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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Without the ability of citizens to directly participate in decision-making and hold public officials accountable, the critical benefits of good governance, such as social justice, poverty reduction, and economic development cannot be achieved. Participatory mechanisms for civic participation have been shown to align development priorities with community goals; enhance communication between the state and citizens; expand the resources available to the poor; strengthen the capacity of civil society to represent and advocate for their communities (Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G., 2010; Grandvionnet, H., Aslam, G., & Rasha, S., 2015; Joshi, A., 2013). However, questions of where and in what ways citizens participate in the governance of social services remain unanswered.

This study rethinks the relationships between methodological approaches to civic participation in governance by elucidating what strategies are used by civil society to improve governance more participatory, how these strategies are used, and the contextual drivers influence their success across Africa. Surveying the literature (peer-reviewed and grey), compendia, and civil society websites, we constructed a participatory governance project database, recording methods, geography, project lifecycle, among other variables. We then conducted 24 key informant interviews with civil society implementers to assess the relationship between participatory governance methods and context.

Overall, we observed 20 distinct methodologies in 31 African countries across 192 participatory governance projects. Our study found four key entry points for civic engagement (advocacy, budget and expenditure, performance monitoring, and rules and regulations), and categorized participatory methods within each of the entry points. The study also uncovered the relationship between methods and civic space, defined as a measure of how responsive, participatory, and accountable the socio-political environment is to non-state actors. The results also demonstrate that the civic space is a strong determinant of what methods are used by civil society and their effectiveness.

Generally, in lower civic space environments, projects tended to be donor-funded, locally focused (small scale) using a single method like a public hearing or citizen grievance box without much engagement of the state in their activities. As civic space increase, we observed that projects used a wider variety of methods, particularly those that require more capacity, resources and access to information, like social audits or participatory budget and expenditure tracking. High civic space countries tended to have a mix of CSOs engaged in co-governance and as watchdogs.

This study is the first to systematically assess the entry points and methods of participatory governance across socio-political contexts. Our frameworks are useful for funders, practitioners, and governments, particularly those working in Africa, as a tool to understand where and how participatory governance methods are being applied. In addition, by identifying how methods are related to one another, practitioners can use our frameworks as a benchmark to assess what methods may be best suited for their projects.
I. BACKGROUND

Public services exist to serve citizens. Whether it is access to healthcare, qualified teachers, or road repairs, the lives of citizens are impacted by the delivery and quality of public services, and as such citizens should be regarded as an integral part of the governance process. Yet, in many countries, citizens are excluded from participating in the governance of key social services (McNeil, M. & Mumvuma, T., 2006; USAID, 2013). There has been a growing consensus that the participation of citizens is essential for the formation and implementation of better public policy and achieving development outcomes (McGee, R., 2010). Participatory mechanisms for civic participation and accountability have been shown to align development priorities with community goals; enhance communication between the state and citizens; expand the resources available to the poor; strengthen the capacity of civil society to represent and advocate for their communities; and complement market and private sector activities (Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G., 2010; Grandvionnet, H., Aslam, G., & Rasha, S., 2015; Joshi, A., 2013). However, questions of where and in what ways citizens participate in the governance of social services remain unanswered.

Across Africa the impacts of nonresponsive governance, poor performance, and lack of accountable institutions are broadly acknowledged as major obstacles to achieving human development goals and improving public service delivery (McNeil, M., & Mumvuma, T., 2006). The strengthening of representative democracies and international support for repairing and restructuring governance in Africa has attracted investment in initiatives that empower citizen participation (McNeil, M., & Mumvuma, T., 2006; Tembo, F., 2013). This proliferation has spurred questions about how African citizens participate in the governance of public services, and how the approaches being used in African countries compared to those used in Asia and Latin America.

In addition to understanding how citizens participate, there is growing recognition from practitioners, governments, and donors of the impact of context on civic participation and accountability mechanisms (Rocha, M., & Shrama, B., 2008; O’Neil, T., Foresti, M., & Hudson, A., 2007). A number of publications have attempted to identify contextual drivers, however there is a lack of consensus and strong evidence to support ‘how’ and ‘why’ participatory approaches work (or do not) within a particular context (Grandvionnet, H., Aslam, G., & Rasha, S., 2015; McGee, R., 2010; Rocha, M., & Shrama, B., 2008).

This increased and sustained focus on governance and accountability has shed light on the fact that the relationships between citizens and the state are often blurred, varied, and complex. Although there are many conceptual frameworks for citizen participation, none of them incorporate or explore the relationship between governance, socio-political context, and the methods used to reach the intended outcomes of citizen voice and accountability.

The establishment of participatory governance has happened through learned experiences of success. For example, citizen report cards were first employed in Bangalore in the mid-1990s (Odugbemi S. & Lee T, 2011). The support for the citizen report card was fueled by the dismal state of essential services in Bangalore, and the public’s perception that the government was indifferent to their problems (Odugbemi S. & Lee T, 2011). The results of these report cards were used to ignite systemic changes in the budgeting of social services and the report cards have now been institutionalized through India. Similar changes were reported in Andhra Pradesh, the first place to institutionalize social audits, completing more than 3,200 social audits, with more than 38,000 disciplinary cases brought against officials and a total of $24 million of irregularities detection (Patnaik P,
In Latin America there have been similar breakthroughs, with notable social movements for equitable service delivery and pro-poor policies in Brazil and Argentina. In the late 1990s, Argentinian CSOs worked through citizen journalism and public interest litigation to monitor government financing laws and campaign expenditures (Rocha, M & Shrama B, 2007; O’Donnell, 2000). The learnings from participatory governance experiments, like social audits in India and budget monitoring in Brazil, have lead to a formalization of methods or approaches. There are now a number of documents that detail the correct way to perform specific participatory governance methods like citizen report cards or social audits. The prevailing framework for categorizing methods comes from the World Bank’s Social Accountability Sourcebook. Their categorization follows the public expenditure cycle, beginning with budget formulation, budget execution, accounting and reporting, and external audit and oversight. The missing piece, however, is how the methods are related to one another and what makes one method more successful for a given set of objectives, sector or sociopolitical environment. If a CSO is working with citizens who are concerned about the quality and accessibility of health services among a population living in informal settlements, would it be better to use citizen report cards or citizen grievance handling, like complaint boxes? Would it matter whether these informal settlements are in South Africa versus Egypt?

