photocopier, and three desktop computers.

Except for regional and zonal NGO coordination desks, no line bureaus and departments had NGO regulation policy documents and kept up-to-date NGO operations records. If at all the required documents were there, it is very difficult to locate and trace the status of NGO projects progress because of poor attendance to proper hand over of project documents when officials and concerned experts leave their position due to the enumerable reasons that compel staff members designated at various levels of government structure in the region resign from their posts. Consequently, every new comer has to start the task of NGO coordination afresh from the scratch.

Government agencies working at different levels of the regional government lacked interest to work with NGOs, and above all, certain critical modalities of support meant for the sector. Services meant to address the needs of the sector were neither properly clarified nor adequately defined in the guideline. Commitments to create awareness from the government side, especially, from the regional DPPC were rather negligible.
Furthermore, unlike other sectors of the economy, the DPPC does not have institutional arrangements at the district level, where NGOs are operationally active. Thus, due to lack of capacity, skill, institutional arrangements failure and government employees poor commitment to work with NGOs, the government failed to:

☞ Ensure the sustainability of NGO projects;
☞ Facilitate and demand for terminal evaluation of projects, which often delayed by at least six months, sometimes, even overlooked, as the NGO sector itself is not up to attending to evaluation of projects;
☞ Set modalities on use of NGO resources, except ordering NGOs to minimize overhead costs, and remain transparent with partners. Many countries' NGO regulation guidelines, including Kenya, Uganda, South Africa, Afghanistan and others, emphasized operational efficiency, issuing a policy guideline that allow NGOs to use 90 percent of their total resource inflow for project activities and only 10 percent for operating costs (Evans, 1996).

☞ As a state concerned with efficiency in resource use, the government should have arranged mechanisms through which NGO resources are accounted for by opening separate NGO budget line in all government line bureaus, so that NGOs remain seriously accounted for the resources they raise.
☞ Attend to project appraisal procedures and site inspection of NGO activities as stipulated in the NGO guideline. These weaknesses, according to the informant, lied not only in the commission's capacity constraints and concerned line agencies' reluctance to respect the guideline, but also in the make up of the guideline itself. In other words, the time framework cited in the document did not make provisions for extended, time taking and sometimes, bureaucratic procedures the appraisal and approval processes are expected to pass through.

On the other hand, NGOs also lacked adequate capacity to adhere to government policies and the obligations authentic partnership requires. Unlike most of the international NGOs operational in the region, over 95 percent of the indigenous NGOs lacked strong institutional capacity in terms of office and office furniture, personnel capacity and logistics necessary for field operation. Data
from zonal DPPD revealed that over 95 percent of NGOs, particularly local NGOs, operational in the region had staff less than five, most of them ill-equipped with requisite knowledge, usually with no college diploma, and related to owner of the NGO in one way or the other (Zonal DPPD, 2005). Except for some, which proved to be competitive and responsive to the agreed general guideline, most of them were regarded as highly inefficient in matters especially pertinent to project implementation, submission of project documents, including annual plan of action and periodic reports.

4.4.1.2. Multiple accountability by NGOs

One key element to discussion of NGO relationships is that of accountability, a relational concept that has been presented as both a potential strength and a source of weakness for NGOs. All NGOs are thus, accountable to:

- Some kind of voluntary body or their members,
- Governmental laws and regulations, as well as rules of bureaucratic procedures and registration obligations, and
- Donor agencies.

They are usually accountable to resources raised and on account of impacts that NGO actions have more widely on other organizations. In the Ethiopian context, the government has the authority to demand an account from an NGO and then impose a penalty if the NGO is not forthcoming, such as banning or expelling. But this was rarely attended to, because of government institutions serious manpower shortage to look through all NGO accounting documents.

Apart from financial accountabilities on which NGOs are usually expected to respond, there are other bundles of accountabilities to which NGOs are supposed to respond. One of these is reporting requirements. In the existing NGO regulation guideline, NGOs are expected to deliver four types of reports (quarterly progress reports, annual reports, audit and project performance evaluation reports), and attend to three types of monitoring and evaluations (mid term, terminal evaluations and annual monitoring). Furthermore, the fact that NGOs are made answerable to many public authorities, made accountability and control over them confusing, contradictory,
overlapping and overwhelming. Table 7 shows procedures NGOs are obliged to pursue in reporting, monitoring and evaluation of project activities.

Capacity complaints was, thus one basic problem that almost all surveyed NGOs complained about to adhere and attend to all the obligations set forth with all co-signatory sectors for all projects they undertake in partnership. This was particularly found to be very challenging for NGOs whom run at least two projects with different sectoral backgrounds and phasing-out dates. In addition to attending to preparation of the required documents, including annual plan of action and reports, NGOs were also expected to deliver copies of all reports to all concerned sectors at all levels (district, zonal, regional and federal) as well as to donor agencies.

4.4.1.3. Delays in project commencement by NGOs

As indicated in the previous section, possession of legal certificate and signing general agreement, securing sufficient fund for execution of the project(s), participatory needs assessment and project planning; appraisal and approval processes were the main prerequisites for project commencement.

One major underlying reason for delay in project activities commencement as stipulated in the project document were project appraisal and approval delay by government partners. Appraisal and approval processes by Oromia DPPC and sectoral bureaus to ensure the projects feasibility and compatibility with the general guideline and needs of the target group took longer time. The relevant government sector bureaus and departments as well as Oromia DPPD itself were not very serious in respecting the deadlines, which is 30 days in this case for submission of the approved document. Regional DPPC in this regard openly admitted government agencies weakness in respecting partnership relationship agreements, although the major problem lies in the policy documents' failure to predict deep into the procedural settings to handle appraisal and approval processes of integrated rural development projects, which are by their very nature time demanding.
4.4.1.4. Lack of 'contact' or 'focal persons' in government line departments

Government stance of strengthening district level offices through its decentralization of power and government workers has literally left higher-level government structures, particularly, zonal departments, with very limited manpower. Most departments did not bother to assign new focal persons or even if at all they did, only temporarily to accompany to a field visit for the issue at hand. Other times, if similar quest come from another NGO or the previous one, assignment of staff was done as deemed convenient.

Assessment findings from five line departments and five district line offices of East Showa zone indicated that, neither zonal departments nor district offices had permanent 'focal persons', kept NGO related documents nor had ever visited or inspected NGO run projects on their initiative. At places where contact workers are assigned, most of the time they get preoccupied with other commitments, for which they normally gave priority. They gave due attention to their primary commitments, as they were evaluated against the job descriptions, and also promoted in their major line of engagement.

On other occasions, if these 'contact persons' were somehow contacted, they considered themselves as alien to NGOs' engagement, demanded benefits which they actually do not deserve, and above all disappeared before finalizing the assignments they take-up as a group.

The lack of credit or appreciation from their employers for handling two or more commitments at a time was one limiting factor for limited commitment by contact persons. Collaborative and strong 'contact persons' rarely stayed on their posts. Usually such workers are captured by an NGO interested in their performance, or their departments reassign them on other posts, usually in demotion, because of failure to perform their major assignment in line with the strategic 'result based' evaluation system currently exercised in the region.
### Table 7: Reporting, monitoring and evaluation procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly progress reports</td>
<td>Sent to sector agencies at all levels</td>
<td>Detailed activity and financial report of the quarter.</td>
<td>Within 15 days after end of quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reports</td>
<td>It is sent to all signatory Go agencies at all levels as well as to the MoJ.</td>
<td>Summary report of the four quarters.</td>
<td>Within one month of the first quarter of the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit report</td>
<td>Sent to the federal, regional and zonal departments of DPPC.</td>
<td>Federal DPPC short-listed external auditors undertake auditing.</td>
<td>Within 6 months of the next budget year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal report</td>
<td>Directed to all co-signatories.</td>
<td>It is a report prepared by the NGO after the project agreement ends.</td>
<td>Within a month after expiry of the project agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project performance evaluation report (PPER)</td>
<td>Shared with all co-signatories and regional relevant offices.</td>
<td>Analytical Summary report of the four quarters, undertaken with members recruited from all co-signatory agencies.</td>
<td>Within a month after expiry of the agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Parties involved</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Time required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation</td>
<td>Undertaken by a committee composed of the signatories</td>
<td>To review the development impact the NGO caused, to ensure that the NGO is on the right track and provide suggestions for improvement, if needed.</td>
<td>In the middle of the project life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Evaluation</td>
<td>Undertaken by a committee composed of the signatories</td>
<td>Final evaluation of project against preset objectives.</td>
<td>As soon as the project agreement ends. NGOs are expected to inform co-signatory Go agencies before hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reporting</td>
<td>It is done by sector Go agencies, either zonal or regional</td>
<td>This is technical monitoring sector Go agencies are required to undertake before renewing license.</td>
<td>This is expected to be done annually before license renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.5. Poor or non-existence of NGO projects monitoring and evaluation

Evaluation of NGO projects is expected to hold at least twice during the project life. Besides, both regional bureaus and zonal sector departments are expected to monitor NGO projects annually before renewing the operation license. According to information gathered from group discussions held, it is learnt that annual technical evaluation is done to standard for mere purpose of NGOs project agreement renewal. However, mid-term evaluation is almost non-existent and the terminal evaluation is delayed by as long as six months. The zonal line departments, besides limited knowledge of the sector, did not have the required capacity to monitor even their sectors' projects implementation status.

