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Executive Summary

The workshop on “Engaging Citizens to Enhance Public Service Delivery and Strengthen Accountability,” organized by the Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM/DESA), was held in Vienna on 11-13 July 2011.

The workshop explored how the engagement of citizens—and their organizations in civil society—can contribute to improving accountability in public service delivery and public spending. It focused on (a) the conceptual and institutional framework, (b) trends and regional perspectives, and (c) challenges, approaches and tools. The workshop encouraged consideration of public services in light of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such as healthcare, education delivery, and anti-poverty programs, as well as consideration of emerging accountability mechanisms involving citizens, parliaments and public enterprises.

The goal of the meeting was to enhance knowledge and to build a shared understanding of institutions, approaches and tools that can be engaged by countries to make public service delivery more effective, equitable, transparent and citizen-centric. This is of particular importance at a time when the United Nations Member States have recognized the value of participatory approaches as a useful course of action for countries to accelerate progress toward the MDGs.

Participants

Thirty-seven participants—of whom seventeen were women—attended from twenty-one countries (Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Italy, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, The Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, The Philippines, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States of America) in five world regions. They represented governments, civil society, academia, and regional and international organizations, including among others, the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration (CEPA), the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). A complete list of workshop participants and their short biographies are provided in the appendices of this report.

Methodology

The meeting was structured as a series of presentations and discussions across seven panels, three breakout groups and a role-playing exercise. There were three consecutive plenary sessions during the first two days of the workshop, organized around three themes and seven subthemes. In the afternoon of the second day, participants selected to join one of three discussion groups to look at lessons learned, tools, and the way forward. The seven panels each included a chair, one or more presenters, and discussants, with the active involvement of the great majority of participants. Then participants broke out into three working groups, tasked with forming conclusions and recommendations arising from the meeting. In the morning of the third day the closing session took place, while in the afternoon of the third day, participants were encouraged to hold meetings with each other.

Briefly, the three themes and seven subthemes were:
Theme A: Concepts and Institutions for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery
  Subtheme 1: The Conceptual and Institutional Framework
  Subtheme 2: Shared Accountability

Theme B: Trends and Regional Perspectives on Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery
  Subtheme 3: Africa and South Asia Perspectives
  Subtheme 4: East Asia and Arab World Perspectives
  Subtheme 5: Latin America and OECD Perspectives

Theme C: Challenges, Approaches and Tools for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery
  Subtheme 6: Sector-specific Approaches and Country Experiences
  Subtheme 7: Participatory Accountability in Public Service Spending

The workshop was also used as a laboratory for experimenting with an innovative training methodology aimed at enhancing participants’ learning experience and promoting knowledge creation and sharing. It was about pilot role-playing exercises created and directed by the Chief of Branch, where participants played assigned roles in a hypothetical, realistic situation. The experiment worked well, as it generated ideas that could not easily be derived from panel-type formats. Also, it opened possibilities for different types of interactions among participants, helping to develop closer relationships; it kept the interest and attention of participants high even after workshop fatigue; and participants appreciated and enjoyed the exercise, as evidenced by their evaluation of the workshop (included in the appendices of this report).

Outcomes

The event generated a number of outcomes, including:

- Participants’ increased knowledge of emerging concepts and issues, trends and approaches to participatory accountability for improved public service delivery;
- Sharing of experience and knowledge from practitioners and scholars, from government, academia and civil society, many of whom wore several hats, including that of the private sector;
- Greater understanding of the key success factors in promoting effective, transparent, accountable, participatory and citizen-centred public services through the discussion of key recommendations and policy options;
- Recommendations and ideas to develop training courses, tools and guidelines to enhance government and civil society capacity to engage citizens in relevant areas;
- Key lessons arising from the panels and workshop discussions that were reflected in a set of conclusions and recommendations, presented in the concluding session, and incorporated in the proceedings of the workshop. They included considerations on the evolving conceptual framework, the importance of access to information and the key role of the private sector in service delivery;
- Information and knowledge of emerging concepts, issues and practices, that enriched the collection of materials of the United Nations Public Administration Network on-line platform and is expected to feed into a major publication of the Branch;
The conclusions and recommendations from the workshop are expected to be an input to the upcoming discussion leading to the planning of activities of the Development Management Branch for the biennium 2012-2013.

Participants’ Evaluation

An evaluation form was completed by 19 of 37 participants (or 51 per cent). The evaluation indicates that 79 per cent of evaluating participants found the training workshop excellent or very good. Participants found that the most relevant elements of the workshop were the breakout groups, the general discussion and the role-playing exercise, as well as learning from other experts and practitioners and exchanging cross-national information.

Among the areas needing improvement, participants mentioned that no clear distinction was made in the workshop between emerging concepts, perspectives and approaches that could have been juxtaposed, questioned and reflected upon. Participants also observed that all the sessions went well but there were just too many presentations per panel, and that the absence of language interpretation limited some participants’ readiness to participate in debates. Additional comments made by participants included to focus more on the workshop objectives, which were found to be relevant and needed, but too broad. Participants also suggested that, instead of organizing several small events, DPADM should hold fewer and larger events with 50-60 participants, to reduce gaps in the representation of civil society organizations, academia and government, and enable a richer discussion in plenary sessions and working groups.

Special mention needs to be made of the need to use the Internet and social media tools to make the workshop public and engage more people. This issue was raised by a number of participants and one “non-participant,” namely IMAXI (imaxi.org), an India-based civil society organization that aims to maximize access and increase civil society involvement in public health issues and institutions through the innovative fusion of web-based tools, mobile telephones and physical meetings. During the workshop IMAXI members contacted a participant in the workshop questioning the openness and on-line accessibility of the workshop, an event that focused on the engagement of citizens. IMAXI, as well as a number of participants, suggested that in future similar events we use web-casting and social media updates. This could be very helpful in making the workshop public, reaching and engaging many more people, and ultimately promoting change.

Findings and Recommendations

A. Concepts and Institutions for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery

Conclusions

• The participants developed an accountability framework that distinguishes between: (a) traditional or hierarchical accountability (a vertical chain of relationships), and (b) modern or participatory accountability (horizontal relationships operating across boundaries and more suitable for engaging citizens in the delivery of services).
• The participants accepted the accountability concepts as given in the paper by Enrique Peruzzotti, noting that countries will have their own ways of handling: (a) accountability institutions or organizations (e.g. parliaments, audit offices, ombudsmen), and (b) other
mechanisms such as use of the market (e.g. participatory planning, participatory budgets, citizen advisory councils). Some western countries, such as the United Kingdom, have moved toward the latter, while developing countries have tended more toward the former.

- Within Enrique's framework, the forms of accountability need to be expanded. In situations where there are many players in the delivery of services, and the government cannot or will not do it alone, collaboration with others is required. In this case there may be shared outcomes agreed upon in service delivery leading to some form of shared accountability. Alternatively, there can be different codes within the public and private sectors, e.g. codes of ethics.

- The existing codes of conduct for public servants are much more linked to compliance with legislation than to ethical behaviour. With issues like citizenship, the rights of the poor, and respect for minorities, the codes of conduct must be revised to include new concepts that address new situations. For example, how can citizens' demands be met for increased participation in decision-making processes, and for inclusion and equity in development policies and programs?

- Mechanisms to enforce accountability must be included in the training of civil servants in codes of conduct. Training must help civil servants shift from personal trust to institutional trust.

- The scope of public services can include many services provided by the private sector (e.g. private schools) but the workshop discussion focused on publicly funded services. Many of these will include outsourcing, while others may be insourced through agreements between government agencies.

- The participants agreed that the Canadian Auditor General’s principles of effective accountability had much merit. These are itemized in Meredith Edwards’ paper: (a) clear roles and responsibilities; (b) clear performance expectations; (c) balanced expectations and capacities; (d) credible reporting; (e) reasonable review and adjustment.

- Critics who complain about the potential loss of citizens’ rights through outsourcing make a substantial case: Citizens are being deprived of traditional rights of inquiry and complaint in the interest of supposedly cheaper and better service with inevitable reduction in accountability. This topic should be further explored in an international setting.

- Training in managing contracts is needed wherever the private sector is involved in delivery. But often there is also in-sourcing where two agencies are responsible to each other and to citizens for services, and principles need to be set here (See the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) list of principles for this type of cross-agency collaboration).

- Context determines the forms of citizen involvement that work best. Citizens want to have the power to make a difference, and that requires both transparency and free access to information. Similarly, citizens may have information necessary for government decisions. Citizens should be involved of their own initiative. Citizen involvement is to be accomplished by both informal learning (e.g. workshops, networks, day-to-day life experience and experimentation) and more formal learning mechanisms (e.g. structured teaching situations).

- Key lessons learned based on country-level experiences are:
  (a) It takes time to engage.
  (b) Transaction costs can be high.
  (c) Learning by doing must be expected.
  (d) A key ingredient is transparency.

- Development strategies to help countries should include education/training for both providers and citizens.
Citizen engagement in public service delivery can promote accountability and help countries achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by directing attention to what works for marginalized groups, and by informing and educating everyone involved.

Discussion during the workshop concentrated on the executive branch of government, and did not give enough attention to the legislative branch. There is a tendency to disregard the role of parliaments and the latest developments in public policy making, a process that involves not only appointed officials, but also elected ones.

Discussion of private sector involvement was weak. This is something to correct in the future. Presentations and discussions concentrated on public administration and civil society, their rights and obligations, and touched only briefly on the private sector. If we define good governance as the construction of policies through consensus, with contracts and guaranties for the involvement of all social sectors, an actor is missing.

**Recommendations**

- Another meeting is recommended to bring together all three sectors: government, civil society and the private sector. Boundaries are blurring among the three. No one can resolve things on their own, so if we want to get good outcomes to the citizens we need to include the private sector in the plan.
- UNDESA role: (a) provide guidelines for civil servants who are required both to involve citizens and to be vertically accountable (i.e. to superiors while also holding subordinates accountable); (b) ensure evaluations occur to meet the demands of those who think in terms of a business model, and ensure more evaluations occur beyond individual case studies (c) provide resources for those who want to undertake relevant training
- UNDESA role (specific suggestions): (a) In the case of outsourcing, provide capacity-building initiatives for public officials in managing contracts wherever the private sector is involved in service delivery. Since there is a trend for many government services to be outsourced, UNDESA should provide training on how citizen participation can help in the allocation and monitoring of outsourcing; (b) In the case of insourcing, where two or more agencies are responsible to each other and to citizens for services, UNDESA should develop principles to be set here (see Australian National Audit Office-ANAO list of principles for this type of cross-agency collaboration).

**B. Trends and regional perspectives on citizen engagement and accountability in public service delivery**

**Conclusions**

- Due to various contexts across the world, social accountability will be understood and practiced in different ways and using diverse tools that are suitable for individual contexts.
- The approaches to citizen engagement will also be different according to policy and programme objectives, information needs of public service officials, needs of citizens, feedback mechanisms and participation in various stages of policy making (design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation).
- There is definitely not a linear path of social accountability but there has to be a vision in each context and a strategy to reach that vision. There are building blocks of social accountability that act as enabling conditions for triggering public accountability (where there is a lack of it) or ensuring that accountability is enhanced.
• Civil society and state actors have diverse interests, knowledge and skills. Capacity-building efforts should be implemented, building actors’ existing capacities, and identifying and addressing gaps to ensure that capacity building contributes to improved service delivery.

• We need to encourage and support countries to develop not only a citizen charter but also a civil servant charter with new rules of engagement. Some elements of these charters would be common to many countries, like citizens’ right to information as well as their right to privacy. It would be valuable to share ideas from different countries. The Netherlands are developing rules of engagement for civil servants, to help public officials deal with citizens who are interested in providing information or in commenting on their work. Other countries, such as Brazil, are undergoing a similar process.

• Key lessons have been learned already that can contribute to the improvement of public services and ensure their contribution to reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These lessons include:
  (a) Political acceptance that change is needed is essential.
  (b) Political and administrative leadership is essential to improving public services.
  (c) Different methodologies exist and there is no “one size fits all” model; thus sharing knowledge is important but with appropriate political economy analysis.
  (d) Civil society should not only have the voice to be heard but also the ability to influence policy decisions and their implementation.

Recommendations

• In post-conflict societies governments should give priority to building the capacity of civil servants, especially the young, building a sense of duty for civil service, and educating the young about the purpose and value of government, the nature of law, and the role of government officials.

• UNDESA should learn from, support, and assist actors already engaged in developing frameworks of Political Economy Analysis1 like the DFID (UK Department for International Development) Drivers of Accountability Programme. It should support continued learning and knowledge sharing among actors who are either not using, or not knowledgeable about, Political Economy Analysis frameworks.

• UNDESA should establish (where necessary) and foster regional and country networks for cross-country and cross-continental learning about social accountability. These networks should involve the public sector, civil society, and the private sector.

• There is recognition of increasingly limited opportunity for citizen engagement with the state due to increased regulation by states; therefore UNDESA and other UN agencies should assist states and their public administrations to create an enabling space for public deliberations between citizens and the state and its agencies.

• Because citizen engagement has different meanings depending on the country, the UNDESA and other UN agencies should assist institutions at a country level in the capacity building of citizens, government officials, and civil society organizations. Civic education can promote civic engagement in contexts where civic engagement has been eroded or lacking. This will include compiling and disseminating information on effective practices of participatory accountability in public service from the perspectives of both citizens and public service officials.

---

1Political economy analysis aims to situate development interventions within an understanding of the prevailing political and economic processes in society. See http://www.gsdrc.org/go/topic-guides/political-economy-analysis
C. Challenges, Approaches, and Tools for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery

Conclusions

- One of the challenges of citizen participation is to reach the citizens who will be beneficiaries of the service, and avoid elite capture or misrepresentation of interests by intermediaries. The latter may distort the relationship between state and citizens by introducing vested interests and failing to represent the interests of the intended beneficiaries. Intermediaries may undermine the sustainability of citizen engagement, as interest is likely to wane in the long run.
- If the targeted beneficiaries of public services can be engaged without interference, they are likely to participate on a voluntary basis in anticipation of the benefits to be reaped, or as part of their civic duty.
- A major challenge is to motivate citizens to engage. Participants noted that citizens in the productive sector have a direct and active engagement with government due to the immediacy of the returns. The social sector tends to be problematic as citizens may lack confidence in the delivery of the service or do not connect their engagement directly with achievement of the service. It was cautioned that citizens have limited time to devote to participatory meetings and so the design of initiatives should be mindful of this.
- There is also a risk that marginal members of the community (the poor, the vulnerable, etc.) may not engage in the available opportunities, so extra efforts have to be made to ensure that the interests and needs of marginal groups are taken into account, and that services delivered work for them.
- There is a risk that government will co-opt citizen groups and civil society organizations (CSOs). Local ethnic groups and single-issue interest groups at the local level can also use their influence to monopolize engagement opportunities if these are not well designed.
- CSOs often don’t have the required capacity to engage in budget processes and other participatory governance mechanisms. The questions to be asked in this regard are: What responsibility does government have in building civil society capacity? Should government provide support for CSOs’ capacity building? Will this undermine the autonomy and independence of CSOs? Or should CSOs seek to build and complement their capacity through networks and peer learning across countries?
- The issue of symmetry of information and capacity is very important. To avoid a hierarchical relationship between government and civil society, and to allow citizens to contribute in a genuine way in the decision-making process, we have to address the problem of asymmetry of information and capacities. Civil society organizations and the representatives in those arenas must have access to information, and must have the capacity to understand and process complex information. Governments need to be ready to invest in developing this capacity and thus give citizens the opportunity to engage in a qualified way.
- Capacity development efforts should target public administration schools, and incorporate action learning in the curriculum. Students would engage in a specific advocacy or research activity in which they have to talk to civil servants, politicians and citizens.
- Transparency and Freedom of Information (FOI) The absence of information greatly hampers citizen motivation and ability to engage in local governance. There is a need for governments to supply simplified, relevant
information to the public through easily accessible means. Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) should be employed in this regard. Other legislation should be checked to ensure that the needed information is generated and properly managed. An FOI law is needed to make it a punishable offense to refuse to make information available.