Moreover, there is confusion about the terminology referring to civic participation. Within the international governance and development community, almost every method used to foster citizen voice, transparency, and accountability falls under the label of ‘social accountability’, democracy and governance, or civic engagement. For this study, we have expanded our existing conceptual framing to include all of the tools used by non-state actors to collaboratively or confrontationally participate in public service governance, not just the ones that work to hold the state accountable. We have decided to use the term ‘participatory governance’, which is the extent and capacity of citizens to work with the state decision-making and operation of social systems. This broad definition is inclusive of co-governance, social accountability, cooperative, and disruptive approaches to improving governance. For the purposes of this study we focus on application of participatory governance methods by civil society.

II. RATIONALE & OBJECTIVES

Participatory governance in Africa is an emerging practice. However, key stakeholders including local civil society groups, international NGOs, development partners, and governments lack general knowledge and understanding of where and how citizens participate, the approaches used, and the context in which those approaches work. Therefore, this study aims to gain a better understanding of participatory governance initiatives throughout the African continent and how to improve strategic use of participatory governance methods. For the purposes of this review, we focused on methods that work on improving public services across any of the social sectors.

The specific objectives of this study are to:

1. Identify key points of entry for engagement in social sector governance across Africa;
2. Capture the range of participatory governance methods being used for each entry point;
3. Identify how socio-political context affects the choice and effectiveness of participatory governance methods.
III. METHODOLOGY & ANALYSIS APPROACH

Our methodology consisted of an iterative multi-stage process. We began by conducting a landscaping review, including a systematic literature review, of participatory governance projects to better understand what participatory governance projects in Africa looks like.

The landscaping focused on what methods civil society and other non-state actors, like citizen journalists, are using to engage with the state and reform public services, and how these methods are being implemented.

1. LANDSCAPE REVIEW

Our landscaping review captured the breadth of participatory governance projects in Africa working to improve public service delivery in any social sector (health, education, agriculture, etc.). For each project we employed specific inclusion criteria:

4  Participatory governance had to be a major area of programmatic focus for the project or initiative;
5  Explicitly defined which methods the project used;
6  Implementation must be initiated between 2007-2014;
7  Led by or meaningfully engaged civil society;
8  Reports and documentation provided enough information for reviewers to deduce the project’s objectives, how methods were used, audience, sector, and geography.

Our analysis relied on systematic searches of scholarly databases, compendia, published literature, and organization’s websites. We conducted an initial search of PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, and Google for both peer-reviewed and gray literature using terms related to “participatory governance” and “social accountability”, in combination with common names or terms associated with specific methods (e.g. citizen report card and participatory budgeting), and each African country. To supplement the findings from the literature, we searched compendia for programmatic information (e.g. landscape reviews, stocktaking, literature sweeps) relevant to participatory governance and social accountability. We also reviewed organizational websites of civil society organizations (CSOs), which implement participatory governance projects, as identified through the first two search strategies for additional project information and gray literature. All projects that met our inclusion criteria were input into a project database.

2. KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Building on the results of the landscaping review, we employed qualitative research methods to elucidate how socio-political context affects the choice and effectiveness of participatory governance methods. Qualitative key informant interviews with civil society participants were conducted in five countries (Ethiopia, Tunisia, Mozambique, South Africa, and Malawi) between July-September 2014. These five countries were purposively selected based on results from the landscape analysis and a number of discussions with external governance experts. The sample of countries was intended to be representative of the continuum of civic space environments in Africa. An average of five civil society stakeholders per country were interviewed about which participatory governance methods they use in their work, what factors affect the impact of those methods, and how socio-political or contextual factors influence method selection and success. Interviews
were not recorded due to the sensitivity of the issues discussed. Thematic analysis of detailed interview notes was performed.

3. DEFINING AND QUANTIFYING CIVIC SPACE

The selection, implementation, and success of participatory governance methods, like citizen report cards and social audits, differ by context. Context can be influenced by many factors including legal, political, institutional, cultural, and historical drivers. Results from a number of studies have generated lists of exogenous factors shown to be important to the success of participatory governance projects. For example, a large review that evaluated the effectiveness of voice and accountability initiatives identified five critical variables that explain the success of citizen-led initiatives, these are: (a) political contexts; (b) existing power relations; (c) enabling environment; (d) the nature of state institutions; and (e) social contract between state and citizens. (O’Neil, T., Foresti, M., and Hudson, A., 2007). An analysis of World Bank supported accountability projects yields a similar list of key factors for success including (a) political context; (b) state capacity; (c) access to information; (d) role of media; (e) civil society capacity; (f) state-civil society synergy; and (g) the institutionalization of accountability mechanisms (Malena, C. Forster, R., and Singh, J., 2010). However, none of the studies discuss whether certain contextual factors are more influential or should be weighted more than others when planning civic engagement projects. The studies also do not discuss whether contextual factors are translatable across different contexts. More importantly, there has been limited exploration of the effect of these contextual factors on the effectiveness of the participatory governance approaches or methods used.

