



Representation in Decentralized Governance and Local Service Delivery for MDGs

Regional Retreat

22-24 June, 2005
Hua Hin, Thailand

Retreat Report

1. Introduction

The Regional Retreat on *Representation in Decentralized Governance and Local Service Delivery for MDGs* was held from 22-24 May, 2005 in Hua Hin, Thailand.

The workshop brought together 26 participants from UNDP as well as external partners. They represented 13 UNDP Country Offices (Afghanistan, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Lao PDR, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Timor-Leste, Thailand and Vietnam), UNDP BDP New York, the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), International IDEA and the UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok (RCB).¹

The Regional Retreat was organised jointly by the RCB Decentralization and Local Governance Policy Advisor and the UNCDF Regional Technical Advisor in the RCB.

2. Workshop Objectives

The Regional Retreat was divided into two main themes: the first which covered the first two days of the retreat being *local democracy and representation in decentralized governance* – focusing on different local government representational arrangements and electoral systems, the role of political parties in local governance, modalities to ensure inclusion of women, youth, ethnic minorities and disadvantaged groups at the local level as well as the role/function of traditional system of representation at the local level. The second part of the workshop, dealt with during the last day of the retreat, was *local service delivery for the MDGs*.

For the first theme the specific objective of the retreat was to develop the capacity of UNDP to address issues of representation and to define – as a regional community of practice on decentralization and local governance – existing gaps in UNDP's knowledge in the area of representation in decentralized governance, particularly in the areas mentioned above.

For the second theme the objective was to discuss next steps in identifying good practices in strengthening both the supply and the demand for services delivery – in particular in rural areas.

As such, the objective of the workshop was to serve as a learning event as well as identifying research needs and agreeing on next steps under each of the two themes.

3. Methodology/Process

The workshop was conducted in a participatory manner and the agenda consisted of presentations, plenary discussions and working groups.² The various sessions were moderated by the UNDP Country Office participants. The working groups dealt with questions coming out of the various sessions and the findings of the working groups were reported back in plenary.

¹ Please see List of Participants in annex 2.

² Please see Regional Retreat Agenda in annex 1.

Prior to the retreat participants received two background papers: *Local democracy in Asia: Representation in Decentralized Governance* prepared by the RCB and the *Study of Local Service Delivery in Cambodia*, a study commissioned by the UNDP and UNCDF and conducted by the Cambodia Development Resource Institute, in order to provide background as well as serve as a basis for discussion during the retreat. At the workshop, the participants also received a paper on Reflection on Setting up Social and People Audit in Thailand prepared by Ryratana Suwanraks from UNDP Thailand as well as a three other documents recently finalised by the RCB.

In order for the retreat to serve as a learning event participants made presentations individually as well as in collaboration enabling them to share as well as learn from the lessons and experiences from the countries represented at the retreat. The learning element was further enhanced by presentations and substantive input by external resource persons on specific topics – also aimed at stimulating discussion amongst participants.³

4. Retreat Summary

The Regional Retreat was opened by Mr. Stephen Brown, Head of Policy and Programmes, RCB followed by an introduction to the subject by Henrik Fredborg Larsen, Policy Advisor, Decentralization and Local Governance, RCB and Neil Webster, Head of Department of development Research, DIIS.

As mentioned above the Regional Retreat was split in two major thematic areas. For the sake of clarity the summary of the discussions during the retreat will thus be presented under the two headings of *Representation in Decentralized Governance* and *Local Service Delivery for the MDGs*. Following this logic conclusions and next steps for each theme will be presented at the end of the respective section.

REPRESENTATION IN DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE

Electoral Systems in Decentralized Governance

The opening presentation was given by Mr. Andrew Ellis, Head of Electoral Processes, International IDEA electoral systems and outcomes as well as issues, challenges and implications of the various electoral systems at the local level.

There is limited knowledge on electoral system design (ESD) and local representation, and the presentation provided an overview of existing knowledge on ESD generally and identified possible differences between national and local electoral system design issues. ESD consists of two elements, namely technical and political issues. It was stated that the political issues may be the most contentious ones as ESD is a political process which leads to a political decision linked to the wider institutional framework. The process of electoral system change needs to involve all stakeholders and will likely require the agreement of all or most existing political parties under the existing system – something which may act as an impediment to change. Furthermore the choice of electoral system may also face various external constraints. The potential impact of the various electoral systems was also discussed in relation to

³ For presentations please see the Retreat CD.

representation, inclusiveness, accountability as well as a number of other aspects. In conclusion it was stated that the sustainability of ESD must be taken into account and that there are no perfect electoral systems. Any given electoral system will work well in some contexts and badly in others.