On the other hand, setting-up and coordinating monitoring and evaluation committee, recruited from co-signatory zonal departments, ended-up in a cumbersome task that in most parts, depended upon the departments willingness to allocate an expert from its limited staff. Consequently, the project performance evaluation report is delayed by at least six months or some times over looked.

The problem is also aggravated by lack of financial/budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation. As a result, monitoring and evaluation of NGO projects was done usually by reading NGO reports.

4.4.1.6. Poor projects evaluation initiative by both actors

It was indicated that NGOs did not have good regard towards evaluating their performances and the effectiveness of their intervention. According to one NGO respondent, among NGOs, evaluation is frequently seen as something, which has been imposed upon NGOs, usually by the government and sometimes by donors. Therefore, it is undertaken with reluctance or even resisted.

Survey findings also showed that NGOs lacked necessary tools, such as impact indicators, which most of the time derives from baseline survey data or situation analysis of areas intervened before intervention takes place. Moreover, there are no provisions given in the NGO regulation or policy
guidelines of the federal and regional governments to carryout baseline surveys by NGOs before commencing operation. It turned out that NGOs are very reluctant to deal with past weaknesses and shortcomings, with no anticipated return for current issues at hand. Furthermore, NGOs are not secured enough to face up to negative outcomes.

4.4.1.7. High turnover of officials and lower level professionals

One of the basic problems facing the sector is lack of basic knowledge of the sector by influential and decisive officials. Most importantly these officials did not have adequate knowledge of the policy under which the NGOs operated. As a result, the perception of these officials is one of mistrust and misunderstanding. Furthermore, it is apparent that the scope for partnership is determined not only by the attitudes and ideas of individuals and their institutions, but also by broader political, social and economic factors.

4.4.1.8. Lack of feedback on reports

Providing feedbacks on NGO reports and other NGO queries was almost non-existent. This has ended-up in stoppage of reporting by some NGOs. Feedback would help the NGOs to learn from their mistakes, and take corrective measures in future operations.

4.5. Government agencies accusation of NGOs on various grounds

From the surveys made at different administrative structures, intense interaction and work relations were tied up with the regional DPPC and zonal DPPD and line departments. The regional DPPC and its subsidiary line bureaus, zonal departments and district offices, accused NGOs against the following major government-NGO relationship indicators.

i. Lack of innovation by NGOs,

ii. Lack of transparency in resource use;

iii. Lack of accountability to beneficiary target groups, regional, zonal and district governments;

iv. Lack of NGO projects integrity and broader constituency with all other development actors both public and private,
v. Lack of respect for NGO code of conduct;
vi. Lack of respect for government-NGO partnership relationship,
vii. Lack of participation, and traditional approach (Top-down) to project appraisal, and
viii. Lack of implementation capacity by many local NGOs for projects they design;

In the following paragraphs views and opinions gathered from interviewed respondents and responses to structured questionnaires related to some of the above findings are discussed.

**4.5.1. Lack of innovation by NGOs**

The findings indicated that most NGOs, including the notable NGO like the World Vision Ethiopia (WVE), CARE Ethiopia and Menschen für Menschen (MFM) working very closely with near-by farming community, had very little original innovation to offer to the target community. Interviewee from East Showa zonal agriculture development department was heard acknowledging the Melkasa Agriculture Research Station, run and sponsored by the Federal Government to have been very innovative, and successful in improving the lives of the surrounding farming community. The findings of this research report, therefore, tended to support the view that most NGOs acted within established development orthodoxy of their own, contrary to the governments' expectation that NGOs remain innovative in their operations.

Although some respondents acknowledged some NGOs for coming-up with new ideas, a cursory observation of activities held by many NGOs found to be common practices like animal husbandry, gardens, sewing, hand-crafts, traditional soil and other natural resources conservation strategies and the like, commonly practiced by local government agencies and even by local community members. Overall, majorities of NGOs in the region were seen conforming to development fashions much often commonly known than they develop or introduce new research findings in their area of involvement.

NGOs themselves did agree to the idea of most NGOs remaining more or less similar with government approach to development. Most stressed the idea that NGOs lack sufficient
experience owing to their recent infiltration, resources and capable staff to as well as networking to attend to many of the expectations stipulated in the general NGO guideline.

4.5.2. Lack of participation and traditional approach to project appraisal

According to a widely held theory, the approach generally taken by NGOs is a participatory one. NGOs are typically described as working within rural communities, ascertaining local needs and preferences, and involving the target population in the planning of their activities. This perception was supported by the responses to one of the questions on the NGO survey. In response to an open question, "How are projects initiated"? About 92 percent of the surveyed NGOs indicated that the beneficiaries were involved in initiation of NGO activities. By the "people", and at "community level" was each common responses. Those who discussed this question in more detail typically explained that community groups identified their needs, sometimes with the help of the NGO.

Government agencies on the other hand, regarded such a participatory strategy by NGOs as a means to conform with government demands than a reality for many NGOs, because of the logical difficulties NGOs have in carrying out such a strategy, given most NGOs financial constraints and weak organizational structure. Government agencies argued that a true participatory approach to project identification requires a very large amount of staff time to stimulate the community and tailor projects to the needs of various groups. Furthermore, no matter whether international or indigenous NGO, they rarely exercised a truly participatory strategy in all phases of project activity.

As confirmed by both actors, except for few NGOs like the World Vision Ethiopia (WVE), Christian Children's Fund (CCF), Self Help Development International (SHDI), Rift Valley Children and Women Development Association (RVCWDA) and Rafiki Foundation (RF) which had relatively adequate field-based workers, the majority of NGOs (48.57 percent) had less than 5 field-based staff, who were there literarily to do everything. In some cases, such a system of field staff was not there at all (Regional DPPC, 2003). Government agencies complained that such NGOs were among the numerous NGOs that prepare project documents, without involving
the community they intend to reach and without due consideration of legal procedures. (Table 8 shows number of field based NGO staff).

In support of the observations made by pertinent government agencies' employees and officials at different levels of government structure, it was indicated by (Tender, 1982) that many NGOs were often top-down rather than participatory in their decision-making, and target beneficiaries marginally (if at all) involved in NGO projects design.

Table 8: - Number of field-based NGO staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>Number of NGOs</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the current Ethiopian context, the issue of community participation occupies, at least on policy bases, a dignified place in development discourse of the country. The government urges development partners to be participatory, and their interventions community centered. According to responses gathered from both partners, including the NGOs, one basic factor of disagreement and frequent source of conflict between the actors was related to the issue of participation. In the context of the regional government of Oromia NGO Operations Guideline, participation entails two basic components:

i. Allowing beneficiary communities to decide on matters that directly affect their day to day life; and

ii. Working in close partnership with all concerned government agencies for technical feasibility and future sustainability of project activities.
As in most cases, since most NGOs did not conform to these principles, it was not difficult to sense a sign of hostility towards the NGO sector among significant number of government workers.

4.5.3. Lack of transparency and accountability in resource use

The other most important element with which the extent of government-NGO relationship is measured, and on which information was gathered is transparency and openness of NGOs in resource use with respect to concerned stakeholders (including, government agencies and beneficiary communities). It was indicated by the survey made that NGOs have never been transparent with government agencies in any respect, particularly in resource use. Government line agencies interviewed in this regard responded as having poor relations with NGOs in resource use. NGOs were neither transparent nor willing to disclose how they make use of the resources they raise. No sector was certain about material and financial resources inputs NGOs make to projects they undertake in partnership. This is mainly obscured by NGOs frequent request for project revision.

On the other hand, state minister Sofian Ahimad, in the Third Quarter Performance Report His Excellency made at the parliament for Budget and Finance Permanent Committee, he disclosed that NGOs are not willing to make public the amount of resources that flow into the country through the sector, how much of the resources they use for development and administrative purposes. The state minister firmly stated that, NGOs share the overwhelming amount of the resources they raise among themselves, while investing a negligible amount in some villages (The Reporter, 25 June, 2006).

