FROM SHOUTING TO COUNTING
A NEW FRONTIER IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
Better Governance, Better results
With Accountable Government:

Democracy is STRONGER
Services are more EFFICIENT
Corruption is EXPOSED
The POOREST in society are BETTER served
Good Governance is RECOGNIZED and RESPECTED

A new manifestation of citizenship based on the right to hold governments accountable by expanding people’s responsibility
ACROSS THE WORLD, WE FIND CITIZENS ARE MOBILIZING, OFTEN LOCALLY, TO DEMAND BETTER SERVICES. NOT BY SHOUTING, BUT BY COUNTING. MAKING SURE THEIR GOVERNMENTS SPEND EFFECTIVELY, AND KEEP THEIR PROMISES.

IT'S NOT JUST ABOUT PEOPLE PROTESTING AND MAKING NOISE. THIS NEW APPROACH TO CITIZEN ACTION ACTUALLY INVOLVES SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS AND INTELLIGENT USE OF DATA, MAKING SURE THEIR GOVERNMENTS SPEND EFFECTIVELY AND KEEP THEIR PROMISES.

THESE CITIZENS ARE DEMANDING ACCOUNTABILITY FROM THEIR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS. AT THE HEART OF THIS IS GETTING AND USING CRITICAL INFORMATION ABOUT BUDGETS, EXPENDITURES, CORRUPTION, PERFORMANCE, ETC. THE NEW BREED OF CITIZEN VOICE IS THUS ABOUT USING INFORMATION IN A WAY THAT CAN LEAD TO RESULTS.
**This is Social Accountability.**

Citizens working together, to ensure their governments are managing their resources effectively, transparently, and meeting their community’s needs. The people themselves become the key to strengthening the demand for government services.

“Too often, services fail poor people. These failures may be less spectacular than financial crises, but their effects are continuing and deep nonetheless.”

James D. Wolfensohn, World Bank President

**WHY DOES SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY MATTER IN DEVELOPMENT WORK?**

“It matters because we are not only investing money in infrastructure, such as building schools. The only way to find out that kids are learning is by checking that those funds are actually reaching their destination, by having the communities participate and verify this themselves.”

Steen Lau Jorgensen
Social Development Director, World Bank

**WHAT’S NEW ABOUT SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY?**

Expanding citizens’ responsibility to hold governments accountable

**The Focus is Good Governance**
How effectively services are delivered, how spending is allocated, how government itself can be improved to serve the community.

**From Shouting to Counting**
Citizens monitor performance using critical information: about budgets, spending priorities, expenditures. They track inefficiencies. They discover misappropriations through corruption. They measure performance.

**From Information to Action**
Information is at the core of this activism. This new approach involves analysis and systematic use of data. Performance and quality of service are measured against budget and expenditure data.

“Unlike the concept of Transparency, the Right to Information requires an activist approach. It puts the burden of framing questions and demanding answers on the people.”

Aruna Roy, Mazdoor Kishan Shakti Sangathan
Association for the Empowerment of Workers and Farmers, India
From Confrontation to Negotiation
Armed with information and analysis, citizens negotiate with their governments, ensuring greater responsiveness. Results are achieved, not so much by confrontation in the streets, as by informed negotiation.

A win-win Partnership
- Politicians gain credibility and are publicly recognized for their performance.
- Citizens move beyond mere protest towards engaging with bureaucrats and politicians in a more informed, organized, constructive, and systematic manner, thus increasing the chances of effecting positive change in governance.

Counting Money to Make Commitments Count
One aspect of social accountability means that citizens participate around the public expenditure cycle in the areas of:
- Budget review and analysis
- Budget formulation
- Budget/Expenditure tracking
- Performance Monitoring

THE CHALLENGE
“There is a lack of capacity on both sides, on the part of civil society to demand social accountability and on behalf of government to respond to these demands.”

“Legal frameworks in support of social accountability are often weak, and information systems are poor.”

William Reuben
Coordinator, Participation and Civic Engagement, World Bank
The education system in Uganda was unsatisfactory in the early 1990s. Basics were lacking, enrollment was 87%, and Ugandan households were paying too much for primary education.

Uganda used its strong economic growth in the early 1990s to invest in primary school education. Yet money was not reaching schools.

A three-fold increase in spending showed no increases in children at school, according to official statistics.

