2015

Book Project: Smart Implementation in Governance

Guidelines for writing a case study on implementation

Internal Document only. Not for circulation or citation.

Table of Contents:

1. Why a book on implementation?	Page 1
2. What is specific about a case study and why has this format been chosen for presenting implementation experiences?	Page 1
3. Preparatory steps: Framing the case study	Page 2
4. Standardized structure of the case studies	Page 4
5. Principles that guide implementation	Page 7
ANNEX 1: Concept Note on the Publication (version June 7th 2015)	Page 9
ANNEX 2: Sample Time Line of a Project with reference to pain and inflection points, critical junctures, opportunities and course correction.	Page 14

Renate Kirsch
Divsion Good Governance and Human Rights, GIZ GmbH

17.08.2015

Guidelines for writing a case study on smart implementation

1. Why a book on implementation?[1]

GIZ's Good Governance and Human Rights Division is preparing a publication with the working title "Smart Implementation in Governance". It focusses on ***how*** GIZ is implementing projects and programs commissioned by the BMZ that support change and transformation processes in partner countries. We consider implementation a very challenging but also rewarding activity that has not been analysed in depth. So far the focus of analysis in the development debate has been on presenting what projects do, highlighting results and achievements. This publication does not focus on what we do, what the impacts are, what the cost-benefit ratio of investment to results is. It will neither deal with the DAC evaluation criteria in detail, simply because they are only marginally addressing implementation.

This publication will concentrate on describing the process between a plan, a design and the results. It will focus on the way – the messy middle part – of getting from an idea to a result. It will do this by retracing the nonlinear process of implementation. Attention is given to contradictions, setbacks, mishap, power struggles as much as to the opportunities, luck, encounters and coincidences that occur when translating a project design into reality. The story told in a case study will disclose how alliances are forged, manipulation happens, informal arrangements are formed and negotiated to become formal and what it takes to convince stakeholders of an idea or approach that was not a priority to them at the outset. Critical junctures as well as course corrections are normal in a complex change process and will be alluded to. A *capacity works* outline assists in explaining the process how a project moved along and why and will be referred to.

Implementation is not a linear process, but one that has a direction but incorporates loops, ruptures, side paths and back and forth movements. Events might occur simultaneously and/or suddenly with or without tremendous delays. The change process is often so complex that its outcome cannot be foreseen in all aspects. Yet, decision makers and project managers have to move forward in an environment where they have insufficient information and constantly changing parameters. The case studies shall carve out the principles of their management, decision making and steering.

Our starting point for framing a case study is by identifying the challenge our partner is trying to tackle (e.g. formulating and implementing a new reform, setting up a new institution) and the specific implementation challenges of this case.

The case studies will have to adopt two perspectives: the perspective of the change process in the partner country and the perspective of the giz project, whose function it is to accompany and advise the partner on implementing the envisioned changes. These perspectives might overlap to a high degree, as the giz project aims at supporting the partner's change process but they might also differ; for example when the partner is not interested in adopting a gender sensitive perspective or prefers adopting an approach the giz personnel finds problematic. What happens than, who pulls which strings, provides which new information, inserts which kind of influence – and how does all this influence the direction of the change process, as much as the GIZ project?

[1] These guidelines have solely been written as an aid for case study writers of the forthcoming GIZ publication "Smart Implementation in Governance". They are for internal use only. They draw heavily on other guidelines and internal documents of GIZ's Good Governance division, which are listed as references in the text. However, quotation does not abide to regular standards. Hence, this document cannot be quoted or circulated.

Guidelines for writing a case study on smart implementation

Implementation of any change process is by necessity a series of (semi-)autonomous decisions reacting to local developments, mostly with rather deficient information, with unclear ideas of what the main change agents want, with frequent changes of conditions (e.g. policies, interests), lack of capacities and resources, and with many people involved. Moreover, the specific change process at hand it not the only moving part. Most likely it is part of a larger transformation process that will influence the reform or change process itself. The case studies intend to reveal such interdependence and help the reader to get at least a glimpse of how partners (and in a supporting function, staff of an advisory project) manage these processes. For them we need to demonstrate how changes happened how the programs reacted and how it moved on.

These guidelines have been prepared to provide sufficient background, structure and guidance to case study writers to grasp the intention of the book, so that they can present the cases in the intended manner. The document will explain why case studies have been chosen as a format to discuss implementation. It will suggest a few steps in framing the case before outlining a standardized structure for the case study and will finally outline in more detail how findings can be presented in the article. These guidelines have been written with the intention to support case study writers. There is no obligation to follow the proposed path.

German reading case writers are referred to the Concept Note of the publication for more background information, which can be found in Annex 1.

2. What is specific about a case study and why has this format been chosen for presenting implementation experiences?

A case study is a well-established method of applied and empirical research. Case studies can provide a clearer understanding of a sequence of events and balance the perspectives of key and other actors. More specifically, a case study seeks to outline *how* interventions were implemented. (Global Delivery Initiative 2014:3). So far this is an evaluator's perspective. In addition the case study incorporates the contributions of local actors and institutions. The case study reveals not only how the reform went along but shows how the implementation process was handled by project staff advising the reform managers.

