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**Abstract**

African peer Review mechanism (APRM) is a voluntarily self assessment mechanism in which each participating country’s government is evaluated and monitored from the four dimensions of governance: Democracy and political governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance and socio-economic development. Ethiopia is one of the member states in APRM and it has produced its Country Self Assessment Report (CSAR) and National Program of Action (NPoA). The mechanism has acknowledged the critical role of all stakeholders including civil society and private sector in the review process.

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the role and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process. The study employed a mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches by means of a triangulation technique in integrating information gathered through questionnaire, interview and document review. Samples were drawn from Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) on the basis of purposive sampling technique in order to gather data through questionnaire. In addition, other organizations from members of National Governing Council and informant individuals were approached through interview. The literature review conducted for the purpose of this study has underlined the importance of meaningful participation of civil society in major activities and stages of APRM to make the review process credible and fruitful.

The finding of the study shows that the role and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM were at minimal level and unsatisfactory. Similarly, the definition and scope of civil society in APRM was narrow. Under conclusion part, the paper indicates that the insignificant engagement of CSOs in APRM would undermine their participation and commitment during actual implementation of NPoA. Thus government should create conducive environment for effective participation of all categories of civil society in governance issues. This would again require engendering vibrant civil society and open political space for civic engagement.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Background of the study

African countries, by and large, are characterized by daunting challenges of poverty and underdevelopment. The reasons for Africa’s daunting situation are numerous and include colonialism, limited human capacity, inappropriate policies, political instability, and the workings of international economic system. Lack of governance, however, is the top constraining factor and that has been identified by African leaders as the most important factor that holds back African development which in turn necessitated New Partnership for Africa’s Development/NEPAD\(^1\) initiative (African Union/AU/, 2003c:1).

Needless to say that sustainable development is unthinkable in situations where there is no good governance (Commonwealth Secretariat/CWS/, 2000:5; Deme, 2005:13). In order to achieve the objectives of NEPAD, African Peer Review Mechanism/APRM/ has been launched since 2003 as a self-monitoring mechanism through which a country would volunteer to be subjected to a country review process with four governance thematic areas: democracy and political governance; economic governance and management; corporate governance; and socio-economic development (AU, 2003b:3). To date 29 African countries including Ethiopia have signed its accession document, the memorandum of understating (APRM monitor, 2009:4).

NEPAD’s APRM as monitoring and evaluation system is essential in facilitating the achievement of good governance indicators in Africa. Babu (2007:98) confirms that monitoring and evaluation systems would have great importance in promoting transparency, making officials to work visibly, enhancing the credibility of performance reports, promoting the culture of learning, building confidence between the agents and their principles.

\(^1\) NEPAD is a vision and a socio-economic development framework for Africa.
APRM as stated in its base document is designed to “foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration through sharing of experiences and reinforcement of successful and best practice including deficiencies and assessing the need for capacity building (AU, 2003a:1).

On the basis of the above premises, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia government has promulgated regulation No. 142/2008 in 2008 for implementation of APRM in the country. Accordingly, the country has completed its first cycle self-evaluation process on January 2009 (Ethiopia’s APRM National Governing Council Secretariat/NGC secretariat/, 2009a:5). The objectives of the APRM implementation in Ethiopia as indicated in the report are to:

- Review the status of governance in the country
- Identify the strengths, weaknesses, and institutional gaps in the areas of four dimensions of governance, and
- Develop a preliminary action plan that will address the identified gaps (Ibid: 4).

Although the APRM can be seen as the most important evaluation and monitoring instrument of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), its success depends on the effective implementation of each individual country particularly it depends on empowered, active and substantive participation of civil society (Takirambudde & Fletcher, 2006: 65-69; UNDP, 2009: 1). This Master’s thesis paper critically examines the role and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process. In this endeavor the study identifies the challenges encountered during the first cycle review process and potential prospects with related to civic engagement in the APRM process.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Good governance can be considered as the prerequisite for sustainable development. African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) as monitoring and evaluation system of government performance in four good governance dimensions would enhance socio-
economic development as well as building governance in Ethiopia (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia/FDRE/ Council of Ministers, 2008:3969). For APRM to succeed, however, participating country’s government should ensure active and meaningful participation of all stakeholders (APRM monitor, 2009:7). Similarly, the guidelines for countries to prepare for and to participate in the APRM articulate that any participating country’s government should ensure the engagement of all stakeholders in the process (AU, 2003d:3).

Civil society is one of the crucial stakeholders which determine the credibility and quality of the review process. According to Verway (2005:20), the meaningful participation of civil society would ensure the credibility of the process. He also notes that “without civil society, APRM is an exercise in government reviewing itself and becomes merely gathering dust.”

Although APRM base document confirms the importance of the participation and roles of civil society, the existence of sufficient political space for civil society organizations (CSOs) to function determines the level of their participation and significance of their inputs (Takirambudde and Flether, 2006:68). This could be explained by the level of freedom of association, freedom of expression, the existence of independent APRM National Governing Council (NGC), and information accessibility related to APRM process (Ibid:69).

The second issue to be considered in enhancing the substantive participation of the CSOs is their internal capacity in terms of necessary analytical, advocacy, research and resources capacities, and their organizational set-up. This would hamper the roles of CSOs in providing real pressure for accountability and transparency within the government (Ibid: 70).

The third important potential problem that could limit the roles and involvement of CSOs is the absence of well designed strategies, which promote effective participation of the civil society, followed by APRM participating country’s government.
The student researcher argues that the successful implementation of APRM process in Ethiopia including other countries is highly dependent, among other things, on the roles and involvement of the CSOs at different stages of the process: Formation of APRM NGC, planning stage of APRM, country self-assessment, consultation, preparation of preliminary program of action and final program of action, and monitoring and evaluation the program of action stages.

1.3. Basic Research questions

Based on the above critical potential problematic areas, the question that this paper aims to address is whether Ethiopia’s first cycle peer review mechanism has had meaningful substantive participation by civil society. Accordingly, the student researcher seeks to address the following five basic research questions in relation to Ethiopia’s APRM process:

1. What strategies were followed by Ethiopian Government to enhance effective participation of CSOs in APRM process?
2. To what extent have CSOs been engaged in APRM process of Ethiopia?
3. How far have CSOs played their roles in the process?
4. What have been the challenges of civic engagement, if any, in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM?
5. What will be the prospects of civic engagement in APRM?

1.4. Objectives of the study

The general objective of this study is to critically evaluate the role and engagement of the CSOs in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process. More specifically, the purpose of this study is to:

1. Evaluate efforts made by government to ensure the effective participation of CSOs in APRM process,
2. Assess the civil society engagement and involvement level in Ethiopia’s APRM,
3. Explore whether CSOs have played crucial roles in the review process,
4. Pinpoint the major challenges of civic engagement in the review process,
5. Identify potential prospects of civic engagement in APRM process, and
6. Suggest possible recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of Ethiopia’s APRM process for the second cycle of self-assessment endeavor.

1.5. Justifications and Significance of the study

Although there has been many studies undertaken on APRM and CSOs participation in other countries, this could be considered as a pioneering work for Ethiopia’s APRM process. Thus this research is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, the study will enrich literature on governance, government’s self-assessment and peer review, and the roles of CSOs in implementing APRM. Secondly, the findings of this research would stimulate senior intellectuals and researchers to undertake researches on this area.

Thirdly, this study will be a valuable contribution to analyze the CSOs’s participation which would in turn pave the way how to search for excellent approach in optimizing the roles and involvement of CSOs in APRM process and other continental level initiatives. Furthermore, undertaking an academic research on one of the most important reform tools, APRM, will have great significance in disseminating information and philosophies of the review process.

1.6. Scope of the study

In order to make the study manageable and focused, it has its own delimitation and boundary with regard to the following points. The first one is related to perspective of APRM’s stakeholders in which only the role and involvement of CSOs was addressed and to some extent the government strategies to create enabling environment for the participation of CSOs in the review process was also touched. The other delimitation of this study is that it only considered those formally registered CSOs at federal (national) level. Except for CSOs which had been participant in the process, other CSOs were approached through their respective networks or umbrella organizations.

The third delimitation aspect of this study is related to major activities and the stages of APRM process. Since the final Program of Action (FPoA) of Ethiopia, which will be
released after approval of heads of state-most probably in the upcoming June\(^2\), has not yet finalized, the study is mainly bound to prior stages to FPoA. More specifically the study has been emphasized on the role and involvement of civil society in formation and composition of APRM NGC, planning/designing the implementation approaches, sensitization, country self assessment, national program of action, and consultation with country mission team stages of APRM.

1.7. Limitations of the study

The student researcher was confronted with a number of challenges and problems in undertaking this study. First the study was constrained by paucity of data on APRM and the confidentiality principle generally surrounding government’s operations. The difficulty to get access to most important materials such as minutes of meetings, and reports of NGC constrained the quantity and quality of secondary data. Similarly, AIMDG could not provide information on a list of CSOs participated in CSAR. The second challenge was consideration of the issue as politically sensitive and some respondents and interviewees showed little willingness during field data collection.

The third limitation of this study is the purposive sampling procedure, the data collection procedure of this study, decreases the generalization of findings. In addition, the findings obtained through qualitative approach could be subject to other interpretations. Finally, financial constraints, limited experience of the researcher, and academic time requirements have also inhibited the researcher from enquiring into all the salient issues used to fully understand the APRM and aspects of the role and engagement of CSOs.

1.8. Methodology of the study

For any research endeavor, methodology shows the way how the topic should be approached and pursued. In this study, the researcher employed largely qualitative approach. The primary approach was qualitative because the researcher seeks to

\(^2\) Communiqué issued at the end of the 12th summit of the committees Heads of state and government participating in APRM, 30 January 2010, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
investigate the role and engagement of civil society in already undertaken APRM in Ethiopia based on the respondents’ ideas and perceptions mainly from CSOs. This was again complemented by some quantitative data which involves quantitative approach. These quantitative data were obtained from the data base of Charities and Societies Agency (CSA) and website of Freedom House. This section highlights research type and approaches, sampling design and data analysis methods.

1.8.1. Methods and Techniques

1.8.1.1. Research Types and Approaches

The quantitative, qualitative and the mixed of the two can be considered as the most commonly used research types. A quantitative research aims at measurement of a phenomenon that can be expressed in terms of quantity whereas a qualitative type emphasizes on the explanation of the reasons of a particular behavior. On the other hand, a mixture of the quantitative and qualitative research type involves collection of both numerical and opinions related data (Creswell, 2003:18). Particularly, mixed method is effective to both generalize the findings to a population and develop a detailed view of the meaning of a phenomenon or concept for individuals (Ibid: 22). In this regard, the researcher applied the mixed type of research to capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

1.8.1.2. Sampling design: Data sources, Sampling and Sampling Frame

The main purpose of this study was to assess the role and involvement of civil society in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process. In order to address this, the researcher designed purposive sampling of non-probability sampling approach from deliberately selected organizations. Thus in order to assess and evaluate the roles and involvement of CSOs in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process, CSOs which have participated in the process, responsible government focal person, and other related organizations were approached by purposive sampling technique. In this purposive sampling technique, data were collected from two major categories of CSOs: Representatives of CSOs in Ethiopia’s African Peer Review Mechanism National Governing council (NGC), and Umbrella organizations/
Networks of CSOs, and key informants (those CSOs which were participants in APRM process as per information obtained from NGC Secretariat and CSOs networks).

The basic justification to use purposive sampling is based on expertise driven approach which is to mean the researcher is looking for individuals or institutions that have experiences and expertise in the review process in order to achieve the objectives of this study.

With respect to the Networks of CSOs, they would represent almost 1172 CSOs/NGOs organizations and these umbrella organizations can be considered as representatives of their respective member organizations. Table 1.1 indicates the membership size of active indigenous networks in Ethiopia.

Table 1.1: Member-organizations in civil society Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Civil society Networks</th>
<th>Number of member-organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Network of Networks of HIV positives in Ethiopia</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Association of Ethiopian Microfinance Institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basic Education Association in Ethiopia</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Consortium of Reproductive Health Association</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ethiopian Interfaith Forum for Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Network of Ethiopian Women Association</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Orphan and Vulnerable Children Network- Ethiopia</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Poverty Action Network of Civil Society organizations in Ethiopia (PANE)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Union of Ethiopian Civil Society Associations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Federation of Ethiopian Associations of Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1172</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Own field notes and Questionnaire result

---

3 Their names are the old ones prior to the new proclamation of CSOs
For the sake of triangulation purpose, representatives from government, opposition parties and the technical research institute were also considered in this study. From government side, particularly to deal with the strategies employed for enhancing participation of CSOs in the process (objective No. 1 of this study), a chief executive officer of NGC Secretariat was the part of the sampling frame. One focal person from each of the four opposition parties represented in APRM National Governing Council (NGC)\(^4\) was also incorporated in the sample for this study.

Moreover to get comprehensive information regarding the Country Self Assessment Report (CSAR) of Ethiopia, the African Institute of Management, Development and Governance (AIMDG)\(^5\) which was responsible for undertaking the CSAR was also considered in this study. AIMDG was considered only to get preliminary information about implementation of APRM in Ethiopia.

### 1.8.2. Data collection tools

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and instruments were employed in order to get comprehensive information. These instruments include questionnaire, interview, and examination of relevant documents. Questionnaire (both open-ended and closed-ended), was used to gather information from the CSOs participated in Ethiopia’s APRM process. In addition, in-depth interviews were conducted with executive directors/focal persons of all civil society networks/umbrella organizations, representatives of the four political parties in NGC, and the manager of AIMDG to collect first hand information about the extent to which civil society has been the part of APRM process in Ethiopia. From government representative, a chief executive officer of NGC Secretariat was interviewed through telephone.

---

\(^4\) The opposition parties were represented by the United Ethiopian Democratic Forces; Coalitions for Unity and Democratic Party, UEDP-Medhin, and the Oromo Federalist Democratic Movement, NGC Secretariat, 2009: 3

\(^5\) AIMDG was commissioned by APRM National council as technical research institute, NGC Secretariat, 2009:4
The other important data collection tool employed in this study was examination of relevant documents related to APRM. To this effect, secondary data on the trend of CSOs were gathered from FDRE Charities and Societies Agency (CSA). In addition, the composition of civil society representatives in NGC was obtained from secondary data and other documents were also assessed from NGC Secretariat and internet sources.

In total, the executive directors/focal persons from 38 different organizations (31 from CSOs and 7 from other organizations related to the subject area) were approached through questionnaire and/or interview techniques of data collection. Since the primary data collection tools were questionnaire and interview, it is important to look at the targeted CSOs and other key informants from data collection tools’ perspectives.

Organizations addressed by questionnaire

The researcher distributed the questionnaire to 33 target population of CSOs of which 29 CSOs organizations responded and returned the questionnaire. As summarized in the above table, the effective response rate is 87.9 percent. Therefore the analysis of data obtained through questionnaire considered 29 CSOs as 100 percent samples. However, a few respondents, at most two respondents, did skip some portions from the questionnaire and thus the analysis was done by considering only those respondents who fully answered some specific portions. In case where there were major variations among the respondents’ views, analyses and discussions considered these variations by taking into account the respondents’ categories: CSOs representatives in NGC and CSOs networks and others. Table 1.2 summarizes a list of respondents’ categories from the sampling frames.
Table 1.2: A summary of sampling frames and response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sampling frames’ categories</th>
<th>Sampling frames in number</th>
<th>Respondents’ size Number</th>
<th>Percentage from sampling frame</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSOs representatives in NGC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>Three couldn’t be found: one from student’s council, two from Regional Women Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSOs Networks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>One didn’t not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other CSOs that participated in APRM process⁶</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Researcher constructs)

**Organizations approached through Interview**

These organizations include four opposition parties represented in NGC, APRM NGC Secretariat, Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce & Sectoral Associations, Ethiopian civil society Task Force, twelve Networks of CSOs, Six Representatives of CSOs in NGC, and AIMDG. At least one focal person was taken in each of these organizations for interview and their responses and comments were incorporated in the analysis part except for AIMDG whose preliminary information was used to design sampling frames. Focal persons who were interviewed are indicated under Annex III.

**1.8.3. Data Analysis Method**

In order to produce meaningful interpretation from the collected data, the data should be examined, categorized, and tabulated in logical manner. On the basis of this premise, the researcher initially organized data into a set of relevant and key themes of the research indicated under the basic research questions. The raw data obtained through questionnaire were organized by computer Software called Statistical Package for Social Sciences

---

⁶ This information was obtained from APRM NGC Secretariat and some key informants are included in this category
(SPSS) that makes the computation precise, dependable and not time consuming. These data were presented by tables, pie and bar charts in the form of frequency counts, and percentages. The data gathered through interview, open-ended questionnaire and document review were systematically organized and incorporated under each theme for analysis.

1.9. Terms and Definitions

The key targets of this study are CSOs and APRM. Each of them is discussed from different angles under the literature review part. However, it is important to define civil society and first cycle in this section. To begin with the civil society, there is controversy as to what CSOs include or do not include (Dessalegn et al 2008: 9). At this point it is therefore important to clearly define CSOs for this particular study. The writer adopts the definition given by Dessalegn et al (2008:9-10) and Hiroko (1999:128) which does not include business sector, political organizations, and the informal civil society organizations Thus CSOs, in this paper, can be conceptualized as organizations that can fulfill the following situations:

1. Formally constituted and registered by Ministry of Justice prior to the new Charities and society proclamation No 612/2009.
2. Organizationally separate from government
3. Not profit seeking,
4. Self-governing, and
5. Voluntary to a significant degree

It is also important to define the term first cycle in the APRM context. As indicated in AU (2003a:5), regular APRM process is undertaken once every two to four years in APRM participating countries. This APRM in Ethiopia, which is the object of the study, is for the first time in its kind and first cycle assessment implemented in the country.

1.10. Structure of the Thesis

The thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter one provides important introductory issues which include background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research
questions, objectives of the study, justifications and significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study, methodology of the study. The chapter also provides definitions for basic terminologies and ends by indicating the overall structure of the thesis.

