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Introduction

Governance is important for development, although it has been a challenge for development agencies to address it appropriately. This brief explores emerging alternative ways of addressing governance and institutional challenges.

New approaches in governance include dealing sensibly with power, incentives, and interests, and they build on how reform and change processes tend to develop.

Applying these approaches in practice implies an everyday way of thinking about the issues of politics at different levels. It leads to an adaptive way of approaching problems and stakeholders, which is not always easy for development agencies to adopt.

The space for working differently is, however, bigger in most agencies as assumed. It may require bold initiatives, innovative approaches, and challenging deeply embedded conventions. But that is, after all, what development is all about.

Framing and Understanding Governance and Development

It has become nearly a platitude to confirm that governance is important for development. For what does governance really mean, and why is it important? Often, it has been taken to mean all things good as in some rich countries, in particular high transparency, effective institutions, and accountability, as well as low levels of corruption.

“Good governance,” often broadly defined, has been assumed to be a causal driver of economic and social development, rather than just correlated with growth.

Being central in the discourse of development agencies, governments, and civil society alike, improvements in governance have often been pursued through “copy and paste” reforms, taking models that may have worked in some settings, and expecting them to work in others. Governance has been seen as another nearly “technical” issue to be dealt with, and sometimes even deferred as a task for “governance specialists.”

For inquiries, comments, and suggestions, please contact the editor of the Governance Brief, Claudia Buentjen at 63 2 683 1852 or cbuentjen@adb.org, SDCC Thematic Advisory Service Cluster, Governance Thematic Group. Previous issues of The Governance Brief can be accessed at http://www.adb.org/publications/series/governance-briefs
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1 This Governance Brief reflects the thrust of the conclusions of the “Meet Lucy” event conducted jointly by ADB, GIZ Sector Network Governance Asia, and OECD DAC GovNet from 26 to 28 April 2016 in Manila (http://www.adb.org/news/events/meet-lucy-new-ideas-governance-do-they-work-practice). The learning event introduced the recent OECD Governance Practitioner’s Notebook (http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/governance/governance-practitioners-notebook.htm) and strength-tested the notebook against case studies from the Asia and Pacific region.

2 Nils Boesen is a consultant specializing in governance and institutional development. From 2011 to 2013, he served as director of UNDP’s Knowledge, Innovation and Capacity Group.
“...institutions, interests, and incentives shape the power relations in society that are, quite literally, the engines of and the brakes on development.”

Over the past decades, alternative ways of understanding and working with governance in development have grown stronger. Branded variously—political economy, drivers of change, good enough governance, strategic incrementalism, best fit or adaptive problem-driven approaches—they are seen as alternatives in situations where more linear and rigidly planned approaches fail. In late 2015, the Governance Network in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published a “Governance Practitioner’s Notebook” where practitioners discussed how development agencies can deal differently with governance, or more specifically, with institutions, interests, and incentives.

Development is taking place in a context of structural, institutional, and political drivers and constraints. The structural conditions and formal and informal rules shape the interests of individuals and groups, as well as the arenas where conflicts and accommodations between different interests play out. These factors also shape the incentives to act (i) whether to migrate from rural to urban areas or to other countries; (ii) to adopt sustainable energy policies; (iii) to amass resources by placing assets in tax havens; or (iv) to acquire a public office because it offers perks of status, power, and money. Figure 1 illustrates this thinking.3

These “soft,” yet in many ways determining, aspects of development—-institutions, interests, and incentives—shape the power relations in society that are, quite literally, the engine of and the brakes on development. It shapes politics—how people and groups accommodate, contest and mediate their interests, be it in communities, organizations of any size, or in countries at large.

Thus, governance is a core feature of any development process. In the new Sustainable Development Goals governance and institutional issues are explicitly in focus in goal 16 and 17—but governance is important for any sector or area of the Sustainable Development Goals. Health services, for example, depend on institutions and reflect different configurations of power and interests. Are high-quality services reserved for the privileged few, or do basic services reach marginalized groups in remote areas?

There are also crosscutting governance issues, some of which may appear technical, but are also deeply shaped by institutions, interests, and incentives. These include (i) public financial management; (ii) procurement; (iii) transparency and accountability; and (iv) the distribution of power, resources, and functions between different levels of government.

