

## **Third Interim Technical Report to the IDRC**

### **Reconciling Africa's Fragmented Institutions of Governance: A New Approach to Institution Building**

IDRC Grant Number 104936-005

by

The Center for Land and Community Development Studies

The Pennsylvania State University

And

The Democracy and Governance Research Program of the Human Sciences Research

Council of South Africa

Countries where research is being carried out and research teams:

<b>Country</b>	<b>Team members</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Overall management	Dr Kidane Mengisteab Dr Gerard Hagg Dr Ikubolajeh Logan	PSU HSRC PSU
South Africa	Dr Gerard Hagg Dr Pearl Sithole Thamsanqa Mbele	HSRC HSRC HSRC
Ethiopia	Dr Merera Gudina Dr Tesema Ta'a Woyessa	Univ of Addis Ababa Univ of Addis Ababa
Kenya	Dr Joe Keijah David Khaoya	KIPPRA KIPPRA
Somaliland	Ms Sadia Musse Ahmed	PENHA

**Report period: 1 April – 30 November 2010**

**Date of presentation to IDRC: February 2011**

## Synthesis

Many African countries suffer from fragmented institutions of governance. This problem is manifested in the adherence of rural populations primarily to traditional institutions while the post-colonial state operates on imported institutions of governance, which are transplanted outside their cultural and socioeconomic milieus and often at odds with traditional African cultural values. As a result, modern institutions have been rather ineffective at preventing and managing sectarian conflicts and at promoting synergy in state-society relations. The incoherence and clashes between the traditional and modern systems have contributed significantly to Africa's crisis of state building and governance. Unfortunately, the acute need for reconciling Africa's fragmented institutions of governance has not received the attention it deserves. The current research aims to contribute to this important area of scholarship and policy.

The project has the following three specific objectives. The first objective is to document carefully the characteristics and attributes of traditional institutions, with emphasis on those that deal with (1) property rights and allocation of resources, (2) prevention and resolution of conflicts, and (3) participation in the process of decision making in general and participation of women in particular. The second objective is to examine carefully the documented characteristics under objective one to assess attributes that (a) overlap with and strengthen the principles and practice of democratic governance; and (b) that can contribute to the development of mechanisms for prevention and resolution of conflicts and thereby enhance a peaceful process of state building. The third objective is to explore how the attributes identified under objective two can be fused with modern institutions in order to create a coherent system of institutions, to examine how the fused institutions can enhance democratic governance and peaceful state building, and how it can be used to improve the plight of vulnerable segments of society, including peasant farmers, pastoralists, and women.

This third progress report covers the research conducted during the second phase of the project, mainly consisting of fieldwork (Household surveys) and a report back and planning workshop in Nairobi, and literature reviews in the four countries.

Fieldwork in nine case studies in Ethiopia, Somaliland, South Africa and Kenya have been completed. The feedback from the fieldwork in preparation for the workshop in Nairobi (29 Nov-2 Dec 2010) indicates that the research is considered highly relevant and addresses key governance issues in the communities. A number of policy makers, traditional leaders and academics have been invited to the Nairobi workshop.

### **The research problem**

Despite the fact that African countries have exerted much effort over the past four or so decades at crafting viable institutions of governance, most of them are still confronted with institutional crisis. Three different types of institutions can be identified. One type consists of the formal institutions of the post-colonial state, which are largely inherited from the colonial state or imported thereafter. The second type of institutions comprises of those inherited from the pre-colonial era of governance. These ‘traditional’ systems vary along the existed political systems (i.e. the centralized chieftaincy systems and decentralized village or kinship systems). A third type of institutions consists of the societal informal institutions (norms, customs, value systems and practices, which vary along ethnic or religious lines and modes of production (e.g., pastoralists and peasant farmers). This fragmentation of institutions, which represents separate socioeconomic spaces, has created a number of problems, one of which is that the different sets of institutions often clash with each other. Although broadly three types of institutions exist and the research team’s understanding has not vastly changed, the literature surveys and initial fieldwork highlight the variation and complexities of the institutions and their relationships. The country and case studies show subtle to significant variations in the relationship between traditional institutions to modern ones. Clearly attributes and dynamics show a richness which is the result of varying national histories, their regional policy and legislative contexts, as well as tensions between the two systems, even where legislators intended to reconcile them.