Chapter two deals with literature review on the areas of governance models, APRM process and civil society and then followed by chapter three which is devoted for pioneering countries experiences and secondary data presentation and analysis with respect to civil society role and participation in Ethiopia’s APRM. Chapter four is about data presentation, analysis, and discussion based on information obtained from secondary data, questionnaire and interview.

The thesis is then concluded by chapter five, which summarizes the main findings, draws conclusions, and suggests recommendations regarding shortcomings and other issues that need remedies.
Chapter Two: Literature Review on African Peer Review Mechanism and Civil Society

Introduction
This chapter discusses mainly about APRM issues, civil society participation and engagement in APRM, strategies for promoting effective civil society participation in APRM, and potential problems and challenge for civic engagement in APRM. It also presents the importance of civil society participation in APRM, engagement and roles of civil society in APRM, civil society concepts from the Ethiopian perspective, and conceptual framework of the thesis.

2.1. Brief history of APRM
APRM Secretariat (2008: 4) states that ‘at the turn of the 21st century, African leaders acknowledged the urgent need to place their countries, independently and collectively, on a path of sustained economic growth and development, and simultaneously benefit from globalization’. This has necessitated the transformation of the Organization of African unity (OAU) in to the African Union (AU) on 9 July 2002 and adoption of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) so as to ensure a joint platform to promote peace and security, democratic and political, economic and corporate governance, as well as new social order in the continent (Ibid: 4).

Herbert and Gruzd (2008:4) indicate that NEPAD asserts to bring political stability and prosperity in Africa by ensuring security, fair international trade, and access to finance, sound public services and good governance. Accordingly, APRM was officially introduced in 2003 as one of the components of NEPAD. APRM secretariat, as cited in Herbert and Gruzd (2008:4), specifies the commencement of APRM in the following manner:

--- in recognition of the imperatives of good governance for human security and political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development, and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration, the Heads of State and Government of the AU in 2002, adopted the Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance. The declaration encapsulates African strategies and program on democracy, human rights and good governance as substantive prerequisite for the success of NEPAD. Subsequently, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), the governance component of NEPAD, was launched in March 2003 to promote adherence to and fulfillment of the commitment contained in this Declaration.
2.2. Overview of African Peer Review Mechanism

At this juncture before the APRM dimensions, and stages, it is important to define the term governance particularly good governance based on the works of different scholars and international organizations. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines governance from sustainable human development that empathizes on effective public administration and the elimination of poverty (Agere, 200:3-4)

World Bank is one of the development partners which originally popularized good governance. According to the Bank cited in Deme (2005:10), good governance refers to “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development”. Governance has three aspects as enumerated by the World Bank (Ibid: 10). These include:

- The form of a political regime;
- The processes by which authority is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources; and
- The capacity of a government to design, formulate and implement policies and the general way in which it discharges its functions.

Mukamunana (2006:71-75) synthesizes the works of many authors on governance theory into three major perspectives: Institutionalism approach to governance, Networks theory, and corporate governance. Institutionalism approach assumes that institutions structure political and administrative behaviors and it considers governance as the exercise of authority and control over these institutions. From Networks theory of governance, governance takes place in networks involving various actors and multiple institutions that need negotiation and cooperation for a positive outcome. The third perspective is from the corporate governance point of view which acknowledges the participation and involvement of all of those who have a stake in the firm. This approach supports the inclusion of all stakeholders (that is employees, suppliers, and society at large) in the decision making process rather than being purely responsible to the firm’s shareholders.
2.2.1. Concepts of African Peer Review Mechanism

Deme (2005:15) defines peer review as the process of exchanging experiences among different parties like governments, society or others on the basis of a common intellectual and moral ground and to identify consensual principles and shared values. It involves a systematic assessment of the performance of a country by other countries (peers) and/or institutions in a position to do so. According to Deme (2005:15), the ultimate purpose of peer review is:

To help the countries concerned make improvements to the way they develop their policies, adopt best practices and respect standards, principles, established codes or other contracted obligations. It is a smooth process and relies greatly on mutual cooperation, trust and understanding between reviewers and reviewees.

In a review process, a report is produced about the progress made, any shortcomings and recommendations. It may end in sanctions or other forms of legal restrictions as in the case of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) while mere sharing of best practices as in the case of APRM (Ibid:15).

APRM as stated in AU (2003a: 1) is:

---a self-monitoring mechanism designed to foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustained development and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration through sharing of experiences and reinforcement of successful and best practices, including identifying deficiencies and assessing the need for capacity building.

APRM has a number of benefits which include:

- Creating a cultures of political dialogue amongst the three major actors: Government, private sector and Civil society;
- Improving the quality of governance;
- Finding solutions to problems that might be neglected or marginalized;
- Deepening democracy and strengthening national institutions;
- Building national consensus and political trust needed to find new solutions;
- Boosting the image of the nation and continent with investors and development partners (Herbert &Gruzd, 2007:2).
Similarly, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa /UN-ECA/ (2005:1-4) acknowledges the importance of APRM to ensure popular participation in the development process and to convert the image of ‘destructive political culture’ between governments and civil society in Africa.

2.2.2. Structures and Stages of African Peer Review Mechanism

This section presents the structures and stages of APRM as explained in Herbert and Gruzd (2007:3-4), UN-ECA (2008:3-7) and Herbert and Gruzd (2008:16-17).

Structures of APRM

The APRM has institutions at both the continental level and the country level. And these institutions are presented in the following paragraphs:

Continental institutions:

1. Forum of Heads of state and Government or Forum: The Committee of Participating Heads of State and Government is known as the ‘APR Heads of State Forum’, the ‘APR Forum’, or simply ‘the Forum’, which is the APRM’s highest decision-making body. It includes the presidents or prime ministers of the countries that have acceded to the APRM. It meets about twice a year, often on the margins of AU Summits. During these sessions the Forum reviews the APRM County Review Report of countries that have completed the exercise. Six months later, this report can be released publicly through the Pan-African Parliament and other bodies at regional or continental level.

2. Panel of Eminent Persons or Panel: This panel oversees the review process and ensures its integrity. The members of the panel are persons of high moral stature who have demonstrated commitment to the ideals of Pan-Africanism. The APR Panel of Eminent Persons currently consists of seven Africans of high standing and integrity who were appointed by the APR Forum to five-year terms. One member of the Panel is responsible for overseeing each country review process, which includes supervising its Country Support Mission, Country Review Mission and the writing and review of the final country report. The panelists
gather periodically to discuss progress and how to handle particular country reviews.

3. The APRM Continental Secretariat: The continental Secretariat is based in Midrand, South Africa and maintains a database on the political and economic developments in all participating countries, prepares background documents for the peer review teams; proposes performance indicators, and tracks the performance of individual countries. It supports the forum by providing the technical capacity to undertake the analytical work that underpins the peer review process. The Secretariat is funded by voluntary contributions from countries that have acceded and by a trust fund to which development partners have contributed.

4. Group of Independent experts or a Country Review Team: The review team typically comprises 15 to 25 members, including eminent academics, business leaders, the APRM Secretariat, experts from the Strategic Partners and independent consultants. It visits an APR country for two to three weeks, to consult with a wide variety of stakeholders in civil society, business and government. The team is responsible for writing the final country report, under the supervision of the responsible member of the Panel and with assistance from the APRM Secretariat. Headed by a member of the Forum and coordinated by the Continental Secretariat, the group conducts country reviews and is free of political influence.

5. Partner Institutions: The APRM has three Strategic Partners that provide support services, advice and assistance with reviews. They are the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UN-ECA), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the African Development Bank (ADB). Country Support and Country Review Missions frequently use African experts from these institutions.

**National institutions:**

1. The APRM focal point: The APRM Country Guidelines stipulate that each participating country must have an APR Focal Point, to act as a liaison between the continental Secretariat and the national APR structures. This Focal Point is
usually a minister, diplomat or senior civil servant who should have direct access to the head of state.

2. The National Governing Council: The country must also create a National Governing Council (NGC) or National Commission (NC). The council is responsible for managing an inclusive national process to produce two key documents: a Country Self-Assessment Report and Program of Action. The Supplementary Guidelines say that the council should include government, business and civil society members, and crucially it should have a non-government majority and a civil society or private-sector chairperson. The Country Guidelines say that the council should contain representatives of different national constituencies, including women, youth, labor unions, people with disabilities, and business organizations, among others.

3. National APRM Secretariat: This secretariat is established to provide NGC with the necessary administrative and technical support.

4. Technical Research Institutions (TRIs): The governing council is expected to appoint eminent academics, experts or Technical Research Institutions (TRIs) to conduct the public consultations, surveys and desk research, as well as compile the Country Self-Assessment Report and Program of Action.

The stages of the APRM

The APRM process is officially divided into five broad phases or stages of activity, as set out below:

Stage 1 – Preparation and self-assessment: The great bulk of the APRM activity occurs during this stage on two parallel tracks organized respectively by the country itself and the continental APRM Secretariat. To get started, the country to be reviewed has initial consultations with the APR Secretariat, which can take various forms, including visits to the country by Panel members and the Secretariat or meetings in other venues. Next, the country hosts a formal Country Support Mission and signs a Memorandum of Understanding assenting to the specific terms of the review. The country appoints a national Focal Point and National Governing Council or National Commission to oversee and drive the APR process, and develops its research and consultation program that will
culminate in the creation of a Country Self-Assessment Report and a Program of Action, both of which are to be based on broad public and expert consultations. Simultaneously, the APR Secretariat writes a background research paper on the country. On the basis of the background research and the country self-assessment, the Secretariat writes an issues paper identifying the major issues that will guide the Country Review Mission. This stage ends with the production of a country self-assessment report (CSAR) and a national program of action (NPoA).

**Stage 2 – The Country Review Mission:** Using the issues paper and the country’s self-assessment as a basis, a team of 15–25 African experts led by a Panel member visits the country for two to three weeks to conduct the Country Review Mission. The team assesses the integrity of the country process and conducts further research and interviews on key governance issues and evaluates the adequacy of the items included in the draft Program of Action in addressing gaps in governance.

**Stage 3 – Preparation of the final country assessment:** Following the Country Review Mission, the review team compiles a draft Country Review Report based on the mission, the self-assessment, Program of Action, and background research. This report is sent back to the government of the country for comment and for government to make changes to its Program of Action in light of the report’s recommendations. The government may append its comments to the final report, but not amend it.

**Stage 4 – The peer review by heads of state:** The continental Secretariat submits the final Country Review Report to the forum of Heads of State and Government of the APRM member states. It is at this stage the head of state is ‘peer reviewed’ by fellow heads of state. This peer review is based essentially on a constructive dialogue that does not prescribe concrete coercive measures in case of failure by a member state. This stage is expected to promote learning, discussion and mutual enrichment through best practices. This usually occurs in conjunction with an African Union summit.
Stage 5 – Presentation to the public and African institutions: Six months after the report is discussed by the Forum, it is publicly released, after being tabled at institutions such as the Pan-African Parliament and regional economic communities.

2.2.3. Dimensions of African Peer Review Mechanism

APRM focuses on systems of governance in which the participating country’s government is assessed through information collected by use of standardized questionnaire. With regard to the structure of the questionnaire, it has 25 objectives, 58 questions and 183 indicators, which are divided among four thematic areas:

- Political and Democratic Governance;
- Economic Governance and management;
- Corporate Governance; and
- Socio-economic development (Herbert & Gruzd, 2007:5)

Let us briefly look at these four pillars and thematic areas of APRM based on explanations given by UN-ECA (2008: 13-14):

1. Democracy and political governance

This pillar of APRM aims at promoting democracy and good governance as the basis for poverty reduction and sustainable development. It mainly assesses the performance of APRM participating country’s government from the democracy and political governance dimensions through measuring popular participation and political equality-fundamental principles of a democratic society. This thematic area addresses the following aspects of governance:

- A defined framework where citizens enjoy the same rights and there is consensus on the constitutional instrument for sovereignty;
- A representative and accountable government;
- A strong and capable private sector to play an important role in a self-sustained development; and
- A strengthened civil society.
2. **Economic governance**

This thematic area assumes that good economic governance, including transparency in financial management, is an essential element for promoting economic growth and reducing poverty on the continent. This focuses on promoting market efficiency, controlling waste in public spending, using natural resources efficiently, consolidating democracy and encouraging the flow of capital to private sector.

3. **Corporate governance**

‘Corporate governance is a system whereby companies are managed, controlled and accountable’. This influences all types of companies in the public and private sectors and good governance is characterized by features such as discipline, transparency, independence, accountability, fairness and social responsibility. This thematic area address issues which help in achieving the following objectives:

- Provide an enabling environment and effective regulatory framework for economic activities;
- Ensure that corporations act as good corporate citizens with regard to human rights, social responsibility and environmental sustainability;
- Promote the adoptions of codes of good business ethics in achieving the objectives of the company;
- Ensure that corporations treat all their stakeholders (shareholders, employees, communities, suppliers and customers) in a fair and just manner;
- Provide for accountability of corporations, directors and executives.

4. **Socio-economic development**

This dimension of APRM involves the continuous improvement of the welfare and living conditions of the people. It mainly focuses on promoting gender equality and new partnerships between governments, the private sector and civil society as well as allocation of appropriate funds to social sector. The major objectives under this thematic area include:

- Promote self-reliance in development and build capacity for self-sustaining development.
• Accelerate socio-economic development to achieve sustainable development and poverty eradication.
• Strengthen policies, delivery mechanisms and outputs in key social development areas (including education for all, combating of HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases)
• Ensuring affordable access to water, energy, finance (including micro-finance), markets and ICT to all citizens, especially the rural poor
• Progress towards gender equality, particularly equal access to education for girls at all levels.
• Encourage broad based participation in development by all stakeholders at all levels

2.2.4. The APRM and the OECD Peer Review Mechanism

There are other peer review-mechanisms that do exist such as those used in Kimberley process, the IMF monitoring system, the World Trade organization’s review mechanism for commercial policies and the economic review used by the European Commission as indicated in the work of Deme (2005:24). However, the peer review used by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is considered to be the more typical of a peer review, and the best known and most cited peer review mechanism on an international level (Deme, 2005:24).

Let us briefly look at the basic similarities and differences between the APRM and OECD Peer Review Mechanism based on the work of Deme (2005: 24-25). From similarities side, both review mechanisms emphasis on improving the performance of participating countries and the combination of the following factors would determine the success of the two cases:

- Credibility: which requires the process to be led by professionalism, and expertise and the absence of political manipulation
- Transparency: which ensures that all stakeholders involved fully comprehend the details of the peer review process
- Mutual trust: which requires the sincere co-operation of all members states which would in turn help ensure optimal results
With respect of their differences, three issues are worth mentioning. The first one is related to comprehensiveness of the contents to be reviewed. Compared to OECD Peer review mechanism, the APRM proposes a comprehensive approach to development issues by defining all facets of governance from four dimensions: political and democratic governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development (Ibid: 24).

The second basic difference is that OECD Peer Review Mechanism’s participating countries have established and integrated a pool commonly shared values that already exist in Western societies, namely respect for democracy, human rights and faith in the benefits of market values. Whereas these shared values are lacking in many African countries and the question remains: ‘How can [APRM participating countries] establish a common institutional culture, based on a set of values that are accepted and shared by everyone?’ Thus for proper operation and success of APRM, it is necessary to argue for a greater involvement of civil society and private sector at all decision-making levels of the APRM. The third difference is in terms of expertise and professionalism in which OECD peer review mechanism has become a benchmark in its work and analyses (Ibid: 25).

2.3. Civil Society Participation in African Peer Review Mechanism

2.3.1. Origins, Definitions and Concept of Civil society

Here it is important to conceptualize civil society based on the works of some writers. The concept of civil society goes back many centuries in Western thinking with its roots in Ancient Greece. The modern idea of civil society emerged in the 18th Century, influenced by political theorists from Thomas Paine to George Hegel, who developed the notion of civil society as a domain parallel to but separate from the states. The 1990s brought about renewed interest in civil society, as the trend towards democracy opened up space for civil society and the need to cover increasing gaps in social services created by structural adjustment and other reforms in developing countries (Ghaus, 2004: 2).

There is a debate among scholars with regard to the concept of civil society that clarifies the composition, scope and role of civil society in political and state interactions. For
instance, one contention is whether political parties and business organizations should be included as civil society or not. Similarly, APRM fails to clearly express about the exact make-up and composition of civil society within the context of its structures and objectives. Even though there is no consensus among scholars on the concept of civil society, governments have started to give due recognition for CSOs as effective and essential agents in formulating, implementing and monitoring policy (Masterson, 2007:10).

Similarly, Hyden et al (2003:2) assert that the discourse on civil society in development and governance arena is the recent phenomenon which has emerged in the study of comparative politics. The significance of civil society was underscored as a result of modernization theorists of the 1960s and subsequent generations of neo-Marxist and neo-liberal students of political economy in the 1970s and 1980s. Since those days, the new deal to development has emphasized participatory forms of development and the idea that institutions outside the state are also important contributors to social and economic development (Ibid: 2).

Many writers on civil society acknowledge that the term civil society is generic, controversial, and difficult to define. However, some of the important definitions are:

Civil society has been defined as the private sphere of material, cultural and political activities resisting the incursions of the state (Kaela, 1998:136).

Civil society refers to that sector of society in which various group initiative are mobilized to participate in economic, social, political and cultural activities (Doh, 1998:157).

Civil society is a sphere of social interaction between the household (family) and the state which is manifested in the norms of community cooperative, structures of voluntary association and networks of public communication … norms are values of trust, reciprocity, tolerance and inclusion, which are critical to cooperation and community problem solving, structure of association refers to the full range of informal and formal organization through which citizens pursue common interests (Veneklasen, 1994 as cited in Ghaus, 2004:3).
Civil society is composed of autonomous associations which develop a dense, diverse and pluralistic network. As it develops, civil society will consist of a range of local groups, specialized organizations and linkages between them to amplify the corrective voices of civil society as a partner in governance and the market (Connor, 1999 as cited in Ghaus, 2004:3).

