Report of the 3rd Development Dialogue:

“Decentralizing the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy: Challenges and Opportunities for Strengthening Partnerships between Government, Civil Society and Donors.”

Prepared by:
Dr. Sulley Gariba, Moderator

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY ALTERNATIVES
www.ipaghana.org
APPRECIATIONS

- The rural community members, especially the poor, the disabled and the vulnerable, in whose name we convened the dialogue and some of who participated in sharing their perspectives, struggles and triumphs over poverty.
- Every one of the 120 participants – this is our land, and here are our voices
- The staff of the IPA and World Bank, including the colleagues from Sierra Leone who pulled these plans to engage in a new form of dialogue
- Government of Ghana, so well represented, that the Northern Regional Minister and his colleagues, along with staff of various Ministries from Accra and the North came in a big way
- Development Partners – especially DANIDA, CIDA, GTZ, The World Bank for providing generous funding and the flexibility to organize this event in a uniquely Ghanaian way
- Partners: ADD, Navrongo Health Research Center, Ibis-Ghana, Oxfam, East Gonja District Assembly, Salaga Town Council, GDCP, OIC, Savelugu Water Board, Savelugu-Nanton District Assembly, SEND Foundation, Tolon-Kumbungu District Assembly, Tamale Metropolitan Assembly, Youth Alive, Tamale and the staff of Gariba Development Associates, Tamale who provided technical and professional support for the field engagement process, as well as many others supported the process.
Table of Contents

1 Synopsis ........................................................................................................................... 1
   1.1 Some Notable Outcomes .......................................................................................... 2
   1.2 Methodology .......................................................................................................... 2
   1.3 Themes .................................................................................................................... 3
   1.4 Engaging with Communities – Voices of the Poor ................................................. 3

2 Shared Perspectives on Poverty .................................................................................... 6
   2.1 Perspectives of Civil Society ................................................................................. 6
   2.2 Perspectives of Government .................................................................................. 6
   2.3 Views from the Private Sector .............................................................................. 7
   2.4 The Voices of the Labour Movement .................................................................... 7
      2.4.1 Conflict between development policy and poverty reduction ......................... 7
      2.4.2 The issue of subsidies in agriculture ............................................................... 8
   2.5 Donor Perspectives ............................................................................................... 8
   2.6 Debate on Perspectives of Poverty ....................................................................... 9
   2.7 Syntheses of Perspectives on Development, Its Blockages and Poverty ............... 9

3 What the GPRS Themes Really Mean ........................................................................ 10
   3.1 Basic Services ....................................................................................................... 10
   3.2 Priorities for the Vulnerable and Excluded ........................................................... 13
   3.3 Decentralization and Public Participation in Local Governance ......................... 15
   3.4 Enhancing Accountability for Poverty Reduction ................................................ 17

4 Synthesis and Outcomes of the Dialogue ................................................................ 19
   4.1 Information for Development and Poverty Reduction ......................................... 19
   4.2 Conflict Management & Peace Building ............................................................... 20
   4.3 Developing Local Entrepreneurial Capacity for Poverty Reduction .................... 20
   4.4 UDS as Engine of Pro-poor Training and HRD .................................................... 20
   4.5 Citizen Engagement with Public Policy Issues ...................................................... 20
   4.6 Environment & Income for Poverty Reduction .................................................... 21

5 Conclusion .................................................................................................................... 22

6 Participant Evaluation and Feedback ....................................................................... 23
   6.1 Assessment of Session on Sharing Perspectives .................................................. 23
   6.2 Comments on the Field Engagement Experience ............................................... 24
   6.3 Reflections, Synthesis & Commitments for Development Alternatives ............... 24
   6.4 How People Saw their own Role in the Dialogue ................................................ 25
   6.5 Assessment of the Organization and Management of the Dialogue .................... 26
      6.5.1 What were the positive aspects of the dialogue .............................................. 26
      6.5.2 What were the negative things I experienced in the dialogue ......................... 28
   6.6 Suggestions for Strengthening the Dialogue about Development ...................... 30

7 Experience of the Institute for Policy Alternatives ................................................. 32

8 Appendix 1 – Detailed Programme ............................................................................ 33
1 Synopsis

Dialogue on public policies, moreso after they have been made, is a rare feature of development practice. Most analysts tend to think that once a policy initiative has been made, the chapter on participation closes. Development Dialogue 3, an innovative engagement for public policy makers and practitioners of development and poverty reduction focused on decentralising the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy, and examined the challenges and opportunities for strengthening partnerships between Government, civil society and donors.

The Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) is the country’s main policy framework for addressing growth and poverty reduction in the medium-term. Government has accordingly mobilized resources both from its own budgetary allocation and HIPC debt relief to begin the implementation of the GPRS in 2002-2003. Furthermore, Ghana’s Development Partners have endorsed GPRS by allocating funds through a Multi-donor Budget Support Mechanism for the implementation of the GPRS. As implementation progresses, the role of Civil Society and that of citizen groups in the poorest sections of Ghanaian society continue to pose important challenges for strengthening partnership with Government and Development Partners. In particular, the limited participation of representatives of the poor in public policy discourses on poverty reduction risks their alienation from the policy process that is intended to reduce their poverty.

In response to this challenge, the Institute for Policy Alternatives (IPA) based in Northern Ghana, in collaboration with a variety of local NGOs in Northern Ghana, the World Bank, bilateral donors and international NGOs, organized a participatory process of dialogue with civil society, government and the private sector. Being the third in the Development Dialogue Series and the first in Northern Ghana, the theme of this dialogue “Decentralizing Poverty Reduction Strategy: Challenges and Opportunities for Strengthening Partnerships between Government, Civil Society and Development Partners”, evoked strong participation from all stakeholders. From an expected participation of 35 in the first two days, we had double the number to 75; and by the close of the dialogue on the third day, upward of 90 participants, representing over a dozen NGOs and civil society groups, including the Trades Union Congress, six major donors, Government of Ghana and private sector participants.

The methodology adopted for the dialogue was an intensely participatory one, creating space for the expression of voices and perspectives on poverty; extending this space to direct engagement with the stakeholders of the poor in rural communities; and reflecting back on the realities of the poor, to produce a syntheses of the way forward. The climax of the 3-day dialogue was in deed the engagement with community-based organizations and their rural constituents working on critical and practical issues of poverty reduction in Northern Ghana. In line with previous Development Dialogues, Development Dialogue 3 created a forum where development thinkers, practitioners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders engaged in dialogue on the critical issues and challenges of
development in Ghana and provided rich perspectives to inform public policy making, implementation and impact assessment.

