



Informed citizenry, accountable government and effective management of oil resources

Leyla Karimli's presentation

at the Thirteenth Annual World Convention Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN) New York City, April 10-12th 2008







<u>Research question</u>: what are policy options for direct public participation in management of oil resources in Azerbaijan?

Main assumptions:

- resource curse is not inevitable (e.g. Botswana, Indonesia)
- transparent and accountable management of oil resources is a significant, if not necessary, component in a struggle against the "resource curse"
- in countries marked with endemic structural problems regarding representation and legitimacy, direct public participation might be more effective than participation through NGO and other representative structures



Limitations



- limitations due to data availability do not allow testing relationship between poverty and oil-dependence in Azerbaijan
- there is no empirical evidence that transparent and accountable management of oil resources helped avoiding resource curse
- the study addresses only one of the variables that one might make use of in the struggle against a "resource curse" in Azerbaijan - improved transparency and accountability in use of oil resources



Problem description



Danger of "resource curse" in Azerbaijan:

- resource dependence indicators
- inequality

Transparency and accountability to avoid the "resource curse":

- SOFAZ
- EITI

Direct citizen participation vs. participation through representatives:

- representative body of public must have legitimate and formalized role
- limitations of representation through NGO



Policy alternatives



Directly dispensing oil revenues in form of cash payment:

- Alaska
- Alberta

Fiscal decentralization:

- municipalities directly taxing oil industry
- municipalities receiving direct transfers of share of the central government's oil revenues
- municipalities receiving indirect transfers from the state budget

Public hearings:

- Caspian Revue Watch
- deliberative democracy



Projecting outcomes of policy alternatives



	ALTERNATIVES				
PROJECTED OUTCOMES	Status quo/Present situation	Alternative I (direct distribution)	Alternative II (decentralization)	Alternative III (public hearing)	
Transparency	Less	Less	Depends	Greater	
Potential for citizens to request information	Less	Less	Greater	Greater	
Reporting to citizens	Not regular, indirect	Regular, indirect	Regular, direct	Not required	
Accountability	Less	Less	Higher	Higher	
 Potential for citizens to influence decisions 	Less	Less	Higher	Higher	
System via which to channel citizens' complaints	Does not exist	Does not exist	Exists	Exists	





	POLICY ALTERNATIVES			
INDICATORS	Status-quo	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III
Does it allow for direct citizen participation?	Disclosing information about management of oil revenues does not require the direct participation of citizens	Allows for direct participation if decisions are made via referenda	Given the electoral problems and institutional challenges, direct participation of citizens will vary among municipalities	Allows for direct participation, yet incentives for participation still need to be examined





	POLICY ALTERNATIVES			
INDICATORS	Status-quo	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III
Does it promote greater accountability of decision-makers regarding the citizen?	There is little (if any) room for citizens to influence decisions. A system by which to channel citizens' complaints is non-existent	Even though citizens might have more incentives to exercise their rights, greater accountability will need reforms increasing parliamentary oversight	Citizens elect local government. Hence they have the power to hold it accountable. This, however, is subject to further reforms, ones strengthening institutional mechanisms (reporting to citizens, channeling citizen's complaints, etc.)	Provides citizens with a formalized forum via which to express their preferences and communicate complaints. Yet final decision-making does not lie with the people. Neither do they have any electoral leverage.





	POLICY ALTERNATIVES			
INDICATORS	Status-quo	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III
Is it politically feasible?	Yes	Major risks of "crony appointments" and mis-management in the absence of a strong Parliament	Yes. Decentralization and the development of local self-governance is one of the priorities had by the current administration	Is feasible if authorization from central authorities is obtained





	POLICY ALTERNATIVES			
INDICATORS	Status-quo	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III
How easy is it to build up technical capacity	Technical capacity is in place	The Oil Fund is already established. Additional capacity and costs will be needed to set up a nation-wide database and hold a referendum. Parliament's overseeing capacities need improving	Fiscal decentralization will improve the amount of resources available to the country. Continual efforts and substantial aid is vital to help build up the technical capacities of municipalities	Some technical capacity is available (at SPPRED, NGO and municipality levels). Additional capacity is needed to balance various public preferences with technical or scientific assessments/consi derations







- Strengthen parliamentary oversight
- Improve elections
- Evolve more responsibilities to municipal level
- Build people's trust towards governance structure



http://www.policy.hu/karimli