While this complaint had a grain of truth in it, responses received from the NGOs surveyed argued the other way round. NGOs on their part claimed to be transparent and open to all stakeholders, including government agencies and even the beneficiary groups. To be transparent with donor agencies was, of course a question of ascertaining future survival. Over 90 percent of the surveyed NGOs confidently responded to have been very transparent with government agencies, if not to satisfy donor requirements and for downward constituency building, remaining accountable and transparent with government agencies guarantees them ease of access to
technical supports, eases processing of formalities, particularly associated with annual license renewal, and project document revision, if need arise.

Therefore, NGOs saw transparency with stakeholders as a way forward to success and sustained ethical and moral ground for future operation. After all government agencies had all the authority and legal grounds at their disposal to inspect NGO accounts and documents, which however, they rarely did, mainly because of:

i. Poor logistics base such as field vehicles and office equipment;

ii. Limited number and capacity of staff at almost all levels of government structure;

iii. Shortage of financial resources for on-site inspection of NGO accounts and project implementation status; and

iv. Limited attention paid to the sector,

4.5.4. Lack of sustainability and scaling-up of NGO projects

A much discussed criterion for evaluating development NGOs with stakeholders concerns their sustainability, that is, their ability to remain viable after external support ceases and their replicability, that is, the degree to which groups not directly assisted by the NGO take-up the NGO projects on their own. As stipulated in the general NGO guideline, one basic reason why the Ethiopian government urged NGOs to work in partnership with government agencies and target groups was to ensure the sustainability of all NGO operations. Government believes that projects should continue benefiting target beneficiaries after the NGO withdraw from the area.

Many government agencies particularly, regional NGO coordination desk interviewees stressed that NGO projects were dominated by donor-driven agendas. As indicated earlier, because quite significant number of local NGOs lacked proper needs identification with beneficiary groups, the projects they usually operate end up conforming to donor priorities rather than responding to target communities' needs.

The whole idea of sustainability of projects rests in, and necessarily entails community involvement at every step of project cycle, i.e. project formulation and appraisal up to project
implementation and management to develop sense of ownership and good working environment with community. Such approach to project management results not only in building the capacity of recipient communities, but also leads to the final take-over of projects and handling its future management by the same.

From the interviews made and information gathered through structured questionnaires, NGOs appeared to be very much concerned about lack of sustainability of most of their projects. In an open-ended question posed to NGOs regarding their major problem area, over 85 percent of NGOs responded to have always encountered problems related to sustainability issues.

According to these respondents, the same problems that inhibited innovativeness, also applied here. Constituency building among partner project beneficiaries require good resource base, sufficient field-based NGO staff, technical and managerial capacity, frequent and persistent consultation with stakeholders, all of which NGOs were almost always in short supply. Problems of project sustainability were reported to be high among local NGOs (Regional DPPC, 1996). It was also indicated that complaints and disagreements between the two developments actors emanated partly from lack of sustainability of NGO projects and respect for partnership relationship and partly from NGOs failure to act in accordance with the General NGO Operations Guideline (Ibid).

However, about 80 percent of NGOs who responded to the structured questionnaire with respect to expanding the impacts of their projects to the larger population indicated working with government and other development actors like the private sector as first priority. Few others (12 percent) took advocating and lobbying as an alternative to scale-up the impacts of their interventions.
4.5.5. NGOs tendency to operate in an uncoordinated manner

Another complaint commonly heard from government officials is NGOs tendency of operating in an uncoordinated manner at all levels. Responses indicated that NGOs try to avoid government agencies involvement in matters that equally concern both parties. They tended to approach government partners for ease of access to legal procedures. NGOs uncoordinated approach to project formulation was seen usually resulting in duplication of efforts, overlapping with other actors' development efforts. On government part this is seen as unnecessary investment, because sooner or later these projects will be handed over to relevant government agencies, for which the concerned sector may not have sufficient budget.

4.5.6. Unfair geographical distribution of NGO projects

Government employees further indicated that the geographical spread of NGO projects does not at all reflect the reality on the ground. As stressed earlier, NGO activities were concentrated in limited zones and districts of the region, commanding about two third of the total inputs of NGO projects.

4.5.7. NGOs tendency to lie low and avoid government interference

Interesting information gathered from NGOs was the existence of local NGOs operational in the region, without the knowledge of neither the regional DPPC nor the zonal DPPD. The respondents indicated that, government institutions at zonal and district levels were poorly staffed and over burdened to assess and monitor who was doing 'what', 'where' in the region.

East Showa Zonal DPPD NGO coordination officer asked in this regard also indicated that they had suspicion of the presence of non-registered NGOs, especially in urban centers like Adama, Shashemene and Arsi Negele as well as in remote rural localities. Even though, it was well over some months since the zonal DPPD was informed of the existence of such NGO-like organizations, the department could not act accordingly mainly due to lack of sufficient staff and logistics as well as well consolidated information as to where to start the search.
However, the point in order is, whatever these organizations may be, their deed is an attempt made to escape and bypass government bureaucracies and limiting policy regulations. It implied that through its policy regulations, the government has restricted the inflow of development resources and relief handouts that the sector can bring into the country as a whole.

As shown by Campbell (1996), NGOs also have a tendency to bypass government institutions. Under such circumstances, community based organizations, or user groups are used for implementation rather than local governments. According to this author, the phenomenon of NGOs bypassing state institutions is most pronounced in states where government capacity is weak, particularly, in some of the poorest sub-Saharan African societies, where local government has almost disintegrated under structural adjustment programs.

On the other hand, this implied that, in spite of strict policy regulations, the government was not strong enough to enforce the implementation policy regulations and monitor its effectiveness due to lack of capacity and commitment from its own employees. This is an indication that the government should seriously think of amending the policy and operation modalities, not only to become realistic in its effort to regulate the sector, but also facilitate conducive working environment for the sector, which is already trying to bypass its bureaucracies.

Personnel interviewed from government line departments firmly stressed that, though it was beyond governments' capacity to keep track of NGOs and fulfill its institutional obligation of coordinating and act in partnership accordingly, most NGOs happily welcome governments' capacity limitation as an opportunity to lie low and avoid government interference.

In addition to the above criticisms and accusations leveled against the sector, by the regulating government agencies, the following were also identified as strictly thinning the two actors smooth cooperation.

i. NGOs failure to live up to the claims made by the sector

Though NGO activities are claimed to be well targeted, participatory, cost effective and efficient in reaching their target communities, many accuse them to be self-centered, top-down, and highly
localized in their operations. The former CARE Ethiopia Managing Director, John G. pointed out that, in Ethiopia local NGOs are income-generating organizations for the people who founded them, and thus, forming NGOs is considered to be a license to print money. NGOs started up by an individual in the country, he referred to them as, "MONGOs', meaning 'My own NGO'.

ii. NGOs tendency to institutionalize themselves at one locality

The survey indicated that no NGO ever attempted to shift from their initial intervention area, in spite of the explicit duration in one locality, (five years in this case) stipulated in the NGO guideline. NGOs tend to hold onto groups for too long without withdrawing so that there can be sustainable autonomous group action Carroll, 1992). By doing so, NGOs tend to weaken local action and autonomy by bringing people into conventional donor-funded poverty reduction activities. This in fact could be a premature criticism, given the recent infiltration of NGOs in the region.

iii. An increase in the number of urban focused NGO projects

Of the total 126 NGO projects under implementation in East Showa zone, 47 were located in different urban centers of the zone. In the urban centers of Adama, Shashemene and Debre Zeit alone there were 28 NGO projects under implementation at the time of this survey.

iv. Lack of clear phasing-out strategy

Though NGOs indicated the existence of phasing-out strategy in every document they submit, both the regional and zonal NGO coordinating bodies revealed that, NGOs rarely adhere to project documents ones entered operation phase. This is so because there is frequent personnel turnover from both sides, in which case personnel in charge of the projects leave their posts without proper hand-over of important project documents take place.

v. Delivering the various types of reports NGOs were expected to produce.

vi. Poor projects handover strategy,

vii. Lack of impact indicators while conducting projects evaluation;

viii. Implementation of project activities not agreed upon, and

ix. Delays in implementation of project activities.
4.5.8. Biased local government-international NGO relation

Interestingly, a good proportion of surveyed international NGOs appeared to have had relatively good relation with local government agencies. As findings confirmed, most of these NGOs had better organized institution, staffed with more or less competent workers. Therefore, whenever, these NGOs intended to handle issues with partner government agencies, they came up with all requirements they think were lacking at government agencies' office.

As a result, government institution workers especially assigned at zonal and district levels had difficulty of understanding the operation of such large NGOs operations. District and in most places, zonal level institutional capacity was by far inferior to such large NGOs like CARE Ethiopia, WVE, MFM, Save the Children and others organizational capacity to fully inspect and comprehend all the dealings and activities these NGOs undertake.