**The Public Expenditure Tracking Survey**

To find out where money was being lost, through corruption or mismanagement, the Ugandan government, with the support of the World Bank, tracked public expenditure in a survey of 250 schools.

The mission was to find how much of the money leaving the exchequer actually reached schools between 1991 and 1995.

It allowed the government to:
- Measure the problems
- Identify bottlenecks
- Expose leaks

The data on grants per schoolchild showed only a shocking 2% of the allocation reached schools in 1991. Most, particularly poor schools, received nothing at all.

By 1995, this rose to 26%, still very low.

On the positive side, the survey revealed children enrolled in schools had in fact risen 60%. Both schools and districts had benefited financially from underreporting enrollments.
The Lessons from Uganda

1. A tracking survey to identify bottlenecks and leaks
2. Sharing information with the public, breaking a culture of secrecy
3. Giving people information to challenge uses and abuses of public funds

Uganda is an example of a cost-effective method that achieves results.

- Using newspapers and radio to inform people of transfers of public funds
- Empowering them to monitor money flows, and demand local officials send the money to the intended schools
- Reducing losses to inefficiencies, bottlenecks and personal gain
- Dramatically improving results
- Ensuring policy decisions and funding allocations translate to results on the ground
- Highlighting the use and abuse of public money
- Increasing government accountability and transparency

IMPACT

- Funds reaching schools rose dramatically, from 2% in 1991, to 26% in 1995, to more than 90% in 1999. These are grants per schoolchild. However, delays are still experienced.
- 15,000 ‘ghost employees’ eliminated from payroll by 1993. These non-existent salaries represented 20% of the total number of teachers.
- Overall non-wage funds leaking from the system dropped, from 97% lost in 1991 to 18% lost in 2001.
- Schools with access to newspapers increased their funds by 10% more than schools that lacked newspapers.

Universal Primary Education

President Yoweri Museveni decided to make Universal Primary Education one of his highest priorities. In 1996, the President decided to remove fees for up to four children per family (of which two should be girls), in a bold effort to achieve universal primary education for all children aged 6 to 12 years by 2000.

In this context, the public has become a force ensuring public funds reach schools.
FAST FACTS

- 1.3 million inhabitants
- Largest industrial city in Rio Grande do Sul State
- US$7 billion local economy

PORTO ALEGRE, BRAZIL

PARTicipatory budgeting

A SUCCESS STORY

“Today, the people involved in the process of participatory budgeting all know the amount of resources available, understand how political power works, and are able to achieve a level of equality in the debate.”

Assis Brasil de Olegario Filho
Coordinator of Relations with the Community Municipal Prefecture of Porto Alegre

BUDGETING BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE

Porto Alegre is a successful example of participatory budgeting. Pioneered by the Workers Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores-PT) and its leader now in power, President Luiz Ignacio Lula da Silva, after it won municipal elections in 1989, this experiment in local government budgeting involves direct public consultation. Citizens participate directly in decisions on the municipal budget.

Every year, more people have joined, reaching 50,000 participants by the year 2000. Uniquely, the poor become stakeholders.

The results are striking. The city of Porto Alegre has improved services for its people while running budget surpluses every year since 1990.


The Workers Party has won successive municipal elections since 1989, and remains strongly committed to participatory budgeting.
**IMPACT**

**New roads** 30 km of new roads paved annually since 1989, in poorer neighborhoods

**Education** Doubled number of children in public schools [1989-1995]

**Water** Households with access to water rose from 80% to 98% [1989-1996]

**Sewage** 900km of sewerage system built [1989-1996]

- Over 100 Brazilian cities are following the Porto Alegre model by the year 2000
- Voted Brazilian city with best quality of life [Exame, business journal]
- Nominated for exemplary “urban innovation”, 1996, UN Summit on Human Settlements

**HOW IT WORKS**

Ordinary citizens meet in successive meetings, participate directly in setting budget priorities, determine allocation of resources with the mayor’s office, and draw up a budget for legislative approval.

**Key Steps**
- Organize budget debates with residents
- Review investment plans of the previous year
- Citizen delegates debate priorities and discuss budget proposals
- Rank demands and community claims
- Divide resources based on a weighting system combining citizen preferences and quantitative criteria
- Citizen council presents final budget proposal to Legislature

“The process allowed the population to discuss and decide the public policies and the budget proposal of the city together with the executive branch of the local government.”

