

# Democracy and Ownership in Nepal

GRIPS, May 22, 2008  
Annette Skovsted Hansen  
University of Aarhus  
ostash@hum.au.dk



## Main point:

- In 1990, Nepal held general elections. This democratic turn fostered expectations among international partners and a broader Nepalese public of a people's ownership of ideas. Popular protests became a way for Nepalese people to exercise ownership when experiences of donor interventions, democratically elected governments, subsequent Maoist insurgencies, and royal responses did not meet expectations.



# Hydro Energy Potential

- Expectations of potential riches for Nepalese people
- Historically:
  - Electricity has been a luxury item from Rana times
  - Sustained high end user cost
  - ODA hydro power projects have been large
  - Private sector involvement
- Plans for ARUN III with estimated cost of US\$1.1 bill.
  - Awareness of smaller more inexpensive alternatives with local jobs and investment opportunities
  - No government interference on behalf of local interests
  - Popular protest
  - Abandoned ARUN III in 1995

Annette Skovsted Hansen  
ostash@hum.au.dk



# Discussion Input I

In the case of Nepal, a combination of

- 1) alternatives (democracy and locally rooted energy supply) offered by the international community and**
- 2) the discrepancies between the expectations to these alternatives and the disappointments with the concrete implementation (cost, lack of influence, basket-funding)**

has angered a segment of the population enough to take charge through popular movements to influence decision making and institution building (ARUN III and

political unrest specifically in 2006

Annette Skovsted Hansen  
ostash@hum.au.dk



## Discussion Input II

---

### International Community Role

1. Offer inspiration of alternatives
2. Know when to step back and let the local community take charge

Annette Skovsted Hansen  
ostash@hum.au.dk



## Chronology of Donor Entry

---


1960s	Japan and Norway
1970s	Denmark
1980s	Finland
1990s	Sweden and Denmark and Norway increased their profile considerably

Annette Skovsted Hansen  
ostash@hum.au.dk




Country	Sector Involvement in Nepal
Denmark	Education, Natural resource Management/Environment Energy, Human Rights/Good Governance/ Decentralization and Private sector cooperation, Support through NGOs,
Norway	Energy/hydropower, Water supply, Education, Ministry to Ministry Co-operation, Support through NGOs, research
Finland	Water supply and sanitation, energy, education, forestry, environment.
Japan	Economic infrastructure, agriculture, social sector, and disaster relief and mitigation
Sweden	Water supply and energy

Annette Skovsted Hansen  
ostash@hum.au.dk



Country	Main ODA objectives	Strategy	Sectors of Assistance in Nepal
Denmark	Promote sustainable economic growth, social development based on improved living conditions, respect for the rule of law, good governance	Based on the country specific strategy (time frame of five years) that is negotiated with partners in the country in question and discussed with Danish interest group before being submitted to the Danish Parliament	Education, Natural Resource Management/Environment Energy, Human Rights/Good Governance/ Decentralization and Private sector cooperation, Support through NGOs, Basket funding and donor co-ordination
Norway	Reduction of poverty, stimulation of economic growth, promotion of sustainable development and human resources, human rights and democracy	Selected regions are focused and an emphasis on Norway's aid policies to be integrated with that of the recipient country	Energy/hydropower, Water supply, Education, Basket funding, Ministry to Ministry Co-operation, Support through NGOs, research
Finland	Promotion of global security, reduction of widespread poverty, promotion of human rights and democracy, prevention of global and environmental problems, promotion of economic interaction	Country strategy paper and an emphasis on long term commitments from the partner	Water supply and sanitation, energy, education, forestry, environment, basket funding
Japan	Annette Skovsted Hansen ostash@hum.au.dk		Economic infrastructure, agriculture, social sector and disaster relief and mitigation



# Basket Funding in Education

---

- International community argument
  - Reflect donor harmonization
  - Promote national ownership, management, and accountability
  - However, donor disagreement:
    - Norway, Denmark, and Finland in favor of basket funding
    - Japan opposed
- Local expectations of access and influence
  
- Issues of Transparency
  - Who has access to information?

