Governance, accountability and citizen empowerment in the global south:

A learning workshop June 11 and 12 2014, Dublin

Seminar report

1. Introduction

The Centre for Peace and Development Studies, University of Limerick, Christian Aid Ireland, Trócaire and the Development Studies Association of Ireland held a workshop on delivering social change in the global south on 11 and 12 June 2014 in Dublin. All presentations and seminar blogs are available on Christian Aid's Learning Exchange site. The programme for the event can be found in annex 1 of this report.

Civil society and government initiatives increasingly focus on how governance interventions can deliver transparency and accountability in order to improve democratic deficits and deliver on developmental targets. Some of these initiatives focus on social accountability and typically aim to enhance the 'social contract' between the state and citizens. They are often designed to empower communities to demand greater accountability from individuals (frontline staff and local government employees) who deliver the basic services to which all citizens have a right. Social accountability therefore refers to the wide range of citizen and civil society organisation actions to hold the state to account, as well as actions on the part of government, media, and other societal actors that promote or facilitate these efforts.

Governance in this context is understood to mean more than just government, it encompasses the nature of power relations between state and society, the rules that regulate the public realm – the space where state as well as economic and societal actors interact to make decisions and have

relations, and the processes and institutions, both formal and informal, through which public authority is exercised.

After a decade of interventions which have had goals such as improving citizens' voice, creating accountable government, creating transparency and accountability, community empowerment, promoting active citizenship, deepening democracy , we have arrived at a point where the seminar organisers felt reflection on research and practice for and by Irish NGOs and Irish and international academics would be important.

While there has been ample international dialogue and academic evaluations of the impact of these interventions, there have been few such discussions in Ireland between practitioners, Irish Aid and academics. Additionally there has been limited dialogue on the tension between the long term process of changing state and citizen relations and donors' needs to produce quick results in Ireland. This learning workshop aimed to bridge these gaps by providing an in-depth forum for dialogue. It focused on the key challenges, tensions and complexities in working on interventions targeted at long-term structural change.

2.   The emphasis on thinking and working politically

There are some key tensions in debates on governance and accountability programmes. Keynote speaker Alina Rocha Menocal from the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) outlined to the seminar that these interventions come in the context of the 'good governance' agenda – substantially promoted by mainstream development actors since the 1990s. The 'good governance agenda' has been defined by a tendency to see development as a technocratic exercise without sufficiently recognising that politics matter and a lack of awareness of the political nature of reform processes. Several unrealistic assumptions underpin this apolitical approach: that there is an automatic relationship between voice and accountability; that is possible to see 'the poor' as a homogenous group; that effective and efficient institutions will be more transparent, responsive and accountable; and that greater democracy always leads to improved developmental outcomes.

McGee and Gaventa warn that many transparency and accountability interventions "focus on the delivery of development outcomes narrowly conceived, neglecting or articulating only superficially the potential for deepening democracy or empowering citizens…" (2011:8). Joshi and Houtzager similarly deplore the fact that "current conceptualisations of social accountability have tended to focus on it as 'mechanisms' or 'widgets', a view which tends to depoliticize the very process through which poor people make claims" (2012:145). The latter are just two examples of academic evaluations which highlight academics' fear that the current focus is too narrowly set on delivering small, incremental changes without engaging with the wider political and power context in which

their interventions take place. Practitioners, argue that issues such as relevance to the community are key; at grassroots level individuals want to participate in interventions that are likely to bring tangible changes within a relatively short period of time (Riddell 2007:272).

NGO practitioners however are increasingly aware of issues of power and politics and the fact that no change happens without a certain level of contestation on behalf of the more powerful, and empowerment on behalf of the less powerful within society. International NGOs support local partner agencies to formulate theories of change, mapping out what type of interventions can lead to the desired outcome for each specific intervention, taking into account issues of power, elite capture, or the monopolising powers of traditionally dominant groups based on ethnicity, gender or caste (Abugre and Valentin 2007). There has been a push, particularly in the UK to 'think and work politically' (for further information see www.doingdevelopmentdifferently.com).