*This research project is financed by Canada's International Development Research Centre ([www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)).*

## **Research findings**

The fieldwork of Phase 2 of the research has been completed, and country reports on the household surveys were presented at the workshop in Nov-Dec 2010. A workshop programme is attached as Annexure A, and a report will be produced in February 2011. The following summary provides the most pertinent findings as presented by Prof Mengisteab on the first day.

### **General objectives of Phase 2**

- To explore how widely and deeply traditional institutions are utilized;
- To examine their attributes, especially in the areas of (a) prevention and resolution of conflicts, (b) participation in the process of decision making, (c) property rights and allocation of resources, and d) gender relations;

### **Special objectives of Phase 2**

Among the objectives are to obtain information on;

- The characteristics of those surveyed,
- The attributes and accountability of traditional leadership,
- The mechanisms of resource allocation and their effectiveness,
- How disputes are settled and how effective the conflict resolution mechanisms are,
- How decisions are made and how open participation is,
- How dissenting voices are handled,
- When and why people choose the traditional institutions over those of the state,
- What level of trust of TIs exists among the population,
- What mechanisms are available to ensure rules are followed,
- how equitable traditional institutions are with respect to gender relations
- what inheritance rules and practices prevail, and
- if and how rights of minority groups are respected.

**The survey has rendered many interesting findings**

- How Intra- community and inter-community conflicts are settled
- How participatory decision-making is;
- How resources are allocated; and
- How equitable gender relations are in the traditional system.

**The following are some findings presented**

**The Traditional System seems preferable in settling intra-community conflicts.**

	Traditional	Modern
• Kenya,	64%	34%
• South Africa	71.9%	25.8%
• Ethiopia	78.7	18.7%
• Somaliland	59.2	15.3%

**The Traditional System seems highly relevant in settling conflict between communities too**

	Traditional	Modern
• Kenya,	60%	37%
• South Africa	--	--
• Ethiopia	52%	6.3%
• Somaliland	37.8%	8%

**Effectiveness of TIs and MIs in Resolving Inter and Intra-Community Conflicts**

	Between Comm. More Effective	Between Comm. Less Effective	Within Comm. More Effective	Within Comm. Less Effective
<b>Ethiopia</b>	57.7%	39%	73.7%	24.7%
<b>Kenya</b>	40%	58%	62%	37%
<b>South Africa</b>	41.2%	31.7	54.3	32.6%
<b>Somaliland</b>	67%	7%	68%	6.1%

## Participation in Decision-Making

	Participated in conflict Resolution	Participated in decision-making	Exclude anyone	Participated in National Elections
<b>Ethiopia (yes)</b>	67.3%	51.2%	45.7%	35%
<b>Kenya (yes)</b>	40%	-	--	--%
<b>South Africa (yes)</b>	26.2%	30.8%	14.5%	48%
<b>Somaliland (yes)</b>	56.1%	64.3%	44.9%	32.3%

## Effectiveness of TAs and Gov't. Authorities in addressing Community Concerns

	TAs are more effective	Govt auth are more effective
Ethiopia	50.7%	49.3%
Kenya	49%	51%
South Africa	39.4%	46.2%
Somaliland	77.6%	15.3%

## Gender relations

	Ethiopia		Kenya		So. Africa		Somaliland	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>Wom. Leaders</b>	14.7%	40.7%	-	-	20.4%	52.9%	-	-
<b>Women Elders</b>	35.7%	19.3%	-	-	25.8%	49.3%	18.2%	-
<b>Wom. In Meetings</b>	51%	4.0%	55%	43%	89.1%	0.5%	51.5%	7.1%
<b>Wom. Get land</b>	52.7%	43.7%	55%	43%	89.1%	7.7%	56.1%	40.8%
<b>Inherit property from parents.</b>	34.%	62%	59%	40.5%	12.9%	20.4%	87.8%	10.2%
<b>Inherit pro. From husbands</b>	71.3%	21.3%	94%	6%	11.9%	4.5%	90.8%	7.1%
<b>Wom. Get child custody</b>	20.3%	-	20%	-	58.8%	-	63.3%	-
<b>Property divided equitably in divorce case</b>	51.3%	24.3%	28%	48%	32.1%	38.5%	5.1%	-

This research project is financed by Canada's International Development Research Centre ([www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)).

## **Reconciling Institutional systems**

- Why Transitional societies with fragmented modes of production and fragmented institutional systems would require creating transitional institutional systems.
- Since institutional fragmentation represents different socioeconomic spaces, nation-building, democratic governance, and even socioeconomic transformation would be difficult without institutional reconciliation.