One major problem detected as steadily growing in these organizations was that they are growing highly bureaucratic, and decisions were very much centralized. For instance, the official in charge of the WVE site office, located in Melkasa town had to secure permission from the head office in Addis to provide the researcher with the needed information. "Go a head" permission was expected from head office before delegated lower level official can act. This is just an example, and the situation with other international NGOs was more or less similar. As a result, the researcher had to repeatedly visit their offices before actually winning their attention. There is a notable disability by almost all NGOs to decentralize decision-making, and it is rare to find true collaboration with other agencies.

4.6. The two actors biased attitude towards one another

NGOs, especially local NGOs always suspected and had a feeling that government higher officials always conspired against them. Many baseless accusations pertinent to unwise resource utilization, and personal enrichment, NGO self-centered motivation, lack of transparency and respect for local authorities, all emanated from government agencies who view the sector as a competitor rather than as partner.
NGOs do not have positive attitude to what government does. They regard measures taken by government with suspicion. Although there was expectation that the relations between government and NGO improves as time passes by (Campbell, 1996), actual realities on ground, however, indicated that still much remains to be done.

On the other hand many government agencies did not have faith in what the NGOs were actually trying to address. The majority believed that whether international or indigenous NGO, both raise fund in the name of disadvantaged people and spend on their own personal use without helping the grassroots or without launching sustainable projects that would have significant impact on the subject people As a result, despite the existence of operational institutional arrangements, few had the desire and willingness to act in partnership with the sector. As a study conducted by the World Bank, (1998) confirmed, NGOs with proven development capabilities and a willingness to work closely with government on a meaningful scale are small.

The majority regarded NGOs as group of individuals brought together in order to be able to raise funds from wherever possible source on behalf of the poor, but only to augment and improve their personal life. Many regarded NGOs as the servants of foreign capital serving the interests of donor agencies mainly inspired by self-centered motivation. The word among many government employees is that NGOs are charlatans racking-up large salaries, luxurious cars and well-furnished offices (Bebbington, 1993).

Many considered NGOs as unaccountable to local citizens and to the resources they raise. During joint monitoring and evaluation with government experts for example, there were cases where evaluations end-up in fault finding and criticisms rather than coming up with constructive measures for future input.

4.7. NGOs over reliance on external sources of funding

It is commonly assumed that NGOs, especially local development NGOs have a problematic relationship with donors as they solely depended on donor resources. It is also argued that donors rarely understand the work of NGOs and particularly, the importance of the processes of
NGO activity. Donors are assumed to support undertakings, which address structural and institutional issues affecting development (Fowler, 1992).

Surveyed NGOs were also requested to respond to how many dependable sources of fund they had. From among the 35 NGOs surveyed, a little more than half (66.67 percent) have responded to have two to three sources and more than 24 percent had 4 and above donors. Large international NGOs like the WVE, CCF, RF and INF and from among local NGOs, RVCWDA and ECC appeared to command more than five sources of funding. All of these NGO resources were expected from donor agencies from the North. No NGO appeared to have local sources of funding. This was one of the problem areas government agencies identified as constraining their relationship. Government suspects NGOs as serving foreign interests, through their exaggerated accountability to donors, leaving aside home based government agencies and target beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Main source</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three Sources</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to five</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A relatively recent UNDP study cited by David L. (2001) on the relationship between local NGOs characterized them as divided, and mistrustful of one another, and found that although the NGOs talk a great deal of exchange of information and experiences, their action, however, show a certain amount of ambiguity to this deed, especially amongst identical organization.

Carroll also suggests that NGOs need to coordinate more effectively among themselves to improve performance. But in practice, competition is more common, mainly pressurized by resource dependence. Due to limited source of funding, many lately emerging indigenous NGOs
tend to protect their funding source information and to maintain a distinct activity niche, which they can use to maintain access to resources (Carroll, 1992).

One important factor, on which NGOs were asked to respond, was how the NGO intends to secure financial sustainability and become less dependent on donor funds. Of the surveyed NGOs, about 52 percent believed that NGOs in the zone should indeed become more self-reliant, while another 27 percent replied that the issue of financial self-sufficiency would be somewhat vague under the present socio-political condition of the country.

In general, there was an indication that NGOs endeavored to remain program focused, kept donors informed of the project under implementation by rigorous report submission and by keeping intact downward and upward accountability. However, unlike non-profit organizations from the north, NGOs in this region do not yet have a local financial base, nor are they likely to gain one in the near future.

At the organizational level, a growing number of NGOs compete for resources. However, the amount of funds local NGOs get is increasing, although local NGOs are also equally mushrooming faster than ever before. Consequently, local NGOs came into conflict not only on sources of funding but also over "spheres of influence" and of "ownership" of the grassroots groups in whose name they requested funding.

4.8. Insignificance of development input by NGOs

There is no reliable data on the volume of development assistance channeled through NGOs and the proportion of the population benefiting from NGO projects. Crain, 2000 estimates that NGOs roughly reach about 15 percent of the total population of Ethiopia through the various services they provide every year (Crane, 2001). He also indicated that NGOs on the average spend roughly close to 1 billion Birr annually. On the other hand, DPPC estimated this figure at about 700 million Birr per annum (DPPC, 2001).
Information from similar sources on regional spending of NGOs revealed that the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Region (SNNPR) spent about half a billion, Amhara about 412 million, and the City of Addis Ababa about 323.7 million in the year 2000 (Crane, 2001).

As indicated, it is difficult to speculate the nearest estimate of NGOs input in the country's socio-economic development. At the regional level, as well, it was not easy to make as close estimation as possible from the meager information available.

From information obtained from regional DPPC, it was estimated that NGOs operational in the region committed to invest 1797.01 million Birr over a period of five years (2003-2007) Oromia DPPC, 2006). Birr 814.39 million (45.32 percent) by INGOs, while the remaining Birr 982.61 million (54.68 percent) was committed by indigenous NGOs.

From the total investment indigenous NGOs committed, over 444.37 million Birr (44.78 percent), was committed to be contributed by 14 different religion-based NGOs operational in different parts of the region. Out of this, over 171 million Birr (38.86 percent) was committed by the Ethiopian Catholic Church, Social and Development Coordination Office (ECC-SDCO). Cluster of church-based and other development indigenous NGOs with committed input level is given in table 10.
Table 10: - Cluster of church-based and other development oriented indigenous NGOs, and committed investment capital over a period of five years (2003-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Indigenous church-based NGOs</th>
<th>Committed invest. in (Birr)</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECC-SDCO</td>
<td>171.68</td>
<td>38.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Evangelical Church</td>
<td>84.97</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Mulu Wangel Church</td>
<td>78.94</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Kale Hiwot Church</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meseret Kiristos Church</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehiowt Brehan Church</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Orthodox Church</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Ethiopian</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Genet Church</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Baptist Church</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>444.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Indigenous non church-based NGOs</th>
<th>Committed invest. in (Birr)</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RVCWDA</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHO</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>24.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action for Development</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators Change Ethiopia (FCE)</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSRA</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>566.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: - Compiled from raw data obtained from Oromia DPPC, 2006.

On the other hand, of the total 814.4 million Birr INGOs committed, to contribute towards the development endeavors of the region, 774.45 million Birr (95.10 percent) was forwarded by 16 major NGOs. Four INGOs, including MFM, CARE Ethiopia, Save the Children USA and the WVE alone committed over 530 million (65 percent) Birr of the total development input by INGOs. Refer to table 11.
Table 11: - Cluster of INGOs and estimated committed investment capital (2003-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Committed investment Capital in mil. Birr</th>
<th>Percent share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MFM</td>
<td>205.58</td>
<td>38.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CARE Ethiopia</td>
<td>131.28</td>
<td>24.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Save the Children-USA</td>
<td>106.16</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WVE</td>
<td>87.64</td>
<td>16.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>530.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share from Total INGOs input</strong></td>
<td><strong>814.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* - Compiled from raw data obtained from Oromia DPPC, 2006.

In general, over 1340.91 million Birr (74.62 percent) of NGO resource inflow into the region was contributed by 16 major INGOs, 6 church-based and 6 non church-based indigenous NGOs. This clearly manifests the poor resource base of majority of NGOs operating in the region.

How significant is NGO input in the region's development endeavors?

A respondent from the regional DPPC and over 70 percent of surveyed NGOs confirmed that NGOs on the average used about 30-35 percent of committed budget for employee's salary and other administrative purposes, as recurrent costs, investing the remaining 65-70 percent in the various development projects they run. This makes the amount NGOs can spend roughly 233.61 million Birr per annum (assuming NGOs spend 35 percent of committed capital as recurrent cost).