3. What does this mean for development practice?

In practice this doesn't mean just "thinking about political things" (most development practitioners do that already), rather it means understanding better the deeper realities of how specific political systems function and how progressive change happens, based on a good engagement with country and global history. ODI (Wild et al, 2015) has outlined key ingredients of this approach:

➢ **Working in problem-driven and politically informed ways:** This might seem obvious but is rarely the norm. Such an approach tracks down problems, avoids ready-made solutions and is robust in its assessment of possible remedies. Too often, diagnosis only gets as far as uncovering a serious underlying challenge – often linked to the character of local politics. Doing things differently means understanding what is politically feasible and discovering smart ways to make headway on specific service delivery issues, often against the odds.

➢ **Being adaptive and entrepreneurial:** Much development work fails because, having identified a problem, it does not have a method to generate a viable solution. Because development problems are typically complex and processes of change are highly uncertain, it is essential to allow for cycles of doing, failing, adapting, learning and (eventually) getting better results. Adaptive processes are not just about 'muddling through'. Rather, they start with some initial hypotheses, test these and then revise the approach in the light of what is found, using the best available information at the time. They scrutinise 'feedback' throughout to see how interventions shape peoples' behaviour and motivations, and whether this leads to the desired impact.

➢ **Supporting change that reflects local realities and is locally led:** Change is best led by people who are close to the problem and who have the greatest stake in its solution,

whether central or local government officials, civil-society groups, private-sector groups or communities. While local 'ownership' and 'participation' are repeatedly name-checked in development, this has rarely resulted in change that is genuinely driven by individuals and groups with the power to influence the problem and find solutions.

ODI further outline how putting these changes into actual practice is still a challenge. While political economy analysis has been used by development actors for a long time it is typically interpreted in a limited way as a tool to help donors achieve programme goals rather than a way of thinking, or an analytical approach capable of helping development practitioners to understand complex issues of power, incentives and relationships when engaging seriously with the politics of development.

The reluctance to meaningfully change practice from technical approaches to more political is partly because the proposition that solutions need to be 'discovered' and are 'uncertain' remains a problem for many: for politicians who need to justify their actions to voters, and for officials who need to make decisions on how to spend funds (in their own countries or abroad). Yet this argument can be won: blueprint planning is itself high risk, and produces costly failures on a regular basis.

What is most signally missing from the debate , ODI contend, is any real discussion about method – about how domestic reformers and international actors can work together effectively to achieve desirable changes in contexts that are both politically challenging and complex. This requires a better understanding of how historical legacies, structures, and institutions shape the incentives of powerful actors. Rather than advocating 'best practice' reforms that do not take these realities into account, external actors should focus instead on connecting with domestic actors who are already working to bring about reform and change.

4. Reflections from the seminar on the practice of thinking and working politically

Seminar presentations covered how this approach of political engagement might be applied in practice. [Alina Rocha Menocal's presentation](#) outlined this means working with the institutions you would rather avoid, but which may be able to help deliver change, focusing capacity building on political skills rather than technical skills, diversifying channels and mechanisms of engagement, establishing more realistic expectations for interventions and providing longer term and more flexible support. It essentially means moving away from a prescriptive, one size fits all approach to a focus on best fit approach rather than a best practice approach. It also means working more explicitly and thoroughly with informal power structures and elites.

[Fletcher Tembo's presentation](#) from the Mwananchi programme highlighted three key lessons from a DFID funded governance and accountability programme: the need to understand the incentives of different actors for why they will or won't support change; find actors who can meaningful make change happen; and embrace contextual dynamics and complexities. The key design lesson from the Mwananchi programme is the need to evolve the theory of change from broad initial premises to a narrow and deep theory of change, which allows for flexibility at project level while justifying and measuring changes that could be expected during each of the phases of the interventions. This flexibility helps to deal with the inherent tensions between the often external expectations around social accountability and what it can practically achieve on the ground (Tembo 2013).

At the seminar, SEND's Siapha Kamara (a Christian Aid Ireland partner) [shared experiences](#) from a two year project in Sierra Leone which sought to improve [accountability within the health sector](#), following the launch of the Free Healthcare Initiative in 2010. Their approach involved using three basic tools; a Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation tool, Health Summits and Millennium Development Goal awards for health centre staff. The Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group in Uganda (a Trócaire partner) outlined their work fostering social accountability between budget makers and communities through participatory community level budget monitoring which informs targeted national level advocacy and propels wider social mobilisation. The Social Initiative for Democracy in El Salvador [presented how](#) they are using a combined approach of local level strengthening of CSO networks, of stimulating integration at a national level and of creating an active citizenship movement have sought to build citizenship. Finally the Ethiopian Social Accountability Programme [spoke of their experience](#) of citizen engagement through information promotion, assessing services, identifying issues and voicing solutions through joint action, and addressing grievances.

