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1.0 Introduction

1.1 I wish to thank the organizers of this Ministerial Conference on Local Governance and Decentralisation. We value the effort and time that organizers and participants give to events such as this; these are important opportunities for African leaders to learn from each other about the challenges, and successes in public sector reforms to bring about decentralisation and good governance as the norm. These gatherings give us the chance to focus on our cultural and socio-economic contexts, and how they impact on our development policies, strategies and achievements.
1.2 Therefore, on behalf of the delegation from Tanzania, I thank the H.E. Mr Emmanuel Edou, Minister of Territorial Administration and Decentralisation of Cameroon, The Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern and Southern Africa and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs for hosting this event with the theme of ‘from policy to implementation’ for decentralisation and local governance. This is one of the biggest management challenges. We therefore look forward to sharing the experience of Tanzania with you, and to hearing the experiences of others which we shall take away with us.

1.3 We appreciate that although this is a Ministerial Conference, the participants are from civil society, international organisations and local governments as well. This reflects the nature of effective governance, devolution and democratisation. Dialogue amongst us stimulates learning, capacity development and, hopefully, results for our people.

1.4 We are all faced with the forces of economic liberalization, democratization, globalization, and demands of modern technology, across our states. Governments are expected to be faster, more responsive, more participatory, less bureaucratic, more flexible, and transparent. We have to meet these expectations with our relatively limited resources, combined with the external support from development partners and international institutions. That support is invaluable but also consumes
time and capacity to negotiate mutually acceptable systems, conditions, monitoring and performance assessment measures.

2.0 Decentralisation Policy Background

2.1 Let me start with the Tanzanian decentralisation policy, before going on to implementation and challenges. I am sure that delegations from other countries will be familiar with different types of decentralisation. We have adapted our public sector to respond to the environment in Tanzania over the years. We have had a centrally managed state, we devolved power, we deconcentrated and we delegated. When the government was not producing the level of services and development expected with a policy we would examine the factors for success and the failures and adjust accordingly. The improvements we strive for are to improve living conditions of our citizens, provide them with quality education, health and other services, improve the economic performance of the state and ultimately to eradicate poverty.

2.2 Like many African countries we have risen to the challenges of the post-colonial period, managing our own affairs. Like many African countries we had a one-party state, a strong socialist culture and a strong central government where the Ministry of Planning was at the forefront. However, despite well intentioned policies we were not able to sustain successes. For example we had one of the highest primary education
enrolment rates in the world in the 1970s (almost 100%), but this dropped dramatically in the 1990s. The performance of the state (good and bad) has been the result of different factors at different points in time. Among these we can cite structural adjustment policies, debt, central decision making, and traditional bureaucracy. I am sure these factors are very familiar to many of you.

2.3 In the 1990s Tanzania embarked on its Civil Service Reform Programme, to make the state more efficient. This programme, probably like many of yours, has elements that are familiar from western states or from the concept of ‘new public management’: privatization, executive agencies, better information management and use for decision making, merit based employment and promotion, and decentralisation, bringing government and decision making closer to the people, to be more responsive and democratic. This coincided with the move from a one-party state to multi-party democracy. Thus there was a significant transformation in the public sector environment during the 1990s.

2.4 The first multi-party elections in Tanzania were held in 1995. This ‘Third Phase Government’ was committed to decentralisation, but, more crucially, it was committed to **decentralisation by devolution**, and this was a feature of the election manifesto. A major national conference in 1996 brought together central and local stakeholders, academics, donors,
the Association of Local Authorities of Tanzania, political parties and representatives of the fledgling civil society at the time. They discussed and debated what was good and bad about the government system and agreed the vision for local government, i.e. devolution, in order to bring about development and good governance. The significance of this conference is often lost or under-rated given the years that have passed since then. It was a major initiative at the time, bringing together interest groups, stakeholders, government and non-government representatives.

2.5 Decentralisation is used in some states as a policy to improve political stability. This was not an imperative for our adoption of a decentralisation policy. We are fortunate that the approach taken by our leaders, under the guidance of Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere, during and after Independence maintained a positive political climate. However, the words of Dr Salim Ahmed Salim, the former Secretary General of the OAU are in our consciousness:

“Poverty brings about instability and insecurity, which breed underdevelopment. The reverse is also true: democracy and development must deliver on the bread and butter issues, otherwise the continent could slide back into situations where the politics of poverty gives rise to the poverty of politics”.
2.6 Tanzania is a relatively large country, with a population of over 32 million people living in 133 local authority areas, and their sub-divisions. In our rural local authorities we have more than 10,000 villages. Therefore the policy of devolution has been our preferred approach. The objective is to bring government as close to the people as possible, where they can participate, in order that services are really responsive to local needs.

