



The World
Bank Group

Deepening Voice and Accountability to Fight Poverty: A Dialogue of Communication Implementers

March 30 - 31, 2006
OECD, Paris, France

A SUMMARY NOTE

I. Introduction

About 80 representatives from government, civil society, think tanks and media organizations in developing countries, as well as representatives from multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, academic institutions, and international civil society organizations participated in a dialogue about deepening voice and accountability to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of national poverty reduction strategies.¹

The purpose of the conference was to bring together the experience and perspectives of disparate actors in the policy community who are focusing on poverty reduction to coalesce around areas of mutual interest.

The objective of the conference was to begin to break through the “iron triangle” of technocrats in government, civil society and donor agencies that currently defines, and in many ways constrains, the development process; to amend the prevailing development paradigm to more effectively address issues of deepening voice and accountability; and to recognize the contribution of information and communication processes to that agenda.²

II. Conference Structure

The conference was designed as a dialogue with a focus on hearing the voices and experiences of the core participants – the government, media, and civil society representatives who are communication implementers in developing countries. The discussions were divided into four broad topic areas, with emphasis on the policy aspects of these issues on the first day, and the practical aspects on the second day³. The topics for discussion were:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Panel I: | Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Can we even have this discussion? |
| Panel II: | Accountability: What creates the demand for good governance? |
| Panel III: | A Strong Civil Society: Looking for commitment |
| Panel IV: | The Media and Poverty Reduction: Moving beyond criticism |

¹ A list of participants is attached as Annex A.

² An Executive Summary of a 2005 study on deepening and sustaining participation in poverty reduction strategy is attached as Annex C.

³ The agenda of the dialogue and description of the Panels are attached as Annex B.

III. Issues of Discussion – Areas of Consensus and Debate

The discussion quickly coalesced around the recognition that deepening voice and accountability is fundamentally about the construction of societies that deliver welfare for the preponderance of their citizens. Participants agreed that deepening voice and accountability in developing countries is about people, including those living in poverty, making the decisions that affect their lives. This means the agenda is not just about democracy, it is about “deep democracy” or representative democracy with a strong participatory element. This is the demand-side of the accountability agenda.

The participants discussed the merits of existing mechanisms to promote civic engagement and demand-side accountability, including citizen charters, participatory budgeting, Citizen Report Cards, Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys, and Right to Information Campaigns. A key principle identified in the application of these mechanisms was a focus on local entitlements in order to engage the interests and vigilance of civil society, and particularly of poor people. The challenge faced by communication implementers is to provide an answer to the question these people will ask: What does this mean for me in my locality? This may involve translating a poverty reduction strategy into local languages, simplifying it, removing jargon and communicating clearly how different communities stand to benefit. However it also means allowing local people to have greater influence in determining the priorities of the strategy in the first place.

Participants expressed consensus that donors, governments, academics, media and civil society need to foster an enabling environment for a vibrant, organic civil society that, of its own volition, demands accountability from government and other leaders. The discussion focused on the need to recognize that support for ‘capacity development’ within formal institutions is not enough. Participants want to see support for the *mechanisms* that encourage participation of the unorganized poor. This is painstaking work because every element of the mechanism and every step in the process of applying these mechanisms are important and context-specific.

Following is a brief panel-by-panel summary of discussions.

Panel I: Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Can we even have this discussion?

Participants discussed the implications of donors avoiding discussion of democratic principles and practice in relation to poverty reduction; what it means today for outside agencies to purport to be politically “neutral”; and whether apolitical language is necessary for diplomacy, or rather, a way for both governments and donors to hide from adhering to true democratic principles.

There was general agreement that, while the term “**democracy**” is still too sensitive in the international development arena, the principles on which it is based – participation; transparency; freedoms of information, expression, and assembly; and domestic accountability – are essential to sustained poverty reduction. As one participant said, if you want to deepen voice, deepen democracy.

One participant noted that African governments have trouble agreeing on the definition of democracy, but do agree on the concept of good governance. There was consensus among the group that the principles that are considered “democratic” are universal and suggested using the term democracy with a “small d”.

The participants strongly agreed that donors bear responsibility, if not for ensuring that such principles are adhered to, then at least for helping to create an enabling environment for them to exist. Government to government accountability is not enough. There must also be accountability to citizens too. Participants suggested donors could support this by making the case for democratic principles to governments; demonstrating the long-term benefits of real accountability to political players; increasing communication capacity in governments; and supporting policies and practices that increase the free flow of information within countries.

