

Participatory Processes in The Poverty Reduction Strategy Technical Notes

S. Tikare, K. McClean, J. Edgerton, and P. Shah

Outline

Technical Notes

- TN 1: Participation versus Conventional Approaches
- TN 2: Case Example: Uganda's Poverty Reduction Strategy (PEAP)
- TN 3: Sample Participation Action Plans from Different Countries
- TN 4: Assessment of the Current Status of Participation
- TN 5: Conducting a Stakeholder Analysis
- TN 6: Guiding questions for the Participation Plan
- TN 7: Costing of the Participatory process
- TN 8. Ensuring that Participatory Processes Include Women
- TN 9: Designing a Participation Plan
- TN 10: Measuring Progress in Participation
- TN 11: Overcoming Constraints
- TN 12: Private Sector Participation in PRS Process
- TN 13: Workshops Methodology
- TN 14: Methods for Consulting the Poor
- TN 15: Can the Poor Influence the Budget? Case of Uganda
- TN 16: Participatory Policy Formulation and Implementation: Poland Pension Reform
- TN 17: Participatory Monitoring of Service Delivery and Public Expenditure: Indonesia
- TN 18: Definitions

Resource List

References

Technical Notes

TN 1: Participation versus Conventional approaches

This technical note discusses some of the benefits of using participation over “conventional”, less participatory approaches in the implementation of development strategies.

In the past, policy formulation has typically been designed and controlled by policy makers with little participation of the populations affected. Successful implementation of development policies is increasingly linked to participatory approaches in terms of effectiveness and sustainability. This is supported by a Task Manager Survey performed in the World Bank (1999). This study found that 74% of the task managers who responded (192/561) believed that participatory processes in projects had improved preparation, design and implementation. Eighty-seven believed that the views of the direct beneficiaries should be incorporated into operations as a way to improve project and policy outcomes. Ninety-three percent support increasing resources for participation and cited the main obstacles to increasing participation as lack of funding, time pressure for rapid processing of operations, and inadequate time.

Comparison of conventional and participatory approaches relevant to the PRS

Conventional	Participatory	Outcome of participatory approach on conventional
Initiation / assessment		
Poverty Diagnostics – LSMS	PPA – participation of the poor Collaboration- data collectors and analyzers	Combining data sets and involving a range of stakeholders ⇒ more realistic understanding of poverty (⇒ public actions)
Formulation		
Validation workshop with limited stakeholder holder involvement	Involvement in design, consultations regarding formulation in government, civic engagement at the national and local levels, information dissemination, feedback, validation of revised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads to strategy • Builds broad consensus • Country ownership • Develops trust between government and civil society • Opens dialogue • Increases relevance and probability of successful implementation
Institutionalization: Implementation and monitoring		
Use limited no of strategies and SH (providers), Often limited info flow and feedback Limiting opportunities to adapt to changing conditions and unsuccessful mechanisms (ie limited impact on poor)	Participation of Stakeholders in implementation – priorities, resource allocation, monitoring Mechanism for reanalysis	Maximize impact on the poor – participation gives a range of options that increase the possibility of success – transparency and accountability Adapt institutional arrangements accordingly

TN 2: Case Example: Uganda's Poverty Reduction Strategy (PEAP)

The formulation (1995-1997) and implementation of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in Uganda (from 1996) followed a process that evolved over time. The major events have been incorporated into a set of key stages in the example presented.

Commitment to, and enabling environment for, Poverty Reduction

1. *President Museveni's Manifesto* to the Ugandan people in 1986 emphasized the need to reduce poverty
2. *Macro-economic growth* and stability achieved through successful adjustment policies since 1987 (6.5% growth pa from 1987-1997)
3. *Consultative Group (CG)* meeting in 1995 raised concerns about poverty in Uganda based on an analysis of consumption poverty
4. *Two-day conference on poverty eradication*, in November 1995, was organized by Government and facilitated by the World Bank, and attended by the high level Government representatives, parliamentarians, the private sector, donors, social researchers, academia, civil society organizations, the press and the general public. Important features:
 - Government opened the door to potential collaboration with civil society for the first time
 - Diversity of stakeholders from government, including the President, donors and civil society
 - Three months notice was given of the conference. CSOs prepared and presented a very critical but constructive paper.
 - Development issues discussed with a poverty focus for first time
 - Consensus that macro-economic growth had not been sufficiently broad-based to improve the income or the quality of life of the majority of the population – the 60% of the population living below the poverty line.

Formulation of the PEAP (1995 – 1997)

1. *Government meeting with donors* to catch the momentum generated by the Poverty Conference, in order to arrange facilitation of poverty reduction efforts
2. *National Task Force on Poverty Eradication* was formed in late 1995 by the Ministry of Finance and Planning, in consultation with civil society, and was headed by a senior government official. The membership represented civil society organizations, government ministries and donors. The mandate of the Task Force was to prioritize public actions across various sectors to maximize poverty reduction and to formulate a strategy, called an *Action Plan* (became the PEAP), that would direct the use of public resources and actions for poverty eradication
3. The Task Force drawn up an *operational direction* to ensure the widest possible participation in formulating the - Government, Parliament, donors, academia and CSOs, especially those that were providing social services to the poor.
4. A *Resource Team* of 5 local and international experts was hired to draft a working document that formed the basis of consultation. This working document was modified and evolved over time. This resource team organized the participatory process on behalf of the Task Force. A key feature to this administration was the rapid and effective flow of information (such as meeting minutes and workshop proceedings) to all stakeholders during the process.

5. *Thematic Working Groups (7)* were formed by the Task Force, with representation from government, civil society and donors, to analyze the situation in thematic areas, such as macro-economics, social services, and food security. Additional working groups were formed as a need arose. The working groups used existing data, collected additional data (e.g. public expenditure tracking survey for health and education), and consulted technical experts and service providers to prepare reports, which focused on priorities for poverty reduction in each thematic area and relations with services and infrastructure – opportunities and constraints.
6. *Thematic seminars meetings and retreats* were organized as required by the thematic teams to discuss sectoral issues. Parliamentarians and key stakeholders in the area were invited to these events, that were chaired by the Ministry of Finance and Planning and often facilitated by local or international experts. In these meetings, the Government was often hard-pressed to defend its policies. The minutes were widely disseminated.
7. *Parliamentarians* were motivated by continually being invited into the process.
8. *Drafting* was performed by a team of consultants who were not part of the original resource team. This occurred due to the split in the Ministry into the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Planning.
9. *Validation* of the PEAP draft (early 1997) led to extensive criticism. This caused a major revision of the draft based on the outputs of the working groups. Subsequent regional and national workshops were held, and feedback came from subsequent CG meetings. Revision of the PEAP produced the working version in August 1997. The priority areas of the PEAP were verified to a limited extent during two consultations with the poor during the 1997 participatory CAS
10. *Cabinet endorsed* the PEAP occurred formally in 1998, although the priority poverty areas had been agreed by Parliament and had operated for the budget-making process since mid-1996.

The PEAP

Since 1997, the PEAP has formed the guiding framework for achieving poverty reduction in Uganda. The PEAP adopts a multi-sectoral approach, recognizing the multi-dimensional nature of poverty. Within the context of continuing macro-economic stability and broad-based economic growth, the PEAP aims to promote the following:

- (i) **Increased incomes for the poor** by supporting the modernization of agriculture to improve food security and productivity; improving land laws; providing an adequate road network; improving rural market infrastructure; strengthening rural financial services; enhanced productivity of the labour force; promotion of micro- and small-scale enterprises; improving telecommunications; and rural electrification.
- (ii) **Improving the quality of life of the poor** by improving access to health care, education and clean water, as well as effective management of natural resources and disaster preparedness.
- (iii) **Strengthening governance** through mechanisms to improve security, increase accountability and transparency, decentralization, enhanced flow of information, and the democratic principles of consultation and popular participation.

In order to eradicate poverty effectively, **priority poverty areas** have been set under the PEAP as primary health care, rural feeder roads, education, water, modernization of agriculture, particularly extension and research. The Government of Uganda has embarked on implementing the PEAP, through sector policies and sector-wide investment programs.

Implementation of the PEAP

Implementation of the PEAP is performed under the 3-year **Medium Term Expenditure Framework** (MTEF) - a Government-wide approach, which integrates policy making with expenditure based on strategic priority poverty areas, and current budget constraints consistent with the PEAP and medium term financial stability. Under the MTEF, line ministries and local governments¹ are given ceilings upon which to base their budget allocations. The revision of the MTEF occur annually as part of the budget-making process. The annual MTEF revision is a participatory process, as indicated by the 1999/2000 budget process outlined below:

- *National Level:*
 - First Budget Conference in October – local and national government and civil society and private sector participants. Ceilings are announced, key areas identified and working groups (16) assigned (e.g. poverty, macro-economics, local government, security, social sectors, accountability, gender, labor etc).
 - Poverty Working Group has advisory functions to all the other thematic / sectoral groups
 - Retreats and report preparation
 - Second Budget Conference where reports of thematic groups are presented and new and core issues discussed
 - Inter-ministerial and donor discussions
 - *Background to the Budget* preparation
- *Local Level*
 - Representation of all district authorities (key political leaders and civil servants) at the First National Budget Conference workshop where indicative allocations for each district disclosed.
 - Second Budget Conference focussed on local government issues of priorities and implementation
 - Each district to prepare a Budget Framework Paper (BFP)
 - Regional workshops on preparation of the BFP, realistic planning and budgeting
 - District BFP to feed into the national BFP
 - National *Budget Framework Paper* prepared – a brief version is made public before the expenditure allocations are approved by Cabinet
 - *Cabinet approval* and public presentation by the President

Some of the key highlights of the implementation of the PEAP are listed:

Participation

1. *Institutionalization of participation* in government processes occurred at national level as a result of the participatory process of formulating the PEAP.
2. *Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process* (UPPAP) was commenced with an extensive participatory poverty assessment, the findings of which were fed into national policy decisions and the budget process (**Technical Note 22**).
3. *MTEF*, as described above.
4. *Participatory sector reviews* and planning.

¹ Ceilings given to local government based on conditional allocations for the priority poverty areas and unconditional grants

5. *District development planning* in some of the 45 districts are performed by consulting lower levels and community, particularly as a result of the Local Government Act 1997 and the Local Government Development Pilot Project.

Resource Allocation

1. *Adjustment of resource allocation* in the 1996-1997 budget to reflect the *Priority Poverty Areas*.
2. *Poverty Action Fund*, created in 1998 with HIPC debt relief and subsequent donor funds, has enabled the Government to double the resources available to programs within the PEAP. The PAF is ring-fenced for the Priority Poverty Areas but is an integrated part of the budget. PAF funds are used exclusively for conditional grants to districts under each of the priority poverty areas. A committee comprised of government and civil society representatives oversees allocations and monitoring of the PAF.
3. Since 1998/99 the MTEF process has incorporated *civil society* in the dialogue on priorities and spending (see above).