- A Freedom of Information (FOI) law is necessary but not sufficient. Implementation of the law is where conflict and negotiation occur, and that is where we should engage citizens. Implementation means determining priorities and allocating a budget to those priorities. Implementation also involves tracking expenditures to check for compliance with procurement laws, and to verify that expenditures have been properly made for their intended outcomes.

- In their discussion, participants recalled the Barcelona Declaration on “The Critical Role of Public Service in Achieving the Millennium Development Goals” signed in June 2010 in the context of the United Nations Public Service Day Awards Ceremony and Forum. It recognized that public decision-making processes should be transparent, accountable and participatory, and that information about government decisions should be clear and accessible to all. Participants also highlighted the relevance of recommendation (g) of the Barcelona declaration that states, “To improve transparency and accountability, governments should promote wider use of information, communication and technology to simplify and reduce the cost of processes and foster broader access. Information sharing and using ICT tools should be a priority to support planning.”

- Participants agreed there is a need to institutionalize citizen participation, while noting the need for flexibility and innovation appropriate to local approaches and applications.

- Replication of programs and policies that work well in one context is not a straightforward matter. Since they are specific to their own setting, they may not transfer well to different contexts. A flexible approach needs to be taken, using the underlying principles from a successful model rather than specific tools that may not be appropriate to a different culture.

- The role of culture is important to consider. Culture is not fixed, but contains competing values that fluctuate. One purpose of social accountability policies is to question certain practices. A particularly damaging practice is the tolerance of corruption. When corruption enters the realm of citizen engagement, it can filter down to the local level. It then becomes decentralized and harder to control or eradicate. Participants noted that culture is not static and that government should take an instrumental role in promoting positive societal values as a basis for change.

- What is the object of participatory accountability within the context of the workshop? One goal could be the democratic value of participation. But if we are dealing with trying to apply participatory accountability within the context of the MDGs and in relation to the poor and other marginalized groups, it is necessary to be more specific about what we are trying to achieve. The government, and not just the private sector, should take the initiative more often than it does.

- The state should especially take the initiative to empower marginalized groups of society, which requires resources and encouragement. Public servants need to take responsibility for participatory democracy. For good governance in the future, effective public servants will empower communities and involve them in the decision-making process.

**Recommendations**
Governments should support technical skills training in complex and specialized competencies for CSOs, e.g. budget analysis, audit, etc., possibly in collaboration with academic institutions.

Governments should institutionalize mechanisms to report to citizens, and should engage them in discussion, seek explanations and seek better understanding of government performance.

Governments should look to guaranteeing ICT’s accessibility to all, bearing in mind the impact of modern information and communication technologies on politics, culture and the everyday life of the people. They should be aware of factors that limit access to technology for a large part of the population. They should recognize the great potential of modern ICTs to facilitate access to information by citizens, including marginalized groups. Governments should address policies to reduce the costs of connectivity and to create opportunities for people to participate more using modern ICT, especially web 2.0 technologies.

Recognizing that the increasing use of contracts (outsourcing) to deliver government services has the potential to undermine government officials’ responsibility and parliamentary oversight, it is necessary to see more accountability in this area and it is recommended to conduct general audits of external entities (outsourced agents) involved in contracts for delivery of services. It is also recommended that this be included in the framework for increasing accountability through parliamentary mechanisms.

Parliaments should not be ignored, as they are important actors in public accountability because they have the mandate to oversee government operations, and therefore they are entitled to do what civil society in most countries cannot do. Parliaments should be included as participants in the public accountability process.

UNDESA should continue to raise awareness and to promote knowledge and information sharing about changes, policies, programmes, etc. provided by governments and CSOs to strengthen participatory accountability mechanisms.

Opening Remarks

Speakers, in order of presentation

Roberto Villarreal, Chief, Development Management Branch, Division for Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA

Ms. Jo Dedeyne-Amann, Chief, Implementation Support Section, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Angela Capati-Caruso, Senior Governance and Public Administration Officer, Division for Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA

Anni Haataja, Associate Expert, Division for Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA

Summary of presentations

Mr. Villarreal welcomed the participants and stated that the objective of the workshop was to assist participants to expand their own capacities and those of their organizations, in their respective countries and internationally, to assess, adapt and eventually adopt institutions and
practices on a specific aspect of public administration, namely the engagement of citizens to make public service delivery more accountable, especially in the case of services related to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such as education, healthcare, water and sanitation, and other urban services.

Mr. Villarreal emphasized that the workshop sought to promote the sharing of information, lessons learned, and networking among participants while focusing on key issues including:

- Policies and practices employed by governments, civil society organizations and international organizations, and the instruments and institutions that exist in countries from all regions to enhance accountability, particularly in public services;
- Knowledge management through documentation, research, and evaluation by development stakeholders and by academic institutions;
- Capacity building using human, technical, financial and normative resources, either available or needed;
- Successful context-related practices;
- Conditions determining success or failure;
- Steps to be taken by development stakeholders independently and/or in cooperation with others, to foster effective, practical, economical and institutionalized practices.

Ms. Jo Dedeyne-Amann discussed five links between the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and the themes of this workshop:

- First, she explained that enhancing public service delivery and strengthening accountability goes hand-in-hand with countering corruption. She noted that the United Nations Convention against Corruption aims to promote integrity, accountability and proper management of public affairs and public property, and pays special attention to the issue of public procurement. It contains measures to promote transparency and accountability in the management of public finances.
- Second, Ms Dedeyne-Amann stated that, in order to advance the Millennium Development Goals, it is essential to counter corruption. In the outcome document, adopted by the High-Level Meeting on the Millennium Development Goals in September 2010, the General Assembly, among others, said it was “determined to take urgent and decisive steps to continue to combat corruption in all manifestations” and—in this regard—urged “all States to consider ratifying or acceding the United Nations Convention against Corruption and to begin its implementation.”
- Third, Ms Dedeyne-Amann emphasized that curbing corruption requires that all stakeholders be involved in enhancing public service delivery and strengthening accountability: the public sector, the private sector and society at large. The Convention, in Article 13, requires States Parties to take appropriate measures to promote the active participation of individuals and groups outside the public sector, such as civil society, non-governmental organizations and community-based organizations. All must participate in the fight against corruption and in raising public awareness of its existence, its causes, and the grave threat it poses.
- Fourth, she said that member states will benefit from the sharing of experiences and lessons learned during this workshop. To facilitate this process, the Conference of States Parties established, at its third session in Doha in November 2009, an open-ended intergovernmental working group on prevention, with the aim of facilitating international cooperation in exchanging information and experiences among States Parties globally. Reference was made to the initiative taken by UNDESA and UNODC to create a new UN Public Service Award for “preventing and combating corruption in
public service.” It is hoped that rewarding positive experiences and practices will be a source of inspiration for other countries.

- Fifth, the speaker noted that this workshop was rightly announced as a capacity development workshop. International cooperation in sharing information and lessons learned is needed for designing effective strategies and putting them into practice. It is also needed to support countries in building capacities. Capacity building is key to the effective implementation of the Convention, as technical assistance is integral to the Convention and to the work of UNODC. UNODC is providing tailored capacity-building assistance on the ground, including activities that build the capacity of civil society.

Ms. Angela Capati-Caruso introduced the workshop themes and structure, stating that the overall goal of the workshop was to explore how the engagement of citizens—and their organizations in civil society—can contribute to improving public accountability in public service delivery and spending. She explained that three sub-themes were chosen for the workshop:

- Concepts and Institutions for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery;
- Trends and Regional Perspectives on Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery;
- Challenges, Approaches and Tools for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery.

Ms. Capati-Caruso described the workshop as a series of discussions organized around the three sub-themes, to take place during Day One and Day Two. In the afternoon of Day Two participants were to break out into three groups, working on a number of questions in order to draw conclusions and recommendations for governments and for DESA. Day Three would open with the presentations in plenary of the groups’ conclusions and recommendations, followed by a simulation exercise and the closing of the workshop by the early afternoon.

Ms. Anni Haataja, made an announcement about workshop logistics, and provided participants with practical information about the workshop schedule, website, conference premises, IT support team, restaurant, medical and travel services and other logistical details.
Workshop Proceeding

Theme A: Concepts and Institutions for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery

Panel 1: The Conceptual and Institutional Framework
Panel 2: Shared Accountability

Panel 1: The Conceptual and Institutional Framework

Speakers, in order of presentation

Enrique Peruzzotti, Professor, Department of Political Science and International Studies, Torquato di Tella University, Argentina

Martha Oyhanarte, Member of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration, and Co-founder of Poder Ciudadano, Argentina

Mike Rowe, Director of Studies in Public Administration and Management, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

Summary of presentations

The session began with an overview of the concept of accountability and noted that it has two important dimensions: 1) answerability, or the obligation of public officials to inform the public about their activities and justify their choices; and 2) enforcement, or the authority to impose sanctions on those public officials who have gone beyond the publicly agreed-upon limits.

The potential contribution of civil society to these two dimensions of accountability is significant. With regard to answerability, it requires transparency and access to information. It also requires feedback and two-way forms of communication between citizens and governments to allow for mutual learning. Transparency involves not just provision of information, but also the way it is provided. Selective disclosure of largely irrelevant or poorly presented or unreliable data (opaque transparency policies) is often a hindrance to accountability. Civil society can contribute through "information politics" by creating independent subsets of information and challenging government data. It may also contribute through the translation of difficult information, through right-to-access initiatives, and by improving signalling mechanisms (namely, options available to citizens to express their opinion, like electoral instruments).

Answerability also requires adequate channels of feedback between service providers and citizens. These provide opportunities for officials to learn about the needs of citizens while citizens learn about the difficulties officials face in implementing policy. Interfaces for feedback include social audits, participatory budgeting, and councils, which can improve input to the policy process, provide a voice to previously marginalized groups that did not have access to public goods in the past, and provide more public, transparent, deliberative channels for negotiation of public services.

Finally, with regard to social enforcement, collective action can expose wrongdoing, mobilize society, increase social awareness, and lead to the activation of existing institutions of control (e.g., courts, auditors). Society plays a role in the cultural war to change social perceptions, and
acts as an informal system of alarms. Civil society may also engage with state agencies in monitoring other state agencies.

The traditional accountability scenario includes elements of interstate accountability, or horizontal accountability between state agencies, as well as vertical mechanisms of citizen control. But it has grown more complex with the creation of new agencies and oversight mechanisms, the participation of media and civil society, and new initiatives to enhance democratic accountability. Furthermore, accountability not only involves answerability and enforcement, but also a combination of systemic, institutional, and individual approaches to make people and institutions accountable for their decisions and actions. The systemic approach emphasizes legal frameworks; the institutional emphasizes training, recruitment, and implementation of best practices; and the individual emphasizes timely interventions supported by a code of conduct.

The session continued exploring the relationship between accountability and access to information. It was noted that good governance could be understood as the formulation of policies with consensus mechanisms, contracts and guarantees for the involvement and engagement of all social sectors. In this framework, accountability and access to information, like two sides of the same coin, acquire a complementary value.

Semi-direct democratic tools ensure citizens have mechanisms of participation in the decision-making process, complementing the right to vote. These include participatory strategic planning and budgeting, citizens’ advisory councils, and public audiences. All offer citizens channels for direct expression of their specific requests. However, this civic engagement proves illusory if citizens do not have assured access to the information the state possesses. The solution to this problem is not the imposition of limits to participation, but the lifting of those barriers that hinder access to information, so that citizens may be informed participants in the political process.

Fortunately, the right of access to information is here to stay. On the 19th of September 2006, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, in the case “Claude Reyes and Others vs. Chile,” expressly stated that the right to access information is a human right incorporated into the right of freedom of thought and expression. Currently, 86 countries around the world boast laws that regulate this right, of which 12 are in South or Central America. Legislation, while important, is not enough to spread this right if, at the same time, a sustained awareness is not raised about how public secrecy affects our daily lives.

In order for access to information and accountability to become tools that contribute to a democratic way of life, we must bear in mind that:

- The concept that public information belongs to people must inspire the work of all public servants;
- Transparency must transcend formal institutionalism and become part of the daily work processes in public administration;
- Access to information is a public good that legitimizes those who provide it, and promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the management of public politics;
- It is not just about passing a law, but about encouraging a cultural transformation through everybody’s responsible participation;
- Accountability and access to information are also tools for taking care of our national patrimony, preserving and comprehending our history and traditions, and recovering our identity and sense of country.
Summary of discussion

On deepening democracy
Accountability involves institutionalizing mechanisms of mutual learning, but sometimes adversarial terms are used that hamper this dialogue and prevent accountability from becoming a tool of mutual learning.

Accountability is often motivated by the desire to avoid sanctions or penalties. But it should rather be based on the hope of deepening democracy. The question is therefore how to develop democratic institutions—including not only organized civil society but also parliament and political parties—into responsible stakeholders and players. People have to be motivated to participate, but the institutions have to guarantee that their participation will be respected at all levels and protected from retaliation by the various stakeholders. Otherwise the risk is that we create too many institutions for accountability that bypass participants and cost much more than is necessary.

Shortcomings of citizen engagement: proliferation of donor-driven participatory initiatives; elite capture; neglect of traditional accountability institutions
We concentrate on the positive aspects of citizen engagement, but we must be aware of negative side effects such as elite capture. Recent research in a number of countries in Sub-Saharan Africa showed that, in many cases, donors have enthusiastically supported specific civil society organizations (CSOs) in a demand for accountability from governments, but governments have demonstrated limited responsiveness to such demands. Moreover, organizations that are not embedded in civil society have often been able to get generous donor funding for initiatives and causes that are not rooted in the needs of civil society.

The other problem is that, in some cases, donors have been carried away by citizen actions and have overlooked the importance of traditional democratic institutions. Hence, there has been very little support for parliaments and for other formal mechanisms to hold governments accountable. The question is whether there is too much emphasis on participation and engagement by citizens rather than on the responsibilities of governments and the institutions that traditionally are meant to hold governments accountable.

On the proliferation of participatory mechanisms
Some of these mechanisms are not formal, but are actually groups in civil society that decide to mobilize. They are not part of an institutional design. They usually mobilize because they are not getting access to public services or because some of their rights are violated, so they organize to demand accountability to the state and they address specific state agencies.

There are other mechanisms of participation that are more institutionalized such as policy councils that involve representatives of civil society. They do not assume that everybody is going to participate but that the organization represents certain sectors of civil society. Some of these mechanisms are already designed to prevent some of the dangers of participation, namely that the strongest or better organized, or those with more resources, can have a greater voice than the rest. They can also prevent elite capture by certain groups that use the mechanism to advance only their private interest or a particular interest at the expense of the rest of the community.

Access to information and accountability
Access to information requires building capacity within public administrations, public agencies and among civil servants so they can participate in this process. Capacity building is also needed to develop technological tools for the public to demand and get access to information.
An opaque transparency policy can allow selective disclosure of largely irrelevant information. It can be presented in a format that makes it difficult for ordinary citizens to comprehend it, and the administration can disclose only irrelevant or unreliable data. The challenge is to find a strategy that prevents such behaviour and allows the public to access the information that is in the hands of the administration. What strategy should we implement to create change in the culture? How should we train civil servants not only to effect cultural change but also to use the requirements of legislation to make it effective?

Regarding the issue of information, not only does it have to be accessible to citizens, but it also has to be understandable. This requires building government capacity. Actually, many state agencies are creating specific organs for communication with civil society or with the citizenry, and are also establishing departments of citizens and complaints in order to translate what sometimes can be very difficult information into more readable language.

Some civil society organizations play this role. For example, organizations that monitor budgets try to synthesize and translate very complex data on budgets into something that an ordinary citizen can understand.

We must insist on the need to educate governors and the governed in exercising their right of access to information, as there is still a lot of ignorance. For example, the 2002 Human Development Report for Argentina indicated that only 1% of the citizens interviewed mentioned the right to information as relevant to democracy. When asked if they know any other way of controlling government apart from their vote, around 80% said no, and the remaining 20% who admitted to knowing any other form mentioned complaints, strikes, protests, calls to the media, letters to newspapers, reports to opposition political parties, etc. but not the exercise of their right of access to information.