1.1 Some Notable Outcomes

The 3rd Development Dialogue Series had five immediate outcomes:

1. A commitment was made to move the Dialogue process forward to the Volta Region, where a network of NGOs has committed to plan and host the next dialogue, with a focus on Information and Communication (including rural, community radio) for Development and Poverty Reduction.
2. The School of Communication Studies and IPA have begun a collaboration to work towards a sustained training programme for journalists on conflict management and peace-building.
3. The School of Communication Studies, the World Bank and other partners, have initiated a training programme for journalists on techniques for development communications, in the context of the overall Media Engagement in Development. Although this action emerged after Development Dialogue 1, it has now been extended to include journalists in Northern Ghana, as a result of consultations and planning sessions held with Northern Ghanaian journalists after DDS 3.
4. Local NGOs in Northern Ghana and some private sector partners have committed to initiate a monthly dialogue, called the “Laabare” sessions, a commitment which emerged during the extensive planning sessions prior to the dialogue event itself.
5. A local NGO coalition is committed to expanding the experience of community-managed water systems in Savelugu to cover urban poor areas in Tamale, as a collaboration between the Ghana Water Company, the Tamale Metropolitan Assembly, and possibly funding support from the World Bank.

1.2 Methodology

The approach for undertaking this dialogue was based on a participatory action and learning principles and practices. By this, policy makers and practitioners interact with community-based development practitioners to define the context and the practical issues to be explored through mutual and experiential learning. Each objective of the dialogue was then explored through an interactive and participatory format, as follows:

- Sharing understanding on the context and content of development and poverty reduction
- Engaging with communities to deepen this understanding and explore the reality of the poor, as well as hear their voices
- Challenge participants to reflect on the realities, as a basis of offering recommendations and making choices about what they, as policy makers and practitioners, could commit in the fight against poverty and ignorance.
1.3 Themes

The engagement process started with a familiar context, the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy and its associated themes, as follows:

- **What Macro-economic stability** means for the poorest of the poor
- **Production, gainful employment** for community-based food security and environmental renewal
- **Orienting Basic Services** towards the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable:
  - Community ownership and management of water supply
  - Health Services and their impacts at community level
  - Education improvements, especially for the poorest of the poor
- **Priorities for the Vulnerable and Excluded** -- Urban poverty and the emergence of Streetism; safety-net and social support networks
- **Pro-poor Governance and Decentralization** – public participation in local governance at the sub-district level.
- **Social and Public Accountability of Poverty Reduction Strategy and Expenditures**: HIPC Watch and other community-based accountability systems.

During the sessions, leading practitioners from NGOs and civil society groups working on the issues stimulated discussions and dialogue, presented their experiences and animated the identification of challenging questions for participants to explore during the subsequent field visit to these sites.

1.4 Engaging with Communities – Voices of the Poor

The high point of the dialogue was a field visit, in which over 70 participants went to 8 sites where organizations of civil society, public institutions and communities are tackling poverty in diverse ways:

1. Problems of streetism were explored, in collaboration with Youth Alive, a Tamale-based NGO.
2. Access to basic services for the poorest sections were examined in the context of community-managed water supply in Savelugu; a private school and health facilities in the same community.
3. Experiences of community-based health delivery was the focus of field visit to Kayoro, under the Navrongo Health research Initiative.
4. The experiences and challenges of disabled persons stimulated the dialogue and field engagement through the ADD in Bolgatanga.
5. Access to credit and livelihoods support inspired a field visit to Dalun, where the Ghanaian-Danish Community Project is undertaking a Women and Micro-credit initiative.
6. Holistic food security solutions engaged the attention of a field visit to a village near Kumbungu, where OIC is working with community-based women’s groups for improved livelihoods.

7. Challenges of decentralization and enhanced public participation in sub-district level institutions – Urban and Area Councils challenged a field trip to the Salaga Urban Council, in collaboration with Ibiş-Ghana, a Danish NGO working in the East Gonja District.

8. Understanding the demand for accountability and techniques used to engage the public in monitoring HIPC was the focus of a visit to Tolon, where the HIPC Watch Initiative was the subject of dialogue and experience-sharing.

The outcome of the field visits created a polyglot of experiences, images and shared learning which the dialogue itself could not fully capture. The major conclusion was that there are a lot more practical manifestations of people and organizations working to alleviate poverty than has been recorded in the GPRS. The implication of this for public policy is that the GPRS needs to support a process of summarizing all major poverty reduction initiatives, and bringing these up to the level of investment and experiences towards Ghana’s Poverty Reduction efforts.

In Increasing Public Awareness, the dialogue organized two press evenings, in which leading local journalists interacted with participants in the dialogue and put out press briefings. A coalition of local media practitioners also engaged in planning sessions as parallel events that allowed for maximum understanding of the developmental impact of the dialogue.

The choice of northern Ghana as the venue was indeed an affirmation of the very spirit of the dialogue to engage the poorest of the poor. That an average of nearly 70% of northern Ghanaians is among the poorest in the country is a significant raison d’etre why the dialogue event should take place here. This is not said to suggest that the event could not have taken place elsewhere with equal significant impact, or that other regions do not have poor people. It has to do with a choice where we can reap the greatest benefit in reaching out to the poor.

A significant posture the dialogue took was to say that its outcome was not to be marked with recommendations to someone else. The outcome has a unique bearing on the commitments, not recommendations, people make either to continue to dialogue or to act in ways that will change the situation of the poor for the better even if in a small way. It is this direction of thought that makes the difference between this dialogue event and a conventional workshop. It bridges the gap between people so that social barriers could not be a hinder in the way people think and act. This is why the final commitments that are collated very appropriately are responsive to the core issue of reducing poverty. It involves the poor, the Government and other partners including civil society making inputs in the poverty reduction strategy. The reality that is confronted in the whole enterprise of dialoguing and decision making is indivisibly born out of the experience that informs the outcome.
Appendix 1 contains the detailed programme for the dialogue.
2 Shared Perspectives on Poverty

The tone of the dialogue was set by the shared perspectives of the diverse stakeholder groups represented at the dialogue. Each perspective presented an understanding of what poverty represents and what practical measures exist to deal with it. The trading of thoughts provided the real essence of the dialogue. It enabled a closer look at what each participant represents in the larger context of partnering to dialogue about poverty and understanding the strategies of poverty reduction. In effect the perspectives shared by participants established the positions, which were to be challenged by the real experiences participants encountered in dealing with the poor by eventually going to the field where development actions occur.

2.1 Perspectives of Civil Society

The Dialogue opened with perspectives from Government, Civil society, and the Donor. The Civil Society perspective projected a situation of commitment of partner and stakeholder approach to poverty reduction. It suggests a decisive policy of engagement that will ensure sustainability in how support goes to the poor or “people wanting development”. Support imposed from external of people needing support will not be sustainable. The ownership question in development is fundamental and policy approach to it must be forthcoming and forthright because ownership is empowering.

