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Participatory approaches have been incorporated at the project level for a long time. With shift to programmatic forms of support in context of Poverty Reduction Strategy Program, the last three years have seen the increasing realization that programmatic and policy based lending should involve a strong element of country ownership and participatory approaches should be adapted at a macro level.

To face the challenge of development of country owned and driven Poverty Reduction strategies, the Social Development Department in collaboration with many other institutions and networks initiated an Action Learning Program on participatory approaches at macro level. The program learns from initiatives on participation at macro level and encourages learning and action in the context of programmatic activities.

As a part of the Action Learning program, an international workshop on "Voices and Choices at a Macro level: Participation in country owned Poverty Reduction strategies" was organized. This enabled macro participation practitioners from about 20 countries to share ideas, cases and experiences with key decision makers from Governments including many finance ministers, civil servants, parliamentarians, civil society organizations, donors and resource institutions. This interaction has been synthesized in this report on the workshop proceedings and offers interesting options for participatory approaches at macro level. The report also traces the developments in participating countries since the workshop and highlights areas where learning during the workshop has influenced practice.

I hope that you will find the information and analysis presented in the report useful for future work on deepening participatory approaches at the macro level.

Steen Lau Jorgenson
Director
Social Development Department
The World Bank
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‘There is immense pressure to move quickly: the world is impatient. But we should recognize that there will often be a tradeoff between moving fast and the genuinely participatory approach that is central to the new approach. If we fail to allow the time to genuinely open the process to different development actors and to the poor themselves, in the design, implementation and monitoring of poverty reduction strategies we might win some immediate battles, but we’d lose the long-run war to develop the accountable institutions that are essential to poverty reduction. Drafting strategy papers in Washington that are subsequently signed off by governments in the name of the people should be a thing of the past.’

-- James D. Wolfensohn, President, World Bank

1.1 Participation at the macro level

For poverty reduction strategies to be implemented in a sustained and effective manner they need to be nationally owned, as opposed to being donor-driven. 'Country' ownership refers not only to government but spans a wide cross-section of non-government actors. The process of preparing and implementing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and monitoring their implementation, thus needs to be participatory. However, implementation of participatory approaches at the macro level is a challenge.

Participation at the macro level can increase the transparency of decision-making, improve government accountability to the people, and as a result, increase the overall governance and economic efficiency of developmental activities. Participation is the process through which stakeholders influence and share control over priority setting, policy-making, resource allocations and access to public goods and services. Participation helps produce poverty reduction outcomes.

Poverty diagnostics, public expenditure management, macroeconomic reform, and monitoring and evaluation can all be done effectively and efficiently with meaningful participation. These four areas make up the "building block approach" to participatory processes (Box 1). They represent the range of options for participatory processes at the macro level.

Participatory processes at the macro level involve three key transitions. The first transition is from participation in a micro (project) context to a macro (policy and program) context. Secondly, this involves moving from community consultations to civic engagement with local and national stakeholders, parliamentarians and across
government institutions. Finally, participation has advanced from using participatory methods to influencing poverty reduction outcomes. These approaches involve going beyond a consultation process for producing a document (i.e., PRSP) to a process that focuses on formulation, implementation and monitoring of poverty reduction strategies.

The Action Learning Program (ALP) on Participatory approaches at macro level, particularly in context of programmatic lending and PRSP, is an initiative of the Social Development Department of the World Bank. The program learns from Bank and non Bank initiatives on participatory approaches being implemented at the macro level in various contexts, documents various innovations and approaches and encourages learning and action in the context of Bank operations.

One of the key outputs of the ALP was a workshop held in April 2001 on *Voices and Choices at a Macro Level: Participation In Country-Owned Poverty Reduction Strategies*. Innovations and institutional application of participatory approaches at the macro-level were introduced and shared at the workshop. The workshop centered on designing a participatory process at the macro level which moves from inputs to outputs to outcomes to impact using the four building blocks. The workshop contributed to introducing outcome-oriented participatory approaches and towards building institutional capacity within country governments and civil society to use them at the macro level.

This report shares the knowledge and learning accumulated at the ALP workshop about the range of participatory approaches being applied and tested all over the world at the macro level in poverty diagnostics, public expenditure management, macroeconomic policy formulation and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. The report records an overview of the participatory approach, its outcomes, country case examples, and challenges as prepared for and presented by experienced practitioners at the workshop. Other significant outputs from the ALP are also listed.

**Participation is the process through which stakeholders influence and share control over priority setting, policy-making, resource allocations and access to public goods and services**

This report is organized into six sections and three appendices. The remainder of this first section provides an overview of the ALP workshop in more detail. Sections 2-5 focus on application of participatory approaches at the macro level using country case studies to demonstrate the context, process and outcomes: section 2 presents participatory approaches and their application in poverty diagnosis; section 3 elaborates on participatory approaches and their application in public expenditure management; section 4 details participatory approaches in macroeconomic reform and section 5 describes participatory processes in monitoring implementation and results of policies.
The sixth and final section presents a postscript on key considerations for designing participatory processes at the macro level. It also highlights how workshop learning has influenced practice in some of the participating countries, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and donor institutions. The annexes provide reference material, the conference agenda and a list of participants. This Report, as well as Conference background documents, country cases and other related resources, is available on the Participation website (www.worldbank.org/participation).

1.2 Overview of workshop on Participatory Processes in Poverty Reduction Strategies

At the workshop, 160 participants from over 20 countries, 15 NGOs and nine donor agencies convened to learn, share innovative experiences and design participatory processes at the macro level including formulation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) using the four building blocks. Countries represented include Albania, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Ghana, India, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Philippines, The Gambia, the United States, Uganda, and Vietnam. See Appendix A for a list of participants.

Participants were from multiple disciplines and included more than 25 finance ministers, deputy finance ministers, cabinet secretaries, members of parliament and other senior officials who are leading the PRSP process in their countries. Representatives from more than 15 local, national and international NGOs (including ActionAid, World Vision, Public Affairs Centre (PAC), Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), Development Initiatives for Social and Human Action and Uganda Debt Network) also attended as did staff from donor agencies including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Department of International Development, UK (DFID), Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), Austrian Development Cooperation, German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), African Development Bank (AFDB), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the World Bank.

The ALP workshop utilized an innovative workshop design. It included building-block sessions, information marketplace sessions and group learning, and country case studies. Building-block sessions included plenary and break-out sessions featuring experienced practitioners from around the world who discussed the context and methods in which they successfully applied participatory processes at the macro level.

During information marketplace and group learning, country teams brainstormed application of building block principles and methods to their own countries. Practitioners from building block sessions were available as resource persons to join country meetings as requested. Country teams
explored which of the participatory approaches offered for each of the four building blocks would (or would not) be appropriate for them and what specific conditions would be necessary for successful application. This lively setting was a great exchange of ideas and a forum for making mutual contacts for future work in participating countries.

During country case studies, presenters described in detail the process through which their respective countries successfully applied participatory approaches at the macro level. Participant discussions included clarification of opportunities and constraints that others have faced.

The United Kingdom's Department of International Development (DFID), Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), and the World Bank funded the workshop. The Participation and Civic Engagement Group in the Social Development Department of the World Bank organized the workshop as part of the Action Learning Program.
2.1 A participatory approach to poverty diagnostics

A participatory approach to poverty diagnostics involves enabling poor communities and their institutions to participate effectively in defining, analyzing and monitoring poverty as they experience it. It means developing a broader choice of poverty actions based on the specific concerns of the poor in each country and regional context. It integrates quantitative and qualitative data for analysis to initiate civic engagement processes and define priority areas for poverty reduction strategies. Box 2 lists the outcomes of using a participatory approach in poverty diagnostics.

**Box 2: Expected Outcomes from Participatory Poverty Diagnostics at Macro Level**

- Choice of poverty actions based on specific concerns of the poor including vulnerability, insecurity and governance.
- Development of qualitative indicators of well-being based on perceptions and analysis by the poor people.
- Integration of quantitative and qualitative aspects of poverty actions in defining specific interventions in Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS).
- Incorporation of non-income aspects of poverty and empowerment related public actions in PRS.
- Better targeting of poverty reduction programs/interventions to arrive at the best fit between poverty profile and poverty actions.
- Civic engagement and participatory processes, which enable poor communities and their institutions to participate effectively in poverty diagnosis, analysis and monitoring.
  