This was followed by presentations on:

- Direct elections of the heads of local governments (based on experiences in Pakistan and Thailand), by Ms. Marie Marchand and Ms. Ryratana Suwanraks;
- Direct or indirect elections for upper levels of local government (based on experiences in the Philippines, by Mr. Emmanuel Buendia;
- Proportional representation (based on experiences from Afghanistan and Nepal), by Mr. Stephen Kinloch and Mr. Ram Krishna Pokharel;
- Complimentary forms of territorial representation (based on the experience of community planning and budget committees in Cambodia), by Mr. Shyam Bhurtel; and
- Representation and influence of appointed administrators in local councils (based on the experience of the Maldives and Iran), by Mr. Bari Abdulla and Mr. Ahmad Salari.

Questions that were raised by the participants in relation to the above presentation included:

- How to avoid minority representatives only being from the elite (i.e. as regards to inclusion on party lists or representatives indirectly appointed);
- The need to look beyond merely the electoral system in order to ensure accountability, e.g. issues of horizontal accountability of line ministry staff to the elected officials and the presence of official accountability mechanisms such as anti-corruption agencies.
- How to address the issue of lower level civil servants feeling accountable to their superiors rather than to the elected representative; and
- That citizens themselves must take responsibility for ensuring accountability in that it is they who are to hold the elected officials accountable.

The participants had further discussions in working groups on advantages/disadvantages of direct or indirect election of heads of local government and plurality-majoritarian vs. proportional systems.

The Role of Political Parties in Decentralized Governance

The session was opened by a presentation which was given by Ms. Linda Maguire, Electoral Systems and Processes Policy Advisor, BDP New York on political parties in decentralized governance.

As part of the presentation a number of issues for consideration were given in regards to political parties at the local level including: the need for developing the knowledge of the UNDP on this issue as there is currently little knowledge; how to improve the policy advice of the UNDP in this area looking at what the needs actually are; and how to operationalise the response to existing demands.

This was followed by presentations on:

- 'Depoliticizing' local government by disconnecting local politics from political parties (based on experiences on local democratic governance not allowing political parties from Pakistan), by Mr. Farhan Sabih;
- What makes political parties in local politics strong (based on experiences from Indonesia), by Mr. Kevin Evans; and
- One-party States and the structure of political competition (based on experiences from Lao PDR and Vietnam), by Mr. Matthias Meier and Mr. Lenni Monteil.

The participants had further discussions in working groups on advantages/disadvantages of allowing or not allowing political parties at the local level and when political parties are allowed whether or not to allow independent candidates.

This was followed by further discussions in plenary. Questions and issues raised included:

- The need to look at how political parties function/operate at the local level in countries around the world;
- The role and access to resources of political parties needs to be addressed;
- The importance of capacity building and work on the institutional arrangements for political parties;
- The need for UNDP to focus both on the demand and the supply side of support to political parties at the local level;
- Evaluate whether what the UNDP does at the national level in supporting political parties can be replicated at the local level; and
- Further emphasis was placed on finding ways for UNDP to work with political parties – including civic education, working with CSOs, working with electoral bodies (e.g. electoral commissions).

Inclusive Systems of Local Governance

The first presentation during this session was given by Mr. Neil Webster on the outcome of electoral systems and local politics and how more inclusive systems of local governance can be developed.

It was emphasised that the choice of electoral system can create opportunities for greater representation of women, ethnic minorities, the poor and other disadvantaged groups in local government. Structural as well as institutional factors pose major challenges faced in achieving this outcome. Affirmative action was not seen as a viable long-term solution for achieving increased representation of these groups. Challenges in identifying the appropriate electoral system and institutional arrangements to achieve inclusiveness require developing an adequate knowledge of the local electorate and identifying a combination of electoral system and affirmative action which best suits the structural as well as institutional context. Measures must be taken to address the issue both from within local government as well as from outside, e.g. national policy reforms and strengthening of local NGOs, etc.

This was followed by presentations on:

- Women and disadvantaged groups (based on experiences from Nepal), by Mr. Anil K.C.;
- Making provisions to strengthen inclusion (based on the experience from India), by Mr. Pradeep Sharma;
- Representation of youth in local governance (based on the experiences on youth councils with representation in local governments in the Philippines), by Mr. Emmanuel Buendia; and
- Bridging traditional and formal systems of local governance (based on experiences of participation of communities and peace building in Afghanistan), by Ms. Sitara

Points that were raised during the following plenary discussion included:

- The need ensure that decisions taken at the national level on affirmative action or policies enacted to ensure representation are also implemented at the local level – something which is not always the case.
- When discussing the relevance of traditional systems of representation care needs to be taken to understand the actual context in that traditional systems might actually run contrary to the intentions and in such cases how can UNDP assist partners to make them function better;
- The need for UNDP to have the knowledge and capacity to work at the local level when there actually is no functioning local government system, e.g. in post-conflict or post-disaster situations;
- That in post-conflict situations it may not be appropriate to look at local government in the context of and allocated resources to decentralization as the first priority is likely to be to rebuild the capacity of the central government to deliver services.
- That local governance issues can not be addressed separately from national governance issues.

Policy Change and the Role of the UNDP

The discussion on policy change and the role of the UNDP was initiated by two presentations on providing advice and implementing policy reforms (based on the experiences in Timor-Leste) and developing capacity to strengthen representation (based on experiences from Vietnam) given by Mr. Jochem Ramakers and Mr. Jonas Lövkrona, respectively.