But the crucial issue about development is that it must be participatory and should occur through a bottom up approach in how decisions are arrived at. An important position that emerged was that poverty reduction can only happen if it is divorced from the propagandist approach and if it goes beyond political gimmicks. Government has a social responsibility in ensuring good health and the general welfare of the people and this role is nonnegotiable. It can not be traded away in withdrawing subsidies and increased tax without Governments fulfilling its own commitment.

2.2 Perspectives of Government

The fundamental issue within which policy is built around is skill development. Poor people are empowered if they are given skill training in areas of the economy where their services will be needed. Skill training and micro financing are areas around which policies are formulated to tackle the problem of poverty reduction. This happens with government and local government building partnership in addressing the needs of the poor.

Government called for the need for public sector workers to increase their commitment to work so that Government so as to increase production. Increased commitment will make it easy for government to respond more forcefully to its responsibility.

The government will be interested in the final outcome of the dialogue. The dialogue is a testimony to the normalcy that exists in Tamale.
2.3 Views from the Private Sector

The conventional thinking that runs through much of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy is the belief that the private sector is the engine of growth, that investments need to be made in export-oriented agro-industries, and that more jobs need to be created to absorb the increasing numbers of unemployed youth. While this form of entrepreneurship is crucial, it does not address the attitude and thinking of young people that seem to suggest that they can succeed only if they were employed by somebody else. They look up to someone else, including government, rather than themselves in creating jobs. This position must be changed in favour of a more determined approach to providing the needed skill training and empowerment of people. Individual awareness and creativity can make a huge difference if that leads to their investing in situations of wealth creation. Thus concentrating in investing in developing the talents of young entrepreneurs is an important milestone in poverty reduction.

2.4 The Voices of the Labour Movement

Development will occur if wealth and wellbeing are spread thereby reducing poverty. This is not a preserve field for policy experts neither is it a preserve of policy makers nor foreign donors alone. Development among others is a sustained relationship involving the poor, the government and its development partners and the rest of civil society. True development will thus occur through participation and sharing involving the poor.

2.4.1 Conflict between development policy and poverty reduction

There appears to be a conflict between the government’s poverty reduction strategy and the drive for our overall national development strategy. Which comes first? Developing bigger economies at the macro level or developing poverty targeted micro/local level economies? Present policy seems to give more emphasis to poverty reduction only at the policy or theoretical level, associating this objective with a “trickle-down of wealth created at the macro-economic level”. But the greatest problem is how to get the poor integrated into the whole dynamics of the national growth strategy. It has to do with commitments at the political level of decision-making. Government has to show enough social responsibility to the people. It has to ensure the provision of good health, quality education and social security, as crucial first steps in the creation of what a participant termed the public capital base, which will allow for both the formation of private capital as well as social wellbeing, security and safety-nets for the poorest of the poor.
2.4.2 The issue of subsidies in agriculture

There is a strong link between poverty and food production in the world over. To this end even the developed world finds it prudent to continue to subsidise agricultural products especially food. As the bulk of the poor in Ghana are subsistent farmers the policy of withdrawing subsidises from food crop production is making farming more and more expensive because agriculture inputs are also very expensive. This is not helping the poverty reduction effort. Expressing this sentiment, a senior public official in the Agriculture and Food sector lamented the contradictions inherent in public pursuit of food security initiatives and the ascension to international protocols and practices of trade liberalization and macro-economic adjustment requirements which are not always pro-poor, mainly food crop farmers.

2.5 Donor Perspectives

Poverty is about choice, voice and the commitment to transform discussions into actions in favor of the poor.

Choice – involves providing the opportunity to help the poor to make choices, informed by the availability of options. This dialogue needs to catalyze choice.

It also needs to enhance Voice, voices of the poor -- dialoguing in a forum like this, and using the participatory method, will strengthen the position of the poor to be able to articulate their concerns and to make appropriate commitments to address their own problems with other stakeholders. But where are the poor in this room? How can the poor contribute to discussions of their conditions and yet are not present at “the talking table?”

By “Walking the Talk,” said Mats Karlsson, Resident Director of the World Bank in Ghana. In seeking to achieve practical results, “we need to make practical our thought that comes as the outcome of our dialoguing”. We will need to “walk the talk” and ensure that we act out what we say we want to do.

Poor people are not free to choose. The Dialogue is liberation for the poor to be able to talk. The ultimate desire is to strengthen the links of accountability and political culture. The era when we think globally and act locally needs to be transformed towards thinking globally and acting globally as well as nationally and locally. Globalization has forced onto us the imperative to be mindful of how global trends – political, economic, ecological and cultural – affect every local action and vis-versa. This means local actors cannot be disconnected with global actors if we are to benefit from globalization rather being destroyed by it.
2.6 Debate on Perspectives of Poverty

The perspectives thrown by individuals took a position that that the dialogue is about development that will reach the poorest of the poor. Three positions were projected:

1. The lack of, or inadequate information in addition to the attitude people carry about themselves and their environment are the reasons why so many people are poor. Without information and education people are more likely to be poor.
2. Leadership and responsibility which are two crucial areas of social engagement are critical in helping people to fight poverty.
3. People must show the commitment to solving our own problems, this demands that we must dialogue enough and should not try to reinvent the wheel. The GPRS is only a guide to help us find the way in reducing poverty.

2.7 Syntheses of Perspectives on Development, Its Blockages and Poverty

There was consensus that development and poverty reduction are about opening new choices and options for the poor and enhancing their voices in decision-making about these choices. The challenges therefore boil down to Information both about development and livelihood options, including technology; and about public policies and private goods. The challenges of disseminating information in democratic and participatory manner were raised as the single most crucial public policy concern. Those who have information monopolize and use it to their advantage against the poor. When efforts are made to disseminate information, this occurs in a language that the poor neither speak, nor understand.
3 What the GPRS Themes Really Mean

After exploring broad perspectives of development and poverty reduction, the dialogue moved on to examine the themes for GPRS and to engage in dialogue about what they really mean. In this discussion, there was a focus on (a) Basic Services; (b) Priorities for the Vulnerable and the Excluded; (c) Decentralization; (d) Enhancing Accountability for Poverty Reduction.

In four working groups, these issues were explored, first with a view to deepening the understanding of public policy, by answering the question: what is working, how? And what is not working, why? Second the groups agreed on where to go to see and to engage in the reality of development and poverty reduction efforts in those fields of endeavor corresponding to the themes. Appendix 2 contains the synopsis of the field visit sites which guided the discussions about where to go and why.