  Institutionalization within government of participatory processes for poverty analysis, poverty action design and poverty monitoring.

Experience shows that poverty reduction strategies are more likely to be meaningful to the poor if participatory diagnostics are used to broaden the analysis of poverty to include, for example, issues of vulnerability, assets, gender, and intra-household inequalities. The participatory diagnostics should try to explain, and not just describe, poverty. For example in Vietnam, the PPA resulted in a broader scope for poverty analysis and suggested priority actions for poverty reduction expressed by the poor (see Box 3). Likewise, in Mongolia, a number of priorities for public policy and action emerged from the participatory livings standards assessment (PLSA). In particular, the PLSA found an emergence of multiple sources of insecurity and vulnerability as a result of privatization of state-owned enterprises and pastoral collectives. In view of rapid depletion of livestock-related assets and livelihoods in rural areas, the PLSA identified the need for communal livestock and herd management systems and micro insurance (see Box 4).
Box 3: Vietnam Participatory Poverty Assessment
Defines Priority Actions for the Poor

Context: Four Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs) took place between July 1998 and April 1999 in Vietnam. These PPAs involved more than 1000 households in four very different parts of Vietnam in a process of research, which focused on issues of well-being and poverty. Four agencies with considerable experience in qualitative research in Vietnam Actionaid, Oxfam (GB), Save the Children Fund (UK), and the Vietnam-Sweden Mountain Rural Development Program (MRDP) facilitated the studies. The PPA work was done in partnership with central and local governments, with donors and NGOs. The aim was to have one PA that would serve the needs for all these groups. The PA was a product of the joint Government-donor-NGOPoverty Working Group (PWG), which includes representatives from eight government agencies.

Process: The PPA was conducted using teams for the fieldwork, analysis and write-ups. The PWG met one day a month to discuss methodology, findings, and to review early drafts. PWG meetings were co-chaired by government and donor agencies (on a rotating basis). The PWG traveled to all four PPA provinces for workshops held to discuss and debate PPA findings.

Outcomes: The PPA findings have resulted in a broader scope for poverty analysis and suggest priority actions for poverty reduction, including:

- Prioritizing interventions which will increase and stabilize agricultural and off-farm incomes;
- For poor migrants, equalizing access to government services;
- Improving the targeting of interventions towards the poor households, minimizing the extent to which better-connected households receive preferential access to services and resources, and improving the transparency of beneficiary identification for government programs;
- Investigating the processes for levying fees and contributions at the commune level. Actions are being considered to rationalize the system;
- Prioritizing access to more information about household entitlements and on government plans, services, decisions and programs;
- Improving infrastructure, particularly those aspects which provide better access for isolated communities;
- Involving poor households in the decisions which affect them;
- Prioritizing interventions which help poor children to attend and complete school;
- For all households, but for the elderly in particular, improving access to affordable health care; and
- Achieving a secure and harmonious family and community environment for children.

Box 4: Mongolia PLSA Leads to Developing Strategy for Rural Development

Context: The National Statistical Office of Mongolia (NSO), with the support of the World Bank and other international agencies, conducted a Participatory Living Standards Assessment (PLSA) in Mongolia in 2000. It was intended to inform national policy, in part as an essential building block for Mongolia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). Specifically, it established a poverty profile and prioritized actions for public policy. It aimed to complement and, where possible, update earlier poverty analysis carried out on the basis of two Living Standards Measurement Surveys (LSMS).

Process: A DFID-funded trainer supported training and fieldwork. During actual fieldwork, a mid-term workshop was held with the teams to share preliminary findings. The teams reconvened for a synthesis workshop to review findings and outline a detailed report upon completion of the fieldwork phase.

Presentations of preliminary results were made at relevant conferences, workshops and separate briefings to Members of Parliament, governors, and senior representatives of all government ministries, local NGOs and other civil society groups, donor agencies and leading international NGOs working in Mongolia. Briefings were also provided to local government officials (at all levels) in the field sites before and after the fieldwork by the team. This provided important feedback to the local administration on the findings from their constituency.

Once completed, the full draft PLSA report was circulated widely. A national-level consultation workshop was also held.

Finally, to promote public debate on poverty and public and private actions, a media competition was held. The competition was opened to all journalists in print and broadcast media and recognized the single best piece of published or broadcast coverage of poverty/living standards in Mongolia.

Outcomes: To help create an enabling environment within which people may achieve more secure and sustainable livelihoods, the PLSA suggests a number of priorities for public policy and action. These include:

9 A focus on ways of reducing vulnerability, including facilitating access to assets for the poor and investment in public and private actions to reduce risk in pastoral livestock production (for example, livestock and herd management systems and micro insurance);
9 Improvements in the provision of social services and infrastructure, particularly in rural areas and smaller urban centers, to enhance their effectiveness and increase community involvement; and
9 Promoting access to information and giving greater voice to communities in establishing priorities in patterns of public spending.

2.2 How do participatory approaches in participatory poverty assessment lead to more and better poverty reduction actions?

Collecting information and data for the participatory poverty assessment (PPA) is critical but not enough. Once the poverty assessment is completed, its priorities for action must be translated into specific recommendations for policy change and used to identify issues for dialogue and civic engagement. The poverty analysis should be directly linked to subsequent policy discussion – from setting priorities to costing and budgeting. In Vietnam (Box 3), for example, PPA findings have widened the policy debate on poverty and resulted in many of the identified priority issues being directly addressed in subsequent government strategies. In Uganda, a recommendation from the PPA to increase credit for agricultural production targeted at women producers resulted in a policy change. The Uganda's Participatory Poverty Assessment Process (UPPAP) stimulated policy responses in a number of broad areas (see Box 5).

There are several options for linking poverty assessments, both qualitative and quantitative, with policy formulation, public action choices, budget decisions and monitoring and evaluation. Box 6 depicts a brief overview of some of the options that have been used.

2.3 How can participatory poverty diagnostics be linked to and improve public action choices, policy choices and poverty reduction outcomes?

The poverty diagnostic should draw as much as possible on existing data, methods, and analytical capacity from earlier poverty assessments and other poverty-related studies (e.g., 'Voices of the Poor'). This saves governments time and money by using what they already have and by tapping existing local capacity to fill data gaps. Combining qualitative and quantitative data and methods is efficient and effective. Participatory analysis can be linked with econometric studies and household surveys in many ways. Vietnam and Mongolia are good case examples. In Vietnam (Box 3), the PPA complemented the statistical data from the Vietnam Living Standard Survey to explain emerging trends in the most disadvantaged areas and to gather the perspectives of the poorer households. Likewise, in Mongolia (Box 4), the PLSA was designed to complement and, where possible, update earlier poverty analysis carried out on the basis of two Living Standards Measurement Surveys (LSMS).

Getting data and feedback, however important, is not enough. To be effective, the participatory process for PPA should be designed to convert findings into policy choices and link them to mechanisms of civic engagement. Sharing this information with multiple stakeholders at all levels facilitates dialogue and initiates further civic engagement to move policy choices to action.
Box 5: Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Stimulates Policy Response

Context: Uganda’s Participatory Poverty Assessment Process (UPPAP) originated in a context where poverty was becoming a key priority for the government. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) developed in 1996 and launched in 1997, was a policy statement of how government intended to mainstream poverty concerns in almost all areas of policy and implementation. The adoption of the PEAP was the beginning of a process intended to mainstream poverty concerns across the actions of government.

Locating UPPAP in the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) has been a critical factor in its success. MFPED has strong leadership which has shown willingness to take up new ideas, embark on reform processes, and importantly, take on the political negotiation necessary to move them forward. The integration of the planning and budget process in Uganda is strong – which enhances the potential impact of the policy process in general.

Process: Research on experiences using PPAs in other countries were incorporated as lessons into Uganda's PPA. To ensure that the PPA findings were linked to policy, a three-year process was designed, which incorporated processes to link the findings both with central and district level policy making. The focus on districts was particularly important in the decentralised context of Uganda where increasingly, responsibility for service delivery is being passed to local governments. The first year involved carrying out a ‘national’ PPA with communities in nine of the forty-five districts in Uganda. In the second year it was envisaged that at a national level, dissemination of the findings would continue, while within the nine districts, the findings of the research would be followed up and activities undertaken to sustain the use of participatory methods to inform planning of the priorities of the poor. In the third year of the process a second national PPA was planned.