## **Existing models of dealing with institutional fragmentation in Africa**

- In most cases there is no policy of reconciling the fragmented institutional systems.
- Creating House of Chiefs as a second Chamber of parliament with little institutional reconciliation.
- The South African Model:
  - Recognition of aspects of the traditional system and involving traditional leaders in local governance.
- The Botswana Model:
  - Botswana has been able to reconcile the traditional judicial process with the modern judicial process.
  - Traditional leaders also have a role in local governance.
  - Botswana's first president was a traditional leader. This seems to have helped in reconciling the two systems.
- The Somaliland Guurti: The Somaliland case is that the Guurti (representatives of a traditional clan) an important organ of the formal governance with authority in the making of laws, in resolving societal conflicts, and even in checking the executive branch of government.

## Forward thinking

- It appears that African societies are becoming institutionally more polarized.
- Institutional polarization can make African societies increasingly more difficult to govern.
- Institutional reconciliation also needs to be accompanied with reconciliation of modes of production.
- Some of the modern institutions, such as those of democracy, also need to be contextualized.

The last two days in the workshop were used to discuss the analytical process and the writing of the final report.

## Project implementation and management

**Activity 1: Fieldwork** (workshop report will be submitted early Feb. 2011)

Dr. Kidane Mengisteab of PSU participated in the field work that included three sites in Ethiopia, three sites in Kenya and one site in Somaliland. Dr Gerard Hagg supervised the surveys in South Africa. The following communities were covered in the surveys, which were based on randomly selected households:

*South Africa:* in Giyani a total of 120 household surveys were conducted in the three communities Giyani Town, Ka-Ngove and Magosha (total of 6 enumeration areas); in Matatiele a total of 100 households were surveyed in Matatiele town, Mafube and Ramohlokoane.

*Ethiopia:* 300 household interviews were held in three communities, namely: a) the Gurage, one of the major ethnic groups in Ethiopia and relatively speaking the most urbanized group; b) the Booranaa, one of the major Oromo branches that are predominantly pastoralists who live in the southern Oromia Regional State of Ethiopia on the frontiers of the Northern District of Kenya; and c) the Nuer who are predominantly pastoralists and are one of the Ethio-Sudanese frontier populations living in the Gambella Regional State as well as in the Sudan.



*Kenya:* 250 household interviews were held in three communities, namely: a) the Miji Kenda community in the Coast province, which has a system of community leadership called the Kaya Council of elders which exists alongside the government system of governance. b) Meru community in Eastern province, which has a traditional institution called the Njuri Ncheke which is a council of elders; and c) Pokot community in Rift Valley, which has a council of elders called Kokwo Poi.

*Somaliland:* 200 interviews were held in the communities around Hergeisa, which are typical of the rest of Somaliland with regard to the dominant traditional institutions, such as the national-level Xeer, the regional Sultans and the clan-located Aquils.

### **Activity 2: Literature Review**

All four teams have been involved in literature reviews, together with the research assistants who conducted the fieldwork. During the second stage, the literature surveys focused on the debates in the case study countries. The literature survey continues throughout the project.

### **Activity 3: Report-back and Planning Workshop 29 Nov. – 2 Dec. 2010**

A programme and list of participants are attached as Annexures A and B

### **Activity 4: Networking and Fundraising**

Dr. Mengisteab was invited to present a paper at a conference on “Customary Governance and Democracy Building: Exploring the Linkages” organized by the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). The conference was held in Addis Ababa on September 15 and 16. Dr. Mengisteab’s paper was entitled “Why Democracy-Building in Africa Might Require Reconciling Modern and Traditional Institutions of Governance”. After the conference Mengisteab was invited by CIDA for a discussion on extending the study to cover more cases in Ethiopia. Dr. Mengisteab and the Ethiopian team prepared a budget proposal to do six more cases (in Benishagul, Amhara and Oromia states), but were informed by CIDA that it does not have funds available at the moment.

D.r Mengisteab will also explore if IDEA could fund at least two more countries for extension of the project.

Dr. Gerard Hagg did a presentation on the first phase for the Giyani community (28 May 2010), and Dr Sithole and Mr Mbele did a presentation on the first phase for the Matatiele community (April 22 2010). Both presentations were well attended by leaders and well received.