On new online social media and web 2.0 developments
Among the mechanisms, tools and channels for accountability, it is important to include new online social media and their revolutionary impact in countries with high Internet use. However, in countries in which people do not have access to the Internet, how is it possible to fit social media and web 2.0 developments into the new accountability framework?

New online social media are crucial in many initiatives, especially the informal ones that try to influence public policy decisions, including those regarding public service delivery. Through social media, neighbours can vote through the Internet on topics such as community budgets, school systems, garbage collection, and public transportation. It has to be noted that online social media cannot entirely replace personal human interaction. By gathering in person, neighbours get to know each other and engage in public deliberation with each other. They share information and learn about each other’s priorities. Just voting from home or participating online does not always allow a mutual learning process.

Recommendations of Panel 1

• An accountability framework for citizen engagement needs to distinguishes between:
  (a) traditional or hierarchical accountability (a vertical chain of relationships), and (b) modern or participatory accountability (horizontal relationships operating across boundaries and more suitable for engaging citizens in the delivery of services). New online social media need to be added to the framework of public accountability. New
social media are crucial in many initiatives, especially the informal ones that try to influence public policy decisions, including those regarding public service delivery.

- It is necessary to raise public servants’ awareness of the notion that public information belongs to people; that transparency should be part of the daily work processes in public administration; and that access to information is a public good that legitimizes those who provide it, and promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the management of public matters.

Panel 2: Shared Accountability

Speakers, in order of presentation

Meredith Edwards, Professor Emeritus, University of Canberra, Australia. Member of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration

Angelita Gregorio-Medel, Executive Director, Affiliated Network for Social Accountability, East Asia and the Pacific

Luiz Alberto Dos Santos, Deputy Minister for Analysis and Follow-up of Government Policies, Presidency of the Republic, Brazil

Summary of presentations

The first presentation surveyed accountability concepts and explored the innovative application of “joint” or “shared” accountability, particularly in horizontal governance arrangements. This contrasts with more traditional dimensions of the concept, particularly regarding vertical accountability. New and emerging types of shared accountability mechanisms were analysed in contrast to the traditional system of vertical accountability of the government to its citizens through parliaments and elections.

The presentation then outlined three possible paths for shared accountability:

1. Two or more government agencies partner together, and several ministers become jointly responsible for results;
2. Two or more levels of government—for example, national, state and local—cooperate to deliver services;
3. Non-state parties collaborate with the government to deliver services.

Presenters noted that there must be shared accountability between institutions. To achieve this, principles of effective accountability must be followed. According to the Australian National Audit Office, the principles of effective accountability include:

(a) Clear roles and responsibilities;
(b) Clear performance expectations;
(c) Balanced expectations and capacities;
(d) Credible reporting;
(e) Reasonable review and adjustment;
(f) Shared risk management.

These new concepts identify two sectors of accountability. The first is the supply side involving the creation of new agencies and mechanisms. The second is the demand side involving social accountability policies. The World Bank defined social accountability as "an approach towards
building accountability that relies on civic engagement in which it is the ordinary citizens and/or the civil organizations who participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability.”

Social accountability means the constructive engagement between citizens and government in monitoring the use of public resources while allowing citizens to demand reform as necessary. The Canadian Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG) rethought accountability in the context of partnering arrangements in service delivery. It specified types of accountability relationships in an environment of shared accountability as follows:

(a) Accountability among the partners;
(b) Accountability between each partner and its own governing body, as in the case of government to parliament;
(c) Accountability to any joint coordinating body.

Summary of discussion

The discussion developed around the following questions:

(a) What concepts of accountability are most useful in the current governance environment?
(b) What are the key issues to be confronted?
(c) What accountability principles ensure effective citizen input?
(d) Is the Australian experience useful with its complex delivery issues?

Concepts and terminology

We were reminded to be aware that the concepts of governance and government are very difficult to distinguish. Also, participants indicated that a new concept of transversal accountability, in addition to shared accountability, should be included in the discussion about the emerging framework. Transversal accountability is defined as mediated citizen action by civil organizations and their representatives, different from social accountability, and intended as social mobilization that applies pressure from outside the state apparatus. These concepts complement and enrich the traditional framework broadening it to encompass notions of both vertical and horizontal accountability.

Professor Ernesto Insunza Vera’s work on this concept of transversal accountability indicates that it is amore adequate concept for an emerging framework than shared accountability in situations with various actors sharing responsibilities—not only responsibilities for acting on behalf of the people but also in asking for accountability from each other.

The discussion also devoted attention to accountability as a general responsibility of government with respect to all citizens, based on the principle of equality before the law, and accountability to the poor and the marginalized groups, based on the norms of equity.

Trust and codes of conduct

It is necessary to differentiate between accountability and responsibility. Any form of accountability can only be fruitful and effective if it is connected to responsibility. That requires some form of trust, because in practice, total transparency and accountability are not realistic. Building trust, whether personal or institutional, depends on established rules of conduct and a system of rewards and sanctions. Also, we have to understand that building trust is a never-ending process.

We have to combine the issue of accountability with the discussion of codes of conduct. How can we make sure that civil servants work in the interest of the poor and not in their own personal interest? How can we raise their awareness and sense of responsibility for the problems of citizens, especially marginalized groups? Transparency procedures for accountability must be
combined with codes of conduct, and civil servants must receive training to reorient themselves from personal trust to institutional trust, to go beyond the person to the institution. If people don’t trust an office to be independent, or the courts to be independent of the legislature, for example, then they don’t have a functional society. Trust and functional codes of conduct are needed in any collaborative arrangement.

**Obstacles to mParticipation (mobile participation)**

With the potential for modern information and communication technologies (ICT)—especially mobile phones—to allow broader participation, there are two main issues to be highlighted with regard to access:

1. In some countries, and for some citizens in every country, access to the Internet by mobile phones is limited because of cost;
2. In some countries, Internet access is not fully in the hands of citizens. The issue here is about power, so even in a situation of shared accountability, the risk is that power is channelled and controlled.

**Recommendations of Panel 2**

1. Codes of conduct are much more linked to compliance with legislation and ethics than to the behaviour of civil servants. When issues like citizenship are involved, such as the rights of the poor and respect for minorities, codes of conduct must be revised to introduce new concepts that are more relevant.
2. Accountability-enforcing mechanisms must be combined with training civil servants in codes of conduct, to reorient them to the change that has to take place from personal trust to institutional trust.
3. Governments should introduce policies to reduce the costs of connectivity and to create opportunities for people to participate more by using modern ICT, especially web 2.0 technologies.

**Theme B: Trends and Regional Perspectives on Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery**

Panel 3: Africa and South Asia Perspectives
Panel 4: East Asia and Arab World Perspectives
Panel 5: Latin America and OECD Perspectives

**Panel 3: Africa and South Asia Perspectives**

**Speakers, in order of presentation**

Mario Claasen, Researcher, Institute for Democracy in South Africa, South Africa
Mark Turner, Professor, University of Canberra, Australia
Fletcher Tembo, Research Fellow, Overseas Development Institute
Abu Elias Sarker, Associate Professor, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

**Summary of presentations**
The panel started with an analysis of citizen engagement in budget work, using the specific case of Uganda. It was stated that, over the last decade, budget work, or applied budget analysis, has become increasingly recognized as an important tool for holding governmental and non-state actors accountable for their policy commitments, budget allocations and expenditures. It was noted that, increasingly, civil society organizations (CSOs) have adopted budget work as a key part of their advocacy for changes in government policy or performance.

In addition, we were reminded that CSOs in developed and developing countries have recognized that three democratic principles are essential for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, namely accountability, public participation and transparency.

Budgeting for education is a prime example of the need to ensure that governments adhere to these three principles. The public has a right to know how the government spends public resources. Governments, in turn, need to justify education expenditures and, in most cases, seek legislative approval before spending from the annual budget. In this way, the legislature, which is entrusted with this duty through the electoral process, must hold the government accountable for the budget.

A range of approaches have been adopted in civil society budget work, including:

- Deepening the debate in the legislature and among the general public on budget policies and decisions;
- Collating budget information and disseminating it in user-friendly formats;
- Providing independent critical analysis;
- Bringing new information to the debate;
- Providing training in budget analysis and advocacy;
- Helping to build a culture of accountability;
- Advocating for more access to budget decision-making;
- Mobilising stakeholders, interest groups and citizens;
- Providing input into budget decisions through existing channels of access, e.g. submissions to parliamentary committees.

Because they generally do not have access to information about the budget when it is being formulated, most CSOs have tended to focus on the budget approval, budget implementation and budget auditing stages of the budget cycle, as this is where they can have the most impact. In the budget approval stage, CSOs have targeted members of the legislature or parliamentarians responsible for debating and approving the national budget. They have done this through:

- Making formal legislative submissions on the budget;
- Simplifying the national budget to help legislators contribute meaningfully to budget debates;
- Running sessions with legislators to influence their views on the national budget and its impact on certain population groups or sectors.

Many CSOs focus on budget implementation, i.e. on verifying whether or not government funds are being spent as intended. Some initiatives have involved monitoring from a national perspective, using data or quarterly reports from government ministries to check that expenditures are being made according to budget plans. Other initiatives have examined the expenditures of state- or district-level institutions responsible for the delivery of education.

The Case of Uganda: Budget monitoring to fight corruption in the education sector
Budget monitoring is defined as observing the processes and activities involved in implementing a budget over a certain period of time. Like budget analysis, budget monitoring for education can be conducted at national, state/provincial, district, or school levels. It can focus on how the overall education budget has been spent over a number of years, or it can examine a specific programme, such as primary education. Budget monitoring considers how disbursements are made at particular points in the system, especially whether they are regular and spent as planned, or if there are any leakages.

In Uganda, education delivery is decentralized to the school level. School management committees and parents are involved in school governance, budgeting and education expenditures. Three child rights organizations in Uganda embarked on training children in their rights, the education system, and budget monitoring skills. Children were also involved in the development of budget monitoring tools, which they used to monitor budget expenditures such as actual delivery of textbooks and other learning materials. The children’s monitoring revealed corruption by teachers, and so, improved their schools’ environments.

Children became part of their schools’ finance subcommittees, and through this they were able to influence the budget by having resources allocated to their needs—for example, sanitary towels for girls, renovation of a classroom for counselling services, and the building of a boarding facility for children who live far from their school.

The next presentation described the three purposes of accountability as (a) control, (b) assurance, and (c) continual improvement. It examined two primary directions of accountability, namely from the top-down by national officials, and from the bottom-up by citizens and civil society. It observed that, too often, services fail poor people—in access, in quantity, and in quality. It noted that this is to be remedied by putting poor people at the centre of service provision by enabling them to monitor and discipline service providers, by amplifying their voice, and by strengthening the incentives for providers to serve the poor.

Expanding the reach of democratic principles forms the basis for this argument. Empower citizens, particularly the poor, so that they will put pressure on government, and government will respond by improving services. Accountability from below is at the core of this approach. Bottom-up performance pressures the “demand side” factors of governance improvement.

The discussion then focused on social accountability mechanisms. Asia has no shortage of examples that show much innovation. A recent survey found that social accountability institutions in South and Southeast Asia had greater community participation and government collaboration than was seen in other regions.

The trend towards “demand side” solutions to service improvements reflects declining faith in “supply side” solutions. Public administration reforms have often been evaluated as disappointing, particularly in human resource management. Patronage, clientelism and corruption discourage performance management, and there is both a lack of incentives for improving services and weak accountability.

The question is always who controls the bureaucratic machinery. Generally speaking, the trained permanent official is likely to get his/her way in the long run. The bureaucracy gets its strength from its huge size as an organization; from its permanence, functional indispensability, and monopoly of expert knowledge; from its self-consciousness as an aristocratic status group and power elite; and from its patient and oblique obstructiveness.
While supply-side accountability has not been a great success, it was recognized that it still has an important role to play in Asia. For example, in India the National Program of Universal Elementary Education makes education a fundamental right. In Cambodia, free primary education led to big increases in enrolments. In Thailand, new health schemes provided nearly all citizens with affordable health care. Ninety-nine percent have health coverage.

In theory, decentralization should assist in promoting improved services and greater accountability because of the enhanced responsiveness of local government. However, there are problems with decentralization, including: (a) leading families and social classes reap the benefits; (b) clientelism can flourish; (c) corruption can occur; (d) there is no performance culture nor incentives; (e) marginalized groups can remain voiceless, powerless and unorganized; and (f) resources may be scarce.

Politics lies at the centre of questions of service delivery and accountability. The top-down question is: How can public administration be reformed to be performance-oriented? The bottom-up question is: How can citizens organize to exert sustained pressure on government?

**Summary of Discussion**

The discussion led to concluding that most Asia-Pacific governments are hybrids on the democratic-authoritarian continuum; they are incomplete democracies. The cultures, social structures, power distribution and state-society relations in Asian countries do not conform to Western models, and they vary among themselves. The politics of accountability must play out in these contexts with citizens engaging state officials and civil society to obtain services to which they are entitled and/or of which they have need or desire. It is not a politics of consensus but one of organizing, coalition building, competition and conflict.

It was suggested that participatory mechanisms have to be institutionalized in order to ensure participation of poor people and to make the administration accountable. First, concerned government departments could make a focused commitment to strategic plans. Second, new agencies could be created to pursue social accountability issues. Third, there could be a legal framework to enforce participatory mechanisms. This raises the question of political will and commitment.

There are some concrete results derived from civic engagement in public service provision. Though the results are not spectacular, they have demonstrated that civic engagement should be an essential ingredient in the public service delivery system.

A fundamental principle that we have to remember is that people’s time is not a free good. It has value and people calculate whether the input of their time will bring results.

Institutionalizing citizen participation is a difficult question. How should it be done? There is always the risk that by institutionalizing the process it may become part of the mainstream bureaucratic process. Cooperation needs to be selective, and there should be periodic replacement of people and organizations in order to avoid the traps of familiarity and stale bureaucracy.

Leadership is crucial in the process of accountability. Where you find the most innovative accountability mechanisms, for example in Asia Pacific, it is difficult to say how much they depend on individual leaders, both within civil society and within government, and how much they rely on institutions.
Recommendations of Panel 3

- Participatory mechanisms need to be institutionalized in order to ensure participation of poor people and to make the administration accountable. This requires that concerned government departments make a focused commitment to strategic plans; that new agencies are created to pursue social accountability issues; and that there is a legal framework to enforce participatory mechanisms.
- Institutionalization of the engagement process may result in its bureaucratization. Cooperation between government and citizens needs to be selective, and there should be periodic replacement of people and organizations in order to avoid the traps of familiarity and stale bureaucracy.
- Leadership is crucial in the process of accountability. The most innovative accountability mechanisms depend on individual leaders, both within civil society and within government, as much as they rely on institutions. Leadership within government must be identified, nurtured and sensitized regarding participatory mechanisms.

Panel 4: East Asia and Arab World Perspectives

Speakers, in order of presentation

Angelita Gregorio-Medel, Executive Director, Affiliated Network for Social Accountability, East Asia and the Pacific

Mark Turner, Professor, University of Canberra

Abu Elias Sarker, Associate Professor, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Summary of presentations

The panel started by identifying the elements of a food governance framework and stressed that, within it, transparency and accountability are critical to restoring trust and turning the tide of corruption. It defined social accountability as the constructive engagement between citizens and government in monitoring the use of public resources while allowing citizens to sustain their assertions for reform. It defined constructive engagement as the process of building a mature relationship between two naturally opposable parties—i.e. citizens or citizen groups and government—bound together by a given reality and negotiating a consensus.

The Characteristics of Constructive Engagement were identified as: (a) trust-building (citizen groups and government create incentives for partnership); (b) an evidence-based agenda that uses valid and reliable data and information; (c) results- or solution-orientation with concrete outcomes benefiting the people, especially the poor; and (d) sustained and sustainable engagement towards developing mature partnerships.

The Challenges were related to the needed change: from “they—them” to “we—us;” from competition to cooperation; from autonomy to heteronomy; from formalism and respect for tradition and authority to dynamism and assertion of flexibility and change.