For Kuruvilla, civil society refers to all institutions and networks outside the official public sector and the household which aggregate individuals based interests, goals, needs and functions. Civil society could thus broadly include advocacy groups, trade unions, academic institutions, the media, professional associations, religious organizations, and even corporations (Kuruvilla, 2005: 6)

From the above given definitions and explanations, it can be said that the term civil society is generic, ambiguous and fluid. No one definition of civil society can encompass all important features of civil society. Therefore, the following could be considered as a working definition of civil society:

Civil society refers to the arena of [Volunteered] collective action around shared interests, purposes and values. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of state, family and market, though in practice, the boundaries between state, civil society, family and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated. Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power. Civil societies are often populated by organizations such as registered charities, development non-governmental organizations, community groups, women’s organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups (London school of economics 2006 cited in Masterson, 2007:12)

2.3.2. Civil Society Concept from the Ethiopia Perspective

In this part, the writer focuses on the origin, typology and legal issues pertaining to CSOs in Ethiopia. Modern civil society associations emerged in Ethiopia during 1930s largely due to urbanization and economic development. A law to administer the CSOs was passed in 1960. This was the period that NGOs such as the Ethiopian Red Cross Society, Boy Scouts’ Association, Student Unions, Women’s Welfare Associations, Labor Unions, and others came in to existence even though their growth pace was slow under the empire and then severely restricted during the Derge period (Clark cited in Organization for Social Justice in Ethiopia/OSJE/, 2007:33).
With regard to the typology of CSOs in Ethiopia, CSOs are diverse and heterogeneous in all aspects. As documented in OSJE (2007:35), CSOs can be categorized as:

A. Traditional CSOs or Community Based Organizations (CBOs): This is a group of various self-help organization which include *Idir, Debo, Iqub, Mahber, Ezen*, etc that have existed in Ethiopia’s traditional society generations. Their main existence is to provide self-reliance for individuals, household, and the larger local community.

B. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs): Even though the establishment time for more traditional national NGOs was in 1960s, NGOs began significant contributions in the nation’s development only after the 1991 fall of the Dergue regime. This category of CSOs includes both local and international NGOs.

C. Membership Organizations: These are associations formed in order to satisfy the interest of their members. Professional associations such as teachers, lawyers, economics, medical, trade, management etc are the typical examples of such kind of CSOs.

D. Civil Advocacy organizations: These are sometimes called as right based organizations since their main focus is on rights. They include organizations working on women empowerment, human rights, governance and democracy and conflict prevention and resolution.

E. Development Associations: These organizations are government sponsored development associations which include the Amhara development Associations, Southern Ethiopian People’s Development Association, and Oromo development Association. They are named as government sponsored development associations because they receive project funds from government to carry out various development schemes though such organizations are supported by contributions from large membership bases.

F. Other Categories: These include mass associations (women, youth, etc), faith based organizations, the free press associations, chamber of commerce, research institutions, and others which are not included in the above typologies of CSOs.
Dessalegn (2002:104) conceptualizes civil society in terms of a variety of autonomous, voluntary institutions which provides services to individuals and which articulates public interests. He categorizes formal civil society organizations in Ethiopia into four groups (Dessalegn, 2002:105; and Dessalegn, 2008:92). These are:

1. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs): This group consists of local or international organizations engaged in relief, development or both. They provide services, channel funds, and carry out development projects.

2. Advocacy Organizations: These consist of rights-based institutions and those with the concerns of environmental issues, human rights, children’s groups, etc. The two mentioned CSOs under this category are the Ethiopian Human rights Council, and the Ethiopian women Lawyers Association.

3. Interest group institutions: This category entails professional associations, trade unions, cooperatives, and cultural societies.

4. Community Based Organizations (CBOs): This group consists of youth associations, and formalized Idirs.

According to Dessalegn’s civil society classification scheme, government initiated organizations such as women’s and youth groups, the case of ethnic-based development associations sponsored by the ruling parties, and political parties are excluded from the civil society (Dessalegn, 2008:91). Civil society is therefore institutionally represented by all the organizations in a society driven by social mobilization that, though possibly engaged with the state are definitely not initiated by the state (Bukenya, 2007:7). Similarly, Ministry of Capacity Building of FDRE (MCB) categorizes civil society in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society categories</th>
<th>Formal/Registered</th>
<th>Informal/Non-registered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-help, member serving</td>
<td>Unions, cooperatives, Professional associations</td>
<td>Debbo, Jigge, Seddaka, Idir, Equb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party serving</td>
<td>NGOs, Advocacy groups and Networks</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: MCB, 2004:5)
The document also recognizes the participation of civil society in four major areas which are coined as the roles of civil society. These include active involvement of civil society in:

- Policy formulation;
- Planning, monitoring and evaluation services;
- Holding all levels of government to account; and
- Mobilizing and utilizing resources in support of government development efforts (Ibid:9)

From the above discussions and civil society classification schemes, there is no uniformity and there is some controversy on composition and scope of civil society. For the purpose of this paper, the researcher sticks to the classification scheme followed by MCB and examines the profile of civil society organizations that participated in Ethiopian APRM in chapter four.

The third issue is about legal issues pertaining to CSOs in Ethiopia. Conducive legal framework for civil society is crucial since it matters the formation and operation of CSOs. Tsehai (2008:160) highlights the importance of legal framework in the manner that it gives recognition of CSOs and how they exercise the three basic rights, namely, the rights of: association, assembly and expression. In Ethiopia, the legal instruments that deal with the formation, registration, governance and control of CSOs/NGOs include the Federal Constitution of 1995, the section about association in the Ethiopian Civil Code of 1960, and legal notice No.321 of 1996 named as ‘Association Registration Regulation’ (OSJE, 2007:43). Recently, the government of Ethiopia (Gov) has promulgated the new proclamation of Charities and Societies (FDRE Proclamation No 621/2008). Even though Ethiopia’s first cycle Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) was concluded before the effective date (13 February 2009) of this new proclamation, it will affect the role and engagement of CSOs in the next cycle APRM process in Ethiopia and therefore let us briefly raise some issues from the proclamation in the following paragraphs.
The proclamation No 621/2008 in Article 2 provides four classification approaches for CSOs on the basis of membership and sources of their income. These are:

1. Ethiopian Charities or Ethiopian Societies: These are those charities or societies that are formed under the laws of Ethiopia, all of whose members are Ethiopia, generate income from Ethiopia and wholly controlled by Ethiopians. This category also includes those charities or societies which receive not more than ten percent (10%) of their income from foreign sources.

2. Ethiopian Residents’ Charities or Ethiopian Residents’ Societies: This group entails those charities or societies that are formed under the laws of Ethiopia and which consist of members who reside in Ethiopia and who receive more than 10% of their funds from foreign sources.

3. Foreign Charities: This category encompasses those charities that are formed under the laws of foreign countries or which consist of members of foreign nationals or are controlled by foreign nationals or receive funds from foreign sources.

4. Mass-based Societies: This category includes professionals association, women’s associations, youth associations and other similar Ethiopian societies.

In the preamble of the proclamation, the government has stated that the intention of the bill is to aid and facilitate the role of charities and societies in the overall development of Ethiopian Peoples. However, a number of contentious issues are articulated in this new proclamation as also explained in Tsehai (2008:165-181). Some of the issues include:

- Restrictive conditions:

The proclamation puts restrictive conditions for CSOs to be considered as Ethiopian societies or charities by stating that all members should be Ethiopian and they have to raise not less than 90 % of their income from local sources. It does not allow the engagement of foreign CSOs and those CSOs that receive more than 10% of their income from foreign sources in the areas of the advancement of human and democratic rights; the promotion of equality of nations, nationalities and peoples and that of gender and religion; the promotion of the rights of the disabled and children’s rights; the promotion
of conflict resolution or reconciliation; and the promotion of the efficiency of the justice and law enforcement services (FDRE, 2008: Article 14/5).

According to Tsehai (2008:167), the qualifications of Ethiopian societies and charities with regard to membership and income sources can kill a great majority of Ethiopian societies and charities since most CSOs rely on funds from abroad. Even at the continent level, the level of income from external sources is stretched up to 50% to be African or African Diaspora CSOs (AU, 2004: 6)

- Excessive government interferences in the functioning of CSOs:
The proclamation permits undue government interference by putting some bottlenecks prerequisites which demands CSOs to provide the government with seven days notice of any general meeting, mandatory annual reporting, requirements to keep meticulous financial records, re-registration of every three years as well as strict provisions on termination, dissolution and liquidation of CSOs.

- Severe punishments on CSOs
Once a CSO is denied registration, or fails to apply, the organization is then declared unlawful. If members and supporters continue their involvement with CSO, they risk severe punishments (FDRE, 2008: Article 102 & 103). According to international standards, CSOs should be allowed freely to come into existence and should not be required to obtain legal personality in order to engage in lawful activities (Tsehai, 2008:168). In other words, the decision to officially register should be voluntary not imposed by the government so as to encourage the free participation of individuals in civil society activities. Similarly, Article 31 of FDRE constitution guarantees individuals freedom by stating that ‘every person has the right to freedom of association for any cause or purpose’ (FDRE, 1995).

2.3.3. The Importance of Civil Society Participation in APRM

The question of how to fill the vacuum of development has been the debate for scholars. Nowadays the order of the day has become popular participation through grassroots’ development instead of top-down development approach (Martinussen cited in Bukenya, 2008:1). Scholars like Chan and Lewis emphasize on the role and contributions of civil society to bring new life to the process of development (Ibid: 1). African leaders have
also pledged to end poverty in the continent through participatory approach to development. On the basis of this argument, Organization for African Unity/OAU/ (1990:5) recognizes and asserts the role and importance of people’s participation in Africa’s decision-making processes and development efforts in this manner:

---The heart of Africa’s development objectives must lie in the ultimate and overriding goal of human-centered development that ensures the overall well-being of the people---through full and effective participation of the people in charting their development policies, programs, and processes and contributing to their realization.

It also recognizes the participation of [civil society] as central tool to the realization of popular participation so as to ensure community empowerment and self-development (Ibid: 7). When it comes to APRM, civil society is considered as a key stakeholder. UN-ECA (2005:4), one of the APRM partners recognizes that the success of APRM depends on engendering a vibrant civil society dialogue within countries.

According to Sarah, civil society and good governance dominate these days’ development circles. This highlights the importance of participation in any development endeavors. She also indicates that two important issues should be considered in the politics of participation: the question of who participated and the level of participation. Under the issue of who to participate, consideration of diversity in the civil society is crucial since people are not homogenous. The second issue regards the level of participation that entails the involvement of stakeholders in management, decision-making and implementation stages (Sarah, 2000:142-143).

At the Africa continent level, the Heads of state and government have also given due attention for the engagement of civil society to attain the objectives of NEPAD and AU. They adopted the statute of Economic, Social, and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC) - the compositions of civil society- as an organ of AU so as to serve as an opportunity for African civil society to plan an active role in charting the future of the continent, organizing itself in partnership with African governments to contribute to the principles, policies and programs of the AU (African Union/AU/, 2004:3). According to the Statute
of ECOSOCC, civil society composition includes social groups, professional groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and cultural organizations (Ibid: 4)

Similarly, the APRM document titled “Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the APRM” outlines the importance of civil society participation in the review process as follows:

The overarching goal of the APRM is for all participating countries to accelerate their progress towards adopting and implementing the priorities and programs of the New partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), achieving the mutually agreed objectives and compliance with best practice in respect to the areas of governance and development. This can only be achieved through the sustained efforts of the country itself, involving all stakeholders. It requires that each country carefully develops a program of Action with time bound objectives and linked to national budgets to guide all stakeholders in the actions required by all-government, private sector, civil society-to achieve the country’s vision (APRM Secretariat, 2003: 2).

Masterson (2007:14) and Verwey (2005:20) also confirm that civil society participation is important if the APRM process is to succeed in a participating country. Firstly, civil society participation is crucial to the credibility of the review process so that the review report represents a consensus of views on a country’s quality of governance. This would in turn determine the validity and effectiveness as well as to justify expenditure and provide accountability. The other benefit of civil society participation in APRM is that it contributes to the informational quality of the peer review.

According to UN-ECA (2008:120), the benefits of a civil society-state partnership in good governance are:

- To contribute to a better involvement of interested parties through a more transparent consultation process, which will foster the government’s accountability;
- To provide general principles and standard for consultation that help the government organs to carry out the consultation procedures in a meaningful and systematic way;
- To build a framework for consultation that is coherent, yet flexible enough to accommodate the diversity of interests; and
To promote mutual learning and exchange of good practices at different levels.

2.3.4. Engagement and Roles of Civil Society in APRM

Organization for Social Justice in Ethiopia (OSJE) coins civil society engagement as a set of actions and efforts designed to address issues of public concern including a feeling of belonging, ownership and an experience of investments to the issue under consideration (OSJE, 2007:21).

Civil society organizations (CSOs) have a number of roles and contributions in ensuring the consolidation of democracy and good governance in a given country by particularly holding the two sectors-the public and private accountable to the citizens. Doh (1998:159) indicates that CSOs serve as monitors of both state and private sector activities in areas of social and economic policies, environmental concerns and human rights. This shows that CSOs have a very important role to play in promoting effective democratic governance in any country. This is particularly justified by the role of CSOs serving as a buffer between the state and society, and advocating, monitoring and seeking to consolidate and strengthen good governance and transparency.

For any society to flourish, civil society is indispensable along with the government and market. The following quotation taken from OSJE (2007:10) can clearly show the importance of CSOs in any county:

Governments and market are not enough to make a civilization. There also must be a healthy, robust civil sector: a space in which the bonds of community can flourish. Government and market are similar to two legs of a three-legged stool. Without the third leg of civil society, the stool is not stable and cannot provide support.

Deme (2005:30-31) emphasizes the importance of the role played by civil society in order to promote the involvement of the public in the review process. To mention the words of Deme, “civil society organizations are the only players that can promote true public involvement, through their countless interactions with all members of society”. Similarly, OSJE (2007:21) underlines that active involvement and participation of CSOs
would yield major development benefits including improved services, increased ownership, enhanced commitment and self initiatives and improved sustainability.

Cangas, as cited in OSJE (2007:18), highlights four major roles of CSOs: Service delivery, as an advocate for representing interest of their constituencies, as a partner with government, and as watchdog role. Service delivery role of CSOs involves provision of necessary institutional basis for service delivery so as to improve the access of citizens to basic services such as education, health and other sectors services. This issue is not considered in this paper. The second important role mentioned in OSJE is advocacy in which CSOs play a role in political life to represent and negotiate citizens’ interests vis-à-vis the state. As a partner with government, civil society may engage in development planning, in promoting understanding of government development and governance packages and in other areas. The other role of CSOs is watchdog role which involves monitoring and evaluating the performance of both the state and the market. Through this function, CSOs can promote good governance and social equity.

Civil society has been widely recognized as an essential ‘third’ sector. Its strength can have a positive influence on the state and the market. Civil society is therefore seen as an increasingly important agent for promoting good governance like transparency, effectiveness, openness, responsiveness and accountability. According to Ghaus, Civil society can further good governance in a number of ways. First, by policy analysis and advocacy; second, by regulation and monitoring of state performance and the action and behavior of public officials; third, by building social capital and enabling citizens to identify and articulate their values, beliefs, civic norms and democratic practices; fourth, by mobilizing particular constituencies, particularly the vulnerable and marginalized sections of masses, to participate more fully in politics and public affairs; and fifth, by development work to improve the wellbeing of their own and other communities (Ghaus, 2004:3).

In the works of Hyden et al (2003: 9-12), three important functions of civil society are boldly indicated. These are: (i) Promoting voluntarism: The notion that individuals make
a choice of their own to associate with others or engage in pursuit of a particular goal in collaboration with others is at the root of development. In this respect, civil society has an important socializing effect. Voluntary associations rely on trust and reciprocity, (ii) Building Social capital: The very existence of civil society is to produce social capital which often measured by trust and reciprocity, and (iii) Creating enabling environment for policy input: Even if civil freedoms and political rights are guaranteed in constitutional provisions, the extent to which organized activities lead to tolerance and activism focused on influencing government policy varies.

Some of the important criteria, as mentioned in Kajee (2004: 252-256), that would have significant impacts on the role and engagement of the civil society are summarized as follows:

A. *Independence of the Review*: This factor would matter the integrity and credibility of the APRM. According to Kajee, independence can be explained by non-interference from politics in the technical aspects of review, to what extent the process is transparent and inclusive. In addition to this, issues related to independence of civil society representatives on the national governing council, the existence of a system to provide information regarding civil society’s role and opportunities for engagement with the process are the overriding criteria.

B. *Independent civil society reviews/shadow review by civil society*: Non-governmental stakeholders - research think tanks and development NGOs have an important role in the APRM process not only as partners to government but as independent and responsible players undertaking shadow review related to APRM thematic areas.

C. *Ownership and communication*: Kajee explains that APRM process in many countries has been housed within the executive level of government with no defined role for civil society sector and even including for legislature. Sense of ownership is on the other hand is the function of correct information flow between the official structure and all stakeholders on timely basis. If there is no timely and factually correct information flows, the stakeholders including CSOs
are unaware of the potential opportunities for involvement at various stages of the peer review process.

According to UN-ECA (2008:31), civil society must fully assume its role by raising the awareness of citizens, by playing an active role in the consultations and reviews, and participating in the development, execution and monitoring and assessment of POA. UN-ECA (2005:14) recommends a number of roles to be played by CSOs in order to ensure the integrity and credibility of APRM. Thus CSOs should plan and strategize its responses to APRM through:

a. Research, Dissemination and Sensitization: This involves providing as much credible information to the review team as possible, undertaking in-depth studies and analysis on the areas where there are information gaps in the APRM codes and standards, making NEPAD and APRM documents accessible to wider public by developing leaflets, brochures, and posters and translating them into local languages, and using APRM as a learning process by ensuring that lessons are popularized and report outcomes widely disseminated.

b. Advocacy and lobbying: This entails influencing the agenda of the review by identifying and selecting the areas of particular interest to civil society from APRM thematic areas, using APRM findings to lobby the government for corrective actions in areas of governance deficits, participating effectively in drawing up the National Program of Action (NPoA) and ensuring it is implemented, lobbying key regional African institutions and structures such as Pan-African Parliament, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights, the Peace and Security Council, and the Economic, Social and Cultural Council of AU to ensure that the review report gets appropriate attention.

c. Monitoring and Evaluation: This encompasses ensuring the integrity of the process by monitoring that it is free from political manipulation, ensuring regular interface among civil society and between civil society, government and other stakeholders to address the challenges and monitor progress, utilizing the press and other media, through newspaper articles and columns, to raise and debate pertinent implementation on a regular basis.
2.4. Strategies for promoting effective civil society participation in the African peer review Mechanism

In this section, the researcher highlights some important strategies to be followed by APRM participating governments in order to ensure substantial engagement of civil society. Among other things, popular participation [through CSOs] is important criterion to assess the level of good governance (Somoleka, 1998:164). Substantial participation can be facilitated through the development of representatives and countervailing institutions of civil society. This would in turn would successful if there is a general climate of stability, oneness and tolerance, access to a wide range of information, and provided that there is a degree of legal protection (Rugumamu, 1998:254).