Main points included that changes in attitude are critical to foster real participation on the part of the local government counterparts. If there is no national reform agenda this will be an obstacle to building capacity at the local level. Furthermore it is essential to mitigate risks in order to avoid deadlocks in attempting to achieve policy change. There is also potential for cross-fertilisation in this area.

The main points that were raised during the following plenary discussion included:

- How to work through the various UNDP modalities (e.g. DEX vs. NEX) and how this impacts on the ability to foster policy change at the local as well as national level;
- The lack of capacity on the part of UNDP to bring local issues to the national level. UNDP's traditional role of working on community oriented projects at the local level needs to be complemented by working with policy makers, e.g. on creating conducive legislative frameworks, etc;
- The need to work at all levels of government in order to be effective; and
- The possibility of working through the other UNDP practices to achieve policy change at the local level, e.g. through the Energy and Environment Practice and their work with CBO's at the local level through the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

Conclusion and Next Steps

The discussion on next steps in the area of representation in local government was initiated by Henrik Fredborg Larsen. It was stated that the workshop had confirmed the rationale of the regional initiative, i.e. the need to enhance the knowledge on representation in decentralized governance in Asia in order to support informed policy decisions. In this regard the retreat served as a major step in the direction of consolidating existing knowledge on representation at the local level but also in identifying areas and questions which need to be further researched.

Agreed further steps in UNDP's work on local representation were:

- Consolidating knowledge on local representation developing further – based on lessons learned and experiences shared by participants during the retreat – and finalising the background paper *Local Democracy in Asia: Representation in Decentralized Governance*;
- Formulation of a draft research proposal (which will be put through a peer review) based on the inputs received from the retreat participants; and

- Identification of national institutions to conduct research in key areas based on the proposal developed by the regional community of practice on decentralization and local governance

It was suggested that the in-country management of the research would be done by the UNDP Country Offices with the UNDP regional team providing management and technical support. Furthermore regional or international institutes/institutions would be identified and engaged in partnerships in order to facilitate support on cross-country research as well as provide additional technical support.

Based on this proposal and the outcome of the previous sessions, the participants discussed and agreed on one or two areas of knowledge in which there is need for further research and which may enhance the formulation of policy in the area of local representation. The participants also discussed what should be additional next steps of the UNDP regional initiative on regional representation. The discussions took place in working groups.

The working groups identified a wide range of areas in which further knowledge was needed and thus deserving further research. These included:

- Accountability mechanisms and systems, and how these contribute to the achievement of outcomes such as service delivery – including looking at perceptions of accountability, identification of creative accountability mechanisms, mapping of legal frameworks for accountability and comparing these, horizontal accountability mechanisms, incentives and links between representation and accountability.
- The cost of holding local elections and competing development priorities – including costs for individual candidates
- Issue of inclusiveness of women and minorities/vulnerable groups – including how to achieve representation of women and ethnic minorities in local government and how they may be supported in getting their voices heard and bring the issues which they represent onto the agenda
- The role of local governments in crisis/post-conflict situations
- The nature of political parties and their role/impact at the local level.
- The socialisation of people in becoming voters – including how it applies to local vs. national elections, in developing vs. developed countries.
- The links between local governance and civil society institutions as well as the role of civil society in electoral processes, e.g. as watchdogs.

There was also a range of suggestions put forward on possible activities, outputs and processes including:

- A mechanism for tracking the evolution of local governance institutions in the region with baselines, indicators, mapping, etc. and regular reporting;

- A practitioner's guide or resource book that would include: discussion of issues, on a thematic basis, case/comparative studies, and inventory/status of local governance institutions;
- Forums for exchanging information and experiences on issues related to local representation for e.g. women and minority groups; local government associations, journalists, youth;
- Regional case studies and good practices;
- Linking research with university/academic institutions to support research based on data from Country Offices and governments; and
- Establishing partnerships with e.g. local researchers, partners who can bring about actions and implement activities recommended in the research, and global and regional partners, such as EPIC, the Commonwealth Local Governments Forum, the International Association of Local Government, and the World Mayors Conference.

It was agreed that it would be necessary to prioritise between the many suggested research areas as well as activities, outputs and processes. It was further emphasised that the local context must be taken into account in that local government is different from country to country in the region. It was suggested that research could initially focus on accountability, as this was a recurrent theme coming out of all the working groups, and how accountability contributes to equity, efficiency and equality.

It was agreed that accountability mechanisms as well as legislation would indeed be a relevant area to look at further. Participants however pointed out that one of the starting points should be the perception of people of accountability. Furthermore it was stated that the research proposal coming out of the retreat must be of relevance to the individual country research. It was also suggested that UNDP needs more knowledge on local representation to enable practitioners to provide decision makers with a menu of options in order to make an informed choice on the most appropriate course to take given the local context.

LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY FOR THE MDGs

Improving Local Supply Arrangements

The second theme of the workshop was opened by a presentation by Mr. Roger Shotton, UNCDF Senior Regional Technical Advisor, RCB, on the background and proposed research framework for policy research on local service delivery for the MDGs which is a joint initiative of UNDP and UNCDF.

The rationale for undertaking research into this area is the urgent need – as identified by the Millennium Project - to promote basic infrastructure and service delivery (ISD) for the poor, in poor and especially rural areas. This requires a move toward more effective decentralisation of ISD, and the promotion of scaleable operational models which go beyond the usual generic, normative prescriptions and the isolated, unreplicable best practices. This in turn requires a greater understanding of how to

most effectively and efficiently decentralise delivery responsibilities in the key MDG-related sectors taking into account real world constraints and challenges – one of which is the greater difficulty of decentralising ISD in rural areas as opposed to in urban areas. This research initiative also sees a convergence of the UNDP RCB's and UNCDF's policy research agendas.

The proposed framework distinguished between ISD **supply** issues (i.e. delivery roles, procedures and practices) and ISD **demand** issues (i.e. citizen involvement in supervision and monitoring of ISD and service access rights).

On the supply side, the distinction between three sets of ISD delivery roles was outlined: ISD policy, ISD provision and ISD production.

- POLICY: setting overall service goals, standards, norms etc and monitoring their implementation (central/higher level role);
- PROVISION: managing finance, planning, budgeting, overseeing & being answerable for service delivery (a sub-national government) – this can be undertaken in Principal or Agency mode;
- PRODUCTION: actually designing, constructing, operating & managing service delivery (sub-national government, private sector, NGOs, or community groups).

As an example of an application of this framework the study of local service delivery in Cambodia was presented. In this case, the framework had been used for a two step exercise: firstly to map out 'who does what' currently, in delivery of the main types of local service; then secondly, to explore the scope for a greater degree of decentralisation of provision functions, in consultation with the main stakeholders. The study showed quite different results for the most efficient levels of decentralization for the different sectors.

It was then proposed that further policy research could be undertaken in Asia on a wider basis in order to:

- Explore the scope for a more effective distribution of ISD delivery roles on a sector by sector basis;
- Identify areas of ISD procedure and practice which are problematic or subject to bottlenecks and/or where there are innovations which can be more widely replicated.

Commentary on the proposed research framework and methodology, as used in the Cambodia study, was given by Mr. Jochem Ramakers and Mr. Pradeep Sharma.

It was felt that the methodology of the study was good but that the study itself was rather 'descriptive' and seemed to neglect outcome of interaction with the institutions being mapped. The interview element was seen as very useful but that multi-

stakeholder interviews were missing. When the methodology is to be applied to other countries additional or other sectors might also be studied.

Furthermore it was felt that donors should also be included in the study matrix and that the set of questions might need to be narrowed down in order for the methodology to be applicable to the varying context of countries in Asia.

In the general discussion it the question was raised of how agency functions are to be coordinated in order to avoid overlapping and to promote partnerships should be studied as well as looking into the costs of ISD in that it is not only mandate but also capacity and technology which will determine at which level service will be delivered.

Participatory Methodologies for Auditing Service Delivery

The discussion on participatory methodologies for auditing service delivery was opened by two presentations: one by Ms. Ryratana Suwanraks on the application of participatory methodologies in Thailand and one by Mr. Emmanuel Buendia on local service delivery and human rights based on experiences in the Philippines. Commentary on the two presentations was provided by Mr. Farhan Sabih.

Questions raised by participants in regards to social audit/participatory methodologies to improving service delivery included:

- What evidence exists of impact of social audits on service delivery, beyond the level of subjective satisfaction of those participating in the audits;
- How to ensure sustainability and replicability of participatory methodologies, i.e. institutional arrangements for promoting these approaches and associated costs which can be mainstreamed;
- How these approaches are to be adapted to sparsely populated rural areas where organising capacities are weaker and costs of such approaches are much higher;
- What evidence exists of the relative efficacy of social audits and other participatory methodologies by type of service and level of local government;
- How to ensure appropriate linkages with more formal local government audits as well as how to ensure action and follow-up by service departments as a result of citizen voice and complaint;
- How useful innovations at the local level are to be mainstreamed into national policy and legal and regulatory frameworks;
- What are the links to the local government accountability research agenda; and
- What are the links to rights-based approaches?

Conclusion and Next Steps

The participants discussed which core questions to explore in relation to service delivery as well as next steps. The discussion took place in the form of working groups followed by a plenary session.

Several proposals were made by the participants including the following:

- Reviewing the implications of recent analyses of decentralisation in the region – such as the Bank-sponsored East Asia Decentralises report;
- Carrying forward the ‘role mapping’ exercise already piloted in Cambodia, but broadening this to include examination of ‘sector approaches’, sector legal and regulatory frameworks, funding flows, etc. A refined approach of this sort – focussed more on analysis of the status quo than on prescription - could be undertaken in other countries and used as a first step in policy dialogue with national authorities.
- Studying the differing roles of local government – as principal or as agent – for different sorts of service.
- Studying multi- and intersectoral coordination and relationships, e.g. divisions of responsibilities for health or education – also between various levels of government;
- Studying the scope and limits of subsidiary (related to the above bullet), including the roles of service user committees (parent-teacher committees etc) in service delivery;
- Studying the outsourcing of public services to the private sector
- Clarifying the policy-making, monitoring and “administrative” role for central government departments in a more decentralised setup.