The presenter concluded by reminding us that social accountability in East Asia does not look the same for all regions. Its form is specific to a country or culture. Moreover, social
accountability is not the only strategy towards good governance and achieving development outcomes, but given appropriate space and time, social accountability is expected to help empower people and ensure good governance.

**Summary of Discussion**

**Supply and demand**
Supply and demand are interactive rather than autonomous processes that can complement each other. Cambodia provides an example with their introduction of free primary education. This was a highly popular supply-side move by the government. At the same time, it satisfied a demand from the population because education is a prized commodity.

**The principle of “good” or “constructive” social accountability**
The World Bank defines social accountability as an approach towards building accountability that lies in civic engagement, with ordinary citizens or civil society organizations participating directly or indirectly in public accountability processes. This definition lacks the dimension of “being constructive.” In certain contexts people may not want to be constructive in the way we might think of the term, so we should not put this into the definition per se, but put it as a principle of good, social accountability. The question is: Should social accountability exclude those who will not subscribe to being constructive? The answer cannot be generalized and is based on a particular country’s experience. Why social? Social implies interaction with other people in society. It is important that there be a sense of civility and respect in that interaction. It has to be social but also it has to get some concrete reform outcomes and change outcomes.

**Accreditation of Civil Society Organizations**
An issue linked to the above discussion of constructive social accountability is that in many countries governments are putting accreditation as a condition to engage with organized civil society. They are saying to citizens, “We want to engage you but we need to accredit you first.” In Bhutan the government is setting up a CSO authority that determines who in civil society is a CSO and who is not. This contradicts what it means to be a civil society and a citizen organization if the government alone can determine these groups. This is also the dilemma, the paradox of mainstreaming: precisely when you are invited to engage, and in a selective way, then the engagement may become a “closed space.”

**Access to information and information management**
It was agreed that fighting for the Right to Information (RTI) law doesn’t necessarily lead to improved access to information. What is necessary is honest political will to improve government transparency, and reflection of this in a RTI law that is progressive, namely that it actually furthers the information rights of citizens. In addition, it is not sufficient for a law to be passed, it also has to be enforced/implemented, and this does not necessarily happen automatically.

For example, in Indonesia the law of access to information was in place for a long time. It was only in 2010 that they started to work together with CSOs to figure out how to make that law meaningful. Mongolia recently approved the right to information law but it is still not implemented.

Implementation is where the contestation, negotiation and conflict occur, and that is where we should engage citizens. Implementation means determining priorities, and allocating a budget to those priorities. Implementation also involves tracking expenditures and determining whether they were made according to procurement laws. It also means that expenditures are examined for
their impact on targeted outcomes and policies. Implementation is a difficult process, and information is critical to support it.

The existence of the law doesn’t guarantee implementation. However, without a law there is no hope of implementation. It is a necessary first institutional step. In countries, such as Australia, that come from an Anglo-Saxon tradition (the Westminster system of democratic parliamentary government modelled after the politics of the United Kingdom), the laws, while important, are not crucial. There is much that can be done within departments or ministries to effect change. But in countries that are not based on Westminster systems, laws and regulations are needed; otherwise implementation would not take place at all.

Recommendations of Panel 4

1. In post-conflict societies, capacity building of civil servants, especially the young, should be a priority, building a sense of duty for civil service. Citizens should be educated about government, its value, what a law is, and what governments officials actually do, or should do. That is an agenda for any democratic society to function.

2. The Right to Information (RTI) law is necessary but not sufficient. Implementation is where all the contestation, the negotiation and the conflict really happen and that is where we should engage citizens. Implementation means determining priorities, and allocating a budget to those priorities. Implementation also involves finding out how the budget was expended, whether expenditure was done according to procurement laws, and the connection between the same expenditures and the targeted outcomes and policies.

Panel 5: Latin America and OECD Perspectives

Speakers, in order of presentation

Rethelny Figueroa, Executive Director a.i., Central American Institute of Public Administration

Beatriz Sanz-Corella, Consultant, “OECD Perspective”

Matt Poelmans, Director, CitizenVision, eParticipation Institute, the Netherlands

Luiz Alberto Dos Santos, Deputy Minister for Analysis and Follow-up of Government Policies, Presidency of the Republic of Brazil

Ms. Pamela Niilus, Consultant, Argentina

Summary of presentations

The first speaker introduced the situation of civil service in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic (all referred to as Central America), and elaborated on a recent citizen engagement experience in Costa Rica. The speaker described the human resources management problems that permeated public service in Central America in the 1990s and early 2000s. They included a weak governing body, limited autonomy of the civil servants from ministry and presidency, and unclear and contradictory rules.
To address the weaknesses of the civil service, it was necessary to promote a new civil service law in the region that would (a) manage the human talent with greater flexibility, (b) develop modern management models to assist the public administration to respond more effectively to the needs of citizens, and (c) implement a meritocracy system of recruitment, upgrading and retention of public services.

A strategy to promote civil service law in Central America was formulated and successfully implemented. The lessons learned from the process were that the participation of all citizens was changing from a hostile environment to a receptive one in this area. Moreover, the involvement of all sectors of society created positive public opinion in this arena, and the discussion of different rationalities justified groups’ interests. The arguments to promote acceptance of the proposed new civil service system were based on rational parameters for entry, access and permanence in the public function, and that allowed progress toward the professionalization of the public function.

Regarding the Latin American region, the presenter identified some of the challenges facing Latin American countries:

(a) Lack of awareness and education of citizens. The demand for access to public information has to be increased in order to nourish and give feedback to these policies.

(b) Absence of specific skills, both in the public sector and in civil society. This element is too often forgotten when designing citizen engagement and social accountability initiatives. Not only are the right tools necessary, but also an adequate capacity-building policy in order to implement them.

(c) Deficient communication and dissemination policies. Successful outcomes and impacts arising from accountability initiatives have to be highlighted. The contagious effect of success is very fruitful.

(d) Taking the risk of implementing more inclusive and extensive accountability policies. Combine traditional mechanisms of accountability with more inclusive forms of shared and social accountability.

The importance of dialogue skills for consensus building and collaboration has to be stressed. People have to learn how to converse and communicate in order to enhance conditions of life. Many conflicts can arise, so negotiation and conflict-solving skills have to be developed, especially among public officers. Resistance to change is a fact. Fear of losing control is present in every organization. There are champions waiting for change in each of the organizations, even at the very bottom level. We just have to identify, highlight and empower them.

Finally, to promote in Latin America the practices and values mentioned so far, we need politicians and officials who are willing to disclose relevant and clear information, interact with citizens, and allow their active participation in the public policy making process and in the delivery of services. Government agencies must engage in ongoing dialogue, publish data in an understandable and useful way and make it available to citizens, and listen to what people have to say to the government about public services and decisions. This requires that government as a whole exercise conscious, sincere and permanent leadership. Without that leadership and political will, it is not possible to switch from a traditional, opaque administration into an open, transparent and collaborative government that delivers increasingly better services to its citizens.

With respect to the OECD perspective, the speaker noted that whatever their starting point and underlying motivations, it seems that governments in all OECD countries are at a crossroads and that the implementation of an open government remains a major challenge. As stated back in 2005, an open government is not something that can simply be grafted onto existing systems. To
be effective requires a fundamental change within the government system (OECD, 2005c). This is even truer today, in light of the manifold challenges faced by governments across the region.

To successfully meet these challenges, OECD countries require a significant shift in the way they conduct their business. Experience shows that involving public and private actors throughout the process, most specifically in the delivery of public services, is undeniably a potential source of innovation and better outcomes. It requires, however, an adaptation of roles and structures of service professionals and a rethinking of accountability mechanisms. In these new forms of delivery, government often acts as leader, coordinator or facilitator within diverse structures, roles and relationships amongst and between multiple stakeholders (OECD, 2011). All in all, a real shift is needed across the OECD member countries, from a “government-as-usual” perspective to a real governance perspective.

The degree to which governments will be open and inclusive in the future depends on fundamental policy choices being made today. Based on the recent experience of OECD countries, greater levels of government transparency, accountability, and responsiveness continue to fuel demand for even more openness and inclusiveness throughout the policy cycle, especially in the production of public services, and there are few signs that such a trend will abate in the future.

The conclusion here is that open government is a journey, not a destination. All countries, especially the ones in the OECD, share the challenges of putting into practice the values of transparency and accountability, participation and inclusion, equity and efficiency, when designing and delivering citizen-centred public policy and services.

Citizenlink (Burgerlink) was presented as an initiative of the Dutch government to improve the performance of the public sector by involving citizens. To that end, Citizenlink promotes quality standards, measures citizen satisfaction, and stimulates eParticipation.

The e-Citizen Charter (Burger Service Code) is a quality standard for eGovernment written from the citizen’s perspective. It consists of ten quality requirements to be met in the provision of digital services, whether in information exchange, service delivery or policy participation. The charter has been adopted as a quality standard at all levels of Dutch government and is also used as the basis for on-going measurement of citizen satisfaction with life events. It is also the criterion for the annual eParticipation Awards.


To date, the e-Citizen Charter has been translated into nineteen languages. The UN, OECD, Council of Europe, and UK Cabinet Office recommend adoption of the charter.

The ten quality requirements of the e-Citizen Charter are:

1. Choice of communication channels: counter, letter, phone, e-mail, internet
2. Transparent public sector: citizens know where to apply for official information
3. Overview of rights and duties: the rights and duties of citizens are transparent
4. Personal information service: tailored information, personal internet site
5. Convenient services: citizens only have to provide personal data once to be served in a proactive way
6. Transparent procedures: openness and transparency of procedures
7. Digital reliability: secure identity management and reliable storage of electronic documents
8. Considerate administration: government compensates and learns from mistakes
9. Responsible management: citizens are able to compare, check and measure government performance
10. Involvement and empowerment: the government stimulates participation and involvement of citizens

Summary of discussion

Regarding the model of democracy: in developing countries, including in many cases in Africa and Asia, civil society organizations adopt roles that are played in other countries by the government. This happens when there is a “performance gap” to be filled. For instance if the parliament, or the media or the supreme audit institutions are not fulfilling their role to ensure government accountability to citizens, citizens may have to take on this role to hold the government accountable. The issue is whether filling this “performance gap” is sustainable as a model, or should citizens in developing countries push for reform and then leave the space for formal government institutions to take over?

Web2.0 tools and democratization

How useful are Web2.0 tools? What benefits do they bring? How do we manage the risks of getting inundated by inconsequential information? Governments need the critical ability to see what is relevant and what is not, and what will improve services and what will not. Citizens may be overwhelmed by information in the attempt to democratize, and to what degree is it real democratization?

Web2.0 and collaborative governance

Information technology creates problems because of access issues as well as concerns for the quality of information—whether it is up-to-date, obtained legally, etc. On the other hand it does help in coping with volumes of email, etc. We should look at this in the framework of what is now called, in the European Union, collaborative governance. We are moving away from a time in which citizens were defined as customers, away from the concept of service delivery, and away from the focus on digitization of government processes. The next step is to create a new model of participation. Some people prefer the traditional political system, but others want to share their ideas about and with government. The new Internet ICT Web 2.0 social media make it possible for people to be involved.

An example from the Netherlands on rules of engagement for civil servants

One of the projects in the Netherlands is “Civil Servants 2.0” which helps civil servants to deal with citizens who are interested in providing information or in commenting on their work. It introduces a real debate about professionalism. A charter is being developed for civil servants who deal with the public. It provides guidance on rules of engagement, and it answers frequently asked questions about what to say, how to give information, etc. Other countries, among them Brazil, are undergoing a similar process. We need not only a citizen charter but also a civil servant charter that specifies what can and cannot be done. Some elements of the charter would be common to many countries, like the right to information and related privacy concerns. In conclusion, new rules of engagement are needed for civil servants, and it would be very interesting to share ideas from different countries on this subject.
An example of Web2.0 application in the Netherlands
An interesting project in the Netherlands allows people who would never participate in person in a town hall meeting to use the Internet to submit their ideas, giving them unprecedented opportunities to be part of public service delivery and public management.

The Netherlands has developed a system for citizens to rate public services online in a very simple way that can then be combined with official statistical information. Both elements, the official information and the feedback from citizens who have experienced the services, give others information to make choices.

Web 2.0 and social media developments and technology are advancing quickly, and this presents challenges for governments everywhere, whether rich or poor. The basic question is: How can we maintain the traditional, effective elements of bureaucracy while introducing the flexibility that is needed in a modern society?

Web2.0 tools and civil servants’ accountability
If the trend is towards increased citizen participation and initiative, whether someone wishes to be engaged online or in any other form, what does this mean for public servants? The question is not just about the civil servants’ capacities, but also their accountability. Public servants are unsure about their role and their accountability, including to whom they are accountable. They want to involve citizens to improve the delivery of services, but they are not sure of the “rules of the game.” So we need civil servants—and also politicians—to adhere to a whole, and possibly new, set of very clear rules, guidelines, and codes of conduct. This may also include a need for some new politicians and civil servants.

Accountability of subcontracted agents
A question arose about a current movement in Latin America to subcontract some public services. How can subcontracted agents be held accountable, especially when the scope of their services is sometimes bigger than that of the government’s services? Critics who complain about the potential loss of citizens’ rights through outsourcing make a substantial case: citizens are being deprived of traditional rights of inquiry and complaint in the interests of supposedly cheaper and better services, with a seemingly inevitable reduction in accountability. This topic should be further explored.

Recommendations of Panel 5

1. The Netherlands are developing rules of engagement for civil servants so that the public sector can deal with citizens who are interested in providing information or in commenting on their work. Other countries, among them Brazil, are undergoing a similar process. We need not only a citizen charter but also a civil servant charter that specifies what can and cannot be done. Some elements of the charter would be common to many countries, like the right to information, and the related privacy concerns. New rules of engagement are needed for civil servants, and it would be very interesting to share ideas from different countries on this subject.

2. The debate tends to concentrate too much on governments, and to forget the politicians. There is a tendency to give little attention to parliaments and to the state-of-the-art in public policy making. The process involves not only governments, but also politicians.
3. Critics who complain about the potential loss of citizens’ rights through outsourcing make a substantial case: citizens are being deprived of traditional rights of inquiry and complaint in the interests of supposedly cheaper and better services, with a corresponding reduction in accountability. This topic should be further explored in an international setting.

Theme C: Challenges, Approaches and Tools for Citizen Engagement and Accountability in Public Service Delivery

Panel 6: Sector-specific Approaches and Country Experiences

Panel 7: Participatory Accountability in Public Service Spending

Panel 6: Sector-specific Approaches and Country Experiences for Realization of the Millennium Development Goals

Speakers, in order of presentation

Luiz Alberto Dos Santos, Deputy Minister for Analysis and Follow-up of Government Policies, Presidency of the Republic of Brazil

Taryn Vian, Associate Professor of International Health, Boston University School of Public Health, USA

Wanjiru Gikonyo, National Coordinator, Institute for Social Accountability, Kenya

Pamela Niilus, Consultant, Argentina

Summary of presentations

The first speaker discussed participatory governance and public service delivery in Brazil, and stated that there have been participatory budgeting experiences on state and municipal levels since 1989. Most have included social participation in neo-corporatist arrangements to increase civil society organizations’ participation in policymaking.

Some of the mechanisms institutionalized are: councils, committees and conferences. There are 90 national councils and committees at the federal level of public administration with the participation of civil society representatives. On the 35 more important councils and committees, 59 percent of the participants are from CSOs.

An innovative experience with social participation in public service delivery has been the Women of Peace Project. This is a project of the Ministry of Justice of Brazil through the National Secretariat of Public Security. In 2003, the position of Special Secretary for Policy for Women was created. In 2007, the Maria da Penha Law (Lei Maria da Penha) was enacted to deal with violence against women. This law created special police units to assist women, and created shelters for female victims of violence. It also implemented women's departments in states and municipalities, and macro policies, like “Bolsa Familia,” an anti-poverty program that includes a component for free education for children in poverty.