Many of the challenges faced within the different projects were very similar and reflected the discussions during the seminar across all countries:

- The low capacity and interest of citizens to engage with accountability programmes, for example illiteracy hampers information sharing.
- Reliable and credible evidence/ data on (budgets for) basic service provision is costly and time consuming to collect.
- The limited power of lower government structures and the difficulty of linking national and local level accountability.
- Political interference in programmes can at times be an issue.
- The difficulty of holding NGOs to account.

- Social accountability takes time and requires a significant amount of investment, restrictions imposed by multi-lateral donors stifle innovation and creativity.
- Budget decisions dictated by centralised power.
- Anti-corruption agencies don't have enough resources.
- Challenges to ensure that all stakeholders are involved.
- Government officials can be busy and lack commitment and not willing to actively engage.
- Involvement of vulnerable groups – partners had difficulty identifying them.
- Initially social accountability committees were dominated by service providers.
- Sometimes community members feared speaking honestly in front of service providers.
- Difficult to sustain committees beyond any initial project.

The case studies highlighted how governance programmes involve slow processes with examples from Ethiopia showing how the time taken to build the trust of local authorities delayed implementation and an example from Uganda showing the frustration as even when government institutions become more accountable, impunity continues. In El Salvador, Christian Aid's partner ISD talked about how they are working from a 50 year plan to reach a society based on democracy and human rights. This shows the scope and ambition of real change but it can be difficult to fit into rigid donor models which in the words of one presenter 'are making me less creative by the day'.

Pieternella Pieterse from the University of Limerick highlighted key lessons from her research in Sierra Leone on health accountability in four projects. The research looked at interventions which provided incentives, some financial, some non-financial to ensure accountable health care provision. Key findings included the fact that individual personalities matter: in accountability groups when you find strong, motivated people, you can select accountability champions – they will be effective. People tasked with facilitating dialogue between communities and service providers must be carefully selected and well versed in power dynamics, so that they can get the most out of group sessions. Development practitioners need to be realistic; rely on repeated power analysis; and shouldn't expect that people risk jeopardizing personal relationships with local service providers if the accountability dividend is uncertain. Finally, well designed, context specific incentives can help to bring about behaviour change.

Finally Niamh Gaynor from Dublin City University looked at the politics of decentralisation in Burundi. Decentralisation is not a major focus of development academics, but it can present opportunities for accountability. It has the potential to make services more efficient and effective as it serves to legitimise the state and rebuild social capital in a fragmented, post-conflict state, and bring decision making much closer to the people that it affects.

5.   What does thinking and working politically mean for donor reporting requirements?

Among other things, the complex and elaborate bureaucratic procedures and reporting requirements – presumably to avoid wastefulness and corruption and enhance upward accountability – can dampen innovation and, eventually, enhanced effectiveness (Natsios, 2010). Staff may be spending too much time meeting such bureaucratic and operational requirements, whereas more encouragement, trust and, crucially, authority to work in a more politically aware manner are needed. Staff may also be reluctant to take risks because this can affect career prospects, while continuous staff fluctuation and rapid turnover rates, especially in terms of presence in the field, pose considerable challenges to building and sustaining long-term relationships with in-country partners and the maintenance of institutional memory (see Ostrom et al., 2002; Rocha Menocal and O'Neil, 2012).

The preoccupation with detailed advance planning and annual monitoring, using outputs and outcomes as performance indicators and target setting, has been widely condemned as unrealistic, including by advocates of problem-driven and iterative approaches. However, a strong orientation to the achievement of results and their measurement should not be confused with ineffective blueprint planning or particular mis-uses of evaluation and monitoring methods, such as the Logical Framework. Doing things differently should actually be more oriented towards results in two respects. First, over reasonable periods of time (which will vary according to the objective), programmes should be able to make plausible claims of having made a contribution to positive development gains, or else they should not be supported. Second, much greater efforts should be made to build up and document experience on the intermediate change processes that make a demonstrable contribution to improved development outcomes. Once some robust metrics have been established, they should be used for close monitoring of efforts that are being directed in the right ways or that need to be redirected.

