



The World Bank Group

**Monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategies:
*Leadership, Budget Links, and the Role of Communication***

**Cape Town, South Africa
June 21 – 22, 2007**

Executive Summary

The World Bank's Development Communication Division (DevComm), External Affairs, in partnership with the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network Africa Region, held a workshop entitled "Monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategies: Leadership, Budget Links, and the Role of Communication" in Cape Town, South Africa in June 2007. Participants included government officials and technical specialists involved in PRS monitoring, communication, policy and budgeting issues. During the discussions, they shared evidence of what they had found to be successful and unsuccessful in their work, and the challenges they still faced. The workshop encouraged peer-to-peer learning through six facilitated discussions. The main findings are listed under each discussion topic below.

1. Securing Political Will for Monitoring and Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategies

- Establish a communication infrastructure for coordination among government institutions, taking into account accountability relationships and each institution/agency's mandate.
- Strengthen inadequate evaluative cultures within governments. Determine who questions performance, and what the incentives or rewards are for good performance.
- Enhance external accountability by communicating information broadly, i.e., beyond government boundaries and into the public arena.
- Develop communication strategies so that both politicians and members of the public will better understand the purposes of M&E in clear and accessible language.
- Establish simple M&E frameworks to monitor service delivery and communicate results in ways understandable to the broader public so that they can demand better services.
- The importance of simplicity and clarity of messages disseminated at the right time is critical.

2. Linking PRS and Budgets for Domestic Accountability – Lessons from Africa

- Balance budgetary targets and policy priorities by organizing budgets based on sectoral concerns.
- Build technical capacity for government agencies to work collaboratively.
- Cultivate understanding of "budgets as politics", i.e., policymakers must deem the PRS as politically relevant.

- Mechanisms that link PRS and budgets should be implemented gradually, with the objective of strengthening pre-existing processes.

3. Tools for Linking Planning and Budgeting Processes

- Enhance coordination between budgeting and finance through the following tools: 1) *Performance Budgeting*; 2) *Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF)*; and 3) practical and adaptable communication solutions.
- Consider political, diplomatic, and technical dimensions of PRSPs (not just technical aspects) when designing tools, processes and instruments that link budgeting and finance.
- Sell the PRS to politicians before implementation starts by taking seriously their prioritization of policies and budgeting. In addition to M&E results, provide politicians with contextual information to help them tell success stories.

4. Information Flows: Promoting Transparency in Policy and Resource Allocation Decisions on PRS Monitoring

- Harness multiple government and public communication processes to support the PRSP in engaging democratic influences across government.
- Communication should be viewed as an integrated activity in governance processes, not merely as a crisis management activity.
- Encourage and enable citizens to participate in all stages of project and program cycles, including implementation and evaluation.
- Cultivate a culture of sharing information and enhance understanding of the role of communication within governance systems.

5. Institutionalizing and Building Communication Capacity for Better PRS Monitoring and Policy-Budget Linkages

- Provide government service consumers with high-quality and up-to-date information.
- Communication must be seen as a distinct sector, of equal substance and standing as other sectors.
- Decentralize communication initiatives by shifting focus from national to local government units.

6. Brainstorming and Action Steps

- The practical thrust of communication capacity building and training is to help others communicate better, not to turn non-communication specialists into communication experts.
- Avoid parallel (i.e., redundant) communication structures within and among government ministries/agencies.
- Design and deploy M&E frameworks that include evidence of the success or failure of communication interventions to build a knowledge base of good practices and areas for improvement.
- People should avoid communicating about policy areas in which they lack knowledge and expertise.
- Collaborate with “technocratic popularizers”, “professional popularizers”, or “information popularizers” -- technocrats who have the ability to translate jargon into terms understandable to non-specialist audiences and improve the quality of public debate.

Introduction

Policymakers and development practitioners have been giving increased attention to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of poverty reduction strategies. A number of common challenges in this area have been identified in studies and reports, including the World Bank/IMF five year review of PRSPs, the World Bank publications *With the Support of Multitudes: Using Strategic Communication to Fight Poverty through PRSPs*, and *Beyond the Numbers: The Institutional Dimensions of PRS Monitoring Systems*.

Efforts to deepen understanding of issues and concerns related to M&E of PRSP's have been carried out by multi- and bilateral institutions and their development partners. Chief among the challenges identified is navigation of the political economy, i.e., the "real world" conditions that often undermine the technical and institutional design of M&E initiatives. These conditions include the following factors: territoriality among public sector agencies combined with lack of incentives to participate; low demand among policymakers for monitoring information; and the inadequate design of M&E systems.

A seminar held in Tunis in December 2006 convened government officials involved in PRS monitoring and evaluation in several African countries. The participants agreed that the primary constraint in implementing PRS M&E was seen as "lack of adequate political will/leadership to support M&E". During a learning event attended by development practitioners and academic experts in Washington, D.C. in May 2007, it was also found that systematic communication interventions are essential to the generation of political will.

In order to deepen understanding of the above-stated findings, The World Bank's Development Communication Division (DevComm), External Affairs, in partnership with the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network Africa Region, held a workshop in Cape Town, South Africa in June 2007. Participants included government officials and technical specialists involved in PRS monitoring, communication, policy, and budgeting issues. During the discussions, they shared evidence of what they had found to be successful and unsuccessful in their work, and the challenges they still faced. The workshop encouraged peer-to-peer learning through facilitated discussions, the record of which is distilled and summarized in this report.

The ideas, insights, and good practices gleaned from the workshop will serve as a basis for advocacy work with policy makers and development organizations and are also meant to aid reformers around the world through the creation of training and capacity-building programs. The event sought answers to key questions under the following three main themes (broken down into 5 discussion sessions and a concluding session):

1st Theme: Securing Political Will for Monitoring and Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategies (session 1)

- What are the best methods for reaching out to political leaders, policy makers, and legislators?
- What communication tools/frameworks have been proven to be effective?
- What is needed to institutionalize and build capacity for this work?

2nd Theme: Linking Policies with Resources (sessions 2 and 3)

- How do we ensure that sufficient budget allocations are made to support PRS monitoring systems?
- How can we strengthen demand for accountability in this area?
- What communication tools/frameworks have proven to be effective?
- What is needed to institutionalize and build capacity for this work?

3rd Theme: Effective Communication and Information Structures and Processes (sessions 4 and 5)

- How can information be utilized to ensure transparency and accountability in monitoring systems for PRSP or similar national development plans?
- What communication tools/frameworks have proven to be effective?
- What is needed to institutionalize and build communication capacity for better poverty monitoring and policy-budget linkages?

Session I – Securing Political Will for Monitoring and Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategies¹

Securing political will requires the following: identifying good practices for reaching out to political leaders, policy makers and legislators; finding approaches to strengthen demand (both within and outside governments) for accountability on M&E of Poverty Reduction Strategies; identifying tools/frameworks that have been proven to be effective; and institutionalizing and building capacity for this work. The distinction between political will and public will was emphasized, as public will is required to put pressure on leaders and to sustain political will.