3.0 Decentralisation Policy Paper

3.1 After our national conference agreed the vision for local government, came five important events. In chronological order these were:

(i) the Regional Administration Act in 1997 that brought about the restructuring of the regional tier of government. It was significantly ‘down-sized’ to reflect the role change from implementation to support and monitoring;

(ii) the local government reform programme was elevated to reflect its importance by a) separating it from the Civil Service Reform Programme and b) publication of the important Policy Paper on Local Government Reform in 1998 to which I shall return in a moment;

(iii) an action plan and budget was prepared for implementation of the Policy Paper. This was jointly appraised by government and donors and a joint basket fund and steering committee were soon in place,
in 1999, to get it started. This was the first basket fund arrangement in our country. The commitment and support of the donors at the time was truly appreciated. I think we have done them justice with the way the programme has functioned ever since and we have enjoyed continued support over the years of our LGRP;

(iv) amendments to local government laws were passed by Parliament in 1999 that gave local authorities their legal framework and responsibilities; and

(v) a Ministry for Regional Administration and Local Government was created, and a dedicated team of staff were added to implement the reforms. I should add that this team was given a semi-autonomous status which has enabled them to proceed often without the bureaucracy that might have delayed some decisions or processes, but still within laid down procedures, good practice and the law. The Ministry has since been elevated and is now under the Prime Minister’s Office.

3.2 The Tanzania policy of decentralisation by devolution, which we call ‘Decentralisation by Devolution’, as articulated in the Policy Paper has four areas within it:

(i) political decentralisation – the creation of multi-functional governments at the local level;
(ii) financial decentralisation – discretionary financial powers and central government supplying unconditional grant transfers;

(iii) administrative decentralisation – giving local governments discretion over human resources management, and being accountable to the local council and people; and

(iv) changed central-local relations – in a system with consultations and negotiations with central government providing support to local authorities and with much reduced directive powers.

3.3 Cutting across the policy is the push for good governance at all levels of government. In Tanzania our governance framework is about being democratic, transparent, accountable, efficient, working with ethics and integrity, reducing corruption, and being equitable in government and in service provision.

4.0 Decentralisation by Devolution Implementation

4.1 Implementation of the reforms got underway in the government year 1999/2000. It took three years to do preparatory ground work from agreeing the vision in 1996, and to get a credible programme in place with funding.

4.2 The Decentralisation by Devolution policy was to be a major re-engineering of how we work in government at all levels. It was decided that a national programme, or ‘big bang’ approach would probably be too
ambitious for the new Ministry and particularly alongside all the other major reform interventions required of central and local government staff. During the last ten years these have spanned all aspects of government work in the areas of health, education, agriculture, water, legal reform, financial systems, human resources and more. Most have incorporated new technology as well, which has been an added challenge for staff, alongside policy changes and their implications.

4.3 Our approach was therefore to progress with political devolution in all local authorities, and financial and administrative devolution in phases. We started with one third of the local authorities (38) in 2000, and intended to move onto the next two thirds in two subsequent phases in years 3 and 4. Some capacity building would be for all LGAs, especially when it came to training for those in leadership posts such as Councillors, Directors, and District Commissioners.

4.4 In phase one two major activities were:
- to create awareness about the reforms to stimulate participation at the local level; and
- to restructure the local authorities; from a uniform structure to one which reflected and aimed to serve local context and needs.

4.5 We used television, radio, local meetings and drama to create awareness. Local authorities organized Council Reform Teams (CRT) to assist with restructuring of local government organisations and strategic planning.
This was a new avenue for civil society and the private sector to work with councilors and staff. This restructuring was necessary to change from a fairly uniform national structure and staffing complement, to one that should fit the local needs and thus be more responsive and efficient in providing services and managing functional responsibilities at the council and lower levels within the area. In most councils this led to a reduced number of departments, better job specifications and training plans, and some retrenchment. It was also the intention that councils have autonomy over their staff and staff which would be a major change from staff reporting to separate Ministries in the capital.