The National Program of Public Safety with Citizenship—PRONASCI, created in 2008, implemented the project “WOMEN OF PEACE” (PWP) with the primary objective of giving
women incentives and power to act as social mediators. The purpose is for them to construct and strengthen social networks to prevent and combat domestic and urban violence. Women over 18 years old, who belong to the social networks, or parents targeted by the PRONASCI, were trained in ethics, citizenship, access to the judicial system, etc.

One of the concerns was that these women would be exposed to even more violence. The initial resistance to the project was gradually dropped as the PRONASCI initiatives proved successful, and now there is a demand for more Women of Peace in the communities.

Although this program is still in its introductory phase, it is a source of institutional learning. It has had an important impact in reducing violence and increasing a feeling of security, with social and economic benefits for the community as well. Public safety is a problem concerning everybody (federal government, states, municipalities, civil society, citizens, etc.) and the role of women has increased in defining social and police actions, and in reducing conflicts. This project represents a new approach built on the engagement and participation of civil society in delivering public services.

The stated purpose of the second presentation was to suggest approaches for building accountability in healthcare services, especially, but not only, as a means to prevent corruption. First, it described the importance of tackling corruption in order to meet the health MDGs, and it explained how accountability and corruption are related. Secondly, it summarized some of the findings from the literature evaluating the effect of public engagement on corruption and accountability.

Health provides us with a special opportunity and a challenge for accountability. People care deeply about health. They see it as precious—it is about life itself. This can be the spark, the issue, that makes them willing to engage in accountability work. But, on the other hand, the value people put on health makes them more willing to engage in corruption, to pay bribes if that is what it takes to get the medicines or the services they need. Power and class differentials between citizens and healthcare providers can make it hard for average citizens or consumers of health services to hold officials accountable. Technologies like text messaging and the Internet are levellers of this power differential. Using these technologies, people can obtain information and voice concerns they might not have an opportunity to say in person, and that can be good for accountability.

The World Health Organization has created a model of six building blocks essential for strong health systems, including good governance and leadership. Corruption threatens these health system building blocks. It weakens health systems, making them more vulnerable to corruption in a downward spiral. Corruption is not the only constraint to achieving the MDGs, but where health systems are weakened by corruption, simply feeding more money into the system will not result in progress.

Increasing accountability is one of the levers we can use to strengthen health systems, both to reduce the risk of corruption and to improve performance. Rwanda provides an example. Ten years ago, the productivity of health workers was low and citizens could not afford to access services. Officials in government cared about those facts and were interested in making changes to address them. So they put in place a system of community-based insurance coupled with financial incentives that reward providers based on volume and quality of care. The system could not have worked without public engagement, as community members had to be willing to enrol in the system, and they played important roles in managing the insurance schemes, including educating members about their rights, and overseeing fee collection.
The combined incentives of the community-based insurance and pay reforms for health workers have resulted in increased uptake of services. People who are covered by the insurance are twice as likely as non-members to seek care for fever, three times as likely to bring children in for treatment of diarrhoea, four times more likely to make four or more prenatal visits, and twice as likely to sleep under an insecticide-treated bed net. The system is still vulnerable to corruption in the form of fraudulent reporting by the health facilities to get more insurance reimbursement, highlighting the fact that every reform creates new opportunities for abuse, and we must be constantly vigilant to manage risks.

The second part of the presentation summarized the literature on the effectiveness of citizen engagement, with examples from four countries, summarized as follows: Hospital boards in Bolivia were effective in reducing rates of informal payments and overpayment of supplies. They were part of a solution in Kenya that decreased theft of user fees and increased hospital quality. But participatory approaches to reducing absenteeism in Indian health clinics, and reducing corruption in road construction projects in Indonesia, were not effective.

Factors important to the success of interventions included the introduction of formal, authorized mechanisms for citizen input such as health boards and committees; management autonomy to discipline corrupt staff or take actions based on citizen complaints; funding to support initial investment in technology; and the interest of government officials in working with citizens to improve services.

Factors which impeded the success of participatory approaches included the possibility of elite capture; power differentials between citizens and the officials they are supposed to monitor; and the free-rider problem which decreases individual motivation to get involved in community monitoring.

Summary of discussion

The discussion following this panel was very rich and generated a number of relevant country examples that are summarized below.

Mexico and Brazil: Access to information, legislation and implementation

In Latin America, some constitutional or legal frameworks are very hard to adapt to the new trends, especially on access to information. In Mexico there has been discussion about the need to introduce in the constitution a provision to oblige the states in the federation to follow the federal example on the introduction of the access-to-information law.

In Brazil, the right to access to information is included in the constitution. But the laws that were enacted, in reality, are not laws on access to information but, rather, laws to protect the state from the citizens who want access to information, because these laws were written in a period soon after the new constitution of 1998 when the culture of secrecy was still very strong. A new law on information access has been discussed since 2005–2006. This proposed law has been in the congress and was approved after one year of discussion in 2010 by the chamber of deputies. It has been waiting since then for the approval of the federal senate. After the approval of the federal law, the states will probably move to approve their own laws. In Brazil there are twenty-six states in the federal district, and states like Sao Paolo and Rio de Janeiro will probably follow the federal law very soon. It is likely that the last-organized states will get a much longer period to adapt to the requirements of this legislation since it requires not only technology investment to change the way information is produced, organized, and made accessible, but also capacity
building for public servants to inform the citizens on how to get the information they need and how to assess whether the information is trustworthy.

**Brazil and the Philippines: Central and local government relationships and roles**

Collaboration between the state and civil society is crucial to the improvement of public services. This collaboration takes place mostly at the local level. What matters is not so much which level of government is involved, but rather, the relationship between central and local government, particularly as it affects citizen engagement. If an innovation takes place at the local level, is it being replicated elsewhere? And why would it be? Is this the responsibility of the central or the state government? Diffusion of good practices should be central government’s responsibility.

Regarding the question about the local and central level relationship, since Brazil is a federation that involves more than 5,600 municipalities and 27 states, it is very hard to coordinate the different points of view, tensions, and needs of those entities, especially when they are so different according to the region and the state of economic and social development. But historically, the federal level has given very strong leadership in this relationship. Policies guided or led at the federal level have a very strong influence at the local level, especially in issues like health and social assistance, because a large part of the smaller municipalities depend heavily on funds from the federal level. Brazil today is facing a three-pronged challenge: to make sure that the relationship between the local and central levels is not a relationship mediated only by financial links or interests; to avoid situations that could reduce the autonomy of the local level; and to respect the balance between the different levels of the federation.

In the Philippines, a programme was started to help government adjust to decentralization. The federal level had to change its role so that funds were devolved to the local level for delivery of services. But the federal government still had responsibilities for setting policies. It was very hard for them to adjust to this shift, so Boston University helped to create a local government performance programme, a tool used in more developed countries, by which the federal government makes available special funds for which local governments can apply. The funds are an incentive for local governments to implement specific projects. If the federal government wants more civic participation they can create a specific fund for that and local governments can compete for it.

**Brazil: Differences between national conferences and national councils**

National conferences offer much broader participation than national councils. Councils are permanent bodies within ministries. They serve on a regular basis for consultation on sector policies. Civil society organizations, business organizations, and labour unions participate in a large number of national councils. While they provide the opportunity for such groups to participate, they meet when the minister considers necessary, or according to their own rules. They discuss sector policies and approve specific proposals that must then be considered by the minister. If considered valid and viable, the proposals are turned into policies or into bills of law to be sent to the president and then to the congress. The councils are a heritage of Brazil’s history. Their process of formulating policy uses a neo-corporatist approach, especially when civil society is involved, particularly business and labour unions.

Conferences have a much larger scope of participation, but they meet less frequently than councils. Conferences are special and massive events that are held every one or two years. They allow thousands of people to participate in specific conferences depending on their sector. They typically last for one week depending on the number of meetings involved. Delegates who have been chosen from all levels participate to represent their constituencies, especially civic organizations, to discuss and approve guidelines and specific proposals to be turned into policies.
Some conferences take place only at the national level. There is some criticism about the process of the national conferences, the main one being that only a small part of the deliberations are turned into law or public policies by the government. This reflects the complexity of the process and the total freedom of the conferences to approve their own agendas. The topics of the deliberations are evaluated and selected by the government in terms of what is or is not possible to be implemented.

Kenya: Committees and elite capture
One of the challenges identified is to prevent elite capture of social audit committees, especially in the early stage of implementation when civil society groups tend to be working at the town level. Forums could be better mechanisms to allow citizen participation because committees tend to be captured by the elites.

Recommendations of Panel 6

• Collaboration between the state and civil society, crucial to the improvement of public services, takes place mostly at the local level. However, diffusion of good practices should be central government’s responsibility.
• Governments should learn lessons from other countries’ experiences and sectoral approaches that can be adapted and adopted, for example:
  o Public safety is a problem concerning everybody (federal government, states, municipalities, civil society, citizens, etc.) and in Brazil the role of women has proven critical in defining social and police actions, and in reducing conflicts.
  o Increasing accountability is one of the levers we can use to strengthen health systems, both to reduce the risk of corruption and to improve performance. Rwanda provides an example, where officials in government cared about access to all affordable health services, and put in place a system of community-based insurance coupled with financial incentives that could not have worked without public engagement. Hospital boards in Bolivia were effective in reducing rates of informal payments and overpayment of supplies. They were part of a solution in Kenya that decreased theft of user fees and increased hospital quality. But participatory approaches to reducing absenteeism in Indian health clinics, and reducing corruption in road construction projects in Indonesia, were not effective.

Panel 7: Enhancing Accountability in Public Service Spending through Citizen Engagement

Speakers, in order of presentation

Štefan Bogdan Šalej, Director General, International Centre for Promotion of Enterprises, Slovenia

Angela Capati-Caruso, Senior Governance and Public Administration Officer, UNDESA

Djaffar Zioui, General Rapporteur, General Auditor Office, Algeria

Summary of presentations
The first speaker explored mechanisms for enhancing the social accountability of state-owned enterprises in the service sectors. He stated that the government, as a public entity, is responsible for developing strategies for achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and that both short-
and long-term strategies have to be announced publicly. This is an important factor of accountability.

Public enterprises have to embrace responsibility for their actions and encourage a positive impact through their activities on the environment, consumers, employees, communities, stakeholders and all other members of the public sphere who may also be considered stakeholders. State companies have to be leaders in this field. They have to be better than private business. The rules set by the OECD in this area are accepted and well known for their standards, even though not all enterprises agree with them. Additionally, it is the role of the Supreme Audit Institutions—or in French, “Court de Comptes”—to exercise control over the budget and the performance of state-owned enterprises.

Communication of financial statements is also important. The state or the state-owned enterprise has to publish their financial statements and help to communicate this information. For example, in Brazil the public companies publish their balances every six months. This does not occur in Slovenia. Sometimes, the balance sheets can become “top secret” within the management. It is important that the public participate more in a positive way and know more about how the companies are doing and how they plan to proceed. This communication has to be for good management, not for increasing their visibility in order to promote candidates or ministries.

The government’s system of control must also be considered. Some countries have ministries while others have departments or specialized agencies that manage government assets. Finally, there is the question of educating the various participating stakeholders about public goods and their delivery.

Transparency
The question here is how to create a win-win situation. Sometimes public sector enterprises are pushed hard into poor management practices so that privatization can be justified. What is needed is the opposite approach: to help them to be the best managed companies. One way to help is with a memorandum for understanding or “Contrat de gestion,” a management contract between government officers and the company. The management of the public company has to be of the highest quality, and it has to have strategic plans and long-term objectives that are very clear.

Conclusion
When government concedes public service delivery to the private sector, the state must not lose its role as regulator. In some situations, governments do not worry about what happens after they privatize services, but the rights of citizens—for complaints, for affordable pricing, for delivery of services in remote areas—may be eroded. In these situations, civil society plays a very important role. It has to push government to establish clear policies for the enterprises that were privatized. It is important to understand that civil society has a role that is much bigger and much more important than now exists or is perceived.

In addition to the professional audit community and legislative oversight forums, an alternate “watchdog” mechanism is needed in order to improve public service delivery. In developing countries, it would also help re-orient public spending so that the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) can be achieved. The alternate watchdog mechanism in mind here is an enhanced collaboration between civil society and the public account committees of parliaments.

There is a problematic gap in holding the state accountable for the delivery of services to the poor and the most vulnerable segments of society. The question is whether parliaments, through
their public account committees, can be empowered by citizens to become more engaged in this process and hold the state accountable.

Increasingly, developing countries are adopting national development strategies—including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)—as instruments to provide a framework for financing (especially donor-related), implementing, and monitoring their development efforts. Several developing countries are also taking the initiative to mainstream PRSPs with MDG Reports—the latter being prepared by government but (supposedly) emerging from broad-based participatory processes. Many of these participatory processes tend to deal mostly with planning and budgeting, and only a very few involve monitoring, and even fewer tackle the overview of public spending. This leaves an important gap in the public accountability process of development management.

Challenges of public accountability in developing countries include: public expenditures that are not appropriately geared toward social sectors to further the achievement of the MDGs; poor and/or inadequate parliamentary oversight of public expenditures due to the weak structure of a country’s supreme audit institutions and/or due to low political interest; state audit reports that focus mostly on compliance or conduct of “regular audits” and rarely on performance of “value for money” audits.

These challenges can be addressed by examining the role of public accounts committees (PACs) in reducing corruption and inefficiency in public expenditures. PACs could be strengthened by building their capacity through partnerships with civil society, and through the adoption of modern ICT tools. Opportunities to increase collaboration between civil society organizations and PACS should also be pursued.

The presenter argued that greater collaboration between PACs and civil society organizations should help PACs to overcome some of the challenges they face, and make them more effective as watchdogs for accountability in the development management process. This argument is supported by scant evidence, but the conviction holds that a targeted survey among PACs and similar institutions in countries with parliamentary democracies would reveal relevant examples and innovative approaches that could be the starting point for deeper analysis and further research.

Two examples were cited showing some relevance, although marginal, in support of this argument. They involve civil society work carried out in South Africa and Argentina. In South Africa, Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM) oversees public service delivery in agencies in the Eastern Cape Province of the country. This work began due to the realization that effective oversight of public agencies was “woefully lacking” and that the Auditor-General of South Africa, in 2002, stated, “not a single one of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts had ever been implemented by any provincial department.”

In Argentina, an organization called the “Asociacion Civil por la Igualdad y la Justicia (ACIJ), or the Civil Association for Equality and Justice, is collaborating with the country’s national audit, The Auditoria General de la Nacion (AGN), to publicize important audit findings among civil society. The AGN is hoping that its partnership with ACIJ will create a constituency within civil society that will pressure the country’s congressional commission on audits. This commission is in charge of approving findings and recommendations and enforcing action against executive agencies cited in the report for irregularities.
Common shortcomings of Public Account Committees in developing countries include a lack of sufficient technical competence to analyse auditors’ reports, and information that is limited to only what the auditors submit, with no access to complete information. Moreover, the PACs usually assess the accountability of the inputs, while their role instead should be evaluation of the effectiveness and relevance of the outputs, namely assessment of the impact of public expenditures. In order to assess the impact, the PACs need the feedback of the beneficiaries of public spending, namely the citizens. To have the results accounted for, PACs need to coordinate with civil society. This can take place via the direct input of individual citizens, or better yet, through civil society organizations (CSOs). Modern information and communication technology (ICT), including new social media, can greatly facilitate this process.

Citizens already collaborate to some extent with PACs, mainly by testifying at hearings. A more advanced form of collaboration—a possible entry point for civil society’s “active participation” in the PACs—are their subcommittees. PACs can appoint one or more subcommittees, each having the powers of the undivided committee, to examine any matters that may be referred to them. Subcommittee members may include civil society representatives who can become members, usually by invitation.

The third speaker concentrated on citizen engagement and communication in Algeria, and began by saying that the principles of citizen participation are already recognized around the world. Now the focus needs to be on the establishment of mechanisms to implement them.

Access to information depends on the laws that guarantee this right and on the mechanisms to ensure their application. All North African countries have adopted laws to fight corruption, and in so doing, encourage citizen engagement and access to information. Nevertheless, enforcement mechanisms are infrequent, not because of lack of willingness but because of lack of means of implementation.