There was also a range of suggestions put forward on possible activities, outputs and processes including:

- Holding of national consultations between social audit organisations, policy makers, and front line service officials to address the type of issues mentioned under the previous heading and see how it would be possible to refine and improve current social audit approaches; and
- Conduct wider regional consultation to bring lessons learned together from the various countries in the region (and perhaps beyond) and codify this knowledge.

In the following discussion it was emphasised that the demand and supply side of service delivery should not be addressed separately. In moving forward with studying local service delivery for MDGs it was stated that the next steps will likely at first follow a phased approach initially mapping existing options, experiences and lessons learned in the region – using these for policy discussions and highlighting good practice and innovation and the regional level. A more detailed proposal, based on the inputs of the participants, for next steps will be put together and circulated for additional feedback.

5. Conclusion

The three days of the Regional Retreat on Representation in Decentralized Governance and Local Service Delivery for MDGs allowed for rich discussions on a wide range of issues within the two main thematic areas. These discussions and the presentations given during the retreat served to consolidate the existing knowledge in the region within these areas as well as serving as a learning event for UNDP practitioners in the region. The input of the participants will also inform and guide future work in these areas. Thus the retreat served a major next step for the practice initiative on local democracy and electoral representation in Asia and the Pacific as well as on the work of the RCB and UNCDF on service delivery.

Regional Retreat on Decentralized Governance

Representation in Decentralized Governance & Local Service Delivery for the MDGs

22-24 June 2005, Hua Hin, Thailand

Tuesday, 21 st June	
15.30	Depart from Amari Watergate (expected to arrive in Hua Hin around 18:00)
Dinner and Introduction of Participants	
Wednesday, 22 nd June	
08:30 – 9:00	OPENING OF THE REGIONAL RETREAT Opening Remarks: the Democratic Governance Challenge in Local Context <i>Stephen Browne</i>
09:00 – 10:15	PART A REPRESENTATION IN DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE (A1) INTRODUCTION Representation in Decentralized Governance: Rationale and Objectives of Retreat <i>Henrik Fredborg Larsen</i> Representation in Decentralized Governance: Issues and Challenges <i>Neil Webster</i> Discussion in Plenary
10:15 – 10:30 Break	
10:30 – 12:30	(A2) ELECTORAL SYSTEMS IN DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE Electoral Systems and their Outcomes: Issues and Challenges <i>Andrew Ellis</i> Direct Election of the Heads of Local Government: Does it Strengthen Accountability and Functionality of Councils? The case of Pakistan and Thailand (10 min.) <i>Marie Marchand and Ryratana Suwanraks</i>

	<p>Direct or Indirect Elections for Upper Levels of Local Government: Strengths and Weaknesses, and Mixed Systems in the Philippines (10 min.) <i>Emmanuel Buendia</i></p> <p>Proportional Representation (PR): Is it really a solution? Current Discussions in Afghanistan and Nepal (10 min.) <i>Stephen Kinloch and Ram Krishna Pokharel</i></p> <p>Discussion</p>
12:30 – 13:30 Lunch	
13:30 – 15:30	<p>Complementary Forms of Territorial Representation: The Case of the Commune Planning and Budgeting Committees in Cambodia (10 min.) <i>Shyam Bhurtel</i></p> <p>The Representation and Influence of Appointed Administrators in Local Councils: The Case of the Maldives and Iran (10 min.) <i>Bari Abdulla and Ahmad Salari</i></p> <p>Working Groups Discussions</p>
15:30 – 15:45 Break	
15:45 – 18:00	<p>(A3) THE ROLE OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE</p> <p>Political Parties in Decentralized Governance: Issues and Challenges <i>Linda Maguire</i></p> <p>‘Depoliticizing’ Local Government: Can Local Politics be Disconnected from Political Parties? The Case of Pakistan (10 min.) <i>Farhan Sabih</i></p> <p>Local Politics: What Makes Political Parties Strong? – the Case of Indonesia (20 min.) <i>Kevin Evans</i></p> <p>One-Party States: the Structure of Political Competition: the Case of Vietnam and Laos (10 min.) <i>Lenni Montiel and Matthias Meier</i></p> <p>Discussion/Working Groups: Lessons learned on political parties in decentralized governance and next steps</p>
End of Day Reactions	
Dinner	