The method case study has several characteristics that support what we try to bring out:

- They are used in qualitative empirical research when the research focuses on questions of how and why and less on the question of what or how much.
- Case studies allow describing and analyzing complex situations particularly when quantitative data is scarce.
- They explicitly include the context in which the case takes place and refer to it in the analysis.
- Case studies can incorporate different strands of interventions and integrate them in the analysis. Changes in objectives, breaking or inflection points in the process, use of opportunities, and circumvention of constraints become presentable and explainable.
- It is a method that can describe the effectiveness of operations by tracing and mapping the implementation process. Through this process the delineation of influencing factors to a result can be carved out. (Fischl, Kaufmann 2014:41).
- The literature differentiates between three types of case studies: descriptive-illustrative, explanatory or cumulative. GIZ project presentations are often written as descriptive case studies to illustrate results and achievements. In this case an explanatory focus is used: The case study's function is it to explain how and why a

process developed as it did. Achieving a specific results will be mentioned in the end but is not the focus of attention.

Here are a few points of what an explanatory case Study is **NOT**:

- It is **not an evaluation** of individual projects and programs; rather it explains variation in outcomes (i.e., the key factors underlying success and/or failure) by highlighting where, how, why and by whom course corrections were made and drawing out critical junctures in the implementation process. The case study provides insights into what it takes to manage a program under conditions of uncertainty and complexity.
- It should **avoid mundane implementation principles** void of context, such as for example "the importance of strong leadership"; rather, it should explain *how* strong leadership played out.
- It is **not a showcase** of a project's successes; rather the case provides insight into the processes and decisions that led to particular outcomes (successful or otherwise)((Global Delivery Initiative 2014:9,10).

Case Studies written for the publication "Smart Implementation in Governance" can be between 15-20 pages long.

3. Preparatory Steps: Framing the case study

In order to obtain a common understanding among involved persons what story the case study shall tell, a few preparatory steps are advisable. They will be of particular importance when the case study writer has not accompanied the entire implementation phase that will be described and is not the project leader that has to sign responsible for the information released.

1. *Define the scope of the case by outlining it on 2-3 pages.*
   As any good article, a case study tells a story. What is the story that shall be told and shared in this case? Write down the rough idea on a 1-2 pages.

   State the development challenge the partner is faced with. Explain how the giz project intends supporting the partner in addressing the challenge. Explain how the project started, which interventions were implemented first and how the implementation process proceeded. Which implementation problem occurred, when and why? How did the project or partner react to the changes/interruption? How did the project proceed afterwards? Which result could be achieved in the end (if any)

   This exercise serves three purposed:
   a) The outline helps to create a common understanding among all stakeholders (AV, case study writer, Fachplaner, partner, etc.) about the narrative or story line that shall be told in this case. It is very important that a general agreement among stakeholder exists of what shall and can be presented before proceeding, as this is written for an international audience.
   b) It assists in identifying the red thread of the story that will need to show throughout the entire article. Developing the narrative or story line in this manner provides the case study writer with a reference point against which details can be mapped and structured.
   c) The outline will set the borders of the case. This is important as it gives guidance what is still part of the story, what is too much to cover.

2. *Retrace key intervention points of the process in a time line*
   The case study focuses on systematically and meticulously tracing the process of implementation, identifying the root causes that underlie the implementation challenge, and illustrating the critical moments, shocks, revelations, and actions which affected there trajectory of the interventions – both those under control of giz personnel and those beyond control (Global Delivery Initiative 2014:5). To recall these inflection points in the sequence of the implementation process it is recommended to draw up a table.

   The intention of this exercise is to
   a) get the time line right and referable
   b) obtain a common agreement among stakeholders what the critical inflection points were that influenced the implementation process
   c) have a reference of the main project highlights when writing the case study

   Annex 2 presents an example of a project timeline from a World Bank project as a reference.

3. *Collect evidence to underpin your argument, assessment or result.*
   The case study must have sufficient evidence to make a statement about outcomes of the implementation process or results. This evidence will most likely come from project documentation, project publication or evaluation reports. At times they might also come from the media or reports. Review the available evidence before starting to write the case to be sure that a statement can be evidenced.

   The intention of this step is
   a) Obtain an overview of available and unavailable project documentation to prove or underpin key statements
   b) Identify further sources that help you *underpin your argument, assessment or result*

4. Standardized Structure of the case studies

Several case studies will be written for the forthcoming publication. A standardized structure has been developed as orientation to provide consistency across cases and to facilitate comparability across cases. Next to outlining core elements of the content that should be covered in each chapter, this section also tries to give guidance on writing and presenting findings. The language used and writing style should be jargon-free and accessible to non-sector specialists.

Executive summary (<2 pages)

Every case study must present an executive summary! **–**
The executive summary, unfortunate as this may be, is in many cases the only part of a case study that busy practitioners will ever read. Therefore, it must function as a standalone document that contains all the main points. However, it also serves as an appetizer to find out if this case is relevant to the reader. Hence, investing in writing a good executive summary is worthwhile.

It clearly states the development challenge and the implementation challenges the case discusses (see below for explanations). It then repeats the structure of the main text in an abbreviated version summarizing the narrative, focusing on major obstacles, actions taken to address them, and inflection points in the implementation narrative. It concludes with summarizing the major lessons of the case.