Outcomes: Specifically, the UPPAP findings have stimulated policy responses in a number of broad areas:

- Redefinition of government priorities of (i.e., the original areas of priority under the PEAP were confirmed, but safe water has received significantly more resources, and the actions to improve security, governance and public service delivery to the poor have become central features of the new PEAP);

- Identification of missing links in the processes of policy implementation (i.e., weakness in information flows, the need for budget flexibility to allow lower level governments to respond to local priorities and political accountability);

- Shifts in the focus of sector policies to be increasingly pro-poor (i.e., agricultural policy); and

- Highlighting key inter-sectoral areas important to tackling poverty that current structures of Government are not well equipped to handle (i.e., nutrition, sanitation, information).

Box 6: Options for Linking Poverty Assessment with Policy Formulation, Budget Decisions and Monitoring and Evaluation

9 Encourage discussion about poverty among cabinet ministers and parliamentarians to create a more widely owned PRS, which represents the perspectives of people with differing knowledge and experience.

9 The PRSP coordinating body could devote targeted efforts for the analysis of poverty data to design the process for formulating a PRSP, selecting priority actions for poverty reduction and allocating suitable resources for these activities.

9 High quality PPAs can increase dialogue and negotiation on poverty at the policy level; increase ownership and commitment to policy delivery on the part of different civil society groups; and strengthen links between communities and policymakers. Establish a compact between the government and its citizens for a shared diagnosis of poverty.

➢ Map out institutional and policy specific linkages to poverty trends and dynamics in country.

9 In order to do this, donors could provide technical assistance for the training of local people, particularly civil society organizations, think tanks and community organizations, in participatory processes for poverty analysis and in policy-making processes so that the two can be linked.

9 Donors could also provide technical support in designing a public information strategy to disseminate poverty data, so that stakeholders are made aware of the types of issues emerging and the extent.


Experiences with participatory approaches underscore the importance of institutional mechanisms to anchor and backstop the process. The institutional location of and responsibility for the PPA is critical to ensure sustainability of poverty reduction. It creates the Links to policy action in budget allocations and policy adoption. Governments that have institutionalized poverty analysis are better prepared to undertake continuous poverty monitoring and trace changes in well-being and effects of policies. In Vietnam (Box 4), the PPA was embedded in an influential process that involved many of the important agencies in local and national policymaking for poverty reduction. In Uganda, the UPPAP (Box 5) has been effectively situated in the Ministry of Finance.
2.4 Country case examples

The Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process, Bella Bird and Margaret Kakande.

Self-Rated Poverty in the Philippines: Social Weather Surveys, Mahar Mangahas, President, Social Weather Stations, Philippines

Vietnam Participatory Poverty Assessment, Carolyn Turk, World Bank

Brazil Voices of the Poor, Marcus Melo, Federal University of Pernambuco

Cambodia Participatory Poverty Diagnostics, Monitoring and Analysis, Kamal Malhotra, Senior Civil Society Advisor, UNDP
3.1 Participation in public expenditure management (PEM)

Participation in public expenditure management (PEM) envisages that citizens and civil society organizations be involved in government decisions about how public money is budgeted and utilized. Participatory public expenditure management may be described as a cyclical process that entails budget formulation, review, budget expenditure tracking and performance monitoring (Box 7). There is considerable scope to increase accountability of public institutions to the poor in all four of these stages. Civic engagement in the PEM cycle can facilitate the institutionalization of participatory processes into the decision-making of public institutions and lead to more sustainable poverty reduction outcomes (see Box 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 8: Expected Outcomes from Citizen Engagement in Public Expenditure Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Accountable, transparent and efficient resource allocation, expenditures and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Civic engagement in budgeting, expenditure tracking and monitoring service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Citizen report cards included as a part of PRSP and use of feedback by citizens as an input to development of Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increased ability of communities and their organizations to participate in budgeting processes, expenditure tracking and monitoring quality, quantity and effectiveness of service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Demystification of budgets and analysis to enable information exchange and discussions in parliament, media and civil society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Public expenditure reviews with a participatory and civic engagement component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Institutional arrangements (mutually accountable) between government and civil society, which create space for civic engagement in public expenditure-related processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Increased intra-government participation around allocation, expenditure and performance monitoring decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Institutional capacity in the country to backstop, catalyze and articulate accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 How does participation in public expenditure management lead to more and better public action choices?

Participation in public expenditure management has recently been initiated in a number of countries. In successful cases, strategies for civic engagement have included three or more participatory approaches simultaneously initiated throughout the budget cycle - formulation, analysis, tracking, and evaluation. Experience from country case examples that have used participatory approaches in the four stages of the budget cycle and their associated participatory process are presented below.

**Budget Formulation**

The formulation stage of the budget usually involves the ministry of finance, cabinet, and the sector ministries. Processes of civic engagement can influence how the expenditure proposals are made – to which sectors and in which amount. Civic engagement in formulation assists governments in connecting poverty reduction strategies with budget allocation processes and offers opportunity for redistribution and more direct accountability. The city of Porto Alegre, Brazil (presented in Box 9) is a widely cited example illustrating how civic involvement in budgeting can enhance resource allocation as well as contribute to democratic governance, equity and re-distributive justice. In this case, the level of participation extends beyond information-sharing and consultation to collaboration. Participation guarantees legitimacy to decisions, and objective budgeting ensures fairness in an otherwise arbitrary process of translating political decisions into distributed resource. Citizens and civil society organizations propose spending projects, set priorities, and help decide which projects will be funded. There appears to be a direct link between increased civic participation in municipal budgeting and service delivery outcomes, including increases in infrastructure investment and education expenditures in poor areas. Over 80 Brazilian cities are now following the Porto Alegre approach of participatory budgeting.

Civic engagement in budget formulation has also involved preparation of alternative budgets to pressure changes in official budgets. The Alternative Federal Budget of the Canadian Center on Policy Alternatives is a complete budget within a coherent macroeconomic framework that is presented as an alternative to the budget of the federal government. It is put together by representatives of some 50 groups across the country, including social action groups and trade unions.

**Budget Review and Analysis**

Budget review and analysis stage arrives post-presentation of the budget in the legislature, and involves review of the impact and implication of different policy proposals and allocations. Civic engagement is used to demystify the seemingly technical content of the budget, create general awareness of pro-poor issues, and even inform and train parliamentarians to pressure the executive for pro-poor changes. Some of these efforts influence parliamentary debate on the budget and generate strong reactions from the public. There are other examples of civic
Box 9: Porto Alegre, Brazil Involves Citizens in Crafting its Budget

**Context:** In 1989, the Workers Party (PT) was formed in Porto Alegre, Brazil to seriously implement an agenda to deepen democracy through "popular administration" of government. Having won several municipal elections in 1989, the PT began a creative experiment of engaging a wide spectrum of people to formulate city budgets. Porto Alegre is the largest industrial city in the state of Rio Grande do Sul with 1.3 million inhabitants. The city has a local economy worth over US $7 billion and a reputation for hosting a progressive civil society led by intellectuals and labor unions experienced in mobilizing people to partake in public action.

**Process:** Once the executive prepares the budget, two mayoral institutions (Planning and Coordination of Relations with Communities) organize budgetary debates with residents. Each year, there are two rounds of discussions in each region and on each of the themes of the budget (transportation, education, leisure and culture, health and social welfare, economic development and taxation, city organization and urban development). The citizens meet around March just before the first round of formal assemblies to gather demands of individual citizens and mobilize the community to select regional delegates.

The first round of meetings between the citizens and the executive follows in April, in the presence of the mayor, to review investment plans of the previous year, discuss proposals for the new year, and to elect people to the Fora of Delegates for subsequent deliberations. Between the first and the second rounds (March to June), informal preparatory meetings are held to discuss demands for investment in sectors as presented by the various community associations (unions, cooperatives, mothers’ clubs, etc.). These demands are then ranked and aggregated for budget allocation by needs and population size.