Using the results from the literature, in combination with results from thematic analysis of interviews, we discerned specific dimensions of the sociopolitical environment that influence how participatory governance methods work. The four dimensions most salient in the interviews were: capacity and resources, access to information, responsiveness, and openness (citizen voice and accountability). We defined these dimensions as ‘civic space’, a measure of how responsive, participatory, and accountable the socio-political environment is to non-state actors, for each African country included in the sample. For each of the dimensions we created a definition based on the descriptions provided by key informants (Table 2). Based on these definitions of determinants of civic space, we surveyed international governance indicators in an effort to make an existing measure of a country’s governance practices and contextual factors align with our determinants of civic space. We compared the definition of the indicator and what data was used to develop the indicator against our four determinants.

For each of the existing governance indices, we calculated a five-year (2009-2014) average score per country ranging from zero to one (one being the highest positive score for each index) (Table 3). The four indices were then summed to create a composite civic space score that describes each country’s civic space. Using these composite scores, we ranked and categorized each country in our sample from high to low civic space (Table 3).
### Table 2: Civic Space Dimensions & Measurement Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity &amp; Resources</td>
<td>Capacity refers to the varying levels of technical expertise and skill-based knowledge required to implement different participatory governance methods. This includes both state and non-state capacity. Required resources refers to the HR, time, materials, etc.</td>
<td><strong>Enabling Environment Index</strong>: measures the propensity of citizens to participate in civil society and whether civil society has an enabling environment in which to function. The Enabling Environment index is a composite score of 53 indicators composed of three dimensions, the socio-economic (education, gender equality, etc.); socio-cultural environment (tolerance, propensity to participate, etc.); and governance environment (civil society infrastructure, policy dialogue, political rights, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>The timely and comprehensive dissemination of information to the public (citizens) from the government (budgets, policy proposals, etc.) and from non-state actors (CSOs, media etc.).</td>
<td><strong>Press Freedom Index</strong>: measures a government’s commitment to enable or allow information to move freely in society. It is a composite index that includes measures for press freedom, the status of national freedom of information laws, and Internet filtering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Duty bearers’ perception and response to the needs and demands of citizens. It is a measure of how willing and able duty bearers are to participate in co-governance. Although responsiveness is partly a function of capacity, it is also a matter of prevailing policy culture.</td>
<td><strong>Rule of Law Index</strong>: measures the rule of law by compiling 47 indicators organized around eight themes: constraints on government powers, absence of corruption, open government, fundamental rights, order and security, regulatory enforcement, civil justice, and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice &amp; Accountability (Openness)</td>
<td>The concept of openness encompasses voice and accountability. Voice is defined as the ability of citizens and other non-state actors to express their opinions, preferences, and views independent of the issue. Accountability refers to the obligation of duty bearers and civil society to be accountable to citizens. The degree of openness also includes duty bearers’ support of legal and financial space for CSOs and other non-state actors.</td>
<td><strong>WGI Voice &amp; Accountability (2013)</strong>: captures perceptions of the extent to which a country’s citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of associate and free media. It is a composite score of 57 indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:

Table 3 shows our country categorization for a select number of countries, the full table can be found in the Annex 2 (Table 3A). Due to the variability from year-to-year scores or the incomplete data for some of the governance indices, a five-year average is more representative of our study period. Annual fluctuations in these governance indices are often due to political unrest, changes in governmental power due to elections or military occupation, or other drastic socio-political changes and can skew the score.
Based on the observed clustering of scores (difference >0.07), we divided countries into five categories of civic space ranging from very low to very high. We used this categorization as an analytical tool to determine whether there were observable differences and patterns in the use of participatory governance methods from low to high civic space. The final step in our analysis was assessing the relationship, if any, between a country’s quantified civic space score and the participatory governance methods being used, by comparing the frequency and application of each method and entry point by civic space level (low to high).

Table 3: Country Categorization by Civic Space Score (Selected Countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Freedom of the Press</th>
<th>WGI Voice &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Enabling Environment Index</th>
<th>Rule of Law Index</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Civic Space Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All indices are calculated to be between 0-1, where 1 signifies the highest positive score for each index. For each of the indices, we calculated a five-year average to help capture the context within the time period of a majority of the participatory governance projects in the database. The enabling environment index (CIVICUS) only has a measure for 2013 and thus was not averaged across time.

Composite Score Range per Category: Very Low (0-0.99); Low (1.0-1.4); Moderate (1.41-1.59); High (1.60-1.99); Very High (2.0-2.5). The categorization of countries was based on natural differences in the composite scores of >0.09 and a subjective judgment from the research team based on experience and past work in most of these countries.

Press Freedom Index (2009-2014): measures a government’s commitment to enable or allow information to move freely in society.

Enabling Environment Index (2013): measures the propensity of citizens to participate in civil society and whether civil society has an enabling environment in which to function.

WGI Voice & Accountability (2008-2013): captures perceptions of the extent to which a country’s citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of associate and free media.
**Rule of Law Index (2010-2014):** measures the rule of law by compiling 47 indicators organized around eight themes: constraints on government powers, absence of corruption, open government, fundamental rights, order and security, regulatory enforcement, civil justice, and criminal justice.

*Resource Governance Index for Enabling Environment:* Measures the broader environment, based on more than 30 external measures of accountability, government effectiveness, rule of law, corruption and democracy.

**World Governance Indicator for Rule of Law (2013):** measures the effectiveness of rules within society including law enforcement, human rights, and the judicial system.

---

### 4. Sample Size

Of the 203 participatory governance projects documented in our database, a subsample of 192 projects from 31 countries was selected for analysis based on the completeness of information. Figure 2 provides details of the subsample of participatory governance projects by civic space category. This subsample includes the 24 projects where we conducted qualitative interviews with implementers. A total of 24 key informant interviews were conducted with civil society practitioners in five purposively sampled countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, Tunisia, Mozambique and South Africa). A number of African countries were excluded because we were unable to find documentation detailing previous or ongoing participatory governance projects. Our findings are presented as three key results—each interdependent and complementary of one another.