Thursday, 23rd June

08:30 – 10:15	<p>(A4) INCLUSIVE SYSTEMS OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE</p> <p>The Outcome of Electoral Systems and Local Politics: How can we develop more inclusive systems of local governance? <i>Neil Webster, DIIS</i></p> <p>What Happened to Women and the Disadvantaged Groups?: the Case of Nepal (10 min.) <i>Anil K.C.</i></p> <p>Making Provisions to Strengthen Inclusion: the Case of India (10 min.) <i>Pradeep Sharma</i></p> <p>Discussion in Plenary</p>
10:15 – 10:30 Break	
10:30 – 12:30	<p>Representation of Youth in Local Governance: the Youth Councils in the Philippines (10 min.) <i>Emmanuel Buendia</i></p> <p>Bridging Traditional and Formal Systems of Local Governance: Participation of Communities and Peace Building in Afghanistan (10 min.) <i>Sitara</i></p> <p>Discussion in Plenary</p>
12:30 – 13:30 Lunch	
13:30 – 15:30	<p>(A5) POLICY CHANGE AND THE ROLE OF UNDP</p> <p>Providing Advice and Implementing Policy Reforms: the Case of Timor Leste (10 min.) <i>Jochem Ramakers</i></p> <p>Developing Capacity to Strengthen Representation: the Case of Vietnam (10 min.) <i>Jonas Lovkrona</i></p> <p>Working Group Discussions</p>
15:30 – 15:45 Break	
15:45 – 17:30	<p>(A6) KNOWING WHAT WE DON'T KNOW: DECIDING ON THE NEXT STEPS</p> <p>The Regional Initiative on Representation in Decentralized Governance: Options for the Next Phase <i>Henrik Fredborg Larsen</i></p>

	<p>Working Groups: Deciding on Issues and Process</p> <p>Discussion in Plenary</p>
<p>End of Day Reactions: Country participants give overall reactions to the day</p>	
<p>Dinner</p>	

<p>Friday, 24th June</p>	
--------------------------------------------	--

<p>08:30 – 10:15</p>	<p>PART B – LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY FOR THE MDGS</p> <p>(B1) IMPROVING LOCAL SUPPLY ARRANGEMENTS</p> <p>Policy Research on Local Service Delivery for the MDGs: Background & Proposed Research Framework <i>Roger Shotton</i></p> <p>Commentary on Research Framework/Methodology <i>Pradeep Sharma</i></p> <p>Commentary on Research Framework/Methodology <i>Jochem Ramakers</i></p> <p>Discussion in Plenary</p>
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>10:15 – 10:30 Break</p>	
-----------------------------------	--

<p>10:30 – 12:30</p>	<p>(B2) PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGIES FOR AUDITING SERVICE DELIVERY</p> <p>Application of the Tools and the Way Forward <i>Ryratana Suwanraks</i></p> <p>Local Service Delivery and Human Rights <i>Emmanuel 'Boyie' Buendia</i></p> <p>Commentary <i>Farhan Sabih</i></p> <p>Plenary Discussion</p>
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>12:30 – 13:30 Lunch</p>	
-----------------------------------	--

<p>13:30 – 15:30</p>	<p>(B3) DECIDING ON THE WAY FORWARD & NEXT STEPS</p> <p>The Regional Initiative on Local Service Delivery for the MDGs - Options for the Next Phase: Working Group Discussion</p>
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

15:30 – 15:45 Break	
15:45 – 16:30	The Regional Initiative on Local Service Delivery for the MDGs - Options for the Next Phase: Presentations and Discussion in Plenary
16:30 – 16.45	Evaluation and Closure
17:00	Departure for Bangkok

Regional Retreat

“Representation in Decentralized Governance and Local Service Delivery for MDGs”

22-24 June 2005, Hua Hin, Thailand

No	Country	Name	Title and Organization	Email Address
1	Afghanistan	Sitara	Assistant Country Director	sitara@undp.org
2		Stephen Kinloch	Advisor, Strategic Planning & Policy (UNAMA)	Stephen.kinloch@undp.org
3	BDP	Linda Maguire	Electoral Systems and Processes Policy Adviser	Linda.maguire@undp.org
4	Cambodia	Shyam Bhurtel	Decentralization Policy Advisor	shyam@online.com.kh
5	India	Pradeep Shama	ARR, Public Policy and Local Governance	Pradeep.shama@undp.org
6	Indonesia	Kevin Evans	Governance Advisor	Kevin.evans@undp.org
7	Iran	Ahmad Salari	Head of Governance	Ahmad.salari@undp.org
8	Lao	Matthias Meier	Programme Analyst – Decentralization/Planning	matthias.meier@undp.org
9	Maldives	Abdul Bari Abdulla	Programme Coordinator	Bari.abdulla@undp.org
10	Nepal	Anil K.C.	Senior Programme Officer	Anil.k.c@undp.org
11		Ram Krishna Pokharel	National Programme Manager	undp@p_lgp.wlink.com.np
12	Pakistan	Farhan Sabih	ARR, Governance	Farhan.sabih@undp.org
13		Marie Marchand	Programme Officer	Marie.marchand@undp.org
14	Philippines	Emmanuel Buendia	Governance Portfolio Manager	Emmanuel.buendia@undp.org
15	Timor Leste	Jochem Ramakers	Programme Officer	Jochem.ramakers@undp.org