Before dealing with the strategies for promoting effective civil society participation in APRM, let us consider the following preconditions for effective civil society engagement.

**Enabling environment for effective civil society engagement**

For vibrant and effective performance of CSOs the government should create conducive political arena by removing all legal and bureaucratic constraints on setting up civil society institutions (Doh, 1998: 159). He further notices that government needs to involve CSOs in policy process, service delivery as well as the recognition of civil society as partners in development agenda. This requires there must be a room for dialogue or negotiations.

According to CWS (2000:12-13), four important factors that enable civil society to play an effective role are:

A. Freedom of association: Citizens should enjoy the right to establish organizations around particular interests (for instances, professional and business associations, labor unions) to pursue general or specific social, economic or political objectives. Such associations can often act as critical watchdogs of the integrity of service providers. At the local level, grassroots community organizations,
cooperatives and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can help the poor and marginalized to get their voices heard in the corridors of power.

B. Freedom of the press and media: Transparency in any society requires information to be available freely in the public domain. A free and competent press is essential in ensuring democracy and good governance principles. Civil society should promote genuine competition in the media market-place to ensure diversity of ownership, so that alternative outlets can provide a broad range of views on public policy issues.

C. Information Technology: Technological advancement particularly in information technology would help civil society’s access to new information and channels of communication, including foreign publications and broadcasts. With this regard, government should provide full and timely information about the CSOs roles in APRM process.

D. Research and analysis: The existence of independent research institutes and think-tanks can provide increased domestic capacity to analyze deficiencies in the system of governance.

More specific to APRM, UN-ECA (2005:13-16) has indicated the following major strategies to be followed by government so as to enhance effective [CSOs]’ participation in APRM process:

1. Government should recognize the APRM process as a national space for policy dialogue:
   This may be ensured, among other things, through inclusion of civil society in the national institutional structures that oversee the APRM process, and ensure the participation of civil society at various stages of APRM: during the country self assessment, in drafting the program of action, final review of the report when tabled by the Heads of state and Government Forum, monitoring and evaluation of the reforms recommended in National program of action

2. Political commitment:
   As a prerequisite, governments have to show the political will and commitment to make the entire process as inclusive and participatory as possible by not only formally inviting
all stakeholders, but also creating an enabling environment for such participation. UN-ECA also underlines that the inclusion of [CSOs] must be done in a transparent, democratic and non-partisan manner to ensure the integrity and independence of the APRM process. Similarly it heralds for the importance of independent CSOs in national governing council and full disclosure of information regarding the roles and opportunities for engagement with the process. Therefore, government must ensure for existence of bona fide participation in the APRM process.

3. Education and sensitization:
This means massive awareness creation and sensitization of the general public which entails allocating a time period just before the self-assessment stage to ensure ownership, facilitate stakeholders’ dialogue, establish trust in pursuit of national development goals, and enhance the general understanding of citizens.

4. Strategic Sequencing:
Early engagement with the populace would help to unfold NEPAD and the APRM process. This entails clarifying the objectives and mechanisms for participation to create an environment for frank and open dialogue which would in turn ensure transparency and legitimacy and minimize misconceptions about the political surrounding the process.

5. Management and Leadership structures:
APRM participating country’s government should set independent national structures and mechanisms to manage the APRM process

2.5. Potential Problems and challenges for civil society engagement in APRM
Friedman and Kihato (2004: 169-175) have indicated three constraining factors that hamper the involvement of CSOs in public affairs which the researcher corresponds with APRM. First, the ability or the impacts of CSOs to participate in [APRM] is limited by their lack of funds or administrative capacity. Second, government may be reluctant and does not listen or is impervious to suggestions from groups in civil society. The third critical problem could be the government’s intolerance of informal mechanisms which include the scene negotiations, petitions, lobbying and mobilizing interest groups. These all three factors would limit freedom and autonomy in civil society which would in turn
provide government leverage over civil society and interfere with civil society’s watchdog role.

According to Ghaus (2004: 6), Civil Society Organizations are at the infant stage characterized by the small scale of the civil society sector in developing countries. Some of impediments to growth of CSOs and deter their engagement in development and governance affairs include Authoritarian political control, limited resources, legal treatment, and the development paradigm in many developing countries (Ibid: 6-8)

**Authoritarian Political Control:** Perhaps the most basic factor accounting for the generally retarded pattern of the third sector development in many developing countries is the long history of authoritarian rule which has limited opportunity and social organization outside the control of the state. As a result, little room is left for a truly independent third sector in these societies. Passivity and dependence rather than empowerment and autonomy thus become the watchword of nonprofit sector activity.

**Limited Resources:** An important factor hindering the growth of the civil society sector is the scarcity of financial resources. Funding constraints limit the scale and functioning of CSOs, significantly impairing their ability to deliver and maintain services. Some NGOs have heavy reliance foreign donors. This is making CSOs more reflective of donor interests than those of their communities or designated target groups.

**Legal Treatment:** A further factor impeding the development of the nonprofit sector in some developing countries has been the legal environment within which nonprofits must operate. Civic engagement would be limited in situation where there is highly restrictive registration procedure and CSOs are used as a means of political control and favoritism. What this makes clear is that establishing an enabling legal environment for civil society action is only a first step towards opening a way for a viable civil society sector.

**The Development Paradigm:** One other factor helping to explain the historically constrained pattern of civil society sector development in the third world is the changing
fashion in development policy and development ideology. During the 1950s and 1960s, development thinking emphasized the importance of a State as the principal agent of modernizing reforms. As a consequence, considerable effort went into differentiating a sphere of State action outside the pre-modern structures of tribe or community, and into creating modern, secular administrative structures that could effectively operate in this sphere. This development framework included a sphere of business in addition to that of government, but it downplayed, if not excluded, CSOs which were viewed as only marginal in the frame of affairs. The shift to “structural adjustment” in the 1980s did not change this fundamentally. To the contrary, the “structural adjustment” paradigm of development merely replaced government with the private business community as the mode of development. In the process, however, it reinforced an essentially two-sector model of society that left little room for a vibrant civil society sector. The lack of civil society growth is thus understandable given that it been historically neglected in the central policy debate.

Similarly, four major challenges for civil society engagement in policy space are mentioned in the work of Jones and Tembo (2008:7). These are:

- Limited funding: financial constraints would cause the inability to invest in capacity strengthening in CSOs human capital, especially research skills and technical knowledge which would in turn may cripple policy advocacy activities.
- Institutional capacity constraints: These constraints are related to lack of space, vehicles, research capacities and technical equipments. These constraints are attributed to funding problems
- Competition between organizations: ‘Owing to competition over influence and funding, CSOs tend to not to pool resources and knowledge, instead working in an insular way’. This would lead to creation of elite band of larger, well-funded organizations that tend to monopolize channels of influence. This could be illustrated by their concentration in the urban areas.
- Limited political space: This entails to what extent government is open to involve civil society in the political and policy space. The authors warn that a recent trend by a number of sub-Saharan African governments including Ethiopia shows that
there is limited political space for CSOs. They indicate that the openness of the government to civil society participation in the policy arena has not yet been secured and properly institutionalized in the region.

In the handbook for African civil society prepared by Economic Commission for Africa, the potential difficulties for civil society in getting more involved in the APRM include the following (UN-ECA, 2008:19-20):

1. Fear of governments
Governments that have acceded to APRM fear that the civil society will use the mechanism for political ends to question the credibility of actions taken by the current government. In addition to this, governments that have a high level of bad governance fear that the result of the review would be tied with aid conditionality established by the international community and by donors. These fears would lead to politicization of the process.

2. Dispersion/disorganization of civil society
Since there are large number of civil society components with the wide variety of areas of action, their philosophical or ideological differences, and often their geographical dispersion, CSOs might not contribute as it should be. There is also a lack of frameworks for concerted action and dialogue between CSOs at the country level to harmonize positions and try to develop common opinions on major issues. Obviously, the absence of frameworks for concerted action and work among CSOs would make it difficult for them to influence initiatives as decisive as the APRM. On the other hand, the cumbersome nature of networks for concerted action would grapple the efforts of the CSOs. In some cases, the structures of CSOs are not functional although there are a large number of national structures responsible for coordinating members’ actions.

3. The credibility of people and organizations acting on behalf of civil society
Due to the fact that APRM is demanding and complex, people and organizations leading it must have the appropriate intellectual and material resources. If CSOs leaders do not have the required stature and capacities, the intellectual balance of power will be in favor
of government, which has significant resources and can take advantage of such a situation.

4. Lack of resources
APRM is a long and costly process and it requires considerable intellectual and financial resources. ‘The meager resources of CSOs would all be used up in facilitating frameworks for concerted action and work, organizing information sessions, participating in self-assessment exercises and training workshops, and performing all sorts of secretarial work’. CSOs need to adopt a clear fundraising policy to ensure their full participation so that their engagement is not compromised by the lack or insufficiency of resources.

5. Obstacles related to complexity and the technical nature of the process
Since APRM is a complex and highly technical process which limit the chances of qualitative participation in country reviews. This why the CSOs involved in the APRM must take into account the complexity and technical nature of the process and thus try to simplify it for their members and for the population as a whole. With this regard, the media must be an active determinant in simplifying the techniques, providing information and educating the citizens.

DPMF (2002:22) participants, on the other hand, have identified three major obstacles which have adverse effect on the role and active participation of CSOs:

- These organizations lack internal democracy due to either ignorance or reasons related to leadership and membership
- Heavy dependence or subservience on external forces for financial, organizational, and other forms of support.
- Unable to articulate national frameworks with in which they operate, create coalitions with other groups with identical interests, and promote cooperation with civil society at sub regional and regional levels.
2.6. Conceptual framework of the study

African countries including Ethiopia by and large are characterized by low level of tolerance culture, unstable macro-micro economy, politically shaped civil service system, infant democracy system, low Human Development Index, problems of underdevelopment, and weak participation of CSOs and private sector among other things. The leaders of African countries recognize the problems of good governance for these daunting situations persist in African continent (AU, 2002:3). NEPAD’s APRM aims to address the problems of good governance in four thematic areas: Democracy and Political governance, Economic Governance and Management, Corporate Governance, and Socio-Economic Development. However, APRM is nothing without the participation of all stakeholders (Anglin, 2008:266).

Fig 2.1: Conceptual framework of the thesis

(Source: Adapted from Takirambudde and Fletcher, 2006:68-69 and AU, 2003b:3)
According to Takirambudde and Fletcher (2006:68), the review process in itself is not a panacea for Africa’s ills unless the meaningful participation of civil society which is the critical and sensitive stakeholder. “For APRM to succeed and progress along the path to sustainable development and ultimate poverty reduction, substantive participation of CSOs is crucial (Tarkirambudde & Fletcher, 2006:68). It is therefore not exaggeration to say that the active participation and roles played by civil service society is at the heart of APRM process’s effectiveness in addressing the deficiencies related to the four thematic areas of governance. This does not imply that CSOs are the only stakeholder of the APRM and not to undermine the importance of the other stakeholders- the government and the private sector.

This paper therefore seeks to assess the role and engagement of CSOs in major activities of APRM in Ethiopia which would in turn affect the credibility of the process from the four dimensions of Good Governance. This implies that the study focuses to answer to what extent the CSOs have been engaged in major activities and stages of APRM as to contribute to improvement of the four dimensions of APRM. In addition, it digs out the challenges for civic engagement in the review process undertaken in Ethiopia. Diagrammatically, the conceptual framework of the thesis is depicted in figure 2.1.

**Conclusion**

The chapter discussed the concepts of APRM from the perspectives of its objectives, structures, stages and the four dimensions-political and democratic governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development. It indicated the two ultimate outcomes of APRM: Country Self Assessment Report (CSAR), which identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the government performance from the four dimensions of APRM, and National Program of Action (NPoA) which identifies action plans for weaknesses identified under CSAR. The chapter underlined that civil society participation in APRM determines the success and credibility of the review process. To this effect, it underscored the independence of NGC with civil society
majority, open political space for civic engagement and effective information flow about the roles of civil society in the APRM process.

The chapter also discussed about civil society concepts from the Ethiopia perspectives particularly in terms of its definition and scope, and legal environment. With this respect, the chapter indicated that civil society is broad concept which includes the third-party serving organizations and member-serving organizations. The next chapter is devoted for the experiences of APRM pioneering countries in relation to civic engagement. In addition, the Ethiopia’s APRM process is briefly touched.
Chapter Three: APRM Pioneers’ Experiences and Ethiopia’s APRM

Introduction

To date six countries7 were peer reviewed by the APRM participating countries’ Heads of state (APRM Secretariat 2009:2-6 & APRM Monitor, 2009:4). Three country review reports and NPoAs were published by the end of 2006 and these countries are Ghana, Kenya and Rwanda. According to Masterson (2007: 16), these three countries’ reviews are considered as early APRM models at the continent level. Based on this justification, this section examines each of the three country’s approach to ensuring the broadest possible stakeholder participation through CSOs engagement in the country’s review, and also seeks to point out the country’s underlying conceptualization of civil society. At the end of this part, Ethiopia’s case is also briefly highlighted.

3.1. Ghana’s experiences

Based on explanations given by Herbert and Gruzd (2008: 157-187) and Masterson (2007: 16), Ghana APRM process with respect to civil society participation can be explained in the following paragraphs.

Ghana, the first country to conduct a country self-assessment, the country’s National Governing Council was composed entirely of non-state members, with the government adopting a supporting role to this governing council. The country’s methodology employed a number of approaches to gathering inputs on the country’s governance standards and practices. The two methods are noteworthy. First the National Governing council commissioned four technical research agencies from Ghana’s Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) community to conduct a national survey process and compile background papers in the APRM’s four governance areas, namely: democratic & political governance, economic management; corporate governance; and socio-economic development. In parallel to this process, the council embarked on a national traveling survey, with the aim of increasing provincial and local citizen awareness of the APRM

---

7 These are Algeria, Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, Nigeria and Burkina Faso
and to get inputs from all of Ghana’s major regions separately. These inputs were gathered during seminars and workshops and formed part of the country’s final self-assessment report. The Ghanaian model was immediately considered as an excellent and progressive benchmark against which other countries should measure their own procedures and methods.

The Ghana self-assessment process is often referred to as exemplary in view of its strong emphasis on civil society engagement and the central role of civil society was highly appreciated. The APRM process of Ghana which was characterized by low level of government involvement has been hailed as positive and beneficial actions which contributed to national and continental confidence in the Ghanaian findings and final report.

The National governing Council of Ghana has created conducive environment for civil society engagement in the five major areas where civil society engagements with the APRM process are both possible and beneficial to all concerned. These APRM major activities include:

- Country Support Missions
- Country Self-Assessment Process
- Civil society representation in the national governing body and/or technical research institutes
- Country Review Mission
- Design and implementation of Program of Action

The engagement of civil society in Ghana, therefore, included civil society representatives on the national governing council, acting independent of government and provided with a separate budget in order to complete the council’s mandates. It also included a national household survey, with participants selected through random sampling throughout the country, and their responses collated into the final country self-assessment by four non-governmental research institutes. Civil society organizations at the local or provincial level were also given opportunities to engage with the APRM
process nationally. This facilitated greater access to the process by community-based organizations, and also provided for less organized constituencies such as local tribes and ethnic groups to participate in the process, in essence ensuring that their lack of formal organization was not held against them during the country review.

The Ghana National APRM Governing Council has been given the responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the NPoA. Since the report was adopted by the APR Forum, Ghana has submitted two progress reports on its implementation of the program of action. With regard to the concept and composition of civil society from Ghana’s APRM perspective, business and professional bodies are also included in its definition.

3.2. Kenya’s experience
Similar to Ghanaian case, Herbert and Gruzd (2008: 189-214) and Masterson (2007: 17-18), describe the experiences of Kenya in ensuring the participation of civil society in APRM as follows.

The Government of Kenya acceded to the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) on 9th March 2003. In Kenya, the national governing council was composed of 30 members though only 20 had the power to cast votes. Its APRM was undertaken from February 2004 through March 2006. The Kenyan APRM process made significant allowances for the engagement and participation of civil society in the country’s self-assessment process.

An interim task force composed of government ministers and officials was initially tasked with defining a road-map for the country on the APRM. In the course of its duties, the task force convened two national consultative forums during which civil society organizations in Kenya were given the opportunity to nominate and elect members to the country’s National APRM Governing Council.

According to NEPAD Kenya’s secretariat as cited in Herbert and Gruzd (2008: 190), ‘the principle to have effective civil society direction-setting to the APRM process must not
be compromised’. Kenya took eight months just to reach agreement with civil society over who would sit on the governing council. The Kenyan method of engaging civil society therefore consisted largely of open invitation to interested parties to attend the two consultative forums, and sporadic and intermittent consultations with civil forums and groups during the country’s self-assessment though the extent to which the views and voice of civil society were adequately captured during the Kenyan process is debatable.

The Country Review Mission (CRM) also noted during its visit the enthusiasm and commitment to the principle of good governance demonstrated “at every layer of [Kenyan] society” and commended the efforts of the Governing Council to sensitize the public to the existence of the APRM process in Kenya and its relevance to their lives. Whilst the CRM commended Kenya for its four-pronged methodology, which included desk research, sample surveys, focal group discussions and expert panel surveys. The country self assessment was conducted by the four lead technical institutions and members of the Governing Council.

3.3. Rwanda’s experience

In the works of Herbert and Gruzd (2008: 216-241) and Masterson (2007: 17), Rwanda is also one of the early APRM models. Let us briefly look at the experiences of Rwanda’s APRM.