Some participants suggested that donors need to recognize that there were actors within governments who directly oppose greater accountability in practice, even though they may agree to it in order to receive development assistance. They agreed that donors need to better understand the local political economy, to make adjustments in their assistance that reflect this, and to push ahead with initiatives that increase and measure accountability.

Panel II: Accountability: What creates the demand for good governance?

Participants discussed whether donors and governments define “accountability” clearly enough for it to be measured; the responsibility of donors and governments in strengthening information and communication processes; and the appropriate role for donors in creating an environment that fosters mobilized public opinion.

Participants strongly agreed that strengthening communication and information processes was central to deepening voice and accountability. They also agreed that measuring whether or not people were aware of their rights and understood the intended outcomes of poverty reduction policies and programs was critical for measuring their ability to demand accountability.

In the same way, they said that measuring whether or not people actually had any influence on such policies and programs was important for determining whether the intended “beneficiaries” truly had any voice in their country. Rather than including such measurements of inclusion and effectiveness, most **consultations** on national poverty reduction strategies have been rather tokenistic and under-representative, according to the broad consensus of the group.

There was fairly strong consensus that the word “consultation”, as it is currently being used, merits skepticism. Too often, consultations amount to asking specific, identified groups to comment on development priorities that have already been set by donors and elite leaders in the country. And, after consultations have taken place, the results are typically not communicated. One participant asked that donors and governments allow citizens to act as ‘architects who construct and design, rather than just interior designers who move the furniture around.’

Another participant explained how the cynicism engendered by the first round of consultations for that country’s poverty reduction strategy led the PRSP team to rethink the process and approach people differently by giving them a chance to actually identify the development priorities for the PRSP. This effectively transformed the process of “consultation” into what she termed a process of “co-creation”.

There was broad agreement that **strengthening communication and information flows** on development issues must be more creative than just focusing on the traditional media. Participants expressed the view that “organic” communication channels—that is, informal channels that exist at all levels, but particularly among poor people—should be respected and utilized by

development leaders, rather than reliance only on artificial or externally designed channels such as formal PRSP consultations.

There was a strong call for better listening to local voices on the part of donors and development leaders to understand how people absorb information and make decisions locally, and to “capture” the voice, opinions and priorities of the multitude of people who may not be represented by formal civil society. Participants agreed that only in this way would a poverty reduction strategy truly represent the demands of the unorganized poor. One participant explained how, in her country, donor, NGO and government representatives in the capital wanted to focus on justice in the poverty reduction strategy. But after consulting 38,000 people in the villages, it became clear that education was the first priority for citizens.

Although informal or non-traditional communication, especially among rural and poor people was emphasized, the group agreed that the traditional media was absolutely critical, and called for creative measures to strengthen its coverage of development issues.

Participants pointed to disparities in access to information, and said that people could not have a voice if they did not have access. Definitions of the word “access” varied, with some participants pointing to translation of PRSP documents in local languages, others calling for freedom of information acts (and enforcement of such acts), access to technology, and the writing of documents in layperson’s language instead of technocratic jargon. Others emphasized the need to give greater support to civic education so that people would have a greater capacity to understand development issues and demand accountability.

Panel III: A Strong Civil Society: Looking for commitment. Participants discussed the respective roles and responsibilities of donors and governments, both in intellectual leadership and action, in strengthening civil society. They discussed what would be required for CSOs to take on a more proactive role in demanding accountability, and what the policy implications would be.

The strongest shared sentiment among the participants was that civil society is “organic”, rather than “built”. Focus should therefore be on helping to create the enabling environment needed for an active and independent civil society to grow and thrive.

Participants called on donors and governments to recognize that the formal civil society with which they work is not necessarily representative of the multitudes of poor people. They called on development leaders to be more thorough and creative in their consultative/participatory processes to ensure that those whom they consult were truly representative of the public at large.

There was a fairly strong consensus that civil society had a responsibility to play a greater role in mobilizing public opinion to increase influence on poverty reduction policies and to demand greater accountability. Some suggested that creating strategic alliances, or common platforms, among civil society, the media and academics could help civil society be a more effective watchdog of government activities, and cited a number of examples where this is being done.

There was a call by many participants to look for creative ways for citizens to hold their governments to account, including the Citizens’ Report Card and the public expenditure tracking survey (PETS). It was noted that these tools or mechanisms require supportive information and communication processes in order to be effective.

There was also a call for the strengthening of the autonomy of existing structures of accountability, including parliaments and their oversight committees, ombudsmen, and disclosure acts, as well as grassroots-level structures for accountability.