The governance relations within and among different sectors and levels create conceptual and operational challenges for development agencies wanting to foster more effective governance. But these are the challenges of development—and embracing that institutions, interests, and incentives
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matter everywhere (and, indeed, every day) is the first step toward working effectively with governance issues.

Many development agencies have been reluctant to talk openly about politics and power, because it has been equated to “party politics,” conflicting with the mandate not to intervene in “political matters.” Dealing with power and politics is perceived as particularly sensitive—which, if poorly handled, can indeed be. But increasingly, development agencies recognize that political economy factors cannot only be dealt with tacitly. They have to be understood, and acted upon appropriately—and this implies precisely respecting the political setting that development agencies cannot avoid to be players in. Not paying attention to political economy factors is like choosing to be a pawn in a chess game without knowing the rules.

If the first step is to frame development in terms of politics, institutions, and power, then the second is to acknowledge that, actually, we know quite a lot about these matters. Social sciences—history, political science, economics, anthropology, sociology, etc.—have researched these themes for centuries. The recent ideas about governance and reforms stand on the shoulders of giants—from Lao Tzu, Plato, Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and far beyond to more contemporary figures. They do not all agree, nor are they necessarily right—but we do not have to reinvent the wheel to grasp what development is also about.

We can look further when we stand on the shoulders of others, but we should also recognize how little we know. We easily risk communicating poorly because we use concepts differently, or because we see things through a looking glass formed by our personal history, the society in which we grew up, and the institutions we have worked for. Acknowledging our relative ignorance and likely bias is a call for humility, but it is also a call for curiosity and genuine interest in the perspectives of others, and for working in teams that combine various professional disciplines.

What are some of the most fundamental insights we should recall about development, change, and reform in the areas of institutions, interests, and incentives, a.k.a. governance? Four basics are worth highlighting:

(1) **There are no singularly right answers.**

Development has, historically, taken place under very different governance conditions. Rule-based authority has only gradually replaced authority vested in persons over the last couple of centuries, starting in Europe, and linked predominantly to growing literacy and the development of tax systems necessary to fund standing armies. Not for nothing did Charles Tilly note that “war make states, and states make war.”

(2) **History matters.** Past choices shape today’s options, and today’s choices shape tomorrow’s. Often, development agencies and researchers look at countries and governance as snapshots—comparing the snapshot of one country with those of others. But development is not a snapshot, it is an unfolding story like a never-ending movie. Yesterday’s events—from armed conflicts to the way power has at some point been distributed, from where roads have been built first to how agriculture has been subsidized or not, and trade protected or not—are shaping the options available today. Choices of today create reinforcing feedback that will make it harder to choose different paths in the future. Sequencing of events matter, so does their duration and timing—and there are unintended consequences. Understanding a country and a context requires inquiry into its history.

(3) **Reform and change is a permanent journey in unknown terrain, not a destination.** A governance specialist trying to craft a support project to a national reform—for example decentralization—may think that the reform period is when the support will be active, for example 3–5 years. But surely, (centralization and) decentralization are fought over for decades, if not centuries, and most likely there were previous periods where the label “reform” was put on certain efforts. Reforms rarely, if ever, develop as intended—they are in many cases unintended, they take turns and move backward, then forward. Reforms seldom produce final “solutions”—they transform problems into new challenges.
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“Doing development differently is not about discarding implementation issues, but adding a different perspective—and drawing the operational implications only when relevant.”

(4) The “good governance” agenda is dead—long live more efficient governance and institutions for development. This is not about giving up being ambitious, not about giving up values about right and wrong, and certainly not about giving up that some answers to problems are better than others. The point is, there is no best solution on the shelves of history or of contemporary practice. There is no standardized, ideal long list of governance reforms that have to be implemented. Such ideals may not have worked anywhere anyway, and they may lead us to understand the “problem” as the gap between the ideal situation and the realities at hand, and the “solution” as filling this gap—instead of addressing specific governance bottlenecks in a manner informed by the dynamics that created the current situation.6

Analyzing, Assessing, and Designing Support for Reforms

The framing of development and governance thinking outlined above—often labeled “thinking and working politically”—is not a final analytical product.7 The macro context of a country or sector—its history, the structural factors, the main stakeholder groups, their interests and incentives, including incentives and interests of those who seek to intervene—may well be something to analyze only periodically.

The everyday thinking that has to be added to the above is much more granular and concrete, including ongoing assessments of three key elements:

• The effects of specific reforms on the distribution of power. A new community water supply scheme may at the same time provide incredible benefits to users and strengthen the power of community strongmen, who may control who gets water at what price.