**Figure 1: Distribution of Participatory Governance Projects by Civic Space**

![Graph showing distribution of projects by civic space category]

**Note:** In parentheses, for each civic space category, is the number of countries included. Each project used one or more participatory governance methods. Excluded countries include: Angola, Cape Verde, Canary Islands, Central African Republic, Eritrea, Gabon, Libya, Mauritania, Mauritius, Reunion, Sao Tome & Principe, and Seychelles.

---

### IV. Findings

#### 1. Entry Points for Civic Engagement

Based on our analysis of 192 participatory governance projects, we found that there are four entry points that civil society, citizens, and other non-state actors typically use to influence public services (Figure 3). For our purposes, an entry point represents a specific approach to engaging in public service delivery and reform.
The first entry point is advocacy, which includes activities used to influence social sector decision-making through strategic communication, such as mass media campaigns. The second category, budget & expenditures, refers to direct participation by citizens, civil society, and the state in any phase of the public budget cycle including planning, formulation, monitoring, and analysis. The third entry point is performance monitoring, where citizens can monitor and evaluate public service planning, delivery, and reform. The fourth entry point is the engagement of non-state actors to support enforcement of the rules that govern public services. These can be formal or informal laws, judicial action, and other mechanisms for checks and balances.

**Figure 2: Entry Points for Participatory Governance in Public Service Provision**

![Diagram of entry points for participatory governance]

*Note: All participatory governance methods are defined in Table 2 (Annex)*

The four entry points were a key finding from the civil society interviews analysis. During discussions about how practitioners plan and implement their projects, the four areas surfaced as natural points of entry to participatory governance. Each entry point targets a different component of the public service delivery cycle—policy and planning, budgeting, monitoring, regulation, and reform. This distinction between entry points is important because at each entry point the objectives of the engagement differ, hence the approaches or methods used to achieve those objectives also differ. One example of this distinction came from a CSO informant in South Africa who explained that they first clearly define a project’s objectives and then consider the best entry point(s) to fit the objectives. The informant stated that if the goal of the project is to build awareness of an educational policy reform the methods they would use would be advocacy methods, but if the objective of the project is to monitor the fidelity of the new policy they would use monitoring and evaluation methods. In practice, civil society organizations prefer to use multiple entry points over the course of the project’s lifecycle, although it is highly dependent on the civic space, as well as funding, timing, and capacity.
2. PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS & ENTRY POINTS

Results from the key informant interviews and the project database identified 20 distinct participatory governance methods in use across Africa from 2007-2014, all of which are listed and defined in the Annex 1 (Table 1). For the purposes of this review, we focused on participatory governance methods that work on improving public services across any of the social sectors. Figure 4 shows the classification of methods by each entry point. Although this classification is not absolute, it is based on how the methods are typically used across the study’s 192 participatory governance projects.

Figure 3: Participatory Governance Methods by Entry Point

Box 1. Using multiple entry points

One CSO interviewed in Ethiopia initiated a project in 2013 aimed at improving sustainable agricultural practices. The CSO chose to use methods for advocacy, primarily information campaigns about the benefits of sustainable practices, and later public hearings with farmers and community members. Following the initial year of advocacy work, the CSO used community score cards (a performance monitoring method) to assess a provincial-level public program providing agricultural subsidies and sustainable irrigation trainings. This phased, two-entry point approach was highly valued by the CSO because it allowed them to reach a broader constituency of citizens. Using methods from different entry points concurrently or sequentially was perceived as more effective, increasing their measured outcomes for this project.

More information about Ethiopia and the other country case studies can be found in Annex 3.

Note: All methods are defined in Table 1 (Annex). Many of the methods captured have previously been termed as tools or approaches in the social accountability literature. Refer to World Bank Sourcebook (2008) for more details. Participatory governance approaches denoted with a * were recorded in more than one civic entry point (advocacy, budget & expenditure, performance monitoring, or rules enforcement), but categorized in the entry point in which they were most frequently used.

In practice, this categorization of methods by entry point is not mutually exclusive. Some participatory governance methods can be adapted for use in multiple entry points. For example, information campaigns and interface meetings can be implemented as
standalone advocacy methods, or as a dissemination method that is embedded in a public expenditure tracking survey. Citizen report cards also regularly include interface meetings as a tool to share the key findings and to create a joint action plan based on the results of the assessment. Similarly, depending on the objectives of a citizen journalism project it could be categorized under advocacy for disseminating information using mass media or it could be used as a tool to monitor public service delivery on the local level and fit under performance monitoring. Some methods tend to have less fluidity across entry points, like public expenditure tracking survey (PETS), which is a budget-specific activity that cannot be classified under any other entry point. That said the grouping provides valuable guidance for civil society, citizens, and state actors in deciding which methods to consider given their entry point and objectives.

Moreover, there tends to be a range of methods that can be used to achieve slightly different objectives. For instance, within budgeting and expenditure, budget demystification works to simplify the budget to make it more accessible to the public, while analytical techniques like audits and public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS) track resource flows and measures the proportion of resources that reached target recipients. This range of methods is a result of differences in context, capacity, resources, and so on that limit or shape the applicability of methods in a given civic space.

3. PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS BY CIVIC SPACE

Our findings show that, as civic space increases, there is a corresponding increase in the number and diversity of methods used. Figure 5 shows the proportion of the methods used per entry point as a percentage of the total methods recorded. There is relatively equal frequency of entry points across civic space category (41% advocacy, 20% budget and expenditure, 24% performance monitoring, 16% rules enforcement on average between 2007-2014), however, the methods used within each entry point changes significantly as civic space increases (low to high). In the following subsections, we have conducted a trend analysis of participatory governance projects by civic space. For brevity, we grouped the two lowest and highest civic space groups together (very low and low = low civic space) in the narrative below.