**Outcomes:** Since 1989, the Workers Party has won three consecutive municipal elections in Porto Alegre. Between ‘89 and ‘96, the number of households with access to water services rose from 80% to 98%; percentage of the population served by the municipal sewage system rose from 46 to 85; the number of children enrolled in public schools doubled; in the poorer neighborhoods, 30 kilometers of roads have been paved annually since 1989; and because of transparency affecting motivation to pay taxes, city revenues increased by nearly 50%.


engagement in improving budget literacy, including Development Initiatives for Social and Human Action (DISHA) in Gujarat, India, and the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA). IDASA, for example, is an independent NGO that enhances the participation of parliament and civil society in the budget. It provides timely, critical and accessible information on the impacts of the budget on the poor through training, books, newspapers, popular materials, community radio and the internet.

In Gujarat, India, through training and communications efforts, an NGO (DISHA) is advancing budget literacy and improving budget processes. Large numbers, complex codification and accounting systems, and a long list of headings are inaccessible to common people. DISHA unpacks and demystifies data to enable citizens, media and legislators to quantify allocations and raise relevant issues through debate, dialogue and civic engagement (see Box 10.)
Box 10: Demystifying the Budget Process and Content In Gujarat, India

Context: The state of Gujarat hosts almost a tenth of India’s 80 million tribal people. Despite official rhetoric of significant investment in tribal development projects, results on the ground have not delivered outcomes. This prompted DISHA (Development Initiatives for Social and Human Action) to undertake state budget analysis in 1992 to ascertain what actually was happening to funds allotted in the name of the tribals under the Tribal Area Sub-plan.

Process: To overcome the overt technical categorization of budget items, DISHA learned and used the Auditor General’s standard guidelines on budget coding which made it a lot easier to compute alternative figures, present the data and dispute and contest official statistics. This basic knowledge of accounting systems gave DISHA significant confidence to go onto the next phase of doing the actual analysis of the contents.

After obtaining the documents on the day the budget is presented to the assembly, researchers at DISHA rearrange figures and data into different headings and enter them into a computer program. The next step involves analyzing incomes and expenditures and interpreting what the proposed allocations, if spent, mean for the poor. Three questions are looked at: i) does the budget mention specific pro-poor policies, ii) are these matched by adequate funding commitments, and iii) do they relate to the socio-economic reality of the Gujarati poor – the tribals, dalits, women and agricultural laborers.

The day after the budget speech, the analyst team at DISHA briefs the press with its answers to these questions, and when discussions commence in the assembly, it analyzes and supplies Members of the Legislative Assembly across political parties with information briefs on the sectors on a daily basis. This enables legislators to raise relevant issues in the course of the debate on accounts and the budget. This information is also made accessible to media and journalists and has influenced the coverage of budget issues in both print and broadcast media.

Outcomes: These analytical briefs have substantially enhanced the quality of debate on the budget both inside the assembly and outside. They serve as an effective channel for feedback to the government. The briefs have mainly been put to use to call for follow-up action, draw attention of the government to particular issues, and in speeches and op-eds. The press has obviously optimized the use of information mentioning DISHA’s work in the context of such issues as government decision to grant land titles to tribal people, the Forest Bill, problems of unorganized labor, and resettlement policies.

DISHA’s work has contributed to demystifying the process and content of budget preparation. The analyses have improved budgetary planning by closing the gap between budgeting and sectoral planning allowing better allocation and release of funds to priority sectors. This successful experiment in Gujarat has over the years been replicated in 12 other states of India, which came together in February 2000 to form a single umbrella organization called People’s BIAS (Budget Information and Analysis Service) to analyze the national budget of India.

DISHA has also started a new program to train and orient the Village Panchayats (local self-government) to read and analyze local budgets and to monitor allocations to ensure downward accountability of public institutions to citizens.

During the budget input and expenditure tracking stage, participation allow citizens to monitor how government spends the money it allocated. Experience shows that participatory tracking can lead to greater resources and improved services for the poor. Government savings can also occur from participatory tracking as it helps identify leakages and institutional bottlenecks.

Two participatory approaches seem to work well for tracking allocations disbursed to ministries and levels below. These include public expenditure tracking surveys and participatory social audits. The Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS) are quantitative exercises that trace the flow of resources from origin to destination and determine the location and scale of anomaly. In the absence of a strong institutional infrastructure to manage information flow, tracking surveys provide a realistic portrayal of the status of demand and supply of services.

If carefully and competently collected, the PETS data can have multiple uses. First, it can serve as a simple diagnostic tool in the absence of reliable administrative or financial data. Second, it can provide microeconomic data for empirical studies on governance, decentralization and cost-efficiency. The Ugandan case is an example of a cost-effective survey that enhanced transparency in budget allocation to schools (see Box 11). The Uganda PETS resulted in capitation grants, the schools were supposed to be receiving, going up from almost negligible amounts in 1991 to nearly 100% in 1999. The findings of the PETS, and a wave of positive reaction it generated, illustrate best how methods that lead to the realization of transparency and accountability can dramatically alter pro-poor outcomes in public service delivery.

Participatory social auditing is another approach for incorporating participation into tracking of public expenditure budgets. Social auditing involves verifying whether expenditures actually reach their intended social aim. Social auditing is a very important step in terms of accountability and making budgets responsive to the needs of those living in poverty. Participatory auditing allows poor people to make claims on resources and can lead to increased pressure at a regional and national level to grant the right to information. In Rajasthan, India, public auditing has led to improved accountability by creating a social impediment against corruption (see Box 12). Experience shows that hard data is infinitely more valuable than anecdotal testimonies. It facilitates a purposive analysis, catches public attention, and facilitates an informative and objective debate.
Box 11: Uganda’s Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) Makes a Difference

**Context:** Uganda’s macroeconomic performance has been remarkable in the 90s with growth averaging 7% per annum. While this new-found wealth creation as well as donor money have been fueling much of the increased public spending in basic social services this decade, the quality of these services has been judged to be very poor. Further, it was seen that despite increased spending, there was no corresponding improvement in outcomes, especially in primary education.

**Process:** In collaboration with the Ugandan government and two domestic firms, 250 primary schools were identified in 19 of 39 Ugandan districts for the survey. The 19 districts were selected to geographically represent the country, and were sub-divided into three groups to reflect the different times during the year they received their budgets. The mission was to find out how much of the money that left the exchequer actually reached the schools between 1991 and 1995. Former teachers were used to collect data on income, expenditure, and enrollment in schools.

Once data on budgetary allocations and consumer perceptions of service delivery were collected, the analysis was documented. Synthesized information was posted on public notice boards. Information was also disseminated through newspapers and radio broadcasts.

**Outcomes:** Despite quadrupling of public spending measured in real terms between 1991 and 1995, official statistics had shown that enrollment rates in primary schools remained stagnant. The PETS found this was not true. Enrollment rates had actually increased by around 60% during the period, but had simply not been reported because of perverse incentives in the system.

Once it was revealed that, on average, less than 30% of allocated capitation money was reaching the schools on average at the end of 1995, the government acted immediately to improve the flow of information and make budget allocations transparent by: i) publishing amounts transferred to the districts in newspapers and radio broadcasts; ii) requiring schools to maintain public notice boards to post monthly transfer of funds; iii) legally provisioning for accountability and information dissemination in the 1997 Local Governance Act; and iv) requiring districts to deposit all grants to schools in their own accounts, and delegating authority for procurement from the center to the schools. By 1999, capitation grants received by the schools had almost reached 100%.

### Box 12: Participatory Social Auditing Exposes Corruption in Rajasthan, India

**Context:** An activist group, Mazdoor Kishan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS), has introduced a process of participatory social auditing in Rajasthan, India to organize ordinary people who are seeking and using their right to information in a collective fashion.

**Process:** Social auditing has involved initiating public hearings, in which detailed accounts derived from official expenditure records and other supporting documentation are read aloud to assembled villagers. The meetings are organized independently and are presided over by a panel of respected people from within and outside the area. Officials and the media are invited to attend and local people are asked to give testimonies, highlighting discrepancies between official records and their own experiences (as laborers on public work projects, applicants for means-tested anti-poverty schemes, consumers in ration shops, etc.).

**Outcomes:** The activity of MKSS has led to the exposure of corruption and illegal powers of local politicians, private engineers and government contractors, leading, in a number of cases, to voluntary restitution. A significant amount of money was returned to public exchequer as a result of the social auditing process.