Dissemination

1. *Dissemination to ministries and national NGOS* has occurred since 1997
2. *Poverty Status Report* was produced in 1999 and will be produced every two years. This report, produced by the Monitoring Unit in the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, reviews the implementation of the PEAP and assesses the progress in achieving the objectives, goals and targets of the PEAP. The Poverty Status Report highlights areas constraints and challenges for government.
3. A simplified, pictorial version of the PEAP was produced and translated into 5 of the major local languages.
4. *Official Regional Dissemination Tour* was conducted
5. *Media* dissemination of simple action-oriented messages is planned

Revision of the PEAP

Currently, the PEAP is being revised based on the following information:

- The improved poverty profile as a result of the Integrated Household Surveys, Core Welfare Surveys and UPPAP findings and other research or reports of relevance.
- Findings of the findings from consultations with the poor under UPPAP (**Technical Note 22** and **23**).
- Poverty Status Report 1999
- Vision 2025 document
- Reports from the MTEF working groups
- Plan for Modernization of Agriculture and working groups

The revision is also based on the following participatory processes of UPPAP, MTEF thematic working groups, CSO Poverty working group activities, sector reviews, and feedback from the recent regional PEAP dissemination (**Technical Note 15** outlines the plan for the revision of the PEAP in the first half of 2000). During the revision, lessons from the first iteration had ensured that the participatory process is well planned and that it incorporates public information campaigns and district level inputs. A Poverty Working Group is working to revisit the outcome milestones and indicators, under the poverty monitoring system.

Source: Personal communication – Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Government of Uganda; Kitabire, D, The Process of Making Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in Uganda, IMF briefing paper, 1999

TN 3: Participation Action Plans from Several Countries

Guinea-Bissau Interim PRSP Participation Action Plan - September 2000.

The participatory process has been familiar in Guinea-Bissau for over a decade due to the emergence of non-governmental organizations. A remarkable example of a participatory process was the DJITU TEN-NLTPS Perspective Studies, a reference document *par excellence* resulting from a wide-ranging participatory process conducted by staff of the National Research Institute of Guinea-Bissau. The preparation of the Interim NPRSP, starting point for the preparation of a full Poverty Reduction Strategy, followed along those lines (Annex 3), and proceeded in the following stages: (i) declaration of commitment by the Government to make the fight against poverty its main concern, announcement of the decision to prepare the NPRSP and consultations with its development partners (April 2000); (ii) presentation of the results of the prior consultation to the civil society; (iii) establishment of the National Committee (chaired by the Vice Prime Minister and involving relevant Ministers, the Vice President of the National Assembly, and Representatives of civil society and donors) and the Technical Drafting Committee of the NPRSP (April 2000); (iv) poverty retreat (May 2000); (v) participatory discussion of the first draft of the I-NPRSP, involving civil society, the military, the diplomatic representatives, international organizations, NGOs, development partners and local authorities (June through August); and (vi) redrafting and submittal to the IMF and World Bank of the final version of the Interim NPRSP (September 2000).

In preparing the full NPRSP, the Government will continue its consultations with local communities in urban and rural areas, with the goal of achieving a rational consensus on aspirations and strategies and preparing regional programs to reduce poverty and improve living standards. Consultations will also continue at the national level through meetings between the Government and civil society during 2001, in order to prepare a strategy paper that will include regional grassroots contributions. Representatives of local authorities, associations, labor unions, businesses and domestic and foreign NGOs will be invited to take part in these consultations. Moreover, the various action plans and programs to be prepared in the context of the full NPRSP will also use participatory methods with active involvement of stakeholders.

To encourage popular participation in the development process in the regions, the Government will speed up and deepen the process of decentralization and strengthening of local authorities and will consolidate the mechanisms for the participation of civil society. The Government will encourage and support improvement of the organizational capacity of different associations and other social and professional groups. As it improves the monitoring of social indicators at the national and local levels and delegates to local authorities the responsibility for preparing and implementing economic and social programs, the Government is convinced that this will help broaden the people's support for the poverty reduction programs and increase the efficiency of economic and social activities.

METHODOLOGY FOR PREPARATION OF FULL NPRSP

The process of designing the full NPRSP will comprise five stages, namely: (1) conducting surveys (MICS, HCES 2001, DHS); (2) conducting participatory studies on poverty; (3) conducting consultations with development partners; (4) estimation of costs to meet objectives proposed in the various components of the full NPRSP; and (5) preparation of the full NPRSP. The envisaged timetable is as follows:

STAGES RESPONSIBLE AGENCY TIMETABLE

1. Surveys

1.1 Survey of women and children (MICS)
National Statistics Office (INEC)
November 2000

1.2 Updated Poverty Profile (HCES 2001)
INEC
September 2001

1.3 Education Statistics
Min. of Education
September 2001

1.4 Health Statistics (DHS)
Min. of Health
September 2001

2. Participatory Study on Poverty

Secretariat of State for Employment and Fight Against Poverty (SSEFAP)
2nd quarter 2001

2.1 Surveys
SSEFAP
April 2001

2.2 Preliminary report
SSEFAP
May 2001

2.3 Full report
SSEFAP
July 2001

3. Preparation of Sectoral Programs and Action Plans

SSEFAP
Nov. 2000-Jul. 2001

3.1 Guidelines for Sectoral Ministries
SSEFAP
November 2000

3.2 First Draft
SSEFAP
June 2001

3.3 Final Draft
SSEFAP
July 2001

4. Consultations

SSEFAP
July/Sept. 2001

4.1 Preparation of Sectoral Programs/Action Plans

4.1.1 Interested Stakeholders

Relevant Ministries
March-June 2001

4.2 Preparation of Full NPRSP

4.2.1 Local Communities — Rural Areas

SSEFAP
March-Sept. 2001

4.2.2 Local Communities —Urban Areas

SSEFAP
March-Sept. 2001

4.2.3 Public Sector Entities

SSEFAP
March-Sept. 2001

4.2.4 Private Sector Entities

SSEFAP
March-Sept. 2001

4.2.5 Civil Society (People's National Assembly, NGOs, Religious Associations,
Professional Associations, Labor Unions, Armed Forces and Police, etc.)

SSEFAP
March-Sept. 2001

4.3 International Organizations

SSEFAP
Sept. and Nov. 2001

5. Preparation of full NPRSP

SSEFAP
Nov. 2000- Dec. 2001

5.1 Approval of detailed NPRSP preparation program

SSEFAP
November 2000

5.2 Definition of system of indicators for full NPRSP
NPSRP Committee (NPRSP-C)
December 2000

5.3 Preparation of initial draft

SSEFAP / NPRSP-C
October 2001

5.4 Preparation of final version

SSEFAP / NPRSP-C

December 2001

In view of the preliminary stage of programming of the various I-NPRSP components, the Government is aware that some of the ambitious policy commitments and objectives described above may have to be reviewed when the full version of the NPRSP is prepared.

Monitoring

Preparation of the full NPRSP will be the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Solidarity, Reinsertion of Combatants, and Fight Against Poverty, acting through its Secretariat of State for Employment and Fight Against Poverty. A Steering and Monitoring Committee will be established in November 2000 to assure the successful preparation of the poverty reduction program and monitor data on poverty. In this context, the Committee will: (i) approve in November 2000 a detailed program for preparation of the full NPRSP; (ii) issue Guidelines, in December 2000, for line ministries on preparing sectoral programs/action plans, on the basis of, inter alia, the Interim-NPRSP and the baseline macroeconomic framework for the period through 2003; and (iii) specify, by December 2000, the system of indicators to monitor poverty developments to be included in the full NPRSP.

The Government intends to set up a poverty observatory system by (i) strengthening national, regional and local capacities to collect, process and monitor quantitative and qualitative data on poverty; and (ii) providing information to the public on the poverty situation and on the impact of the policies implemented. In order to set up and guarantee the proper operation of the system to monitor the NPRSP indicators and, in particular, the data on poverty, the Government intends to carry out annual cost-of-living and living conditions surveys, with external support yet to be identified. The Government is aware of the need to continue the efforts undertaken in the context of the NPRSP with a view to establish an updated knowledge base on poverty. The Government intends to strengthen existing information systems, including those pertaining to public expenditures and social indicators at the central and local Government levels, and to develop new systems as deemed necessary, such as comprehensive household consumption and expenditure surveys.

Bolivia Participation Action Plan, Interim PRSP, May 2000

1. Based on this important experience, and with the aim of constructing a final strategy for the reduction of poverty with full participation of the principal social and political actors, including the political opposition, a **second National Dialogue will be convened with the following objectives:**

- (i) To transform initiatives into State policies aimed at promoting growth and reducing poverty, on the basis of agreements reached between the government, the opposition, and civil society.
- (ii) To strengthen civil society trust in this instrument.
- (iii) To prioritize the use of resources for poverty reduction.
- (iv) To institute a participatory body in charge of following up on and monitoring commitments made in the course of the National Dialogue.

2. At the present time, **the participation of NGOs and private entrepreneurs has been assured and discussions are underway to include the church and political parties of the opposition.** International cooperation in conjunction with the public sector will prepare financial funding for the principal programs of social development.

3. A tentative agenda to achieve these objectives would include the following :

January 2000. National Dialogue announced and convened.

January 2000. Consultations with all political parties, congress representatives, and the church to reach an agreement regarding the most important topics to be discussed in the dialogue.

January 2000. A steering council will be formed, chaired by the President of the Republic and comprising the Vice-President of the Republic; the Ministers of the Presidency, Finance and

Economic Development; and representatives of civil society. The council will determine the topics of discussion within the issues agreed upon in the previous consultations and will promote participation. The council will meet every two weeks to monitor the dialogue process and to follow-up on its results.

January 2000. A National Dialogue Secretariat will also be created, chaired by the Vice-President and composed of representatives of the Ministries of Finance and Economic Development and representatives of civil society. The Secretariat will organize meetings to develop and analyze the proposals and will name representatives for the workshops in which participation will be actively promoted.

January 2000. Discussions with the representatives of the civil society to assist in defining the specific issues for the National Dialogue.

February 2000. Working documents will be prepared by the participants in the dialogue, the government, and representatives of the civil society. These documents will comprise the basis for the discussion. The government will provide official information on social statistics, financial data, and other documents required by the representatives of the civil society for the development of their working documents.

March 2000. Three National Workshops will be held to revise the policy proposals obtained from the working documents, and the agreements and disagreements resulting from the workshops will be documented. These results will, in turn, be presented to the Regional Workshops.

April 2000. The results of the National and Regional Workshops will be discussed with the goal of helping to define the national policies at local levels, taking the specific problems and characteristics of each region into account.

May 2000. National Dialogue meetings will be held to consider the poverty reduction strategy proposal and its plan of action.

May 2000. The proposals will be brought together and a final poverty reduction strategy document will be prepared.

KENYA I-PRSP PARTICIPATION ACTION PLAN June 2000

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST – KSH. 70 MILLION

Objectives/Values	Activities	Stakeholders	Monitoring Indicators	Time Frame
<p>To promote participation of the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p>To increase transparency and accountability to the public from the planning to delivery stages.</p> <p>To reach consensus/agreement with various stakeholders on policies and priorities for poverty reduction.</p>	<p>1. Set up a National Consultative Structure:</p> <p>Set up a consultative committee.</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping.</p> <p>Capacity building for all stakeholders on the PRSP</p>	<p>Government</p> <p>Sector groups</p> <p>Civil society</p> <p>Private sector</p> <p>Poor communities</p> <p>Media</p> <p>Women' s groups</p> <p>NGOs</p> <p>Others</p>	<p>Functioning small working group (6-10) persons).</p> <p>Develop participatory map – and agree on principles, select districts and stratify by livelihood patterns.</p> <p>Information dissemination (on the process) through variety of channels, i.e. public</p>	<p>July – Aug 2000</p>

Draft for Comments. April 2001.