3.1 Basic Services

One of the central themes of GPRS is to enhance and accelerate basic services and orient these towards the poorest of the poor. The dialogue explored basic education services and saw, first hand, how most rural residents in poor areas access their basic education services, often under trees and sheds.
On Health, the discussion group was vehemently opposed to the cash and carry policies that exist in the health delivery system. The poor are mostly affected because they lack the financial resources to pay readily for health services. In this regard the policy is not viewed as pro-poor.

**Alternatives:**

- The new thinking about health insurance is a positive direction for health delivery to the poor. It enables them to save some in the form of premium and in the event that they fall ill, money is available for them to fall back on.

- The group further identified three developing health insurance namely
  a. mutual health insurance scheme
  b. district wide insurance scheme
  c. private for profit health insurance

In addition, to the above the participatory health delivery approach was identified as another level of health delivery service. This approach ensures that poor people participate in the design and implementation process of health delivery.
One of the profound burdens of poverty is the mode of Water supply and its management. The group came to the general agreement that the government policy on water was flawed. A fundamental reason stated was that water sources provided to communities lacked community input or involvement, management or ownership. This oversight by the government in what lead to the management problems that water services facing. The facilities often break down without Community people knowing how to repair or manage the facilities. The result, women, often with children on their backs spend all day long fetching water for daily consumption.

Alternatives
- Government to implement a policy of ownership and management by the communities themselves. The policy also demands that the community pay a 5% contribution towards capital cost of the facility. The Community people are encouraged to also pay a fee towards maintenance of the facility. They will be provided with basic management training, so that they will be better placed to manage their own water resources efficiently.

Loop hole identified the New Policy
- the 5% capital contribution retards poor peoples ability to access potable water and proper sanitation facility.
- District Assembly and government do not commit enough resources towards the provision of water and sanitation facilities.
- There is not enough participatory decision making in policy formulation about water and sanitation delivery to the poor
- District Assembly are also over burdened with demands for counterpart funding.

3.2 Priorities for the Vulnerable and Excluded

The group deliberated on a wide range of options for engaging the vulnerable and the excluded:

- Urban poverty and emergence of streetism; safety-net and Social support networks
- Disability is exploited as a business in urban centres as they exploit their beggars
- Extended family structures have broken down, people are going individualistic
- Traditional practices have accounted for vulnerability. A woman has no access to land because she gets married off to another family and hence has no links with previous family. Eventually she is cut off because in her new home it is the man who owns land.
- The economic factor is a reason for family break-up.
- Children benefited from the estate of their parents but now the head of the family takes up the estate and it ends there. In the past it was not possible to circumvent the rules of tradition but it is possible to do
- Christianity and Islam have contributed to the breakdown of the family systems because they have removed the element of fear through traditional checks and balances
- Peer influence leads to vulnerability on the street
- In the past the disabled were respected and there was no stigma. The beliefs associated with recognition for the disabled are dying out.
- Misapplication of religion. The principles of religion are not being closely followed

What policy measures are being used presently to address issues of vulnerability and exclusion?

- The GPRS Framework
- Policies in Education, Health, e.g. health services for the aged, disabled etc.
- Poverty Alleviation Fund
- Community Based Poverty Reduction Programme
- Streetism – Formal Education and Capacity Building
- Nutrition and Food Security
- Measurement of Security
Skills Training and Employment Placement ---→ S T E P
- Social Investment Fund
- Youth Fund
- Disasters affect vulnerable groups more and hence the establishment of NADMO
- functional literacy Programme
- Rural Agric Producers
- Children in difficult circumstances
- Street children
- Displaced communities
- HIV/AIDS people
- Residents of Urban slums
- Elderly with no access to cares
- Physically challenged
- People suffering with diseases
- Drug addicts
- Victims of abuse

What is working and what is not working these policy efforts?

1. HIV/AIDS programmes - problem has been harmonising new programmes with old ones
2. Programmes have become stereotypes e.g. dress making, hair dressing, Youth Programmes are in this category
3. Coordination of NGOs’ activity
   - Cost-sharing
   - Good leverage

The group posed fundamental questions: Are these policies necessarily pro-poor and targeting the most vulnerable?
The recently Ghana Rural Poverty Programme (GRPP) has too many flaws. It is not pro-poor and does not target the most vulnerable. E.g. some migrations are due to other reasons besides poverty.

- NGOs get into support communities without baseline data
- HIV/AIDS Campaign money does not go to the right organizations for the right targets
- Poverty Alleviation Funds individuals targets wrong groups and individuals. Strengths not assessed, and equal amounts given to all members of a group. Functional Literacy Programme
- Civil Society Organization are not effective in monitoring development
- What actions can be taken?
What systems, approaches and methods are in place to engage the marginalized youth, disabled persons and widows in planning engagement in programmes targeted at improving their livelihoods?

Marginalized Youth

Youth Development Fund
- Youth Alive builds capacity of youth in vocations skills and provide formal education

Policy issue
- Ministry for Youth and Sports initiates Youth Policy to address youth concerns

3.3 Decentralization and Public Participation in Local Governance

Existing Policies
1) Establishment of Sub-District Structure
2) Partial financial devolution
3) Development of MTDPs
4) Establishment of decentralized departments
5) 50% of government appointees to be women
6) All stakeholders (including civil society) to be involved in development planning process
7) Partial implementation of MTEF
What is working and what is not working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is working</th>
<th>What is not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some physical structures are in place</td>
<td>some are not functioning because of lack of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some staff recruited</td>
<td>Absence of enough units committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some council are functioning</td>
<td>Untimely release of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some unit committees are in place and Functioning</td>
<td>Strict guidelines making fund management difficult e.g. DACF HIPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All DA’s prepare MTDP</td>
<td>Input from lower local levels not Captured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited involvement of Civil Society/stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear and untimely planning guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate resources for Preparation of MTDPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial implementation of MDPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized departments exist</td>
<td>Decentralized departments are Partially functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some departments are not Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few are involved at various Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most DA s don’t use the MTEF</td>
<td>Few DA use the MTEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACF in existence HIPC</td>
<td>Strict guidelines in making fund management difficult e.g. DACF HIPIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do women and men have equal opportunities?

No

Reasons
- Lack of equal educational opportunities
- Negative cultural practices
- Lack of resources
- Political stigmatisation

Occurring good Practices
- Women representation at local level administration
- Involvement of some communities in MTDP Planning process
- Existence of local government elections
- Exchange visits among district (NR/UWR)

Citizens holding District Assemblies responsible
- Formation of civil society networks (e.g. HIPC Watch)
- Capacity building and advocacy of civil society organizations on budgets
- People’s assembly concept

**Preparing for Field Engagement in Decentralization**

**Field Questions**

**District Assemblies**
- Your experience in implementing decentralization
- What are your development priorities and why?
- How were your priorities identified?
- How do you support the councils?