Participants called on donors to not only make consultation and disclosure mandatory in programs which receive assistance, but to also call for measuring of the success of such activities to ensure that they are having the promised effect of increasing accountability (i.e., whether people know their rights and understand what is happening and whether the environment is such that they may exercise these rights and participate effectively to influence policy).

Panel IV: The Media and Poverty Reduction: Moving beyond criticism.

There has long been criticism of the developing countries' media for being unwilling or unable to sufficiently cover poverty-related issues. However, there is good and bad journalism everywhere. Media in developing countries often face increased risk and require more assistance, according to some conference participants, than they are currently receiving from the highest levels of government and the donor community.

Participants discussed the respective roles and responsibilities of donors, governments and civil society in terms of strengthening the media and improving the environment in which they work. Consensus was expressed around the idea that the media had a responsibility to contribute to development and poverty reduction and that the donors, governments, civil society and academics should see the media as not just disseminators of information, but as active partners in development.

Several expressed skepticism about the media's ability to be an effective and interested partner in development because of the notion that poverty and development issues do not sell newspapers; the political biases of owners of media outlets; and poor capacity of journalists to understand development issues. Others identified examples of news organizations and civil society working together to increase the interest and capacity of the media to cover development issues in a way that did sell, thus making the point that the inherent need of media to cater to their public could co-exist with public-service journalism. In the words of one participant, "socially responsible journalism can be good business."

Participants also mentioned the importance of taking into account the environment in which journalists work. Several noted the risks many journalists take and the intimidation and harassment they face when undertaking investigative reporting. Unless the rule of law and media freedoms are enforced, participants said, the media is not free to fairly report on issues such as corruption and accountability. Such freedom, they said, is central to sustainable development.

There was a strong consensus, however, that the focus on dissemination of information should not be limited to the traditional media, which currently does not reach (or is not respected by) many people at the grassroots level. The advice of many participants was that donors and their government partners need to respect, help strengthen, and work through local structures of communication that already exist.

One participant suggested that media in developing countries need to adopt the best practices from the Western media tradition, particularly journalistic ethics, and adapt them to their own situation.

There was also discussion about the need to increase the capacity of journalists outside of the urban elite newspapers to help increase the coverage of development and poverty-related issues in local media. Repeated calls were made for better training of journalists and increased support to educational institutions that train journalists.

IV. Roles and Responsibilities for furthering the Voice and Accountability Agenda

What Role for Civil Society? Participants agreed that civil society should assume the lead role in amplifying the voice of the people and demanding greater domestic accountability, but said governments and donors should support this by ensuring that more relevant information is provided, and is in a format and language people can understand. There was consensus that civil society should be an active player in setting the agenda for poverty reduction in their countries.

What Role for Governments? Participants said that governments need to be better and more transparent communicators. They need to be more focused on the demand side of development, and ensure that poverty reduction strategies reflect the views of citizens. It was agreed that governments have a role to play in passing freedom of information legislation and making relevant information more readily available to citizens in a format they can understand and access. Some expressed the view that increasing government communication capacity was important. One participant pointed out, however, that governments are often capable of communicating more effectively, but may not have the willingness or incentive to do so.

What Role for Donors? Participants acknowledged that donors should not be the primary actors in developing countries in terms of communicating directly with people, mobilizing civil society, or improving the coverage of journalism. This is the responsibility of countries themselves. However, they asserted that wherever donors provide financing, they have a responsibility to be, in some ways, accountable to citizens, not just governments.

Donors also have a role to play in creating an environment where citizens' participation in the development process is improved by better information and communication processes around development issues, according to participant consensus. Some expressed the view that donors should do more to increase government communication capacity, and where political will is lacking, make the case to governments for implementing participatory processes, and emphasizing the political benefits of accountability.

Participants called on donors to increase conditionalities to oblige governments to disclose information, foster an enabling environment for the media and civil society to participate freely in the development discussion, and fully implement freedom of information acts.

One participant asked the donors who organized the conference, "Are you serious about taking action on these issues?" challenging the donors and offering to work with them to follow up with further actions to strengthen voice and accountability.

What Role for the Media? There was consensus that the media should be seen as active partners in development, not just mouthpieces for government or donors. It was noted that donors should promote the media's role as an independent watchdog, and as an institution essential to the governance and accountability agenda. It was suggested that the media should and could do a better job of covering development issues in a way that interests their audiences. It was also suggested that the media could share some common platforms with civil society and academic groups to improve coverage of poverty issues.

What Role for Academics? The role of academics was seen as one of partners with journalists and civil society for translating and explaining complex development issues. One academic present said that the role of academics in developing countries as partners for civil society and media was not being fully explored.