The Government of Rwanda acceded to the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) on 9th March 2003, the country begun to prepare for the APRM implementation process immediately and later hailed to be one of the APRM early models. In February 2004, it hosted the 1st APR Forum of the Heads of State and Government in Kigali, at which the country volunteered to be among the first four Countries to be reviewed.

The National Commission, which composed of 50 members from a cross section of Rwandan society, was inaugurated on 24th June 2004 to provide overall guidance and oversight to the national level processes, as provided in the guidelines for countries to
prepare and participate in the African peer review mechanism. Its composition was based on the core principles of inclusiveness, participatory and transparency in the self-assessment process and peer review but the government was criticized for its dominance in the NGC.

Prior to the actual commencement of implementation activities in Rwanda, sensitization campaigns were carried out to raise awareness of NEPAD and APRM, among key stakeholders starting with the National Assembly. Thereafter, as part of the self-assessment stage of the review, several workshops were organized to obtain views of the different stakeholders. Broad and participatory consultations began in March 2004, including regular advocacy and media campaigns. The first workshop took place on the 25th and 26th of March 2004 and was attended by over 200 people. Prior to this, the APRM Focal Point’s office had conducted desk research, contacted many stakeholders, and solicited views on the different governance issues.

The APRM National Commission was also organized into working sub-commissions according to the four thematic areas of the APRM. Taking into consideration the advice of the Support Mission, the sub-commissions held discussions with different stakeholders, and guided the Technical Review Team in improving on the self-assessment report. Similar to the cases of Ghana and Kenya, the country self-assessment of Rwanda was conducted by the four lead technical institutions and members of the Governing Council.

The National Consultation Process was informed by an independent desk research, a national technical review team for each of the four themes, thematic sub-commissions of the National Commission, a quality control exercise by an international Think Tank, and finally by a National Validation Workshop. Following the submission of Rwanda’s Self Assessment report in March 2005, a two-week long External Review Team of more than 16 African Experts in all four APRM thematic areas came to Rwanda. The actual Peer Review for Rwanda was held on 30th June 2006 at the Heads of States Forum convened at Banjul the Gambia.
3.4. Lessons Learnt from the Pioneers

The South African Institute of International Affairs published in 2008 a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the APRM in five ‘pioneer’ countries, drawing lessons to maximize the potential benefits of the process (Herbert and Gruzd, 2008: 137-154). Based on feedback from participants in the reviews, the study identifies a number of recommendations to promote a more constructive review process, including:

- Assert independent NGC leadership: the need to implement APRM process in a rigorous, open and candid and make it free from political manipulation.
- Commit publicly to a set of fair principles that all pledge to uphold in the conduct of the process.
- Consult civil society before making decisions on the process and governing structures.
- Choose eminent and non-partisan council members.
- Allow non-government leadership of the National Governing Council.
- Make the Governing Council process transparent.
- Include the media on the National Governing Council and regularly brief the media.
- Allow enough time for consultation at all stages of the process.
- Make full draft available to enable meaningful validation and post-draft texts on the internet.
- Circulate the Country Self Assessment Report and Program of Action.
- Circulate the final country report as soon as it is presented to the Heads of State.

3.5. Ethiopia’s experience

The Government of Ethiopia has acceded to the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on 9th March 2003 with the founders of the this new initiative (APRM Secretariat, 2009:5). The country, however, begun to prepare for the APRM implementation process in January 2008 after the issuance of regulation No. 142/2008 (FDRE Council of Ministers, 2008).
In this regulation, the government also establishes the APRM National Governing Council (NGC) by giving the following powers and duties:

- Oversee the process of Ethiopian country self-assessment ensures independence, professionalism and credibility;
- Review the self-assessment reports submitted by the technical research institute;
- Arrange and facilitate the visits from assessment and support teams of the panel of the African Peer review mechanism to Ethiopia for assessing and counseling;
- Aware all stakeholders as to the APRM process and effect their full participation in it;
- Ensure accurateness, participation and coordination in the whole process of the APRM;
- Identify key areas of concern on the self-assessment report; prepare and submit to the government the final report and National Plan of Action;
- Implement its budget upon approval by the government, and orders the auditing of its accounts.

The APRM National Governing Council (NGC) was composed of 23 different stakeholders, out of which 9 are from civil society. Similarly, the structure and compositions of governing council in the Regional states have resembled the NGC. The research institute which undertook the CSAR was African Institute of Management, Development and Governance (AIMDG). AIMDG employed six methods in conducting the CSAR. These methods were desk research, key informants’ interviews, household survey, expert opinion survey, Woreda consultation forum, and focus group discussion. The CSAR document asserts that different stakeholders were in attendance in four round workshops (NGC Secretariat, 2009a:3-4).

The CSAR comprises of six chapters. The first chapter deals with the theoretical background of APRM including its process and its overview objectives. Chapter two is about the Ethiopia’s political environment particularly its evolution till the current situations. The third chapter assesses issues under the theme of democracy and political
governance. Chapter four of the CSAR deals with findings related to economic governance and management issues. The issues of corporate governance and socio-economic development are addressed in chapter five and chapter six respectively (Ibid: 6)

The CSAR has identified both strengths and limitations of the government performance in Ethiopia. The problems and challenges in Ethiopia’s government system have been grouped under the four thematic areas of APRM: Democracy and Good Political Governance, Economic Governance and Management, Corporate Governance, and Socio-economic Development. On the basis of the problems and challenges identified by the CSAR, the AIMDG has prepared National Program of Action (NPoA) which underscores the required actions and monitoring indicators under each objective of the four dimensions of APRM. Under Democracy and Good Political Governance, the required actions and monitoring indicators are devised to achieve nine major objectives. The NPoA puts forth the required actions and monitoring indicators for five major objectives under Economic Governance and Management. It develops plan of actions and monitoring indicators to achieve five major objectives under Corporate Governance. Under Socio-economic development thematic area, the NPoA aims to attain six major objectives (NGC Secretariat, 2009b).

The NPoA has underlined that the successful implementation of program of action would require the collaboration and extensive involvement of the public, private sectors as well as CSOs. The comparisons of major events of Ethiopia’s APRM with the three pioneering countries are depicted in table 3.1.
Table 3.1: The comparisons of major events of Ethiopia’s APRM with the three pioneering countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public launch of the APRM process(^8)</td>
<td>18 March 2004</td>
<td>14 July 2004</td>
<td>24-26 March 2004</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Size and description of governing body</td>
<td>7 Members, all civil society</td>
<td>33 members of which 26 are from CSOs</td>
<td>50 members of which 11 are from CSOs</td>
<td>23 members of which 9 are from CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Scope of civil society</td>
<td>Both member-based and third party serving organizations</td>
<td>Both member-based and third party serving organizations</td>
<td>Both member-based and third party serving organizations</td>
<td>Only mass-based organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Bing-Pappoe, 2010:6, and Herbert and Gruzd (2008: 9-10)

\(^8\) In addition to public sensitization workshops and seminars, the three pioneering countries created their respective APRM websites.
Conclusion

The experiences of these pioneering countries-Ghana, Rwanda and Kenya have confirmed that civil society is the prime partner in the APRM process and the countries have considered the broad concept of APRM. However, there are variations in the composition of NGC of each country. Almost all seats of national governing councils of both Ghana and Kenya were filled by civil society representatives where as civil society was not adequately represented in the case of Rwanda’s NGC. All the three countries commissioned different TRIs for each of the four thematic areas of APRM.

In case of Ethiopia’s experience, the commencement of APRM was delayed very much though its accession was the same with the three countries. There are some variations between Ethiopia’s APRM and the pioneering countries. The first is in terms of the concept of civil society in which only mass-based organizations were considered in Ethiopia. The other difference area is that all four thematic areas of APRM was undertaken by only one Technical Research Institute (TRI).

The variations among APRM countries in terms of the concept of civil society, and composition of NGC should not be compromised since all implement the review process through common standards and principles of APRM base document. More importantly, APRM is common agenda to all participating countries to achieve the objectives of NEPAD.

Now the time comes to critically investigate the role and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM. Thus the next chapter deals with presentation, analysis and discussion regarding the role and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM process based on primary and secondary data.
Chapter Four: Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

Introduction
This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and discussion of data by following the basic research questions formulated in chapter one. As indicated in methodology part of chapter one, data collected through document review, questionnaire and interview are systematically presented, analyzed and discussed one after the other under each main topic of the basic research questions.

The chapter is mainly classified into the major topics of assessment of the prerequisites for civic engagement in APRM, performance of APRM NGC and strategies followed by government, CSOs participation and engagement in APRM, roles played by CSOs challenges to civic engagement, and prospects of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM.

4.1. Profile of the respondents
Even though the target sampling frames are civil society and other organizations- from organization perspective- it is also important to look at the profile of the respondents in terms of education and work experiences in CSOs.

The researcher distributed the questionnaire to 33 target population of CSOs of which 29 CSOs organizations responded and returned the questionnaire. The effective response rate is 87.9 percent. Therefore the analysis of data obtained through questionnaire considered 29 CSOs as 100 percent samples. In case where there were major variations among the respondents’ views, analyses and discussions considered these variations by taking into account the respondents’ categories: CSOs representatives in NGC, and CSOs networks and others.
The above table (table 4.1) shows that more than half of the respondents (55.2%) have second degree and/or above. With regard to the respondents’ work experience in CSOs, majority of them (79.3% of the respondents) served the civil society organizations more than five years. From the table, one can say that the respondents’ educational level accompanying with their rich experiences in CSOs would enable the researcher to get adequate information regarding the role and involvement of CSOs in Ethiopia’s APRM process.

In addition, organizations were approached through interview technique. These organizations include four opposition parties represented in NGC, APRM NGC Secretariat, Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce & Sectoral Associations, Ethiopian Civil Society Task Force, Twelve Networks of CSOs, Six representatives of CSOs in NGC, and AIMDG. At least one focal person was taken in each of these organizations for interview and their responses and comments were incorporated under each major topics of the chapter.
4.2. Assessment of the Prerequisites for CSOs participation and engagement in APRM of Ethiopia

Needless to say the existence of vibrant and independent CSOs would matter the level of participation and engagement of civil society in APRM. On the other hand, vibrant CSOs are institutionalized as long as there is healthy political space for them. Thus, it is vital to precede the concern for there have been the prerequisites for CSOs participation and engagement in APRM of Ethiopia before looking at their level of participation and engagement.

According to Doh (1998:15), and CWS (2000:12-13), the major elements to be considered as prerequisites for substantial participation and engagement of CSOs in APRM process include the level of freedom of associations, legal instrument space for CSOs, the independence of CSOs representatives in APRM National Governing Council (NGC), and the full disclosure of information regarding CSOs roles in APRM process. To begin with the extent to which the citizens enjoy the freedom of associations as shown by figure 4.1, nearly 35 percent of the respondents rated as low or very low and the same proportion of the respondents (35%) rated it as moderate. On the other hand, 30.8 percent of the respondents replied that extent of citizens enjoy the freedom of association is high or very high. From respondents’ views regarding the extent of freedom of associations, there was no consensus among them. This could emanate from the fact that civil society represents a number of different interests and segments of society and accordingly the extent of freedom varies from one area of engagement to another area because some interviewees emphasized that government is not willing to allow civic engagement in some restrictive areas such as human rights, advocacy, and politics.
With respect to the legal instrument, two scenarios that could be raised are the new FDRE charities and societies’ proclamation No. 621/2008 and its predecessor’s legal instrument. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate the extent of legal space for CSOs from the two scenarios. Here it is important to bear in mind that the new proclamation of charities and societies was effective after the implementation of APRM and its consideration is significantly important for the upcoming APRM process in Ethiopia. More specifically, the consideration of the new proclamation is important to analyze the prospects of civic engagement in the coming review process. In this regard, figure 4.2 shows the respondents’ views about the extent to which legal environment prior to the
new proclamation No.621/2008 gives space for any member of civil society to form associations, networks to better realize their community shared goals.

**Figure 4.2: The extent of legal environment space for formation of CSOs prior to the new proclamation**

![Figure 4.2](image)

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

The space of legal environment for formation of CSOs prior to the new proclamation was rated high or very high by majority (67.8%) of the respondents and moderate by 17.9 percent. A few respondents (14.3%) thought that the space of legal environment for CSOs was very low or low. This can show that legal environment space for CSOs involvement in different areas was considerably high and conducive. From this element as a prerequisite for civic engagement, it can be said that civil society organizations engagement and their role would be expected to be high in the first cycle of Ethiopia’s APRM process.
Here it is important to enrich the above inconclusive finding related to civil rights with the work of Freedom House. The House Freedom, as explained in its official website (http://www.freedomhouse.org/ratings/), rates each country’s civil liberties on a seven-point scale, with 1 representing the most free and 7 the least and assigns a broad category status of free (for countries whose ratings average 1.0 to 2.5), partly free (3.0 to 5.0) or not free (5.5 to 7.0). According to this result, Ethiopia has been ranked as partly free status with 5.0 civil liberties score each year since 2002 up to 2010. On the basis of this finding, the score puts the country’s freedom status at the bottom of partly free countries. This shows that civil society does not enjoy the optimal level of freedom related with associational and organizational rights.

The above finding shows that every citizen does not enjoy freedom of associations for any purpose which does not conform with Article 31 of FDRE constitution that guarantees individuals freedom by stating that ‘every person has the right to freedom of association for any cause or purpose’ (FDRE, 1995). This would reduce the number and quality of CSOs and ultimately undermine the effective participation and contribution of the civil society to the APRM process.

The third element among the prerequisites for substantial civic engagement in APRM process is related to the existence of independent CSOs representatives in NGC. This element is particularly important because NGC determines the major aspects of APRM. As underlined in the regulation No. 142/2008, NGC was mandated, among other things, to aware all stakeholders, and to ensure accurateness, participation and coordination in the whole process of the APRM (Regulation No. 142/2008, 7/4&5). By the same token, representatives of CSOs in NGC should work to ensure the full participation of civil society and of course others. This is especially attributable to the real representation and independence of CSOs in NGC.

Even though the issue of CSOs representatives’ independence is highly subjective to measure, the large proportion of respondents (37.9%) agreed or strongly agreed that the independence of CSOs representatives in NGC has been doubtful. Similarly, 34.5 percent
of the respondents were indifferent/neutrals towards the independence of CSOs in NGC. The remaining small proportion of the respondents (27.6%) agreed or strongly agreed on the independence of the CSOs which formed the NGC.

![Figure 4.3: The independence of CSOs representatives in NGC](image)

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

With regard to the level of independence, there are variations among the responses of the CSOs which were the members of NGC and other CSOs particularly the civil society Networks. CSOs representatives in NGC argued for their independence has been undoubted while the networks and others argued against the opinions of the organizations which were the representatives of civil society. Only few respondents from CSOs networks and others, which account for 6.9 percent of the entire respondents, argued for the independence of CSOs in NGC. On the contrary to this, 37.9 percent of the respondents who strongly disagreed or disagreed on the issue were from civil society.
networks and others, and those 34.5 percent of the respondents who rated the independence of CSOs in NGC as neutral were from this category. The above facts make the legitimacy of representatives of civil society in NGC under question and hesitation. Figure 4.4 indicates the variations among the respondents’ categories in reaction to the independence of organizations representing civil society in NGC.

At this juncture, it is important to answer why civil society networks and other CSOs are hesitant about the CSOs which represented in NGC. The major source for such hesitation arises from the question how and by whom the nine representatives of CSOs were selected. Particularly all the interviewees from the CSO Networks said that the representation of these nine CSOs were done based on their mere smooth relationship with government and their selection was done without the consultation of civil society.

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
For instance, the respondents considered Union of Bar Association as surrogate organization which represents a single individual but it was assumed as one of the nine CSOs representatives in NGC. There were also some respondents which complained that the CSOs represented in NGC were created by government itself purposively. Generally speaking, majority of the interviewed individuals pointed out that the organizations representing CSOs were not the true representation of civil society but they were hand-picked by government. Accordingly, they underlined that fundamental problems of government performance could be ignored in APRM process since ‘GONGOs’-government yet non-government organizations- were selected in the NGC.

In this regard, almost all the respondents (96.5%) answered that the selection of CSOs representatives in NGC was done in an opaque manner or by government itself. Only one of the representatives of CSOs in NGC (3.4%) said that it included in NGC by its request. This clearly shows that the inclusion of civil society representatives in NGC was not done in transparent and democratic manner. Even the regulation enacted to establish NGC does not specify how and by whom representatives of CSOs were selected. On the other hand, Herbert and Gruzd (2008:16) underscore for the independence of civil society representatives in the council so as to ensure the validity and success of the APRM process. Thus the above finding shows that APRM in Ethiopia was under the control government and a few selectively invited CSOs which would cause doubt on the validity of the entire processes of APRM.
In contrary to the undemocratic way of civil society representation in NGC, APRM base document principles emphasize the independence of CSOs representatives in NGC should be ensured by undertaking the selection through civil society forum or consensus (AU, 2003a:1). As information obtained from interview, the nomination of two Ethiopian CSOs⁹ in ECOSOCC could be mentioned as best practice. From the above facts, it is safe to say that the members of NGC on behalf of the civil society lack legitimacy since there was no consultation by the civil society forum to nominate its representatives in the NGC.

The fourth issue that serves as a prerequisite for active participation of CSOs is the full disclosure of information about CSOs roles in APRM process. In this respect, more than

---

⁹ Ethiopian Teachers’ Association, and Network for Ethiopian Women Association were selected in ECOSOCC by an electoral college of CSOs (Source: Interview, March 2010)
half of the respondents (62.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed on there has been full disclosure of information about CSOs roles in APRM process. Similarly, 10.3 percent of the respondents rated it as neutral. Only a few respondents (17.2%) agreed on there has been full disclosure of information about the roles of CSOs in APRM process and 10.3% rated it as very high. The above facts show that majority of CSOs did not have awareness and information as to what should be their roles in the APRM process. However, Kajee (2004:254) emphasizes on the creation of sense of ownership for the actual involvement of CSOs and he argues that sense of ownership in APRM is the function of information flow and disclosure from the NGC about the roles of CSOs in the process. In situation where the sense of ownership by civil society organizations is low, their engagement during implementation of NPoA would be poor. Figure 4.6 shows whether there has been full disclosure of information about the roles of CSOs in the process.