<p>To develop a gender responsive poverty reduction strategy.</p> <p>To enhance ownership of PRSP.</p>	<p>process.</p>		<p>forums, districts, and civil society organizations, media, etc.</p> <p>Organize capacity building workshops for all stakeholders.</p>	
<p>To reach agreement of monitoring and evaluation plan for the PRSP.</p> <p>To develop an action plan on poverty reduction.</p> <p>To seek support from development partners on the implementation of PRSP.</p> <p>To ensure transparent resolution of implementation difficulties.</p>	<p>2. <u>Conduct Local Level Consultation:</u></p> <p>Transparent participatory poverty diagnosis inclusive of the perspectives of the poor, women and other vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Poverty information is analyzed.</p> <p>IPRSP re-examined.</p>	<p>Communities</p> <p>Sector groups</p> <p>Local level institutions</p> <p>Women' s groups and women opinion leaders</p> <p>NGOs</p>	<p>Participatory monitoring and evaluation plan that articulates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identification of the poor - location of the poor - identification of their needs for goods and services - opportunities for engaging the productive poor - confirmation or proposed changes to IPRSP. 	<p>Sept 2000</p>
	<p>3. <u>Conduct District Level Consultation:</u></p> <p>Participatory monitoring and evaluation plan endorsed.</p> <p>Compiling information from local level consultations</p>	<p>Local communities</p> <p>Research institution</p> <p>Sector groups</p> <p>Private sector</p> <p>Civil society</p> <p>Women</p> <p>Districts officials</p> <p>Development partners</p> <p>Media</p> <p>NGOs</p> <p>MPS</p>	<p>Agreed list of monitoring and evaluation indicators.</p> <p>Consensus on priorities and strategies for poverty and growth.</p> <p>Ranked priorities and strategies by sector.</p>	<p>Nov 2000</p>
	<p>4. <u>Provincial Workshops:</u></p>	<p>Government officials</p>	<p>Articulate reports on needs per sector and</p>	<p>Nov/ Dec 2000</p>

Draft for Comments. April 2001.

	Harmonize sector needs by province and livelihood patterns	Private sector Civil society Sector groups Women representatives	livelihood patterns.	
	5. <u>National Level</u> Emerging priorities and proposed policy responses. Agree and endorse the proposed monitoring and evaluation plan. National Seminar	Sector groups Private sector NGOs Development partners Civil society National level committee Women representatives	Draft PRSP Well articulated Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Plan endorsed Feedback to stakeholders	Jan 2001
	6. <u>Parliamentary Consultations:</u> Workshop to disseminate information and discuss draft PRSP.	Parliamentary Committees Cabinet	Articulated political support and commitment to implementation	March 2001
	7. <u>Consultative Group Meetings</u> Feedback Dissemination	Development partners Civil society Women Public media Private sector NGOs	Achieve agreement on strategies Agree on support to PRSP implementation Publication	May 2001
	8. <u>Monitoring and Evaluation:</u> Set up implementation oversight committees.	Mps Communities Private sector Women representatives Other	Operational Committee Feedback to communities. Ongoing improved implementation.	Ongoing

TN 4: Assessment of the Current Status of Participation

This technical note provides a useful tool for assessing participation by visualizing the links between stakeholders and government processes. The template in Table 1 will assist the government in determining how stakeholders can be most linked to government processes in each phase of the participatory PRS process at both the national and the local levels. Each “box” can indicate the level of involvement of that stakeholder group in each area of decision making and program implementation, ranging from high to low.

Table 1: Template to Map the Status of Participatory Processes in Poverty Reduction

<i>Stakeholder Groups</i>	Formulating the PRS *			Implementing the PRS		Monitoring the PRS*
	Planning	Priority Setting	Public Action Choices	Resource Allocation	Programs	Participation in Monitoring
National Level						
Government						
Representative Assemblies						
General Public						
Poor and Vulnerable Groups						
Organized Civil Society						
Private Sector						
Donors and IFIs²						
Local Level						
Government						
Representative Assemblies						
General Public						
Poor & Vulnerable Groups						
Organized Civil Society						
Private Sector						
Donors and IFIs						

² International Financial Institutions

TN 5: Conducting a Stakeholder Analysis

The purpose of stakeholder analysis is that the policy-makers gain a better understanding of the range and variety of stakeholders in their society. Stakeholder analysis will allow the government to formulate, implement and monitor their programs. This can be done through local surveys, studies by researchers, through community-based networks which track civil society development and activities and so forth.

Step One: Identifying major stakeholder groups

Identify groups of stakeholders which will be affected by, either directly or indirectly, or will have an effect on the Poverty Reduction Strategy. These groups will include representative bodies, community-based organizations, women's groups, trade unions and guilds, youth groups, journalists, academics, non-governmental aid organizations and donors. Recognize that stakeholders can be individuals, communities, social groups, organizations, etc. Also disaggregating stakeholder groups into men and women, major ethnic groups, locality and other variables will assist in identifying important groups who may otherwise be overlooked.

Step Two: Determining importance and influence

Determine which stakeholders are important for the formulating and implementing the poverty reduction strategy; those for whom the strategy will be important; and those who are influential in determining the strategy. The following diagram (Table 1) can be used to determine the importance and influence of stakeholder groups. This will act as a guide to which groups should be given prominence in the participatory process.

In the diagram, stakeholders can will be categorized and placed in different boxes according to their importance in or for the strategy versus their influence in determining the strategy, based on the current country experience with participation. This analysis will help identify major omissions in participation. As seen in the worked example in Table 1, from the three country types (I, II, III), the poor, who have significant importance in the poverty reduction strategy, generally have little or no influence over the strategies for poverty reduction.

Table 1: Mapping of Stakeholders

Influence of Stakeholder	Importance of Stakeholder			
	Unknown	Little/No Importance	Some Importance	Significant Importance
Unknown				
Little/No Influence		CSOs (III)	CSOs (II) Local Govt (III)	The poor (I, II, III) Local Govt (II)
Somewhat Influential				CSOs (I) Local Govt (I)
Significant Influence			Donors (I, II)	National Govt. (I, II, III) Donors (III) Rep Assemblies(I,II, III)

Once stakeholder groups have been identified and differentiated by influence and importance, additional questions can be asked. For example:

- Have vulnerable groups been identified?
- Which groups are mobilized and have been active in promoting their interests?
- Have supporters and opponents of PRS been identified?
- Which groups will benefit from the delivery of the poverty reduction strategy and which groups might be adversely impacted?
- Where are groups located – representatives and membership?

Step Three: Selecting representation

When broad stakeholder groups have been identified, representatives of each group should be selected, preferably by the stakeholder group itself. The representative should be capable of active dialogue, contributing the views of the membership and sharing the information back with the membership of the group. Consultations at community and with the poor will be different, as discussed in the **Community-Driven Development chapter, Poverty Diagnostics chapter and Section 3.3**. Some guidance for selection is given below.

Selection of Representatives within Government:

While selecting participants for consultations within government, it is important to include government officials both at the national and the local level. At national level, the lead ministry plus line ministries, such as Health, Education, Infrastructure, Local Government, Gender, and Agriculture, as well as agencies, such as Bureau of Statistics, should attend participation events, and ideally should be present on the coordination and working groups. Local representation at national level, may be achieved through associations of local authorities or by choosing regional representatives from the districts in each area. Mechanisms to include representative assemblies must be considered. Information sharing or involvement of a member of a relevant parliamentary committee on the coordination group could be considered.

Civil Society Selection at the National Level:

Selection of Civil Service Organizations (CSOs) is a difficult and sensitive task. The ideal process of selection is one which is carried out by CS themselves e.g., via an umbrella or apex body (such as an NGO federation) or a national steering group with government support.

The questions below allow the process to be focussed on most appropriate participants. More detailed profiles of civil society might be sought by commissioning a specific analysis or from existing donor files, academic sources or network / apex / umbrella organizations. The types of CSOs are expected in the three types of countries are presented in the Table 2.

Key questions for assessing individual organizations

1. What are the activities in which civil society organizations (CSOs) and community-based organization activities engaged? Is the area of specialty one of the major poverty priority areas?
2. At what levels do these actions take place and to what extent are they coordinated with other CSOs and with government activities?
3. What umbrella organizations exist that represent major stakeholder groups? Do these organizations coordinate at local or national level? Is the network far-reaching? Are mechanisms for sharing information with membership and the general public in place?
4. What expertise do civil society organizations have in specific sectors? Could they be involved in implementing or monitoring the PRS, particularly delivering services to poor men and women?
5. How do civil society organizations and government work together and in what areas?
6. What groups of society do not have organized representation or groups?

**Table 2: Country types
Civil society organizations relevant for participation at the National level**

Country Type I	Country Type II	Country Type III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networks of civil society organizations including NGOs • Key NGOs implementing social sector and poverty reduction programs • Federations or Networks of community based associations (membership) both governmental and non governmental • Academics and Think tanks • Unions (organized) • Private sector including trade and industry chambers • Religious institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key NGOs implementing social sector and poverty reduction programs • Community associations promoted through state development programs • Academics and Think tanks • Private sector including trade and industry chambers • Religious institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community associations promoted through state development programs • Informal sector organizations (low level of organization)

Civil Society Selection at the Local Level:

At the community level, selection will be a much more complicated process because of their size and diversity. It is important again to allow the local groups to make their own selection criteria, with specific consideration given to certain groups, such as women, indigenous groups, communities in remote areas, the sick and the elderly.

Overall, the coordinating body of the participatory process will, in most cases, have to monitor who is left out when self-selection occurs, and to take appropriate action (e.g., separate consultations for indigenous people's groups). The dangers of bias can be reduced by:

- Using the advice of staff who are most familiar with civil society in the country;
- Listening to the advice of key informants in civil society;
- Ensuring that participants represent the full range of groups and interests that exist by gender, ethnic origin, region and social class; and
- Using objective selection criteria, including the organization's track record and credibility among its peers.

Selection Criteria for the Private Sector:

In most cases, the international private sector has already established some presence in the decision-making processes of that country. They already understand the importance of having their interests represented in the political arena. However, domestic firms and small businesses often are not as well organized. As a result, when selecting private sector representatives, it will be important to gain access to domestic firms and representative bodies who might not have an established communication link with policy-makers.

TN 6: Guiding questions for the Participation Plan

Each country has a unique set of conditions and opportunities for organizing participation in poverty reduction-related processes. To assist senior decision-makers in Government to assess their specific context, and to identify priority areas in which participatory processes would best contribute to formulation of a poverty reduction strategy, the following guiding questions may assist. Guidelines for decision-makers in answering these questions are provided below.

Guiding Question 1: Participation in formulating poverty reduction strategies or national development strategies.