This is roughly equivalent to annual recurrent budgets of Illubabor and East Harerghe zones put together, or annual recurrent budget allotment to agriculture and natural resources development or roughly a third of total regional capital budget allotment in 2005/2006. In other words, estimated total annual NGOs development input is roughly equivalent to 7.5 percent of total regional government annual expenditure assignment (BoFED, September 2005).
This clearly indicates that currently NGOs spending in the region is limited, and thus difficult to consider them as significant players in the region's development. Besides, NGOs concentration in limited geographical areas makes their input insignificant, as the impact of their effort cannot be felt beyond their immediate intervention areas.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) on the other hand attributes NGOs limited role in development of the country to limited experience and capacity, as well as constraints in the policy environment (UNDAF, 2001).

However, There are indications that the amount of resources flowing to the sector is increasing, particularly, since the last election in May 2005. On a workshop held with civil society groups operating in Ethiopia, Head, EU delegation in Ethiopia, called upon NGOs, to submit feasible project proposal for its 2.5 million Euro development grant, allotted to build the capacity of non state actors in the country. The ambassador, Tim Clark, urged all NGOs working in the country to promote good governance and enhance social services, among others, in a bid to improve the living standard of the rural poor, especially women if NGOs focus on EU's priorities, the commission agreed to scale-up its grant from 2.5 million Euros to 10 million Euros (The Ethiopian Herald, June 2006).

4.9. Lack of integration of NGO input with regional economy

One of the important areas in Go-NGO relations and on which respondents were inquired to provide response was how resource inflows by the NGO sector were incorporated into regional/national economy. Principally, this is expected to materialize by arranging strict working environment between partners, continuous two-way information flow, and good knowledge of government policy priority areas. On practical bases, this component of authentic partnership between the actors, as indicated in previous sections, is far from being one. Both actors, particularly, NGOs are blamed of doing things their own way, while they still know that their reputation on most cases depended upon the sectors' ability to build broader constituency with all other partners.
The public sector is also not immune to this criticism, for it failed to implement and respect the policy guideline put in place by itself, to guide and push the NGOs come to common platforms so that NGO resource inflows are accounted for to standard. The public sector is using the regulatory policy guideline, as many NGOs referred to it, to control NGOs and their operations.

The above observation emanated from responses gathered from interviewed government agencies' personnel, pertinent to NGO resources incorporation into regional/national economy. Respondents indicated that there was no way through which this was attended, except through partnership relationship stipulated on the NGO operations guideline. But both partners have poorly adhered to the guideline, leaving out the huge NGO input indicated in the previous sub-topic. Adhering to and where necessary, building the capacity of partner government agencies has tremendous advantages for the NGO sector. If the NGO sector does not endeavor to make public its contribution wherever it operates, the public sector may not bother to publicize on behalf of them. It is crucial for NGOs to be better advocates for their own work and to disseminate the out puts and impacts of their projects. They should be able to provide better opportunities for interaction with government structures at all levels.

One reason why NGOs appeared reluctant about accountability and NGO resources integration with national and regional economy at all levels is that until now, NGO assistance is not accounted for in the regional budget, and therefore, does not incur a budget offset on the part of regional government. If NGO budgets were made part of the regional budget allocation, the federal government will adjust the distribution of federal grants accordingly, deducting regional budgets by an amount of money NGOs commit to supplement government annual budget. But now NGO budgets are not offset from regional grants, regions, including Oromia, see NGO resources as extra input on top of their regular budgets. It is therefore not surprising if government partners are not serious about their partnership relationship with NGOs. It is also not surprising if NGOs keep quite, as the other partner action allows it to use the resource they raise without any serious control. If things were the other way round, government could have chased every coin NGOs bring into the economy of the region.
4.10. Poor networking among actors

Cooperating and networking among NGOs helps them create an enabling environment and build bridge between non-member NGOs, membership organizations and wider political structures such as the State and international donors (David L. 2001). Considering the increasing numbers and heightened scale of NGOs in the region, the need for NGOs to coordinate more effectively with each other is high. This has not proved to be the case with most of the surveyed NGOs in the region.

Though NGOs are networked under the CRDA, the membership does not include all registered NGOs in the region. Of the surveyed 35 NGOs only 19 of them were members of the CRDA. The survey indicated that very few NGOs have established networking system with member NGOs. The culture of sharing experience and working together is still at its rudimentary stage. Rather, as one NGO informant indicated, NGOs compete among themselves over areas of engagement and funding agents. This is particularly true for NGOs working in the same locality. They compete to build constituency among beneficiary group, who simultaneously get assistance from both side, thereby ending in duplication of efforts.

4.11. Current government-NGO relations

During the Dergue regime, the states institutional arrangement relating to NGOs focused very much on control. There was little alternative for NGOs, but operate through state structures at a local level. Some NGOs did support the then regional ministry staff with resources and training; however, cooperation remained limited (Jones 1992).

As indicated earlier, with EPRDF coming to power in 1991, the sector was offered substantially more political space than the previous regime. The increase in political space for the sector eased relations between the state and NGOs. There was little danger of being banned or expelled. The political and development direction of the government also suggested that relations between the state and NGOs would improve radically as the development philosophy of the regime was more in tune with NGO approaches, including a focus on grassroots participation. Moreover, the
existence of an independent coordinating body for NGOs, CRDA, which by 2005 had 215 members, offered potential for facilitating co-operative NGO-state relations. It appeared that the potential benefits of cooperation out weighed the costs (Campbell, 1996).

Though the change in regime in the country seemingly was promising, through the institutionalization of the NPDPM General Policy Guideline, the government attempted to impose even greater control on NGO operations than the military regime (Campbell, 1996). Many even considered the NPDPM as a threat to their autonomy. In spite of the institutional arrangements made for partnership, the Ethiopian government considered NGOs as more implementers and facilitators of agendas set by the government. Even if opportunities were made visible, as it was attempted to engage NGOs in the monitoring of Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program (SDPRDP) efforts underway in the country since 2001, it was only nominal, and state bureaucracies hampered inputs of NGOs. The regional and zonal NGO coordinating bodies, for their part now differentiate between good and bad NGOs suggesting a degree of acceptance of some NGOs, while equally showing a tendency of rejecting others.

Even though the contribution of NGOs towards the emergence and consolidation of democratic values has been insignificant (Kassahun, 2002), over the few movements evidenced in the past recent years, there is confusion over NGOs role in advocacy, which is misunderstood as political maneuvering and opposition instead of constructive sharing of ideas and experiences drawn from the grassroots.

More recently, particularly, since the last election in May 2005 and the subsequent political unrest, many NGOs felt they were insecure. Surveyed NGOs asserted that the relation they had with government partners was surrounded by tensions and sometimes harassment by local officials. To cite as an example, as per the NGO operations guideline, except on legal procedures pursued by the federal and regional DPPC, no higher official has the authority to close down or ban NGO operation, even if found illegal. The most one can do was reporting to these authorized government entities. However, local authorities in one of the districts of East Showa zone closed down one local NGO working on control and prevention of HIV/AIDS. This is just an example,
but the extent of harassment that NGOs raised in the course of discussions could be serious and numerous if assessments were made at larger scale.

Considering current socio-political condition of the country, and overall NGOs tendency of trying to lie low in response to local government agencies lack of capacity to enforce the regulation, the prospects for NGO-state cooperation are rather diminishing. This is reflected through NGOs resistance to submit reports, and carryout evaluations as per the NGO operations guideline, avoid government interference by lying low in an attempt to bypass government bureaucracies, and it looks that NGOs, on the whole, retained their positions of non-cooperation established long before under the Dergue regime.
CHAPTER FIVE

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusions

NGOs now feature prominently in efforts to secure social and economic change in favor of marginalized populations, especially in efforts being waged to reduce poverty; by acting as conduits for resource inflow, reaching poor people in desperate need, especially in inaccessible areas, their capacity for innovation, their close link with the disadvantaged and skill of participation.

Efforts being waged to reduce poverty at all levels calls for improvements and fundamental changes in the way that development is understood, decided upon, and actually addressed. Calls for the various sectors of society to work more closely, in the hope that such concerted efforts may yield greater benefits than isolated activities are, abound. Collaborative approach to development, which is one form of government-NGO relations, has recently been recognized by scholars as vitally important to a systematic improvement of the way development is effected. Such approach to development is gaining wide acceptance to deal with the ever-widening effects of poverty, as it is a conscious effort on the part of both governmental and voluntary organizations to work together, despite deeply engrained mistrust and antagonisms between the two.