Figure 5: Distribution of Participatory Governance Entry Points by Civic Space

Note: The innermost ring of the donut graph represents the lowest civic space category; with subsequent outer rings representing increasing civic space.
Country Trends by Low (very low & Low) Civic Space

A majority of projects focus on advocacy. On average (2007-2014), 41% of participatory governance methods used in low civic space countries were for advocacy, 55% of which were information campaigns to raise awareness on a target issue (Annex 4, Graph 1A). Civil society informants attributed this pattern to the general public’s low level of knowledge and participation with public service issues, requiring CSOs to spend time and money raising awareness. Advocacy methods using mass media channels remain underutilized. Informants spoke about the challenges associated with low pluralism (representation of opinions), media dependency (ability of media to function independently from the state), and the high levels of environmental censorship and imprisonment of journalists in low civic spaces. Other entry points were utilized, but tended to use one or two of the least complex methods. Within rules and regulations, CSOs focused on public interest litigation surrounding human rights protection and citizens’ knowledge of their rights and entitlements (Annex 4, Graph 1D).

Projects are locally-focused and use a single participatory governance method. A majority of the projects in low civic spaces focused on local engagement at the community, district, and regional levels. CSOs identified capacity and funding as the key inhibiting factors to increasing the scale and reach of their projects. They also spoke about the lower risk involved with localized activities because the centralized government has less restrictive power and oversight. Moreover, CSOs felt they had to build their constituency of supporters, who were often not accustomed to participating in governance issues or, even, informed of them. All CSOs in low civic environments reported that the first step is local level advocacy.

The use of a single method was attributed to lack of support from the state, limited endogenous fundraising or sustainable funding sources, and lack of capacity within the CSOs. These projects rarely involve state cooperation. The methods tended to the one that require the least amount of resources and time. Overall, under 10% of projects in low civic space environments used complex methods such as audits, budget demystification, public polling, oversight committees, regulation enforcement, citizen juries, or citizen charters. Within the lower civic spaces projects focus on sectors that encompass basic rights or needs, including education, health, roads, agriculture, and social well-being.

Method selection is often influenced by international donors and partnering organizations. Most projects in low civic spaces were externally funded, with the donor or international partner directly informing the CSO’s approach by either selecting the participatory governance method or providing them a choice between a few methods. According to informants, donor preference is for CSOs to focus on one method due to capacity and short-term project cycles in low civic space environments.
Prevailing funding mechanisms creates competitive, elitist CSO landscape. The prominent type of funding in low civic space environments is small-scale, competitive grant funding provided by external donors. This mechanism not only limits the autonomy of CSOs to select their methods, but also CSO’s tendency to seek and establish partnerships. The competitive nature, size, and timing of the awards lower the incentives to collaborate and form coalitions. Further, established CSOs have a large competitive edge in the awarding of grants. Oftentimes the same CSOs are awarded multiple grants from multiple donors. Informants clarified that established does not necessarily mean that they are CSOs that have been working in the country for long or that they are reputable. CSO informants told various stories about politically connected or powerful individuals forming CSOs specifically to respond to grant-funding opportunities.

Country Trends by Moderate Civic Space

Projects are still dominated by advocacy methods, but the methods are more diverse. Projects in moderate civic spaces used advocacy methods frequently (45%) but there was a diversification of methods used including local issue forums (27%), citizen journalism (12%) and technical working groups (9%). Within moderate civic space environments, the type of advocacy also begins to diversify, including more channels of mass communication and the use of electronic media and online portals. Methods used for budgeting and expenditure remained around 20%, with a 19% increase in the use of audits compared to projects in low civic space. Another component of the diversity is sectoral focus. Projects and methods focused on addressing issues in multiple sectors, including both basic needs and more specialized issues such as gender, environmental protections, natural resources, youth, and vulnerable children.

Growing recognition of the importance of performance monitoring of public services. Projects in moderate civic spaces utilized all performance monitoring methods with similar frequency (ranging from 12-19%) (Annex 4, Graph 1C). Performance monitoring became a central focus of CSOs in moderate civic space countries. They use these tools to monitor the performance of projects and services. CSOs in moderate civic space had expanded capacity to conduct monitoring, research, and evaluation. According to informants, the state is more receptive and gives legitimacy to CSO’s role in monitoring their services. International development partners showed increased interest in hiring CSOs to monitor their programs, hence there were more opportunities for CSOs to assume this role (Annex 4, Graph 1D).

Citizen voices are more focused and channeled. The increase use of citizen charters, citizen report cards, grievance handling, and citizen juries was significant compared to projects in low civic space. CSO informants talked about the evolution of channeling
citizen voice more effectively as civic space opens. As citizens become more active and receptive, civil society increased in number and scope. Projects in moderate civic space tended to use these particular methods to capture and amplify citizen voice. Other rules enforcement methods remain strained due to poor legal protections for non-state actors, according to CSO informants.

**Projects are increasing in scale, but still have a short timeline.** Projects in moderate civic space countries were working at national and local scale but still had short (2-3 year) external funding cycles. CSO informants stated that one of the main challenges to their work is the expectation of donors to observe change in such a short period of time. Many of the intended long-term outcomes of governance work takes years, if not decades, to cultivate in dynamic and formerly repressed contexts.

**Increasingly utilizing disruptive mechanism to hold the government accountable.** Within moderate spaces, the emergence of criticisms directed towards the government was a clear pattern. Transparency and accountability were main themes of many CSOs projects. The increased openness of the government allowed for CSOs to hold them accountable to the their promises. This shift increased citizen confidence in the legal framework and knowledge of their rights and entitlements according to key informants.