**Councils**
- How do District Assemblies respond to proposals from councils?
- What support do you get from District Assemblies?
- Would you stand for re-election?
- Is there any interaction between the council and the unit committees?
- What is the nature of interaction between the council and NGOs?
- Are you sufficiently informed about District Assemblies activities?
- Have you ever complained about any aspect of District Assemblies activities?
- What do you find positive and negative about the District Assemblies?

**Citizens**
- Who are your council members?
- Who is your assemblyperson?

**3.4 Enhancing Accountability for Poverty Reduction**

- HIPIC Initiative Policy (Macro-Economic Policy)
- Debt Relief to provide Social Services to the poor (e.g.) education, Health
- Disbursement of funds in two ways
- Macro-economic stability
  1) Revenue and Expenditure (FISCAL)
  2) Money supply (Monetary Policy)

**Expenditure**
- Consolidated Fund – control by government
- Stationary Fund

  1. what Policy measures are being used in the short term to address issues of Macro-Economic stability
  2. How do these policies affect the poor?
Ensuring sustainability growth on poverty reduction

**Key information to look for in a Community:**
- Identify leakages in a form of accountability
- Capital expenditure suffering
- Limited money goes to personnel

**Who to talk to:**
Farmers, Technocrats, Opinion Leaders, Chiefs, Teachers, Magazias, Community Chairmen, Chairman of HIPIC, Monitoring Campaign

What Monitoring and Evaluation system are in place?

**District Assemblies**
- 1) Direct District Assembly Monitoring System - NDPC
- 2) District HIPC Monitoring Committee (DHMC)
- 3) Civil Society
- 4) Office of Accountant General

Are monies committed to issues of poverty?
4 Synthesis and Outcomes of the Dialogue

After the extensive discussions of the field visit outcomes, the following represents a summary of what we found:

- Poor people are extremely committed to improving their lives and livelihoods
- Considerable amount of resources are provided. Although not enough, the little there is appears not to be reaching the poorest of the poor
- Huge bottlenecks still exist in Information sharing within government and that between government and people
- Priorities determined for budget allocations are therefore not always the ones that poor people will like to see

The Paradoxes:

- At what level are choices made?
- Who participates in the making of these choices?
- How are they legitimized in the arena of governance, the District Assemblies
- What can we do to shift these priorities towards pro-poor growth
- How can resources be better targeted towards communities and Districts
- What commitments are prepared to make in creating space for alternative development?

Strategies proposed to engage these issues included the following, some of them coming with explicit commitments from the participants.

4.1 Information for Development and Poverty Reduction

- To lobby for the inclusion in the Freedom of Information Bill a clause compelling MDAs to produce publicly available annual reports
- To spearhead the rigorous investigation into new digital technology for poverty reduction and rural development
- Media practitioners and experts to put their knowledge and skills at disposal of poverty reduction initiatives by providing functional information
- Building a network of communications experts and practitioners to champion poverty reduction activities. RUMNET committed to serving as a local coordinating point for this network
- Information Services Department to be more pro-active in disseminating information to the community level and to serve as a pilot forum for reaching out to local communities (eg. Mobile vans).
4.2 Conflict Management & Peace Building

- Adopt Participatory approach in dealing with issues of development
- Promote inter-cultural exchanges
- Increase dialogue
- Organize seminars and workshops
- Build strong collaboration between NGOs and Government in dealing with conflict prevention & Peace-building
- DAs should involve schools in community-based activities for peace-building
- Institute training of media people in reporting on conflict management and peace building
- Government should be pro-active in managing early warning signals

4.3 Developing Local Entrepreneurial Capacity for Poverty Reduction

- We need Public policy targeted at filling gaps in entrepreneurship development
- Public policy to address trade issues, eg. Anti-dumping
- Provide incentive schemes to individual entrepreneurs to serve as demonstration effect – eg. Out-grower schemes; partnership between RCC, DAs and the private sector in integrated mango development
- Develop regional and inter-regional business links
- Effective and efficient utilization of HIPC Resources in a sustainable manner
- Improving business skills and understanding of administrators at the District level

4.4 UDS as Engine of Pro-poor Training and HRD

- Instrument for doing this is to blend academic world with community practice to provide constructive interaction for total development
- All major development organizations and DAs who use the services of UDS to be convened in a conference to support and own the Third-trimester system of student training – Conference scheduled for Wa in Upper West Region … as a follow-up to this Dialogue.

4.5 Citizen Engagement with Public Policy Issues

- Commitment to engage ordinary citizens in public policy discussions
- Support the process of decentralization and public participation in local governance
4.6 Environment & Income for Poverty Reduction

- Sustained environmental education at all levels to change attitudes, beliefs and practices
- Provide alternative livelihood opportunities
- Reward systems for good environmental management practices
- Government to provide adequate budget resources for environmental needs
- DAs to coordinate, collaborate on environmental programmes
- Strengthen environmental protection institutions
- Mainstream environmental considerations in Development Planning Act
- Enforce laws on environmental impact assessment of projects
5 Conclusion

The Development Dialogue has begun a process of engagement among a diverse group of stakeholders of development and poverty reduction. The overwhelming conclusions of this process appeared to be that:

Dialoguing about development can be an end itself; if it introduces shared perspectives among development practitioners in such a manner that they approach their development practices differently. In particular, the possibility that policy makers in Government would acquire greater sensitivity concerning consultations and participation of stakeholders of the poor in public policy making, makes the dialogue an end in itself.

Dialogue as a challenge to “walk the talk”. All too often, development practitioners spend an inordinate amount of time in “workshops and seminars” discussing development and the plight of the poor, without actually engaging the poor nor improving the strategies that seek to address their situation. The Development Dialogue, in adopting a participatory dialogue-engagement method took the dialogue to the field, where the poor live and work. Commitments following the dialogue stressed the importance of activating initiatives that would translate the talking into sustained action. Some participants remained frustrated that this aspect of the dialogue was not deep enough, and that concrete implementable actions did not emerge from the dialogue.