The community of practice that has emerged around the Doing Development Differently manifesto has started some work on this and is committed to doing more (www.doingdevelopmentdifferently.com).

Process measures of this sort could include the following:

- Measures of the extent to which issues have local salience or relevance, and whether processes give priority to local leadership and capacity.
- Evidence of adaptation to context.
- Evidence of learning in action.
- Measures of innovation and entrepreneurial action.

They contend it is important, however, to avoid choosing intermediate progress indicators that rely solely on past experience of what works, even if this experience seems solid. a big part of what is needed is greater learning and adaptation, including learning from failure. Yet it has been well-documented that for large donor organisations, their internal incentives can work against this (see for example Ostrom et al., 2001; Eyben, 2009; Natsios, 2010). Pressures to spend and disburse money are frequently cited as undermining the scope to learn and adapt in real time.

6. Reflections from the seminar on reporting requirements

The seminar focused on the question of if current funding and monitoring and evaluation methods are fit for purpose for working with power and politics. The challenges international NGOs and governments face and what new approaches might be needed were assessed. Earnann O'Cleirigh from Irish Aid gave a presentation on accountability and answered questions about the challenges of reporting requirements from a donor perspective. Karol Balfe from Christian Aid Ireland outlined how their implementing programmes challenged the adequacy of log-frames for assessing complex changes and shifts in power dynamics. Programmes reported that while the Irish Aid Results Framework were useful for making the link between strategies, outcomes and change and enabling partners to see how their work contributes to the programme in what areas of change –most felt that annual target setting does not work for long-term governance programming and does little to facilitate an understanding of change and our contribution to it.

Niall O'Keeffe from Trócaire identified a number of challenges and learnings in relation to designing governance programmes and the tension which can exist between supporting local civil society on one hand, and upward reporting requirements on the other, these were: 1) Strategy Alignment: The selection of the area of focus should be guided from the bottom up and so advocacy work at local and national level should be responding to and guided by the needs which are identified by community groups. But while the alignment risks curtaining some of the freedoms, it does provide for a more strategic and effective use of resources, which are limited. 2) Empowerment: Empowerment for community groups can't be imposed from outside. But we have been developing a standard set of generic indicators that focus on knowledge, capacity, action, and so on, and these can then be contextualised for each situation. So while we don't want to be prescriptive of the progress of community groups, we have enough experience to know broadly how empowerment evolves. 3) Results oriented: Governance programmes can take several years to bring about the expected change, but if we are to avoid a waste of resources and if we are to avoid the apathy amongst community groups, then we must identify realistic changes that can be expected in a reasonable time and hold ourselves accountable to these. 4) Data and information management:

We gather more information that we know what to do with, unfortunately it is not always the most useful information, and we seem to do social audits that produce one type of information and project management monitoring data captures a different type of information. There is a large overlap between both of these information requirements and we need to distil what information is really needed and cut out the rest. 5) Risk and human rights defenders: Trócaire is currently researching this more and hoping to devise better strategies to support people in high risk situations when they are advocating for more accountable governance, particularly at a local level. But we must also explore strategies which bring duty bearers along, engaging them in the process, and avoiding tension if possible.

7.   A final note on complex, politically charged environments

How the challenges of thinking and working politically should be considered when working in countries where civil society is severely constrained is a critical issue of concern; political instability can undermine a citizen engagement intervention in cases where tensions with elites could easily erupt into violence or repression. While this subject was discussed by participants, due to time constraints the seminar did not explore this in any great detail.

Nevertheless, the seminar covered case studies from a wide variety of operational environments. A [case study from Ethiopia](), demonstrated that social accountability can even be implemented though a partnership between NGOs and the government. Representatives from one of the implementing NGOs explained how the Ethiopia Social Accountability Programme manages to achieve real service provision improvements through their successful country-wide social accountability programme. It is arguably less clear if this approach would lead to an incremental opening up of civil society space, or if the programme, in first instance focuses on public service delivery only.

 A recent [INTRAC publication]() addressed the challenges of influencing and supporting change in complex and politically charged contexts where governments are routinely unwilling or unable to fulfil the basic responsibilities to their citizens. They defined these environments as 'politically charged' where civil society is active supporting those affected by violence, conflict or repression. These places may be national but are also local. Violent conflict is not always present, yet people are exposed to low levels of violence, to political volatility and tensions in their communities. Advocacy may be risky or illegal in such environments.