The Nigerian experience demonstrates that with political will, champions can be identified within the bureaucracy. After a recently reformed *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)*, the MDGs office, with the President's support, assumed leadership of the effort for a unified M&E system across the government. Although political will has been displayed at the federal level, securing buy-in from the many different politically independent states, policy and program coordination has proven to be an enormous challenge. In terms of demand, M&E is increasingly recognized by the Parliament as an oversight tool. Moreover, NGOs have expressed increased demand for participation in the process. Nonetheless, the majority of the work is done at the federal level. Other institutional issues include overlapping mandates and disjointed M&E initiatives across government.

¹ Session Chair: **Sina Odugbemi**, *Development Communication Division, The World Bank*; Presenters: **Lawal Aboki**, *Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President, Nigeria*, **Peter Ssentongo**, *Office of the Prime Minister, Coordination and Monitoring Department, Uganda*, and **Nigel Thornton**, *Agulhas*

For PRSPs to be effective, accountability relationships must be understood and recognized. The political economy of institutions is a concern, as each institution has a mandate they wish to implement. However, the desired results can not be achieved by one agency alone. In order to establish a coordinated effort among government institutions, a communication infrastructure is necessary. Also, incentives must be codified in a policy framework that encourages optimal performance and results. In addition, results must be publicly communicated and open to feedback and criticism. More emphasis needs to be placed on the demand for information, as there is a tendency to over invest in the supply side.

The lack of evaluative cultures within governments is another challenge. Who questions performance, and what are the incentives or rewards for good performance? Why should politicians care? Politicians who are populists are more concerned about data that will meet their political needs. However, it is not the creation of data itself that is most important, but the stories and their meaning. The best way to communicate and put pressure on politicians is not through the line ministry, but outside the government for external accountability. Also, information communicated broadly, i.e., beyond government boundaries, places pressure on the government.

Emphasis should be placed on capacity building and developing communication strategies for M&E, so that politicians and the public will better understand its purpose. Simple M&E frameworks to monitor service delivery need to be in put in place and communicated in ways understandable to stakeholders. Communication is necessary so that potential clients or consumers are not only aware of services, but can also demand these services and provide immediate feedback. In Rwanda, local governments have an open house once a month for citizens to meet with officials, ask questions, and provide feedback to hold government contractors accountable for failed service delivery.

Unnecessary duplication and creation of parallel structures within governments should also be addressed. The importance of simplicity and clarity of messages disseminated at the right time is critical; communication should be simple, clear, and made as public as possible, which will create public pressure to create political will. Finally frameworks of accountability should be established internally for government officials, and externally for the parliament, civil society, media, and communities. An efficient, information-rich environment supports the creation of political will.

Session II – Linking PRS and Budgets for Domestic Accountability – Lessons from Africa²

Creating and strengthening linkages between PRS and budgets requires shared ownership and coordination among relevant ministries and agencies, primarily those responsible for finance and economic planning. In Rwanda, for example, the budgeting framework is linked to longer term investment programs. Achieving a sense of shared ownership requires taking stock of political realities that shape policymaking processes.

² Session Chair: **Laban Mbulamuko**, *Budget, Policy, & Evaluation Department, Uganda*; Presenters: **Vera Wilhelm**, *The World Bank* and **Tim Williamson**, *Overseas Development Institute (ODI)*.

Understanding these processes will assist in identifying opportunities for and limitations in creating linkages. Coordination among ministries and agencies is contingent on the adoption of communication tools and good practices.

One key challenge that underscores the need for linkages is the fragmentation of processes. The PRS is usually under the supervision of the planning ministry while the budget is under the purview of the finance ministry. This has resulted in the proliferation of redundant and/or disjointed policies, poor budget execution, and the lack of evidence-based decision-making.

The contested ownership of what should be linked budgetary and planning processes weakens domestic accountability. Without a clear link to planning, there is a tendency to overstretch the roles of budgets as policy instruments. In contrast, taking stock of linkages will show that there are other complementary avenues for crafting, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating government policies. Moreover, an inordinate focus on budgets overemphasizes the scarcity of resources and gives short shrift to consideration of policy priorities.

Solutions should revolve around finding ways to readjust budgetary targets while preserving policy priorities. One way to do this is to organize budgets based on functional classifications, i.e., budgets should be policy oriented and segmented based on sectoral concerns. Administrative frameworks should be adopted that enable division of budget across agencies and sectoral interests.

Technical capacity should be built toward this goal and a shift in organizational culture from stovepiping (lack of coordination among agencies) to collaboration should be cultivated. Reporting mechanisms that foster collaborative relationships among government agencies should be adopted. For this to work, incentives for planning and budget integration can be created by linking performance reporting requirements to decision making processes. Policy should be built from budgets up, taking account of PRS priorities from the beginning of the budgetary cycle.

All of these solutions are contingent on understanding “budgets as politics”, i.e., policymakers must deem the PRS as politically relevant. For wider political buy-in, simple language should be used whenever appropriate and feasible. Also, gaining political support is more likely when linkages between PRS and budgets serve to strengthen and harmonize existing processes through a gradual approach. However, supporters of planning-budgeting linkages should consider whether the gradual approach is appropriate in specific instances. There may be occasions when larger scale fast-track change is required.

Regardless of whether gradual or fast-track change is pursued, it is important to remain cognizant of the view that technical fixes are insufficient and parallel communication and governance processes are inefficient. Although planning and budgeting are highly technical activities, these processes should not be captured by technocrats, but should include non-specialists who have real-world experience.

From a normative perspective, these processes should be politically owned because in democratic contexts, politics should have built-in accountability mechanisms. Efforts at fostering and strengthening linkages must engage political and economic realities, and gain support from various levels of government leadership and bureaucracy.

Session III – Tools for Linking Planning and Budgeting Processes³

What tools/frameworks have proven to be effective for linking planning and budgeting processes? What is needed to institutionalize and build capacity for this work?

When coordination is poor between budgeting and finance, the targets and projects of the Ministry of Economic Planning are often unrealistic, and budget allocations fall back to being based on historical precedent rather than on policy priorities. Potential solutions include the following: 1) *Performance Budgeting* diminishes repetitive budgeting and bases budget allocations on results, and 2) *Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF)* program budget allocations over a certain period of time to meet planning objectives.

The ability to identify options for achieving planning targets and reallocating from existing spending is a challenge for the planning ministry. In contrast, the budget office's challenge is encouraging allocative flexibility to improve budget preparation. Adopting communication interventions can aid in coordinating the tasks of the different ministries, i.e., by linking planning and budgeting. The challenge lies in conceptualizing and deploying communication solutions that are practical and adaptable to particular contexts. Standardization and normalization of processes should be pursued, and adopted methodologies should provide shared tools between Ministries of Planning and Finance. These processes should be institutionalized and promoted through the use of political will.

In Albania, an Integrated Planning System (IPS) has been initiated, which links policy, strategy, operations, and resources. The phased implementation strategy linking these factors begins from the top-down, i.e., from policy to budgeting, but then continues with a bottom-up approach (e.g., operational choices), which revolves around selecting feasible and affordable policy implementation options. The IPS has not yet completed a full cycle, but an accountability test will be carried out in 2008.