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
Yes, we have used participatory approaches in formulating our current strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Examine if the extent was adequate. Consider broadening the public understanding of the plan 2) Assess the degree to which poor and vulnerable groups have been able to contribute to the vision and strategy 3) Examine the quality of the participation process (See Section 3)
We are using consultations to develop a national vision and medium term development strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Focus on including civil society organizations in the setting of priority poverty reduction areas and key public action choices (2) If donors are engaging in national visioning processes (Eg UNDP) consider increased collaboration and utilization of existing coordination mechanisms. Analyze where the existing process needs strengthening.
We have so far had little or no participation beyond a small group of national level officials	Examine the need and opportunities for broadening the involvement and ownership of the strategy (see Sections 2 and 3)

Guiding Question 2: Participation in poverty diagnostics

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
We have already conducted large-scale consultations with poor and vulnerable groups, and adequate /participatory quantitative data exists.	Assess the degree to which the data collected have been analyzed and used in decision-making.
The poverty profile is focused on income poverty	Better use of qualitative data (from consultations with the poor) should be made OR More data should be collected to ascertain the perspectives of the poor
We have some relevant data from consultations with the poor, but it not comprehensive and not systematically available	Undertake an adequacy assessment – See Poverty Diagnostics chapter
We have inadequate, insufficient, or no qualitative (perspectives of the poor) data	Consider a primary data collection exercise by consulting the poor – See Poverty Diagnostics chapter
The understanding of poverty is limited to a few stakeholders	Disseminate information and conduct workshops to build consensus on the understanding of poverty

Guiding Question 3: Participation in resource allocation / budgeting processes

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
Within government, broad priorities are determined by the cabinet; resource allocation is decided primarily by central ministries (possibly under the sanction of the parliament)	Consider broadening the participation of civil society (through participatory approaches) and the general public (through governance structures) (see Sections 3 and 4)
As above, but local governments have a role in determining priorities and allocations at the local level	Consider deepening the involvement of local communities by consulting them (See Section 3.3 and Community-driven development chapter)

Guiding Question 4: Participation in poverty monitoring

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
Yes, we have use participatory approaches in poverty monitoring and/or impact monitoring	1) Assess which stakeholder groups have participated, and consider broadening the range of groups involved 2) Assess the degree to which the outcomes of participatory efforts have been used in decision-making
No: we might consider this: what is involved?	See Monitoring and Evaluation chapter and Section 4 in this chapter

Guiding Question 5: Mainstreaming participation

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
We have little experience with participatory approaches, except at the local level associated with donor-funded projects	Consider using the PRS formulation process to enhance participation and to build local capacity, and taking the long-term perspective into account when deciding priority participatory processes
We have experience in regularly consulting civil society organizations, central and line ministries, and the donor community, but this rarely extends beyond a series of sporadic meetings to get comments on our draft budget.	Consider mainstreaming participatory processes into the implementation and monitoring of the strategy (see Section 4)

Guiding Question 6: Information about poverty reduction policies and programs

Illustrative responses	Suggested Follow-up
The poverty reduction strategy was drafted in one of our central ministries, and circulated to the donor community.	Consider broadening the consultative process to include key line ministries and regional and district centers (See Section 3.4).
Government policies and strategies are disseminated widely at national level and to local authorities	Consider a public awareness campaign (See Section 3.4)
We have had extensive consultations in the capital city, with sector thematic working groups (including NGO representatives and district officials) preparing the first drafts of relevant sections of our medium-term budget framework.	Consider broadening the consultative process to include more stakeholder groups at the local level (see Sections 3.3)

TN 7: Costing of the Participatory process

The cost of the participatory processes will vary between countries. This technical note is a guide that may assist in budgeting the for participation process.

Costing would depend on the context (typology), participatory approaches being used for PRS, existing national and local capacity for facilitating and managing participation, the existing donor efforts and programs for introducing participatory approaches. In a country with a higher existing capacity and intensity of participatory processes at the national level (Eg Type I Country) there is a high potential to strengthen participatory processes at lower incremental costs. Therefore, the incremental / additional costs for strengthening participation in formulating a Poverty Reduction Strategy will be low, although the total costs of participation may still be high (many of which are on-going and have already been included in a budget).

On the other hand, in a country with little capacity and limited participatory processes (Eg Type III Country), more efforts would be required initially to assess the situation, including stakeholder analysis, ensuring poverty data incorporates qualitative approaches and building local capacity for facilitation and participatory research. The incremental costs may be high as initially higher external resources and professional inputs may be required for capacity building and facilitation. However, this could be reduced further if facilitators and practitioners from other neighboring countries are used to facilitate the process (e.g. using the teams trained in Bulgaria and Kyrgystan for doing participatory poverty assessments in Albania)

Key Areas of Costs for Participation

The following are the key areas in which participation has cost implications:

- Coordination of the process
- Assessment of stakeholders and participation, and process design
- Participatory approaches leading to more comprehensive poverty diagnostics and consulting the poor for their perceptions e.g. PPAs, Voices of the Poor
- Participatory approaches for civic engagement which enable discussions on priority setting and public action choices and for building consensus e.g. national and local level consultations and workshops
- Mechanisms for information sharing – ie dissemination and feedback mechanisms – that include translating and preparing documents in local languages and public information campaigns

Cost elements and range of costs for participatory processes

The key cost elements include :

- Training
- Employment of personnel
- Cost of organizing workshops and events (includes logistics, material etc)
- Costs of institutional coordination

Cost implications of participatory processes

PARTICIPATORY PROCESS	APPROXIMATE COSTS (range in us \$)
1. Stakeholder analysis and Process Design	10,000 -30,000
2. Coordination group meetings	5,000 - 10,000
3. Consulting the poor	
• Voices of the Poor (seeking direct perceptions of the poor)	25,000 -50,000
• Participatory Poverty Assessment (input to the poverty diagnostic and seeking perceptions)	75,000 - 100,000
4. National Level Consultations	80,000 - 150,000
5. Local level (Eg regional / districts) workshops	20,000 -30,000
6. Focus groups with key stakeholders	10,000 -20,000
7. Public Information campaign	40,000 -100,000
8. Feedback and Validation workshops	50,000
9. Institutional structures within Government for participatory processes, feedback and analysis (e.g. UPPAP, Uganda)	300,000 - 500,000

Note: All these costs are for single event. Many events may be required for representation and iteration. The number and intensity of these participatory processes would depend on the context and design of the participatory process.

In a Type I Country, one may find that many of these processes may have been initiated and costs have been already incurred. The local capacity for organizing and participating may be high. Therefore, it would be critical to ensure that the PRS process is linked with the existing process. Also more resources are likely to be available from other donors who are already supporting similar processes.

In a Type III country, limited finances may restrict participation activities to assessment, coordination, a Voices of the Poor consultation exercise, limited national consultation and some sharing of information. Resources would need to be raised externally from the donors active in the country. In many cases, external expertise may be required for facilitation and capacity development.

TN 7: Ensuring that Participatory Processes include Women

The **Gender chapter** describes the rationale for actively seeking the inclusion of men and **women** in the participatory process of formulating , implementing and monitoring a country's Poverty Reduction Strategy. The tables indicate solutions to the barriers often faced ti engender consultations and hence implementation strategies, as well as key gender issues in the PRS Initiative.

Seeking women

Initially, difficulties are often experienced in meeting with groups of poor women. In some communities it may be necessary to have separate sessions for women and men, while in other cases special techniques must be used to ensure that women are actively involved. Some of the steps which can be taken to promote women's participation include:

1. Assess existing mechanisms to evaluate the extent to which different groups of women (single/married/widowed; young/old; poor/less poor etc) are involved in participatory processes. In many cultures the most important kinds of consultation are face-to-face so the assessment must capture the dynamics of traditional culture as well as observing what happens in formal meetings.
2. Assess the barriers to women's participation. In some cases the barriers may be cultural , but in many others the reasons are more due to the fact that meetings are held at times and places convenient to men; and the level of women's participation could be significantly increased simply by consulting them on when and where to hold the meeting. In some cases it may be necessary to pay for or provide transport so that women can attend. Child-care arrangements may also be required.
3. Assess the extent to which women feel that their views and priorities have been reflected in the choice of projects.
4. Experiment with, and evaluate different mechanisms to increase women's participation.

Table 1 below, identifies some solutions to overcoming barriers to women participating in consultations.

Table 1: Overcoming Barriers to Women’s Participation in PRS Consultations

Barrier to women participating	Possible solutions
National Level	
Lack of representation at national consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include women’s networks and umbrella organizations • Include Ministry handling gender issues
Women’s participation is not considered by organizers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there are women members of coordinating group
Local Level	
Women do not attend meetings at lower levels or do not speak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold separate meetings with women • Organize meetings at a venue and time to suit women • Ensure the meeting is put into the context of women’s lives – what affects them
Women are not informed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted dissemination of information about PRS and poverty priorities to reach women • Use women’s networks or umbrella groups for representing the voice of women at national levels
Culture may limit meetings of women with male facilitators or outsiders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use female facilitators and local interlocutors
Facilitators may be told information that the participants expect they want to hear, possibly reinforcing the stereotype	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build trust with women, locally and nationally • Use trusted or well-respected facilitators
Women’s views are not heard nationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop new gender-inclusive consultation mechanisms

Table 2 outlines some of the key aspects to engendering the participatory processes of formulating and implementing a Poverty Reduction Strategy.

Table 2: Engendering the participation process in the PRS

Likely Structure and Key Elements of the PRS	Contribution of Gender Analysis to the PRS	Key Tools and Approaches for Engendering a PRS	Expected Different Outcomes
<p>Participatory analysis and process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Support to broader and more inclusive understanding of poverty and its components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Capability □ Opportunity □ Security □ Empowerment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ gender-inclusive participatory poverty analysis brings to light different Constraints, Opportunities, Incentives, and Needs (COIN) of men and women □ broader understanding of differentiated nature and impacts of poverty and inequality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ identification ("mapping") of stakeholders is gender inclusive □ gender balance in membership of teams preparing PRSs □ gender-inclusive consultations with the poor to highlight different COIN³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ different issues raised in poverty analysis: vulnerability, violence, social capital (trust), insecurity □ opportunity to articulate expressed needs and priorities of men and women, as and where they differ □ ensure that prioritized action and implementation plans integrate differences
<p>Public policy responses and actions prioritized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Budgets □ Service delivery □ Sectoral focus □ Regional focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ gender as a criterion for prioritizing key poverty reduction measures □ gender-aware growth strategy □ concurrent investment in the household economy, w/ focus on labor-saving technology, water and sanitation, transport (IMT). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ gender as criterion to prioritize, sequence, and re-orient spending priorities -- specifically supports country efforts to establish effective public action priorities with maximum poverty impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ gendered understanding of poverty informs public policy and investment choices and priority setting □ different needs identified, including those in the household economy, impact
<p>Participatory analysis and process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ gender inclusion □ giving voice to the voiceless 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ men and women contribute differently to poverty reduction and are affected differently by poverty measures □ ensure that the priorities of poor men and women are the actions retained in PRS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ structure participatory process for priority setting to elicit different COIN and to ensure that these are effectively prioritized □ "gender budget initiatives" and gendered local level "audit" of budget impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ participation frames a different agenda and priorities for retention in PRS, responsive to different COIN of men and women

³ COIN – Constraints, Opportunities, Incentives and Needs are different for men and for women

TN 9: Designing a Participation Plan

This technical note offers some basic tools and example in designing a Participation Action Plan

Once the linkages between stakeholders and participation in government processes have understood, the following tool can be used to assign participation objectives and participation methods to stakeholder groups, as well as a time frame and costing implications.

Table 1: Design Analysis: Linking stakeholder analysis to participation tools and techniques

Stakeholder Group	Objective of their intervention	Type of participation	Participation methods		Time line		Estimated cost
	Why are they included		Which ones	Who will be responsible	Start date	End date	
Government							
Representative Assemblies							
General Public							
Poor and Vulnerable groups							
Organized Civil Society							
Private Sector							

Once the this tool has provided an organized structure for a participatory process, some priority areas that may be important for determining how to develop a PAP are as follows.