Assis Brasil de Olegario Filho
Coordinator of Relations with the Community, Municipal Prefecture of Porto Alegre

**A YEAR OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING**

**March**
Informal citizen gatherings collect demands

**April**
Citizens meet with mayor’s office:
- review previous year’s projects
- discuss new proposals
- elect delegates

**April to June**
Delegates discuss needs
Citizens and civic associations rank their demands

**June**
Counselors of Participatory Budgeting [COP] installed:
- 44 councilors
- 2 from each of 16 city regions
- 2 from each of 5 themes:
  - transportation
  - education, leisure, and culture
  - health and social welfare
  - economic development and taxation
  - city organization and urban development
- 2 additional representatives

**July to September**
Weekly COP meetings

**September**
COP approves new budget, and sends it the legislature

**November**
Budget approved

“Participatory budgeting is like a big family that is grouped together to make a decision that will improve things inside your own home.”

Gentil Claudio de Souza Lopes, Delegate, Council of Participatory Budgeting
PUBLIC HEARINGS: A TOOL TO STOP FRAUD AND CORRUPTION

A small Indian NGO, introduced public hearings in villages in Rajasthan in 1994. The aim? To stop fraud and abuse of public funds.

The assembled people listened to detailed accounts of official expenditure records and supporting documents. Villagers were invited to testify discrepancies between official records and their personal experiences. Laborers, suppliers, and contractors were invited to verify payments on the documents. The setting was informal, but presided over by respected members of the community.

The local NGO spearheading this movement is Mazdoor Kishan Shakti Sangathan—MKSS, or Association for the Empowerment of Workers and Farmers. The hearings are known as ‘Jan Sunwai’.

A SOCIAL AUDIT: THE RIGHT TO KNOW CAMPAIGN

Rajasthan shows what can happen when citizens audit government spending, cross-checking accuracy, and measuring discrepancies between stated records and actual results.

MKSS copied documents pertaining to minimum wage regulations and public works, such as a check on dam construction, and new school building. They took that information from village to village, verifying details. What they learned, outraged local people:

- Wages had been paid to fictitious workers, taken from electoral rolls, including the dead.
- Incomplete works were certified as completed, and paid for in full.
- Over billing rackets for materials, that were never supplied.

From these beginnings, MKSS has spearheaded a campaign to expose corrupt officials, by using government documents, which the public can verify.
FROM SOCIAL AUDIT TO ACTION

Once discrepancies are noted, officials are asked to return the missing sums. In some cases, officials have returned money voluntarily, in others, significant sums of money were returned to the public exchequer.

If officials refused to disclose information, villagers took turns holding long sit-ins, until they received a response. These climaxed in a 52-day protest to pressure the Rajasthan government to make public its development funds.

INFORMATION: THE POWER OF EVIDENCE

Armed with detailed financial records, citizen movements can audit government spending, systematically exposing fraud, and creating a social impediment for corruption.

Social auditing is an important step towards accountability, transparency, and making budgets live up to their stated goals of addressing the needs of the poor.

Key Steps
- Organize civil society and local NGOs to focus on government’s transparency and accountability, specifically on public funds for development projects—building schools, drinking water schemes, road construction
- Investigate potential discrepancies between what the government claims, and direct experiences of contractors, laborers, and beneficiaries
- Get the right to view bills, vouchers, and employment rolls of development projects from the government
- Get the right to copy documents
- Interpret the technical details in official documents
- Cross-check with residents/beneficiaries
- Hold public hearings, inviting everyone, including elected representatives, local government officials, and the media

IMPACT
- Exposing corruption and illegal powers by local politicians, and government contractors
- Sums of money returned
- The Right to Information Act became law in Rajasthan in May 2000, protecting the people’s right to access public financial records
- Obstacles encountered by local bureaucracy and local government are overcome
- Institutionalizing the process: social audit powers were invested in new Ward Sabha units, with powers to remove local officials

“The simple but straightforward demand of access to detailed records of development works, including bills, vouchers, and muster-rolls has snowballed into a statewide debate on transparency and accountability of the State.”