• The readiness to change in a given context. Change happens when the power and capability behind the change is bigger than the resistance to change. The dynamics of this “change equation” will make or break reforms, sometimes before they start.

• How best to adopt and adapt designs of development agency programs and operations so that they stay clear of what agencies may rightly consider undesirable “political” outcomes, and “fit” the dynamics of the change readiness at hand.

This kind of thinking cannot stand alone. Governance and institutional development are specific (i.e., water and sanitation, or energy), and reforms must be informed by an array of technical, economic, environmental, and social analyses, ideas, and approaches from elsewhere, etc. Doing development differently is not about discarding important issues, but adding a different perspective—and drawing the operational implications only when relevant.

Effects of Reforms

When examining the effects of reforms, the powerful ideas of Nobel Laureate Douglass North and his colleagues may be useful.8 They distinguish between the few and very recent example of open access orders—societies where open access to economic and political organizations sustains economic and political competition and thereby the social order—and the “natural state” of “limited access social orders” that provide order by using the political system to limit economic entry to create rents for the insiders, and then use the rents to stabilize the political system and limit violence. Societies are likely to be a mixture of more open and more limited access systems and institutions. This perspective provides a handy way of thinking about reforms and change: are they, apart from their specific content, a step toward a more open access order where more citizens—in particular the poor—can become stronger economic and political actors

“Many reforms cannot be driven by an individual, the government, or by civil society on their own. Coalitions will often bring together different perspectives of the problems.”

– or are they, conversely, strengthening institutions in a political and economic order dominated by a small elite?

Unintended outcomes of reform are real risks. A centralized political system based mainly on patronage and extraction of rents may face pressure to decentralize, say, the provision of health and education services. In terms of power, such a reform could well strengthen the power of local “strongmen.” It may enhance their capability to build their local patronage network, e.g., by solidifying a system where doctors, nurses, and teachers must pay bribes to get a position; where patients and parents pay the same doctors, nurses, and teachers for what should be free services; companies pay to get contracts of e.g. supply of medicines, or construction works. The rents can then feed political campaigns and reward supporters directly or indirectly.

Change Readiness, Stakeholders, Coalitions, and Leadership

Institutional change and governance reform do not happen primarily because it is desirable, or because it is technically sound. They happen, put very crudely, when it is politically feasible—when the combined power of those with a positive interest in reform is bigger than the power of those opposing it. Change readiness is not about individual proclamations of commitment or opposition to a reform proposal—it is about the interests of different groups and individuals, their incentives to act and keep acting over time, as well as the resources and power they are likely to bring to the party.

What are power and resources in this context? Power and resources include (i) the ability to shape an agenda, (ii) exert formal and informal authority, (iii) manage networks of and access to influential individuals, (iv) direct flows of money, (v) utilize technical and managerial capabilities, and (vi) craft a relatively shared vision among key stakeholders of how to move forward (or how to prevent others from doing so). It includes the ability to transform crises to opportunities; even to create crisis as the necessary prelude to change.

Stakeholder analysis is often one of the recommended “tools” for assessing change readiness. Such may be helpful, but it rarely captures the essence. A president may have given her support to, say, the introduction of a medium-term expenditure framework. The ministry of finance may be enthusiastic, thinking it would give them greater power over sector ministries. But, alas, the president may have committed to 10 other reform ideas that same week, and may not really have the medium-term expenditure framework among the two that he or she will invest political capital in seeing through. Powerful sector ministries and their allies may quickly lean in on the ministry of finance—and may be powerful enough to convince the president to forget about the medium-term expenditure framework. A formal stakeholder analysis would most often not capture this—thinking politically about change readiness would.

Thus, it is necessary to get beyond superficial in advance confirmations that “political will” is available, or after observations lamenting “lack of political will” as the cause of reform failure. Instead, deeper assessments of the incentives and interests of those backing change are required—are they deeply committed to the long-term cause with little interest in seeking compromises, or pragmatically seeking advances for a longer term agenda while also pursuing the tactical battles of the day? Or are they opportunists sitting on the fence until they can see a tactical advantage in joining the fray—going back to the fence once the going gets tough? Equally, opponents may be passive, offer active resistance, or be opportunistic, depending on the salience of the issues for their interests.