4.1. Introduction to the case study (<3 pages)

a. Introduce the reader to the case by setting the scene (e.g. via a quote, a scene, an incident, a short story). "The initial introduction should explain to the reader why this case is interesting (what lessons it holds, what may have been unusual about the case) … . A good place to start is with an engaging "hook"– the aim here is to draw readers in, presenting them with reasons to care about the case, and to want to read the study. The hook may focus on a compelling example of problems affecting end users, or it may focus directly on the dilemma facing implementers, or it may quickly point out both.
A hook can also be an unforeseen change to the original objective or partner constellation of the project or new political twists that force program managers to change their course, to abandon work streams, to realign their partners.
b. State the main message of the contribution and how this message is thought to add to the understanding of smart implementation upfront. This will give the reader guidance. Mind you, the reader is not used to analytical papers on implementation.
c. Introduce the major <u>development challenge</u>, centered on the needs/conditions of the partner and the partner's vision what the change shall look like. Development challenges are the pressing issues that countries face, which, if resolved, would significantly contribute to enhancing the quality of life of their citizens.
d. Explain how the giz project intends to support addressing the challenge and briefly introduce the main features (objectives, concept, and resources) of the project or program. However, remember contrary to "regular" narratives the objectives and means to reach them are less prominently displayed. Instead, the main emphasis is on the way the program moves and the forces responsible for the implementation process.
e. Introduce the <u>implementation challenge</u>(s) – that is, the major implementation problem faced by implementers as they evolve in accordance with local conditions, time, resources, alliances, interests etc.
f. State the research question(s) that guide the narrative. There can be more than one research question for a case, but there should not be more than three. These questions are referred to as <u>implementation questions</u> and may be phrased as hypotheses. They emphasize processes, decision making, and the implementation trajectories of projects. These questions will be revisited in the concluding section of the case study. The intention of the book "Smart Implementation in Governance" is to review the principles that guide GIZ implementers in their choice of approach, collaboration, decisions and actions that allows them to steer and manage the process in short intervals. A reference to principles that were relevant in this case upfront is desirable (see here also chapter 5 for more discussion on principles).

4.2. Contextual conditions of the case study (<2 pages)

Highlight the contextual conditions in which the case takes place, including trends over time that might have affected implementation. This might include references to previous or other programs in the same sector or country, policy efforts, political changes as well as relevant landscape or historical conditions in the particular country or sector.

This section outlines the relationship between the overall development agenda the partner tries to achieve and the contribution of the GIZ project towards it. It will explain which approach was chosen to address the partner's challenge and the logic or expectation how this contribution could provide a contribution to solving the problem?

Avoid routine depictions of economic and demographic profiles here, typically used to characterize countries. Instead focus on the most relevant contextual conditions that affect the development interventions (e.g. specific political, budgetary, cultural, historic, or social conditions).

4.3. Tracing the Implementation Process (<10 pages)

This section is the heart of the case study and presents the main narrative. The challenge here is to weave together narrative and analysis. The story that will be told about implementation needs to be underpinned by reflection (i.e. analysis) and evidence to make a convincing case. The narrative should be constructed, generally, in chronological sequence across the life of the project or program. The narrative traces the process of implementation, structured according to the flow of time, the sequence of the intervention under study, and the decision-making processes of relevant actors.

This chapter begins with outlining the major implementation challenges – how did practitioners (partners and/or giz personnel) realize that they had a problem or opportunity, and what strategies did they identify to deal/use with it? Enabling conditions should also be mentioned here, such as newly available information to support decision making, internal or external support.

The skeleton along which the narrative of the implementation process can be developed are critical junctures, turning points (positive and negative) or external shocks in the process that forced a reaction or action of the implementers. This is where the exercise of developing a project implementation time line (see chapter 2) is made use of. However, the time line alone does not tell the story in full detail. It requires also the description of what it takes to come to decisions under adverse circumstances, by deviation, by short cutting, by all kind of knacks in order to continue working towards a legitimate solution to meet a target that is constantly moving.

Aspects that can be reviewed to identify *pain points* to an implementation process include resistance or discontent of actors or central decision makers; but also unconducive conditions, bottlenecks or hindrances in the frame conditions. *Inflection points* are interferences that push the implementation in a specific direction (accelerating or setting the process back). The implementer's reaction will be an *adaptation* of timelines, objective, interventions, stakeholders etc. with the result that directions or patterns of implementation change. *Feedback loops* help to reflect how these changes occurred and how the progress unfolds from here. *Organizational and/or behavioral change* will already indicate results and can be highlighted, if they can be related to the process.

It is also important to mention what was *kept constant* and did not change. Adaptations are generally gradual changes that are taken with a strategic consideration at the level of the partner institution as well as that of the project. May be closing down strands of activities means a loss of trust to certain stakeholders (civil society, other sector ministries) that are still required to support the change process later on, or resource flows or planning processes did not allow for more flexibility at a certain point in time Furthermore, implementers (partners and giz personnel) use instruments to analyse the situation and to facilitate the adaptation process. These are often GIZ specific instruments.It should be explained which tools or instruments the implementers used to facilitate the analysis, adaptation process and feedback loops.

Our goal is to understand how to practice adaptive management, how to engage in a trial and error process – and how to exit again, until the next time. The case studies shall provide experience and insights into what it takes to manage a program under conditions of uncertainty and complexity.

Trust is a prerequisite for a lot of steering options in a change process. For example, due to trust in previously established alliances change agents have the opportunity to ask to follow their leadership or to influence third parties that have not been convinced yet. On the other hand, the change process might get stalled because the actors do not trust each other and are unwilling to sign responsible for moving ahead with a new or risky decision. In this case investments in building trust are needed to be able to move ahead. Such aspects are often taken for granted and are hardly provided for in the results matrix but are central to successful implementation thinking and steering.

It is important to do justice to differing interpretations of events. The case study should reflect the diverse and potentially divergent opinions, actions and rationales of different stakeholders, both partners and potential opponents, involved in the intervention (including a country's public institutions, agency staff, consultants, clients, civil society, etc.); this will require both that the case writer understand the incentive and motivations of these individuals and groups.