Performance measures on the political level include program policy goals and objectives, and on the technical level, program outputs, activities, and inputs. It is important to be clear on responsibilities and accountability which are, in this case, distributed among ministers, program managers and staff, the General Secretary, etc. Furthermore, institutional arrangements include various committees, sector working groups, and groups for strategy budgeting and integration. Although communication is a key element in establishing and sustaining these arrangements, the question remains: What types of communication are required at which levels?

³ Session Chair: **Vera Wilhelm**, *The World Bank*; Presenters: **Geoff Dixon**, *Overseas Development Institute (ODI)*, and **Simon Stone**, *Independent Consultant for Economic Policy Implementation & Management*.

The tools and processes are technically driven, which raises the question of demand, and how civil society influences these processes. The political, diplomatic, and technical dimensions of PRSPs should be taken into consideration when designing tools, processes and instruments. Political commitment is necessary for cooperation within government. Also, because prioritization among development partners varies, politicians' involvement is required.

Problems are usually mitigated when a system involves politicians with prioritization of policies and budgeting. However, to secure commitment from politicians, you need to sell the PRS before implementation commences. M&E should not stop at technical culling and analyzing technical data. There needs to be an emphasis on providing contextual information that helps politicians tell success stories.

Accountability relationships must be understood, and the meaning behind holding a minister accountable should be clarified. Furthermore, the role of parliament should be defined – is it planning or oversight? Capacity building is needed to better understand the tools and processes involved for linking budgeting and planning, both within the government and outside to create demand. Lastly, if investments are made in data collection but the information gleaned is not distributed, M&E initiatives are suboptimal at best.

IV. Information Flows: Promoting Transparency in Policy and Resource Allocation Decisions on PRS Monitoring⁴

How can information be utilized to ensure transparency and accountability in monitoring systems for PRSP or similar national development plans? What communication tools/frameworks have been proven to be effective? What is needed to institutionalize and build capacity on communication for better poverty monitoring and policy-budget linkages?

The PRSP process today is facing difficulties in engaging democratic influences across government, as well as effectively harnessing multiple communication processes across government and in the public arena. In the political sphere, the challenge is attaining commitment of both governments and opposition parties to development goals, and involving Parliament more in M&E, as well as increasing the level of media coverage and commentary on development goals. Across government agencies, there is the challenge of enhancing ownership, gaining the support of different agencies toward a common set of policies, strengthening vertical accountability, and linking PRSPs, sectoral policies and resource allocation mechanisms.

Communication between the public and the government is essential for the latter to do its job effectively. Information on results of development projects and programs should

⁴ Session Chair: **Paul Mitchell**, *Development Communication Division, The World Bank*; Presenters: **Nigel Thornton & Marcus Cox**, *Agulhas, Waheeda Samji, Aga Khan Education Services, Tanzania*, and **Ntabadde Justine Catherine**, *Communication Officer, Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda*

be disseminated in a meaningful manner to civil society, who should also be involved in M&E processes and in local resource allocation. Relevant communication-based initiatives include: 1) informing citizens about what the government is doing and finding out what their opinions are; 2) illuminating the mechanisms of government and laying them bare to external scrutiny, and 3) involving citizens in governance.

In Tanzania and Uganda, limited budget and understanding of communication are the main constraints for effective implementation of PRSPs. Communication is often seen as a crisis management activity or as inadvertently raising expectations among the public. Additional communication challenges related to M&E in Uganda include the following: bureaucratic red tape in approving documents; lengthy reports cast in technical language; difficulty accessing public information; and the media's limited skill and interest in covering PRS performance. Also, in Tanzania, access to information remains a challenge across the board; within government, in the public realm, and in the private sector.

While the majority of the public is at least aware of policies, there are no interventions to enhance understanding of policy implications, and little is done for uninformed members of mass audiences. While there is an increased focus on domestic accountability, there is no role for the private sector to engage in policy dialogue or budget monitoring. Finally, the links between PRS and budgets are based on resources allocation and not on M&E.

M&E initiatives should not only be carried out with donor interests in mind, but should cater to a variety of audiences. In Tanzania, donors are viewed as dominant in the development scene and have little will to share information. Civil society is recognized as contributing to the national development processes, however it is marginalized by donors who fund large portions of the budget. Citizens should be active at all stages of the project, including implementation and evaluation. For this, messages need to convey how citizens can take advantage of opportunities available for participation.

There needs to be a change in culture of sharing information. Uganda's approach to sharing of information has enabled the demand for information regarding government processes. However, frustrations arise from a lack of transparency and a rigid bureaucracy. The government refuses to recognize the demand for information on performance, presumably due to the attendant difficulties of competing in a free information market. The main issue is that governments have not systematically defined communication; they think it is selling a product rather than two-way processes between government and its constituents. Therefore, there needs to be a better understanding of communication's role within governance systems.

Another problem is poor communication between ministers and government agencies. There is a need to create functional communication lines across these agencies. Communication blockages need to be removed for reporting, sharing, and feedback to occur. There needs to be a systematic process of reporting and information sharing in place.

Communication is particularly critical when people cannot be coerced and voluntary compliance is required. It is crucial to use communication effectively in an environment of contention, which is also ripe for change. Finally, as communication technologies and contexts change, government communication needs to change.

Session V – Institutionalizing and Building Communication Capacity for Better PRS Monitoring and Policy-Budget Linkages⁵

How can communication strengthen linkages between planning and budgeting processes? Communication with parliament, the private sector, and traditional authority are seen as essential to successful planning and implementation. Building the capacity of the public is also deemed important—citizens should have access to accurate and up-to-date information in order to participate meaningfully in the work of governance.

In Ghana, for example, the PRS has been effectively used as an entry point for mainstreaming multi-stakeholder communication flows. Cross-sectoral information sharing was legally mandated, i.e., the law requires a decentralized and participatory planning approach. As a result of the law's adoption, the national development framework is now crafted by cross-sectoral planning groups, which include both governmental and non-governmental entities. Moreover, government spokespersons are appointed by sector and are able to speak to the country's PRS because these people have been given the political space to do so.

Despite the successful integration of communication in linking PRS and budgets in a few contexts, this is not the case in most countries. It is rare for a country to have a widely shared sense of ownership of the PRS and budgetary processes. Corollary concerns to this lack of ownership include the following: Why is the planning and budgetary environment not perceived to be open? Why is the supply side of information weak compared to the demand side?

In Mali, for instance, at the end of the first stage PRS, a large majority of people did not know that a strategic framework to fight poverty existed. Many people believed the strategy was imposed by the IMF and the government. That most PRS-related documents were available only in French served to exacerbate erroneous perceptions. Furthermore, a large percentage of the population is illiterate, so access to printed communication was restricted.

A few events were covered by the press, but that was the extent of public communication regarding the PRS. Also, most ministers did not have communication strategies in place and were not able to provide financing to communication-related activities. Having learned from these experiences, the government of Mali created a coordinating mechanism for technical and financial matters. In addition, spokespersons for the government were also made spokespersons for strategic poverty reduction initiatives.

Solutions to these problems include increasing communicative skill levels of both individuals and governments. A good place to start is taking the point of view of users, i.e., provide users of government services with information and, more generally, improve

⁵ Session Chair: Masud Mozammel, *Development Communication Division, The World Bank*; Presenters: **Kafu Kofi Tsikata**, *Ghana Office, The World Bank*, **Yacouba Doumbia**, *Poverty Reduction Department, Mali*, **Paul Mitchell**, *Development Communication Division, The World Bank*.

public access to information. In order to achieve this, communication must be seen as a sector, having equal substance and standing in comparison to other sectors.