Mechanisms of implementation can be developed in three areas:

1. Civil society: citizens who mobilize do not have enough resources, and they need to build and develop their capacities.

2. The press and media: these bodies need to become more professional and qualified, and need to increase their specialization.

3. Public institutions: citizens have to specify what must be included in the mission of the institutions, so that they can develop a program to carry it out.

Citizen engagement can improve and foster accountability in public management. A law on association movement in Algeria allows citizens to organize freely. However, limited human and financial resources are barriers to effectiveness.

One of the principal weaknesses that hinder efficient citizen engagement for accountability in public administration is the lack of necessary qualifications, skills and capacities of civil servants. This hinders organizations’ access to useful information and also to a good interpretation of the available information.

As long as civil society does not implement the appropriate instruments of investigation with adequate expertise, it will continue to have to depend on existing information. Such expertise is especially necessary in the case of fraud and corruption that, these days, are embedded in complex networks and arrangements, making them difficult to detect; however, this situation
may be resolved by developing and strengthening the capacities of civil society organizations. This also implies the use of information and communication technology tools.

The Supreme Audit Institution, which was established in the Algerian Constitution, is charged with controlling the use of public resources and assessing compliance with legislation. With the results the Institution generates, it encourages the efficient use of resources and public funds, and promotes accountability and transparency in public management. Toward this end, the Court of Auditors seeks to implement a process of communication among government and public enterprises as well as citizens.

To achieve this, various communication tools have been provided. Among them are annual evaluation reports on the implementation of the budget law. In this case, an emerging news media specialized in public finance and budgetary law may help to overcome the difficulties of technical language by “translating” it into a layperson’s terms. These reports may be useful communication tools that promote good governance and support decision-making. Public hearings have also become a means to strengthen transparency in the work of the Court.

Other communication activities include meetings, conferences, or interviews, which often include experts or people who are approved by the president of the Court. This provides an opportunity to share information about the outcomes of the Court or to answer questions of general concern.

ICT tools have also been developed. The Court has established a website that provides useful information regarding the work of the institution. It has also developed an intranet site that allows friendly exchanges of information and experiences among auditors. Also, there is an e-mail system for auditors and public managers to share questions and data electronically.

One action that is necessary to enable the participation of citizens in the accountability process is the implementation of an effective communication policy that has to provide economic, financial and accounting information. This policy must do two things: it must combine the technical and legal aspects of financial, accounting and economic subjects, following rigorous standards; and it must be done in simple terminology that citizens can understand. Citizen participation depends heavily on comprehensible information, so every effort must be made, on an ongoing basis, to adhere to this requirement.

There are often irregularities in the implementation of the budget law, including financial and accounting transgressions. Financial laws may have financial but not criminal punishment because such transgressions are considered only management faults that don’t necessarily lead to criminal prosecution. However, public opinion is becoming less tolerant of accepting that poor management of public service delivery is punishable only at the administrative level.

Another real challenge to citizen engagement involves the press and media. If these bodies are not capable of assimilating complex and technical information, then they cannot convey it to citizens in useful ways. Therefore, building capacities for media and civil society organizations will provide citizens with information in less formal ways, and this, again, will encourage citizen engagement.

Summary of discussion

The role of parliamentary committees and the accountability gap at the local level (a recommendation)
In Australia there is a Joint Committee of the Public Accounts, jointly administered across the houses of Parliament. It is the body to which the Supreme Auditor reports, with the report then going through to Parliament. It is important to note, for those who want to explore the use of this mechanism, that there is a glaring accountability gap in the path of money from the national government to local governments, since, at the local level, the Supreme Auditor has no power to follow up on implementation of the recommendations of the audit report. It also says: “The committee recognizes the increasing use of contracts (outsourcing) to deliver government services,” and with reference to service delivery, “the committee is concerned that it has the potential to undermine ministers’ responsibility and parliamentary oversight.” It says it wants to see more accountability in this area and wants to see a general audit of external entities, including contracts for delivery services. So it is recommended that this be included in the framework for increasing accountability through parliamentary mechanisms.

Malawi: Parliaments
In Malawi, a country with a multiparty democracy, 70 percent of parliamentarians, as well as the chairs of all selected committees, are from the ruling party. The strategy in this and similar cases would be twofold: (1) civil society would have to focus not only on a public accounts committee, but would also have to look into parliamentary committees dealing with public services; (2) civil society should explore which other groups would support the causes through public hearings and outside parliaments. This means creating venues for this discussion to take place outside the committees themselves. This should help the groups to pressure the parliamentary committees as needed.

Mandate and capacity of parliaments
Some parliamentarians are elected on the basis of their competencies; others are elected because of their political platform. Once they join specialized committees, they are often lacking in the technical capacity needed for dealing with the issues at hand. Parliament should not be ignored, though, as they are important actors in public accountability because they have the mandate to oversee government operations, and therefore they are entitled to do what civil society in most countries cannot do. Parliaments should be put in the context and framework of public accountability and parliamentarians should receive appropriate technical capacity building.

South Africa: PACs and the power to sanction
PACs have the potential to be the most powerful committees in parliament because of their mandate to hold government and ministries accountable. What is lacking though—and this aspect needs more research—is the power to carry out that mandate: to sanction ministers and to hold them accountable. In the case of South Africa, PACs are allowed to fine, but in reality, this is a real challenge to do. It is necessary to think about how to reinforce the accountability mechanism around the sanction power.

Other important issues are: the independence of the legislature from the executive, and the implementation of consequences resulting from auditors’ reports. Also, committees need more support in ICT adoption and use. For this, they would benefit from collaboration with citizens to use their skills.

Kenya: Parliaments
In Kenya there have been some reforms in the parliamentary committee’s work, and now the reports of the committee, once disclosed within the house only, are also open to the public. This has been included in the new constitution, which has also separated the executive branch and parliament. Before this, members of parliament were heading ministries, and that made accountability very difficult because the political was getting mixed up with the executive.
An online portal was created through collaboration between parliament and a number of other institutions in civil society. The strategy used by civil society was to win the confidence of a parliamentary committee, so that it would then take up CSOs’ research, policy deliberations and policy proposals. The capacity of both parliaments and civil society is still low but is improving. There is a move toward publishing all deliberations of the committees on the portal.

South Africa: Accountability of public enterprises
In South Africa, the energy sector—which is run as a monopoly—has forced municipalities to increase electricity bills between 25 and 30 percent in the coming months, without telling parliament or citizens. How do we, in a context like South Africa where there is a monopoly, deal with this issue? How do we ensure that these institutions are accountable to the citizens?

Public enterprises: efficiency and citizen oversight
The principal interest of enterprises, whether public or private, should be their efficiency. The importance of public enterprises increases at times of economic and financial crises. The public sector is present, in Brazil and in many countries around the world, not only at the federal government level but also at the municipal level, for services including water, telephone, garbage collection, etc. It is astonishing that when we talk about public administration we are not usually including this important sector. In many cases, the intervention of government has been necessary to support private business development; also there have been cases where privatization has not been the panacea that governments may have thought it would be. There are no rules for this. Poor management and irresponsibility can be found both in private and in public business.

Civil society has specific roles with public companies to control their activities. Many public enterprises that deliver services (electricity, water, etc.) have established consumer councils at the local level to help manage the companies and anticipate possible problems. The role of parliament is also very important, as well as national government policies, because simply having a dedicated ministry or department does not mean that the problems are solved.

Recommendations of Panel 7

1. Recognizing that the increasing use of contracts (outsourcing) to deliver government services has the potential to undermine ministers’ responsibility and parliamentary oversight, it is necessary to see more accountability in this area. In addition, general audits should be conducted of external entities (outsourced agents) involved in contracts for service delivery. It is also recommended that this be included in the framework for increasing accountability through parliamentary mechanisms.

Parliaments should not be ignored, as they are important actors in public accountability. They have the mandate to oversee government operations, and therefore they are entitled to do what civil society in most countries cannot do. Parliaments should be included in the framework of public accountability.
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HOFMANN, Domenica  
Assistant to the Board of Directors, Transparency International - Austrian Chapter (TI-AC)  
Chairlady, Austrian Association for Corruption Research (VfK) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domenica Hofmann is a political scientist (University of Vienna and Sciences Po Paris) who specialized in international relations with a particular focus on anti-corruption studies. At the time of this workshop she worked for the International Anti-Corruption Academy and UNOV's Visitors’ Service. Within her current functions at the above-mentioned CSOs (TI-AC and VfK) she supports and promotes the Austrian civil society anti-corruption movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| JAIN, Adishwar  
| Professor  
| Ave Maria University, LAC  
| San Marcos, Nicaragua |

Dr. Adishwar Jain has a PhD in Finance from the University of Southern California, Los Angeles. He has authored several papers on topics including e-business and microfinance. He is currently engaged in research concerning e-governance, education quality in Latin America and corruption related issues.

| JAIN FIGUEROA, Anjuli  
| Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States of America |

Anjuli Jain Figueroa is a graduate student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. She holds a bachelor's degree in Civil and Environmental Engineering and is currently pursuing a master's in the Technology and Policy program of the Engineering Systems Division. Her research and work experience have focused on water and wastewater management in developing and developed nations. Anjuli has a keen interest in learning how to engage citizens in large development projects that relate to water infrastructure.
JANSSENS, Roel
Economic Adviser

Economic Governance Unit
Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and
Environmental Activities (OCEEA)
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
(OSCE), Vienna, Austria

Roel Janssens obtained a Masters degree (MA) in Political Science at the Brussels Free University and a Master of Science (MSc) in International Politics at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). In addition to developing and implementing projects related to broader good governance issues, including in the anti-corruption and local government reform fields, he also works on issues related to customs harmonization and trade and transport facilitation. Previous management experience includes work in the electricity and gas as well as automobile sectors. He has also worked at the Brussels Regional Parliament in Belgium.

MD. KHALID, Khadijah
Executive Director

International Institute of Public Policy and Management,
University of Malaya

Khadijah Md. Khalid (Associate Professor Dr) earned her PhD in Political Studies from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London in 2000. She maintains close ties with ministries and agencies, and has been responsible for providing vital input, feedback and recommendations to the government and public sector on a host of policy and administrative issues. At the international level, she is pro-active and heavily engaged in collaborating with both international governmental and non-governmental organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDAYAKO, Balewa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Century Associates, Legal Practitioners & Consultants**  
| Nigeria |

Balewa Ndayako holds a Master of Arts in Peace & Conflict Studies. He is an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Secretaries & Administrators (ACIS). He is also a Member of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (MCIArb) and of the Institute of Chartered Mediators and Conciliators (ChMC) as well as a Member of the Nigeria Bar Association (B.L.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NILUS, Pamela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Consultant on public policies and governance,**  
| **Associated at “LOCAL Consultants”** |

Pamela Niilus holds a Master's in Political Science from the Faculty of Science of the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina. She brings seventeen years of professional experience, mostly at the government level. She is a co-author of the workshop report on “Engaging Citizens in Development Management and Public Governance for the Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals” and the “Guidelines on Citizens’ Engagement in Development Management” on behalf of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations (UNDESA).
OYHANARTE, Marta
Member of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration (CEPA)
Co-founder, Poder Ciudadano, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Marta Oyhanarte is Attorney in Law, and former Undersecretary for Institutional Reform and the Strengthening of Democracy, and the National Director of the Citizen Audit Programme. She is a registered mediator of the Ministry of Justice, and co-founder and President of Poder Ciudadano, a non-party-related foundation for the promotion of citizen participation. She has a long work history regarding citizen’s participation in public management. She is the author of several books on these issues.

PERUZZOTTI, Enrique
Professor
Political Science and International Studies,
Torcuato Di Tella University,
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Enrique Peruzzotti earned his PhD in Sociology from the New School for Social Research in New York. With over 17 years of academic experience in social and political sciences and international relations, he has authored numerous publications and articles on innovations in participation and representative democracy, rule of law and social accountability. He brings strong analytical and systematic research experience in global governance regimes and civil society, participatory governance, social accountability, and participatory budgeting in particular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILGRIM, Julia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Support Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption and Economic Crime Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Julia Pilgrim holds a Master's in European Studies from the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University in Bonn, Germany. Prior to her current post she served at UNODC’s Global Programme against Money Laundering, Proceeds of Crime and the Financing of Terrorism (GPML). She is experienced in the implementation issues related to the United Nations Convention against corruption, including its chapter II on preventive measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLATZER, Michael K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michael K. Platzer earned a Doctor of Law from Cornell University and a PhD from Columbia University. He is the founder of the United Nations Society of Writers and a member of the Austrian United Nations Association, the World Society of Victimology, and Penal Reform International. He has written, taught and produced videos and organized symposia on a wide range of other issues including human rights, the rule of law, peace-building, and ethnic minorities amongst others.
| POELMANS, Matt  
Senior Consultant  
Citizen Vision, eParticipation Institute  
The Netherlands |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Poelmans, MSc, is specialised in citizen engagement and web 2.0. Previously he was in charge of several eGovernment programs initiated by the Dutch Ministry of the Interior: Citizenlink, eCitizen Programme, eGovernment Knowledge Centre, Public Counter 2000. Poelmans invented the e-Citizen Charter, a quality standard for e-Government written from the citizen’s perspective. Based on his professional and political experience, Poelmans publishes and lectures on public management reform and e-government policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ROWE, Mike  
Lecturer in Public Management  
Director of Studies  
Public Administration and Management  
University of Liverpool Management School  
United Kingdom |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rowe, PhD in Public Accountability, is a former civil servant responsible for fraud and security policy in the Department of Social Security. More recently, he has worked in academia undertaking research in Nottingham and now Liverpool. He is an experienced practitioner and researcher in the issues of accountability and engagement modalities in public service delivery at the local level of governance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **ŠALEJ, Štefan Bogdan**  
| Director General  
| International Centre for Promotion of Enterprises, Slovenia |

Śtefan Bogdan ŠALEJ has a background in business administration, a graduate degree in political science, and expertise in international marketing. He is a professor at universities in Brazil and abroad. As a business leader, he has been a member of different institutions related with business and management including CEAL (Consejo de empresarios de America Latina) at present. In the diplomatic field he is member of the Slovenian Strategic Council for Economic Diplomacy.

| **SANS-CORELLA, Beatriz**  
| Independent Consultant  
| Spain |

Beatriz Sanz-Corella holds an MSc in Development Management from the London School of Economics. She has more than 15 years experience with programme and evaluation work on civil society, governance and capacity-building initiatives for the European Commission, other international organizations, and the NGO sector. She has published several books and articles on civil society, capacity building and decentralised cooperation. She is also a lecturer and associate researcher at ESADE (Institute for Social Innovation) and the University Autónoma de Barcelona. At present, Beatriz is the team leader of the technical assistance team providing support to the EC in the Structured Dialogue process addressed to civil society and local authorities worldwide.

| **SARKER, Abu Elias** |
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| **Schafar, Katrin**  
Advisory Project on Good Governance and Democracy  
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Germany |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrin Schaefer, PhD has experience in issues about democratic governance and strengthening state-civil society engagement in the governance agenda, with special focus on Germany and Africa. As an academic, her interests also centres on the evolutionary forces and constraints that shaped and continue to shape our minds, our behaviours, and our bodies. She is also Associate Professor and Deputy Head of the Department of Anthropology, University of Vienna.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Schwarz, Susanne**  
Staff member  
General Secretariat International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susanne Schwarz has a Master’s from the Institute of Translation Studies at Vienna University. She joined the Austrian Court of Audit in 1978 and worked for the General Secretariat of INTOSAI until 1993. She brings many years of experience in the field of audit institutions, strategies and processes.

| TÄNZLER, Dirk  
Professor of Sociology  
Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelm University of Bonn and University of Konstanz |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Tänzler holds a postdoctoral degree from the University of Konstanz. Prior to his current position as professor at the University of Konstanz, he held several posts as visiting professor at various universities in Europe. He is experienced in qualitative methods in social research, and has coordinated a number of research and policy advisory projects, including the international research project “Crime and Culture” within the Sixth Framework Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TEMBO, Fletcher  
Research Fellow  
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)  
London, United Kingdom |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Tembo is a research fellow and director of ODI’s Governance and Transparency Programme called Mwananchi (Kiswahili word meaning “ordinary citizen”) that covers seven African countries of diverse governance characteristics. He is the author of a 2003 book titled Participation, Negotiation and Poverty: Designing and Implementing Social Transformation Projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TURNER, Mark**  
Professor of Development Policy and Management, and Head of the Government Discipline  
University of Canberra, Australia |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Turner has undertaken research, consultancy and teaching in many Asia-Pacific countries. He specialises in Asia-Pacific politics, public sector management and development, decentralisation and autonomy, Third World development, and terrorism and kidnapping. He has published extensively in these fields and is a regular contributor to international conferences and workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **VIAN, Taryn**  
Associate Professor of International Health  
School of Public Health  
Boston University |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taryn Vian earned her MSc in Health Policy and Management from Harvard, and her PhD in Public Policy and Global Health from Boston University. A former Peace Corps volunteer in Cameroon, she has worked in 30 countries to improve management and to enhance the quality of health care services, including managing a multi-million dollar USAID-funded project in the Philippines to improve the quality of child survival and family planning services after decentralization. She has authored and edited numerous publications, including the 2010 book, <em>Anticorruption in the Health Sector: Strategies for Transparency and Accountability</em>, published by the Kumarian Press.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **VILLARREAL, Roberto**  
| Chief  
| Development Management Branch,  
| Division for Public Administration and Development Management  
| Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
| United Nations  
|  
| Roberto Villarreal earned his PhD in Economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Prior to his current position, he was head of the Division for Territorial Development in the Directorate for Public Governance at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). He worked for more than 20 years in the federal government of Mexico in the area of social development. He is an expert in multilevel governance for development and in public sector reform, involving innovative regulatory and managerial approaches in public programs and strategies for development.  

| **ZIOUI, Djaffar**  
| General reporter (rapporteur général) of the Court of Auditors of Algeria  
|  
| Djaffar Zioui is general reporter of the Court of Auditors of Algeria. He holds a bachelor’s degree in public law from the University of Algiers. He has expertise in the audit of public finance and in the prevention of, and fight against, corruption.  