Effective and cooperative government-NGO relationship in development is influenced by various factors, including the attributes of the NGOs, government agencies and the contexts shaping the relationship. Perceptions of the characteristics of NGOs that seek to work in cooperation with government agencies in development efforts are central; the present and past activities as well as its' present areas of expertise and others affect the way it is perceived by government, and ultimately, its' working arrangements. Furthermore, the political, economic and social environments in which rural development efforts ultimately occur are other major mediating factors.
The policy framework acknowledged the smooth relationship of NGOs, particularly in poverty reduction. With poverty reduction being a matter of priority, development NGOs have been recognized and invited for participation in the development process not only to supplement government efforts among others, in fund raising, but also to contribute their share as responsible citizens.

The working environment showed clearly the interest of the government to enable an environment that allowed for maximum control of the NGO sector. As evidenced by the findings of the research, for lack of inputs from the NGO sector in best possible legal and policy support, the regional NGOs operation guideline could not be to the full satisfaction of NGOs operational in the region. Even though tremendous efforts were made to translate national NGO operations guideline into region-specific reality, the document ended-up in duplication of efforts without any substantive empowering clause to regional level NGO coordinating bodies.

As a result, government-NGO relation in the region is left much to be desired, and that government procedures, rules and regulations hampered NGO activities. The introduction of the National Policy and Disaster Prevention and Management (NPDPM) in 1995 by the government has greatly hampered the sectors' freedom. As a result, while many NGOs anticipated having much better relations with the EPRDF government, actual government-NGO relations have rather remained poor. NGOs claimed that this policy regulation has imposed a far-reaching control over NGOs and their operations than the Dergue regime did. As a result currently NGOs and umbrella organization like the CRDA, engaged in grassroots development, empowerment, advocacy, including human rights and lobbying for changes in government policies are disliked and rarely tolerated. This manifested that government-NGO relations are very much dependent on the type of functions served by NGOs. There is confusion over NGOs role in advocacy, which is misunderstood as political maneuvering and opposition instead of constructive sharing of ideas and experiences drawn from the grassroots.

It was indicated that government agencies tended to level criticism against NGOs to cover their inability to execute their roles as stipulated in the guideline. If government agencies monitor and evaluate NGO projects, which they could not, due to capacity limitations, they could have treated
NGOs as authentic partner. If it were not for capacity limitations, government agencies had all the authority to audit and inspect all NGO documents anywhere (at head office or project site) at anytime of the year. Thus, many NGOs regard criticisms that government agencies level against them as baseless, especially, on issues related with accountancy, sustainability of project activities and scaling-up of impacts of NGO interventions.

A major problem facing almost all government agencies is the lack of capacity, both institutional and financial resource to coordinate, monitor and enforce legislation designed to regulate NGOs. The legislation also failed to include proper appeal mechanisms for NGOs. The NGO regulation policy and the general guideline did not anticipate dynamism in the sector, nor did it encompass all dimensions of issues that have to do with NGOs. From this survey it is learned that NGO regulations require regular reform.

Due to lack of institutional capacity, necessary skills, and government employee’s poor commitment to work with NGOs, government failed to ensure the sustainability of NGO projects, facilitate and demand for terminal evaluation of projects, set modalities on use of NGO resources, arrange mechanisms through which NGO resources can be accounted for, attend to project appraisal procedures and site inspection of NGO activities as stipulated in the NGO guideline. In general the government failed to enforce policy directives as desired.

These weaknesses, according to the regional DPPC informant, lies not only in capacity limitations of concerned government agencies, but also in the make-up of the policy document itself. The document, for instance did not make provisions for extended, time taking and sometimes, bureaucratic procedures the project appraisal and approval processes are expected to go through. It also did not consider the dynamic nature of the sector, and even the whole economy in response to national and global circumstances.

The survey also indicated that the current NGOs spending in the region is limited, mainly because of resource constraints, capacity and experience in the business by many local NGOs. However, there are indications that the amount of donor fund flow into the sector is increasing, particularly, since the last election in May 2005. The challenge is however, whatever the extent
of the resource inflow may be, is very poorly or marginally incorporated into regional/national economy.

There is an indication that NGOs are not heart fully ready to work with government agencies. Most NGOs have been reluctant to directly involve government agencies. NGOs displayed a distinct preference for isolation. Using government agencies' capacity limitations in terms of personnel and logistics, many tended to lie low, and keep away from government interference.

Considering current socio-political condition of the country, and overall NGOs tendency of trying to lie low in response to local government agencies lack of capacity to enforce the policy regulation, the prospects for NGO-state cooperation are rather diminishing. This was reflected through NGOs resistance to submit reports and carryout evaluations as per the NGO operation guideline, and it looks that NGOs, on the whole, tend to keep silent if not challenged to do so.

5.2. Recommendations

5.2.1. Government Perspective

i. Revise legislation and guidelines for coordinating NGO activities with input received from several reviews and Government-NGO forums. The guideline should focus at clearly defining roles and responsibilities of government agencies at different levels in registration and monitoring of NGO projects, and improve the existing legislation. In this regard, finalizing the draft NGO registration regulation proclamation started by the MoJ with full participation of concerned stakeholders may suffice the purpose.

ii. Consider the establishment of new institutional set-up for coordination of development NGOs and incorporation of NGO resources into regional/national economy, by opening separate budget line in government line bureaus working with NGOs. The current institutional arrangement is very much biased towards relief services coordination and management. Thus government and NGOs together need to create an institution to ensure that NGOs' activities are coordinated to standard, and integrated with efforts being waged to reduce poverty and improve the living standard of the disadvantaged.
iii. Building the regulatory capacity of government agencies
Strengthen NGO programs/projects coordination and supervision teams with capable personnel and allocate sufficient finance for project appraisal, formulation, monitoring and evaluation at all levels. Government coordination role should target fostering conducive environments, but not dominate coordination. Sensitive coordination does not amount to controlling NGOs, but it should encourage NGOs to avoid duplication, attend to geographic or sectoral gaps, eliminate religious and/or ethnic biases, and avoid activities which are unrealistic or which contradict state programs.

iv. Create climate of trust and openness
Political and senior officials, representatives of government agencies and employees need to deliberately work towards creating a climate of openness and trust with NGOs, to facilitate opportunities for interaction and mutual respect. Increased openness and interaction creates opportunity to secure sustainability for NGO projects.

v. Access to information
Sharing of information and experience helps influence the attitudes of both actors as well as contributes to effectiveness of NGOs as well as widen learning approach to project formulation and execution.

5.2.2. NGO Perspective

i. Institution building
NGOs need to work towards building their institutional capacity to function as effective and competent entities with mechanisms for long-term and sustained work. Besides, they should work towards strengthening local constituency and reduce over reliance on foreign source of funding. If NGOs wish to act as a voice of civil society, it is a necessity that they develop effective ties with their sectoral partners, local government authorities, grassroots target beneficiaries and remain accountable for the resources they raise. This helps NGOs to secure sustainability for their operations and meet each new change as it arises. This requires, among others, building and strengthening the institutional capacity of partner government institutions.
ii. The right to fare NGO policies

NGOs need to convince government that they merit appropriate and consistent policies based on consultations and exchange of views.

iii. Strengthen fund raising and project implementation capacity

NGOs need to create the capacity to generate funds for their operations, which is key for effective project implementation. This will for sure enable NGOs to curtail criticisms from government, and its application as a pretext to limit infiltration of NGOs, particularly local NGOs. NGOs should try their best to stick to participatory approach to all phases of project activity, as the sector is acknowledged for its popular approach to development worldwide.

ii. Increase networking

NGOs need to find ways to build linkages among themselves and across other development partners in order to develop wider networks. NGOs need to work towards strengthening NGO database to increase transparency with their constituencies. Furthermore, NGOs should advocate for themselves to make public their input towards the development of the region and push regional government to open separate NGO accounts in all sector bureaus working with NGOs. If NGOs incline to lie low, they can never escape from criticisms that could level against them from different sectors of the society.