Aruna Roy
Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan
COMMUNITY SCORECARDS: A TOOL TO CLAIM THE RIGHT TO BETTER SERVICES

FAST FACTS
- 11 million people
- Life expectancy: less than 40 years
- Under five mortality: 234/1000 live births

A SUCCESS STORY

"Health service users and providers are now able to work as partners. Major decisions are made jointly with both sides willing to take up responsibility in improving the health delivery."

Virginia Kamowa, Care International, Malawi

COMMUNITY SCORECARDS

Community scorecards are tools in a process, not an end in themselves. They are a simple concrete tool for a community to claim their right to better services. The people create the scorecards: setting the criteria, defining the standards, and getting to meet face-to-face with their providers, sharing ideas on how to reform and improve.

The focus in Malawi was healthcare, in 81 poor rural villages, served by the Chileka and Nthondo health centers. This Local Initiatives for Health Project began in May 2002, facilitated by Care International, together with local Village Health Committees. This initiative will continue through a partnership with the World Bank.
KEY STEPS

First, a village develops its own community scorecard. In Malawi, villagers decided how to judge the performance of their local health center, including suggestions for improvement.

At the same time, the health center workers filled out their own self-evaluation cards, with their ideas on how to improve care.

Once scorecards were completed, a face-to-face meeting was called, often separating the men and women, to encourage all views. Each meeting could then discuss feedback, debate suggestions, and decide on an action plan for the next 6 months. Responsibility was assigned for each action item, with timeframes for each activity/result.

By repeating the scorecards six months later, progress can be monitored and assessed.

The key is that the scorecards become a tool for the community to voice its demand for better services, and gain the right to participate in the reforms. The scorecards become the tool for accountability. The result? A community actively engaged in their right to better services.

“Communities understand our work much better, they know how and when to assist with our work and they monitor our work and give advice rather than criticizing. There is a lot of dialogue and understanding between the service users and us now.”

Eliya P. Phiri
Chileka Health Center, Ministry of Health

IMPACT

- Empowers citizens to monitor, participate and measure the quality of services
- Initiates dialogue among health service providers and users
- Generates indicators from both communities and service users for monitoring change
- Recognizes areas of good work and areas that need improving
- Rebuilds lost trust
- Decides actions to improve people’s access to health services
- Devises strategies for effectively using limited health services
- Gives a chance to the community to make informed decisions to improve their healthcare
- Instills a sense of responsibility and ownership of health services among users
- Promotes accountability and transparency between providers and users, and within the levels of health service providers

“This scorecard is very interesting. Why don’t you come back to discuss other services...like education?”

Women’s discussion group, village Ndevu, Lilongwe District.
“Before the beginning of our LUPA FISCAL program, there wasn’t any civil society organization monitoring and fostering budgetary information. We were also pioneers in training civil society and the media, promoting a better understanding of the budget.”

Laura Malajovich, CIPPEC

BUDGET DEFICITS

The cause of Argentina’s budget deficit is often explained as political, not economic. Weak institutions and little public information and control over public policy are critical to low tax revenues. All contribute to recurring crises and an inefficient and unequal allocation of public spending.

BUDGET WATCHDOG

The goals
Since 2002, a small local NGO introduced a Budget Watchdog program, with clear goals:

- Greater transparency and accountability in the public budget
- Give citizens the tools to monitor public resources and spending
- Encourage citizen participation
- Strengthen legislative debate on the budget

The NGO is Center for Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth (CIPPEC). The program is known as ‘LUPA FISCAL’, literally, fiscal magnifying glass.
KEY STEPS

The NGO focused on creating tools for the public and lawmakers to understand the budget clearly. These involve publications and training seminars.

“The Lupa Fiscal program generates publications, tools, and training courses aimed at civil society organizations, journalists, legislators and their staff, and universities. These materials seek to strengthen the capacity of civil society to participate in and monitor the budget process.”

Miguel Braun, Director, CIPPEC

PUBLICATIONS

- Budget Briefs: how the central government spends the money, what economic assumptions are made. These are distributed to legislators, the media, and members of civil society.
- Budget Guides: published once Congress approves the budget, with in-depth analysis, and international comparisons.
- Public Spending Implementation Briefs: A clear summary of government spending, keeping track of the budget.
- Monthly Fiscal Bulletin: current budget topics analyzed, and distributed to legislators and the media.