The dialogue enriched the public policy process of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy. Through shared experiences, a myriad of serious engagements with the poor were recorded and explored. Many of these are not presently captured in the GPRS, nor acknowledged. The impression is created that poverty reduction efforts begun with GPRS and end with it. Therefore the success or failure of GPRS to achieve its ambitious targets are likely to lie squarely with the GPRS effort. By contrast, the Development Dialogue has revealed that a large variety of development initiatives and funds (deployed mainly by NGOs and civil society groups), increase the possibilities of sustained poverty reduction in Northern Ghana. These will need to be understood and incorporated into the GPRS, both in their content, orientation and reach. A comprehensive strategy for poverty reduction encompassing the ongoing programmes of all organizations (not just the government-initiated ones) is needed to complete the landscape of poverty analysis and the strategies and programmes designed to reduce poverty.
6 Participant Evaluation and Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme and Session</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1: Sharing Perspectives about Development and Poverty Reduction Themes</td>
<td>Very Useful &amp; Positive 37</td>
<td>No change for me 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2: Engaging with Communities on realities of poverty and their coping strategies</td>
<td>39 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3: Reflections, synthesis and commitments about development alternatives</td>
<td>44 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and arrangement for dialogue</td>
<td>44 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Assessment of Session on Sharing Perspectives

The following un-edited comments were expressed:

- Interesting, the Dialogue was put on line
- It was a learning process
- One could see the different lenses that people wear about development
- I am an advocate for innovations and doing things differently; this should be repeated often
- Lesson was very useful to let this tone for the way
- The short time used by panel members was commendable, people had the opportunity to present different perspectives
- It gave me a greater insight into the burden of poverty reduction and the way forward
- In sharing with others who are very experienced, I have up-dated my knowledge in using Radio to fight poverty
- Very useful in informing me about Interventions, however education as a strategy as a long term was left out in deliberations
- The Number and level of personnel was quick selection and appropriate
- Various perspectives emerged – enriching
- The themes were well discussed and the ‘way forward’ clear
- Gave credence for some of my perspective
- It enabled the presenters to come out with divergent views and overview of some critical issues to reduce poverty
• The dialoguing was in the right directions since it afforded me enough opportunities to come into contact with a real attempt to tackling poverty
• It was in the right direction because affected me more knowledge

**Things which could have been better on Day 1:**
• More time could have been given for more perspective to come up
• Discussion to prepare field visit was not well structured, nor focussed
• Next time all participants should be made to make a contribution by passing round the microphone

**6.2 Comments on the Field Engagement Experience**

• Excellent
• It was a good chance to hear from the horse’s own mouth
• Excellent indeed wonderful experience. I love it
• That was a perfect way of doing things differently
• Discovering a lot for action
• There should be continuous engagement with comments
• Group was too large for meaningful community interaction and the group’s attitude towards community was poor.
• A very useful experience
• The realization that something on poverty alleviation is taking place by NGO support
• Through the engagement I realised that the communities are accessing loans and some of their needs are met
• Our trip to Tolon in one of the most deprived districts in Ghana has though that with support and information lives of deprived can change.
• Good work is being done, but more has to be done in sustaining programmes by communities
• Communities perceptive was more educative and natural
• Myths dissolve
• Only a few groups’ communities members were involved the timing
• Very useful limitations with aims/performance and program
• First hand information on how the communities on organization themselves to support one another as a strategy to curb some of the hardships confronting them
• Came face to face with poverty at the community level and attempts made by locals to remedy their situation with the aids of NGOs interventions
• The effects of poverty and the efforts to reduction was clarified

**6.3 Reflections, Synthesis & Commitments for Development Alternatives**

• It gives me the opportunity to dedicate myself to my work
• Very relevant and significant in reducing poverty
• For maximum impact effect, congratulations!
• Discovering a lot for action
• Waiting for final report
• More time should have been allocated for more people to comment on some of the commitment outlined
• Too much talking with no concrete commitments made. Geographic make-up of group was too disparate for specific commitments
• The process was very useful however; the time allotted to this section was too little more time would have brought out more interesting issues and news
• Done in a very participatory manner
• The freedom to lobby around issues is very encouraging and positive
• Each of the groups had produced alternate was that I believe would promote the poverty reduction process
• Quite informative
• More awareness created
• Very little commitment
• Hope that commitment made will be implemented
• A few dominated discussions
• A stormy useful session on the role of information communication through poverty reduction
• Sharing experiences, knowing some of the challenges and making commitments to network and reach out to the poor by way of information dissemination
• The café’s committee has given way for making way for a commitment to tackling poverty rightly.
• A lot of effort might have gone into it. A reflection of people commitment
• Very well done
• Just excellent
• System so perfect and new to me. That would enhance my organization ability
• Good
• It is well done
• Very good
• Very good to realize different ways of engagement than other workshops (accommodation, food and other social evenings made a difference in creating new and different environments for dialogue).
• Everything about the dialogue was right
• Well done

6.4 How People Saw their own Role in the Dialogue

• I am satisfied with my contribution
• I feel I made useful contribution in production of the oriented Radio Program
• My role not very well played
• I succeeded in testing more of other people’s perspective on Decentralization. There is hope.
• I contributed as usual my input to the process
• I feel honoured
• Loved to have experiences
• However since my office is in Tamale, I was still subjected to pressures to slip-out
• I contributed positively to enable my group to make a number of commitments
• I got involved in actions and tried to grab every information and also share with others
• By asserting views, giving suggestions and asking for clarification
• As a facilitator and community development specialist, I felt deeply honoured that so many people needed information, which I readily shared
• Enriched others
• Although I contributed very little I hope to use experience gathered in my programme
• Gave my perspectives on development which some discussed at the group level
• A fulcrum in the Dialogue process: carrier of knowledge for growth
• I participated actively and made new friends
• As a participant
• Joining the peace building and conflict committee, I believed I made an impact
• I added some inputs in the conflict management

6.5 Assessment of the Organization and Management of the Dialogue

• Very good
• Excellent and timely
• More of these

6.5.1 What were the positive aspects of the dialogue

- Dispassionate and constructive engagement of all; i.e. politicians, civil society academia and business. This gives opportunity for networking
- I realize that development partners went to the field to listen and see things for themselves
- It was positive for me to work with key people in civil society. Government and donors can agree with the idea that the poor are being left out in the development process especially because decentralization not effectively practiced
- Provided the space for discussing very challenging matters relating to poverty reduction and decentralization
- Women to be encouraged to come forward to participate in development by all. Civil society to advocate for more accountability
- The high level of interaction, discussion. The blend of various development actors of different levels was a strength
- Well planned process and a great deal achieved – commitments
- Poverty could be reduced among the poor if they have access to information on development initially people were not clear as to what they were to do. This
needed effective moderation and this was provided the convener, participant were friendly and contributed to issues irrespective of where they coming from.