Figure 4.6: Full disclosure of information about CSOs roles in APRM process

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
The above facts related to freedom of associations, legal environment space for civic engagement, the independence of civil society representatives in NGC, and full disclosure of information about the CSOs roles in APRM process would indicate that these four prerequisites were not good enough for effective civil society engagement in APRM process. Particularly the latter two prerequisites were found to be unappealing. On the other hand, credible, independent, and professional peer review can be only achieved through civil society participation (AU, 2003a:1). The above unappealing prerequisites give the government wide discretionary powers to dominate the APRM process. Thus this raises the danger of cooptation of civil society by the government to the extent that critical voices from CSOs are deliberately excluded; this would again create dysfunctional effect on the validity of the two key documents of APRM: CSAR and NPoA.

4.3. Performance of APRM NGC and strategies followed by Government

In this section, the performance APRM NGC and strategies followed by government in enhancing civic engagement in APRM are discussed one by one.

4.3.1. Performance of APRM NGC in enhancing civic engagement

Composition of Ethiopia APRM National Governing Council (NGC)

Since NGC shapes the entire implementation of peer review mechanism in Ethiopia, its composition would affect the validity of the two key documents: CSAR and NPoA. According to Supplementary Guidelines as stated in Herbert and Gruzd (2008:16), NGC should be composed of various stakeholders mainly with the majority of civil society and a civil society chairperson.

By principle, the composition of Ethiopia’s APRM NGC (look at Annex IV) considers the inclusion of different segments of the society. It also takes into account that the assumption of the majority seats should be given for civil society. In this respect, 39.1 percent of the NGC seats were filled by civil society representatives. However, the
structure and formation of NGC has some deviations from the APRM base document and the supplementary Guidelines in at least two points (Herbert and Gruzd, 2008: 17). The first and foremost is the chairperson position was retained by government representative but the supplementary guidelines say that the NGC should have a civil society chairperson. The second point of deviation is in terms of conceptualizing the civil society. In Ethiopia’s APRM process, civil society is confined to mass-based associations and professional associations. It excludes the third-party serving civil society organizations such as NGOs, Networks, and advocacy groups.

Specifically, the performance of NGC in creating conducive environment for active participation and engagement of CSOs is examined based on the facts and evidences provided in figure 4.7. Fairly large portion of (39.3%) respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that NGC has created conducive environment in enhancing active participation of CSOs and they all were from CSOs networks and other CSOs category. Similarly, 28.6 percent of the respondents, all from the CSOs networks and others category, were indifferent for the matter. On the other hand, only a few respondents (10.7%) from the category of CSOs networks and others rated as agree or strongly disagree on there has been conducive environment for CSOs engagement in APRM process. The remaining 21.4 percent of the respondents, all from CSOs representatives in NGC, claimed that NGC has created conducive environment for CSOs participation in the process.

Even though the representatives of CSOs in NGC reported that there has been conducive environment, the evidences from CSOs and other categories did not support the claims of the members of NGC. Likewise, majority of the interviewed individuals said that NGC did not discharge its legally mandated responsibilities in creating conducive environment for the engagement of civil society. This clearly shows that APRM NGC did not create enabling environment for effective civil society engagement. This would again undermine the integrity and credibility of the APRM.
Obviously one way of ensuring the engagement of CSOs could be through inviting majority of CSOs from wide range categories. In this regard, large proportion (55.1%) of the respondents felt that majority of the CSOs were not invited to participate in APRM process. The remaining 27.6 percent and 17.2 percent of the respondents rated the statement on ‘majority of CSOs have been invited in APRM process’ as neutral and agree respectively. These facts are shown in Figure 4.8.
Information obtained through interview also revealed that the APRM process in Ethiopia was not transparent and it was only under the control of a few individuals and organizations. It was suggested that more CSOs should have been engaged in APRM process. Some of the interviewed individuals resembled the APRM process in Ethiopia with that of ‘experiments’ done in ‘laboratory’- with careful investigation of the government and they also added that citizens did not have awareness on different aspects of APRM. On the other hand, the experiences of APRM pioneering countries and the standard of APRM show the process should be transparent and stakeholders’ inclusive. Even Ethiopia’s NGC have not created website to disclose information on APRM process as has been done by early APRM models such as Ghana, Rwanda and Kenya.

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
Particularly, some members of NGC from opposition parties emphasized that NGC did play nothing in enhancing the engagement of CSOs because they explained that only the chairperson of NGC selected the representatives of CSOs and research institute-AIMDG which prepared the CSAR. Even they also added that members of NGC were called after the draft of CSAR prepared. They said that CSOs and the research institute were chosen deliberately, by the chairperson of NGC who was appointed by government, for a special purpose.

Even all representatives of CSOs in NGC viewed that they only represented their own respective organizations instead of the entire civil society. In this regard, the interview responses show that no one CSO representative in NGC claimed for the inclusions of diversified range of CSOs that encompass the third party serving groups in the APRM process. This clearly indicates that civil society did not act in an organized and integrated manner in APRM process instead few CSOs participated in fragmented approach.

Such handpicked practice to select the representatives of CSOs violates the standards of APRM base document which assume CSOs should be one of the independent partners in the process. The experiences of APRM pioneering countries have witnessed that representatives of CSOs are selected by civil society council/forum itself (Herbert and Gruzd, 2008:9-10). As the interview’ responses revealed, the selection of Network of Ethiopian Women Association and Ethiopian Teachers’ Association through civil society forum as representatives of Ethiopian CSOs in ECOSCOO could be mentioned as excellent practice that should have been replicated in the case of APRM in selecting the civil society representatives in NGC and in the process.

4.3.2. Strategies followed by government to enhance active engagement of CSOs

The process of APRM involves a number of activities and stakeholders which would in turn require a huge amount of resources. On the other hand, the validity and accuracy of the process is mainly determined by the extent to which it is participatory. Similarly, the expenditures on APRM process are justifiable by its valid output. This would necessitate for government to design appropriate strategies so as to enhance civil society and other
stakeholders’ engagement in the process. According to APRM NGC Secretariat officer, the FDRE government has employed different forms of strategies like inclusion of CSOs in NGC, political commitment to engage in CSOs at all stages of APRM, education and sensitization, strategic sequencing, and the establishment of management and leadership structures for APRM process at the federal and regional levels so as to enhance the engagement and participation of CSOs in the process.

Based on data collected through questionnaire, the extent to which government has employed various forms of strategies to enhance CSO’s engagement in APRM process found to be at low level and not appealing as summarized in table 4.2. With regard to the inclusion of CSOs in NGC as a strategy employed by government, the majority (55.1%) of respondents rated as very low or low, 24.1 percent as moderate and 20.6 percent of the respondents rated as high or very high. Even though the government has allocated 39 percent of the seats for civil society in NGC (Annex IV), some of the respondents thought that the government has not effectively employed this strategy by allowing civil society to select its own representatives.

Similarly, more than half (55.2%) of the respondents felt that the extent of government political commitment¹⁰ to engage in CSOs at all stages of APRM was low. 17.2 percent of the respondents rated the level of the government political commitment strategy as moderate and 27.6 percent rated as high or very high. With regard to the extent to which government has employed education and sensitization of APRM as a strategy, the majority (68.9%) of respondents rated as very low or low. The level of this strategy was rated by 17.2 percent and 13.7 percent as moderate and very high or high respectively. Similarly, nearly 66 percent of the respondents rated the extent to which government has created frank and open dialogue environment for APRM as very low or low.

The independence of NGC leadership and management as a strategy, still the majority (65.5%) of respondents rated as very low or low. Only few respondents (13.8%) thought

¹⁰ Political will to make the entire process inclusive and participatory as indicated in UN-ECA (2005:13)
that the extent of government effort to establish independent NGC structure was very high or high and the remaining 20.7 percent of the respondents rated it as moderate.

Table 4.2: The extent to which government has employed the various forms of strategies to enhance CSOs participation in the APRM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of strategies</th>
<th>Respondents’ Responses</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inclusion of CSOs in NGC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political commitment to engage in CSOs at all stages of APRM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education and sensitization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creating frank and open dialogue environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent Management and leadership structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

From the above facts, one can understand that the overall efforts and commitments of government in enhancing the engagement and participation of diversified CSOs were not satisfactory. However, one should also bear in mind that the government has invited many stakeholders which include the opposition parties, private sector and others in the major stages of APRM. Particularly, interview’s results showed the following remarkable performance of government in APRM process:

- Even though the official launch of APRM was late, the effort to implement APRM should be appreciable;
- The effort to include major opposition parties in the process;
- The CSAR has been prepared by incorporating communities up to grass-root levels; and
- There were hot deliberations, discussions, great chances to participate during consultation on CSAR document.
4.4. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) participation and engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process

Mere representation of CSOs in NGC does not validate the APRM process. The validity of APRM process is mainly determined through substantial participation of the civil society. As indicated in the literature chapter, civic engagement refers set of actions and efforts that CSOs undertake in the major activities and stages of APRM process. On the basis of this, this section is devoted to the analysis of CSOs participation level and engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process. The extent of CSOs engagement will be examined from APRM’s major activities and four thematic areas perspectives.

Table 4.3 discloses a summary of the extent of civic engagement in major activities of APRM process. The extent of CSOs engagement in formation and composition of APRM National Governing Council was rated as very low or low by the majority (72.4%) of respondents and only 27.6 percent of the respondents rated as moderate. With regard to the extent of CSOs engagement in designing the approaches of APRM implementation, nearly 59 percent of the respondents rated as very low or low, 27.6 percent rated as moderate and a small portion (13.8%) of the respondents rated as high or very high. Similarly, majority (62.1%) of the respondents thought that the extent of civic engagement during focus group discussions was very low or low only 6.9 percent rated as moderate. The remaining 31 percent of the respondents felt that the civic engagement in this activity was high or very high.

Approximately half (48.2%) of the respondents rated the extent of civic engagement in filling questionnaire for CSAR as very low or low, 24.1 percent rated as moderate and 27 percent as high or very high. With respect to the extent of civic engagement in commenting on CSAR, a small majority (55.2%) rated as very low or low, 24.1 percent rated as moderate and 20.7 percent rated as high or very high. The majority (62.1%) of the respondents reported that the civic engagement in designing NPoA was very low or low. Similarly, a small majority (55.2%) of the respondents answered that the extent of civic engagement during consultation with country mission team was very low or low.
and 27.6 percent rated as moderate where as a few respondents (17.2%) reported as high or very high.

Table 4.3: The extent to which CSOs have been engaged in the major activities of APRM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRM activities</th>
<th>Respondents’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formation and composition of APRM National Governing council</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Designing the approaches of APRM implementation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. During focus group discussions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Filling in the questionnaire for CSAR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commenting on CSAR</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Designing NPoA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consultation with country mission Team</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

From the above given facts, one can observe that the overall civic engagement level was rated as low or very low. Particularly, civic engagement during formation and composition of APRM NGC, in designing the approaches of APRM implementation, and in designing NPoA in the country were extremely rated as unsatisfactory. On the other hand, the extent of civic engagement in participating during focus group discussions, and in filling in the questionnaire for CSAR were considered relatively better than that of other activities. This shows that the civic engagement in basic activities of APRM was low which implies the dominance of government in the process. Thus the discourse on good governance in the name of APRM initiative would not bring significant change by the effort and commitment of one stakeholder-the government. This would rather necessitate for government to search the way how to augment the engagement of diversified CSOs in the review process.
The other important issue to be taken into account while discussing the civic engagement in APRM is the question of the extent to which suggestions and comments of CSOs have been incorporated in CSAR and NPoA. In response to this case, majority (53.9%) of the respondents said that the extent of CSOs suggestions have been incorporated in CSAR was low or very low. Of respondents, 30.8 percent felt that the CSOs suggestions have been incorporated in CSAR moderately. Contrary to this a small portion (15.3%) of respondents presumed the consideration of CSOs suggestions in CSAR was high or very high. Figure 4.9 explains this fact. This indicates that the CSAR and NPoA were prepared without much consideration of the CSOs suggestions. The failure to incorporate suggestions and comments of CSOs would affect the validity of the entire process of APRM and its two key final documents: CSAR and NPoA.

Figure 4.9: The extent of CSOs suggestions have been incorporated in CSAR

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
Respondents were also asked about the engagement of CSOs from the perspective of APRM’s four thematic areas: Political and democratic governance, Economic governance and management, corporate governance, and Socio-economic development. From this perspective, nearly half of the respondents thought that the extent of CSOs engagement in evaluating the performance of government from political and democratic governance, and Economic governance and management was low or very low. On the other hand, proportional number of respondents argued for both low and moderate level of engagement in evaluating government from corporate governance and socio-economic development perspectives.

As indicated by table 4.4, only a few respondents (ranging from 13.7% to 27.5%) claimed that the contributions of CSOs in evaluating government performance in four thematic areas of APRM were high or very high.

Table 4.4: The extent to which CSOs have been engaged in APRM’ four dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRM Dimensions</th>
<th>Respondents’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political and Democratic Governance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic Governance and Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Corporate governance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Socio-economic development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

As part of methodological triangulation technique, respondents were asked to rate the overall level of CSOs participation in Ethiopia’s APRM process. Figure 4.10 represents the respondents’ reaction toward the level of CSOs participation in APRM process. Accordingly, fairly large (58.6%) of the respondents argued for the low or very low participation level of CSOs in the process where as only a few respondents (13.8%) took the stand of the level of CSOs participation was high or very high. The remaining 27.6 percent of the respondents rated the moderate level of CSOs participation in APRM process. This would show that importance of civil society organizations in APRM was
understated and government did not give due attention for the contributions they provide in the process.

Figure 4.10: The level of CSOs participation in Ethiopia's APRM process

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

This self-explanatory figure shows that the overall level of CSOs participation was rated low or very low though a few respondents claimed that the extent of CSOs participation in APRM was high or very high. From this figure and above explanations, one can assert that the degree of participation and engagement of civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM was at minimal level. That is why the level of CSOs engagement in major activities and the four dimensions of APRM were rated as very low or low by majority of the respondents. This could be again
attributable to non-inclusive forms of strategies employed by government in enhancing the engagement of CSOs in APRM as discussed in section 4.3.2.

4.5. Roles played by CSOs in Ethiopia’s APRM process

As one of the important stakeholders of APRM, CSOs are expected to engage in APRM process actively. The above section highlighted the issues of CSOs engagement and participation in APRM’s major activities and four thematic areas. In addition to civic engagement in major activities of APRM, CSOs need to play a number of roles to ensure the citizen participation in the process and the validity of CSAR and NPoA - which are the two important products of APRM. These roles, as mentioned in UN-ECA (2005:14), mainly include raising the awareness of citizens on APRM through research and sensitization of APRM, advocacy and lobbying, undertaking shadow review, and ensuring the standards of APRM base document in the process. Based on these roles as references, this section presents how far CSOs have contributed in playing these roles in Ethiopia’s APRM process.

A. The role of civil society in raising the awareness of citizens

The scholars confirm that the effectiveness of APRM is extremely determined by popular participation in the process and this could be achieved when civil society plays its role in raising the awareness of citizens. With this regard, a sizable number (72.4%) of respondents said that the extent to which CSOs have played in raising the awareness of citizens was very low or low. Only 10.3 percent of the respondents thought that the role of CSOs in raising the awareness of citizens was very high or high and the remaining 17.2 percent of the respondents rated as moderate.
Some of the interviewed persons particularly the executive directors of almost all civil society networks surprisingly commented that how uninformed civil society could have assumed the role of sensitization and information dissemination in APRM. They also added that it was the government responsibility to openly provide full information about the role of civil society in APRM process.

B. The role of civil society in advocacy and lobbying

By principle, civil society needs to influence the implementation modality of APRM process, identify the areas of particular interest from APRM thematic areas, and lobby key regional African institutions and structures to ensure that the review report gets

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
appropriate attention. Figure 4.12 illustrates that nearly 80 percent of the respondents felt that the extent to which CSOs have played the role of advocacy and lobbying was very low or low and 10.3 percent rated this role level as moderate. However, extremely a few respondents (3.4%) claimed for the role of CSOs in advocacy and lobbying was very high or high.

Figure 4.12: The extent to which CSOs have played the role of advocacy and lobbying

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)

The interviewees also shared the above facts and many of them expressed their worries and concerns about systematic disbandment of advocacy and lobbying role of many CSOs by government through introduction of the new proclamation on charities and
they emphasized that the implementation of APRM in Ethiopia was done under the auspices of this new proclamation though not operational at that time.

C. The role of civil society in undertaking shadow review

As proposed by scholars, CSOs mainly think tanks and development NGOs should not only act as partners to government in APRM process but also as responsible players to undertake independent shadow review related to APRM thematic areas. In response to the extent to which CSOs have played the role of undertaking shadow review in Ethiopia’s APRM, the majority (89.7%) of the respondents rated as very low or low, 6.9 percent rated as moderate and the remaining 3.4 percent of the respondents rated as very high or high.

Figure 4.13: The extent to which CSOs have played the role of undertaking shadow review

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
**D. The role of civil society in ensuring the standards of APRM in the process**

This role of civil society is of vital importance in attaining the credibility and integrity of the APRM process. The major standards of APRM entails that the process should be done based on the principles of independence, professionalism, credibility, and stakeholders’ inclusive. The basic question here is that how far CSOs have played the role of ensuring these principles in the implementation of APRM process in Ethiopia. Figure 4.14 represents the extent to which this role was assumed by CSOs. Accordingly, the extent to which CSOs have played the role of ensuring APRM standards in the process was rated as very low or low by fairly large number (68.9%) of the respondents, rated as moderate by 13.8 percent and rated as very high or high by 17.2 percent.

*Figure 4.14: The extent to which CSOs have played the role of ensuring the APRM standards in the process*

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
The above facts show that the overall roles played by CSOs during the first cycle of Ethiopia’s APRM in issues related to raising the awareness of citizens, advocacy and lobbying, undertaking shadow review, and ensuring the standards of APRM in the process were at minimal level and almost non-existent. Thus it can be said that civil society in Ethiopia did not play vital and major role as it ought to be. Table 4.5 summarizes the views of the respondents on how far CSOs have played various roles in APRM process.