Communication initiatives should be decentralized because government must function beyond the capital. The widespread adoption of communication processes and solutions is integral to good governance. In order for poverty reduction strategies to work, the population needs to know what services are available. However, there are no generally accepted procedures for measuring the success of communication efforts. In contrast, it is relatively easy to count the number of kilometers of road built and the number of children in schools. There is a need, therefore, for an agreed upon M&E framework to build an evidence base for communication initiatives.

Concluding Session – Brainstorming and Action Steps⁶

Guided by the insight that politics determine outcomes in the areas of planning and budgeting, what practical mechanisms can address the problem of disjointed PRS and budgeting processes? Solutions include the following: the need to ensure that information is reliable and of high quality; cross-government communication capacity building and training; M&E frameworks to build an evidence base for communication interventions; communication training for specialists from various substantive areas; and the need to collaborate with technocrats who have the capacity to effectively communicate with non-specialists, the media, and mass audiences.

First, priority must be placed on the quality and reliability of information communicated. Also, communication should not revolve exclusively around positive news. When possible and appropriate, local languages should be used and technical information should be stated in simple terms.

Second, communication capacity building and training is needed across government ministries and agencies. The practical goal is to help others communicate better, not to turn non-communication specialists into communication experts. In addition, parallel (i.e., redundant) communication structures within ministries should be avoided. Rather, communication should be an integrated activity throughout government. Areas should be identified where development communication fits within governmental work cycles.

The communication capacities of top decision makers in government should be developed, especially in the ministries of planning and finance. High level officials should possess basic ideas of how they can communicate effectively with civil society and the larger public. Such training should also be available to civil society leaders. If civil society leaders perceive enhanced transparency and accountability in governance through effective communication mechanisms, they will be more open to engaging in the political process. Clear communication channels between government and civil society will lead to productive uses of information, avoiding abuse on either side.

⁶ Session Chair: **Sina Odugbemi**, *Development Communication Division, The World Bank.*

Third, there is a need to design and deploy M&E frameworks that display evidence of the success or failure of communication interventions. These frameworks will enable the building of a knowledge base of good practices and areas for improvement. Much can be learned from the ways in which the private sector evaluates communication efforts. The challenge is to make information valuable to decision making processes at various levels of governance. Information and communication should be collected, used, and managed at the country, provincial, and district levels, as well as across levels of government.

Fourth, people should avoid communicating about areas in which they lack knowledge and expertise. To paraphrase one of the dialogue participants, communication is so important that it should not be left to communication specialists alone. Area experts should be trained in communication. No single profession has the capacity to communicate about all substantive areas.

Fifth, technocrats who have the ability to translate jargon into terms understandable to mass and non-specialist audiences have essential roles to play in development communication. These “technocratic popularizers”, “professional popularizers”, or “information popularizers” can explain complicated issues from budgeting and planning processes to the latest advances in economics and medicine to wide audiences and increase the quality of public debate.

These popularizers may hail from civil society, the private sector, or the public sector, and are sometimes ex-civil servants. They drive the market of information by dealing effectively with the media and the public by getting messages out in widely accessible language. The work of strengthening communication processes in areas of governance rigidly ruled by highly technical policies and procedures will be enhanced by cultivating a community of practice among these popularizers, who are perhaps most strategically situated agents of change.

**Monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategies:
Leadership, Budget Links & the Role of Communication
21–22 June, 2007 - Cape Town, South Africa**

Participants' Response Cards and Feedback

Session 1: Securing Political Will for Monitoring and Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategies

- 1. The PRSP translates the political will of the government. The solution is to change the mentality of the stakeholders especially of the politicians the technocrats towards a culture of efficiency and results. The mission requires three things: Communication of information, capacity building, and democratization of the strategy. 2. To guarantee the success of the strategies to be executed, there must be rules that address the issues in the strategies. 3. Put in place an organizational structure and a coherent execution plan (centralized and decentralized) that correspond to national policies.
- 1. To make communities demand services from the politicians and this should be quite clear. 2. To put it differently – to make the politicians accountable so that they are interested in monitoring. 3. Political competition will make politicians accountable so as much as possible encourage political competition. 4. Empower independent monitors to report or to monitor – NGOs, think tanks, research institutions, and the media and let governments use them as partners. In most cases these bodies act as opponents (e.g., voice of the voiceless) while government challenges them as having been given the mandate.
- 1. Find out what stories politicians need or want to hear in order to better establish their priorities related to PRSPs. 2. Have IFIs and donors withdraw from the process; governments should drive the process while donors build the capacities of countries. 3. Show politicians and policymakers how M&E provides the technical basis to collect information that supports their priorities.
- Build capacity of communication and information aspects of M&E for promoting simplicity. Institutionalize the sharing of info coming out of M&E processes. Engage politicians/policy and decision makers in M&E systems
- Need simple frameworks that can be understood by all stakeholders. M&E information should be seen to aid service delivery. Only then can political will be achieved.
- 1. We need a simplified M&E framework which politicians can understand because M&E tends to be too technical. 2. Capacity Building for political leaders so that they know the purposes of M&E of PRS. They should not think about M&E at the time of elections. 3. The technocrats should endeavor to provide the

data on M&E to the political leaders because sometimes the leaders are ignorant of the M&E processes because they are not well informed.

- 1. Basic principle: Tailor what to do on a case by case basis, as situations are very different.
- 2. General areas on what to do (five areas):
 - (1) Political will: have government report to Parliament on PRS implementation based on well developed quantitative and qualitative tools.
 - (2) Public will: enhance capacity building of NGOs and the populations on the PRS process, tools and needs for M&E.
 - (3) Technical will: develop adequate tools for M&E. Simple and friendly language should be used, so as not to be intimidating to the public. Work with media.
 - (4) Public administration will: reform classical administration from projects administration to strategies and program administration, to make them M&E agents.
- Information needs to be interpreted – made into simple stories. Need an information-rich environment to support political will. Political will across levels of government is a major challenge.
- The poverty reduction strategy should be owned by the nation concerned and should not be seen as emanating from donors. All government institutions, politicians, civil society organizations, beneficiaries and stakeholders (donors) should participate in coming up with the PRS document. Implementation of that prepared PRS document will be in the interest of everyone, hence M&E. Since M&E is a new concept in Africa as a decision making tool, there is need first to sensitize politicians about the need for M&E as this will expose the successes they are registering in their constituencies as regards to development initiatives.
- 1. Ensure that the M&E system provides support to the accountability relationships that exist within any particular country. 2. Build simple M&E frameworks that all stakeholders can understand. 3. Government institutions should move beyond territoriality and ensure a smooth follow through to all stakeholders – within government and beyond, including NGOs and journalists.
- We must engage the outer framework of accountability in each country:
 - 1 – Parliamentary oversight
 - 2 - Mass media scrutiny
 - 3 – Engaged civil society
 - 4 – Communities themselvesWe should focus, therefore, on public will.
- Political will is often generated by a perception that a problem exists. Technocrats must be proactive in identifying the problems, and the solutions which allow politicians to appear proactive in addressing the problem. This may require line ministries to have greater ownership of issues in their sectors.