Some academic researchers said their work was constrained by the politics that affect funding for their universities and research projects, leading some of them to be nervous about making comments or undertaking studies that could be construed as political. Nevertheless, they saw there was a need and responsibility for them and their peers to do more to contribute to understanding by governments, the media and civil society of complex development policies.

Academics can also partner with donors to help produce a “body of evidence” that supports the value-added by communication and information for deepening voice and accountability. Many participants noted that such evidence is required to be able to demonstrate the impact of deepening voice and accountability for poverty reduction programs.

V. Participants’ Recommendations for Promoting the Voice and Accountability Agenda

Participants were asked to recommend one practical and feasible action to promote voice and accountability. Suggestions included:

1. **Sharing media best practice:** Identify and share best practices in media through some type of events or activities, to demonstrate that media coverage of poverty is not philanthropy, but is good business as well. The suggestion was made to choose some champions, for example the BBC, to assist in this.
2. **Dedicated fund for training journalists:** Donors could look at supporting a dedicated fund to support investigative journalism.
3. **National-level communication dialogue:** Hold national-level conferences which discuss the central role of information and communication to poverty reduction.
4. **Central role for communication:** Put communication and information front and center in the strategic goals of development. Use the results of this meeting to sensitize technocrats in donor organizations.
5. **Information initiatives:** Donors could invest more in dedicated information initiatives
6. **Communication studies:** Donors fund studies on the local perceptions of the media and communication, the unorganized poor, and alternative ways of communication.
7. **Make communication mandatory:** All projects funded by donors should be required to have communication strategies.
8. **Simplify Donor Processes:** Donors should better harmonize and simplify their procedures so that their representatives in countries can spend more time on implementation to improve the effectiveness of assistance.
9. **Development research:** Select research on development, simplify and convert it into something the various media networks could use to get more media coverage of development issues.
10. **Support pilot projects:** Donors provide support to projects which are already underway, for example ECONDAD (the Ecowas Network on Debt and Development) which is working at

the West Africa level to increase civil society influence on development policy, and find ways to replicate the experience.

11. **Communication research:** Choose one or two countries to research how information flows among unorganized poor. Use that research to spark nationwide conversations about what it means to be a part of the unorganized poor. This could be an instructive tool that communicates how to reach this group, rather than just a report.
12. **Sensitize donors:** Donors' field-based staff need to be sensitized to communication issues. Donors should look at practices in some agencies to 'mainstream' communications as a core skill for agency and field staff.
13. **Governance reforms :** Support oversight capacities of parliamentary committees, especially committees on media and information, public accounts, poverty alleviation, human rights and justice.
14. **Standard setting:** Support projects facilitating local implementation of international and regional standards of freedom of expression and information to allow people in countries to fulfill their role as watchdogs.
15. **Help build communication capacity in governments :** Donors should look at ways to help developing country governments build communications and information capacity, and encourage the political will to increase participation
16. **PRSP communication strategy:** In the PRSP updating process, government officials should come up with a communication strategy together with donors.
17. **Support for institutes of higher education** should be given by donors to increase the study and comprehension of development issues.
18. **Support freedom of information** acts in developing countries.
19. **The communication environment audit.** Conduct media audits to show the gaps in reaching the unorganized poor. Start with two cases.
20. **Design and roll out globally a senior management course on development communication.**