Appendix Four

WORKSHOP REPORT, DAY THREE, MORNING SESSION
ROLE-PLAYING EXERCISE: ACTED CASE STUDY FOR ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The Vienna workshop was used as a laboratory for experimenting with innovative training methodologies to enhance participants’ learning experience and promote knowledge creation and sharing. One of the innovations introduced was a pilot “Acted Case Study” created and directed by the Chief of Branch, where participants played different assigned roles in a hypothetical, close-to-real-life situation. The experiment worked well, as it generated ideas that could not easily be derived from panel-type formats; it opened possibilities for different types of interactions among participants that contributed to developing closer relationships; it kept the interest and attention of participants high even after some natural workshop fatigue; and last, but not least, participants appreciated and enjoyed it, as evidenced by their evaluation of the workshop. What follows is the explanatory note distributed to participants including the “actors” and a write up of the interventions and discussion.

Explanatory Note

A case study is usually a written text portraying in detail a variety of aspects of a real-world situation for readers to analyse and discuss. The goal is to find ways in which the situation depicted in the text could actually be dealt with if it were to arise in reality. Case studies are a common tool used in graduate programs in private and public administration. Their pedagogic value consists in helping readers to bridge theory and practice. They are presented with the challenge to relate concepts and analytical frameworks or reference models to situations that are likely to be faced in practice. The aim is to solve problems in an educated fashion, to bring high-level theoretical analysis to down-to-earth circumstances that require a practical way forward.

The rich expertise and diversity of participants in this workshop permitted adaptation of the case study pedagogic method to a role-playing exercise in which participants would tackle a real-world public administration challenge. The specific task was to explore how different stakeholders could co-operate to effectively assess, and eventually adapt and adopt, strategies to engage citizens for improving public services in a country, seeking to improve accountability and to eradicate corruption.

The aim was to create through a hypothetical situation—fed by facts corresponding to conditions that could be observed in the real world—a case in which civil society and government in a country talk and negotiate about the definition and implementation of public participatory strategies to improve accountability and prevent corruption in public services. In this process, they were to make efficient use of existing institutions of international co-operation that could help both the government and civil society to meet their domestic public administration innovation challenges.

The scenario was as follows:

1. One participant would play the role of a leader representing the interests of citizens and civil society in a particular country. As a point of departure, s/he would present, in ten minutes, the perceptions of citizens and their organizations regarding public services.
S/he would then present the agenda of civil society about participatory activities to enhance accountability and eradicate corruption in public services.

2. Another participant would play the role of a government decision maker. In ten minutes, s/he would respond to the proposals or requests contained in the agenda presented in (1), stating which parts of the agenda were acceptable to the state in the short run or at some determined time in the future, and which were unacceptable, indicating in each case why this was so. Reasons might depend on: what the existing legal framework permits; the political context of the country; organizational and coordination features of the public administration (responsibilities of different entities, competencies of national and local government, etc.); the financial and human resource conditions faced by the public sector, and so on.

3. A third participant would play the role of an international Social Accountability Network (SAN) that exists in the region where the country is located. In five minutes, s/he would present how the SAN could be of use in providing various kinds of assistance to relevant stakeholders in the country to advance their national initiatives to foster, in a pragmatic fashion, participatory approaches to improve public services, enhance accountability and prevent corruption.

4. Afterwards, a participant would play the role of a representative of the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC). In five minutes, s/he would explain what the UNODC could offer to civil society and government officials in the country.

5. Similarly, another participant would play the role of a UN representative in the Secretariat or the respective Regional Commission. In five minutes, s/he would describe what the UNODC could offer.

6. Next, a participant would play the role of an international consultant and, in five minutes, propose a specific project to improve accountability and eradicate corruption in a specific service, for example healthcare, education, water and sanitation, etc.

7. Finally, another participant would play the role of a donor agency or an international financing institution. S/he would explain in five minutes how this organization could contribute funds to a plan to foster a strategy, put together by government and civil society, to improve public services in general, or one particular service, indicating conditions to be met, and indicators and goals to be put in place to monitor and evaluate outputs and outcomes.

The role paying as outlined above would take 45 minutes in total. Participants acting in these roles were expected to present a complete case about the viability of a multi-stakeholder strategy to improve accountability and eradicate corruption in public service delivery in the hypothetical context.

After the role-playing, all other participants attending the workshop would comment for the next 45 minutes on the case as presented to them. To conduct the entire exercise and collective analysis, a chairperson would ensure that time was efficiently used and that key lessons were generated by all participants.

The Cast (the Stakeholders):

- Civil Society Representative: Wanjiru Gikonyo
- Government Official: Fletcher Tembo
- Social Accountability Network Representative: Mario Claasen
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Representative: Jeffrey Bawa
- United Nations Regional Commission Representative: Jalal Abdel-Latif
- Consultant: Taryn Vian

The cast selected and adapted a real-life situation occurring in contemporary Kenya. The first two role players, of their own initiative, prepared concise PowerPoint presentations in which they summarized some information they considered relevant for this case study exercise.

About Free Primary Education (FPE)

During the 2002 general elections, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) made the provision of free primary education a part of its election manifesto. Following its victory, on January 6, 2003, the Minister for Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) launched the Free Primary Education policy (FPE) to fulfil NARC’s election pledge. Fees and levies for tuition in primary education were abolished as the government and development partners were to meet the cost of basic teaching and learning materials as well as wages for critical non-teaching staff and co-curricular activities. The government and development partners were to pay 1,020 Kenyan shillings for each primary child in that year. Following the NARC intervention in January 2003, it was estimated that the national enrolment rate rose from 6,314,726 to 7,614,326 by the end of the year, representing a 22.3% increase nationally.

Funding of FPE

The initiative for Free Primary Education has been strongly supported by the donor community. Encouraged by the public response and the Kenyan government's political will, reflected in the disbursement of $6.8 million in emergency grants to provide for basic classroom needs including textbooks, UNICEF donated $2.5 million, and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) donated $21.1 million. In 2004 an additional grant of $50 million came from the World Bank and $10.6 million came from DFID and the Swedish International Development Agency. The World Food Programme ($13.9 million) and OPEC ($9.9 million) have also contributed in the funding of this programme. Up to $500 million have been offered in assistance over the four years between 2004-2008, with the British government providing $200 million in that time.

Misuse of Funds

About two months prior to this role-playing exercise, the media leaked a story implicating MoEST officials in misappropriation of more than $40 million over the four-year period between 2004-2008. The Minister of Education subsequently issued a statement indicating that his office was investigating the claims, but cautioned the public against believing everything that was written by the media. Two weeks later the media leaked a report of the British High Commissioner in Kenya confirming that the British government instituted an independent audit into the use of FPE funds.

The Scene: A Meeting/Consultation of Major Stakeholders of the FPE

Civil Society Representative

The Civil Society Representative, in a passionate statement, presented the background and context of the FPE, and stated that the preliminary report from the British government—the findings of which were contained in a public statement read by the British High Commissioner—
indicated that FPE grants seem to have been abused by unscrupulous officers in the following ways:

- Over $40 million, almost a quarter of the FPE assistance, was unaccounted for;
- $10 million had been lost due to fraudulent procurement processes where fictitious meetings were held and bottles of water supplied for 900 Kenyan Shillings (10 USD) each;
- The remaining $20 million appeared to have been paid as per diems to education officials on monitoring visits around the country, but there was no supporting documentation;
- It was noteworthy that the initial report citing the abuse was prepared by the MoEST internal audit department over a year before, and only leaked to the press when the Minister of Education’s office failed to act.

On the basis of the findings of the report of the British government, the civil society representative in this role-playing meeting demanded:

- The immediate resignation of the Minister of Education and that of the accounting officer in charge;
- An immediate release of the reports prepared by the internal audit and independent auditors to give the public a clear picture of what was going on;
- That the FPE institute a proactive disclosure policy to make sure the public is able to track all expenditures on a regular basis, as provided in Article 35 in the Constitution of Kenya 2010 (CK2010);
- That school heads make available to the schools’ Parents-Teachers Associations and to all parents the full accounts of funds received and expended, as current disclosure is insufficient or non-existent;
- That those responsible be prosecuted to the full extent of the law;
- That the MoEST further apologise to the public for the negligence demonstrated in letting the abuse of funds go on for three years without action.

The civil society representative concluded in this acted situation by stating that the CSO she represented would submit its petition to the National Assembly, the Public Service Commission as well as the Anti-corruption Commission, and noted that failure by these bodies to act would force the CSO to institute legal proceedings of its own.

**Government Official: Minister of Education**

The person acting as representative of the Ministry of Education stated the following: The Ministry of Education is committed to achieving the MDGs. There is an accountability framework of the Ministry, and to explain how it works he showed a chart which portrayed a complex and intricate constellation of actors and relations for accountability. Various public and private stakeholders were involved at the central, regional, local, district, and community levels. He admitted that the accountability system in place in the country was possibly “a bit complicated,” and for that reason it was taking time to find out where the accountability system had failed in the FPE case. Moreover, he stated that a national committee report could be found on the Internet, explaining the whole system by which the government is accountable at all levels. He explained that now that civil society raised the issue of the missing FPE funds, considering the accountability system in place, the Minister was accountable, but also “everybody” was accountable as the system is designed. He added that the auditor general and the police were looking into the matter. He concluded rhetorically: “I want to say that I am OK. The people voted for me, and I am committed to this country and to the achievement of the MDGs”.

**Social Accountability Network Representative**
We believe strongly in constructive engagement; that is why we have asked to convene this meeting in order to consider an important step in the engagement process. The key step is to support our partners in building their own capacity in expenditure tracking. The Minister has admitted that one of the key problems is lack of capacity at the district level regarding tracking: where the funding actually goes and whether it reaches the beneficiaries. The question is, “What should the ministry do?” Should it undertake voluntary disclosure of information? We currently do not have an “Information Act” in this country, so we could only encourage, not require, the disclosure of information about the disbursement of funds to schools across the country. We would also like to encourage social auditing, so we could track easily not only where the funds go but also what the impact would be, and what teachers and school committees are doing with the funds they receive. There were some allegations that financial management is not what it should be in this ministry, so I would like to encourage the minister to use as an example the work that has been done by other governments in our region. Last, your government has delegated many procurement functions to the district level, and my question is this: Do district education officers have the skills to do this? Is the question of their skills and capacity an issue for you?

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Representative
My office has been engaged in looking at the report. We have also talked to UNICEF, which deals with children’s education, and briefed CSOs in the country. We want to point out that citizens have the right to access information, and we note that the government has not yet fully developed a policy for such access. We always encourage government to come up with a new vision to link with the MDGs. We commend the reforms that have already taken place, and we encourage government to discuss with NGOs how to make their engagement much more constructive rather than adversarial and confrontational. We could help them in creating a forum to support and promote the solution to this issue. The UN is not pointing fingers. The UN is here to help our country to achieve the MDGs.

Consultant
I would like to recommend a specific project. Per diem spending struck me as a huge issue; a similar issue presented itself in Tanzania in 2009, where per diem payment was 59 per cent of total spending. We need to look at per diem spending to see if there are abuses. At Boston University we recommended setting a goal to limit per diem spending. In a participatory way, we need to develop a policy and set up a framework for this type of spending that is reasonable. Learning from best practices, I would recommend that direct payment of per diem spending through bank accounts should replace cash payments, so that it will be possible to track the expenses.

Donor Agency Representative
The representative of Swedish SIDA, a major donor of the FPE funding, was interested in two issues: the proper use of the funding as well as its impact. We have to report to our constituencies and the donor country about the use of the money and the impact of the programme. We have to report to the taxpayers about proper use of funds and what results they achieved. We want to hear what the programme has done to improve primary education and what has been done to bring the programme closer to achieving the MDGs. It is very important to have a vibrant civil society to be involved in expenditure tracking. Also, we could establish a program for capacity development for civil society, for the Ministry and for the parties involved in the primary education programs. They would come together in a public dialogue forum, as offered by the UN. This might not be enough, so we also need a capacity development programme for the ministry to engage in proper financial management.
Media
The media representative reports on the lead news as follows:
The government has failed, and the society has become reactive. The local media reported on a big scandal of misuse of international funding for education. Despite the promise of strong support of education by the government and political parties, the $40M for funding elementary school education has disappeared. The Ministry of Education denies any direct responsibility, including responsibility for the departments to which it transferred the job of distributing the funds. The facts show clearly that the money has disappeared and the system needs to be changed. The international funding will be questioned, the UN sponsors will say this shows that the system should be changed, but in any case the money is still gone. No one is in jail for this, the minister has not yet resigned, the government is defending itself, and the children have no money for school.

Moderator
Now we've had our meeting. We need to hear from you how you feel about this situation. What did you hear, and do you think there will be collaboration in enhancing accountability and reducing corruption in the next year or so in this country?

CSO
I would like to reiterate our first condition for moving forward. The internal audit report indicates clearly that $40M are missing. The donor report indicates a similar amount is missing. We cannot continue this discussion until the minister steps aside or someone is prosecuted. It is premature for donor agencies to talk about capacity building. The Constitution says that the responsible party must step aside. The most responsible party here is the minister. He must step aside because he is preventing this dialogue from going further.

MoEST
The minister responded by giving thanks for the various comments, saying, “We have procedures in this country, and sometimes to solve a problem you have to get at the roots, not the symptoms. You can get rid of someone, and the next person will do the same thing. Regarding information, the government is online, and you can find all information there.

Social Accountability Network
A participant from the social accountability network said, “Minister, you are quite defensive around this issue. You said you were going to do certain things. Minister, you are responsible for this ministry; you are accountable, and accountability stops with you. So what are you going to do?”

United Nations Regional Commission
As the UN regional commissioner, I express my concern that, for the sake of the children, and creating a win-win situation, we should differentiate between the allegations and the evidence. I believe this was a systemic problem. We all agree we have a problem, but what we have to look at are the competencies and capacities of the system, including the ways in which engagement occurs in the country. I know that civil society is angry. We should look at this incident as a separate case and then promote a systematic dialogue, an effective dialogue. Donors are willing to contribute with resources. We have a consultant that is willing to interrogate about per diem spending.