- Show how these PRS initiatives will be integrated in government management systems. Take account of political cycle. Stop talking about “will” and “capacity”. Instead, talk about “commitment” and “organizational competence”.
- Good communication skills should be put in place. There should be decentralization for ease of information flows. Reporting systems should be from top to bottom and from bottom to top with accountability of all -- especially for budget allocation
- From the onset of formulation / development of PRSs, the politicians should be involved to build consensus. As such, when it comes to M&E of PRSs they are fully aware and able to execute their roles. The information from reviews should be made available to stakeholders (feedback mechanism) as well as the stakeholders also giving inputs to the process.
- First, we have to choose the simple indicators to work with them in M&E of PRS, it means that these indicators have been chosen according to the reality of poverty, and we have to pursue the decentralization of political decisions.
- 1. Build political ownership of the policies embodied in the PRS – by ensuring policy formulation is political and engages the cabinet. 2. Build demand for the implementation of policies – for the legislative and the public (media, civil society, etc.). 3. M&E systems provide simple and understandable information. 4. Link M&E to decision making processes – cabinet and parliament – especially the budget.
- To improve work in this area it is necessary to involve all stakeholders, especially the media. The public and private media have to be financed so that they can publish stories about the PRS. The community media, especially radio and television, will help the community to understand what is going on concerning the PRS. In conclusion, policymakers and their development partners have to increase attention on the role of the media on the evaluation of the PRS.
- Securing political will entails that politicians are involved in the definition and understanding of the strategies for poverty reduction. It is important that the PRS does not only serve to improve socioeconomic transformation of the population but also political and financial accountability to the population as voters and taxpayers. It is therefore when the politicians and technocrats talk the same language that M&E will be seen as a useful tool for politicians and policy decision making processes in a given country. In addition, the output of M&E should be seen to be promoting synergies among all stakeholders.
- Politicians do take an instrumentalist view of M&E and communications. In both, the de jure and de facto scenarios, politicians and country systems can be very open. The problem is the lack of appreciation of M&E and communication as a governance issue by politicians, technocrats, civil society organizations, and with it, the capacity to deploy it for poverty reduction and development as a whole. Political will is therefore undermined by lack of capacity/understanding at the highest levels of decision-making and CSOs: CSOs can muddy the water by politicizing issues instead of promoting dialogue in support of transparency and

accountability. It is also dependent on technocratic will which may be translated into the premium placed on resources for M&E and communications even within item aid modalities (budget support). Lack of confidence in existing systems breeds the creation of parallel institutions: politicians want work results, and so build their own structures instead of investing in building the capacity of existing ones. Development partners often support fragmentation and creation of parallel institutions because they do not care to investigate the institutional landscape for M&E and communications in order to support a coherent national agenda.

- 1) Increase capacity building to solidify the capacity for the existence of a public will that increases quality of governance. 1a. Increase the public's capacity through information and education (communication through the use of national languages). 1b. Increase public accountability through reform (decentralization) of the government in order to give responsibility to other stakeholders by decentralizing. 2) Reinforce the budgetary process by making it more participatory and more focused on the resolution of sectoral problems
- Good communication between politicians and the public. Decentralize to the lowest possible level. Allow the program beneficiaries to express their desires. Allow them to plan in a bottom-up manner. Cultivate a spirit of innovation among the population.
- Strong monitoring and evaluation mechanisms; establish a good communication strategy.
- Meet the needs of the politicians. Politicians need results; they need an account of what has been done with the money allocated in the budgets. This means when coming up with plans, there is need to establish clear targets to be achieved. And when reporting, report on whether these targets have been met or not. Make the report simple and easy to understand. Report in a timely manner.
- Match products to audiences, Ensure analysis and capacity-building processes are in place. Gather some success stories on obtaining political will.
- 1. IDPs should engage more with subnational governments, especially where the federal/central government is already converted. 2. Community engagement in process will help dictate the M&E agenda for the political leadership. 3. Demonstrate utility of information generated; accessible/usable information.
- 1. PRSPs must be developed under the auspices of Ministries of Finance. 2. PRSP M&E must be developed jointly with budget M&E. 3. This will put meat on the tables of politicians who are interested in launching and showcasing good and successful projects and results. What is the model of ministerial structure in a PRSP and MDG era?
- 1. In donor dependent countries, donors need to put pressure on governments to be more strategic and assertive on information flows. 2. Use the information that is collected more effectively. 3. Make a definitive link that is understood between

M&E and budget processes. 4. Any communication initiative on M&E will need follow-up – it is not a one-off activity because information is dynamic.

Session 2: Linking PRS and Budgets for Domestic Accountability – Lessons from Africa

- 1. Link to political realities – budget must be linked to PRS → accountability will happen. 2. Recognize PRSP does not necessarily need budget support.
- Combine the Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Finance into a “Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning”.
- Develop a strong link between the two processes so that the PRS has its activities or strategies translated through the budget. Similarly, or in other words the budget should be aligned to activities in the PRS venue making it easier in terms of checks and balances for accountability and transparency.
- Provide budget process training for all involved. How can it be the case that in all governments there are senior managers who could not explain in a 30 minute presentation to their staff – the basic operation of their government’s PEM cycle?
- There should be some ownership, especially of the strategy. There should be some transparency in decision making. Decisions should be based on evidence. Budget should be executed in a more harmonized manner and there should be “priority spending.”
- Undertake comparative studies of detailed budget preparation processes to identify best practice.
- Domestic accountability means all should be able to account for the resources that are allocated to poverty reduction strategies to achieve this. All need to buy in to the strategies that are laid out. Budgets have to be aligned to the PRS even if there might be political interference. Donor support should be linked to the implementation of the PRS.
- 1. Interministerial Policy Committee: put in place a high- level interministerial committee to oversee the process of linking PRSP priorities with the budget: Planning Ministry, Finance Ministry, Economic Ministry and Budget Ministry. This committee should be coordinated by the Presidency of the Republic or the Prime Minister, Members of the Parliament will be included.
2. Interministerial Technical Committee: This is a structure that will include sectoral ministries to harmonize PRS strategies, priorities, and the budget. It serves as the technical adviser to the Interministerial Committee above. It should include civil society representatives.
3. At Provincial Level: Create a similar structure at the provincial level in a Federal system. Ultimately, the local level will also consider similar structures.