This section should include evidence of outcomes for clients/citizens when available, using available quantitative data tables and figures, and other types of documentation.

4.4 Lessons from the Case Study (<3 pages)

This section explains and elaborates the key implementation lessons from the case study. It can start out restating of the initial delivery questions and answering this question in the following. This can be done by summarizing the main supporting and hindering aspects to implementation and drawing conclusions on the discussion. A summary of the project's main results may be included, but they need to be traceable from the process described.

Since the publication tries to identify principles of managing and steering implementation of support given to complex reform or transformation processes, a discussion on principles that have been applied in this case – and with which outcome - is important at this point.

Additionally, a discussion on the methodological limitations of this case can be included.

.

5. Principles that guide implementation

The publication “Smart Implementation in Governance” tries to describe how GIZ personnel and partner organizations implement projects and programs in uncertain situations and in constantly changing conditions. The case studies are an instrument to illustrate the process of how teams maneuver a change process in these circumstances. The second intention of the publication is to distill principles that project leaders and staff applies in order to steer the project or program towards achieving results. The assumption here is that each context conditions under which a project is implemented are unique; hence the implementation experience can hardly be replicated one by one to a different sector, program or country. But there might be a few guiding principles that lead implementers in their management. Can these principles be carved out, described and presented in a manner that other implementers can utilize them?

Previous discussions at GIZ on management and steering in complex situations recognized a few principles that guided previous experiences[2]: They are summarized in the following and might serve as a starting point for teams to discuss their leading principles in their specific case.

- Adoption of a <u>multi stakeholder approach</u> with the understanding that the project facilitates coalition building and new alliances among actors in the wider realm of the project. The project invests in building trusting relationships in the understanding that actors are needed to manage the transformation process.
- Participation, i.e. the inclusion of all relevant and affected stakeholders in the change process at all stages is a principle describing how the first principle of multi stateholder engagement is approached.
- The relationship of the project members to any actor is based on the principle of <u>partnership</u>. Partnerships are non-hierarchal cooperation based on the understanding that decisions carry due to mutual dependence and interests.
- An <u>interdisciplinary and multi-sectoral approach</u> to implementation to register and manage the effects of change in adjacent policy fields or sectors.
- Adoption of a m<u>ulti-level approach</u> where a program engages at all levels (policy, organisational and target group) of the change process, with the intention to move change forward wherever the energy is at present and to be able to establish feed-back loops between the levels for quick responsiveness and adaptation.
- <u>Continuous analysis and assessment of the political environment</u> in which the project operate. Understanding the interests and power constellations of actors as well as their room to maneuver is crucial before selecting interventions and implementation partners. The political and economic context is not an external or fixed frame condition that needs to be accepted by the implementers, but an inherent element of decision taking. Thus, the rules of the political game must not only be known (e.g. political environment, conflict, incentive structure in organizations, leadership and champions) must not only be known, but implementers must be able to maneuver within them to steer a process towards an intended outcome. This is why the focus of implementation often lies on the political and not the technical dimension.
- <u>A mode of operations</u> that integrates technical, political, process and organizational development advice to partners in one hand, flexibly offering what is needed in a given situation.

---

[2] Sarah Franken, Margarete Jacob, Ulrich Müller, Albrecht Stockmayer: The Role of Ownership and Political Steering for Development Results. In: Fenken und Müller (eds.): Ownership and Political Steering in Development Countries. Nomos, GIZ 2010

- Context specific and incremental implementation of interventions. The implementation of interventions is led by local conditions, including pace. Local problems are addressed and local capacities used to develop solutions. Interventions are tried out on a small scale and grow incrementally in their scope (scaling-up).
- Iterative proceedings with space for experiments, learning and adaptation. Interventions differ in content but follow similar proceedings in order to learn from and build on previous experiences. However, all elements of the proceedings are flexible and can be adjusted if need be. The iteration provides structures, security and generates depth.
- High flexibility in project requirements. This includes the sequence in which objectives or resource allocation of a project can be adjusted. This flexibility is a prerequisite of the project to respond to the reform dynamics that it shall support. Only such flexibility allows choosing among different strategic options that unfold in the process.
- Continuous monitoring of the reform and change process that the project advises in order to register how interests, priorities and partner constellations are changing and to realize when previously made assumptions are not valid anymore and ned to be revisited.
- Adaptations and course corrections are based on evidence that has been generated via evaluation and analysis. This requires a close combination of planning, analysis, implementation, evaluation and replanning.
- Reflexive Management that uses feed-back loops. Previous experiences are taken into consideration when planning the next steps.
- Long-term engagement in the transformation or reform process to ensure direction and results.

ANNEX 1: Concept Note on the Publication (version June 7th 2015)

Konzeptpapier für die Publikation „smart implementation in governance“ (Arbeitstitel)