MKSS discovered that local governments were paid for clinics, schools and public toilets that were never built, for workers who were long dead, and worse, for disaster-relief services that never arrived. The response of citizens of Rajasthan led to the passing of legislation by the State Government, the Right to Information Act, which enables any citizen and community group to ask for copies of government orders and decisions. Subsequently, two other states in India passed similar legislation.


---

**Performance Monitoring and Evaluation**

The aim of evaluating and monitoring government performance is to see how government spending on social services and budget reform programs actually perform and impact on the lives of the people, particularly the poor. Experiences with participatory approaches in performance evaluation primarily focus on using citizen report cards.

Report cards on pro-poor services draw on the private sector practice of soliciting feedback from citizens and compiling 'report cards'. Their evolution followed the idea of looking at "citizens as customers" and public services as products. By systematically gathering and disseminating public feedback, report cards are a useful medium through which citizens can credibly and collectively 'signal' to agencies about their performance and produce pressure for change. Report cards provide rich information on where and how basic services are failing the poor, key constraints the poor face in assessing public services, their views about the quality and adequacy of services, and the behavior they experience in their interactions with government officials.

The methodology involves surveying an intended clientele of public services to determine quality of, access to, and satisfaction with such services. There are two practices. In one practice, an
independent group conducts the survey for a government or donor agency, as is the case of the Philippines, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Denmark, and France and in Ghana where the World Bank used the Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire (CWIQ). The Filipino Report Card on Pro-Poor Services offers valuable insights on the priorities and problems faced by the clients and on how the various services may be better tailored to the needs of Filipinos in general, and the poor in particular (see Box 13.) The pro-poor citizen Report Card received extensive media coverage. The Report Card complements the expert analyses and findings of the Philippines Poverty Assessment. Its results helped to test some of the policy conclusions identified in the poverty assessment and are having significant development impacts on the current government’s efforts to deliver services. There is considerable interest from a number of other countries, including Vietnam, Albania, and Argentina in the preparation of report cards, based on the Philippines model, as a way to capture citizen feedback on public services.

---

**Box 13: Filipino Report Card Facilitates Social Accountability**

**Context:** There is a growing concern in the Philippines regarding the performance and accountability of public agencies that deliver services, especially to the poor. Most accountability mechanisms for public agencies focus on inputs (e.g., number of personnel, facilities, and expenditures) and occasionally on broad outcome indicators such as literacy and mortality rates. The Filipino Report Card provides a national level snapshot of people’s perception, especially of the poor, of key government pro-poor services in health care, elementary education, water supply, housing, and the distribution of subsidized rice. The Social Weather Station, a local social survey agency, undertook implementation of the report card with support from World Bank. It is a stand-alone national survey involving nearly 335 questions on a sample size of 1,200 voting adults.

**Process:** Inputs of different stakeholders were actively solicited and incorporated in the design of the survey questionnaire. After completion of the fieldwork, preliminary findings were presented to stakeholder representatives (including government officials from coordinating agencies and service providers, local government units, private service providers, civil society organizations including NGOs, and donors) through four regional workshops.

The Report Card survey findings were prepared into sector-specific write-ups and shared with the government to encourage independent scrutiny and validation of the analysis by the government. The results were also presented in a national forum participated in by a large number of participants from the government, business, civil society and media. The report card received significant media coverage in about 23 newspapers and created citizen intent and accountability issues.

Key to the project’s success has been the support of the government, with the administration of President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo stressing feedback. She has required her cabinet members to take a pledge ensuring “regular feedback from our citizen-customers, and subsequent uses of this feedback,” and has promised that Filipinos will no longer be treated as beneficiaries but as clients.

**Outcomes:** The findings of the Report Card are being used by the new administration to revise the Philippines Medium Term Development Plan, craft a new poverty alleviation strategy and design community-driven poverty programs. A number of “localized” Report Card initiatives are also underway.

In the other practice for report cards in performance monitoring, citizen groups conduct the surveys. An example is the Public Affairs Center in Bangalore, India. This the independent citizen group's use of the Report Card on Pro-Poor Services is inspiring use of report cards as a popular civil society instrument to increase government transparency and accountability to the poor all over India (see Box 14.)

**Box 14: Report Card Results Encourage Changes in Government Services in Bangalore, India**

**Context:** A small advisory group of local leaders first planned the report card initiative in 1993 as a way to move away from coping to organized action against poor access to public services, non-responsive government, rampant corruption, and abuse of discretion. This informal exercise has since been institutionalized as one of the core functions of the Public Affairs Center, a non-profit society established in 1994.

**Process:** The report card used a process for systematic demand-driven change. The process begins with creating demand for good governance and identification of key issues through panels comprised of citizens and government representatives. The survey instrument for the report card is designed using this initial feedback. Once identification of a scientific representative sample of the city population is complete, the survey is administered by an independent agency. Analysis of quantitative and qualitative survey data is compiled and mini report cards on four of the key service providers (telephone, water, electricity and the municipality) are produced. These report cards are used to initiate dialogue with key stakeholders. After selective meetings with stakeholders, reports are circulated to all public agencies and senior state government officials, followed by a launch ceremony for the press. After letting the findings sink in through heavy media coverage, problem-solving forums and actions are facilitated involving senior officials from the agencies and the public.

**Outcomes:** Although the quality of service could not have been radically overhauled in Bangalore between 1994 and 1999 just as a result of one Report Card findings, of the eight agencies surveyed in 1993, four made attempts to respond to public dissatisfaction. The worst-rated agency – the Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) – reviewed its internal systems for service delivery, introduced training for junior staff, and along with the Bangalore Municipal Corporation, began to host a joint forum of NGOs and public agencies to consult on solving high-priority problems such as waste management.

The major spin-offs have been the development of similar Report Cards on state government's overall performance, which are presented before the annual budget. This model is also now being repeated at the national level with citizens doing a comparative performance of states in terms of delivery effectiveness and responsiveness.

Community monitoring is another participatory approach that has been used to evaluate the performance of government. It is a relatively new approach and also entails measuring the performance of a government agency. Information about actual government outputs is collected by civic society organizations over a certain period of time. This information is then compared with the publicly declared outputs of that agency. Community-based monitoring utilizes anecdotal as well as statistical information of people in the community who collectively assess government performance. Community monitoring has been attempted in the U.S., Uganda and the Philippines.

3.3 How can methods and processes of participation in public expenditure management be improved?

Participatory public expenditure management (PEM) is a way to make government spending more responsive to the demands of poverty reduction as articulated by the poor themselves and by civil society organizations. It highlights the role of civil society organizations as key players in budget decisions of governments. Country case examples show how citizen groups have made important contributions to improving budget deliberations, monitoring how government money is spent and determining the effectiveness of public services.

Recent experiences with participation show that despite the various considerations in budget formulation, when all is said and done, it is primarily a political exercise. Thus, while such practice is often dominated by the exercise of political power by the elite, it is also susceptible to strong public pressure. In some of the cases presented at the workshop, civil societies have built alliances with legislators and parliamentarians to pressure public institutions to be more accountable.

Experience also suggests the importance of balancing the role of intermediary groups and the participation of the poor in PEM. So while training and capacity building are critical success factors, it is important that intermediary groups also receive training and capacity building in advocacy, communications and networking so that they can effectively engage the poor directly in these initiatives. This may include, for example, translation of government budget reports into real terms describing how they impact on ordinary people's lives in order to encourage citizens to participate in this decision-making process.

While one-off civic engagement at any stage of the PEM cycle (Box 7, p.11) can be useful, the leakages in the system can eventually erode the effectiveness of that one engagement. The four stages have critical forward and backward linkages. To be fully effective, participation in PEM requires the full range of participatory approaches to be developed and applied in a given country throughout the four stages. It is also critical to use institutional mechanisms, which can influence bureaucratic action, political action and citizen action in a mutually reinforcing and complementary manner.
Country case examples


Municipal Budget Formulation in Porto Alegre, Brazil, presentation notes from Zander Navarro, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.


Report Cards on Public Services in Bangalore, India, Samuel Paul, Public Affairs Centre (PAC).

Canada’s Alternative Federal Budget, John Loxley, University of Manitoba.

Encouraging Inclusive Budget Process in Gujurat, India, Madhusudan Mistry, Development Initiatives for Social and Human Action (DISHA).