No	Country	Name	Title and Organization	Email Address
16	Thailand	Ryratana Suwanraks	Manager, Governance Responsive Unit	Ryratana.suwanraks@undp.org
17	RCB	Stephen Browne	Head of Policy and Programmes	Stephen.browne@undp.org
18		Henrik Larsen	Policy Advisor, Decentralization and Local Governance	Henrik.larsen@undp.org
19		Roger Shotton	UNCDF Senior Regional Technical Adviser	Roger.shotton@undp.org
20		Santosh Mehrotra	Programme Advisor – Governance & Poverty	Santosh.mehrotra@undp.org
21		Nils Taxell	Research Officer	Nils.taxell@undp.org
22		Panvirush Vittayaphapakul	Practice Team Assistant	Panvirush.Vittayaphapakul@undp.org
23	Vietnam	Lenni Montiel	CTA	Lenni.montiel@undp.org
24		Jonas Lovkrona	Head of Governance Cluster	Jonas.lovkrona@undp.org
25	External Partners	Neil Webster	Head of Department of Development Research, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)	nwe@diis.dk
26		Andrew Ellis	Head of Electoral Processes, International IDEA	a.ellis@idea.int

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

REPRESENTATION IN DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE & LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY FOR THE MDGS

UNDP REGIONAL RETREAT, HUA HIN, THAILAND, 22-24 JUNE 2005

Ratings: 1=lowest; 5= highest – The consolidated feedback below is based on 19 evaluation questionnaires received from 17 participants from UNDP Country Offices and 2 External Partners. A total of 26 people participated in the workshop – 17 from COs, 2 external partners, 1 from BDP NY and 6 from RCB (BDP and RCB staff did not participate in evaluation)

Overall Ratings

‘Overall, how do you rate this practice meeting?’

Rating 5	4 Participants
Rating 4	10 Participants
Rating 3	4 Participants
Rating 2	0 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 4.0⁴

Comments:

- Very good.
- Learning/good start to be replicated.
- Very informative and rich in details from countries specifically.
- Good exploration.
- It touches the most relevant and critical area in local governance.
- Background papers provided the contexts and frameworks for discussion which were very helpful.
- A useful event to ensure that participants could share contexts and experiences as well as show common approaches for future work.
- I really think that we were getting somewhere at the end.
- The relevance of issues addressed. Good mix between practitioners and external/internal experts.
- Useful exposure to practices as well as resource persons in other COs and regional centre.
- The workshop has planned to provide more chances for exchange of experiences on the issues as well as challenges faced by various countries.
- Allowed good interactions, exchange and presentations of regional cases and comparison.
- COs could reconsider poverty reduction strategies for local governance and review its effectiveness.
- Too little focus on programmatic implications. Too much focus on research. Too long sessions with unclear objectives.

⁴ The number is based on 18 participants giving the ratings.

“The programme met its goal and objectives”

Rating 5	1 Participants
Rating 4	10 Participants
Rating 3	5 Participants
Rating 2	0 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 3.75⁵

Comments:

- Good work.
- It helped to clarify future direction of RCB local governance work.
- The event was well-organized around topics. The resource persons and the participants were well-informed.
- At large it met its objective; although, some sessions do not have the required time.
- Better understanding of representational issues and analytical framework for Local Services Delivery.
- I think it did. Still have to see how all the inputs are materialized into research or other proposals.
- Exchange/information sharing but wondering to what extension the feedbacks will flow into the regional activities is not totally clear to me.
- The event was successful in triggering some of the needs of the COs and in highlighting knowledge gaps, but did not manage to distil fields of common interests. Also the discussion particularly on the issue of representation was too academic and did not give enough advices for implications on programming.
- Some elements are needed to be worked out through the meeting rather than leading through a strong structure.
- The objectives on Decentralized Governance are still needed to work out in a general frame.
- Generally, it achieved the objectives.
- Suggestions for future steps are needed to be assessed but preliminary objectives have already met at this stage.

“The programme met my objective”

Rating 5	6 Participants
Rating 4	8 Participants
Rating 3	4 Participants
Rating 2	0 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 4.11⁶

Comments:

- Excellent/very well/well-satisfied/Good coverage of regional realities.
- I hoped for a more discussion on what UNDP can do - including from a regional perspective – and how to use research, if any, for that purpose (rather than as stand-alone activities).
- Professional interactions with co-practitioners and resource persons.

⁵ The number is based on 16 participants giving the ratings.

⁶ The number is based on 18 participants giving the ratings.

- It picked up a few areas where further work in the country is possible and may further strengthen the decentralization programme.
- It enables me to meet partners, to share current thinking and analysis with key practitioners, to have first hand perceptions of the issues involved from the field. It was also an interesting workshop on social audit and other local governance/MDG issues.
- Very informative and relevant to my current work at the CO.
- My first meeting of this kind. In case of leaning, the objectives have been met.
- Very inspiring experiences with resource persons from other COs and the regional centre. Collaboration in preparation of the meeting was particularly useful in term of bringing together people and knowledge.
- Intellectual and learning objectives were well met. Personal objective of getting to the beach has not yet realized, but this is a measure of the quality of the workshop.
- Definitely met my objectives of deepening knowledge of issues and good practice in local governance.
- It helps me understand the framework for documentation and studies on poverty reduction programme.