**Box 3. Holding officials to account in Tunisia**

Tunisia has emerged from the Arab Spring revolution with a new constitution, democratically elected officials, and an invigorated civil society. The prevalence of watchdog organization has surged since the Arab Spring and many are focused on making sure the democratically elected officials are held accountable. Al Bawsala is one of these organizations. During the drafting of Tunisia’s new constitution in 2013-2014, Al Bawsala monitored the process and publicly reported each of the 200+ MPs biographies, their voting record (vote tracking), and absenteeism and made it publicly available through a online transparency portal. They also manage a website that publishes expenditure tracking results and general performance data for roads, education, and health by municipality. Marsad Baladia is an critical resource for citizens and civil society to use in order to monitor local budget, projects, and HR. ([http://baladia.marsad.tn](http://baladia.marsad.tn))

Similarly, iWatch is an anti-corruption organization that recently developed an online Accountability Meter for key politicians. Their largest meter is dedicated to measuring the progress of the new President. During his inauguration speech he made 32 promises. Those promise were captured by iWatch, separated into categories (economy, elections, and security) and monitored through weekly progress updates of the Accountability Meter.

**Country Trends by High (high & very high) Civic Space**

CSOs functioning in high civic space environments use multi-methods across concurrent entry points implemented at a national scale. In higher civic space countries, the density (number of projects per country) increased, as well as the number of methods used. There is a drop in advocacy (37%) and an increase in complex methods within performance monitoring (28%). Interestingly, budget and rules enforcement remained at similar proportions. There is a substantial increase in online platforms and social media used for dissemination of information about service monitoring, corruption, or dissatisfaction with the services. The use of online and social media as channels of
communication between citizens, CSOs, and state actors is more solidified. CSO informants insisted this form of communication enhances state responsiveness.

The complexity and implementation scale (community-, district-, national-level) were expanded. Qualitative analysis of informant interviews revealed that the complexity of methods is variable primarily by technical complexity; some require a survey and statistical or economic analysis, while others require a simplification of complex information, and some require a facilitator to lead a discussion. The scale or reach of participatory governance methods also increased as projects in high civic space commonly work on multiple levels advocating for reform at the central level and hosting citizen juries to solicit reform recommendations at the local level.

**Increased co-governance approach with government, but remains focused on holding government to account.** A much higher percentage of projects had components and activities that allowed for direct engagement of state stakeholders. Informants also talked about their observations of state actors showing more willingness to actively engage. Although there was an increase in co-governance activities, accountability was still an important focus for CSOs. CSOs talked about their challenges in navigating how to be a watchdog, holding the state and citizen to be accountable for their commitments, and also be a partner and facilitator to improving services. Informants discussed this as a key barrier to working with some state officials who are threatened by the watchdog role and prefer to avoid working with CSOs.

**Greater demand for open and flexible funding sources.** Although many of the CSOs in high civic space countries generate funds from both external and internal donors and supporters, external funding mechanisms were viewed as problematic due to their prescriptive nature, limited timeframe, and time-consuming monitoring and evaluation frameworks. A number of the informants talked about the issue of NGOs and CSOs adapting their activities and purpose to accommodate the available funding rather than developing a program themselves that fit the needs and objectives of their group of constituents and seeking funding that fits that.

**There are various coalitions and alliances of CSOs to enhance their work and increase the reach.** Partnering organizations tend to merge projects. Sometimes this increases geographic coverage. Other times, one organization specializes in one methodological approach, such as budget analysis, whereas the other organization does communication campaigns. In some cases, the donor environment is more favorable to this in high civic space countries, offering pooled funds for larger networks of CSOs.

**Available capacity and technology expand the use of data.** Projects in high civic space reported having access to more data on service delivery and leveraging technology to compile, analyze, and disseminate the data. Use of analytical software was reported in conjunction with complexity of performance monitoring methods.

The use of mobile phone, online platforms, and tablets to collect data were all discussed by key informants.

---

**V. DISCUSSION**

This study is the first to systematically assess the entry points and methods of participatory governance across socio-political contexts. Our frameworks are useful for funders, practitioners, and governments, particularly those working in Africa, as a tool to understand where and how participatory governance methods are being applied. In
addition, by identifying how methods are related to one another, practitioners can use our frameworks as a benchmark to assess which methods may be best suited for their projects.

Our study is also the first to evaluate the relationship between civic space and participatory governance methods. There are a number of distinct trends observed from low to high civic space which serves as evidence of the direct and indirect influence contextual factors have on which methods civil society organizations are able to use and how they implemented. For instance, projects in countries with the higher civic space utilize a greater number of methods within all entry points, and use multiple methods concurrently across sectors and issues. Overall, the average number of methods per project is 2.8, although it varies significantly by civic space (Ghana 3.1, Malawi 2.3, Mozambique 1.8, DRC 1.3). This continuum of civic space from low to high is important because participatory governance looks very different in low civic space environments as compared to high. For example, low civic space countries, like Ethiopia or Egypt, have governments that exert pressure and power on constituents, civil society, and the accessibility of information, narrowing the CSOs ability to implement governance projects that assess public services. Comparatively, in high civic space environments like Ghana, civil society is able to create transparency portals that track corruption and publicly publish it, similar to platforms like Publish What You Pay and Ghana’s Open Data initiative that published over 50 governance datasets in 2014.