Sometimes reforms or change do not happen even if the “power balance” is actually positive. There may be “collective action problems”—which many suffer from, but no individual or group have incentives strong enough to stop behavior that cause these, and they may have widely diverging views about the most appropriate solution to the problem they share. A simple example could be littering in public places, a complex one could be rush hour traffic congesting in a megacity.

In such situations, which arguably are quite frequent, the way forward may involve nourishing a “coalition of change.” Many reforms cannot be
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driven by an individual, or by the government, or by civil society on their own. Coalitions will often bring together different perspectives of the problems. But since everybody will only invest a smaller part of his or her political or social capital—the energy and resources available for these kinds of social or political ventures—the coalition may still be effective in overcoming collective action problems. There are plenty of examples of such coalition building—in land management, titling, and taxing based on transparent rules may attract support from owners, local and national government officials, and politicians. In natural resource management, e.g., a fishery community, where fishers and officials may accommodate their different interests and converge around a shared agenda to conserve the fish stocks they all depend on.

Broader reforms may rarely be the work of a single individual, but there is still a particular role of “leadership” in reforms. Concepts such as “change sponsor” and “change agent” are often invoked, sometimes in a “technical” way: they can be “officially appointed” in these capacities. This is not enough—change champions must have political and personal capital and visibly invest their reputation, their ability to pressure, etc. Change is most often painful and costly, and somebody has to pay the bill.

The concept of a “change entrepreneur” focuses on the personal capabilities of often charismatic individuals who relentlessly pursue an agenda, convince others, identify opportunities that few others see, and rally opinion, resources, and (the right) people behind a cause, and then turn ideas into actions. 10 This can either happen in the short term, or can take years.

Such individuals may unfortunately be rare, but giving space for bold leadership is essential for achieving change. Without leadership, governance and institutional reform is unlikely to happen.

Will it always be possible to find sufficient convergence to form a coalition that can overcome barriers to collective action? Will strong and canny leadership always be able to break through brick walls? History and a politically informed perspective will warn us against excessive optimism. Sometimes interests simply clash—if an elite is entrenched in predatory behavior, diverting huge rents from extractive industries to personal accounts, then there may be no convergence with others with a development agenda. Reform is not always feasible, every reform may have its time and place. Thinking and working politically is precisely facilitating understanding, and then acting within (i) the realities of complex and dynamic change readiness, (ii) the possible options of crafting coalitions, and (iii) the leadership available. It is not a remedy for introducing comprehensive reforms in settings where this is not possible.

### Approaches to and Design of Support to Governance and Institutional Reforms

Successful reforms require power or energy—it is not enough that they are “needed” from some technical or economic point of view. Moreover, power and energy must largely come from national players—outsiders can nudge, inspire, accompany, support, facilitate, broker or even threaten, but they rarely have sufficient “embedded power” to drive reforms. Geopolitical security and market forces can shape strong incentives to act—but eventually, national players have to drive the action.

There are a number of operational implications for development agency staff following from these insights:

- **Help partners sequence and prioritize their reforms, do not impose an agenda.** In some cases, a reform agenda may harness support from dominant power-holders in a country, making it possible to introduce sweeping, “big bang” reforms. This, however, is the exception. Most reforms tend to take place incrementally.

- **Whatever the nature and “speed” of reforms, they will always be contested, and often radical reforms in more stable polities will not fly.** Or the adoption of multiple, simultaneous reforms—however logical and interconnected they may seem—may overstretch both the political and the technical and/or administrative capacity required to implement them. We have seen this in rich and poor countries alike.

- **Development agencies have had a tendency to recommend what has often been laundry lists of desired reforms, including in fragile settings where political contestation still runs high and all sorts of capacities are low.** 11 This is not helpful—but
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sequencing and prioritizing reform to match both the available “power surplus” for reforms and the needed capabilities is a daunting task. It makes sense to focus on the feasible and most critical—but which of these are hard to determine and not an objective issue free of political interests. Helping national partners negotiate a prioritized agenda can be immensely beneficial, but there is no blueprint for this—it requires everyday attention to the political and social dynamics in a given setting—and the humility to reckon that the national players must agree on the answers, because it is their interests and issues that are at stake.

There are more than political issues involved: technically, reforms may be closely interconnected (e.g., devolution of functions to local levels can set the course for future “silos” if not conceived in a context of fiscal decentralization). Again, there is no right answer, except investing in finding the appropriate one. Learning from both successful and failed endeavors elsewhere is a critical part of the process—not to “copy and paste,” but to learn about the many unforeseen factors that pop up and lead to, or block changes.