Negotiations were continued with the German development funder Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) in order to obtain funds for extending the project in the four countries Uganda, Tanzania, Cameroon and Southern Sudan. However, a new director for South Africa was appointed in July 2010 and the team was informed that at this stage GTZ focused on democracy issues, rather than traditional institutions of governance. This decision was partly the result of a restructuring of the South African National Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs into two separate departments. GTZ has thereby limited its focus to Cooperative Governance (within modern institutions). Possibilities of cooperation with the Arnold Bergstraesser Institut were investigated but they are not a funding organization, and can only co-operate if funds are available.

Negotiations with the Department of Traditional Affairs in South Africa for support have continued although no formal cooperation could be established. This Department is still in the process of establishing itself, and officials are very busy with internal planning. The South African Department of Justice and Constitutional Development has expressed an interest in using some of the results of the IDRC funded project for its own planning of a research project on the Traditional Courts Bill. The finalization date of this Bill has been postponed until 30 Dec 2012, in order to allow for broad consultation at provincial level. Discussions continue with the Department, but the latter experiences no pressure for delivery of the Bill, which may impact on availability of funds.

The HSRC has also requested Konrad Adenauer Foundation for funding for a roundtable in early 2011, but the KAF informed us that their budget for 2011 does not allow for this request. An informal video-conference will be arranged by the HSRC to which policy makers and scholars will be invited. This initiative will be used for fundraising as well.

## **Management**

The project was managed by the HSRC involving the project manager Dr Gerard Hagg. Dr Hagg went on pension on May 1, 2010, but was retained by the HSRC as the project manager. The project administrator is Ms Zama Koba, with support from administration units in the HSRC. The HSRC will remain the project's institutional home in order to comply with the IDRC Grant Conditions and the HSRC-PSU MoA. In the PSU the project is managed by Dr Kidane Mengisteab, with involvement of administrator Jennifer Hillebrand and several sections in PSU. In both institutions all legal issues are vetted by legal departments.

The completion of the project will consist of:

- Full analysis of the fieldwork of the second phase, in comparison with findings from interviews from the first phase;
- Literature surveys of each country and a consolidated literature study;
- Presentation of country reports to policy makers and stakeholders in the four case study countries;
- Publication of the draft final report for presentation at roundtables and seminars in all four countries, if funds are available. Policy makers and scholars will be invited to these roundtables and seminars, and these report-backs will be used for fundraising;
- Fourth progress reports (technical and financial) to the IDRC; and
- Submission of final report to the IDRC

## **Request for extension of project period**

While the project management team is well-aware of the original project completion date set for 30 November 2010, it wants to request that the project completion date be *extended to 31 May 2011* for the following reasons:

- In the Second Technical Progress Report the HSRC/PSU requested the IDRC for an extra three months which would allow us to have the final workshop for report writing in early November 2010, followed by the first draft report to the IDRC and stakeholders (including policy makers) in early January 2011, with the final report on 31 March 2011. This extension was based primarily on
  - anticipated delays with regard to the finalization of the end report, due to a foreseen shortfall on the fieldwork item on the budget;
  - opportunities for consultations with policy makers before finalizing the report, and
  - plans for further fundraising.
- In order to cover part of the expected shortfall on the fieldwork budget the PSU decided in consultation with the HSRC
  - not to appoint a Research Assistant; as a result Prof Mengisteab had to put in more time, which delayed the project;
  - to delay the appointment of a Research Assistant on Wages, who would assist in the analysis of fieldwork data, and to make it a part-time appointment; as a result the full analysis of the fieldwork has not been completed.
- These decisions by the management team were based on the assumption that an additional disbursement or additional funding would become available after the fieldwork had been completed (refer above Activity 4: fundraising). A detailed submission of financial statements explaining the shortfall and savings/fundraising could only be produced by end November 2010, and is part of this technical progress report (see below and Third Financial Progress Report). As the shortfall has not yet been fully covered, the Research Assistant on Wages has not yet been appointed, and the analysis can only take place in 2011.

- Due to the above and other delays in the fieldwork, the workshop for the report-back on the fieldwork and planning of the final report could only take place at the end of November; research partners were only able to finalise their fieldwork reports in January 2011 as December is not a productive month in the South due to the summer holidays.
- Assuming that the shortfall will be covered within the next month, the team views 31 May as a feasible completion date for the project.
- The extension of the project period will not change the original project objectives, except for delivery dates.
- The savings are reflected in the amended budget in the attached financial statements, and explained in the section: **Shortfall on the budget, savings and request for additional disbursement**, below.