Also evident from our findings is the dire need for further research on participatory governance. The current empirical evidence of the impact of African CSO-led participatory governance methods in service delivery is mixed. Some evidence supports that they have helped to enhance the voice of citizens, reduce corruption, and improve the quality of and access to services, particularly in health and education (McGee, R & Gaventa J., 2010; Rocha, M & Shrama B., 2006). However, these results are context specific and little has been done to understand the factors responsible for these outcomes( McGee, R & Gaventa J., 2010; Tembo, F. 2013). There have been a few large-scale impact evaluations on the use of social accountability or citizen participation across contexts, but they have not been focused on methods. Our study highlights a critical need for further research in measuring method-specific outcomes and processes. To measure the outcomes and impact of participatory governance accurately, it is important to determine how individual perceptions, decisions, and actions translate into collective action. This can best be measured using qualitative data, and thus a number of projects are now adopting a mixed-methods evaluation approach. Usually projects use more than one method over the project’s lifecycle and use outcomes that are too broad to measure method-specific impact and efficacy.

Moreover the funders, primarily international donors, that support participatory governance projects are allowing for too little time and using unsustainable financial support mechanisms. Most organizations do not have the resources to measure long-term effects. Yet, to be successful, many project follow long-term pathways and the sustainability of the impact on the systems and communities remains unknown. Further, sustainable funding sources outside of traditional donor mechanisms, such as short-term grants, are required in order for civil society to begin shifting to long-term strategic participatory governance projects rather than bounded, localized, information-led projects. Moreover, when the participatory governance methods are selected by the external entity it inhibits the autonomy of endogenous actors. Meanwhile, the understanding and purposive selection of a method based on its
applicability and feasibility for the intended outcomes, objectives, and the contextual environment is often overlooked by donors who have pre-determined goals and outcomes. The accessibility of information about participatory governance projects is one of the largest limitations of this study as we were only able to capture a punctuated snapshot of all the past and ongoing projects. CSOs and donors should promote the sharing of information about ongoing projects and their results. The quantification of civic space is a heuristic tool for practitioners to assess and compare with other country experiences. Much of the global recommendations for planning a project and considering the impact of contextual factors recommends contextual analyses like a political economy analysis, formative research, or feasibility study. Most CSOs don’t have the time or money to undertake such activities in order to plan their projects. Practitioners who want to leverage learnings from different country contexts may use the civic space categorization to compare their individual scores to countries that are similar and different to determine candidate methods and approaches.
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## Table 1: Definition of Participatory Governance Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Points for Civic Participation</th>
<th>Defining Participatory Governance Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information Campaigns</strong> - builds understanding and disseminates information in order to engage citizens, journalists, private sector, and members of national government. Can range from mass media campaigns to small awareness building activities that promote visibility and credibility within a community or society on a particular topic or issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Issue Forums or Consensus Workshops</strong></td>
<td>citizen-driven meetings where citizens, journalists, and other non-state actors, and public officials can participate in a dialogue and provide feedback on issues within their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interface Meetings</strong></td>
<td>formal meeting where government officials, citizens, and CSOs have the opportunity to exchange information and form a joint action plan. CSOs are usually the facilitator of these meetings. Interface meetings are often included as components of other methods like social audits and community scorecards, but can also function as a standalone mechanism (e.g. public hearings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Working Groups</strong></td>
<td>an ad-hoc group of subject-matter experts working together to achieve specific goals. Typically, technical working groups happen at the national level and consist of experts, funders, large CSOs or coalitions, and national government representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Journalism</strong></td>
<td>citizens participating in the process of collecting, reporting, analyzing, or disseminating information about governance issues for the general public, usually using some mass media communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgets &amp; Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Joint Budgeting</strong> - is a process by which citizens can view the budget formation, decision-making, and monitoring of the budget. It provides a space where citizens can voice their budget priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Budget Demystification</strong> - translates the inaccessible technical language and density of the budget into comprehensible information that is actively disseminated to citizens and other non-state actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public Expenditure Tracking</strong> - a methodology that traces the flow of resources and measures the proportion of resources that reached its target recipients. Oftentimes using a quantitative survey of households and/or service delivery personnel to compare budget to delivery of goods or services (e.g., public expenditure tracking survey (PETS), independent budget analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Audits</strong> - a process of determining whether the reported expenditures of the state, or organization providing services, reflect the distribution of resources on the ground. For example, social audits often review financial documentation and official records from the state to determine whether state reported expenditure reflect the money spent at the local level. The resources received by the communities are often assessed via survey or qualitative methods and the analysis is disseminated publicly. Participatory physical audits refer to when community stakeholders participate directly in collecting information about resource allocation. An example would be inspecting project sites and measuring quantity and quality of materials, infrastructure, and facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Monitoring

Citizen Report Cards - participatory surveys that solicit feedback from citizens and service users on the performance and quality of public services. The outcomes of the survey are usually disseminated through media and/or civil society advocacy.

Community Score Cards - community-based monitoring tool that solicits public service users and providers perceptions of quality, efficiency, and transparency. Since it is a grassroots process it is also more likely to be used in a rural setting.

Transparency Portal - spaces (usually online) that publish public service delivery information with minimal lag time. In some instances, these portals are also places that citizens can post concerns, observations, or proof of corruption.

Community Monitor (Watchdog) - activities that monitor, record, and evaluate the government, on a national or local level, on fulfilling their obligations. The goal is to hold the state and public service providers accountable, provide feedback, share control of the M&E, and engage citizens and public officials in identifying and taking corrective actions.

Oversight Committees - parliamentary committees, that include CSOs, have been established in many African countries in order to have a more informed parliamentary debate, assess legislation, and hold the government to account. CSOs play a role in collecting evidence and soliciting feedback from the community on specific topics or legislation.

Rules Enforcement

Public Interest Litigation - the use of legal practices on a not-for-profit basis to protect public interest, help poor or marginalized people, and to change social policies.