Filipino Report Card on Public Services, Bhuvan Bhatnagar, Senior Social Scientist, World Bank.
4.1 Participation in macroeconomic formulation and implementation

Viable and appropriate macroeconomic policies are necessary for sustainable poverty reduction policies. These include efforts to control aggregate volumes of credit and money (monetary policy), to manage aggregate public revenue and expenditure (fiscal policy and public sector reform) and to initiate changes in sector programs (institutional reform and decentralization policies). However, getting the technical content of macroeconomic policies right is only part of the answer for arriving at sustainable policy results. Of equal importance is the process by which the content of policies is formulated and put into action. An effective policy process builds broad public consensus around policy content and secures wide support for policy implementation.

There are many emerging contexts in which participatory approaches have impacted on monetary policy, fiscal policy and institutional reform. Successful participation in public policy increases government's accountability, transparency, openness, and responsiveness to demands from a wider range of societal groups. Box 15 offers a list of the expected outcomes from applying participatory approaches in macroeconomic policy formulation and implementation.

**Box 15: Expected Outcomes from Participation in Macroeconomic Policy**

- Multi-stakeholder institutional arrangements and consensus in key areas of policy formulation and implementation.
- Identification of key stakeholders/interest groups and institutions critical for policy formulation and implementation and matching issues to the stakeholder interest.
- Development of mechanisms for negotiation and rules of engagement between key stakeholder groups.
- Demystification of the macro policy issues in terms of specific issues impacting various stakeholders and disseminating information more widely and publicly to enable participation and civic engagement.
- Identification of potential areas of dispute and conflict and institutional mechanisms to resolve conflicts.
4.2 How does participation in macroeconomic reform lead to more and better policy choices?

The processes for setting fiscal, monetary, and institutional policies consist of an iterative and multi-directional stream of issues, agendas, and priority-setting exercises that lead to policy decisions (Box 16.) Participatory approaches center around incentives and interest groups. There are multiple participation entry points and opportunities throughout the policy cycle - policy analysis and formulation, policy adoption, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. These four entry points for participation and country case examples are presented below.

Policy Analysis and Formulation

Once a decision has been made to promote a new policy or reform an existing one, a range of analyses and diagnoses is undertaken. Formulation adds operational detail to the initial policy analysis, which includes a statement of the problem, the policy goals and objectives, a framework that sketches programs in support of those targets, and a statement of required resources. All these elements need to be fleshed out and elaborated for effective action and implementation to take place.

Options to engage civil society in policy analysis and formulation range from information sharing to collaboration. An innovative example of participation in policy analysis and formulation is from Ireland, where social partnerships facilitate negotiation between the government, the private sector and civil society on monetary, fiscal and institutional policies (Box 17). Over the past five years, Ireland has successfully used social partnerships to develop a national social contract that has improved its economic performance considerably. The Ireland case underscores the economic benefits that can be achieved using a negotiated process to evolve consensus on key elements of fiscal and monetary policy. The social partnership facilitated negotiations for budget deficits, wage rates, social sector spending and safety nets. It also created opportunity for the various partners to fulfill their part of the pledge, making them accountable for it.

Policy Adoption

Options for external groups to participate in official policy adoption are quite limited, because formal adoption involves a legal or administrative requirement for a referendum, a parliamentary vote, a cabinet memorandum, or an agency official directive. Participation in policy adoption is most often just information sharing.
Box 17: Ireland’s Consultative Process for Macroeconomic Policy

Context: The idea of social partnerships evolved in the late 80s when Ireland was going through a tough recession (1980-87), aggravated by high inflation, heavy public borrowing and deficit, and loss of manufacturing base. The NESC (National Economic and Social Council) formed in 1973 to play an advisory role to the government on “the development of the national economy and the achievement of social justice”. Over the years, its role has evolved to become a facilitator among a range of social partners to pursue a consultative process of shared learning for an inclusive overview of socioeconomic options, challenges and tradeoffs. The Council is based in the Prime Minister’s Office. Its membership comprises representatives from the government, trade unions, business and employer organizations, farmers’ associations, and community and voluntary organizations. There are 19 social partners in total, who were selected by the government to broadly represent the four “pillars” of Irish society.

Process: The five different agreements since 1987 have each been struck through slightly different processes, with a notable departure witnessed in 1996, when community and voluntary organizations were first allowed to come to the negotiating table, and issues with greater ‘social’ slant, such as exclusion, were given greater prominence. There is thus a built-in mindset among partners to bargain and present trade-offs to each other.

The Department of Finance prepares a central economic forecast and submits it to the NESC. Over a period of one year, the NESC discusses the issues and parameters laid out in the forecast with the experts, and together with inputs from other thematic reports on aspects of socio-economic performance, draws up a strategy report to serve as a background paper for discussion.

This preparatory process is followed by three to four months of formal consultations among all the partners and the government, resulting in a new agreement. The negotiated agreement obviously takes a different form to that of the strategy report, emerging as a compilation of endorsed ‘Operational Frameworks’.

The government creates and serves as a forum in which the process operates. It sends invitations to participants to begin the process and determines the limits within which the partnership’s structure operates. It moderates competing claims and facilitates the negotiation process.

Outcomes: By establishing an institutional framework and process in which the government, the private sector and civil society representatives take major socio-economic decisions with broad-based popular support, a virtuous circle of benefits has been created for all participants. Social partnerships are responsible for moving Ireland’s economy from a budget deficit of 1.4 billion in 1986 to a budget surplus in 1999 of over 1.1 billion Irish Pounds. This has allowed expenditures on health to be increased by 150%, on education by 84% and on welfare by 70% since 1987. Other notable impacts over the decade include a national debt/GDP ratio of 52% in 1998 compared with 120% in 1986 and average annual inflation of 2.8% since 1987 contrasted with rates up to 20% in the early 80s.

However, for the broader processes of policy adoption — creating legitimacy for the policy and building supportive constituencies — participatory options are wide open. Consultation, collaboration, and joint decision-making are all vital to creating legitimacy, making the policy content understandable to non-specialists (demystification as in Gujarat, India), and establishing supportive policy constituencies. To the extent that external groups feel empowered to take ownership for policies, adoption becomes more of a reality and increases the chances for sustainable policy change.

**Policy Implementation**

Entry points for external participation in implementation vary significantly depending upon the type of policy. Some sectoral policies, for example, offer opportunities for collaboration, shared decision-making, and empowerment through partnerships. Partnerships for service delivery, for example, are where external entities may take the lead through contracting-out, delegation of authority, or community co-management. Some types of administrative reform policies have introduced options for external consultation, such as decentralized public personnel policies that solicit input from local citizens on performance. But most experiences with participation in macroeconomic policy implementation have not adopted participation options beyond information sharing and dissemination.

Incorporating social and poverty issues directly into macroeconomic reform and sectoral adjustment policy has resulted in more attention to participation and citizen consultation as part of adjustment. A process of extensive consultations was used in the Andhra Pradesh (AP), India program of reform for its irrigation sector (see Box 18). The government's objective was to understand the viewpoints of all concerned. Therefore, participation in the public consultations was not restricted to farmers, but also included politicians, political parties, researchers, and the press. The consultations have enabled the government to steer the reform process in a transparent manner. From the beginning, there was no clearly defined blueprint to guide the actions of the government. Rather, the state has attempted to adopt a learning process approach, continually incorporating feedback to guide the reforms. Change in the irrigation sector is only a portion of a program of reforms initiated over the last five years in AP. The program aims to modernize AP’s government and vitalize its economy by making the providers of services such as irrigation, power, education, and health accountable to users and other stakeholders.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The possibilities for external participation in monitoring and evaluation mirror those for policy analysis and formulation. External actors can provide information to policy monitors and evaluators, or they can be consulted for their opinions, interpretations, and analyses. They can collaborate in joint monitoring and evaluation, or they can conduct their own independent assessments and evaluations, as in the case of the Public Affairs Centre's service delivery surveys in Banglore, India (see Box 14). These kinds of civil society-led analytic exercises can serve as countervailing views on the policy from a range of alternative perspectives and as input to the broader arena of political dialogue and debate in a country.
Box 18: Public Consultation used in Reform of India’s AP Irrigation Sector

Context: In 1997, the state of Andhra Pradesh (AP), India embarked on an ambitious program of reform to its irrigation sector. In this large agricultural state, irrigation management has been revolutionized by transferring responsibility for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of irrigation schemes to groups of farmers. In total, 10,292 Water User Associations (WUAs) have been created. The reform required a number of very difficult changes, as the role of irrigation agency is gradually shifting from service provider to facilitator, and reform has not come without resistance and conflict. However, early indications are overwhelmingly positive, as many irrigation systems are realizing increased revenues, an increase in irrigated area, and enhanced involvement of farmers in the operation of irrigation.