### Proposed revised dates for progress reports

If the IDRC allows for the above extension, the following dates for submission of reports and payment are proposed:

Milestone	Due date	Submitted by	Centre payment amount
Third Technical Progress Report, covering period April- Nov 2010	First week of February 2011 (4 <sup>th</sup> February 2011)	Recipient	n/a
Payment by the Centre, following acceptance of Third Technical Progress Report	One month after receiving satisfactory report (28 February 2011)	n/a	51,625 CAD plus US\$25,000 if approved
Fourth & Final Technical Report (2 print copies and a digital format)	On or before Research Work Completion Date, 31 May 2011	Recipient	n/a
Final Financial Report covering all funds expended on the project	On or no more than 30 days after the Research Work Completion Date (30 June 2011)	Recipient	n/a
Final payment by the Centre, following acceptance of the Final Technical Report and satisfactory Final Financial Report	30 days after receipt of satisfactory final reports		Up to 21,675 CAD

*This research project is financed by Canada's International Development Research Centre ([www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)).*

## **Costs**

### **General notes**

The detailed forecast and worksheet is based on the following factors: a) the HSRC actual expenses for own research component and b) transfers to Penn State University according to HSRC/PSU MoA, which was based on the original project budget. In order to ensure that fieldwork could be completed PSU allocated funds to necessary budget items at their discretion.

### **Personnel – PSU**

Funding for a Graduate Assistant on wages was used to cover fieldwork costs, but this appointment is still required by PSU for the final analysis, revised as ZAR140, 000 on the revised budget.

### **Consultants:**

Comprises of Project Managers fees (Dr Gerard Hagg) and fieldwork consultants in SA.

- This item was overdrawn by R73, 887 to cover a portion of Dr. Hagg's time as a consultant. As Dr Hagg took over the responsibilities of Dr Ntsebeza, ZAR116, 250 from the HSRC Personnel item was used to cover part of Dr. Hagg's costs.
- Other consultant fees amounted to ZAR237, 913 which was within the original allocation of ZAR246, 000.

### **Travel staff**

- It should be noted that cost savings of up to 91% were a result of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation contribution for workshops held in South Africa and Nairobi. The Nairobi workshop replaced the Addis Ababa workshop.
- A special note is due to explain the calculation of the credit of R29, 730 under the section Travel Staff, HSRC, Nairobi workshop/South Africa:
  - The original budget made provision for two report-back workshops in Nairobi and Addis Ababa. (ZAR36, 000). KAS provided funding for a planning workshop (in South Africa) and two report-back workshops in

South Africa (replacing Nairobi) and Nairobi (replacing Addis Ababa).  
The budget item combines these last two workshop costs.

- The HSRC incurred a cost of R4, 267.24 towards per diems for the Nairobi workshop. This amount was debited against the workshops budget line item resulting in a credit balance of R29,730 broken down as follows:

▪ SA Workshop reimbursement (KAS) -	(ZAR33, 997.10) Cr
▪ Nairobi costs	- ZAR4,267.24 Dr
▪ Total	- (ZAR29,729.86) Cr

### **Shortfall on the Budget, Savings by HSRC/PSU and Request for Additional Disbursement**

- In the Second Technical Progress Report, an expected shortfall on the budget was submitted to the IDRC with a request for an additional disbursement. At that stage the shortfall was estimated at about CAD 68, 000. The shortfall was based on foreign exchange losses and higher costs for the fieldwork in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somaliland than was estimated in the original project budget. The IDRC requested the HSRC/PSU to look for cost-savings and cost-sharing.
- The HSRC was able to absorb the foreign exchange losses and made several cost-savings through management decisions.
- Through savings and co-funding by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation the HSRC/PSU were able to reduce the shortfall to US\$25,000, which was mainly for the costs of fieldwork in the second phase. The project financial statement and projected budget for the rest of the project appear below.
- PSU made a saving of ZAR 171, 901 by reducing the personnel costs of the PSU project leader from ZAR 458, 402 to ZAR 286, 501. This reduction was based on the assumption that the project completion date would be extended, giving Prof Mengisteab time to do most of the analysis himself.
- PSU saved on research expenses by limiting research site visits to one person, saving on travel costs for workshop attendance by the PSU team and teams from

*This research project is financed by Canada's International Development Research Centre ([www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)).*

other countries, and by appointing fieldworkers in Kenya directly rather than through KIPPRA. This saving is not visible in the original budget as only limited funds were provided for.