**Deepening Voice and Accountability to Fight Poverty:
Dialogue of Communication Implementers
Participant List**

| Name | Affiliation | Email contact |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Abdul S. Oroh | Nigeria - MP | aroh@yahoo.com |
| Abhijit Banerjee, | US - Massachusetts Institute of Technology | banerjee@mit.edu |
| Aissata Bagnan Fall | Niger - PRSP Secretariat, Prime Minister's Office | aissata_fall@yahoo.fr |
| Alfred Opubor | Benin - West African News-media and Development Centre | papas@wanad.org |
| Dan Banik | Norway - University of Oslo | dan.banik@sum.uio.no |
| Danilo Leonardi | UK - Oxford University | danilo.leonardi@socio-legal-studies.oxford.ac.uk |
| David Ugolor | Nigeria – African Network for Environmental and Economic Justice | david@aneej.org |
| Emilia Pires | West Bank/Gaza – Local Aid Coordination Secretariat | pires.emilia@gmail.com |
| Esther Duflo | US – Massachusetts Institute of Technology | eduflo@mit.edu |
| Fackson Banda | South Africa – Rhodes University | f.banda@ru.ac.za |
| Hovhannes Azizyan, | Armenia – PRSP Secretariat | hazizyan@mail.ru |
| Mahfuz Anam | Bangladesh – <i>The Daily Star</i> Newspaper | editor@thedailystar.net / editor@thedailystar.net |
| Mandana Ismail Abeywardene | Sri Lanka – <i>The Sunday Leader</i> and <i>Morning Leader</i> newspapers | mandy_i2000@yahoo.com |
| Maya Sandu | Moldova – Ministry of Economy and Trade | msandu@moldova.md |
| Minon Vega | Nicaragua – Executive Office | mvega@presidencia.gob.ni |
| Suresh Acharya | Nepal – <i>Agenda Saptahik Weekly</i> newspaper and Nepalnewstoday.com | sacharya@info.com.np |
| Norbert Mao | Uganda - MP | nmao@parliament.go.ug |
| Phan Van Ngoc | Vietnam – ActionAid International | NgocP@actionaidvietnam.org |
| Rustam Babajanov | Tajikistan – PRSP Monitoring Group | barumi@mail.ru |
| Samuel Paul | India – Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore | samuelpaul@mac.com |
| Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay | UK – Oxford University | sanghamitra.bandyopadhyay@economics.ox.ac.uk |
| William Ahadzie | Ghana – PRSP Secretariat | wahadzie@ug.edu.gh |

OECD Member countries

| Country | Name | Email Contact |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Germany/BMZ | Steffen Beitz, | Steffen.Beitz@bmz.bund.de |
| Greece/Hellenic Aid | Maria-Loukopoulou | mloukopoulou@mfa.gr |
| Netherlands | Jeroen Verheul | Jeroen.Verheul@minibuza.nl |
| | Martin de Boer | marten-de.boer@minbuza.nl |
| Norway | Beate Stirø | beate.stiro@mfa.no |
| | Monica Svenskerud | Monica.Svenskerud@mfa.no |
| Portugal/IPAD | Cristina Pinto | christina.pinto@ipad.mne.gov.pt |
| | Margarida Lages | margarida.lages@ipad.mne.gov.pt |
| | Paulo Bernardo | Paulo.bernardo@ipad.mne.gov.pt |
| Sweden/SIDA | Johan Akerblom | johan.akerblom@sida.se |
| | Peter Erichs | Peter.erichs@sida.se |
| | Gunilla Cederqvist | gunilla.cederqvist@sida.se |
| | Laila Abdallah | Laila.abdallah@sida.se |
| Switzerland/SDC | Patrick Kalas | patrick.kalas@deza.admin.ch |
| | Anton Stadler | Anton.stadler@deza.admin.ch |
| UK/DfID | Michael Green | M-Green@dfid.gov.uk |
| | Michael Battcock | M-Battcock@dfid.gov.uk |
| | Sina Odugbemi | S-Odugbemi@dfid.gov.uk |
| | Eamoinn Taylor | E-Taylor@dfid.gov.uk |
| UK OECD delegation | David Bendor | david.bendor@fco.co.uk |
| USA/USAID | Wendy Coursen | wcoursen@usaid.gov |

Other

| Organization | Name | Email contact |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Romania | Mihaela Popescu | mihaela.popescu@amb-roumanie.fr |