Process: The Water User Associations (WUAs) and 174 Distributory Committees (DCs) were created through a democratic process of elections. In India, the state has the power to create WUAs and federate WUAs into higher-level committees.

Beginning in April 1996, a series of public consultations were held in centrally located places in command areas of major projects. These informal discussions gave a tremendous amount of input to the government for use in designing a suitable plan of action. The first round of public consultations was used to elicit the viewpoints of the farmers and Irrigation Department staff. Subsequent rounds employed a more structured framework for discussion.

Outcomes: Reform has made the irrigation agency accountable to the Farmer Organizations, and resulted in the tripling of water charges and linking the money collected to the costs of operating and maintaining irrigation systems. The State has gradually transferred significant operation and maintenance powers to the water user associations.

Reference: Andhra Pradesh Water Sector Reforms J. Raymond Peter, Executive Director, the International Network on Participatory Irrigation Management. 2001.

4.3. How can participation in macroeconomic policy and implementation be institutionalized so as to improve the outcomes of poverty reduction strategies?

Consultations and partnerships are critical in setting the stage for institutionalization of participation in macroeconomic policy. While such participatory options in public policy may be challenging, costly and take years of consistent effort, their benefits on poverty reduction can be substantial. Country experiences with participatory approaches in macroeconomic policy offer the following insights on institutionalizing participation into public policy.

The policy process is not linear or coherent. With policy development and implementation, change is often multi-directional, fragmented, frequently interrupted, and unpredictable. How to sequence actions, what to pay attention to, and who to include can be hard to determine, and can vary over the life of the policy cycle. Unlike projects and programs, which have relatively clearly defined sets of activities and components, the boundaries for policies tend to be fuzzy, to shift over time, and to be open to interpretation. Multiple stakeholder institutional arrangements can help build consensus in key areas of policy formulation and implementation.
No single agency can manage the policy process. Policy is typically led by a small number of agencies - in the case of macroeconomic policy, a central bank, a ministry of finance, or a cabinet. Still, it usually requires the concerted actions of multiple agencies and groups to succeed. The array of actors shifts as policy moves from analysis to formulation and to implementation. Even if one of them is nominally the lead agency, in reality no individual entity is “in charge” of policy. Authority and responsibility are dispersed among the actors involved. Traditional command-and-control management approaches are not applicable. Informal power and authority relations will be as important as formal channels. Identifying all the actors (civic organizations, interest groups and institutions) and their issues of interest substantially helps one build an understanding of the policy process and a strategy for managing participation.

Policy change creates winners and losers. Changes in policies usually involve imposing costs on some societal groups while benefiting others. This feature clearly applies to macroeconomic policy. This means that policy reforms often become highly politicized. Most often, the losers are those who gain from the current state of affairs in the country and who are in a powerful position to defend the status quo and resist change. In this situation, mechanisms for negotiation and rules of engagement are useful for building multi-stakeholder consensus.

The resources required to develop and implement policies may not be readily available. Projects and programs have dedicated budgets, but policies may lack the resources needed to conduct them in a participatory manner. This often applies to fiscal and monetary policies. Few public economic agencies have sufficient slack resources to initiate extensive civic engagement, to demystify the macro policies, and to disseminate them. Institutionalizing participation in macro policy would require a concerted effort to lobby for new funding, identify existing sources of support (domestic and international), and negotiate for resource reallocation. These efforts necessarily extend over a long timeframe as a policy package moves from formulation through implementation.

4.4 Country case examples

Participation in Macroeconomic Policy: Experience and Implications for Poverty Reduction Strategies - A Synthesis Paper. Brinkerhoff, D and A. Goldsmith. College of Management, University of Massachusetts

Andhra Pradesh Water Sector Reforms. J. Raymond Peter, Executive Director, the International Network on Participatory Irrigation Management

Russia Coal Sector Reform. Ashraf Ghani, Lead Anthropologist, World Bank.

5.1 Participatory monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is the mechanism intended to be used by governments and resource providers to assess whether national strategies and actions have succeeded or failed to reduce poverty. The conventional M&E approach involves a limited set of stakeholders and does not allow citizens and users of services to give feedback on performance of various programs and public actions. Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) involves a process whereby users and citizens provide regular feedback to decision-makers and service providers, and institutional mechanisms are created in public systems to learn from feedback and act on it.

PM&E broadens participatory approaches in identifying and analyzing change. It involves giving voice to the poor and their organizations in decision-making and providing civil society an opportunity to influence the governance process in the country. It focuses on results and lays a foundation for increasing accountability and transparency in decision-making around public actions, resources and services. Box 19 depicts the expected outcomes from PM&E.

### Box 19: Expected Outcomes from Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E)

- Development of feedback mechanisms and participatory monitoring systems which enable citizens and stakeholders within the government to monitor key poverty actions, public actions and outcomes as part of PRS formulation and implementation.
- A citizens report card on PRS performance and implementation and mechanisms to incorporate citizen feedback in adaptation and improvement of the PRS (increased citizen empowerment).

PM&E is a social learning process as much as a technical process. It involves trust, negotiation and dialogue. It provides a tool for dialogue between multi-stakeholders across power and other differences. Thus, PM&E 'creates space' for participation. By opening up the range of stakeholders involved in the monitoring and evaluation process, PM&E also builds broader ownership and commitment.

The iterative nature of the PM&E process is essential for its success and for its sustainability. Feedback and information generated from one round of PM&E process is incorporated into future rounds of decision-making and program implementation.
5.2 How can participatory approaches for monitoring implementation and policy lead to poverty reduction outcomes?

PM&E can lead to improved poverty reduction outcomes through greater transparency and accountability. The PM&E process begins with negotiation to reach agreement about what will be monitored or evaluated. Through the process, agreement is also reached on when data will be collected and analyzed, what the data actually means, how findings will be shared, and who will take action in response.

Successful PM&E processes establish institutional mechanisms to facilitate negotiations between stakeholders and disseminate information and feedback. In Malaysia, the Sustainable Penang Initiative (SPI) is facilitating a more responsive and effective local government through a citizens’ initiative. This involves using roundtables that institutionalize a process for identifying and monitoring holistic development indicators (Box 20.) The SPI offers a practical example of how representatives of government, business and civil society can find common ground and produce relevant and practical inputs to the development planning process.

Case experiences suggest that feedback from monitoring key poverty actions, public actions and outcomes be widely disseminated through mechanisms tailored to different groups of society. In some cases, experience shows that multiple media interests can be leveraged to increase awareness and information flows on the feedback about the performance and impact of various poverty actions and public actions in the country. In Bangalore, India (Box 14), for example, a civil society-led public information center conducts in-depth service-delivery surveys and disseminates the results to decision-makers and the general public through its own publications and the media.

Experiences also point out that to be effective in making policy change, these institutional mechanisms must reach the key stakeholders. Case examples of linking feedback from monitoring to institutional mechanisms for policy adaptation and improvement include Uganda (Box 5 and Box 11), Vietnam (Box 3) and the Philippines (Box 13).

5.3 Country case examples

*The Sustainable Penang Initiative (SPI)*, Pao-li Lim, Socio-Economic and Environmental Research Institute (SERI).

*Overview of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation at the Macro Level*, John Gaventa, Institute for Development Studies (IDS Sussex, UK)
Box 20: PM&E in Malaysia empowers citizens

Context: Although Penang has enjoyed relative prosperity and experienced high annual growth rates in the years preceding the economic crisis from 1997-1999, it has also been plagued by hill collapse, floods, traffic jams, sacrificed heritage, social ills and many other 'side effects' and tensions of development. Penang's citizens became increasingly concerned because their relatively high quality of life was being threatened by rapid growth and development trends. Citizens also felt disempowered by a top-down development planning process that did not allow for their direct input.