Die Abteilung Good Governance und Menschenrechte der GIZ hat in den letzten Jahren eine intensive Diskussion zu dem TZ-Beratungsverständnis in Governance geführt und dabei neue Impulse für das „was“ und „wie“ der Beratung gesetzt. 2009 veranstaltete die GIZ zwei internationale Konferenzen, die sich mit der Frage beschäftigen, wie werden Resultate in der IZ erzielt und was ist die Rolle von Politik, ownership und entwicklungspolitischen Maßnahmen dabei? Es wurde ein nicht-lineares Entwicklungsverständnis zu Grunde gelegt. Gleichzeitigkeit von parallel verlaufenden Prozessen, die Wechselwirkungen untereinander erzeugen, beschreiben die Vorgänge komplexer Entwicklungsprozesse besser, und sollten bei der Planung und Steuerung von Maßnahmen als Grundannahme gelten. Dieses Verständnis aufgreifend, wurde auf den Fachtagen 2013 Transformation als Rahmenkonzept für die Abteilung vorgestellt. Transformation wird als ein Prozess definiert, der alle Dimensionen des politischen, wirtschaftlichen und gesellschaftlichen Wandels umfasst, wozu Strukturen, Spielregeln, aber auch Interessen und Werte der Menschen gehören. Transformationsprozesse werden oftmals von Akteuren angestoßen, die eine Vision für gesellschaftlichen Wandel haben. Die Resultate einer Transformation sind jedoch kaum vorab definierbar oder vorhersehbar, denn der Prozess des Wandels bringt fortlaufend neue Ereignisse, Zwischenergebnisse und Machtkonstellationen hervor, auf die reagiert werden muss. Transformation betont die Gleichzeitigkeit und Vielschichtigkeit, in den Veränderungen stattfinden. Diese Dynamiken machen den Prozess in seiner Gesamtheit nicht steuerbar.

Für die IZ besteht die Herausforderung darin, in einem Kontext der Komplexität und Nichtplanbarkeit einen klar definierten Beitrag zu entwickeln, der (Teil-)Prozesse mit Beratung, Instrumenten und Methoden unterstützt und die Akteure befähigt, möglichst wirkungsvoll zu agieren (Rahmenkonzept Transformation 2013:4). Nach diesem Verständnis ist jeder Transformationsprozess ein Governanceprozess, denn es geht immer um die Neuaushandlung von Interessen, Ressourcen und Macht. Hingegen ist nicht jede Reform, zu der Governancevorhaben beraten, ein Transformationsprozess, da nicht immer Werte und Überzeugungen tangiert sind.[3]

Aber wie setzt man dieses Entwicklungsverständnis in der Beratung von Veränderungsprozessen in Partnerländern und für das Management von Beratungsvorhaben um? Hierzu liegen bereits einige Einsichten und Erkenntnisse aus der Praxis vor, diese sind aber nicht systematisch erfasst und hinlänglich belegt, sondern eher Erfahrungswissen. Die Publikation möchte einen Beitrag leisten, dieses Erfahrungswissen zu überprüfen und an einer Zahl von Fallbeispielen belegbar zu machen.

Die **Intention** der Veröffentlichung ist es, sich mit den beiden Frage auseinanderzusetzten, wie in komplexen Transformationsprozessen entschieden und gesteuert wird und welche Rolle Beratungsvorhaben darin haben. Durch das Herausarbeiten von Prinzipien und

[3] Exzerpt aus „Ein Rahmenkonzept der Abteilung Good Governance und Menschenrechte. Aus der Praxis für die Praxis. Transformation – Zum Verständnis. GIZ April 2013 https://intranet.giz.de/cps/rde/xchg/giz_intranet/XSL/hs.xsl/-/HTML/11988.htm

Prozessen, die während der Begleitung von Veränderungsprozessen in Partnerländern zur Anwendung kommen, ist die Erwartung verbunden die Handlungsfähigkeit von Entscheidungsträgern (einschließlich Partner) in Transformationsprozessen, und damit letztlich auch die Wirksamkeit von Beratungsvorhaben, zu verbessern. Governance wird hierbei weniger als Überbegriff von Themen der Regierungsführung verstanden (z.B. Verwaltungsreform, Rechtstaatlichkeit, Demokratisierung), sondern als die Steuerung von Transformationsprozessen.

Eine zweite Intention ist die Positionierung der GIZ in einer internationalen Diskussion: Die Debatte um Implementierung hat international deutlich an Aufmerksamkeit gewonnen. Zentrale Impulse hierzu kommen aus der Weltbank mit einer Diskussion um „Science of Delivery“, von ODI mit der Präsentation ihrer Forschungsergebnisse des Africa Power and Politics Program und einem Initiative unter Federführung der Harvard Universität zu „Doing Development Differently“. Die Eingangsthese sagt, dass technische Lösungen zu komplexen Problemen notwendig, aber nicht ausreichend sind und dass erwartete Resultate von Entwicklungsvorhaben oftmals nicht (im erwarteten Masse) eintreffen, weil Schwierigkeiten und Veränderungen während der Implementierung auftreten. Um weitreichende und nachhaltige Wirkungen zu erzielen muss das „wie“ der Implementierung besser verstanden werden. Damit bietet die Publikation der GIZ eine Chance sich als IZ-Organisation zu präsentieren, die ein Wissen besitzt, was für andere eine „black-box“ ist, aber als Erfolgsfaktor anerkannt wird. Das Wissen der GIZ über Implementierung, was andere Geber zurzeit als wertvoll und notwendig erachten - und keineswegs selbstverständlich erscheint – kann explizit gemacht werden.

Die **Zielgruppe** der Publikation ist entsprechen

- eine internationale, entwicklungspolitisch interessierte Fach-Öffentlichkeit, die sich mit dem Thema Implementierung auseinandersetzt
- Politische Entscheider in Deutschland (BMZ, AA, BMUB; AWZ u.a.) und andere potenzielle Auftraggeber (EU, DIFID, Weltbank, UNDP u.a.)
- und
- die Mitarbeiter der GIZ in Vorhaben, den operativen (Regional)Bereichen sowie im Fach- und Methodenbereich.