International Organization Representatives

| Organization | Name | Email contact |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---|
| OECD | Kiyo Akasaka | kiyo.akasaka@oecd.org |
| | Richard Manning | Richard.Manning@oecd.org |
| | Javier Santiso | javier.santiso@oecd.org |
| | Michael Roeskau | Michael.Roeskau@oecd.org |
| | Joanne Caddy | Joanne.Caddy@oecd.org |
| | Bill Nicol | William.Nicol@oecd.org |
| | Ida McDonnell | Ida.mcdonnell@oecd.org |
| | Josephine Pagani | Josephine.Pagani@oecd.org |
| | Henri-Bernard Solignac-Lecomte | Henri-Bernard.SOLIGNAC-LECOMTE@oecd.org |
| | Bathylle Missika-Wierzba | Bathylle.Missika-Wierzba@oecd.org |
| | Sebastian Bartsch | Sebastian.Bartsch@oecd.org |
| | Patti O'Neill | Patti.O'Neill@oecd.org |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| | Meggan Dissly | Meggan.dissly@oecd.org |
| | Felix Zimmermann | Felix.zimmermann@oecd.org |
| | Nico Jaspers | Nico.Jaspers@oecd.org |
| | Ebba Dohlman | Ebba.Dohlman@oecd.org |
| | Ben Dickinson | Ben.Dickinson@oecd.org |
| The World Bank | Paul Mitchell | Pmitchell1@worldbank.org |
| | Linda Van Gelder | lvangelder@worldbank.org |
| | Rajib Upadhya | rupadhya@worldbank.org |
| | Masud Mozammel | mmozammel@worldbank.org |
| | Diana Chung | Dchung1@worldbank.org |
| | Zita Lichtenberg | zlichtenberg@worldbank.org or zita14@gmail.com |
| | Nawsheen Elaheebocus | nelaheebocus@worldbank.org |
| | Jean-Christophe Bas | jbas@worldbank.org |
| Asian Development Bank | Omana Nair | onair@adb.org |
| African Development Bank | Magatte Wade | m.wade@afdb.org |
| | Eric Chinje | e.chinje@afdb.org |
| International Monetary Fund | Pierre Ewencyk | pewencyk@imf.org |
| UN Millennium Campaign | Mandeep Bains, | mandeep.bains@undp.org |
| European Commission | Peter Linvald-Nielsen | Peter.LINDVALD-NIELSEN@cec.eu.int |
| European Centre for Development Policy Management | Bridget McBean | bmb@ecdpm.org |
| World Association of Newspapers | Timothy Balding | tbalding@wan.asso.fr |
| BBC World Trust | Stephen King | stephen.king@bbc.co.uk |
| Communication for Social Change Consortium | Denise Gray-Felder | denise@communicationforsocialchange.org |
| | James Deane | jdeane@communicationforsocialchange.org |
| UNDP Oslo Governance Center | Elizabeth McCall | elizabeth.mccall@undpgov.org |
| Panos London | Jon Barnes | Jon.Barnes@panos.org.uk |
| Institut Panos Paris | Françoise Havelange | fhavelange@panosparis.org |
| | René Roemersma | rene.roemersma@panosparis.org |



The World
Bank Group

Deepening Voice and Accountability to Fight Poverty: Dialogue of Communication Implementers

OECD, meeting room Franqueville
30-31 March, 2006

PROGRAM

March 30

- 8:30 *Arrival and tea/coffee outside meeting room*
- 9:00 **Opening remarks** by Richard Manning, Chairman, OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and Javier Santiso, Chief Development Economics – Deputy Director, OECD Development Centre, and Sina Odgubemi, Manager, Information and Communication for Development Information and Civil Society, DFID
- 9:30 **Panel I: Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Can we even have this discussion?**
- 10:45 *Break*
- 11:00 **Panel II: Accountability: What creates the demand for good governance?**
- 12:30 *LUNCH*
- 14:00 **Panel III: A Strong Civil Society: Looking for commitment**
- 15:30 *Break*
- 15:45 **Panel IV: The Media and Poverty Reduction: Moving beyond criticism**
- 17:15 **Closing Remarks**
- 17:30 *End of Day 1*
- 19:30 *DINNER at Le Boeuf sur le Toit restaurant*

March 31

- 8:30 *Coffee outside room*
- 9:00 **Wrap up from Day 1 and setting goals for breakout groups, which will cover practical applications for topics discussed on Day 1.**
- 10:00 Breakout group discussions
- 12:30 *LUNCH*
- 14:00 **Report back and discussion.**
- 16:00 *Break*
- 16:15 **Discussion on commitments for next steps**
- 18:00 *End of Conference*

Day I Panel Procedures

Each panel will have a facilitator, and will consist of three participants: a lead speaker and two respondents. After the facilitator introduces the topic, the lead speaker will briefly (10 minutes) identify key issues and priorities under that topic. One respondent will then reply to the points made by the lead speaker, expressing any agreement /disagreement with the key issues, and, if desired, add other issues or priorities. The second respondent will reply to the points made by the lead speaker and first respondent, and is free to add additional points. Each respondent is asked to take around 5 to 10 minutes to respond. The facilitator will summarize what has been said, and will then open up the discussion to the entire group.

Day II Breakout Group Procedures

A facilitator will work with the entire group to summarize proceedings from day one and set up the discussion for day two. Then the group will divide into smaller, breakout groups, which will meet for two hours to discuss the practical applications of the four topics discussed on day one. Each group will choose its own facilitator and *rapporteur*. One of the conference organizers will participate in each group to record proceedings in detail. Lunch will be served, after which, the groups will meet back in the main room where the four *rapporteurs* will report back to the entire group. A facilitator will then work with the entire group to summarize the conference and agree on recommendations for next steps.