Process: The Sustainable Penang Initiative (SPI) involved seven roundtables, one on each of the five study themes - Ecological Sustainability, Social Justice, Economic Productivity, Cultural Vibrancy, Popular Participation, and one each for the Malay- and Chinese-speaking communities. Participants were invited to prioritize key local issues related to the roundtable theme. Each roundtable brought together 50-80 people and altogether about 500 participants from diverse backgrounds (government, NGOs, business, industry, professional associations and academia) spent over 4,000 people-hours at the roundtables, follow-up meetings and workshops. After each roundtable, a Roundtable Report was produced.

The roundtables culminated in the Penang People's Forum - a one-day forum to communicate the principal output of the roundtables to senior leaders of the state government, the business sector, NGOs and the general public. The Penang People's Report, which documented the 40 indicators of sustainable development chosen by the participants of the roundtables, was also launched on this occasion.

Once multiple stakeholders identified priority issues, they agreed on a process for monitoring by the citizens using indicators that were meaningful to them. For example, a crow count was used to measure unmanaged urban waste.

Outcomes: The SPI has facilitated a more responsive and effective local government. It has resulted in a mechanism in the annual people's forum where the performance of the authorities in terms of achieving sustainability in development is assessed and presented through the publication of an annual report. It has also resulted in the incorporation of sustainable development as the overarching framework under which the Penang Strategic Plan will be formulated; ecological sustainability, economic competitiveness, cultural vibrancy and social justice are among its five thrusts and popular participation is, for the first time, incorporated into the process of drafting the plan.

The Penang State Government has also decided to form a State Council for Sustainable Development and to create a Centre for Sustainable Development. The results of SPI would provide valuable inputs into the Council and the Centre. A quality of life index will be formulated for Penang for the first time in 2001 and a number of the SPI indicators will be included in the index.

Reference: Malaysia - Sustainable Penang Initiative, presentation and paper by Pao-Li Lim, Socio-Economic and Environmental Research Institute (SERI)
6.1 Some key considerations for designing participatory processes at the macro-level

As shared by the participants and expressed in the country cases presented at the workshop, there is a positive movement away from participation as an input to production of papers and documents towards participation as a process. While some countries have demonstrated successful application of participatory approaches producing tangible actions and policy changes, participation as a process for achieving sustainable poverty reduction outcomes and getting country ownership remains a challenge at the macro-level. Box 21 offers key considerations for designing participatory processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 21: Key Considerations for Designing Participatory Processes at Macro Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Participation is not an end in itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Participatory processes are likely to be a key link between intended strategies and effective outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Participatory processes are more critical during implementation and monitoring of strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Participation should not be perceived and used as a conditionality but as an opportunity for achieving effective outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Participatory processes are adaptive, cyclical, incremental and iterative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Feedback should be linked to participatory and policy processes for adaptation and change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Institutional mechanisms are necessary to anchor and backstop participatory approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Recent developments in the participating countries, NGOs and donors

Box 22 highlights how lessons learned from the workshop have influenced practice in some of the participating countries, NGOs and donor institutions in the period following the workshop.
Box 21: Influencing Practice in Participating Countries

In Albania, a citizen report card for performance assessment of public services in the urban sector is being designed. As part of the PRSP consultations, a newsletter was circulated to all relevant stakeholders, which enabled them to participate constructively. A PM&E program is being developed as part of the Health Sector reform in the PRSC.

In Ghana, a participation workshop is planned to bring together stakeholders at all levels with civil society organizations to design multi-stakeholder institutional mechanisms for accountability in public expenditure management of key public services, monitoring and evaluation of the GPRS and social impact assessment of the PRGF. A citizen report card on public services is also being proposed.

In Mongolia, the findings from the PPA are being used as an input to the PRSP. The government is also designing a citizen report card to assess the quality of public services. Initiatives are also being undertaken to develop capacity in the government for qualitative impact monitoring.

In Niger, a PPA was carried out to provide input to the PRSP. The findings from the PPA will also provide a baseline data for future M&E work. The Participation Action Plan in the PRSP was translated into the national language and was extensively communicated through community radio stations, websites, newsletters and private media events and through journalists. Public debates, known as the, poverty caravan', were initiated in Niger's districts as part of the PRSP process. These public debates gathered poor people's opinion on their state of poverty and were used to correlate the causes and effects of poverty. The Parliament with the support of the NDI launched public debates on decentralization to achieve consensus on division of regions and the creation of departments and districts.

In the Philippines, a Government Watch (G-Watch) project has been initiated to enable citizens to track public resources allocated to key government projects. The findings from this project were presented in a public briefing. The Budget Advocacy Project (BAP) has been established to undertake independent analysis of Philippine budget and fiscal issues. Spearheaded by a former Secretary of the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), the project aims to conduct periodic public briefings and publish articles on budget and fiscal issues, as well as conduct training programs for advocates and policy-makers seeking to understand the content and process of the budget. The Localized Anti-Poverty Program has initiated a project to make government accountable for the progressive reduction of poverty using a poverty-tracking tool pioneered by the government itself. The project is now prepared to move into the next phase, which is advocacy for allocation of resources to address the priority needs of the poor in the communities where the data was obtained. A regional workshop on social and public accountability is planned for country teams from Indonesia, Vietnam and Mongolia to learn more from the Philippines experience and how to design citizen report cards. The Filippino Report Card continues to receive international and national recognition. A number of local Report Card initiatives are also underway.

The Gambia plans to continue its poverty diagnostic initiative to establish a solid database for poverty in order to target the poor with relevant interventions and facilitate access to information. In PEM, there are plans to establish performance indicators for public resource allocations and to establish institutional mechanisms for dialogues between government, donors and civil society to ensure efficient resource utilization. Citizen report cards are also planned in priority sectors. The country is also planning to establish mechanisms for implementing the Poverty Reduction Fund to enhance transparency of expenditure on poverty reduction within the budget.
In Vietnam, a citizen report card on urban public services and utilities in Ho Chi Minh City is being designed. Findings of the participatory poverty assessments conducted by the Ministry of Labor and General Statistics Office have served as input to the PRSP process. The PRSP was entirely written in Vietnamese and this has greatly increased government and country ownership. The government also plans to translate the document into local dialects and disseminate it widely in the local communities. To ensure transparency in public expenditure management, steps are being undertaken to demystify and prioritize budget allocation and encourage local administrations to execute their own budgets. The international development targets, as agreed upon by the UN Millennium Summit, have been localized to fit the Vietnamese context and specific targets have been outlined in the PRSP.

**ActionAid**, continued its involvement to facilitate participation of marginalized and vulnerable communities in the PRSP processes in Haiti, Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Rwanda, Uganda and Vietnam. In Kenya, the rights of people with disabilities and issues affecting the pastoralists were realized with important affirmative policies built into the PRSP. Also in Kenya, Vat policies in the 2000/2001 national budget responded to demands for a progressive tax structure in the Interim PRS to generate resources in ways not harmful to the working poor. Similarly, in Malawi, people with HIV/AIDS and rural women were involved in the process. And in Vietnam and Rwanda, ActionAid played a pivotal role in bringing the voice of peasant producers into the consultations.

**ISODEC**, Ghana continued to undertake research and analysis on the budget and the economy as a whole, conduct training and provide budget information services to promote pro-poor and gender-equitable impacts in the generation and use of public resources through the budget. **ISODEC** has broadened its training to both government and civil society organizations in public expenditure management, budget analysis and pro-poor and equity enhancing budgeting. It is also currently involved in developing dialogue and in building capacity to undertake alternative macroeconomic policy frameworks.

**Uganda Debt Network** which leads the budget advocacy initiative and the civil society initiative to lobby and advocate on poverty focused public expenditure in Uganda, led the civil society PEAP revision task force established in January 2000. In collaboration with the government, the task force will participate in the revision of the poverty eradication strategy for Uganda. The Network has also initiated grassroots committees to monitor utilization of debt-relief resource and a grassroots anti-corruption campaign in various districts in Uganda.

At **Inter-Africa Group**, the group has facilitated and deepened district level consultations in 116 districts in Ethiopia. They are also involved in closely monitoring the PRSP process.

At the **World Bank**, the work on developing participatory approaches in public expenditure management has been further deepened with organizations of a number of regional and national key events and development of a sourcebook on social and public accountability.
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