4.6 The restructuring process took longer than anticipated in the first councils. The staff, Councillors and Reform Team realized that the information available for decision making was quite poor, and motivating staff and re-orienting to the new arrangements and responsibilities was not all plain sailing. Under the centralized system most staff and departments were feeding information to their Ministries, at the centre. That data and information had not necessarily been systematically collected and stored within the local authority, and it took time to re-organise that. Meanwhile staff reactions to being employed by the local Council, instead of a Ministry, was mixed. A mixture of support and resistance to change is of course common in most organizations.
4.7 Administrative autonomy was boosted when the Local Government Service Regulations were passed in 2001. These gave the first 38 councils the power to hire, fire, discipline, develop and manage their staff. It also brought in autonomy over some aspects of remuneration, to give means to attract and motivate staff. However, I have to mention a couple of challenges immediately associated with this:

- the Regulations applied in only one third of local governments and running two systems of human resource management was complex and confusing for many LGAs; and
- the discretion over budgets and grants from central government was still behind what might be needed for administrative autonomy.

4.8 By 2001 the restructuring processes and fiscal decentralisation were behind schedule as envisaged in our implementation plan. Therefore the Government and donors organized a Joint Review of implementation progress in 2001. This coincided with our Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper as our new national development framework. The Review concluded:

- the policy and plan were sound but the original plan (especially the timeframe) was too ambitious;
- the need to prioritise systemic reforms to give true meaning and effect to Decentralisation by Devolution. It identified the systemic issues as:
legal harmonization, fiscal decentralisation and human resource autonomy;

- to move away from the ‘phasing’ approach and implement reforms nationally; and

- the need to provide incentives for local authorities.

4.9 What followed was the development of a ‘Medium Term Plan’ (Medium Term Plan) for Local Government Reform, the first 3 year cycle (2002-2005) of a 12 year reform horizon, in line with other public service reform programmes at the time. The Medium Term Plan also had some new elements that had been identified from the experience of phase one. They were:

- improving reform coordination;
- improving monitoring of the reforms and LGA performance; and
- strengthening the Ministry and Regions to perform their roles and functions. Organisation structures were to be fundamental to this: the Ministry was restructured and the Regions are following.

4.10 The incentives question was to be addressed through a new unified and discretionary grant system for local authorities, known as the Local Government Capital Development Grant System, or ‘LGCDG’, which was officially launched on Local Government Day, 1 July, 2005. Local authorities are assessed on, inter alia, their leadership posts being filled;
their financial management, human resource management capacity, and planning and budgeting capacity; and a number of governance indicators. If the local authority passes the assessment they qualify for a development grant that is calculated with an agreed formula. There is another formula on how the grant is to be allocated between the council and lower levels. This system came out of intense negotiation efforts, over months and years, between Ministries and with development partners who currently provide most of the funding. Development partners agreed to wind up their separate projects and programmes in various, individual, local authorities. These support projects were often symptomatic of ‘cherry picking’ in some geographical or thematic areas, to the detriment of the local government system as a whole. They were building capacity but they were also diverting capacity from routine government systems to parallel reporting and incentive structures.

4.11 I should add that the LGCDG assessment criteria are consistent with normal LGA legal and operational obligations and expected standards. They are not additional or setting higher standards. Therein lies the justification for their application to LGAs to secure resources and autonomy.

4.12 We had a further Joint Review of implementation in 2004 and the second Medium Term Plan (2005-2008) was produced. Again the main policy areas and implementation successes at the local level were endorsed.
What the new Medium Term Plan had to incorporate was how to embed Decentralisation by Devolution at a national level, to address the fourth policy area of Decentralisation by Devolution: really reflecting changed central-local relations.

4.13 The information I have just given is historic of course. I have included it because these review processes were essential for keeping us on track, responding to challenges and changes in the environment, re-prioritising where essential for Decentralisation by Devolution to be meaningful and to be implemented effectively, as per the theme of our discussions.