Consultant
The consultant added his comments, saying, “I completely agree that it was very critical for the minister, as the representative of the government, to respond to this incident. The government
needs to be responsible to the people of Kenya. It is really not the role of donors or consultants to demand that the government be accountable to us, or to get involved in this accountability relationship regarding the abuse. The correct role of consultants and donors is to help government and civil society to figure out how to prevent this kind of incident from happening in the future, how to respond in the future most effectively in similar instances, and to make sure that any changes in the policies are actually improvements.

**Donor**
The donor representative said there is a difference between mutual accountability and domestic accountability. We want the government to be accountable to us for the funds donated. But the government has to be accountable to both sides. In order to continue pursuing the basic goal of improving primary education in Kenya, SIDA will probably continue the support but possibly changing the mode of delivery. Now we will give direct funding to capacity development. We will discuss this with the government, but also with civil society. SIDA will not interfere with political discussion about resignation—that is not the role of the donor—but we can bring back the primary discussion to the real issues about the improvement of primary education.

**Media**
The media representative has reported an update on the lead news as follows:
The minister of education was under strong pressure from civil society to explain the disappearance of the money, but no explanation was given. The international donors are asking to change the system with the full assistance of international organizations, including the UN. But this is not enough, and it is necessary to ask the question, “Why are foreign tax payers—the British tax payers and other donors—“helping to foster corruption in the country instead of education?” Addressing this question will be basic for changing the behaviour of donors, which is needed. The Kenyan case will be the benchmark of future cooperation and behaviour of donors in such situations.

*After the cast played the roles described above in this acted case study exercise, the moderator invited all participants to make comments, to ask questions, and to highlight what lessons could be extracted from this limited, although motivating, exercise.*

One participant commented that while there were many stakeholders, two were interacting more closely: government and civil society. He mentioned that the role paying assumed that there was some kind of interaction between them and that the CSOs were supposed to put pressure on the government for better accountability. He questioned to what extent it is possible in real cases to empower civil society organizations. Because CSOs are not government organizations, their interventions are not mandated in the constitution, and they have no authority to demand investigations or to impose sanctions. So he raised the issue of the extent to which political pressure is sufficient to exact accountability, particularly when, as seen in the acted case, the minister and other government officers in the auditing, judiciary and police areas, could collude amongst themselves for partisan or other political reasons.

Another participant pointed out that the acted case study missed the point that there are institutions in the country responsible for addressing mismanagement or corruption in the public sector, such as the police, the auditing office and the justice system. These important real life actors have to be considered and the relationships among them and with the ministry have to be analysed. Unfortunately this was not represented in the play.

Another participant in the workshop commented that it was interesting that the exercise was inspired by a real life experience. In her opinion, the attitude and approach of the minister was
illustrative and well presented, highlighting the difficulties for civil society to effectively exact accountability. Civil society often relies on public pressure, hoping that government leaders will be forced to act and, possibly, that the officers involved in wrongdoing would be embarrassed enough to resign. However, there are situations where those public officers do not care about headlines, and other authorities do not really care about the social pressure, as long as the president or the party leader does not instruct them to take action or ask them to step down. She added that even the parliament, anti-corruption agencies and the police sometimes drag their feet. In situations like that, civil pressure is not so effective and the legal and institutional framework has to be designed so as to counterbalance these political realities and present civil society with effective procedures to exact accountability and to fight corruption.

Lastly, one more participant referred to situations where foreign donors at times make things worse. After certain corruption scandals, to put an end to embarrassing situations, they say that standards have been set, and that training and capacity building are to be done to ensure that it does not happen again. However, unless effective sanctions are applied and stolen money or assets are recovered, the incentives for others to steal again are very high.

After these comments from the participants, the chairperson made some final remarks:

1. The Social Network representative in the acted case made a very good point, namely that there was no law on transparency, and that therefore the uneven flow of information from the government to the people was compensated for by the active role of the media. This highlights the importance of ethics in the media and also poses the question: to what extent can independent media substitute for the mandatory disclosure of public information, and at what cost? While ethics and independence of the media are certainly important, their investigative and communications work can be significantly easier and more effective if transparency laws are in place.

2. Regarding the role of civil society portrayed in this play, it seemed that the CSO acted on behalf of a civic constituency, and not so much on behalf of an education constituency. Perhaps the CSO could be more effective if it articulated the interests of both constituencies, maybe including the views and claims of parents, teachers and their associations, and not only of citizens or political groups.

3. The interaction between government and CSO, as portrayed in this acted case, was to some extent confrontational. This could be understood as a strategy of the CSO to use strident language to gain visibility for its cause and to achieve a greater impact. This maybe an illustration of what several participants throughout the workshop had referred to as constructive tension between civil society and government. Effectiveness in the long run requires managing that tension in ways that make it results-oriented and do not break dialogue and cooperation between civil society and government to address ever-arising challenges of accountability. Perhaps it helps to call attention not only to the wrongdoings of those who may be responsible, but also to the outcomes of the wrongdoings, so as to go beyond confrontation and punishment and into consensus building on the gains for the public good that stem from integrity in the public sphere.

4. In the play, civil society did not make any concrete proposal besides the resignation of the minister. It appeared implicitly from the comments of the Social Accountability Network that CSOs in the country lacked the capacity to engage in social auditing or participatory budgeting. It was good that the Social Accountability Network representative could identify capacities in the region and suggest to the minister ways to build those capacities using international accountability networks to help local constituencies. In the role-playing, the Social Accountability Network shared knowledge and identified concrete actions and interventions that were useful for civil society in the country.
5. The government representative looked in the acted case as if he had something to hide. The diagram presented by him seemed like a smoke screen with which the Minister could cover the issues. Unfortunately the minister could not differentiate between the wrongdoings of the individuals in government and the faults of the state. In his acting, it was unclear if he was defending the corrupt officers or the institutions of government, and, therefore, he did not manage to establish trust in government. It seemed as if he was supporting his own political party or the union of public sector officers, but his intervention did not help the government much, and as such did not help himself either. Perhaps had he said “Let’s find who is responsible for this and what the money has been used for,” he could have served better both the government and the people, even though this would have exposed him to a high political risk from annoying the centres of corrupt power in the country. In any case, even if the minister did not have anything to do with the affair, he was accountable.

6. The representative of the United Nations in the play showed how this organization could contribute with advocacy and principles that are useful for stakeholders at the national and local levels. He referred to the particular expertise of UN agencies like UNICEF and UNODC, and clearly portrayed that the UN regional commissions can channel the global expertise of the different entities of the UN system to meet the particular needs of countries in different regions.

7. In the acted case, the consultant offered a very interesting technical proposal for the national stakeholders: to conduct an empirical study, based on control groups, to test whether new ways of intervention through civic engagement could exact accountability in education services, compared to situations where this is not done.

8. In turn, the role played by the donor agency suggested that it was not so much interested in solving the problems of corruption in education in the country, but rather on how to report back to the donor country taxpayers, evaluators and parliament.

9. Finally, the play showed that the initial high level of confrontation and accusation between civil society and the government was eased and could evolve into a solution-finding process through the interventions of the media, the international community and the international organizations. Yet, it was evident that these cannot act on their own and civil society must build its capacities to coordinate collective action and to articulate the strategies of all those stakeholders who work for better accountability and against corruption. The government, sooner or later, will have to assess when the political balance calls for a tilt away from covering up the old network of corrupt interests towards becoming a legitimate, committed, capable and effective purveyor of public services that is accountable to the people.

END OF ROLE PLAY
PARTICIPANTS’ EVALUATION - SUMMARY

The workshop on “Engaging Citizens to Enhance Public Service Delivery and Strengthen Accountability,” organized by the Division for Public Administration and Development Management of DESA, was held in Vienna on 11-13 July 2011. Thirty-seven participants—of whom seventeen were women—attended from twenty-one countries in five world regions. They represented government, civil society, academia and international organizations. They participated in panels, working groups, a role-playing exercise and debates.

The workshop explored how the engagement of citizens—and their organizations in civil society—can contribute to improve public accountability in public service delivery and spending. The workshop provided ample time for discussion of regional trends and contexts, and encouraged consideration of public services in light of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such as healthcare, education delivery, and anti-poverty programs. The workshop also allowed for consideration of emerging accountability mechanisms involving citizens, parliaments and public enterprises.

Key lessons learned by the participants, presented in the concluding session of the workshop, included considerations about the evolving conceptual framework, the importance of information and the key role of the private sector in service delivery. Conclusions and recommendations are incorporated in the proceedings of the workshop, published on-line.

An evaluation form was completed by 19 out of 37 participants (or 51 per cent). The evaluation indicates that 79 per cent of evaluating participants found the training workshop excellent or very good. Participants found that the most relevant elements of the workshop were the breakout groups, the general discussion and the role-playing exercise, as well as learning from other experts and practitioners and exchanging cross-national information.

Among the areas needing improvement, participants mentioned that no clear distinction was made in the workshop between emerging concepts, perspectives and approaches that could have been juxtaposed, questioned and reflected upon. Participants also observed that all the sessions went well but there were just too many presentations per panel, and that the absence of language interpretation limited some participants’ readiness to participate in debates. Additional comments made by participants included to focus more on the workshop objectives, which were found to be relevant and needed, but too broad. Participants also suggested that, instead of organizing several small events, DPADM should hold fewer and larger events with 50-60 participants, to reduce gaps in the representation of civil society organizations, academia and government, and enable a richer discussion in plenary sessions and working groups.

Special mention needs to be made of the need to use the Internet and social media tools to make the workshop public and engage more people. This issue was raised by a number of participants and one “non-participant,” IMAXI (imaxi.org), an India-based civil society organization that aims to maximize access and increase civil society involvement in public health issues and institutions through the innovative fusion of web-based tools, mobile telephones and physical meetings. During the workshop, IMAXI members contacted a participant, questioning the openness and on-line accessibility of the workshop, an event that focused on the engagement of citizens. IMAXI, as well as a number of participants, suggested that in future similar events we
use web-casting and social media updates. This could be very helpful in making the workshop public, reaching and engaging many more people, and ultimately promoting change.

For more information, please visit: http://www.unpan.org/2011WKS-CE-Vienna

**PARTICIPANTS’ EVALUATION - ANSWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your overall impression of the training workshop</td>
<td>Excellent: 8, Very Good: 7, Satisfactory: 3, Unsatisfactory: 1, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and clarity of training documentation</td>
<td>Excellent: 1, Very Good: 10, Satisfactory: 7, Unsatisfactory: 1, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the workshop objectives</td>
<td>Excellent: 7, Very Good: 6, Satisfactory: 3, Unsatisfactory: 3, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the objectives of the workshop were achieved</td>
<td>Excellent: 2, Very Good: 11, Satisfactory: 3, Unsatisfactory: 2, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which you were satisfied with the working relations with the organization</td>
<td>Excellent: 9, Very Good: 8, Satisfactory: 2, Unsatisfactory: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the materials used during the activity</td>
<td>Excellent: 3, Very Good: 9, Satisfactory: 6, Unsatisfactory: 1, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the activity</td>
<td>Excellent: 6, Very Good: 8, Satisfactory: 3, Unsatisfactory: 2, Poor: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the activity to the needs of your organization</td>
<td>Excellent: 4, Very Good: 12, Satisfactory: 1, Unsatisfactory: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF ANSWERS**

40 71 28 10 1 2

**QUESTION**

**ANSWERS**

- Breakout groups.
- The working groups.
- Debate on the working group and general discussion.
- Small group meeting to discuss concepts of government accountability; using social media to connect the public with the government.
- It was interesting to see the views of all different experts on the subject of engaging citizens. I particularly liked the role-play exercise: I found it a very innovative idea. The whole workshop was very good and very well organized. Congratulations! (Susanne Schwarz, INTOSAI).
- Learning from other experts from academia, practitioners (Mario Claasen, South Africa)
- Update state of academic and researchers’ thinking, analyses and work outputs. Expand network of contacts.
The most relevant element of the training workshop is to have allowed a reunion of different cultures and visions to debate about questions of common interest and discover at the end that we share the same human values (Djaffar Zioui, Algeria).

The structure of the workshop; conceptual aspects, regional trends, case studies, etc (Rethelny Figueroa de Jain, Costa Rica)

Learning new things and enhancing my knowledge on issues pertaining to key themes such as social accountability, good governance, etc., from experts and fellow participants from across the globe (the small-group discussion is very useful).

Shared accountability presentation.

The issue of citizen participation in the delivery of services and creating trust between citizens and government (Adishwar Jain, Costa Rica)

Cross-national information.

Information (Maximilian Edelbacher, Austria)

What was the least useful element of the training workshop?

- No clear distinction of emerging propositions and perspectives that could have been juxtaposed, interrogated and reflected on.
- Lack of discussion of problems which civil servants face in delivering services (Adishwar Jain, Costa Rica).
- Some topics were redundant.
- All the sessions went well but just too many presentations per panel (Mario Claasen, South Africa).
- A weakness was the lack of language interpretation to ensure the necessary readiness during debates (Djaffar Zioui, Algeria).
- Inopportune time management.
- Get more practitioners.

Additional comments and suggestions

- Repeat the role-playing! It is a fantastic training exercise! (Martha Oyhanarte, Argentina, CEPA Member)
- To include participation of members/countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, India (for Asia) and other major countries from other continents—50-60 participants, to ensure more people in the smaller group discussions—to enrich further the discussion. Congratulations for the successful organization of the workshop. Thank you very much. (Khadijah MD. Khalid, University of Malaya, Malaysia).
- A team-building activity or role-playing (like the one that was decided upon at the last minute) might have assisted the group dynamic, if it had been done at some point on the first day. (Balewa Ndayako, Nigeria).
- Clear objectives of workshop should have been defined and handed out. I enjoyed the simulation exercise, as it played out similar to real cases seen in the media. Printed summaries of documents would be helpful, and links to find the detailed cases. Social media (twitter, Facebook, blogs) are free media that could help make the workshop public and engage many more people.
- It would make the workshop more interesting if: a) there were participants who are actually civil servants involved in delivery of services; b) since there is a trend where many government
services are being outsourced, it would be useful if there was some exposure to how citizen participation can help in the allocation and monitoring of the process of outsourcing, namely the public procurement process; c) mechanism through which citizen participation enforces non-corrupt behaviour (Adishwar Jain, Costa Rica).

- Adequate time required.
- The composition of the group, with different perspectives, and with experience from different fields: governments, academia, international organizations, etc. (Rethelny Figueroa de Jain, Costa Rica)

- Make available at the meeting a list of participants with addresses, telephone numbers and e-mails; and some papers of interesting lectures (Maximilian Edelbacher, Austria).
- There were gaps in representation of CSOs, academia and government. The workshop objectives were too broad, but relevant and needed; overall quality of activity was good really, not just merely satisfactory, but much could be improved. Good and much needed initiative from UNDESA.
- Much promise and potential here. UNDESA needs to articulate clear action research and also networking agenda on anti-corruption/accountability/public service delivery, especially perhaps from local to national and then across country levels. Focused session on corruption with capacity building needed.
- I would like to commend your team for having carried out the ground work of investing in human capacity, which will certainly bring its fruits in due time (Djaffar Zioui, Algeria).
- Objectives of different panels and inputs were not clear to me, so I cannot say whether they were achieved or not, or to what extent. Guiding questions for panellists’ discussions would have been helpful. Presentations were too long and too many. Sixty minutes for three presentations AND a panel AND a floor discussion is not enough, generally schedule was too tight. For next time plan fewer workshops, but more time for each of the workshops. At the beginning of the workshop there should have been a round for all participants to introduce themselves. Conception of the individual panels: most of the time the presentations held within one panel did not relate to each other. Hence there should have been guiding questions for every panellist to structure the panel and to lead to a specific outcome and their input to conclusions of each panel. In the Aide Memoire it was announced that “prior to the workshop, background material will be distributed.” Unfortunately I have not received any and could not find it on the webpage. Flipcharts, important training tools, were missing during working groups (Katrin Schaefer, Germany).
- It was not clear that this was a training workshop. It had a very static format, poor environment, poor time management, etc.