- Under research expenses, the HSRC saved ZAR 32,588 with regard to travel, per diems and accommodation during research site visits and the fieldwork, by using experienced local consultants as fieldwork managers and by obtaining lower quotes due to an increasingly competitive sector in South Africa.
- Through obtaining co-funding the HSRC made an important saving on travel and costs for the three workshops during the project. The Konrad Adenauer Foundation funded the workshops to the value of approx. ZAR 497, 382 as follows:
  - **Planning workshop**, Feb. 2009, South Africa: disbursement ZAR 47, 353 and in-kind ZAR 89, 237 (most of the travel costs and the venue/accommodation);
  - **First report-back workshop**, Jan. 2010, South Africa: disbursement ZAR 33, 997 and in-kind ZAR 86, 795 (travel, venue/accommodation)<sup>1</sup>
  - **Second report-back workshop**, Nov-Dec 2010, Nairobi: in-kind ZAR 240, 000 (all arrangements except per Diems for South African team and travel costs of PSU team).

## Disbursements

The HSRC has made the following disbursements in the period 1 April – 30 November 2010. These figures are based on HSRC financial year statements.	In ZAR
<b>Income</b>	
IDRC: CAD 360,200 (3 payments) conversion value	2,716,437
<b>Total income</b>	
<b>Expenditure</b>	
Personnel HSRC	590,520
Personnel PSU	433,567
Disbursements HSRC including Indirect Costs	1,063,160
Disbursement to PSU including Indirect Costs	1,836,510
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>2,899,670</b>

<sup>1</sup> FR5 in the signed Financial Progress Report incorrectly states that ZAR33,997.10 was pledged per contract. This should be ZAR120,795.



## Forecasted expenditures for the period 1 December 2010 – 31 May 2011

The forecast below makes provision for the following losses/deviations from the original budget:

- Personnel costs of HSRC have been reduced as the Project Manager, Dr Gerard Hagg, has retired. As Dr Hagg is on a freelance contract with the HSRC to continue management of the project from 1 May 2010 his costs now fall under budget item *Consultants* together with the costs of the fieldwork. If the IDRC approves the extension of the project to 31 May 2011, consultancy costs for Dr Hagg will only increase by ZAR 7, 000 to cover his costs of preparing and attending the planned roundtable in April 2011. HSRC personnel costs in the table below provide for the involvement of one HSRC research director for the rest of the project period.
- Costs of Research Assistant on Wages has been decreased to ZAR 140,000 as the appointment will be part-time.
- The costs of fieldwork in Ethiopia, Somaliland and Kenya in 2010 proved to be higher than originally estimated. Some of these costs were absorbed by PSU through lowering their labour costs. The shortfall has been reduced to US\$ 25,000

### Revised budget for period 1 December 2010 – 31 May 2011

Item	Revised budget (CAD=ZAR7.28)
<b>Personnel</b>	
HSRC	83,311
PSU	140,000
<b>Consultants</b>	
HSRC	310,075
PSU	
<b>Travel staff</b>	<b>21,000</b>
<b>Training</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Research expenses</b>	
HSRC	45,600
PSU	184,000
<b>Indirect costs</b>	<b>16,555</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>800,541</b>

This research project is financed by Canada's International Development Research Centre ([www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)).

## **Project outputs and dissemination**

During the period covered in this report, the project output and dissemination consisted of:

- Fieldwork reports on case study countries Somaliland, Ethiopia, Kenya and South Africa were presented at a workshop in Nov-Dec 2010 to which a number of policy makers, academics and officials contributed (see Annexures A and B)
- Prof. Mengisteab delivered a paper titled “Why Democracy-Building in Africa Might Require Reconciling Modern and Traditional Institutions of Governance” at the UNECA/IDEA conference on “Customary Governance and Democracy Building: Exploring the Linkages”, in Addis Ababa, on September 15 and 16.
- Presentations by the HSRC team (Hagg and Mbele) in Giyani and Matatiele (project case study communities), 28 May and 22 April.

## **Impact**

Although impact based on research findings cannot be determined at this early stage, the project teams have been welcomed back in all communities as well as by stakeholders at various levels in government. Stakeholders in all four countries are awaiting the final report in order to respond at a policy making level.