5.0 Decentralisation Progress, Achievements and Challenges

5.1 As we are in the final year of the current Medium Term Plan, and seven years into implementing the policy of Decentralisation by Devolution, where are we? In short, we have made progress, and an overview is given below, but we still have a long way to go. During the last year we have also been formulating a programme that will be the framework for Decentralisation by Devolution for the next five years, i.e. the successor programme to our LGRP. We are grateful to development partners support for this. While I am here the development partners are overseeing an appraisal of the new programme, and the programme documents are being discussed by all our Ministries and their Permanent Secretaries in our Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee.
5.2 However, to return to our progress, I shall use the pillars of political, fiscal and administrative decentralisation and changed central-local relations that are the key features of our Policy, and relate these to poverty reduction indicators as poverty reduction has been the overall goal of our LGRP and our national efforts.

(i) Political Decentralisation

5.3 The third national round of Councillor Elections was held in 2005, and we will hold our fourth round of elections for posts at lower levels, including villages, in 2009. Local authorities and villages have fully constituted Councils (governments) and Assemblies and various statutory committees that support them. Councillors are in these Committees and the Council Chairperson is elected from among the Councillors. A code of ethics and conduct was issued in 2002 for all elected officials (and staff), which govern behaviour in conducting work. The Council Chairperson delivers an Annual Accountability Report to the people within the local authority on 1 July each year, Local Government Day.

5.4 We ensure equitable representation through a quota system of one third of seats are ‘special seats’ for women and marginalized groups. These seats are allocated in line with election results and appointments are from political parties. Such affirmative action policies have their pros and cons.
I can report that we do now have women contesting for elections. We want this proportion to increase.

(ii) Fiscal Decentralisation

5.5 At the start of our reform programme local governments were receiving irregular transfers from central government, that could not cover much more than salaries and operating costs. This was in part due to the cash budgeting system in operation that was to cope with the severe budget constraints at the time. It was also a function of an outdated system of intergovernmental transfers. We have now reached a stage where we operate with 3 year Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks, and development budgets are based on objective assessments and a formula, and both transfers and expenditure are publicized nationally and locally, through the LGCDG system.

5.6 The government now has an integrated financial management system (IFMS) at national and local level. This has facilitated book-keeping, timely reporting and public information. We have teething problems with introducing and maintaining technology, in the same way that many western states have. But it is the future, and we will persevere.

5.7 The combination of administrative and fiscal decentralisation has brought improvements to local government revenue collection, although there is still work to be done on the revenue sharing arrangements. Currently,
LGAs have more discretion over local revenue sources. In addition they are allowed to ‘out source’ revenue collection. We have many examples with evidence of how this has improved revenue collection. For example, Rungwe District Council privatized market fees and increased those revenues by 83% (or $19,600 per annum). Iringa Municipal Council privatized all revenue collection and realized an increase of 173% (or $40,700 in a year).

5.8 I mentioned the importance of embedding Decentralisation by Devolution as a priority in our current Medium Term Plan. Last year we agreed a strategy and roadmap for this. We initiated ‘Decentralisation by Devolution assessments’ in six (of the total twenty four) central and sector Ministries. Examination of their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and strategic plans revealed a number of activities that could be, and should be, devolved to local governments. The accompanying financial resources for those amounted to Tshs345 billion ($300million). There followed some delicate negotiations to transfer the financial resources from central to local government and in the budget passed in July 2007 Parliament approved Tshs216 billion ($193.5 million, or almost $8 per capital). We are now doing the same exercise in a further eight Ministries and will eventually assess the rest.

5.9 Therefore, when we talk of Ministers responsible for decentralisation, we have to start thinking that ALL Ministers have important roles and
responsibilities for devolution. This is a view we have taken at other conferences with similar themes. It is also something we are cogniscant of when following the Aberdeen Agenda and Auckland Accord under the Commonwealth framework.

5.10 The quality of our financial management systems are checked in several ways. Centrally we have public expenditure reviews, and locally we have seen a mushrooming of civil society organizations mobilizing Public Expenditure Tracking Systems (PETS), to ‘follow the money’. The approach was first seen in Uganda and we have learned about success factors from there. Their success does benefit from a strong working relationship with the Councillors and Council staff, and their collaboration with civil society. They are not audits or inspections, but useful checks on transparency and accountability. They will also help LGAs advocating for where improvements can be made in the public financial management system. Some PETS revealed that problems in LGAs are caused or exacerbated by late transfers of funds from central government, or complicated fund transfer and account management systems.