Organizing participation

What to do first for organizing participation

- Engage local experts (Short term)– if it does not exist, employ experts from neighboring countries, hire, consultants, train (Long term) – the **Resource List** provides local participation networks and expertise in many countries
- Develop skills in organizing – information sharing from other countries, facilitation by the World Bank / IMF, external Technical Assistance (short term)
- Identify and build skills in consultations – Eg facilitation skills from other projects, training
- Consulting the Poor– recruit expertise from projects that use PRA, train local personnel “on-the-job”, borrow expertise from neighboring countries, technical assistance
- Info dissemination – recruit expertise from the media

In a country with less development of civil society, capacity needs may be identified as strengthening the ability of civil society to dialogue by organizing a workshop for major stakeholder representatives, building local capacity to consult communities by local authorities

with local expertise and organizing training, and information sharing by collaboration with media groups. In a Type III Country, all-round capacity for participation would be limited. A starting priority may be identifying capacity for consulting the poor from neighboring countries, if not available locally, and utilizing this expertise to conduct the consultation and to train local facilitators. Additionally, national training may be required for government and external technical advisory support may be needed.

Increasing the Capacity of civil society to dialogue

What to do first to strengthen constructive dialogue

- Share information and aid understanding – Government facilitates civil society
- Training in influencing government processes and negotiation techniques for key government and civil society stakeholders – possibly funded by donors

Tips for capacity-building for policy influence

- Enhance the framework for doing influencing policy, especially analytical tools, sensitivity to constituents' behaviours and ideas, an actor- rather than structure-oriented approach, inclusiveness and conversance with the dynamics of power and policy processes;
- Integrate research and information management into policy influence, including access to information, information-sharing among allies, and analysis of information and context;
- Building capability to design and conduct policy-focused research;
- Developing market research skills to test public opinion and evaluate the impact of policy influence initiatives;
- Negotiation skills, including analysis of institutions and power relationships;
- Broadening linkages and networks;
- Strengthening the organization and management of policy influence activities;
- Elevating the practice of influencing government processes to a discipline

(Source: Adapted from Co 1999).

Case Example of skills building workshop for civil society organizations : Uganda

The Uganda Debt Network (UDN) conducted a workshop on budget influencing budgetary processes-making for Network members organizations in October 1999. The Global Women in Politics (GWIP) Initiative of the Asia Foundation, and the Institute of Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) provided technical assistance. The activity brought together a complementary group of international experts including UDN's expertise in debt lobbying, GWIP's expertise in planning, training and constituency building, and IDASA's expertise in infusing national budgets with a gender perspective.

Participants were from 15 civil society organizations, including a women's network and resource centre, the Uganda Manufacturers' Association, the national NGO Forum, and National Farmers' association, and the National Organization of Trade Unions. The workshop:

- Equipped participants with skills in policy influence;
- Increased their knowledge of the policy environment;
- Identified key state actors in policy planning and formulation;
- Discussed and identified strategies to influence them;
- Identified potential issues around which to design policy influence campaigns;
- Developed strategies that combine constituency-building, message development and persuasive lobbying.

Source: Adapted from GWIP 1999 and Lisa Vene-Klasen, pers. comm

TN 10: Measuring progress in participation

Milestones, or indicators, for measuring progress in participation during the formulation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy should be developed in a participatory manner. This increases ownership and commitment to the process and increases the likelihood of achieving participation outcomes. The table below provides some milestones that may be appropriate for the 3 different typology countries. These milestones may allow a country to measure its progress in achieving participation during the formulation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy.

Possible Participatory Process Development Milestones

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRS coordination mechanism in place 2. Participation assessment performed 3. Consensus through consultation has been reached at the national level on the PRS process 4. The PRS formulation process has broad based representation at all levels 5. The poverty reduction strategy formulation process has broad based representation in civil society 6. Participatory processes have taken place for priority setting for poverty reduction 7. Local capacity to organize participation is being increased 8. Participation is being decentralized by engaging local civil society 9. Information on poverty priorities is being disseminated at all levels 10. All data gathered, especially qualitative data, is being incorporated into the poverty profile 11. The monitoring system is reoriented to include participation 12. Poverty reduction strategy paper has been prepared and validated by a wide range of stakeholders 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRS coordination mechanism in place 2. Major stakeholder participation in government processes to date has been assessed. 3. Current mechanisms for information flows have been analyzed within government and between government and civil society 4. Consensus has been reached with civil society at the national level on the PRS process. 5. Interim PRSP has been validated 6. Capacity developed 7. Understanding of poverty have improved through use of qualitative data and perceptions of the poor, and consensus built 8. Local capacity to organize participation is being increased 9. Information flows between government and civil society have been improved 10. Poverty reduction strategy paper has been prepared and validated by a wide range of stakeholders 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRS coordination mechanism in place 2. Examination has been conducted into the existing participatory processes within government 3. Assessment has been made for possible stakeholder participation in national processes 4. Capacity for organizing participation has been evaluated 5. Capacity has been developed 6. Current mechanisms for information flows have been analyzed, especially within government 7. A process of consensus building on assessment results and the way forward has been undertaken 8. Validation of the Interim PRSP has been undertaken 9. Poverty diagnostic, including qualitative data, has been conducted 10. Validation of the PRS has been done with some inputs from the local level
---	---	---

Medium Term Goals		
Country I	Country II	Country III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop mechanisms for institutionalizing participation in implementation, review and monitoring government processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop mechanisms for on-going consultation and feedback in poverty reduction in government processes Increase information given to the public Increase participation in implementing and monitoring poverty reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the processes of participation initiated through PRS formulation Increasing information flows within government and between government and the public Continue processes of stakeholder engagement that have been started in the PRS formulation process

Criteria for assessing the QUALITY of participation in achieving milestones

Proposed criteria for measuring the quality of participation
<p>The issue of minimum acceptable standards for quality in participation is not easy. One approach would be to ensure that the weakest and most powerless group is enabled to participate in the policy formulation. This will ensure that the voices not normally heard are included.</p> <p>Expected outcomes of quality in participation in policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the resulting policy: in terms of how equitable, far-sighted and sustainable its effects are; Inclusiveness of the participation process: the hearing and inclusion in negotiations of all the different perspectives and priorities on a particular issue; Broad-based ownership: attainment of widespread ownership of and support for the policy in the country and throughout the population; Capacity-building: enhanced capacities of various stakeholder groups and public agencies to enable participation in future policy work . <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Source: Tandon, 1998</i></p>



TN 11: Overcoming Constraints

This technical note provides some guidance about the pitfalls of a participatory process and the constraints that may be faced. The following table offers some possible solutions to overcome constraints.

CONSTRAINTS	SOLUTIONS
Creating parallel participatory processes that are not integrated with existing political structures.	Link the participatory processes for PRS with government decision making
Limited trust between stakeholder groups	Finding allies Identifying facilitators
The diverse perceptions of different stakeholders concerning the participation process, poverty and the importance of poverty reduction efforts in the country	Information flow – scope and objectives agreed upon and made clear Facilitators Emphasize the importance / benefits of participation
The high expectations of stakeholders that all of their desires will be met	Emphasizing benefits in the bigger picture Emphasizing change takes time Explain the implications of their demands Information sharing and feedback mechanisms Scope and objectives agreed upon and made clear Realistic goal setting in participatory manner
Situations where information not widely disseminated regarding the purpose, the process and the outcomes of participation	Improved information flow
Poorly planned participation processes that are open-ended and not realistically budgeted	Identifying facilitators – impartial, respected Cost the Process and determine funding available
Lack of political will among government agents to allow wide participation due to the fear of loss of power or influence	Develop commitment Emphasize benefits of participation
Skeptical attitudes and non-participatory behaviors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government – know what people want, not transparent • Civil society organizations – want to criticize, disrupt, use process for ulterior motives 	Emphasize benefit of participation in achieving outcomes – poverty reduction, economic growth Emphasize benefits and opportunities to work together Ground rules - Active listening, respect of other stakeholders and their views, open-mindedness
Time pressure	Careful planning to maximize input and broaden input of views of variety of stakeholders
Limited capacity	Identify deficiencies and train or recruit Seek technical assistance
Limited financial resources	Budget for participation Fund raise
Consultation fatigue	Utilize and build on on-going and existing processes
Conflicting interests / disunity between stakeholder groups such that processes are disorganized	Organize process to avoid conflict Emphasize benefits
Different bargaining powers	Awareness so that participation can be employed to access the views of all stakeholders in the process
Confidence of government is abused by CSOs – E.g., leak government documents as basis for publicity or lobbying	Government increase transparency Emphasize benefits Form a compact and ground rules of participation
Token effort by the organizers	Commitment by government Emphasize benefits

TN 12: Private Sector Participation in PRS Process

Private Sector participation is essential for a fully representative view of a national context. This technical note provides some mechanisms and case examples illustrating concerning private sector participation in macro-policy formulation and implementation, as well as good practice examples.

The private sector can be engaged at local and at national levels, through the following mechanisms (refer also to **Section 3.2**):

- Participation in PRS coordination and working groups
- Representation by private sector foundations, or umbrella or network groups, such as Chambers of Commerce, manufacturers associations, farmers associations, professional bodies, cooperatives
- Focus discussions
- Perception surveys
- Workshops, as in the case example of Uganda below

Uganda: Workshop with the Private Sector

In Uganda, the Manufacturers Association, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the World Bank organized a workshop to

1. Review survey results of 105 businesses and 265 private investors
2. Introduce a private sector development strategy to a broad constituency of private sector, government and donors
3. Achieve agreement of fundamental elements
4. Identify a private sector task force to begin preparation of a possible participatory project in this area.

The workshop design used public involvement methods for bringing in large numbers of stakeholders in building agreements about policy, strategy and execution. The method integrated more than seventy participants in a series of small group discussions designed to identify issues, resolve conflicts and build understanding about a proposed program design. Summary responses from participants indicated that they believed the workshop demonstrated the government's commitment to a collaborative, demand-driven process.

Source: The World Bank Participation Sourcebook, Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1996, p. 190.

Inclusion of the private sector as active participants in national dialogue for poverty reduction, increases the ownership of the strategy by the private sector and increases the likelihood of working in partnership with government and raises consciousness concerning the concerns of the poor.

TN 13: Workshops methodology

This technical provides a brief overview of participatory workshop methods. It provides practice pointers on how to design a workshop and some guidance on timing preparatory steps.

Stakeholder workshops, sometimes called "action-planning workshops," are used to bring stakeholders together to design development projects. The purpose of such workshops is to begin and sustain stakeholder collaboration and foster a "learning-by-doing" atmosphere. A trained facilitator guides stakeholders, who have diverse knowledge and interests, through a series of activities to build consensus. Appreciation-Influence-Control (AIC), and Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP), are two such methods.

Practice Pointers: Designing a Workshop

- **Only plan what you *can* plan**
Leave room in your planning for making continual changes
- **Don't plan further ahead than what can be overseen**
It is necessary to think ahead and plan a broad outline of each session, but keep in mind that the process can develop in different ways. Therefore, detailed planning is usually unnecessary.
- **Plan as much as possible with the involvement of the participants**
Because it is their learning experience, participants can become involved in deciding the purpose, direction and possibilities of the course.
- **Move from the General to the Particular, then back to the General.**
This will keep the participants attention if they move from the larger picture to more specific issues. It is important at the end though, to draw back to larger principles and to summarize what they have learned.
- **Stay close to reality**
The more realistic the exercises, the more likely it is that learning will be integrated into the participants' future behavior
- **Always consider participants energy levels**
Provide variety and regular, well-timed breaks. Participants will enjoy the experience more if there is varied subject matter, roles and types of learning situations.