- We need to redefine accountability and make it truly mutual. Donor accountability should not only mean realizing funds on time! It must include accountability to the people. We tend to sideline the private sector in policy formulation. We have to place them in the equation – e.g., CSOs will say no PSP in water, but the private sector would argue differently. They must also be part of mutual accountability. CSOs must also be part of mutual accountability.
- 1. Reform should be based on what exists, promoting incremental change. 2. It is easier to work up from policy-oriented budget, than to budget from a PRSP which is not budget-oriented. 3. Reform should avoid creating parallel structures or contributing to fragmentation.
- We need to harmonize the political “manifesto” with PRSPs if political commitment is to be secured and politicians also own the agenda. Budgeting then becomes a process for identifying or phasing out these plans depending on prevailing realities.
- The PRS should be built around the politics of the day to make the budget relevant to poverty reduction.
- 1. Have well-financed sector investment plans. 2. Apply the available resources to the plans and determine how much of these plans that can be done every year and spread the expenditure over the required period to meet these plans. In the process, the plans are improved.
- Policies/strategies must be within the realm of the budgets. Budgeting is an iterative process in arriving at the targets to achieve policies.
- Get right information to right people to foster accountability.
- Budgets should be understood as the means/tool of translating the medium term plans (PRS) into reality. Resources that are allocated to poverty reduction activities should not be diverted to other expenditures such as statutory and statehood as is the case with many African countries. The formulation of a budget should be done in the consultative manner, i.e., involve different stakeholders to input in the budget.
- Explore further on whether the PRS needs to become a financed activity plan – could it be a budget guiding document as a policy only? Explore better use of many already in the sector budgets and whether they relate to PRS objectives. Maybe aiming too high to get more resources allocated?
- To improve work in this area, the following have to be done:
 1. Full involvement of stakeholders
 2. Involvement of academics/institutions
 3. Involvement of local NGOs
 4. Full involvement of Media (public and private sectors)
 5. Involvement of local media, such as community Radio and Television
 6. Transparency

- Need to set mechanism to ensure communication and information flows between budget preparation and policy planning processes. Strengthen communication within government institutions responsible for budget, policy planning, and ensuring accountability.
- 1. African governments should reduce donor dependence for PRS because they end up accounting to the donors and not to the citizens. 2. Ministries or sectors should include PRS budget in their budgets so that the sector budgets can be incorporated in the overall PRS strategy/budget. 3. A work plan for PRS should always be developed so that the activities are tagged to a cost; if the PRS plan is beyond the available resources, then adjustments can be made.
- We have to better understand how politics affect the allocation of resources in budgets. The PRS has to be politically owned otherwise the budget will not link up with it. It will be irrelevant. Politics shape everything. That's why communication is crucial.
- 1. Sustained enforcement of the criteria of funding of only those projects/programmes contained in the PRS and in the budget. 2. Engage all major stakeholders in the PRS process and then legislating discipline in the implementation through the annual budget; with clear sanctions for violations.
- Resource allocation to minority areas. Improving transparency and accountability through improved public financial management. Improving alignment of donor resources.
- Given that we have to maximize gains for technical, economic, operational, and political effectiveness, how do we make the whole government perform without boiling up the budget policy instrument?
- 1. Distribute a PRSP that is understandable. 2. The budget of the chosen program for implementation, derived out of the PRSP, has to be credible. This budget has to be realistic, grounded on the constraints of internal and external resources. A budget has already been approved, and the chosen PRSP program should not lead to revision of the previously approved budget. There must be synergy between the strategies. We need to know the cost of the strategies and the required budget. We also need to define the impact of external factors.
- 1. When planning, we need to keep budgetary constraints in mind. 2. Start by making a list of priorities
- 1. Make the adoption of the PRSP process more participatory: general public, national assembly, and other government institutions. 2) Harmonize programs through which institutions and political parties were elected and the PRSP. 3. Provide sectoral ministries with decision-making instruments such as the provision models and methods focusing on results. 4. Integrate the structures in charge of planning and budgeting. 5. Increase the transparency of external funds. 6. Evaluate the process each year and take into account the

recommendations. 7. Institutionalize the envelope process prior to the start of the budgeting process.

- 1. Improve the way the budget is allocated (this means: use the budget on the priority areas) 2. Develop a budget for each program. 3. Avoid wish lists when planning.
- 1. Planning and budgeting, two interdependent tasks in the budgeting process; they have to have government approval because they have to be in line with the government's annual strategy. 2. "Executive" tasks and "legislative" tasks should not be confounded whereby PRS strategies serve as references of these two instances (legislative-executive). 3. The executive reports to the legislative in the execution of the budget in a systematic way. La loi de reglement (the law) constitute a type of document presented by the government
- The integration of planning and budgeting is indispensable for the success of the implementation of the PRSP in a country. It is important to ensure that specialists of all the countries involved in the PRS process communicate on this issue in order to find solutions to the roadblocks that present themselves. Politicians have an important role in this integration.

Session 3 – Tools for Linking Planning and Budgeting Processes

- 1. Political leaders should have an understanding of the need for linking up planning and budgeting. 2. Political leaders should understand the relevance of the PRS and thus could easily defend the linkage of planning and budgeting processes. 3. Coding the budget in line with the strategies in the PRSPs.
- Think out of the box for linking the two. Accountability is key. Make PRS part of the election manifesto.
- It is important that there is an integrated approach to the planning and budgeting processes. For effective results and sustainability there is a need to prioritize in a limited resource envelope and also to ensure that expenditure adheres to the plan.
- This is a lot more than a technical process. The real issue is how you make reform happen and stick in the multi-stakeholder environment that every country is. This is the real world. This is the grounding or effectiveness path. Technocrats need to take this very political process seriously. This is where communication tools and techniques can help.
- Institutionalization of communication process is important for linking planning and budgeting processes. There is a need for engaging the ministries such as planning and finance where communication plays a key role. Also, there is a need to focus on the issue of political will and build ownership in the process of policy planning and resource allocation.
- Political will. There is a need for effective communication/dialogue between planning and finance ministries.

- 1. Make sure budgets are realistic and implemented as planned first. 2. Develop simpler and more politician-friendly ways of linking budgets to policies/plans. Describe what the budget will achieve? 3. Develop budget-friendly plans.
- Think broadly: policy-strategy-planning-budgeting and take performance measurement and accountability as an entry point.
- To improve work in this area the following are needed:
 1. Promote communication between the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Finance, as well as the other ministries involved in the process of planning and implementation of PRS programs.
 2. To promote M&E and evaluation of all the processes with the involvement of all stakeholders, especially the Media in the public and private sectors.
- Given the complexity of the processes, instruments and tools, there is need for standardizing the tools and instruments to :
 - Link government planning and budgets
 - Link national processes with donors' processes, tools and instruments
 - Develop a framework to regularly evaluate the links between technical, diplomatic, and political components of the PRS
 - Facilitate workshops with politicians, diplomats, and technicians involved in linking planning and budgeting of PRS
- It is very important to position PRS in the political process, rather than positioning PRS in the budget process. Timing and alignment are the critical factors that determine the relevance of PRS in the National Policy Process.
- 1. MTEF, MTSS, and the Annual Budget should be in that cascading order. 2. Codification of budget line items to allow funding of only those activities captured in the MTSS and the MTEF.
- 1. Build more institutional and communication capacity between Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Planning and Development. 2. Promote “more” transparency and simplify the budgeting process to integrate the other plans.
- 1. Put in place (institutionalization) a reporting system on budget execution. 2. Develop a Strong mechanism for M&E to inform budget allocation by sector.
- It appears the cause of the de-linkage between Planning and Budgeting is due to having two separate Ministries of Planning and Finance.. Merging the two ministries could solve or at least reduce the problem.
- 1. There should be ownership of policies. Either ministries or departments must own policies by planning for them and drawing up budgets. 2. Planning and budgeting should be based on PRS activities and programs. 3. A political direction is needed in the planning and budgeting processes.