5.11 A key part of fiscal decentralisation has been improving staff capacity in financial management, particularly in use of the IFMS and audit. We have also tried to train all staff at lower levels. Earlier we mentioned the number of administrative and governance units we have below the
council. This means we have to have a system of training and refresher training, and the financial resources, for roughly 14,000 staff at that level. Their capacity is going to be critical for us to succeed with further decentralisation, in line with the principle of subsidiarity.

(iii) Administrative Decentralisation

5.12 The Local Government Laws in place give a clear framework for local authorities to operate and where their responsibilities and discretion lie. We have been monitoring the legal framework since we began Decentralisation by Devolution, and we know where improvements are needed, e.g. to enshrine accountability responsibilities that may otherwise be vague or unstated. We also know that there is more to do to harmonise legislation to embed principles of Decentralisation by Devolution.

5.13 Local governments are now able to promulgate their own by laws to operationalise national policies and legal frameworks, in line with local needs. The time taken from them to do this has been reduced significantly as a result of the reforms. Central government has to keep pace. Meanwhile the quality of the by laws has improved, helped by the installation of a by law database available to all LGAs, Regional Secretariats and central government, to review by laws.
5.14 Restructuring has been completed in the majority of the local authorities and we expect the remainder to be complete by the end of the Medium Term Plan. Those that were in phase one are now reviewing and updating their original strategic plans, and most are continuing to use their CRTs. The first batch of restructuring identified 500 posts surplus to requirements. The final batch of 24 LGAs has identified the following improvements:

- a reduction of 67 departments across the LGAs, from 253 to 186;
- slimming 155 sections, from 756 to 601; and
- savings of Ths51 million (approximately $45,000) per month; that is over half a million dollars per annum (approximately $537,000).

5.15 Human resource autonomy still has some way to go. We would like to see some changes to the existing Public Service Act to support LG autonomy and this is a matter that requires Cabinet colleagues to support devolution, not just me as the Minister in charge.

5.16 We are faced with staffing shortages at all levels. At the same time we want to improve the diversity in the local government service, and LGAs are dealing with HIV/AIDS in the workplace and supporting home based care in many cases. The intention was that councils could use savings from restructuring and staff redeployment at their discretion but that

---

argument has not yet been won at central level, in view of constraints in the budget for personnel emoluments across the service.

5.17 LGAs have however, taken on full responsibility for recruitment, employment, and development, through local employment boards and discretionary capacity building grants (part of the LGCDG system). LGAs are now also employing executive officers at all lower levels.

5.18 We are serious about devolution and the principle of subsidiarity. We have therefore started to devolve more resources to lower levels, for development in line with locally produced plans. We have a participatory planning process that is truly bottom up, known as Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O&OD). These plans are incorporated in the overall Council plans submitted to Ministry of Finance each year. It is safe to say that the next period of reforms, that will succeed this Medium Term Plan, we will be paying a lot of attention to the lower levels.

5.19 So far we have invested over Tshs16.6 billion ($14million) on training. That training has been for elected leaders, council directors and staff, change management, critical skills such as record keeping. More than half of the training money has been used for training at lower local government levels. And, the budget has also been split almost 50-50 between political leaders and technical staff. We are not saying this is a right or wrong way to invest the resources across the different groups. We are just sharing information on how our training has been conducted,
in line with needs that have been identified during implementation so far. Obviously different countries have different numbers of leadership positions, both elected and in management positions, and different governance structures.

5.20 One thing I can say is the need for continuous capacity building opportunities for leaders. It is ten years since our Policy was launched; we are in our third government since then; many local and central leaders and civil servants have moved on. We cannot take capacity of successors for granted.

5.21 We have also invested in developing our management systems. We have started using information technology to support planning, monitoring and reporting for LGAs. We realized very early that LGAs were being asked to collect different data for different people or Ministries, without any coordination. This duplication was wasting resources, and a lot of the data was not even being used. We have streamlined the monitoring systems accordingly but we are still grappling with getting complete data on a timely basis.

5.22 So, what is all the outcome of all these interventions at local level, i.e. restructuring, systems, autonomy, training, etc.? We can say that service delivery data is showing improvements. Enrolment in primary education is up, transition rates to secondary education have increased. Citizen surveys are also telling us there is a general increase in satisfaction with
services provided by local governments. An independent evaluation in 2007 also concluded that LGRP has facilitated improvements in health services. But we are still not reaching the national targets, which will take us to attaining the Millenium Development Goals.