Source: Jules Pretty, Irene Guijt, John Thompson and Ian Scoones, *IIED Trainer's Guide*, London: International Institute for Environment and Development, 1995, p. 120.

Working within a Timeframe: Suggested Timings for a National Consultation

Stage and activity	Time Frame
Identify and invite possible participants	One month prior
Chose a neutral venue and a professional facilitator	One month prior
Prepare materials for distribution	Two weeks prior
Distribute materials to participants	One week prior
Describe the objectives and scope of the consultation	Day of (should also be in invitation letter)
Feedback results to invited participants	Between two week and one month afterwards
Reconvene repeat consultation	As PRS process progresses

TN 14: Methods for Consulting the Poor

Sample selection within a community

Within a community, separate discussions need to be held with groups of poor men, poor women, youth and with other key poverty groups identified in the community. The results from discussions with these different focus groups in a community may vary. It is important to bring out these differences within a community. Ultimately, the team should be confident that the findings are representative of the poor in that community because the study team has met with enough poor people in the community that the findings have been sufficiently cross-checked.

Seeking the poor

At every site it is vital to ensure adequate consultations with the poor. Teams should use their judgment about the best sequences and with whom it is best to start. In some communities it may be sensible and tactful to start with mixed groups including the non-poor, and to meet and consult with different categories of people and households. There may also be key initial informants among the non-poor. A range of people may be involved in the process of social mapping, household listing and well-being ranking to identify the poorer households and people. Meeting a mixture of people initially can also help in triangulation. Focus groups of the poor can then be invited for consultation. In other cases, it may be easy to work directly with groups of poor after going through the appropriate process and informing local authorities and leaders about the purpose of the study.

Within the category of the poor, consult with separate groups of women, men and youth. Be alert for special categories among poor people (e.g. old women, low status social groups, disabled etc.) and use judgment about bringing them together for consultation as appropriate. Children are a special group who often have different perceptions and priorities from adults. Establish space for a process with integrity at the community level – respect, follow-up and feedback for participants

Consulting the Poor about Poverty: Summary Checklist

A set of fundamental tasks need to be addressed in designing a PPA process, which comprise the following:

- Identifying the central institutional location for the PPA (seeking *commitment, access to policy information and influence*)
- Finding technical assistance (seeking *experience, flexibility, capacity to deal with different areas and functions – training, analysis, etc.*)
- Identifying implementation partners for different functions (*financing, policy influence, design and analysis, training, dissemination, logistics, field management etc.*)
- Agreeing objectives and research agenda (seeking *shared commitment among key partners, clarity, manageable scope*)
- Identifying members for field teams (according to agreed criteria, which may include *openness to change in values/attitudes, flexible availability for follow-up, expertise and experience, understanding and access to policy debates, area/linguistic/cultural familiarity*)
- Identifying sources of financial support (seeking *flexibility, long-term commitment*)

- Selecting field research sites and participants – geared to representing the social and livelihood conditions in poor communities in the country/state/province (seeking *credibility for results, a manageable scale for fieldwork, appropriate disaggregation to investigate causal links, enhanced value for policy analysis*)
- Developing an integrated methodology for field research, synthesis of findings and policy analysis using results (seeking *an appropriate balance between standardisation and flexibility for the goals of the PPA; a guiding conceptual approach; methods which allow for comparison, aggregation and synthesis of diverse materials*).
- An implementation plan for fieldwork (which allows *space for reflection, sharing of experiences, recording, reporting and analysis*)

Key lessons from the experience and practice of PPAs are:

- Gear the timing of the design process to building ownership and commitment in key partners
- Set clear objectives – and establish a flexible structure for support
- Work with key stakeholders to establish the thematic focus for the PPA

Source: Andy Norton et.al., A Rough Guide to PPAs: An Introduction to Theory and Practice, Draft, Jan 2001, p. 43

Using Informal Institutions for poverty diagnosis: A Case Example from Indonesia

In Indonesia, the urban poor depended mainly on indigenous community-based institutions and private sector agencies providing micro-credit such as private banks, moneylenders and pawnshops. The rural poor rely on a larger variety of informal community-based institutions and village government officials and get their credit in-kind from local shops. According to the poor, an institution is effective when it is proven to be able to solve their problems, is easily accessible and is prompt in responding to their needs. The poor also value being consulted on the forms of assistance they are to receive. They trust an institution which is transparent, fair, keeps its promises and trusts the poor in return. *No government services or programs or any NGOs* were included among the institutions the urban poor selected as their top 5 choices in terms of importance, effectiveness, trustworthiness, and openness to community influence.

Rural women are consistently excluded village councils and government programs for poverty alleviation when ranking institutions according to importance and effectiveness. However, **both** men and women in rural and urban areas agreed that **they could not influence government programs at all. In their opinion this was the primary reason why government programs has so little impact on poverty.**

Pitfalls

The following pitfalls should be borne in mind during consultations with the poor.

- When facilitated by outsiders, participatory approaches can **raise expectations** of local people for future involvement
- The outcome depends on the **attitude** and vision of the persons facilitating the process
- If carried out **too quickly**, they can lead to incorrect insights
- The choice and sequence of methods needs to be **adapted** to fit each situation
- In most cases, they will **not lead to quantifiable** results
- They will never provide full answers. Don't expect them to, be prepared for this.

Design features for consideration in PPAs

Cost	\$75 – 125,000
Number of communities selected for research	40 - 60
Time spent on training	2 weeks
Time spent on field research	3 – 6 months
Time spent on analysis	2 – 3 months
Size research team (including team leaders and trainers)	10 – 20 people
Composition of research team	Nationals of country, half men and half women, ability to speak local languages, representatives from various ethnic groups and a cross-section of age groups.
Typical agency conducting the field work	Government extension workers; local and international NGOs; academic institutions; independent consultants and firms
Examples of donor who have contributed to government led PPAs	DFID, World Bank, Action Aid, Oxfam, UNDP, UNICEF, DANIDA, Asian Development Bank

TN 15: Can the Poor Influence the Budget? – Case of Uganda

Case Example: Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process (UPPAP)

The Ugandan participatory poverty assessment is unique in that it is an **on-going process** to incorporate the perspectives of the poor into the policy and planning dialogue for poverty reduction. The Uganda PPA process (UPPAP) is a 3 year initiative **located in a small dedicated unit** within a **key, central ministry of the government** – the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED).

To-date, the *voices of the poor* from the recent participatory poverty assessment have been **strategically disseminated** to enable the information to influence the budget making processes and resource allocation priorities at the national government level, in the following manner:

1. The PPA findings served as input to the **Mid-Term Expenditure Framework** process (See **Technical Note 7**), such that the Poverty Working Group utilized the findings briefings extensively, and briefings were prepared for thematic groups and presentations made at retreats.
2. Additional focus and resources were allocated to the **clean water sources**.
3. The requirement for **flexibility in the utilization of conditional grants** paid to districts from the central government was realized so that local government could adapt its spending to meet location specific needs.
4. The expenditure **monitoring** of funds disbursed to district authorities from the **Poverty Action Fund** was strengthened at local levels, the to increase the effective utilization of conditional grants and the impacts on local people.
5. The perspectives of the poor featured in the 1999/2000 **Background to the Budget** and the Poverty Status Report, among other government publications.

In addition, to these impacts on resource allocation, the perspectives of the poor contributed to the following:

1. **Poverty indicators** identified by poor people were included into recent national household surveys.
2. Basis of the **revision** of the Uganda Poverty Reduction Strategy – the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (**PEAP**).

3. Creation of the mandate of the **Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture** to focus on the poor farmer.
4. **Raising awareness** of local and central government politicians and civil servants and refocusing the poverty dialogue in terms of the poor man and the poor woman.
5. Utilization of participatory **methods by local authorities** to consult at local level.

Source: Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. Personal communication.

The success of UPPAP has been attributed to the following :

1. Conducive environment for poverty reduction

- Macro-economic **stability**
- Established system of **decentralized** governance
- Efforts to promote **good governance**
- National **vision** for poverty reduction
- **Commitment** to poverty reduction formalized in comprehensive strategy
- Mechanisms for setting budgetary priorities in line with poverty reduction objectives
- Commitment of government **resources to poverty reduction**
- Poverty **monitoring system** in place

2. Characteristics of UPPAP process that maximize the scope for policy-influencing

- **Ownership** of the PPA by Government
- **Location** of the PPA process within Government
- Careful **design** that built upon previous participatory studies and with specifically trained local researchers
- Implemented in **partnership** with local government authorities, CSOs and donors
- Strategic methods of **dissemination** of PPA findings
- Flexible, reflective **mechanisms of policy review**
- **Institutionalization** of consultations with the poor at national and local levels
- Strategies to ensure **sustainability** of the PPA process

Source: McClean and Muhakanizi. Utilizing PPA results to influence policy. Experience in Uganda. 1999

Practice Pointers for Increasing the Impact of Consulting the Poor

1. Understand the political environment

- Undertake the PPA only after potential political implications have been thought through.

2. Create a conducive policy environment if possible

- Build consensus among various government branches. The value of conducting a PPA where there is limited government support will be compromised.
- Build dialogue to create a more open climate so that ministries feel included in analyzing the resulting data.
- Maintain a policy dialogue through continuous follow-up with various stakeholders.
- Use personal judgment and attune stakeholder involvement to the overall political, social, economic, and institutional environment in country. There is no blueprint approach to the timing of stakeholder inclusion in the policy dialogue.

3. Ownership

- Key policymakers lead the process from the beginning. Develop relationships with and understanding of the key players.
- Know how to organize workshops with appropriate **follow-up**. Work-shops are not the end of a process of participation. Final consensus might not be achieved so the documents should reflect the differing views. If people's views are not included, that should be explained. The quality and follow-up of workshops will affect the impact of the PPA and the relationship among participating stakeholders.

4. Strengthen the policy delivery framework

- Identify a credible institution where participatory research could be analyzed, coordinated, and disseminated.
- Investigate provincial capacities.
- Work with institutions (universities, networks of social scientists, etc.) already undertaking social research to ensure that research is not duplicated and the PPA becomes part of the body of social knowledge.

Source: Caroline Robb, "Can the Poor Influence Policy?" World Bank: Washington, DC, 1998.

TN 16: Participatory Policy Formulation and Implementation: Poland Pension Reform

CASE STUDY ON PARTICIPATION IN POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION: PENSION REFORM IN POLAND

In January 1999, Poland launched a new pension system that was the result of 5-6 years of broad outreach campaigns and complex negotiations within the government and between the government and key stakeholder groups.

Post-communist Poland operated on a traditional pay-as-you-go (PAYG) system; payroll taxes of current workers financed the pension benefits of current retirees. Due to a number of policy changes expanding early retirement options and other privileges, pension costs skyrocketed in the mid-1990s and Poland had one of the highest spending rates of any post-communist transition country. In addition, long-term demographic shifts led to a decline in people paying into the system relative to those receiving benefits. Contribution rates (i.e., payroll taxes) had already risen from 25% in 1981 to 45% in 1990. They could not easily be pushed up further.