Consider adaptive and flexible approaches to support reforms. Rigid results frameworks—whether as policy triggers to release funding tranches, or as preset outputs and outcomes—have strengths because they force attention to the details where the devils of reform processes are often hiding. But unless carefully crafted and managed, they may build on an assumption that reforms—like engineering projects—can be drawn up in a linear fashion where A is followed by B that leads to C, and so on.

Reforms are more like soccer games. Competing teams have different strategies, and during the game these are likely to change as one team will be more successful than the other. The problem—how do we win this match—does not have a predefined solution that the coach will have to follow. Even the objective may change—from wanting to win it may be lowered to a draw.

If reforms follow unpredictable paths and end in places unimagined, if they have high intensity periods and nearly dormant breaks—then effective support to reforms need to be adaptive and flexible, and often iterative. This is what has been labelled a “searchers” approach to development, as opposed to a “planners” approach.\textsuperscript{12}

For many development agencies, it is a challenge to build sufficient flexibility, adaptiveness and short-term learning loops from prototyping and pilot processes into operations. The incentives in and interests of agencies are often driving staff to prioritize upward accountability for achieving predefined results (including disbursement results and building up a pipeline of future operations), rather than investing heavy in accompanying messy implementation processes on the ground.

This said, experienced staff in most development agencies are able to find their way “around the system,” if necessary. They may craft sequences of support using different and complimentary modalities. Agency offices in-country may be empowered to adapt support within certain limits. Consultants may be paid not for being in-country in a given period, but for having delivered just-in-time advice and technical inputs explicitly and verifiably requested by the client at a time appropriate to the client.

No new orthodoxy. Should reforms always be incremental, even timid? Should support always be flexible, are more linear approaches and robust results frameworks never the appropriate answer? Are agency staff always squeezed in the middle between the needs and realities they can see on the ground, and the incentives, interest, and institutional factors that shape the arena for their work?

Of course not. The successful worldwide reform-wave dismantling public sector telecom monopolies have benefitted from hardwired results, tight timetables, and considerable consultant inputs building on global practice. There may also have been associated rent-seeking in some countries—who got licenses on which terms? But overall, these reforms have been driven through based on explicit political decisions backed by the necessary power.

The point is that only a politically informed analysis can determine what is best in a given situation. Being flexible and adaptive is not a new orthodoxy—but thinking critically and broadly about it, often across disciplines, to find a good balance between more planned and more emerging or flexible approaches—that is, indeed, the universal call.

Ownership in Practice

Thinking and working politically is not new. It confirms well-known concepts like “ownership”—but seeks to bring these concepts down to earth, into the daily work of agency staff working with governance and institutional issues across sectors. This is not without tensions—awareness about the tensions, open-minded attention to the incentives and interests of everybody, including oneself, is the fundamental step. A number of specific issues are highlighted below.

**The reform is not the project—look for the actual owners.** A problematic tendency in the relation between agencies and national actors is when reforms become synonymous with the project of a development agency, becoming, in practice and discourse, creatures of the agency. This may be the reality—in which case national ownership is likely to be very limited or fragmented so that reforms are bound to fail anyway. But it may also reflect agency incentives to control processes and to display reforms, to taxpayers or funders, as “theirs.” In a few cases, shielding a reform from attack by making it an agency project may be helpful—but in the majority of cases it will make it an island of apparent success, and undermine the ownership of national stakeholders that are the foundation for longer term sustainability and impact. If several development agencies compete in a sector, it may do more harm than good to governance and institutional strengthening.

Most development agencies claim that they are supporting national projects, rather than having their own. Checking whether this actually is true, and determining when and how to move closer to real national ownership in daily, operational practice, is an essential part of thinking and working politically.

**Technical assistance: navigating the Bermuda triangle.** In principal–agency theory—and in management literature—it is normal to observe the difficulties involved in serving several masters at the same time. Technical assistance (TA) is most often recruited and contracted by development agencies while working, on a daily basis, under the management of a national partner, most often a government official.

This is, from any viewpoint—be it loyalty, client confidentiality, or management authority—is a messy setup. Consultants may typically react in four ways to the challenges: (i) sticking to the terms of reference—a kind of bureaucratic response, risking delivering the wrong products at the wrong time; (ii) identify with the development agency (“don’t bite the hand that feeds you”); (iii) identify with the national partners (but then risk losing the confidence of the development agency); or (iv) try to manage the tensions on behalf of everybody, having a slightly different discourse when they talk to the national partner and to the agency.