(iv) Changed central-local relations

5.23 I have touched on the changed role of central ministries, to proving policy support and support on capacity building and monitoring. I also noted that even after some years of implementation we find that there are more functions of Ministries to be devolved. This will be done based on the principle of subsidiarity and with LGA capacity to take on those responsibilities, whether in terms of staff or funding.

5.24 In terms of governance we have some good news and some not so good news stories to tell. We believe, through surveys and other sources, that ethics and integrity have improved and corruption reduced. We already have reached 30% female representation in government, through special seats. We have also reached 30% of Local Authorities having female Directors, and my own Ministry (PMO-RALG) has 30% female Directors. However, we are not getting the same proportion of female applicants for new jobs yet. We need these and will develop new recruits to ensure the public service reflects society.

5.25 Our LGAs are performing strongly in upward accountability. Some are active in downward accountability, some are not so active. We already
have fora such as Village Assemblies and Full Council meetings open to the public. LGAs are required to post information on financial receipts and expenditures. We are developing a framework for downward accountability to help LGAs go forward in this area. This is essential for democratization, transparency and participation, and to combat corruption. Corruption is still a burning issue. The Government recently launched the second phase National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan (NACSAP II), which includes all LGAs. While NACSAP is a separate programme we will continue to focus our concentration on improving routine business processes and their transparency at all levels, e.g. land allocation, procurement.

(v) **Poverty Reduction**

5.26 Poverty in Tanzania has been measured through a number of data sets since LGRP was commenced. These have been Household Budget Surveys, Education and Health Information Systems, and data collected through our Local Government Monitoring Database. We can claim that, in general, livelihoods have improved. However, this is not a uniform trend across the country or within rural or urban settings. Further some service delivery has improved but we are yet to see the impact in all social measures, e.g. maternal health or child mortality.

6.0 **Conclusion**
6.1 I have mentioned some of the challenges of implementation already. I want to add one or two more before I conclude my presentation regarding the experiences of Tanzania in implementing decentralisation by devolution.

6.2 First, we have introduced devolution into a public service that has not operated in this way before. The civil servants were educated and had careers in a service that was more centralized with little local discretion and performance assessment. We, therefore, have to re-orient people to help them to do their jobs differently. I am pleased to say that we are now also working with education institutions to make sure curricula, and teaching, reflect the new ways of working in government. For example, at the beginning what did our staff know about local economic development and outsourcing?

6.3 Second, with economic development the public service is no longer the major employer in the country. We are competing with private companies, whose revenues often enable them to pay employees better rates than the government can afford. Nevertheless we hope that, with improved revenues and autonomy, LGAs will be able to attract and retain competent staff.

6.4 Third, when we started we had a small civil society ‘sector’ in Tanzania and most organizations were involved in service delivery. Civil society has
developed quite rapidly and organizations are knocking on our doors to participate nationally and locally, and they pioneering independent monitoring systems. We need to make time and space to work with them, on top of the traditional Ministry and LGA tasks. This is something for us to factor in when we review our organization structures and our staff competences as we go along.

6.5 Fourth, one of our strategies has been participation in the reforms, in their design, in implementation and in monitoring. Participation has been about including government colleagues, the umbrella organisation ALAT, and civil society. This is an important process for transparent and accountable government to have quality strategies. However, it is also time consuming and can be costly in terms of time and money. It is certain that we underestimated the impact in the early days of implementation.

6.6 I have already said that we are formulating the implementation strategies for Decentralisation by Devolution for the next five years, in our LGRP II. All these challenges are being taken into account. I can share with you that this formulation is going to take account of the paramount roles of other Ministries for decentralisation to be effective. I say again that decentralisation is the responsibility of my Ministerial colleagues, almost as much as it is my responsibility.
6.7 We have also included leadership capacity building interventions at central and local levels to support devolution and new ways of public sector management. Management and implementation will be a challenge. We have a large country and my most of my ministerial colleagues are tasked with their respective reforms. We need to show how devolution is strongly linked to their effectiveness too.

6.8 I look forward to hearing the challenges and implementation experience from other countries during this Conference. These will also give us a lot of valuable issues to think about during our Formulation of a new programme to carry forward the implementation of Decentralisation by Devolution.

6.9 Thank you for your attention.