Panel Details

Following is a more detailed outline of some key issues to guide the panel discussions, (participants may, of course, identify additional issues or priorities). Keeping in mind that this is a unique conference of people who are actively working worldwide in the areas of information, communication, and civil society participation, it is hoped that the following three questions will be explored as an underlying theme, in each discussion:

- a. How do we reconcile the rhetoric of participatory poverty reduction with the reality of politics and political power plays on the ground?
- b. How do we “scale up” and make sustainable the good work that is already being done?
- c. What is the specific role of communication and information in all of the areas we are discussing?

Panel I: Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Can we even have this discussion?

Assertions: Donors commonly use “participation” and “transparency” as politically neutral terms which constitute good development practice. Yet these words actually represent democratic principles which challenge the political culture and power structure of many countries. What governments may accept at the table, in theory, to obtain financing, is typically distorted or even discarded in practice when politics take over and vested interests are threatened.

Questions:

1. What are the implications of avoiding the discussion of democratic principles and practice in relation to poverty reduction?
2. Are donors and governments in sync with other key development players—in particular the media and civil society—in terms of the terminology being used?
3. What does it mean today for outside development agencies to be politically “neutral”?
4. Is apolitical language acceptable for its diplomacy, or is it really a way for both governments and donors to shield their poverty reduction programs from having to adhere to true democratic principles?

Panel II: Accountability: What creates the demand for good governance?

Assertions: Donors and governments these days all formally agree on the need for good governance and accountability for poverty reduction programs and their results. Yet they do not fully recognize the essential role of information and communication processes, which are still added on as afterthoughts, rather than seen as integral to the transformation they are trying to achieve.

Questions:

1. Is this true?
2. Are donors and governments defining “accountability” clearly enough for it to be measured?
3. How are the media, academics and civil society doing in terms of holding government and donors to account?

4. What is the responsibility of donors and governments in supporting countries' information and communication processes to mobilize public opinion, and strengthen ownership and transparency of poverty reduction strategies?
5. What is the situation regarding solid research on the role of information and communication in improving development effectiveness, and do we need more?

Panel III: A Strong Civil Society: Looking for commitment

Assertion: An active civil society is important in the fight against poverty. However, local political dynamics and policies often prevent or undermine an active civil society despite efforts by donors and NGOs to support it.

Questions:

1. What are the most important developments needed, in terms of policy and the local environment, to support a more active and effective civil society?
2. What should be the roles of governments, donors, and academic researchers and civil society itself to help create such an environment?
3. Are we seeing enough commitment and action from these groups?

Panel IV: The Media and Poverty Reduction: Moving Beyond Criticism

Assertion: Free, plural and independent media systems are fundamental for pro-poor development. It is not for nothing that in the West, the media are called the Fourth Estate of the Realm. Yet still, too often we see that poverty issues in developing countries are not covered in a way that will mobilize public opinion and change policy, and lead to greater accountability and better results. We need to move beyond simple criticism of the media, however, and into constructive action for change which involves all relevant stakeholders.

Questions:

2. Is this true?
3. What are we seeing—and not seeing—in terms of strengthening the media and improving the environment in which they work?
4. Who is—and who should be—taking responsibility for various aspects of this?
5. What is the role that donors, governments and academia should be taking, and what do we need to see from the media themselves?

Panels and moderators

Day I

Panel I: Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Can we even have this discussion?

Moderator: Michael Green (DfID)

Lead Speaker: Norbert Mao

Respondent 1: Phan Van Ngoc

Respondent 2: Maya Sandu

Panel II: Accountability: What creates the demand for good governance?

Moderator: Jeroen Verheul (OECD)

Lead Speaker: Samuel Paul

Respondent 1: Suresh Acharya

Respondent 2: David Ugolor

Panel III: A Strong Civil Society: Looking for commitment

Moderator: Michael Battcock (DfID)

Lead Speaker: Emilia Pires

Respondent 1: Abhijit Banerjee

Respondent 2: Mandana Ismail Abeywardene

Panel IV: The Media and Poverty Reduction: Moving beyond criticism

Moderator: Paul Mitchell (The World Bank)

Lead Speaker: Mahfuz Anam

Respondent 1: Abdul S. Oroh

Respondent 2: William Ahadzie

Day II

Wrap up from day one, discussion on goals for day two, and report back and discussion of breakout group results

Moderators: Henri Bernard Solignac-Lecomte and Josephine Pagani (OECD)

Discussion of commitments for next steps

Moderators: Paul Mitchell, Michael Green, and Sina Odugbemi

**Study on Deepening and Sustaining Participation in the Poverty Reduction Strategy:
The Opinions and Experiences of Implementers of Communication Interventions**

Executive Summary

This DFID-World Bank study was conducted as part of the joint World Bank-IMF 2005 Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) five-year review process. The research was qualitative, based on desk research and telephone interviews with the implementers and supervisors of communication interventions in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). By collecting and analyzing the opinion, experience, and recommendations of the practitioners on the ground, the study aims to present practical constraints to two of the core PRSP principles of ownership and participation, offer solutions proposed by the practitioners for removing these constraints, and, finally, provide recommendations for specific action steps to utilize strategic communication approaches to strengthen stakeholder participation in the PRSP process.