## **Recommendations**

Summarising the report above, it is recommended that the IDRC:

- approves the extension of the completion date to 31 May 2011 together with revised schedule of submissions and payments;
- Approves additional disbursement of US25, 000.

**Workshop of Phase II on Reconciling Africa's Fragmented  
Institutions of Governance: A New Approach to Institution building**

**29<sup>th</sup> Nov- 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2010  
HILLPARK HOTEL, NAIROBI**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>SESSION/ACTIVITY</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b>
<b>Day 1: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010</b>		
	Arrival of International and local delegates	KONRAD/SCA
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm	Dinner	Hillpark Hotel
<b>Day 2: 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010</b>		
<b>Session I: Chairman – Dr. Joe Kieyah</b>		
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Registration of delegates	KONRAD/SCA
9:00 am – 9:30 am	Introductory Remarks	Dr. G Hagg of HSRC Anke Lerch of KONRAD IDRC Representative
<b>Session II Chairman- Dr. G Hagg</b>		
9:30 am – 10:15 am	Overview of project	Dr. K Mengisteab
10:15 am – 10:45 am	Coffee/Tea Break	
10:45 am – Noon	Discussion	
Noon – 12:30 pm	Closing Remarks	
12:30 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch Break	
<b>Session III Chairman- Dr .I Logan</b>		
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Objectives of the Phase II	Dr. K Mengisteab
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm	Discussion	
4:00 pm – 4:30 pm	Coffee/Tea Break	
<b>Session IV: Chairman – Dr. M Gudina</b>		
4:30 pm – 5:15 pm	Report on Kenya & Discussion	Dr. J Kieyah
5:15 pm – 6:00 pm	Discussion	

6:00 pm – 6:15 pm	Closing remarks	Dr. J Kieyah
<b>Day 3: 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010</b>		
<b>Session I: Chairman – Dr. I Logan</b>		
9:00 am – 9:45 am	Report on South Africa	Dr. G Hagg
9:45 am – 10:00 am	Coffee/Tea Break	
10:00 am – 11:00 am	Discussion	
<b>Session II: Chairman Dr. T Taa</b>		
11:00 am – 11:45 am	Report on Somaliland	Sadia Ahmed
11:45 am – 12:45 pm	Discussion	
12:45 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch	
<b>Session III: Chairman – Dr. Kieyah</b>		
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Report on Ethiopia	Dr. M Gudina & Dr T Taa
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm	Discussion	
4:00 pm – 4:30 pm	Coffee/Tea Break	
<b>Session IV: Chairman – Dr .G Hagg</b>		
4:30 pm – 5:45 pm	Way forward and Final Report	
5:45 pm – 6:00 pm	Closing Remarks	Dr. G Hagg
<b>Session V: Chairman – Dr. J Kieyah</b>		

## ANNEXURE B

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NAME/ADDRESS OF ORGANISATION/INSTITUTION</b>
1	John Mireri	Kenya National Commission for UNESCO
2	G..E.M. Ogutu	University of Nairobi
3	C.O. Nyarienga	SCA
4	Hanna Kamau	SCA
5	Iris Foellner	KAS
6	Stefan Jansen	KAS
7	Ochanda Gideon	KAS
8	Anke Lerch	KAS
9	Isaac Were	University of Nairobi
10	Marleen Renders	Coheal University
11	Robin Isaiah	University of Nairobi
12	Merera Gudina	Addis Ababa University
13	Prof. F.X. Gichuru	African Cultural Regeneration Institutue
14	Beatrice Rachuonyo	KAS
15	B. Ikubolajeh Logan	Penn State University
16	Sadia Ahmed	Somaliland
17	John Moogi Omare	Department Of Culture
18	Easter Ciombaine	African Cultural Regeneration Institutue
19	Clement Akondo	Luo Council of Elders
20	Kidane Mengisteab	Penn State University
21	James Kuloba	Department Of Culture
22	Cyril Bahati Mululu	Department Of Culture
23	Dorcas Odege	Department Of Culture
24	Catherine Mwangi	Department Of Culture
25	Thamsanqa Mbele	Human Schience Research Council
26	Halakhe D. Waqo	National Cohesion and Int. Com
27	Tesema Taa'	Addis Ababa University
28	Gerard Hagg	HSRC
29	Prof. Joe Kieyah	SCA