The ongoing debate on pension reform quickly spread from experts to policymakers as pension spending increased from 8.6% of GDP in 1990 to 15.5% in 1994. Fiscal conservatives pushed successfully to limit deficit spending. Through a series of *ad hoc* measures, policymakers began to chip away at pension benefits in an effort to close the gap between contributions and benefits.⁴ This got the government through the immediate fiscal crisis but it provoked strong criticism from pensioners and unions and may have contributed to the eventual collapse of the post-Solidarity government in 1993.

⁴ Steps included reversal of benefits for special groups, such as those undertaking hazardous jobs, under-indexing so that benefits lagged behind rising prices, changes in tax treatment of pension benefits, changes in the wage base for calculating pensions and a reduction in minimum guaranteed benefits.

Key Stakeholders: Pension Reform in Poland

- Alliance of the Democratic Left (SLD) government 1993-97 (left-centrist)
- Solidarity Electoral Action government 1997-present (right-centrist)
- Trade unions, including “old” OPZZ and “new” Solidarity federations
- Pensioners and workers nearing retirement (close to 50% of eligible voters)
- Middle-aged and young workers paying into the system
- Social Insurance Institution (ZUS) with 4,000/40,000 employees

In subsequent years, the Ministry of Labor (MOL) wanted to modify and retain the current PAYG system. The Ministry of Finance (MOF) wanted to convert to a predominantly funded system. Disagreements between the two ministries and within the SLD effectively stalled reform for the next eighteen months. Finally, in the autumn of 1995, Parliament approved a broad program prepared by the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister that included a mandatory funded pension. However, several obstacles, including a change of government, delayed the process.

The new labor minister, Baczkowski, appointed in February 1996, built a team of experts and began working quietly on a significantly revised program but calling it an update and expansion of the previous proposal that was viewed as too conservative. The revised program, entitled “Security through Diversity”, was completed in February 1997, three months after Baczkowski’s sudden death.

Conducting Public Outreach

In May 1997, as Parliament considered the “Security through Diversity” program, the Office for Pension Reform (OPR) launched a public relations campaign that targeted policymakers, political leaders, unions, employers, and the media. The campaign stressed the long-term insolvency of the current system and the necessity of comprehensive reform. The Office conducted public opinion surveys and widely publicized the results, organized seminars, developed a recognizable logo for the Office, held training programs for OPR and ZUS staff in communications techniques and the principles of the proposed new system, maintained a website, and produced thousands of brochures targeted to employers, unions and different age groups. The OPR put considerable effort into media relations, arranging interviews with key architects of reform. Members of the media joined Parliamentarians and government officials on a study tour to four countries that had undertaken comparable reforms and this greatly informed their reporting.

Early press releases outlined experiences with pension reform in other countries and developments in the legislative process while later ones explained the specifics of proposals adopted in Poland.

The Second Public Outreach Campaign

By the end of 1998, continued polling indicated clearly the need to shift from opinion-leaders to the general public. Only 30 per cent of people surveyed said they had heard of the pension reform and understood the changes proposed. Some 55 per cent had heard of a reform but didn't know the specifics. Some 83 per cent felt they were not sufficiently well informed and 77 per cent said they would like to learn more.

In March 1999, as mentioned above, a second, broader campaign launched with objective of explaining the new system and the different options open to different age groups. Conflicting information was put out by various pension funds with massively larger advertising budgets (\$100 million compared to \$5 million spent by the government). Software for estimated pension benefits could be downloaded from the OPR website. A call center was created which handled 200,000 inquiries from March-December 1999; press, television spots and brochures promoted the call center and the new ZUS; four televised spots reached an estimated 96 percent of urban adults; booklets were included with monthly telephone bills.

With outside consultants, the OPR used focus groups to track the effectiveness of outreach efforts and, where necessary, make mid-course corrections. Initial results were disappointing. People could recall slogans but did not understand what they meant. Focus groups indicated that the key sources of information for people were conversations with friends, press articles and, literature produced by private pension funds. ZUS was a last resort and associated with old system.

The office of the Plenipotentiary was officially dissolved in April 1999 but some of its employees continued work from within the Ministry of Labor. Focusing on opinion leaders to educate key publics, Lewicka traveled to eight of the largest cities outside Warsaw in May and June 1999. She met with employers, trade union representatives and local media. A new communications strategy, adopted in August, developed new television spots and added radio. Newspaper advertisements answered the most common questions identified by focus group participants and cautioned the public about possible excessive claims by private funds.

Additional focus groups indicated that people realized that pension funds were providing subjective and general information and that information from the Office of the Plenipotentiary was considered more reliable than ZUS.

Public education efforts continue and the UNFE also ran a limited information campaign and held visitor hours in its offices. Officials appeared on radio and TV programs and joined debates and conferences, mostly aimed at supporting employers and unions in setting up voluntary "third pillar" schemes. Rather than producing easy-to-use explanatory tables, the UNFE proposed new cost structures that created new confusion. But, as noted, they played a very constructive role in monitoring the advertising and sales blitz conducted by private pension funds in 1999.

Conclusions

- Special offices created early in the process were very important in coordinating reform and signaling high-level commitment.

- The government built support outside its own governing coalition that was essential for sustaining reforms. The support of opposition deputies was essential to approval of key aspects of the first-pillar law.
- The government effectively reached out to trade unions and business associations before finalizing legislation for Parliament
- The broad consensus carefully constructed during the reform process slowed the pace and content of reform but contributed significantly to implementation.
- Important concessions made to build support will significantly increase transition costs but do not undercut the essential objectives of the reform.
- Not only the government but trade unions and other organizations faced difficult trade-offs. The loss of early retirement options and other occupational privileges and a decline in the level of pensions from 1994 levels is a difficult blow. But there was an assessment that the relatively exceptional circumstances in the mid-1990s were not sustainable over the long-term and the trade unions are now a full partner in the new system.
- The long-term prospects of the new system appear good.
- New stakeholders created during the reform will play an increasingly important role.
- In general, public outreach and communications efforts were effective. Opinion polls taken at this time indicated that the proportion of people who felt their information was adequate or improved had increased from less than half in late 1998 to nearly 80 per cent. Just 16 per cent said they felt they lacked information, compared to nearly half earlier. Approximately 50 percent of respondents thought information was easy to find and, by March 2000, this proportion had risen to 70 percent.
- The media played a key role throughout the reform process and one of the most effective investments of government resources was in media outreach and education.

TN 17: Participatory Monitoring of Public Services: Indonesia: Community-Based Monitoring of Social Safety Net Programs

Background⁵

Following a dramatic drop in per capita GNP from US\$ 1200 in early 1997 to US\$ 680 in 1998, the Indonesian government began implementing social safety net (SSN) programs targeting the adversely affected - those who became poor after the crisis and everyone already living in poverty. These were aimed at supplementing their purchasing power through the Special Market Operation (OPK) of subsidized rice distribution, preserving access to critical social services such as education through student scholarships, and augmenting incomes through labor intensive employment opportunities. To monitor the implementation of these SSN programs and to provide donors and government with qualitative information about the social impacts of the 1997 financial crisis, the World Bank formed the Social Monitoring and Early Response Unit (SMERU) with major assistance from AusAid, Asia-Europe Meeting Fund, and USAID. SMERU has five different units⁶ with tasks of, i) building local capacity for rapid

⁵ Draws heavily on material posted at www.smeru.or.id

⁶ Crisis Impact and Program Monitoring, Community Based Monitoring, Otonomi Daerah, Data Analysis, and NGO Liaison & Partnership.

assessments of potential 'danger' situations in the field, ii) forming a network of networks of NGOs for information exchange at all levels, iii) building capacity of communities to do their own monitoring, iv) storing and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, and v) conducting a study on the impact of provincial trade deregulation. CBM is thus just one of the five units responsible for one of the core mandates of SMERU. With an authoritarian regime in place for much of the past 30 years, Indonesia did not have a strong tradition of civic participation in public life, let alone open scrutiny and monitoring of government programs. Community Based Monitoring under SMERU thus started in October 1998 by declaring that not much was known in the country on how monitoring of government programs ought to proceed. Hence an action research project was initiated in three areas, one urban and two rural. Based on these findings, a full-fledged guideline on CBM was to be prepared.

Process

Three areas that were chosen by SMERU in September 1998 for pilot monitoring were *Bandung* City in kelurahan Cibangkong, and *Gangga* and *Sekotong* in kabupaten Lombok Barat. In Bandung, the process was kicked off by a team from SMERU introducing the program to the mayor and officials from local government agencies in the city. After the mayor endorsed the idea of monitoring the flow of funds intended for the targeted beneficiaries, SMERU and its civil society partners undertook social mapping, identified local stakeholders and invited their representatives to attend an inclusive community workshop. SMERU was however only facilitating the process. The real hosts were the people from RW 11 – one of the sections of Kelurahan Cibangkong – who in turn invited representatives from 12 other RWs in the Kelurahan. This workshop paved the way for the formation of a forum of RWs in the region. People attending the workshop democratically elected community volunteers to lead the Kelurahan forum. SMERU introduced the program in Lombok Barat similarly by briefing the chief of the region. Because of difficulties posed by geography, elaborate participatory community workshops, as happened in urban Bandung, could not be held here, although residents of one village each in Gangga and Sekotong were consulted. A forum of village representatives was created, and as in Bandung, results of the participatory processes were presented to a 'trans-actors' forum – a much wider 'social space' at the kabupaten level - with representatives from the community, regional government, universities, media, NGOs, etc.

Within the respective forum, several task forces were formed with representation drawn from all parts of the city (all 13 RWs) and all the villages in the rural regions to look at specific aspects of the SSN programs. It was agreed that monitoring would be done through what was described as a 'multi layered problem solving approach', beginning at the level of the kelurahan (village) and kecamatan (district) forums. Complaints on specific programs would first be directed to the respective task force, e.g., complaints about cheap rice not reaching the neediest would be handled by the OPK task force at the village forum level. Problems that couldn't be solved here would then be forwarded to the Task-Actors forum that facilitated open meetings among community representatives and government officials. If problems still remained unresolved even at this 'meso' level, they would then be put forth for resolution at the level of the line ministries. This multi-layered approach was introduced to ensure that the central government was not inundated with complaints that could be best verified and taken care of by empowered bodies at lower tiers. The forums also have a task force responsible for the community's general development needs, resources, and constraints that serves to support bottom-up development

planning. As these discussion forums are being institutionalized, SMERU has been working to create a transparent information system that allows the public to access data on budget allocation, criteria for target group identification, and disbursement mechanism, so that the task of community monitoring would be easier.

Results

The forums have become suitable effective venues for local conflict resolution. People have brought anomalous cases to the attention of the forum, many of which have been instantly resolved.

Some examples:

- i) In Lombok Barat, people complained that subsidized rice under the OPK program arrived late. The responsible agency for distribution blamed the late arrival of operational funds for this slow delivery. The community agreed to advance transportation costs to remedy the delay. Some also complained that many non-poor families were included in the list of cheap rice beneficiaries. This was verified, and the forum agreed to weed out ineligible beneficiaries by repeating the selection process. Poor families also complained that they had to pay a hefty Rp. 2,500 to transport the rice home. The head of the village and OPK team agreed to drop the rice not at the kelurahan office, but down at the dusuns (?).
- ii) Also in Lombok Barat, students complained that they were not receiving the full amounts of their scholarship money. The forum consulted with students, parents and the school to find that of the allocated amount of Rp. 120,000 per quarter, the students had only received Rp. 55,000. It was revealed that the school master had been siphoning part of the grant to other deserving students, as only 27 of the 108 poor students qualified for these awards. Part of the money was also being used to purchase wood for the school. Deemed not a gross mismanagement for personal gain, the community forum however did request the school master to get approval from the scholarship committee before he took actions that were not sanctioned by the school regulation.
- iii) In North Jakarta, complaints surrounding the manipulation of the names of workers on the cleaning up of the Kamal Muara canal, as well as concoction of fictitious names of micro-credit recipients, were investigated and verified. This forced the local authority to agree to identifying target groups in conjunction with the community forums.