- Practical methods to address the key issues came out clearly as the diverse groups exchanged ideas
- The open space approach with dialogue was highly innovative; there was an open, fair and frank discussion. The wide spectrum of experts who were invited made the discussions rich.
- Learning about practicalities on the ground, networking, talking and thinking through issues on development provided enough challenge to some assumptions.
- It is feasible to engage stakeholders in a dialogue
- Poverty can really be reduced with dialogue as a good communication tool.
- The further deepening of the import of information in the development process so far as choices are concerned. The facilitation of establishing personal connections
- To be a good listener to other opinions
- The openness and spontaneity of the dialogue. Allowing space for response and reaching perspective to dialogue
- Different perspectives on development with capacity to dialogue in a frank and positive way shows ample hope for future development as people show concern and commitment.
- Learning the process of freedom of expression from others
- Opportunity to interact with people through radio stations. Interest of development partners in the influence of radio communication. The level of interest shown by participants in moving development forward.
- The participatory nature was wonderful
- The commitment of all participants and participants to own the dialogue. The field trip was fantastic
- Different important issues could be discussed simultaneously.
- The willingness of many to contribute and share and learn
- Meeting colleagues from various sectors
- The whole process has been a positive initiative, the style of the dialogue process as well as style of the moderator, the different combination made it very good
- I had the opportunity to blend them with field investigation and analysis of the causes of poverty. I also adequately interacted with different development partners and practitioners on poverty and decentralization issues.
- The participatory nature of the dialogue
- The presence of substantive heads of World Bank country representative and others (regional minister, etc.) Participatory nature – freelance contribution and broad spectrum nature of participants – meeting friends
- Through the dialogue, I was able to share ideas and experience which I hope would promote decentralization of poverty reduction
- I had the opportunity to meet high level development practitioners, learnt a lot from them and also had the opportunity to access myself.
- Theory such as discussions held on day followed by field trip to learn at first hand programmes of poverty reduction, the preparedness of all to share ideas freely and frankly
- The sharing and contributions from all cross sections of people that matter in the network
- Free and frank expression of perspectives
- In my group, which talked about using the media especially, Radio for development there were so many contributions from almost all the participants.
- Exposure to other peoples thinking about development opportunity to engage with decision makers on the issues of development
- It was extremely useful with regard to networking. I met new people, collected new ideas on how to do things differently. It was an excellent opportunity to reflect about own ideas
- The view of others both donors and other development partners.
- Shared views with others and learnt new things
- Innovative development dialogue and bringing together donors, development partners under one roof to discuss poverty reduction and market space strategy to sell ideas
- Provided opportunity for appreciating other prospective about the poverty alleviation processes.
- Interacting with other development partners
- With some efforts from the stakeholders will be able to reduce poverty through community participatory programmes
- Government and civil society organizations and development partners to examine issues that affect their work which impacts poverty reduction strategies
- During the dialogue, I realized that the time was ripe to know and act upon our poverty situation particularly in the North, and how NGOs and others are collaborating were helping to reduce poverty
- Coming together and discussing issues on problems of under development was a worthwhile experience
- The way forward for protecting peace in the area
- Varying perspectives about dealing with poverty reduction, information flow and development
- On one hand there may be dialogue with development partners and community members

6.5.2 What were the negative things I experienced in the dialogue

- None, however I wished we could have more time in the communities perhaps a night
- The poor were not in our midst for the dialogue – that is a big gap
- That most participants would have wished to go to more than one location for the field trip
- I felt sick of malaria for a while and was bad and knocked down in action
- The conspicuous absence of the poor, the distance of the some of the communities that were interacted i.e. Salaga and Navrongo
- The dialogue did not result in any specific commitment but seemed like a lot of talking with no action or results
- Not sure of any such negative experience
- Little opportunity to showcase the North by virtue of documentary, etc. statement on conflict situation and more time used in meals – long lines to serve, more participants on their day – lateness and therefore draw-back in issue discussion
- Throughout the presentations and perspectives it was realised that there is a serious lack of information flow to enhance the poverty reduction endeavour
- I cannot really say there was any negative things that I encountered
- Some sectors of the education were left out in the dialogue. Education – apart from the universities
- Communities not being serious about some of their answers of smaller group and particular strategies used to interest of communities
- No real enthusiasm to get the field experience. Tendency to defend government position apparent in some exchanges. A lot of stereotyping about poor people
- Not much to say
- Gathering was rather too large and for so most people could not contribute at plenary.
- Sometimes avoidable confusion; no clear time setting, not sufficient structure and guidance in the discussions/group work
- No provision was made for fuel to participants and drivers
- The large members but negative impact would be reduced if organized at the onset in smaller groups
- The dialogue should have two parts, one part exploring the views of community’s members then the second dealing with what has transpired. Key poverty reduction issues such as conflicts environmental degradation and HIV/AIDS were not given enough prominence
- Seriously speaking I did not personally see any negative thing I did experience
- A kind of defensive stand of some government sector participants, responsibility for implications of field visits not clear. E.g. who pays for related costs?
- The district chief executives who are at the local level to see to the development were not there to explain certain issues bothering the minds of people
- It is unfortunate that some of the ideas brought out can’t be implemented overnight but there is the hope that this will be the beginning of future change
- The initial delays in the organization of the field trip to the field
- Lack of coordination of development partners
- My own inability to participate in the field trip
- No negative trend during the intervention
- The time was not entirely adequate but satisfactory
- Having three discussion groups in one hall made the environment very messy. There were some extremists who tended to dominate the group discussion
- Too short time in the field limited the extent of social emersion
- That we all talked at the time about the same thing and yet there was no mention of some people doing things about the problems
- Time factor – too short. We needed a week to truly engage with the poor and then bring detailed analysis back for sharing.
6.6 Suggestions for Strengthening the Dialogue about Development