Frühere Auseinandersetzungen in der GIZ zu dem Thema politische Steuerung von komplexen Sachverhalten (Frenken und Müller 2010) haben bereits Aspekte herausgearbeitet, die auch für Transformationsprozesse in Partnerländer relevant sind. Damit Ergebnisse und Wirkungen in Kontexten mit hohen Unwägbarkeiten erzielt werden können, werden Charakteristika eine „*smart implementation* strategy“ beschrieben[4]:

- Ein multi-stakeholder Ansatz mit dem Verständnis Akteure darin zu unterstützen Vertrauen und Beziehungen zu anderen aufzubauen und Interessensgruppen zu bilden, damit sie gestärkt sind um Transformationsprozesse zu managen.
- Einbindung aller relevanten Akteure in den Veränderungsprozess (von der Planung bis hin zum Monitoring und derEvaluierung)
- Ein systemisches Verständnis von Veränderung wo Maßnahmen auf verschiedenen Ebene und nicht auf einen Aspekt begrenzt durchgeführt werden (Mehrebenenansatz)

[4] Sarah Franken, Margarete Jacob, Ulrich Müller, Albrecht Stockmayer: The Role of Ownership and Political Steering for Development Results. In: Fenken und Müller (eds.): Ownership and Political Steering in Development Countries. Nomos, GIZ 2010

- Ein partnerschaftliches Verständnis, das davon ausgeht das Partnerschaften einen nicht-hierarchischen Kooperationszusammenhang darstellen und Entscheidungen auf der Einsicht gegenseitiger Abhängigkeiten basieren.
- Ein interdisziplinäres und multi-sektoraler Vorgehen, damit die Auswirkungen des Wandelns auf die unterschiedlichen Sektoren und Politikfelder erfasst und zu gemanget werden können (Sektorgovernance).
- Die laufende Analyse und Bewertung des politischen Umfeldes nach Interessen- und Machtkonstellationen. Die Einschätzung der Handlungsspielräume der Akteure stellt in der Konzeptionsphase (und danach fortlaufend) eine wichtige Verstehens- und Handlungsgrundlage für die Steuerung von Vorhaben dar. Der politische und ökonomische Kontext ist nicht als externe oder fixe Rahmenbedingung zu verstehen, sondern als Teil des Handlungskalküls. D.h. die Spielregeln des politischen Agierens (politisches Umfeld, Konfliktsituation, Anreizstruktur in Organisationen, Führung und Champions, Eliten und Vetomächte) müssen nicht nur bekannt sein, sondern die Partner und Mitarbeiter der Vorhaben müssen darin operieren können. Damit liegt der Fokus der Implementierung auf der politischen und nicht der technischen Dimension.
- Eine politik- und prozessorientierte Arbeitsweise, in der Fachberatung mit Politik-, Prozess- und Organisationsberatung praktisch verknüpft wird.
- Kontextangepasste und inkrementelle Umsetzung von Maßnahmen. Die Implementierung wird von lokalen Bedingungen geleitet. Lokale Probleme werden bearbeitet und lokaler Kapazitäten genutzt, um Lösungsoptionen zu entwickeln. Lösungsoptionen werden im Kleinen ausprobiert, bevor ein schrittweises scaling-up erfolgt.
- Ein iteratives Vorgehen in dem Raum zum Experimentieren, Lernen und Anpassen besteh; indem Kurswechsel möglich sind und Ziele rejustiert bzw. neu gesetzt werden können. Das Vorhaben unterliegt einer kontinuierlichen Anpassung an Veränderungen in der Reformdynamik. Das bedeutet zum einen ein kontinuierliches monitoring der Reformprozesse, um zu erfassen, wie sie sich entwickeln und wann sie von den ursprünglich gemachten Annahmen abweichen. Anpassungen erfolgen dann auf der Grundlage von Evidenzen, die in Evaluierungen oder Analysen generiert werden. Zum anderen bedeutet es aber auch Flexibilität in der Zielsetzung und im Vorgehen, um positiv auf verändernde Bedingungen reagieren und eine Abwägung zwischen den Optionen treffen zu können.
- Enge Verknüpfung von Analyse, Planung, , Umsetzung und Evaluierung, so dass Evidenz, den nächsten strategischen Schritt informiert (evidence based feed-back)
- Ein systemisches Wirkungsverständnis, bei dem der Dialog und die Aushandlung in den Kooperationspartnern über die zu erreichenden Wirkungen und Indikatoren im Vordergrund stehen.
- Ein reflexives Management, was vorherige Geschehnisse und zukünftiger Planung in Beziehung setzt, um den Reformprozessen der Partner durch die Beratungsleistung eine Richtung zu geben.
- Flexible Finanzierung und Vorgehensweise
- Planen in strategischen Optionen, um Alternativen bewerten zu können
- Langfristige Begleitung der Veränderungsprozesse
- Steuerung, Beobachtung und Bewertung des Fortschritts und strategischer Entscheidungen erfolgen mit und durch die relevanten Partner

giz

Fragestellung und methodischer Ansatz

Im Rahmen der Publikation sollen die folgenden **Fragen** (und Unterfragen) erörtert und gewonnene Erkenntnisse in einem Schlusskapitel synthetisiert werden:

1. Welche Prinzipien sind handlungsleitend in der Begleitung von Transformationsprozessen?
   In der oben zusammengefassten Diskussion werden bereits Prinzipien und Leitlinien für die Gestaltung und Umsetzung einer Implementierungsstrategie und für die Begleitung von komplexen Veränderungsprozessen unserer Partner gemacht. Werden diese durch die Projekterfahrungen bestätigt oder nicht? Können sie durch Fallbeispiele belegt / ergänzt / modifiziert werden? Die folgenden drei Punkte umfassen Teilaspekte dieser Leitfrage:
   - Welche Informationen / Analysen sind relevant für die Konzeption und Steuerung von Transformationsprozessen? Nach welchen Kriterien wird gehandelt, wenn zu wenig oder zu unsichere Informationen vorliegen? Wann und wie erfolgt eine Anpassung auf Veränderungen im Prozess?
   - Implementierung bedeutet für die GIZ immer auch Prozessbegleitung. Wie werden diese Prozesse unterstützt, vorangebracht, gelenkt, so dass sie Lösungen zu Governanceproblemen entwickeln und Wirkungen erzielen? Welche Instrumente/ Prinzipien / Leitlinien werden für die Begleitung genutzt?
   - Wie arbeiten wir, wenn wir davon ausgehen müssen, dass die Situation nicht stabil ist, d.h. unsere Annahmen nicht lange halten? Oder wenn wir wissen, dass wir zunächst an den Bedingungen für zukünftiges Wissen/Allianzen arbeiten müssen, um zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt in einem neuen Bereich handlungsfähig zu sein?
2. Welcher Rolle kommt Governanceberatung in diesen Transformationsprozessen zu? Wie kommen wir zu einem gemeinsamen Verständnis mit den Partnern welche Veränderungsprozesse (als nächstes) bearbeitet werden sollen und wie? Wie definieren wir Ziele bzw. Zielkorridore mit unseren Partnern a) für den Veränderungsprozess und b) für giz unterstützte Vorhaben? Davon abgeleitet schließt sich die Frage an: Wie erreichen wir Ziele, Ergebnisse und Wirkungen einem kontext-sensiblen und sich stets anpassenden Implementierungsansatz und wie können wir diese belegen und vermitteln, so dass Außenstehende es nachvollziehen / überprüfen können?

   Capacity WORKS ist das Managementinstrument der GIZ und dient dem Management und der Steuerung von Projekten und Programmen in komplexen Kontexten. Die CW website[5] erläutert die Rahmenbedingungen in dem von der GIZ unterstützte Vorhaben agieren und beschreibt damit ähnliche Ausgangsvoraussetzungen wie das Transformationskonzept:
   “In der Regel wird ein Vorhaben nicht mehr allein mit einem Partner gestaltet, sondern in übergreifenden Zusammenhängen von Organisationen und Institutionen. Die Vorhaben basieren auf einer zielgerichteten Kooperation von Repräsentanten dieser Organisationen, Institutionen und Netzwerke, die jeweils für sich ein Zentrum von Interesse, Macht und Einfluss sind. Da Partnerschaften einen nicht-hierarchischen Kooperationszusammenhang darstellen, basieren Entscheidungen auf der Einsicht gegenseitiger Abhängigkeit. Diese Vorgaben stellen die Herausforderung für ein

[5] https://intranet.giz.de/cps/rde/xchg/giz_intranet/XSL/hs.xsl/-/HTML/93919.htm

Gelingen dar. Capacity WORKS unterstützt die Auftragsverantwortlichen dabei, in diesem Rahmen handlungsfähig zu sein: die relevanten Aushandlungsprozesse zu identifizieren, in den Blick zu nehmen und zu bearbeiten."
Capacity WORKS setzt einen Rahmen und bietet Hilfestellung für die Implementierung von GIZ unterstützten Vorhaben. Im Rahmen der Publikation kann in den Fallstudien auch dargestellt werden, wie Governance-Vorhaben mit Capacity WORKS arbeiten, und diskutiert ob, wann und wie das Managementinstrument Projektmitarbeitern dienlich war, eine *smart implementation* Strategie für Transformationsprozesse zu entwickeln und umzusetzen.

3. Wie lernen wir? Wie entwickeln wir unser Verständnis zu Implementierung weiter? Wie entwickeln wir Methoden (z.B. zur Erfassung des Kontextes), so dass der Implementierungsansatz auch zukünftig effektiv sein kann, wenn wir davon ausgehen, dass Komplexität oder Fragilität weiter zunehmen werden?
4. Worin unterscheidet sich Implementierung in nationalen und regionalen Governancevorhaben bzw. in fragilen oder stabileren Länderkontexten?

Der Fokus der Auseinandersetzung liegt auf der Frage „wie" wurde die Beratung für komplexe Veränderungen umgesetzt oder diese erreicht, nicht „was" wurde gemacht. Fallstudien sind eine Methode der empirischen Sozialforschung, die diesen Fokus aufnimmt. Es soll versucht werden, die Beschreibung einer *smart implementation* á la GIZ mit Hilfe dieser Methode herauszuarbeiten. Darüber hinaus erlauben Fallstudien eine gute Anbindung an die internationale Diskussion, denn es besteht die Idee, eine Bibliothek zu dem Thema „Science of Delivery" mit Fallstudien aufzubauen. Hier besteht die Möglichkeit sich über die Nutzung des Formats *Fallstudien* in diese Diskussion einzubringen.

Organisation und Durchführung

Die Publikation wird gemeinsam zwischen der Stabsstelle Unternehmenspolitik und der Fachabteilung Good Governance und Menschenrechte erstellt. Das Einleitungskapitel und zwei Fallstudien werden auf den Governancefachtagen 2015 in Berlin exemplarisch vorgestellt, um mit den Mitarbeitern der Abteilung in die Diskussion zu kommen. Die Fallstudien werden nach den Fachtagen ausgewählt. Die Fertigstellung der Publikation ist für die 2. Jahreshälfte 2016 geplant. Die Publikation, soll über die Governancefachverbünde und über die Regionalkonferenzen auch an die Landesdirektoren verbreitet werden.