While the forums in the city and the villages were originally created to specifically discuss SSN programs, this space has already been broadened by the people to discuss wider community issues such as land disputes, local public services, local sanitary conditions, etc. A country with weak democratic traditions, the contributions these forums are making in Indonesia by allowing people to come together and debate their rights and discuss about their legitimate entitlements has added immense value to local social infrastructure, which means that even after the SSN programs are withdrawn, these are likely to be sustained as active self-governed community organizations.

Monitoring has highlighted subtle but serious flaws in the targeting and design of SSN programs such as their failure to take into account local conditions. It was found that when one of the national criteria for identifying the poor was by looking at whether houses had a dirt floor, in regions like Lombok Barat, where having a dirt floor was part of the way people lived irrespective of their ownership of wealth, even rich people qualified for SSN programs while in some other parts where even the poor lived in elevated houses with wooden floors, they were

not be included as targets. Similarly, under the labor-intensive programs in some regions, people were using the money allotted for wages to buy materials like asphalt, cement and sand, and contributing labor for free. This showed that communities needing development projects had been mis-identified as those needing income generating opportunities. Also in some places where targeting of remunerative labor programs had been done right, it was, however, seen to undermine the tradition of voluntary collective work.

SMERU's experience in community monitoring is very recent, and it is only complementing numerous other initiatives by the government and other donors in this field. Because all this was triggered by the 1998 financial crisis, and both SSN programs and their evaluations are both a work in progress, there does not yet exist a rich pool of evidence and experience to draw far-reaching conclusions from the successes, or lack thereof, of these initiatives. But initial signs are promising, and all actors seem to realize that community-based activities are there to continue, even after the SSN programs cease to be implemented, justifying multiple interventions at institutionalizing these nascent efforts presently.

TN 18: Definitions

Participation

Participation is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them.

Participation occurs in **four distinct ways**:

- **Information sharing** - one-way flows of information to the public
- **Consultation** - two-way flow of information between the coordinators of the consultation and public and vice versa.
- **Collaboration** - shared control over decision-making
- **Empowerment**- transfer of control over decision-making and resources to all stakeholders

Examples of methods

Information sharing	Consultation	Collaboration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • translation of official documents into local languages • dissemination of written material through newspapers, magazines and pamphlets • distribution of documents through local government • televised or radio broadcast discussions • poster campaigns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participatory assessments • beneficiary assessments • consultative meetings • field visits and interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participatory planning • workshops to discuss and determine positions, priorities, roles • joint committees, working groups and task forces with stakeholder representatives • joint work with user groups, intermediary organizations and other stakeholders • stakeholder groups given principal responsibility for implementation • meetings to help resolve conflicts, seek agreements, engender ownership • public reviews of draft documents and revision

Dimensions of participation

Scope of participation encompasses the diversity of government processes in which different stakeholder groups are involved

Extent of participation involves the diversity of stakeholder groups participating.

Level of participation equates to the level of government operations - national or local level

Quality of participation the depth and diversity of views expressed, incorporation of these into strategy formulation, consensus building, building of partnerships for delivery of the strategy, and information sharing amongst the stakeholder groups involved.

Stakeholder Group Definitions

Civil Society: At its simplest, civil society is the arena in which **people come together to pursue their common interests** - not for profit or for political power, but because they care enough about something to take collective action. In this sense, **all organizations and associations outside the family and state** are part of civil society, except firms, including religious and professional organizations, labor unions, the media, grassroots associations, NGOs of different kinds, and many others. Because civil society is a very broad term, it refers to different interests, types of associations, and expressions of values, some of which will conflict with others, **the profile of civil society is different in every context.**

Civil society organizations (CSOs) include both local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community based organizations, grass roots organizations, business and professional associations, chambers of commerce, groups of parliamentarians, media, policy development and research institutes. The following chart shows some of the different types of CSOs that exist in each of these categories.

Diversity of CSOs

Representation	Technical Expertise	Capacity-Building	Service-Delivery	Social Functions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership organisations e.g. labor unions • NGO federations and networks • Churches and faith-based organizations • Organizations of indigenous people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional and business associations • Advocacy NGOs • Think-tanks and research groups • News media groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations (local and international) • NGO support organizations • Training organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing NGOs (local and international) • Credit and mutual aid societies • Informal, grassroots and community-based associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mosque or prayer groups • Sports clubs • Migrants' associations • Choral societies

Representative Authorities: refers to elected bodies of the government, for example, parliaments and assemblies at the national and state levels, district and municipal assemblies and elected councils, and elected community leaders.

The Public: The public consists of several groups of people, including:

- Those who are **directly** affected by the policies under discussion, such as individuals and families, indigenous groups, women's groups and so forth who will feel the impact of the policies immediately.
- Those who are **indirectly** affected by the policies under discussion, such as the private sector, which may have more or fewer customers as a result of the policy, religious groups, community associations and networks and local NGOs
- **Interested parties** who have the ability to influence the policy outcomes, both positively or negatively, such as donors, public sector representatives, national and international NGOs, universities and research centers

RESOURCE LIST

Key Documents

1. Aycrigg, Maria, *Participation and the World Bank: Successes, Constraints and Responses*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1998
2. Blackburn, James with Holland Jeremy, *Who Changes? Institutionalizing participation in development*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998
3. Brocklesby and Holland, *Participatory Poverty Assessments and Public Services: Key Messages from the Poor*, London: DFID, 1998
4. Chambers, Robert, *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the first last*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1997
5. ESD, *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1996
6. Holland, Jeremy with Blackburn, James, *Whose Voice? Participatory research and policy change*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998
7. IFC Environment Div, *Doing Better Business Through Effective Public Consultation and Disclosure*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1998
8. Joint Report of the Government-Donor-NGO Working Group, *Vietnam Development Report 2000: Attacking Poverty*, Consultative Group Meeting for Vietnam, 1999
9. McGee, Rosemary. *Participation in Poverty Reduction Strategies: A synthesis of experience with participatory approaches to policy design, implementation and monitoring*. IDS, 2000
10. Operations Policy Dept, *The World Bank and Participation*, Washington: World Bank, 1994
11. Pretty, J.; Guijt, I; Thompson, J; Scoones, I, *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainer's Guide*, London: IIED, 1995
12. Robb, Caroline M., *Can the Poor Influence Policy? Participatory Poverty Assessments in the Developing World*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999
13. NGO/Civil Society Unit, SDV *Civil Society Consultation Sourcebook*, (forthcoming) Washington, DC: The World Bank,
14. World Bank, *Methodology Guide: Consultations with the Poor*, Washington, DC: Poverty Group, PREM, 1999
15. World Bank, *Consultations with the Poor*: Washington, DC: In preparation. Also available on the World Bank website at: www.worldbank.org/poverty/wdrpoverty/conspeer/national.

16. World Bank, Review of Participatory Approaches to Country Assistance Strategy Formulation, 1999

References

1. Aparicio, T and Garrison, J; Dolphin N and Symle J; Gruenberg, C, Cesilini, S and Menckopff, G; Fox J; Bain K and Gacitua-Manio, E, *Thinking out Loud. Innovative Case Studies on Participatory Instruments*, Civil Society Team, LAC, World Bank, 1999
2. Arboleda, Jairo, "Participatory Country Assistance Strategy in Colombia: A Case Study." Paper No. 33, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999
3. Aycrigg, Maria, *Participation and the World Bank: Successes, Constraints and Responses*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1998
4. Blackburn, James with Holland Jeremy, *Who Changes? Institutionalizing participation in development*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998
5. Booth, D & Holland, J; Hentschel J and Lanjouw P; and Herbert A, *Participation and Combined Methods in African Poverty Assessment: Renewing the Agenda*, London: DFID, 1998
6. Brocklesby and Holland, *Participatory Poverty Assessments and Public Services: Key Messages from the Poor*, London: DFID, 1998
7. Chambers, Robert, *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the first last*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1997
8. Christopher Mausolff, "Report on the OED/SDV Task Manager Survey on Participation," Draft, 2000
9. Co E, *Beating the Drums: Advocacy for Policy Reform in the Philippines*, Great Britain: Oxfam, 1999
10. ESD, *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1996
11. Holland, Jeremy with Blackburn, James, *Whose Voice? Participatory research and policy change*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1998
12. Ibrahim, Saad Eddin, "Nurturing Civil Society at the World Bank: An Assessment of Staff Attitudes towards Civil Society," Paper, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999
13. IFC Environment Div, *Doing Better Business Through Effective Public Consultation and Disclosure*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1998
14. John Garrison, "From Confrontation to Collaboration: Civil Society-Government-World Bank Relations in Brazil", Draft, 2000
15. Joint Report of the Government-Donor-NGO Working Group, *Vietnam Development Report 2000: Attacking Poverty*, Consultative Group Meeting for Vietnam, 1999

16. Kitabire, D. The Process of Making Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in Uganda. IMF Briefing paper, 1999
17. McClean and Muhakanizi. Utilizing PPA results to influence policy. Experience in Uganda. 1999
18. McGee, Rosemary, "Participation in Poverty Reduction Strategies: A synthesis of experience with participatory approaches to policy design, implementation and monitoring," Brighton: IDS, 2000
19. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. Personal communications, 1999, 2000
20. Operations Policy Dept, *The World Bank and Participation*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1994
21. PREM, *Public Expenditure Management Handbook*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1998
22. Pretty, J.; Guijt, I; Thompson, J; Scoones, I, *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainer's Guide*, London: IIED, 1995
23. Robb, Caroline M., *Can the Poor Influence Policy? Participatory Poverty Assessments in the Developing World*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999
24. Rydin Y and Sommers F. , "Evaluation of Stages 1 & 2 of the LITMUS project. An evaluation of the public participation dimensions of a local sustainability indicators project." Report to London Borough of Southwark, , 1999
25. Stokes, E.; Edgerton, J; Donnelly-Roark, P; Reinikka, R; Balde, D; and Kasozi, M., "Participatory Approaches to Country Assistance Strategies: Lessons from Africa." Note No. 48, Social Development Dept, World Bank, 1999
26. Tandon R, International Conference on Participation of Primary Stakeholders: Lessons Learnt and ways Forward - *Recommendations presented at concluding sessions.* , Paper presented at the Int'l Conference on Up-scaling and Mainstreaming of Primary Stakeholders: Lessons Learnt and Ways Forward, 1998
27. Tumusiime-Mutebile. Making partnerships work on the ground. Experience in Uganda. Presentation to Stockholm Conference. 1999
28. World Bank, *Methodology Guide: Consultations with the Poor*, Washington, DC: Poverty Group, PREM, 1999
29. World Bank, *Consultations with the Poor: Country Reports*, Washington, DC: Poverty Group, PREM, 1999
30. World Bank, *Review of Participatory Approaches to Country Assistance Strategy Formulation*, 1999