TRAINING SEMINARS:

- Legislators: tools for analysis
- Journalists: tools for analysis and communication of issues
- Community organizers: tools for effective participation

IMPACT

National level:
- Increasing citizen awareness of budget choices and process
- Cited once a week, on average, in the national press, by 2003
- Strengthening Congressional oversight and debate on budget
- Used by opposition party leaders in their budgetary analysis
- A credible reference point for accurate information and analysis

Local level:
- Helping local community groups monitor municipal budgets
- This grass-roots training, empowering citizens to monitor their local government budgets, is planned to expand in 2004

“We’ve been working a lot over the results and the impact of the budget analysis trying to increase social accountability.”

Javier Fornieles
Participacion Ciudadana de Balcarce [local town civic group]
Ireland
Social Partnership Agreement

Fast Facts
- 4 million people
- 5.8% economic growth [2000-2001]
- 15 years of economic growth since 1987

A Success Story

“There was a shared recognition among the key economic and social actors that the challenges facing Ireland could not be addressed by any one group, but instead required a collective and sustained response.”

Simon Hare
Department of the Irish Prime Minister (Taoiseach)

How It Began

In the late 1980s Ireland was going through a tough recession (1980-1987), with high inflation, heavy public borrowing, deficits, unemployment, and loss of manufacturing.

The idea of a social partnership agreement came from consultations between the government and its social partners: the main trade union, employer and farming organizations.

Ever since 1997, participation has also included the community and voluntary sector, to help address social policy issues such as exclusion and unemployment.

What was needed was a national strategy to secure low inflation and steady growth, underpin competitive incomes and distribute fairly, and prepare Ireland’s economy for European Monetary Union and the Euro. In effect, the government consulted key members of society on how the country should be run.

Each agreement lasts three years, and covers pay, taxes, and a wide range of national economic and social issues.
SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

- A framework and process
- Government, private sector, and civil society representatives
- Taking national socioeconomic decisions together

KEY STEPS

- Department of Finance prepares central economic forecast
- National Economic and Social Council (NESC), the forum for consultations, draws up a strategy report
- 4 months of consultations among all partners and the government
- Each group presents its position, listens, and adjusts
- The government moderates competing claims and facilitates negotiations
- A new social partnership agreement outlines future macroeconomic policy, and other key national issues

IMPACT

Ireland’s experience suggests this broad approach to government, inviting each sector of society to participate in setting priorities, goals, and policies, yields impressive results:

- restoring competitiveness
- maintaining industrial peace
- providing a conducive environment for investment and growth
- one of Europe’s fastest growing economies
- average 4.9% GDP growth per year, compared with EU 2.8% average
- average 2.8% annual inflation since 1987, compared to 20% in early 1980s
- over 1.1 billion Irish Pounds budget surplus (1999), compared with 1.4 billion deficit [1986]
- stability offered by these multi-annual policy, tax, and wage commitments
- unemployment reduced from 17.5% to under 5% in 12 years
- pay rates rose 2.5 times EU average in the 1990s
- one third of American investment in Europe is going to Ireland, especially high-tech companies

“From a government perspective, these agreements have played a very significant role in our economic and social development over the years, particularly in terms of helping to overcome the fiscal crisis of the 1980s and, subsequently, in stimulating investment and job creation on an unprecedented scale.”

Simon Hare
Department of the Irish Prime Minister (Taoiseach)
Social Accountability is a Right

the Right to Know

the Right to Question

the Right to Participate

the Right to Better Services

the Right to Stop Corruption

the Right to End Poverty

the Right to Demand that Commitments are Respected

“The main difference between success and failure is... the degree to which poor people themselves are involved in determining the quality and the quantity of the services they receive.”

World Development Report, World Bank, 2004
“The people have a right to know, a right to question, a collective Constitutional right to receive an answer.”

Aruna Roy, MKSS Rajasthan, India

Social Account/Ability: the Ability to Make Commitments Count
CONTACT INFORMATION:

THE WORLD BANK
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA

www.worldbank.org

Participation & Civic Engagement Group
Social Development Department
F: 202-522-1669
E: copsa@worldbank.org

www.worldbank.org/participation

Sustainable Development
External Affairs and Communications
T: 202-458-2841
E: sdcommunications@worldbank.org

www.worldbank.org/sustainabledevelopment