1. We need sustained follow-up
2. Decentralize the dialogue to rural communities more involvement of policy makers
3. Should be continued and should move from region to region
4. The dialogue brings together all stakeholders
5. It should allow more chances for participants to go to more than one field trip, need for more days of dialogue
6. Replication of this (where funds permit at the regional level in each of the 3 NR
7. Effective participation with identifiable poor groups/communities in dialogue processes, development issues for discussions should be narrowed
8. Have the same dialogue but only for one region, such as Upper East or Upper West, etc, this will force group members to really collaborate and make meaningful commitments
9. There is the need for this kind of dialogue to continue to address other development issues
10. Important partners like UNICEF, UNDP were conspicuously missing
11. Continued dialogue and participation
12. Follow-up with ‘talking point’ and regional radio discussion on what took place. Development partners (World bank/GTZ) support a project in the region on one of the key issues as a commitment and for a commemoration, IPA to invite a refresher/Post-dialogue assessment mid year (6 months time)
13. I suggest that the media should network on the issue of development to be able to make a more positive impact on the poverty reduction effort
14. I suggest that the dialogue is institutionalised so that findings and recommendations could be channelled to government and donor agencies for consideration
15. Political activist of the different political parties should also be represented
16. More group work
17. Recognition of importance of information to making choices about development priorities
18. If rural people would be engaged the next time, in order to feel and share their experience even in the local language it would go a long way to enhance the process.
19. More of such with more focused topics and smaller numbers
20. Principally the open space is a useful tool but it must be enriched with focussed and output oriented group work, otherwise the whole discussion remains ‘floating’ without commitment. Reduce time to maximum 2 days
21. The role of information/communication as well as linking with partners for networking for growth and development of our communities so that we can reduce poverty
22. Dialogue should be regular, provision for fuel and allowance to drivers should be made in the future
23. Need for networking of participants for mutually beneficial collaboration
24. Subsequent dialogue should focus on key issues in the GPRS
25. Involvement of the vulnerable in the discussion
26. Reaching out for more people to participate e.g. the physical disability and the vulnerable
27. A quarterly meeting of panel members of key issues identified to take the findings a step further using the commitments, and then forming a mini dialogue between donor agencies and the government to ensure that the workable commitments are adhered to
28. There should be a quick follow-up to this dialogue and media involvement in poverty reduction should be strengthened
29. Discussions should continue
30. More of these workshops should be organized including media like this
31. Rural people and other beneficiaries of development should be engaged in the dialogue process
32. A work team should be set up to follow up on dialogue recommendations
33. Information about even should be given way ahead for adequate preparation
34. There should be a committee of dialogue members to put to good views that have been discussed
35. The dialogue must not stop in Tamale; it should rise to the top for effective changes to begin
36. The current arrangement seems perfect and could be improved by involving more local and indigenous NGOs
37. This should be organized every year and rotated to include the targeted poor
38. Organize such events at least once a year
39. The media should be represented at all level once that is the channel for reaching the people
40. Topics must be geared towards solving specific problems, we must get the politicians (policy makers and implemented) to commit themselves to the decision arrived at. Must also give chance at the end of the day to donors and NGOs to make commitments to solving the problems identified
41. There could be another forum with implementers of the decision arrived at in the dialogue
42. The dialogue should further be decentralized to the regional and district level
43. Extensive field visit and less static engagements
44. More dialogue, development partners should be encouraged to do more
45. More regular interactions between the grassroots and policy makers and implementers
46. Taken to the grassroots level (grassroots participation)
47. More time for people to match their field experience with the perspective
48. Development issues for discussion should be narrowed for thorough discussion
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Experience of the Institute for Policy Alternatives in Moderating the Dialogue

The Institute for Policy Alternatives (IPA) is a center of excellence in the learning, monitoring and evaluation of sustainable development, through the spectacle of local and international researchers collaborating with practitioners engaged in national and community-level development efforts. As an independent think tank, IPA’s mission is to promote policy alternatives in Africa, by combining the efforts of researchers with those of practitioners to establish perspectives, experiences and new, more engaging paradigms for development. The Institute supports Ghanaian and African policy makers and practitioners to undertake development research, policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation, in order to give meaning, intellectual relevance and empirical challenge to practitioners and researchers in policy development and advocacy.

In addition to its core mandate of promoting dialogue on development and policy alternatives, IPA is currently running training programmes on Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation for:

- Members and Staff of African Parliaments (to understand techniques for poverty monitoring and their own role as oversight bodies for poverty reduction).
- Local Government personnel, on decentralizing poverty monitoring and evaluation.
- International students on evaluating poverty in the context of development learning.

The IPA also supports work on Social and Public Accountability, providing skills development and the application of citizen-based tools for engaging civil society organizations and public institutions in accountability.
8 Appendix 1 – Detailed Programme

Day 1: Monday October 20

7:00 – 8:00 am Breakfast

8:00 – 9:30 am Arrival, Registration, Information, Documentation

9:30 – 11:00 am Introduction Session and Perspectives on Development and Poverty Reduction:
- Chairman’s Opening Remarks
- Introduction to Dialogue Themes and the Participatory Process

Dr. Sulley Gariba, Moderator

- Mr. Samuel Zan, SEND Foundation
- Mr. Issah Ketekewu, Deputy Minister of Local Government & Rural Development
- Dr. Angela Ofori-Atta, Deputy Minister, Employment & Social Welfare
- Ms. Nadia Ibrahimah, TUC – Northern Region
- Dr. Hakeem Wemah, Agrovets Ltd.
- Hon. Mustapha Ali, MP., Minister of Works & Housing
- Mats Kalsson, Country Director, World Bank
- Hon. Ernest Debra, Regional Minister

11:00 – 11:30 am Coffee-Tea Break, Groups are formed according to areas of expertise and interest

11:30 – 1:00 pm Dialogue Sessions in small groups to set the context and share understanding on Development perspectives

1:00 – 2:00 pm Lunch

2:00 – 2:30 pm Session re-convenes to receive information on planned field trip locations and issues. People then register for specific field visits.

2:30 – 5:00 pm On the basis of expressed interest, groups meet to develop tools for engaging communities in field activities

6:00 – 7:00 pm Press interaction and cocktail at the Forecourt of the Institute for Policy Alternatives

7:30 – 8:30 pm Dinner (buffet served at Gariba Lodge Terrace restaurant).
Day 2: Tuesday October 21

6:30 – 7:30 am  Breakfast
7:30 – 4:00 pm  All day in the field, packed lunch provided.
4:00 – 6:00 pm  Groups meet to synthesize their thoughts and prepare short synthesis for distribution in a hand-out the next day.
5:30 – 7:00 pm  Media Working Group has a session with Dr. Audrey Gadzekpo
7:00 – 8:00 pm  Dinner (buffet served at Gariba Lodge Terrace restaurant).

Day 3: Wednesday October 22

7:00 – 8:00 am  Breakfast
8:00 – 10:30 am  Market Place display of outcomes of field engagement, followed by Panel Discussion on the themes and reflections on field engagement processes
Panel comprised 6 persons selected from the teams that went to The field, moderated by the convener, Dr. Sulley Gariba
10:00 – 11:00 am  Tea, coffee break; open space for participants to form groups around selected sub-themes:
11:00 – 12:30 pm  Group Sessions convene in small cafés to deliberate on issues they signed up for. Recommendations emerging from their dialogue are then formulated as partnership commitments
12:30 – 1:30 pm  Synthesis of key partnership commitments and their implications for future dialogue
1:30 – 2:30 pm  Lunch
2:30 – 5:00 pm  Selected discussion groups, as may be arranged by various partner groups:
  • Some development partners make courtesy calls on Regional and District Leadership
  • Media Working Group develops detailed plans as per agreements on Tuesday and Wednesday sessions
7:00 – 10:00 pm  Dinner and Dance