The end
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ANNEX: 1 Size and number of districts of zones of Oromia region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>No. of districts</th>
<th>Area Km²</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23724.44</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bale</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63917.46</td>
<td>18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borena</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42905.00</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Harerghe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24900.21</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harerghe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17552.23</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guji</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52835.00</td>
<td>14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illubabor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16555.36</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18412.54</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Showa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13624.09</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Showa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14503.00</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Showa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11376.32</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Showa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7049.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wollega</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21863.82</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wollega</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23788.13</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>353006.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ANNEX: 2 Population size and density of zones of Oromia region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsi</td>
<td>1557984</td>
<td>1577702</td>
<td>3135686</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>132.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bale</td>
<td>854584</td>
<td>827222</td>
<td>1727306</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borena</td>
<td>475969</td>
<td>462581</td>
<td>938550</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Harerghe</td>
<td>1298104</td>
<td>1257531</td>
<td>2555635</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harerghe</td>
<td>915138</td>
<td>871948</td>
<td>1787086</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>101.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guji</td>
<td>549424</td>
<td>531409</td>
<td>1080833</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illubabor</td>
<td>587134</td>
<td>610022</td>
<td>1197156</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimma</td>
<td>1382460</td>
<td>1391270</td>
<td>2773730</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>150.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Showa</td>
<td>1246576</td>
<td>1229369</td>
<td>2475945</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>181.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Showa</td>
<td>1087673</td>
<td>1120664</td>
<td>2208337</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>152.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Showa</td>
<td>806536</td>
<td>819951</td>
<td>1626487</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/West Showa</td>
<td>537434</td>
<td>548461</td>
<td>1085895</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>154.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wollega</td>
<td>873408</td>
<td>906228</td>
<td>1779636</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wollega</td>
<td>1077575</td>
<td>1103143</td>
<td>2181718</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13249999</strong></td>
<td><strong>13303001</strong></td>
<td><strong>26553000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nex 3: -Map of national regional state of Oromia
ANNEX: 4

1. **Northern NGOs**: - These are located in the countries of the north with their branches, projects and programs in the countries of the south. These are NGOs that play the role of donors, project implementers, or 'partners' working with southern NGOs, and community-based organizations; forming an increasingly important element of the aid industry.

2. **Southern NGOs**: - These are indigenous NGOs operating with their roots and origins within the countries and with people from within the countries providing leadership (David L., 2001).
ANNEX: 5 Schematic Representation of Licensing Procedure at the Federal level

Note: Once operation agreement is signed at the federal level with the Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC), NGOs will proceed to the regions where they would contact the sector bureau they would desire to work with and then proceed with processing of the legal procedure.
ANNEX 6: - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Questionnaire for regional DPPC and zonal DPPD

Objective of the study:
This questionnaire is designed for the purpose of gathering information pertinent to Local-government-NGO Relations and partnership in Deployment in Ethiopia, particularly, in the Regional State of Oromia. The result of this survey will be used to make inferences about the relationship between the two development actors. You are therefore, cordially requested to cooperate in providing accurate and reliable information as much as you can. The paper that will be produced, besides qualifying me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Masters Degree, it will also serve academic purposes and research endeavors in development studies.

“Thank you”

INSTRUCTIONS: In places where multiple choices are given, please mark an “X” in the boxes provided.

1. Name of the Bureau/Commission/Office: ____________________________
2. Date the questionnaire is filled: ____________________________
1. What is your role as regards the operation of NGOs in the region?
   1. ______________________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________________
2. What is the general understanding towards NGOs involvement in development activities of the region?
   1. Appreciated 2. Seen with suspicion, thus discouraged 3. Disliked ______________________________________________________________________
3. Who decides on the specific area/district in which NGOs intervene?

4. Do you have NGO mapping?  1. Yes  2. No ______________________________________________________________________
5. Do you provide any sort of incentive to NGOs? If your answer is yes, please list them down.
   1. ______________________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________________
6. Are there NGOs operating in the region without your knowledge?  1. Yes--------  2. No------ ______________________________________________________________________
7. Do NGOs implement project activities that are not previously agreed upon?
   1. Yes  2. No ______________________________________________________________________
8. What governing /penalizing regulations are in place if NGOs fail to comply with regional
9. NGO regulations? Please list them down if there are any.
   1. ______________________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________________
10. Have you ever dismissed an NGO from operating in the region for failure to comply with the necessary legal
    procedures? If yes, please list down the name, type of NGO, and year of dismissal in the last five (5) years that
    is, (2000-2005) in the table provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of NGO</th>
<th>Sector it was involved in</th>
<th>Year dismissed</th>
<th>Operation area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigen.</td>
<td>Intern.</td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do the NGOs submit reports regularly?  1. Yes  2. No ______________________________________________________________________
12. If your answer is yes, how often?
   1. Quarterly  2. Bi-annually  3. Ones a year  4. Not at all ______________________________________________________________________
13. If at all NGOs submit reports, to which administrative structure implementing agency do they submit?
   1. Regional  2. Zonal  3. District  4. To all levels ______________________________________________________________________
14. Do you provide feedbacks to NGO reports and queries?  1. Yes  2. No ______________________________________________________________________

V
15. If your answer is no, why not? Rate the following variables in their order of importance.

1. Limited number of staff
2. Limited capacity of staff
3. Limited availability of logistics such as field vehicles
4. Limited attention given to the NGO sector
5. Shortage of financial resources
6. Others (Specify)

16. Are there regular feedbacks between regional, zonal and district level concerned bodies? If yes, how is this made possible?

1. 
2. 

17. Do all NGOs undertake situation analysis (baseline survey) of their project areas before starting operation?

1. Yes 
2. No

18. Do you evaluate NGO financed projects? 

1. Yes 
2. No

19. If yes how often?

20. Which parties participate in the evaluation process?

1. 
2. 

21. Do you have impact assessment indicators when conducting evaluations?

1. Yes 
2. No

22. If your answer is no, what exactly do you look at when evaluating the impacts of project? Elaborate.

23. Do all NGOs have ‘phasing out’ strategy for all projects they ran?

1. Yes 
2. No

24. Do you have any idea about how much resource NGOs mobilize and make use of in the projects they operate?

1. Yes 
2. No

25. If your answer is yes, do you know roughly, how much of what they raise is used for development activities? Indicate in percentage.

26. If you answer is no, how is NGO resource input incorporated into national/regional budgetary system? Elaborate please.

27. From your work experience with NGOs, how do you characterize the sustainability of NGO financed projects after the NGO pull out?

1. Seen as part of government financed projects and sustained
2. Poorly sustained
3. It depends upon the NGOs’ relationship with implementing Go agencies

28. What do you think should NGOs do to sustain and scale-up the impact of their projects to the larger community?

1. 
2. 

29. What is your general perception towards the whole NGO business?

30. Please list down activities of your sectoral areas in which NGOs have currently engaged

1. 
2. 

31. How do you evaluate your institutions capacity to coordinate NGOs? Encircle

1. Very Strong 
2. Strong 
3. Weak 
4. Very weak

32. How do you explain your offices’ general partnership relationship with NGOs?

1. Very Strong 
2. Strong 
3. Weak 
4. Very weak

33. How far is NGOs open enough and ready to make use of your technical and/or administrative supports?

1. Highly open-enough
2. Open-enough
3. Somewhat open-enough
4. Not open-enough at all
34. If they are not open-enough as such, what do you think are the reasons behind? Elaborate please.

35. In the course of your working experience with NGOs, please name the first ten (10) NGOs that you found are best in establishing the desired partnership relationship with the sectoral government offices and with your office as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Is there any organizational mechanism with regard to maintaining synergy among different levels of your office in terms of involvement in NGO project-based partnership relationship? 1. Yes 2. No

37. In the course of your partnership with NGOs how on average do you rate NGOs operating in your sectoral involvement with respect to the following variables?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Adherence to the general NGO code of conduct and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Respect to the Government-NGO partnership relationship Guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Extent of bottom-up planning and implementation approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Quality of project planning (need-based formulation of viable project documents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Capacity in project implementation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Quality of the staff (credential and professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Quality of service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Level of broader constituency building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Contribution of NGOs to the development endeavors of the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. If your evaluation is found to be less or equal to “Good”, what further steps you suggest should NGOs take to best contribute to the development endeavors of the country in general and the region in particular?