Table 4.5: The extent to which CSOs have played the various roles in APRM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles played by CSOs</th>
<th>Respondents’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raising the awareness of citizens</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research and sensitization of APRM</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advocacy and lobbying</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undertaking Shadow review</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensuring the standards of APRM in the process</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by questionnaire, March 2010)

The previous discussions have been focused on specific issues about the participation and engagement of CSOs in major activities and thematic areas of APRM as well as to what extent civil society has played various forms of roles in the process. At this point it is important to answer the extent of CSOs have been part of Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process. In reaction to this question, fairly large number (58.6%) of the respondents thought that the extent of CSOs has been part of Ethiopia’s APRM was very low or low and 24.1 percent of the respondents argued for moderate level. Contrary to this, the extent of CSOs has been the part of Ethiopia’s APRM was rated as very high or high only by a small number (17.2%) of the respondents. This is depicted in fig 4.15.
In all perspectives, it has been found that the extent of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM was unsatisfactory. Even though APRM has acknowledged the critical role of civil society in the process, the Ethiopian civil society has not played substantial role in first cycle of APRM. This would create doubt on the integrity and credibility of APRM process and would affect the participation and commitment of CSOs during the implementation period of NPoA. Thus, it is sensible to look at factors attributable to the unremarkable/poor engagement of civil society in APRM process and this is presented in the next section.

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
4.6. Challenges to civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process

The identification of challenges encountered during the first time (cycle) APRM in Ethiopia in relation to civil society engagement would be vital to tackle these challenges in the upcoming second cycle APRM process in the country. This would in turn make responsible stakeholders to take actions accordingly so as to enhance meaningful and vigorous civic engagement for the next time APRM process and other initiatives that require civil society involvement.

On the basis of the possible challenges drawn from APRM pioneering countries and research works in the area, the CSOs were asked the extent to which the challenges, as indicated in table 4.6, were the determinants of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM.

Table 4.6: The extent to which the following challenges were the determinants for civic engagement in APRM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and problems</th>
<th>Respondents’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fear of government</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restricted legal/political space for CSOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CSOs institutional capacity constraints</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disorganization of CSOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Limited resources and funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Obstacles related to complexity and technical nature of APRM process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
As indicated in table 4.6, restricted legal/political space for CSOs was ranked as the first top challenge by 55.1 percent of the respondents. On this point, some interviewees were surprised why government did not participate the majority of civil society particularly the third-party serving CSOs in APRM process. They added that this category of civil society has been actively involved in other national and international initiatives such as a Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP), Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Cotonou Agreement. Fear of government and obstacles related to complexity and technical nature of APRM process, both were ranked as the second top challenges by 41 percent of the respondents. The third top challenge for poor civic engagement was attributable to CSOs institutional constrains by 37.9 percent of the respondents. Disorganization of CSOs was also considered as a challenge in the fourth rank by 34.4 percent of the respondents. The extent of limited resources and funding as a challenge was ranked as very high or high by a small number (31%) of the respondents as compared to other challenges.

Even though the above challenges were identified by the respondents, clear consensus was not reached among the respondents particularly between CSOs representatives in NGC and CSOs networks and others. For instance, all 55.1 percent of the respondents which said that the extent of restricted political space for CSOs was very high or high are from civil society networks and others. This is illustrated by figure 4.16. On one hand, majority of the civil society representatives in NGC thought that the internal issues of CSOs like institutional capacity constraints and disorganization of the CSOs were considered as the major challenges of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process. On the other hand, fairly large civil society networks and others argued for the external challenges such as restricted political/legal space for CSOs and fear of government as determinants of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s first cycle APRM process.
Definition and scope of civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM process as a challenge

Even though there is no clear demarcation as to what civil society does include and does not, scholars such as Doh (1998:157), Dessalegn (2002:104) and Kuruvilla (2005:6) have underlined the wide range compositions of civil society which include both third-party serving CSOs and member-based organizations. Third-party serving CSOs comprises of NGOs, advocacy groups and networks while member-based CSOs include professional associations and mass-based associations such as associations for youth and women (MCB, 2004:5).

Contrary to the conventional concept, civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM is defined as ‘those organizations which are eligible to involve in political issues and those which have

(Source: Data collected through questionnaire, March 2010)
their own constituency particularly members’ (Ethiopia APRM NGC Secretariat officer, Interview, March 2002). More specifically, the officer coined civil society as mass-based organizations and some professional associations by excluding third-party serving civil society organizations. Surprisingly, some interviewees reported that the youth and women leagues organized by the ruling party were also assumed the status of civil society in the review process.

The above definition of civil society is more or less derived from the thought of the new proclamation on societies and charities. The definition explicitly indicates that civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM was understood in a narrow sense and the legal space for civic engagement in the review process was consequently restricted to specific CSOs which were eligible to participate in the process. The controversial issue here is that FDRE acknowledges for broad-based classification of civil society and it recognizes the advocacy, monitoring and evaluation functions for all categories of the civil society whether third Party serving or member serving or self-help before the effective date of the new proclamation (MCB,2004:5-9).

The experiences of APRM early countries such as Ghana, Kenya and Rwanda also show that civil society encompasses broad ranges of organizations with the cardinal role given to third-party serving organizations such as NGOs and Networks (Herbert and Gruzd, 2008:9-10). Unfortunately, such diversification of civil society did not take into account in Ethiopia’s APRM. The profile of CSOs which participated in APRM in our country (Annex III) shows that the concept of civil society was extremely narrowed and restricted to mass-based organizations and professional associations.

Such narrow definition of civil society in APRM would have negative impacts on the quantity and quality of CSOs participating in the review process. This would in turn undermine the engagement and roles of majority of CSOs in APRM and then affect the independence of the entire APRM process. Unquestionably, the above challenges whether external or internal would have impediment effects on the engagement of civil society in APRM. This has been also
confirmed by many interviewees. For successful participation and engagement of civil society in APRM, these challenges should be addressed by the act of collaboration between the government and civil society. On one hand, government should regard civil society in broad dimension and as its partner. More importantly, government needs to make the legal space open for civil society involvement without reservation policy as in the case stated in the new proclamation of civil society. On the other hand, civil society should create strong coalition and improve its internal capacity to engage in initiatives like APRM since civil society is broad concept involving wide ranging activities, receiving funding from different sources, having different perspectives and representing different interests. The research finding of Bing-Pappoe (2010:19) confirms for the importance of coordination and solidarity among civil society and explains in this way:

The divisive effects of these differences among civil society organizations have to be bridged and managed if civil society is to successfully engage with an initiative such as the APRM, and indeed to become to a greater degree an organic outgrowth of society as a whole.

Thus CSOs in Ethiopia needs to establish independent coordinating unit so that they can realize their shared goals and objectives as one body. This was also suggested by many interviewees. This would strengthen the unity of civil society and relieve the challenges related to disorganization and dispersion of CSOs.

In addition to the above challenges and problems, some respondents and interviewed individuals commented other challenges and problems related to limited awareness creation and promotion facilities of government, the mistrust between government and civil society, the time the APRM was undertaking is when CSOs were busy with regard to the issue of their existence based on the new proclamation, Government’s cooptation strategy through direct selection of handpicked CSOs in the process, participated CSOs were abstainers during consultation stage, instant provision of CSAR during meeting time, short time to reflect on voluminous CSAR, and many CSOs were under shock because of the introduction of new proclamation on civil society at the time APRM implementation.
Some interviewees from civil society added that Government defended the findings of CSAR—particularly during the final discussions of CSAR, state officials were outnumbering civil society and private sector. There were also complaints that the documentation to be discussed (the CSAR and NPoA) were not made available beforehand. On the other hand, the government regards civil society—particularly third party serving—as being too dependent on foreign funds and working on a foreign agenda. This situation would lead to zero-sum game where no one can be benefited from such mistrust between the government and civil society.

Many respondents and interviewed persons forwarded a number of recommendations in reaction to above mentioned challenges and problems encountered during the first cycle Ethiopia’ APRM process. These include:

- Government should have made the entire process of APRM open and transparent;
- The government should have been committed to involve at least majority of CSOs;
- Government should have worked on capacity building program of civil society and should have promoted the independence of CSOs;
- Government should have changed its negative attitudes towards NGOs particularly advocacy groups— the need to shift treating NGOs as the opposition allies to development partners;
- Government should have created adequate space for CSOs participation in APRM process;
- CSOs should have been strong enough to coordinate themselves in concerted way instead of acting in fragmented approach;
- The continental APRM eminent persons should have monitored the implementation of APRM process to ensure its right track

These recommendations are very important for betterment of civic engagement in APRM process as well as other initiatives at continental, regional and national levels. However, the extent of effectiveness in achieving the recommended points depends on the responsible stakeholders’ commitment to discharge their mandated responsibilities in the APRM
process. This would particularly necessitate government to create conducive environment for civic engagement (that includes diversified ranges of CSOs) at all stages of APRM process.

4.7. Prospects of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s African Peer Review Mechanism

This section examines the prospects of civic engagement in the upcoming APRM process in Ethiopia. In the works of Herbert & Gruzd (2007:2) and UN-ECA (2008:11), meaningful civil society engagement in APRM would have a number of prospects which include identifying deficiencies in government performance, fostering improving relationship between CSOs and government and, creating policy and political space for CSOs. With this regard, almost all interviewees agreed on these outstanding prospects of APRM given that the process is transparent, genuine, and participatory.

However, active and substantial participation of civil society in APRM is obviously affected by the existence of independent and vibrant CSOs both in number and quality. UN-ECA (2005:4) underlines that the success of APRM prospects depends on engendering a vibrant civil society organizations. In this regard, Doh (1998:159) argues that government should create conducive political arena by removing all legal and bureaucratic constraints from civil society institutions.

Since the upcoming—the second cycle—APRM in Ethiopia will be undertaken under the auspices of new proclamation No. 621/200811, the prospects of civic engagement in APRM is analyzed on the basis of this new legal framework. In this regard, many respondents felt ambivalent views about the extent to which the new proclamation gives space for civic engagement and some respondents were reserved on this question. However, these respondents and interviewed individuals did not disguise their confusion and anxiety with the new proclamation. The basic reason for such kind of confusion and

11 Unless it is changed or modified, this new proclamation determines the level and effectiveness of civic engagement
hesitation to the current proclamation is that it determines what CSOs in Ethiopia will be able to do on the basis of the extent to which they rely on external sources of funding. The proclamation gives space only for those Ethiopian societies and charities that can secure more than 90 percent of their funds from local sources to engage in policy, political and governance issues (FDRE, 2008: Article 14/5). This violates the premise of the country’s constitution that states ‘every person has the right to freedom of association for any cause or purpose’ (FDRE, 1995: Article 31).

Here it is worth noting to supplement the above inconclusive finding by the help of secondary data obtained from data base of FDRE Charities and Societies Agency (CSA). With this respect, only few civil society organizations are eligible to take part in APRM process and even the number of CSOs is getting diminished. In the work of Dessalegn (2008:100), the number of CSOs in Ethiopia (excluding trade unions and cooperatives) exceeded 4000 in 2007. Similarly, the document of CSA reveals that there were nearly about 3822 CSOs prior to proclamation No. 621/2008. However, these figures have declined in re-registration of CSOs according to the new proclamation. Table 4.7 shows that a total of 1590 charities and societies were re-registered until 13 February 2010-the due date to re-register.

Table 4.7: Re-registered CSOs by their major categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Major categories of CSOs</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foreign Charities</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ethiopian Residents’ Charities</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethiopian Charities</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ethiopian Residents’ Societies</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ethiopian Societies</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data base of FDRE Charities and Societies Agency, March 2010)

As noted in table 4.7, the number of CSOs has been decreased by more than 58 percent even by taking the previous small figure given by the CSA prior to the effective date of the new proclamation. Even though identifying the reasons for such sharp decline of CSOs requires further investigation, one can say that there is a downward trend in number and typologies of CSOs and this situation is not encouraging. Particularly, the
above figures show that the number of CSOs engaged in governance issues are very few because the new proclamation legitimize only for Ethiopian Charities and Ethiopian Societies- which are less than 300. This would by default prohibit the engagement of many CSOs from APRM since its focus area is good governance. This would definitely deter the involvement and engagement of majority civil society organizations in APRM and then the prospects of civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM would be frightening. If this confrontational relationship between government and civil society remains unchanged, the independent and vibrant civil society would be tricky.

The research finding of Tsehai (2008:160) confirms that conducive legal framework is a must for civic engagement as it determines the formation and operation of CSOs. Thus one possibility to harvest the potential prospects of civic engagement in APRM would be through open legal space for CSOs. Otherwise, the role and engagement of the third sector in APRM is questionable which would in turn degrade the success and credibility of the whole APRM process.

The next chapter summarizes the main findings, draws the conclusions of this study, and presents the recommendations to enhance the effective participation and contribution of civil society to the upcoming APRM process in Ethiopia.
Chapter Five: Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations one after the other. The conclusions and recommendations are based on the results obtained and discussions made under chapter four.

5.1. Summary of Findings

To begin with the prerequisites for civic engagement, freedom of associations, conducive legal space, the independence of civil society representatives in NGC, full disclosure of information about the CSOs roles in APRM process were considered. With regard to the extent to which there is a conducive political space for civil society engagement, Ethiopia has been ranked as partially free by Freedom of House.

More specifically the prerequisites for civic engagement in APRM were explained by independence of CSOs in NGC and the extent of information disclosure for CSOs. On the basis of this, a small majority (37.96%) of the respondents felt that they strongly disagreed or disagreed on the independence of representatives of CSOs in NGC and 34.5 percent of the respondents held neutral position. The remaining 27.6 percent of the respondents argued for independence of the civil society representatives. More importantly, inclusion of CSOs representatives in NGC was only done by exclusive decision of government or by anonymous body which was confirmed by nearly all respondents (96.5%). Meanwhile fairly large percentage (62.1%) of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that there was full information disclosure about CSOs roles in APRM process.

Contrary to the above bad news, the extent of legal environment space for CSOs formation and operations prior to the new proclamation No. 621/2008 was rated as high or very high by majority (62.8%) of the respondents.

Concerning composition of APRM NGC, a small majority (39.13%) of the NGC seats was filled by civil society representatives but only mass-based organizations and
professional association were deliberately selected in NGC. In relation to Performance of APRM NGC in creating conducive environment for civic engagement, majority of the respondents and interviewees replied that NGC did not discharge its responsibilities in enhancing civic engagement in APRM process though the civil society representatives in NGC argued that they did so. Similarly, majority (55.1%) and 27.6 percent of the respondents disagreed and felt neutral respectively for the inclusion of diversified civil society in APRM process. The other surprising issue was representatives from civil society in NGC did not stand as one body rather they thought as representatives of their respective organizations only let alone creating conducive environment for civic engagement in APRM process.

Concerning the extent to which the government employed different forms of strategies to ensure active engagement of CSOs in APRM, majority of the respondents ranging from 55 percent to 68.9 percent rated the extent of employing various strategies as very low or low. These forms of strategies were inclusion of CSOs in NGC, political commitment to engage in CSOs at all stages of APRM process, education and sensitization, creating frank and open dialogue environment, and independent management and leadership structures.

With respect to the extent to which CSOs have been engaged in the major activities of APRM process: formation and composition of APRM NGC, designing the approaches of APRM implementation, during focus group discussions, filling in the questionnaire for CSAR, designing NPoA, and consultation with country mission team, the overall level of engagement was low. This was confirmed by majority of the respondents ranging from 48.2 percent to 72.4 percent for various major activities of APRM. In connection with the extent of civic engagement in APRM, the extent of CSOs suggestions have been incorporated in CSAR was rated as low or very low by majority (53.9%) of the respondents. From the perspective of APRM’s four thematic areas: political and democratic governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development, majority of the respondents rated the extent of CSOs contributions as very low or low or moderate.
Concerning roles played by CSOs in the areas of raising the awareness of citizens, research and sensitization of APRM, advocacy and lobbying, undertaking shadow review, and ensuring the standards of APRM in the process, majority of the respondents (on average 76.6%) rated the extent to which CSOs have played these roles as low or very low.

The overall participation of civil society in APRM major activities was rated as low or very low by nearly 59 percent of the respondents, as moderate by 27.6 percent of the respondents, and as high or very low by a few respondents (13.8%). Similarly, the extent of CSOs has been part of Ethiopia’s APRM process was rated as low or very low by fairly large (58.6%) of the respondents.

The other issue of this study was related to challenges to civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process. Accordingly, the extent to which restricted political space for CSOs engagement, fear of government, obstacles related to complexity and technical nature of APRM, CSOs institutional constraints, and disorganization of CSOs as determinants for civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM were rated as high or very high by 55.1 percent, 41 percent, 41 percent, 37.9 percent, and 34.4 percent of the respondents respectively. In addition, narrow definition and scope of civil society was considered in the first cycle of Ethiopia’s APRM.

The last but not least concern of this study was related to prospects to civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process. Nearly all interviewees thought that APRM would have a number of prospects so long as it is undertaken in transparent and participatory approach. However, the current number of CSOs has been decreased by more than 58 percent from the number of CSOs existed prior to the proclamation No. 621/2008. In addition, the type and number of CSOs participating in political and governance related initiatives like APRM is getting declined.
5.2. Conclusions

In theory, the APRM represents a valuable opportunity for civil society to get critical issues on to the national agenda. In practice, however, as illustrated in the above-mentioned major findings, the level and extent of participation greatly restricted to certain category of civil society particularly to mass-based organization and to certain activities in the review process.

In Ethiopia’s APRM process, it can be said that civil society engagement very much depends on how the government interprets the concept of civil society. As can be observed from the finding of this study, the concept of civil society was narrowed to mass based organizations, trade union, and few professional organizations. It is pretty straightforward to conclude that the definition of civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM was skewed from the literature, the AU’s standards and experiences of APRM pioneers. This can show that the definition and scope of civil society in Ethiopia’s APRM was determined by the thought and assumptions of the new proclamation which gives space for CSOs engagement in governance issues only for a few Ethiopian societies and charities which can cover more than 90 percent of their expenditures from local sources. Ironically, third-party serving civil society has been playing cardinal role in PASDEP and MDGs initiatives.