None of these reactions are ideal. Bringing TA, national, and agency staff together, during implementation, to level out expectations and identify where more flexibility would be warranted, would often be a better course. This requires all those involved to be willing to look at their roles and relations.

Of course, national authorities could also contract their own TA, if funded by development agencies. Some do, but for many governments the procurement process related to international consultancy is still difficult, and they may rather prefer agencies perform this task. The key challenge then, is how best to set the TA “free” to deliver when it is timely, and in a manner that products are fully appropriated by national partners.

**Diagnosis, design, and delivery roles and relations.** Development agencies often want their own analyses and a strong hand in the design of their operations, for some good and some less good reasons.

For due diligence reasons, agencies need sound diagnostics for their investment decisions, as well as designs that are sound technically, financially, environmentally, socially, and gender-wise. The problem comes if both diagnosis and design are neither owned by the partners to an “appropriate” degree—and for institutional and governance aspects, this means a rather complete ownership. If a diagnosis concludes that a ministry has to change its functions and structure, and the design is implying that this will lay off some staff, then the way the diagnosis and design is owned or disowned by different actors will make the whole difference when it comes to implementation.

This seems straightforward in theory. Only the top quarter of a class appreciate being assessed in exams, the bottom quarter hates it. Being assessed by others is always sensitive. A poor, but owned, self-assessment may take us longer on a road of change than an expert assessment of us made by others.

In practice, it is not that straightforward. It is a specialized competence to make assessments, terms of references, or results matrices that will...
pass smoothly through the approval processes in agencies. Often, agency documents will then confirm that “consultations” with national partners have taken place.

Ownership in practice often demands much more. If national authorities are really to be in the driver’s seat—not for the sake of it, but to make the journey successful through implementation—they may have to play a much bigger role. Making that happen is not easy—national partners are most often civil servants with a full-time day job running an organization, while agency staff, so to speak, have nothing else to do than to analyze, assess, design, and write up documents.

Working successfully with institutions and governance may sometimes demand that this traditional model be turned upside-down—that development agencies and staff, down to smallest details, act as supporters to a national endeavor, rather than ending up waiting for national partners to support the endeavors of the agency.

Making Space, Being an ‘Intrapreneur’

Where is the starting point for acknowledging and working with the political economy, politics, power, incentives, and interests? The answer is simple: start looking at the mirror. Understanding and finding space to work differently within your own agency is both an excellent learning field for working politically, and a place where you can be an internal, “domestic” actor.

There is most likely more space than commonly assumed for trying to nudge your agency in the direction of more politically informed, problem-based, flexible, and adaptive approaches when working with governance and institutions. Most likely, there are also quite a number of colleagues who are working in this manner when relevant. Possible things to do may include:

- Identify development entrepreneurs who can work proactively and creatively to form coalitions and getting those sitting on the fence to join and stay.
- Search for ways of expanding your own room for maneuver—add a day or two to missions to learn from unusual national partners and sources; visit universities; form teams with colleagues in country missions and/or offices. Find ways to change the routine.
- Look at your inbox and prioritize communication that reaches out of your agency, drop some of the internal stuff that does not make a difference.
- Be inspiring—tell stories about what is difficult and what did not work as well as intended. Remember that stories of unqualified success are not inspiring, they would never make it to a publication for which people have to pay.
- Think politically, ask the hard questions, listen more (and maybe talk less!). Be critical as to what constitutes success—do not look only at what worked and did not work from what you did, look also at what made it work or not work.

It is easy to dismiss the options above as too challenging—after all, agency staff are not recruited to be autonomous mavericks trying constantly to change the culture of the organization which recruited them. Many of those tempted by work in development agencies may well, by inclination, look for orderly and planned approaches to development—we are not all naturally born change entrepreneurs, or easily coping with complex webs of interest, incentives and institutions.

That said, we can all question our assumptions and the assumptions of others, including those behind this brief. We can actively identify personal everyday challenges, big and small, for how we can work better to foster development. Development in itself is such a big challenge that nothing less would be good enough.

“...There is likely more space than commonly assumed for trying to nudge your agency in the direction of more politically informed, problem-based, flexible, and adaptive approaches.”
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