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________

52. Any general or specific information you need to supplement, please?
2. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECTOR BUREAUS/OFFICES/COMMISSION

Name of the Bureau/Commission/Office: __________________________
Date: ______________________

I. General
101. What is the role of your sectoral Bureau/office, as regards the operation of NGOs in the region? Elaborate please.
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

102. What are the basic requirements expected from any NGO to start operation in your sector? Please indicate them
item-by-item, if there are any legal procedures that NGOs should fulfill at your level.
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

103. In what particular areas do you serve them to start their operations in your sector?

104. How long does it take before NGOs formally start their operations?

105. Please list down activities of your sectoral areas in which NGOs have currently engaged
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

106. What is the general understanding towards NGOs involvement in development activities of the region?

107. Who decides on the specific area/district in which NGOs intervene?
   1. Appreciated  2. Seen with suspicion, thus discouraged  3. Disliked

108. Do you have NGO mapping?  1. Yes  2. No

109. If your answer to question 104 is yes, what is the base for the mapping?

110. Do you provide any sort of incentive (technical, advisory, facilitation...etc) to NGOs?
   1. Yes  2. No

111. If your answer to the above question is yes, please list them down item by item.

112. Are there NGOs operating in your sectoral involvement in the region without your knowledge?
   1. Yes  2. No

113. Do NGOs implement project activities that are not previously agreed upon?
   1. Yes  2. No

114. What governing/penalizing regulations are in place at sectoral implementing agencies level, if NGOs fail to
comply with regional NGO regulations? Please list them down if there are any.
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

II. Project appraisal, monitoring and evaluation
201. Which parties participate in project appraisal? Please list down their names.
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

202. Do the NGOs submit reports regularly?  1. Yes  2. No

203. On how many components NGOs are expected to deliver reports? Please list them down.
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________

204. If your answer is yes, how often?

205. If at all NGOs submit reports, to which administrative structure implementing agency do they submit?
   1. Regional  2. Zonal  3. District  4. To all levels

206. Do you provide feedbacks to NGO reports and queries?  1. Yes  2. No
207. If your answer is no, why not? Rate the following variables in their order of importance

1. Limited number of staff
2. Limited capacity of staff
3. Limited availability of logistics such as field vehicles
4. Limited attention given to the NGO sector
5. Shortage of financial resources
6. Others (Specify)

208. Are there regular feedbacks between regional, zonal and district level concerned bodies? If yes, how is this made possible?

1.

209. Do all NGOs undertake situation analysis (baseline survey) of their project areas before starting operation?

1. Yes
2. No

210. Do you evaluate NGO financed projects?  1. Yes  2. No

211. If yes, how often?

1. Quarterly
2. Bi-annually
3. Ones a year
4. Not at all

212. Which parties participate in the evaluation process?

1.

213. Do you have impact assessment indicators when conducting evaluations?

1. Yes
2. No

214. If your answer is no, what exactly do you look at when evaluating the impacts of project activities on the target beneficiaries? Elaborate please.

215. Do all NGOs have ‘phasing out’ strategy for all projects they ran?

1. Yes
2. No

iii. Accountability, sustainability, and scaling-Up

301. Do you have any idea about how many resources NGOs mobilize and make use of in the projects they operate?  
1. Yes
2. No

302. If your answer is yes, do you know roughly, how much of what they raise is used for development activities? Indicate in percentage (%).

304. If you answer is no, how is NGO resource input incorporated into national/regional performance in poverty reduction and overall development endeavors? Elaborate please.

305. From your work experience with NGOs, how do you characterize the sustainability of NGO financed projects after the NGOs pull out?

4. Seen as part of government financed projects and sustained
5. Poorly sustained
6. It depends upon the NGOs’ relationship with implementing Government agencies

306. What do you think should NGOs do to sustain and scale-up the impact of their projects to the larger community?

1.
2.
3.
4.
In the course of your partnership with NGOs how on average do you rate NGOs operating in your sectoral involvement with respect to the following variables?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Adherence to the general NGO code of conduct and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Respect to the Government-NGO partnership relationship Guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Extent of bottom-up planning and implementation approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Quality of project planning (need-based formulation of viable project documents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Capacity in project implementation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Quality of the staff (credential and professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Quality of service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Level of broader constituency building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

319. How do you rate the overall contribution of NGOs to the development of the region?

320. If your evaluation is found to be less or equal to “Good”, what further steps you suggest should NGOs take to best contribute to the development endeavors of the country in general and the region in particular?
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________

321. Any general or specific information you need to supplement, please?
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________

3. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NGOS

I. Identification particulars:
1.1. Name of the organization: ________________________________
1.2. Date questionnaire is filled ____________________________

II. General
201. To which one of the following does your NGO belong?

202. The NGO operates in one of the following area.
1. Rural 2. Urban 3. Both rural and urban

203. How long is it since you started operation in this zone? It was in: __________________
204. How many projects are you currently operating?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Budget (Birr)</th>
<th>Year started</th>
<th>Year it Terminates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205. Apart from this zone where else in Oromia does the NGO operate? Write name of the zones.
1. 
2. 

206. How many expatriate workers do you have on these projects?

207. Apart from this region, where else does your NGO operate in Ethiopia? List the name of the regions, if there are any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

208. Do you work in collaboration with other NGOs? If your answer is yes, please list down the name of the first most important NGO in terms of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

209. Please list down the sectoral orientation of your projects.
1. 
2. 

III. Relation with the government:

201. How did you find the NGO working environment in Oromia?
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Not good at all

202. If your evaluation for the above question is “Not good at all” what do you think has made the situation problematic?
1. 
2. 

203. What particular support do you get from co-signatory government agencies, that you think is really very helpful for your operations?
1. 
2. 

204. Does the government involve you in formulation of policy issues?
1. Yes
2. No

205. If your answer is yes, how is this made possible? Elaborate please.
1. 
2. 

206. How do you characterize your relationship with the government?
1. Generally positive
2. Generally negative
3. Mixed relations
4. Isolated problems cited

207. What is your perceptions regarding government agencies cooperation with NGOs?
1. Government agencies are primarily cooperative
2. Government agencies are primarily interfering
3. Government agencies are both cooperative and interfering
4. Government has no effect on NGO work

208. What is your perception of the time required to process registration, license renewal, processing of permit for expatriate workers and the like?
1. Normal and acceptable
2. Lengthy and bureaucratic
3. Lengthy and bureaucratic
4. Lengthy and time taking

209. How do you compare your working environment with regional government agencies as compared with that of the national level? Working with regions, particularly, Oromia is:
1. Much better
2. Better
3. Difficult
4. Very difficult
210. If your evaluation for the above question is choices number ‘3’ and ‘4’, what do you think are the underlying reasons? Elaborate please.

1. 

211. As an indigenous NGO (if you are one of them) what particular problem(s) do you have in your partnership with regional government agencies? Please list them down in their order of importance.

1. 

212. As an international NGO (if you are one of them) what particular problem(s) do you have in your partnership with regional government agencies? Please list them down in their order of importance.

1. 

213. What is/are your major sectoral area of intervention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

214. Please list the names of co-signatory government institutions/agencies with whom you are working as a partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

215. How do you characterize government agencies employees’ attitude towards NGOs like you and their operation? Elaborate please.

216. As an NGO working in this region, what do you think are the major shortcomings/limitations of?

- The overall NGO sector:
  1. 
  2. 

- International NGOs?
  1. 
  2. 

- Indigenous NGOs, in particular?
  1. 
  2. 

217. Are there problems you face in raising fund, particularly, as related to the government?

1. Yes
2. No

218. If your answer is yes, please list them down.

1. 
2. 

219. From the perspectives of NGOs, what do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of working with government agencies?

- **Advantages:**
  1. 
  2. 

- **Disadvantages:**
  1. 
  2. 

220. As you know the majorities of NGOs are stationed and operate in urban areas or in areas very close to urban areas? Why do you think is this so? Elaborate please.

221. As a non-profit making NGO, and active participant in the country’s development and poverty reduction endeavors, what do you think should the government do to fully exploit all the resources and potentials of the NGO community? List them down, if there are any.

1. 
2. 

xii
222. As a non-profit making NGO, and active participant in the country’s development and poverty reduction endeavors, what do you think should the whole NGO community do to have full autonomy and respect from government agencies higher officials with whom they work and? 
1. 
2. 

III. Funding
301. Please list down your sources of finance by source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Local sources</th>
<th>External donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 

302. Do you get any fund from the government / both federal and regional?
1. Yes 
2. No 

303. Have you ever contracted a project from the government to implement financed by your staff?
1. Yes 
2. No 

304. How do you evaluate the overall regional government agencies institutional capacity to coordinate, monitor, evaluate and provide feedbacks to your reports and queries?
1. Very strong 
2. Strong 
3. Weak 
4. Very weak

305. If the result of your evaluation for the above raised concept is ‘very weak’ what do you think are the major limitations? Rate the following variables in their order of importance.
1. Limited number of staff
2. Limited capacity of staff
3. Limited logistics, such as field vehicles
4. Biased personnel attitude towards NGOs and their operations
5. Limited financial resources
6. Others (Specify)

306. In the course of your partnership with government agencies, how on average do you rate government agencies operating in your sectoral involvement with respect to the following variables?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very good 02</th>
<th>Good 03</th>
<th>Satisfactory 04</th>
<th>Poor 05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Respect to the Government-NGO partnership relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Capacity in project/program coordination, M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Quality of the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Scaling-Up
312. The NGO expands the impact of its intervention to the larger society of the region:
1. By growing large
2. By expanding the type of activity undertaken
3. By working with others, providing trainings and create knowledge
4. By working with the government and the private sector
5. By encouraging the formation of new NGOs
6. By advocating and lobbying
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