Civil society also expressed strong concern that government filled the national governing council with civil society representatives to be government friendly or the government unilaterally named civil society without the consensus of civil society. Similarly, the decreasing trend of CSOs in quality and quantity would affect the credibility and validity of the process which requires vigorous and vibrant civil society.

As indicated in the summary of finding part, since the status of Ethiopia’s civil liberties right is partly free, and the independence of civil society representatives in NGC was questionable, it is difficult to say that there were necessary prerequisites for civic engagement in APRM process. That is why the overall participation and involvement of civil society in APRM was not satisfactory; it can be said minimal level in fragmented
approach. Particularly, third-party serving civil society which includes NGOs working on development and advocacy, and civil society networks was passive in Ethiopia’s APRM.

Since broad civil society consultation is considered as a requirement in the process, it cannot be rushed without undermining efforts to build trust and consensus around the process. For instance, the Kenya case—one of the APRM early models—it took eight months just to reach agreement with civil society over who should sit on the governing council body. The Ethiopia case, however, did not consider the experiences of APRM pioneering countries and APRM base document in that the representation of CSOs in NGC was handpicked by government. This approach would create hesitation that the process was under the control of government. On the other hand, the government dominance over civil society in APRM process would cripple the independence and vibrant third sector-civil society in the country.

Ideally, APRM would have a number of benefits such as identifying deficiencies in government performance, fostering dialogue between the government and CSOs, improving relationship between CSOs and government. However, the insignificant involvement and participation of civil society in APRM process would polarize the relationship between the government and civil society rather than creating rapport relationship between them. Such mistrust between the major stakeholders of the process could have negative impacts on the success and effective implementation of national programs of action—where civil society is expected to play a major role.

The role of civil society in the peer review exercise is crucial. Without civil society, APRM is an exercise in government reviewing itself. If the peer review exercise is to be credible and transparent, civil society must engage in all stages and activities of APRM. This would again necessitate civil society to work in collaboration with government for constructive purposes by addressing its internal challenges related with weak institutional capacity and disorganization/dispersion. More importantly, government needs to make adequate open space for diversified civil society engagement in APRM and other initiatives.
5.3. Recommendations

Although civic engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process faces many institutional and implementation hurdles, these can be overcome through political commitment to engage in wide range categories of civil society at least through networks. Below are some recommendations, which outline what should be done by different stakeholders to make the instrument of African Peer Review successful and effective in achieving its intended objectives:

**APRM Continental Secretariat:**
- Should design clear direction about critical issues that include the composition of CSOs, how and by whom the representatives are chosen in NGC, the roles of civil society in the review process, how technical research institutions are selected and other related issues.

**Government of Ethiopia:**
- It would be important if the APRM NGC has been established by act of parliament with its own independent secretariat instead confined to executive organ of government. Thus the government should establish the national governing council through transparent and democratic procedures by act of House of Peoples Representatives for the coming APRM process in Ethiopia so that this would ensure to make it an inclusive national effort.
- Should let civil society to select its representatives in NGC instead of nominating CSOs participating in the process through handpicked approach so long as the involvement of independent civil society is a requirement in APRM.
- Government should accommodate the conditions for the existence of a vibrant and independent civil society. This particularly begins from the conceptualization of civil society needs to be shifted from narrow sense (which includes only mass-based associations and professional associations) to wider sense (which includes NGOs, advocacy groups and networks in addition to the previously mentioned ones). With this regard, it would be important if government follows the
provisions indicated in the document of ‘Civil Society Capacity Building Strategy’ prepared by FDRE Ministry of Capacity Building or at least not contradict with ECOSOCC principles about African civil society. More importantly, government should allow for any segments of society to form associations, unions and networks for any reason as stated in the constitution rather than determining areas of civil society involvement by the extent of sources of funding.

• Should create conducive environment for CSOs functions and engagement: since the new proclamation on charities and societies allows only Ethiopian charities and societies to participate in issues related to governance like APRM, government should relieve areas of involvement restrictions on Ethiopian residents charities and societies so that the quality and quantity of civil society will be improved. They are powerful instruments to make the process more credible, transparent, accountable and effective.

• Government should design a strategy for information dissemination and public education about NEPAD and the APRM.

• Should take the leading role to build mutual confidence and trust with civil society which would be the basic foundation for constructive and substantial engagement of the third sector in all aspects of APRM and other programs.

• In collaboration with civil society, should build and strengthen the institutional, human and financial capacity of civil society in the four dimensions of APRM.

**APRM NGC:**

• The council should employ participatory approach to make any decision related to APRM process that includes designing the approaches of APRM implementation, awarding the technical research institute(s), and designing NPoA.

• It should allocate enough time to each stages of APRM: Planning, sensitization, self-assessment, design of NPoA.

• Since one of the principles of APRM is ensuring popular participation in APRM, the work of sensitization in raising the awareness of citizens and civil society
should not be compromised. The NGC should appropriately discharge its responsibilities in this regard.

Civil society:

- Civil society as a group should be represented in NGC and the representation should be done according to its own democratic procedures without government interference.
- Needs to establish one strong coordinating unit representing the civil society sector at least at national level to realize exerted effort and play momentous role at continental and national level initiative like APRM.
- Civil society should establish its own APRM monitoring and tracking mechanism so that its engagement will be enhanced.
- It should strengthen its intra-sectoral relationships through strong and active partnership and networking.
- CSOs should act collectively as one body in APRM instead of fragmented approach- on individual organizations basis.
- It should influence the APRM process through continental institutions like APRM Secretariat, and ECOSOCC and through international organization like UN-ECA,
- In collaboration with responsible bodies, civil society should capacitate itself on the dimensions of APRM process so as to fully and substantially engage in the process.
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Annexes
Annex I: Questionnaire

Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics
Post-graduate program for Public Administration (MPA)

Questionnaire for:

- CSOs/NGOs Networks
- Members of APRM National Governing Council
- Other CSOs participated in Ethiopia’s APRM

Dear Respondent:
The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather relevant information in order to assess “The Role and Involvement of Civil Society in Ethiopia’s first cycle African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Process” in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MPA.

Therefore, student the researcher kindly requests you to provide genuine information. Be sure that all the information provided by you shall be treated with at most confidentiality and used only for Academic Purpose.

General instructions:
1. You are not required to write your name
2. Depending on the nature of the question:
   - Fill appropriate figures, or
   - Make “√” mark in appropriate box, and/or
   - Write on the space provided.

Thanks in advance

➢ NOTE: For purpose of this study, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are only to mean formally registered CSOs which do not include the traditional CSOs such as Idir, Iqub, etc

Part I. General Questions (Only for CSOs/NGOs Networks)
1. How many Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) do exist under your umbrella organization/Network? (By category)

   International NGOs   Local NGOs
   Advocacy groups     Professional Associations
   Community based organizations

Others (please state them and show their numbers):
2. How many of these organizations have been participated in Ethiopia’s APRM-Country Self Assessment Report?

International NGOs  
Local NGOs  
Advocacy groups  
Professional Associations  
Community based organizations  

Others (please state them and show their numbers):

(Would you please attach the names (by their categories) and addresses of those which were participants in APRM-country self assessment Report)

**Part two: Structure, Performance of APRM National Governing Council (NGC), and Strategies followed by government**

3. Who has chosen CSOs representatives in NGC

CSOs/NGOs Council  
Government itself  
Both CSOs and Government  
Not Known  

Other (please state): ______________
4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by putting a \( (√) \) in appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question Item</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>No matter how CSOs were selected in NGC, your organization/Network has agreed on their representatives of CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NGC/Government has created a conducive environment for active participation and engagement of CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NGC/Government has invited majority of CSOs to participate in Ethiopia’s APRM process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The independence of CSOs representatives in NGC has been undoubted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>There has been full disclosure of information regarding CSOs roles in APRM process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you feel that NGC/ Government did not play its role and responsibilities in enhancing civil society engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM, what were the reasons? (Put in the rank of order)

A. __________________________________________________________
B. __________________________________________________________
C. __________________________________________________________
D. __________________________________________________________
E. __________________________________________________________
6. Please indicate the extent to which there is a conducive political space/environment for CSOs engagement in APRM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question Item</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>To what extent do citizens enjoy the freedom of associations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>To what extent FDRE charities and societies proclamation No 621/2008 gives space for any member of civil society to form union, and association to better realize their community shared goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>To what extent legal environment prior to the new proclamation No 621/2008) gives space for any member of civil society to form union, and association to better realize their community shared goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The extent to which government has employed the following forms of strategies to enhance CSOs’ participation in the African Peer review mechanism (APRM):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Forms of strategies</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Inclusion of CSOs in APRM National Governing Council (in terms of quantity as well as quality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Political Commitment to engage in CSOs at all stages of APRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Education and Sensitization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Strategic sequencing: creating an environment for frank and open dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Management and Leadership structures: the existence of independent national structures and mechanisms for APRM process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Part Three: Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) participation and engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM process**

**Direction:** For those CSOs which participated in Ethiopia’s APRM process by representing your specific organization, this part should be answered from your own organization perspective only. However, CSOs/NGOs Networks and CSOs representatives in NGC should answer from overall Civil society perspective.

8. The extent to which CSOs were the part of Ethiopia’s APRM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The level of CSOs’ participation in APRM process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The Extent to which CSOs have been engaged in the following major activities of APRM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities of APRM</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Designing the approaches of implementing APRM in Ethiopia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Participating during focus group discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Filling in the questionnaire for CSAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Commenting on CSAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Participating during the design of monitoring and evaluation system of Program of Action implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others: (please state them)

Comments:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________
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11. The Extent to CSOs have been engaged in the following basic stages of APRM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Stages of APRM</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Formation and composition of APRM National Governing Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Sensitization of APRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Consultation stage of APRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Country Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>National program of Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Consultation with Country Mission Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others (Please State them):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The extent to which your suggestions have been incorporated in Country Self Assessment Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The extent of your participation and engagement in evaluating the performance of government in terms of APRM’s four dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>APRM Dimensions</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Political and Democratic governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Economic Governance and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Corporate governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Socio-economic development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Part Four. Roles played by CSOs in Ethiopia’s APRM/ Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR)

**Direction:** For those CSOs which participated in Ethiopia’s APRM process by representing your specific organization, this part should be answered from your own organization perspective only. However, CSOs/NGOs Networks and CSOs representatives in NGC should answer from overall Civil society perspective.

14. The extent to which CSOs have played the following roles in APRM process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Roles played by CSOs</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Raising the awareness of citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Research and Sensitization of APRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Playing an active role in the consultations and reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Advocacy and lobbying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Playing an active role in the country’s self-assessment report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Participating in the development of National program of Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>Playing an active role during consultation with Country Mission Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Undertaking shadow peer review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Your contributions/roles to ensure the CSAR complied with the rules and standards of APRM base document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others (please state them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If you think that the overall roles played by CSOs were insignificant and not substantial, what were the reasons? (put in the rank of order)

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Part Five: Challenges and problems encountered with regard to CSOs engagement in APRM/CSAR

16. The extent to which the following challenges and problems were the determinants of CSOs participation and engagement in Ethiopia’s APRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Challenges and Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Fear of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Restricted legal environment and limited political space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>CSOs Institutional capacity constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Dispersion/disorganization of CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Limited resources and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Obstacles related to complexity and the technical nature of APRM process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (Please state them):

Comments:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Part Six: Recommendations to enhance the engagement of CSOs in APRM

17. What do you recommend to address the challenges and problems encountered during the APRM process in Ethiopia?

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________
6. ____________________________________________

18. Any other suggestions on CSOs engagement in APRM?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Part Seven: Respondent’s personal information

1. Sex: Male □ Female □

2. Age (in years): Below 30 □ 30-40 □ Above 40 □

3. Level of education: Below Diploma □ Diploma □ First Degree □ 2nd degree and above □

4. Name of your organization
   ____________________________________________________

5. Your experience in CSOs: Below 5 years □ 5-10 years □ More than 10 years □

Once again, thank you for your cooperation
Annex II: Interview Checklist

Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics

Post graduate program for Public Administration (MPA): Interview checklist for

- AIM-DG
- NGC GOV Representatives and Secretariat Officer
- NGC Opposition parties Representative and others

The purpose of this interview is to gather relevant information in order to assess “The Role and Involvement of Civil Society in Ethiopia’s first cycle African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Process” in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MPA.

Therefore, the student researcher kindly requests you to provide genuine information. Be sure that all the information provided by you shall be treated with at most confidentiality and used only for Academic Purpose.

Thanks in advance

Name of Interviewee: ___________________________
Name of organization that interviewee represents: ___________________________

1. Definition, compositions and scope of civil society from Ethiopia’s APRM perspective.
2. How and by whom representatives of CSOs in NGC were selected?
3. What strategies have been followed by government to enhance the engagement of CSOs in APRM process?
4. Did the NGC clearly specify the roles to be played by CSOs?
5. Do you believe that CSOs have been adequately represented and participated in APRM process?
6. How do you explain their level of engagement?
7. What were their roles and contributions from four APRM dimensions?
8. What are the prospects for the civic engagement APRM?
9. What should be improved from both government and civil society as APRM partners?
10. What were challenges and major problems you encountered in CSAR with reference to CSOs engagement?
11. What do you recommend to address the challenges and problems raised in Q No. 10?
Annex III: Respondents’ categories and Interviewed individuals

Respondents’ categories:
There were four major categories of organizations from which the data were gathered to undertake this study:

a. Representatives of CSOs in NGC: There lists are indicated under Annex IV

b. CSOs/NGOs Networks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Civil society Networks</th>
<th>Number of member-organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Network of Networks of HIV positives in Ethiopia</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Association of Ethiopian Microfinance Institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basic Education Association in Ethiopia</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Consortium of Reproductive Health Association</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Christian Relief and Development Association(CRDA)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ethiopian Interfaith Forum for Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Network of Ethiopian Women Association</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Orphan and Vulnerable Children Network- Ethiopia</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Poverty Action Network of Civil Society organizations in Ethiopia(PANE)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Union of Ethiopian Civil Society Associations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Federation of Ethiopian Associations of Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. CSOs that participated in the consultation of CSAR:

The APRM NGC has filed a list of the following organizations those participated during a five round consultations of CSAR. This list does not include the CSOs representatives in NGC though they also participated in the consultation stage:

1. Addis Ababa Youth Association
2. Addis Ababa Youth Federation
3. Adult and Non-Formal Education Association in Ethiopia
4. Ethiopian Bar Association
5. Ethiopian Pharmacy Association
6. Ethiopian Women Lawyer’s Association
7. Ethiopian Writers Association
8. Addis Ababa Physically Handicapped Association
9. Addis Ababa Women Association
10. Initiative Africa
11. Ethiopian National Association of Physically Handicapped

d. Interviewed individuals: Representatives of opposition parties in NGC, Representatives of government in NGC, focal person from Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce & Sectoral Associations, focal persons in AIMDG, and Ethiopian Charities and Societies Agency

Here is a list of interviewed persons in each organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Organizations</th>
<th>Focal Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>UEDP-Medhin</td>
<td>Ato Lidetu Ayalew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Coalitions for Unity and Democratic Party</td>
<td>Ato Ayele Chamisso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Oromo Federalist Democratic Movement</td>
<td>Ato Bulcha Demeksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>United Ethiopian Democratic Forces</td>
<td>Ato Alemu Gebebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>APRM NGC secretariat</td>
<td>Dr. Liku Dametew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce and Sectoral Associations</td>
<td>Ato Fekadu and Ato Yohannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Six CSOs that represented in NGC</td>
<td>Executive Directors of each CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Civil Societies Task Force Chairperson</td>
<td>Ato Eshetu Ahera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Partnership Africa Canada in Ethiopia</td>
<td>W/ro Engudai Bekele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>AIMDG</td>
<td>Dr. Tegegne Teka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex IV: Composition of Ethiopia’s APRM NGC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Categories</th>
<th>Number of seats in NGC</th>
<th>% of seats</th>
<th>Name of Represented organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Government               | 4                      | 17.39      | 1. Ministry of Capacity Building—the leading organization of the council  
                                 |                          |            | 2. Ministry of Youth and Sport  
                                 |                          |            | 3. NEPAD Focal person who is an economic advisor of the Prime Minister  
                                 |                          |            | 4. Ruling Parties of emerging Regions |
| 2.  | Opposition parties      | 4                      | 17.39      | 1. United Ethiopian Democratic Forces,  
                                 |                          |            | 2. Coalitions for Unity and Democratic Party,  
                                 |                          |            | 3. UEDP- Medhin  
                                 |                          |            | 4. The Oromo Federalist Democratic Movement |
| 3.  | Private sector          | 4                      | 17.39      | Chamber of Commerce and Sectoral Associations |
| 4.  | Disabled group          | 1                      | 4.35       | One person from parliament |
| 5.  | Academia                | 1                      | 4.35       | Addis Ababa university |
| 6.  | Civil society           | 9                      | 39.13      | 1. Confederation of Ethiopian Trade Unions,  
                                 |                          |            | 2. Ethiopian Teachers’ Association,  
                                 |                          |            | 3. University Students’ Council,  
                                 |                          |            | 4. Union of Bar Association,  
                                 |                          |            | 5. Ethiopian Public Health Association,  
                                 |                          |            | 6. Ethiopian Economics Association,  
                                 |                          |            | 7. Addis Ababa Women Federation,  
                                 |                          |            | 8. Amhara Women Association and  
                                 |                          |            | 9. Benshangul-Gumz Women Association |
|     | Total                    | 23                     | 100        |                                   |
Annex V: Ethiopia’s APRM major events chronologically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>09 March 2003</td>
<td>Ethiopia has been acceded to APRM initiative of NEPAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>02 January 2008</td>
<td>Regulation No. 142/2008 was issued by Council of Ministers to provide for the implementation of African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) in Ethiopia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• APRM National Governing Council consisting of 23 members was established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10 to 14 June 2008</td>
<td>A support mission was fielded to Ethiopia(to kick-start and officially launch the Ethiopian APRM process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>01 September 2009</td>
<td>Ethiopia Submitted its CSAR to African Panel Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>04 to 12 September 2009</td>
<td>APRM Country Review Mission led by Professor Adebayo visited Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: APRM NGC Secretariat office, March 2010)