1. **<u>Zentrale Aktivitäten im Erstellungsprozess</u>**
   a. Konzepterstellung und -abstimmung in der Abteilung
   b. Erarbeitung Kooperationsvereinbarung mit Stabsstelle Unternehmensentwicklung
   c. Abfrage und Sondierung von Ideen für Fallstudien aus der Abteilung und den Vorhaben
   d. Abfrage nach Instrumenten aus Cluster, Task Forces und AG der Abteilung
   e. Kriterien für die Auswahl der Fallstudien erarbeiten
   f. Erstellung eines Leitfadens für die Erstellung der Fallstudien für Fallstudienschreiber
   g. Begleitung und Kommentierung der Fallstudienentwürfe mit Hilfe von 2 Workshops während der Erstellungsphase der Fallstudien
   h. Qualitätssicherung, peer reviewing der Fallstudien mit interner und externer Besetzung (Freiberg, Stockmayer, Kirsch)
   i. Schreiben des Einleitungsartikels,

j. Schreiben des Abschlussartikels
k. Einrichten einer Website mit für FATA Teilnehmer
l. Verhandlungen mit Buchverlagen
m. Lay-out, Druckfahnen korrigieren
n. Präsentation und/oder Verteilung der Publikation in Fachverbünden und auf Regionalkonferenzen, sowie in internationalen Foren ab Ende 2016

2. Rollen und Verantwortlichkeiten im Erstellungsprozess

Die Erstellung des Buches wird von einem Kernteam verantwortet. Dieses Kernteam besteht aus Lead Governance Advisor, AL Governance und Konflikt, Senior Politikberaterin der Stabsstelle Unternehmensentwicklung und dem Gutachter. Das Managementteam der Abteilung 42 entscheidet über zentrale Aspekte des Buches (z.B. Konzept, Fallstudienauswahl). Die Fallstudien werden von Projektmitarbeiter/innen oder Fachplaner/innen der Abteilung geschrieben. Für jede/n Fallschreiber/in wird eine Fachplaner/in als Back-stopper bzw. Tandempartner/in benannt.

Annex 2: Sample Time Line of a Project with reference to pain and inflection points, critical junctures, opportunities and course correction.

(Source: Delivery Case Study Guidelines. Global Delivery Initiative. Science of Delivery, November 2014, page 24,25)

Note: This sample timeline is drawn from the case study "Argentina's Plan Nacer / Programa Sumar: How to ensure quality health-care and coverage of uninsured populations," by Ipsita Parida and Daniel Ortega Nieto.

This table highlights key inflection points along the program path to quickly summarize main program highlights.

Date	Event	Justification for inclusion/ relevance	Remarks
2001 - 2002	Economic Crisis	Increase in IMR to 16.8 (even 22) in provinces and increase in MMR showing worrying trend reversal	Inflection point
2003-2004	Conceptualization of Plan NACER	The idea is generated and consensus building and stakeholder collaboration activities start, before the actual launch of the program	The crisis triggers innovation
2003-2004	Selection of a results based financing model for program intervention	Cost-effectiveness and cost- benefit analysis done to devise the most financially sound method for program delivery	Feedback loop
2003-2005	Program design and building in course correction	Designing a twin contract that allows for rigidity and flexibility to allow homogeneity of quality of care and basic infrastructure (rigid contract) while also giving room for annual renegotiation of the performance targets based on capacity.	Adaptation
2003-2004	Selection of the tracers	Critical to program success in determining key health outcomes and selected based on previous experiments in smaller pilots in hospitals.	Feedback loop
2004	Stakeholder collaboration and accounting mechanism	Activation of COFESA which gave the National MOH the legitimacy to launch NACER and held provinces accountable through public documentation.	Facilitating tool
2004	Plan NACER is launched in 9 northern provinces (in the NOA and NEA). Initial pilot and test run.	Inflection point for the first roll out of the program. It is a maternal and child health benefit plan for mothers after45 days of delivery and children until 6 years of age	Feedback loop

2004-2007	Information systems are created and operated to address data collection for results monitoring	Primary care units follow a standardized and homogenous method of documentation and diagnosis	Organizational change
2007	Program is launched in all the remaining 15 provinces	Due to high demand and political pressure the program is rolled out to the rest of the provinces and cross country implementation is put in place	Inflection point
2008	Corruption allegations and controversy leading to change of program staff and loss of program support	Critical inflection point to study how the team bounced back and how NACER was able to maintain its ground despite such political and institutional turmoil.	Inflection point/ Pain point
2008	Creation of the Government action accountability and procurement plan	Response to the corruption scandal and a measure to ensure more transparent procurement process.	Adaptation Organizational change
2010	Expansion of the benefits package to include Congenital Heart Disease and some high risk maternal delivery and neonatal intensive care conditions	Presidential challenge to bring infant mortality down to a single digit, declared. Political support for expansion.	Inflection point
2012	Programma Sumar launched	Critical inflection point entailing the launch of the program, expanding the beneficiary group to include adolescents from 10-19 and all women until 64 years of age, with focus on 49 service lines and 400 benefits (including cancer care, congenital cardiopathies etc.)	Inflection point
2012-Ongoing	More provider level and outreach initiatives deployed to ensure better service delivery (like using taekwondo teachers for adolescent age groups)	Scaling up and expanding with the extensive menu of benefits provided under SUMAR, requires innovative incentives to involve the new stakeholders.	Adaptation