Average ratings⁷ in different aspects:

- **Design**

Rating 5	0 Participants
Rating 4	12 Participants⁸
Rating 3	4 Participants
Rating 2	1 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 3.62

- **Preparation and Planning**

Rating 5	5 Participants
Rating 4	10 Participants
Rating 3	1 Participants
Rating 2	2 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 4

- **Facilitation**

Rating 5	4 Participants
Rating 4	8 Participants
Rating 3	5 Participants
Rating 2	1 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 3.83

⁷ The numbers are based on 18 participants giving the ratings except for the design of which only 17 participants gave the ratings.

⁸ Including one rating of '3.5'.

- **Resource people**

Rating 5	4 Participants
Rating 4	11 Participants
Rating 3	1 Participants
Rating 2	2 Participants
Rating 1	0 Participants

Average Rating: 3.94

Comments:

- Meeting room without window is always bad.
- Acoustics and lighting of the hall could have been better.
- Too long sessions/days with unclear objectives.
- Too many presentations. Also, output of the meeting could have been clearer.
- Very intensive programme with good balance between theory and practical experience.
- The workshop was very well-organized and extremely efficient with respect to the handling of all practical details. Circulation of notes prior to presentations might have been an advantage.
- Excellent and smooth implementation and organization.
- Facilitation is not always perfect but it was excellent that everyone facilitated.
- Should have more resource persons focusing on Accountability, Transparency, Responsiveness and Social Audit.

The most useful and interesting session⁹

A1	Introduction	1
A2	Electoral Systems in Decentralized Governance	6
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The session provided an overview of the various types of elections including pros/cons. 		
A3	The Role of Political Parties in Decentralized Governance	4
A4	Inclusive System of Local Governance	3
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The session has great relevance to issues that we face and would like to address. • It addressed a great concern for local governance and issue of women representation at local level. 		
A5	Policy Change and the Role of UNDP	3
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion made most sense from CO perspective. 		
A6	Knowing what We Don't Know: Deciding the Next Steps	1
B1	Improving Local Supply Arrangement	2
B2	Participatory methodologies for Auditing Service Delivery	4
B3	Deciding on the Way Forward & Next Steps	3

⁹ The scores are noted only to show popularity of the session and cannot be counted for comparison: some participants promoted more than one session, and some generally showed equal satisfaction for all session.

The least useful and interesting session¹⁰

A1	Introduction	
A2	Electoral Systems in Decentralized Governance	2
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too theoretical and not applicable. 		
A3	The Role of Political Parties in Decentralized Governance	
A4	Inclusive System of Local Governance	
A5	Policy Change and the Role of UNDP	
A6	Knowing what We Don't Know: Deciding the Next Steps	
B1	Improving Local Supply Arrangement	
B2	Participatory methodologies for Auditing Service Delivery	2
Comments		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible difficulties in application. 		
B3	Deciding on the Way Forward & Next Steps	1

Recommendations for future practice meetings¹¹

- Circulate the topics in advance and bring some case studies from the COs for discussion.
- Distribute research methodology in advance.
- More variety in the agenda e.g. includes the study visit. Allow changes in the agenda.
- Specify objectives at the beginning.
- Focus on Programmatic aspects – what UNDP could do through its programme.
- We should have a clearer idea of where we are going and what role the COs are going to play.
- Sharper focus on the objectives to be achieved.
- Longer session of advance notice [check].
- Provide more time for colleagues to network and share experiences.
- Be more realistic in expecting participants to have read and commented on the two studies.
- It would be helpful if we could interact with the electoral officials and share their perspective on the issues to understand how they interact with their constituency.
- There is considerable difference in the level of design and implementation of governance/devolution reforms; thus, the issues of interest and relevance are different. Perhaps RCB should take this into consideration for the group discussion topics.
- Fewer presentations and more of in depth discussion.
- Combine “static” sessions with more “mobile” activities to enlighten the session.
- Meeting room should have windows.

Recommendations for practice meeting follow-up

- Organize the workshop in different contexts.
- Sub-regional meetings may be more useful as countries in the region are diverse.
- Seek further comments on conclusions, if any, before moving ahead with next steps.

¹⁰ The score are noted only to show unpopularity and cannot be counted for comparison: most participants did not refer to any session as least useful.

¹¹ The handwritings of two questionnaires are too difficult to decode with respect to recommendations for future events and follow-up.

- Take into account the variations within this region and assist the COs within the region to network with the other COs that may be in similar stages of development but may not be part of the region.
- Build a network and share the actual practice on how electoral officials manage the delivery of services.
- Draft ToR for agreed studies (accountability and local services delivery mapping) can be shared with the COs for comments.
- Share researches that have been done and discuss possibilities of replication.