- Use the MTEF, relating the policies and budgets in an iterative manner. Relate objectives and goals with outputs and activities, and constrain these to the budgets.
- Donors must stop the “colonization” and capture of various functions in both planning and budgeting processes. We have been sending governments on a merry-go-round!
- 1. Budget/plan links can be technically simple, if the system is well defined. 2. Budget and planning need to be part of a common process. 3. Line ministries should have more flexibility on actions, but be accountable for results. 4. Accountability means: ministries should be asked to justify their actions by reference to the PRS and evidence or results.
- Documentation and case studies on alternative budget preparation procedures which link performance budgeting and MTEF. Comparative tables of differences between the options.
- 1. There is a need to improve the political and technical decision making processes. 2. Realizing those planned outputs is achieved by a good outlay of inputs for which the budget is an example. 3. Make every stakeholder realize that we operate in a world of constrained/limited resources.

Session 4: Information Flows: Promoting Transparency in Policy and Resource Allocation Decisions on PRS Monitoring

- 1. Instill a client orientation perspective in government related to communication. 2. Instill communication as integral to all these processes. Not a sideline. 3. Fix budget and capacity issues related to communications. 4. Encourage political will of people to undertake more communication.
- Improve communication and information flow within the government system specially the horizontal accountability. The supply side of information needs to be strengthened. Government needs to improve communication capacity and institutionalize communication systems and functions.
- 1. Governments need to prioritize communication and include it in their budgets instead of relying on donors to support communications activities. 2. Capacity building is needed for governments to understand or know what good communication is.
- Information needs to be distributed to the intended people. i.e., the politicians, the general public. Reports need to be simple, easy to understand. Presentation of ideas should not be complicated. Parliament should be involved in budget monitoring since it is in the eye of the general public. Good communication has to be client focused.
- 1. Communication should not be just a free-standing activity, but something integrated into government. 2. We can create incentives for communication BUT

also need to use communication in those areas where voluntary compliance is needed. 3. Communication should be client focused.

- Communication works in place of coercion and where you incentive structures cannot be manipulated. Communication helps with persuasion, attitude change, and behavior change. Approaches and techniques exist to help make these things happen.
- 1. Institutionalize and systematize communication systems to include government, civil society, Parliament, the private sector, and donors. 2. Make the content of the message culture-friendly while maintaining good scientific content. This is possible if the communication and information strategy is an integral part of the PRS content. 3. Make communication and information on PRS a component of the national budget. 4. Create a Parliamentary Commission specifically for PRS.
- Encourage development of an arms-length government agency for presenting objective information about actual achievements against PRS targets. This could be, e.g., a government funded institute of social research.
- 1. Use other non-conventional methods, e.g., local drama. I.e., get it embedded in the day-to-day life of the people but one must keep it simple and focused. 2. Focus on messages that bring benefits to the people being targeted, otherwise it becomes voluntary.
- Information is a powerful tool and for any process to be effective. It is imperative that stakeholders are well informed. PRS information should therefore be shared and relevant stakeholders given an opportunity to provide input, and reports/feedback should be communicated back in a simple manner.
- 1. In order to improve transparency in policy and resource allocation decisions, everyone must understand issues and speak the same language. Governments should therefore work with all stakeholders to design messages that are comprehended by all. 2. In addition, all stakeholders have to view themselves as partners rather than antagonists/inspectors holding others accountable for their actions.
- To improve work in this area it is necessary to promote the participation of all stakeholders especially the mass media. Mass media have to lead the communications process by promoting discussions in their stories, involving communities. The Government needs to know that well informed communities are the bases for transparency in policy and resource allocation decisions on PRS monitoring.
- 1. The political will and funding (by implication) for information programmes. 2. Accessible reports (less jargon, less volume). 3. Enforcement of a carrot-stick mechanism for information sharing horizontally.

- Need to actively involve CSO, private sector, and other stakeholders to participate in the initial preparation of PRS which will give them a sense of responsibility to monitor the PRS implementation as well as the budget.
- Strengthen supply side of communication:
 - Break up turf thinking among bureaucracy
 - Try to find out what people want to hear and can understand
 - Find ways to create incentives for horizontal communication across government
 Demand side: Build trust between CS and government; build capacity and include the private sector.
- Integrate communication strategies in the PRS and PRS monitoring processes. Implement the access to information act and ensure that the information act supports the PRS process.
- Lobbying Parliament for effective communication and decision-making. Strengthen sharing of information among peers through sector working groups. Improved resource allocation to communication since it is expensive.
- Join up communications in planning and finance that forces the issues on the table. Provide incentives. Get the private sector involved.
- Sharing information on resource allocation with citizens. Putting in place a citizen report card system. Participatory resource allocation between citizen and government. Use of simple materials to disseminate decisions on resource allocation.
- Civil society needs its capacity built – particularly the media and organizations that can critique and interrogate policy.
- There should also be a hierarchy of communication. Information needs to be fully participatory. Information shouldn't be neutral; one must have a stand in order to get feedback. Information/communication must be dynamic.
- 1. The debates were enriching but communication is a problem in all countries. I think we lack financial resources to put in place efficient systems. 2. We need to promote communication in PRS processes. Specialists often give up when there are problems. Only communication can bring about public consensus. Less bureaucracy will enable us to communicate better. We must highlight communication with technical and financial partners whose interventions are necessary for success.
- 1. Help to put in place communication strategies for poverty reduction strategies. 2. Give priority to the implementation of communication strategies because they cost a lot (participation of partners, private sector and government). 3. Look for consensus in the elaboration of indicators and their harmonization

- 1. Develop communication reports that are modern and appropriate for each target audience. 2. Develop traditional communication methods: sketches, plays, radio, TV.
- Sending messages: 1) be timely in disseminating messages, 2) ensure systematic follow up – periodical and even exceptional (vertical/horizontal), 3) develop large campaigns about objectives, 4) seize every opportunity to communicate.
- We need to involve civil society so that beneficiaries can be informed about what is in their interests. Their active participation in the development of strategies is necessary.

Session 5: Institutionalizing and Building Communication Capacity for Better PRS Monitoring and Policy-Budget Linkages

- There should be a government-led holistic approach to communication
- Measure success of different forums of communication and increase funding of the most successful.
- 1. Communicating to economists is hard work. 2. It is important to have systems and procedures which create incentives for communication throughout the planning process. 3. Capacity is currently weak
- PRS should have communication strategies as a supplement to ensure that citizens have access to information and are able to understand the process. There is a need to build capacity of those involved in Government so that they are skilled to undertake the task of communication effectively.
- 1. Clear/distinct budget line and funding. 2. Treat communication less as support service and more as an integral operational function in policy/program/project cycles. 3. Demonstrate value-added.
- Create demand for information from the public on PRS and budget. Brand the PRS?! Move away from trying to measure impact of communication and accept that it has to be done.
- Use communication processes to improve quality of information → regular communication requirements can help to focus minds – collect more and relevant information.
- Lobby for clear budgeting of communication. Build capacity of journalists to be able to report on the progress of PRS implementation. Managers should be trained in reporting and talking to journalists.
- To improve work in this area, it is necessary to provide funds to the media as a part of capacity building for their job. Media need to be involved directly, so that the funds will help them to report on many issues related to PRSs.