The study was designed around four main themes: Governance, Access to Information, Media, and Civil Society. These particular themes were chosen because they represent the areas in which structural impediments to participation and country ownership are most visible in many of the PRSP-implementing countries.

Governance. Governance refers to the institutional arrangement within a country, and whether this arrangement fosters government-citizen dialogue, enabling participation by the public in the formulation of policy. Following were the main findings:

- In countries with a low participation governance culture, government-citizen dialogue, in general, has not been conducive to broad and effective public participation in the PRSP process.
- Government-citizen dialogue was strengthened by the PRSP process, which established an institutional setup for more systematic communication and legal framework for public participation.
- The PRSP might leave some permanent practical legacies if some of the practical constraints to participation are addressed.
- Respondents stated that constraints to participation include: lack of legal framework for participation, lack of awareness about the PRSP, lack of demand for information by the general public, lack of transport infrastructure and communication channels, lack of media capacity, and lack of trust between Government and civil society.
- Recommendations to improve participation include: transparency and open disclosure of information by Government; formalizing the partnership between Government and civil society; removing the public's dependency on the government and encouraging public participation in policy-making; and building capacity of government employees, citizens, and NGOs.

Access to Information. This category examines the existing system within a country for policy-related information to effectively reach its citizens. Main findings include:

- PRSP is a relatively complex policy document, whose related policies are difficult to translate into manageable information for the different stakeholders.

- Much information about the PRSP was circulated at the preparation stage, but this practice has not continued through implementation, thus creating a communication and policy gap between and among PRSP stakeholders.
- There seem to be irregularity and inconsistency in the data published by the Government on PRSP policies.
- While data may be relatively easy to access, the practicalities of doing so are limited only to insiders.
- Respondents' suggestions to overcome obstacles to effective policy communication include: creation of local-level PRSP monitoring centers, promotion of NGO participation at the local level as conduit for information dissemination and feedback, and establishment of formal partnership and cooperation between Government and civil society.

Media. The most common obstacles for communicating PRSP-related reforms rest in the media. Main findings about the media include:

- Lack of practical, legal, and institutional protections of the media for free speech
- Weakness of institutional capacity within the country to respond to media investigations
- Media's vulnerability to capture by a few interest groups or individuals
- Absence of independent sources of finance
- Lack of expertise of media professionals
- Weakness of business acumen among media managers and shareholders
- Weakness of the advertising markets
- Lack of awareness and interest among the media professionals about the PRSP
- Lack of understanding by the media professionals about their role in the PRSP
- Recommendations to overcome these obstacles include: building ownership in the media to continuously cover PRSP-related policies, fostering cooperation between Government and the media, encouraging the Government to provide information regularly and in a timely fashion, and providing training for media professionals.

Civil Society. The role of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as the link between Government and citizens is important in the PRSP implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process. Main findings are as follows:

- Lack of CSO involvement past the PRSP policy-formulation stage
- Lack of effective, albeit active, CSO involvement in the implementation process
- Constraints to CSO participation in the PRSP process include: the absence of capable CSO counterparts to work with the line ministries and government agencies on specific PRSP-related policy issues, lack of CSO capacity to effectively work as partners to or watchdog of the government agencies, lack of Government support to promote CSO inclusion in the process, lack of timely and regular information flow to CSOs, absence of transparency in the CSO selection process in the PRSP, and lack of a clearly defined role for CSOs in the PRSP process.
- Proposed solutions to remove these constraints include: building NGO capacity; educating NGOs about the PRSP and clearly defining their role in it; training NGOs in the independent analysis, identification, and report-writing within the PRSP; explicit Government support for NGO participation in the PRSP; remunerating NGOs; building a genuine partnership paradigm between CSO and Government within the PRSP, establishing an institutional setup for NGOs to promote cooperation among NGOs to work as a team, encouraging closer cooperation between NGOs and the media, and promoting donor coordination to remove duplication of efforts by CSOs in certain sectors and regions.