A series of case studies presented during the seminar highlighted the importance of INGOs having a deep understanding of local context while providing assistance to those subject to abuses of civil and political rights, or are simply not in receipt of basic public services that all citizens has a right to.

Citizen engagement can ensure that the most marginalised can be heard and that spaces are opened up that can be used for building trust between citizens, communities and the state.

There are no quick fixes to bring about change in fragile or challenging environments. Any engagement needs to be on the basis of a robust power analysis. Conflict sensitivity needs to be seen not as an additional activity but a central way of thinking in the implementation of any programme.

However the INTRAC publication also warns that international organisations need to 'be humble' and need to reach further and deeper into their understanding of contexts and take stock of historical lessons of getting it wrong. INGOs are urged to dedicate resources and energies to create enabling space for civil society and to take practical steps to encourage respect for freedom of expression, association and civil society space. The NGO Front Line Defenders contends that caution about upsetting host countries around human rights violations is justifiable only in extreme cases. Programmes focusing on voice, accountability and participation are meaningless without supporting the space for critical civil society. This includes advocacy but also practical measures to support and protect human rights defenders.

The event was organised by Christian Aid Ireland in collaboration with Pieternella Pieterse, a PhD researcher at the University of Limerick whose research focus is health accountability in Sierra Leone. Christian Aid Ireland has supported local partner organisations in governance and accountability interventions in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East for over a decade. Trocaire supported the event by facilitating and funding the participation of Mukunda Julius Mugisha from Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group (CSBAG) Uganda.

Literature

Abugre, C. and Valentin, P. (2007) 'No Small Change. Christian Aid's understanding of how change happens'.

Ackerman, J. M. (2005) 'Social accountability in the public sector: A conceptual discussion', World Bank Social Development Working Papers (82).

Houtzager, P. P. and Joshi, A. (2008) 'Introduction: Contours of a Research Project and Early Findings', IDS Bulletin Volume 38 Number 6.

Joshi, A. and Houtzager, P. P. (2012) 'Widgets or Watchdogs?', Public Management Review, 14(2), 145-162.

McGee, R. and Gaventa, J. (2011) 'Shifting Power? Assessing the Impact of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives', IDS Working Paper 383.

Natsios, A. (2010) 'The Clash of the Counter-Bureaucracy and Development'. Washington, DC: CGD.

Ostrom, E., Gibson, C., Shivakumar, S. and Andersson, K. (2001) 'Aid, Incentives and Sustainability: An Institutional Analysis of Development Cooperation'. Evaluation 02/01:1. Stockholm: Sida.

Riddell, R. C. (2007) Does foreign aid really work?, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rocha Menocal, A. and O'Neil, T. (2012) 'Mind the Gap: Lessons Learned and Remaining Challenges in Parliamentary Development Assistance – A Pre-Study'. Stockholm: Sida.

Tembo, Fletcher (2013) 'Rethinking Social Accountability in Africa: Lessons from the Mwananchi Programme, ODI.

Wild et at (2015) 'Adapting development: improving services to the poor', Overseas Development Institute.

Annex One: Seminar Agenda

GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY AND CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT: A LEARNING WORKSHOP

AGENDA

Effective governance is increasingly recognised as critical to international development. Efforts to strengthen accountability from the state towards its citizens have become central to improving public services and realising the vision of the Millennium Development Goals. More and more development programmes focus on empowering citizens to demand better services and engage with how decisions are made, both locally and nationally. Arguably the most important lesson to emerge in this work is that power and politics matter. Formal institutions matter but also critical are the politics that lie behind the institutions. Central to this is the ability of civil society and donors to think and act politically.

This learning workshop aims to provide an in-depth forum for dialogue to better understand **how change actually happens and how we can think and work politically in practice in governance programming**. It will explore lessons, successes, challenges and failures in governance programmes. Academia, local partner organisations, international non-governmental organisations and donors will discuss the following themes:

- Thinking and working politically- how to make it work in practice
- Delivering change at local and national levels: lessons from civil society in securing the right to access basic services
- Thinking and working differently? Assessing what current funding and monitoring and evaluation methods mean for working with power and politics

Wednesday 11 June 2014

8:30am **Registration**

9.00am **SESSION ONE: THINKING AND WORKING POLITICALLY**

The purpose of this opening session is to give a broad overview of new insights, debates and lessons on governance programmes. It will look at what is needed to enable those working on, or funding, governance programmes to think and work politically. Lessons will be shared from the Mwananchi programme in Africa.