- Set up a network between government and media institutions both public and private. Develop a capacity building programme for those who work in the media sector.
- Build capacities of managers to be better communicators. Articulate how to measure impact of communication.
- Managers should be trained or equipped with communication skills so that they may appreciate the role that communication plays. Communication functions should be mainstreamed into all sectors, ministries, and departments of government.
- Harmonize communication channels between governmental institutions, government, and civil society which have to be supported by a legal framework. Communication should be treated as a sector. As such, resources should be provided in the national budget. Freedom of the press should be protected by government so that the information that reaches the public will not be biased in any way – as communication is also about the quality of information.
- Mainstream communication in all PRS processes. Train public sector managers to understand how to communicate! Ensure adequate funding for communication. Governments should brand themselves and communication is the key!
- 1. There is a need to enable all stakeholders to realize that communication is a development tool. 2. There is also need to put in robust indicators of effective communication.
- 1. There is need to involve traditional chiefs as actors in the communication strategy and develop tools in local languages to enhance their capacities to monitor and evaluate PRS. Make use of local institutional frameworks and actors to design, implement, and evaluate communication strategies. 2. Make communication and information teams interdisciplinary to ensure the content is realistic but at the same time technically sound. 3. Use a bottom-up communication strategy.
- 1. See communications as sector. 2. Reform government communication. 3. Provide more capacity-building assistance. 4. Ensure that government perceives communication as serious work and integrates it into its overall strategy.
- Media training for technocrats in senior positions so that they understand how to deal with journalists and also know how the media operate in their respective countries. 2. Strengthen internal government communication through clear internal structures that enable officers to report, provide feedback, and disseminate information to the outside world.
- Technocrats in developing country governments need communication and media relations training. They also need to learn about the role of communication networks/professionals in leading modern governments that they admire so

much: Britain, France, US, Germany, etc. Once they learn it, they will see the need to build government institutional capacity in communication.

- 1) Communication is a field that cannot be bypassed. All countries elaborate their own strategies and I think it is essential to keep in mind the resources available and the reinforcement of capacity needed at the level of staff and professionals. 2) We need to put in place (something) to measure the impact of communication activities on the functioning of the entire PRS process. We also need to have better coordination among all the systems in place to communicate better horizontally as well as vertically. 3) Better governance is only possible with good communication.
- 1) “The one who holds the information holds the power”. We need to share information to share the power (a communication challenge). This communication happens from the top to the bottom and also from the bottom to the top. 2) having a shared view of how to manage the problem of fighting poverty at the government level and the general public. 3) Using the least expensive communication structures/organizations (public/private).
- 1) Reinforce the capacity of managers in the field of communication, 2) Put in place a communication system at all levels – technical, political, internal, external, 3) Promote the specialization of communicators in the development field.
- 1) To introduce communication, we need to have communication specialists and train them at the same level as journalists in the private media are trained, 2) Give more resources to communication agents.
- 1) Integrate the various sectoral policies in the field of communication, in a national system, in a national communication strategy for development, 2) Reinforce the capacity of political leaders and other managers in communication, 3) Promote the culture of communication in the training programs of managers and other professionals.

**Monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategies:
Leadership, Budget Links & the Role of Communication
21–22 June, 2007 - Cape Town, South Africa**

Participants

Country	Name	Title	Affiliation	e-mail
Australia	Geoff Dixon	Consultant		gdixon@geoffdixon.com
Burkina Faso	Alfred Yeye	Chargé d'étude	Ministre de l'Economie et des Finances	Alfred_yeye@yahoo.fr
Democratic Republic of Congo	Kalonji Ntalaja	Senior Professor of Economics and PRS National Coordinator	University of Kinshasa and Ministry of Planning	kalonjintalaja@yahoo.com
Ghana	Mary Mpereh	Senior Planning Analyst, Social Policy and Communications	National Development Planning Commission	mmpereh@yahoo.com
	Kofi Tsikata	Communication Officer	The World Bank	Ktsikata@worldbank.org
Madagascar	Olivier Rajaonarison	Directeur Général des Dépenses Publiques p.i. et Directeur des Investissements Publics	Ministère des Finances et du Budget	vevetalatamaty@yahoo.fr
Malawi	Rhoda Eliasi	Chief Economist	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development	reliasi@yahoo.com eliasir@mepd.gov.org
	Priscilla Kandoole	Economist	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development	kandoolep@mepd.gov.org
	Yohane Soko	Economist	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development	ayoso2003@gmail.com
Mali	Yacouba Doumbia	Chief, Bureau of Communications	Cellule Technique, Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la pauvreté (CSLP)	yacoudoumb@yahoo.fr
	Abdoulaye Touré	Directeur general	Direction du Budget	ablo@lycos.com

Mozambique	Alfredo Mutombane		Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	
	Jordao Sabao Muvale	National Director	Government Information Office	jordaomuvale@gmail.com
Nigeria	Lawal Y. Aboki	Coordinator, Needs Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation	MDGs Office, The Presidency	lyaboki@yahoo.co.uk
Rwanda	Abel Gatoya	Budget Officer	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	gatoya2000@yahoo.fr
	Ange Mutesi	Public Relations and Communication Officer	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	ange.mutesi@minecofin.gov.rw
	Francois Sekamondo	Planning Officer	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	Francois.sekamondo.@minecofin.gov.rw
Tanzania	Waheeda Samji	Director	Aga Khan Education Services	waheeda@carpediemink.com
Uganda	Ishmael Magona	Commissioner for Infrastructure and Social Services	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	Ishmael.magona@finance.go.ug
	Laban Mbulamuko	Economist	Budget Policy & Evaluation Department	laban.mbulamuko@finance.go.ug
	Peter Mukisa Ssentongo	Assistant Commissioner for Coordination and Monitoring	Office of the Prime Minister	peter.sentongo@nimes.go.ug peter.ssentongo@gmail.com
	Catherine Ntabadde	Communication Expert	Office of the Prime Minister	cntabadde@yahoo.com
	Longino Tisasirana	Commissioner for Economic Development Policy and Research	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	longino.tisasirana@finance.go.ug
United Kingdom	Marcus Cox	Consultant	Agulhas Applied Knowledge	marcus@agulhas.co.uk
	Simon Stone	Consultant	Research on Economic Policy Implementation & Management	simon.stone@wanadoo.fr

	Nigel Thornton	Consultant	Agulhas Applied Knowledge	nigel@agulhas.co.uk
	Tim Williamson		Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	twilliamson@odi.org.uk

World Bank

Development Communication Division, External Affairs Vice Presidency		
Antonio Lambino	Consultant	alabmino@worldbank.org
Zita Lichtenberg	Consultant	zlichtenberg@worldbank.org
Anjali Manglik	Program Assistant	amanglik@worldbank.org
Johanna Martinson	Communications Associate	jmartinson@worldbank.org
Paul Mitchell	Manager	Pmitchell1@worldbank.org
Masud Mozammel	Sr. Communications Officer	mmozammel@worldbank.org
Sina Odugbemi	Sr. Communications Officer	aodugbemi@worldbank.org
Poverty Reduction and Development Effectiveness Department		
Vera Wilhelm	Sr. Economist	vwilhelm@worldbank.org