- **Welcome and opening remarks**
Dr Su-Ming Khoo, Development Studies Association Ireland and Rosamond Bennett, CEO, Christian Aid Ireland

- **Keynote address I:** *The importance of political voice in governance and accountability programmes. (45 mins)*
Alina Rocha Menocal, Research Fellow, Overseas Development Institute

- **Keynote address II:** *Re-thinking social accountability in Africa: Lessons from the Mwananchi Programme. (45 mins)*

Fletcher Tembo, Research Associate, Overseas Development Institute

11.00am **COFFEE BREAK**

11.30am **PANEL DISCUSSION**

Alina Rocha Menocal and Fletcher Tembo, ODI

12:00 **PLENARY DISCUSSION**

12:30pm **LUNCH**

13.30 **SESSION TWO: MAKING PEOPLE COUNT**

The purpose of this session is to look at how specific programmes seek to improve accountability from state to citizens on the human right to basic services. Presenters will address issues such as:

- **What's working and not working in engaging citizens and improving accountability from government at a local level?**
- **The challenges of working politically in practice**
- **Linking local interventions to national and international advocacy**
  - **Chair and respondent**
  Alina Rocha Menocal, ODI

  - **Experiences from partners I:** *Delivering accountability for health services in Sierra Leone*
  Siapha Kamara, CEO SEND Foundation, Sierra Leone

  - **Experiences from partners II:** *TBC*
  Julius Mukunda, Coordinator for the Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group in Uganda

  - **Experiences from partners III:** *Building citizenship in El Salvador*
  Ramon Villalta, Director, the Social Initiative for Democracy

  - **Experiences from partners IV:** *Giving voice to citizens on service delivery in Ethiopia*
  Tamiru Lega Berhe, VNG, Management Agency, Ethiopian Social Accountability Programme (ESAP2)

  Tamrat Getahun Woldemichael, KMG, implementing partner agency representative, ESAP2

15:00pm **PARALLEL DISCUSSION SESSIONS**

Chair

Alina Rocha Menocal, ODI

15.30pm   PLENARY DISCUSSION

16:00pm   CLOSING REMARKS

Eamon Meehan, Director of Trócaire

Thursday 12 June 2014

9.00am   SESSION THREE: THINKING AND WORKING DIFFERENTLY?

The purpose of this session is to assess if current funding and monitoring and evaluation methods are fit for purpose for working with power and politics. It will assess the challenges international NGOs and governments face and what new approaches might be needed.

Re-cap and welcome

Tom Lodge, Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Centre for Peace and Development, University of Limerick

Chair and respondent

Tembo Fletcher, ODI (Mwananchi Programme)

- **Presentation I*: Social accountability programmes as part of large donor-supported basic services grant**

Bizuwork Ketete, Irish Aid Ethiopia

- **Presentation II:** *The perspective from Irish Aid*

Earnan O' Cleirigh, Irish Aid Policy Department

- **Presentation IV:** *Sharing key lessons and challenges from governance programmes from the INGO perspective*

Niall O'Keefe, Trócaire

Karol Balfe, Christian Aid Ireland

10:30am   PLENARY DISCUSSION

Chair Earnan O'Cleirigh

11.00am   COFFEE BREAK

11:20am   SESSION FOUR: DELIVERING LOCAL CHANGE

The purpose of this session is to provide in-depth examples of lessons on how change is happening at a local level. They session will look at a case study from Sierra Leone on health services and a study of decentralisation in Burundi.

Chair and respondent

Siapha Kamara, CEO SEND Foundation, Sierra Leone

- **Research presentation I:** *Lessons from social accountability programmes in Sierra Leone*
Pieternella Pieterse, Department of Politics and Public Administration and Centre for Peace and Development, University of Limerick

- **Research presentation II:** *The politics of decentralisation*

Dr Niamh Gaynor, Development and International Relations, School of Law and Government at Dublin City University

PLENARY DISCUSSION

13:00pm LUNCH

14:00pm SESSION SIX: FINAL DISCUSSION SESSION

Chair: Tom Lodge, University of Limerick

The purpose of this session is to bring together the main discussion points from the entire workshop.

16:00pm Close