Regulation and Legal Enforcement - using the freedom-of-information laws to request access to the information or advocacy of the need for these laws. Many of the countries that have FOI laws have a formalized process in order to access information, but CSOs sometimes need to use litigation or judiciary action in order for the government to comply.

Legal Representation (for Vulnerable Populations) - the use of legal practices and representation for persons who otherwise would not receive fair representation. Legal advocate groups tend to focus on one or two vulnerable populations to ensure they receive fair and just rule.

Citizen Grievance Handling - a system by which queries or comments about the project are responded to, problems with implementation are resolved, and grievances are acknowledged and resolved.

Citizen Juries - approach that gathers members of the community, using a combination of random and stratified sample, to address important questions about policy and public service planning. The jurors are fully briefed on the background information through written documentation and evidence from witnesses. Jurors scrutinize the information, cross-examine witnesses, and discuss different aspects of the issue in small groups in plenary sessions.

Citizen’s Charter - is a rights-based approach which informs citizens about their service entitlements including procedures and charges of the service, standards for service and remedies for non-adherence to service delivery. Separate charters are usually designed for distinct services and/or organizations and agencies. Sometimes, citizens’ obligations or acts that are subject to fines are also listed.
Note that the definitions in Table 1 represent how these methods were used by projects in our database. With each method listed in the table, a number of approaches or applications may exist. For example, audits can be a financial audit where budgetary information is reviewed to determine whether state reported expenditure reflect the money spent locally or it could be a social audit, which include budgetary review and participatory physical audit, where community stakeholders directly participate in collecting information about resource allocation.

Additional sources that include method definitions:

# ANNEX 2

## Table 3A - Country Categorization By Civic Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All indices are calculated to be between 0-1, where 1 signifies the highest positive score for each index. For each of the indices, we calculated a 5-year average (2010-2014) to better capture the civic space across the timeframe of a majority of the projects in the database. The enabling environment index (CIVICUS) only has a measure for 2013 and thus was not averaged across time.

**Composite Score Range per Category:** Very Low (0-1.35); Low (1.36-1.70); Moderate (1.71-1.99); High (2.0-2.5); Very High (2.5-4.0). The categorization of countries was based on natural differences in the composite scores of >0.05 and a subjective judgment from the research team based on experience and past work in most of these countries.

**World Press Freedom Index (2010-2014):** measure the level of freedom that journalists, news organizations enjoy in each country and the effort made by authorities to respect and ensure this freedom.


**Enabling Environment Index (2013):** measures conditions that impact the capacity of citizens (whether individually or in an organized fashion) to participate and engage in the civil society arena in a sustained and voluntary manner.

**Rule of Law (2010-2014):** is a compilation of indicators that captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the judicial system (civil, criminal and informal justice) ([http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports))

*Resource Governance Index for Enabling Environment:* Measures the broader environment, based on more than 30 external measures of accountability, government effectiveness, rule of law, corruption and democracy.

**World Governance Indicator for Rule of Law (2013):** measure the effectiveness of rules within society including law enforcement, human rights, and the judicial system.
ANNEX 3
CASE STUDY

Ethiopia
2014

SNAPSHOT — POLITICAL SPACE

Ethiopia remains a semi-closed sociopolitical environment. Independent press and local organizations working in governance are under close watch by the central and regional government, and continue to be restricted in their coverage of governance issues. 1 Civil society organizations (CSOs) are limited by various legal and financial restrictions from the central government. Although the constitution and a select number of public policies support opportunities for good governance and civic participation, the space is restricted by mistrust in the government and the limited presence of CSOs working on governance issues. 1

Political Space: LOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of the Press</th>
<th>Voice &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Enabling Environment for CSOs</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS — RESULTS FROM CSO INTERVIEWS:

Breakdown of Participatory Governance Methods

- Advocacy
  - Community Forums
  - Awareness Campaigns
  - Literacy Campaigns
  - Training & Capacity Building
  - CSO Committee Forums
  - 68%
- Performance Monitoring
  - Citizen Report Cards
  - Community Scorecards
  - Community Mapping
  - 32%

1 Source of information for the ‘Context’ summary was obtained from Freedom House: Profile of Ethiopia: http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2013/ethiopia#.VETV4haWG88
*Map icon is from Icon Download: icon-download.com
Public understanding of participatory governance and the role of civil society in governmental decision-making are still quite new in Ethiopia. The results from this case study show that the methods currently being used in Ethiopia are ones that require the least capacity and tend to mobilize citizens on a community level, rather than the central level. The openness of the state is a major barrier for the implementation of certain methods in Ethiopia, as they require both openness and some level of responsiveness or state participation in order to properly work.

Much of the participatory governance methods focus on major sectors, such as education, health and agriculture, mainly in the rural areas. The most widely used methods include citizen report card, workshops or trainings, and community dialogue forums. Budget tracking and audits are ongoing at the central level, but the role of CSOs is minimal.

According to the key informants, the participatory methods being used by CSOs in Ethiopia are bottlenecked by access to information both from the government as well as CSOs encountering difficulty in disseminating information. Capacity is also a two-way barrier. Both supply- and demand-side capacity for implementing participatory governance methods is limited, as citizen, CSO and state exposure and institutionalization of the methods are limited. The access to information, especially budget information and policy implementation documents, are relatively restricted to CSOs and the general public.

The key informants discussed that the capacity of their staff and partnering organizations remains limited. The largest social accountability project in the country, Ethiopia Social Accountability Program (ESAP), is in its second iteration. In 2013, a few CSOs tried to pilot social auditing and gender responsive budgeting, but social audits required too much technical assistance and gender responsive budgeting was not well understood or received by the government counterparts. All of the key informants iterated that CSOs in Ethiopia are lacking the appropriate number of staff with adequate understanding of participatory governance and often do not account for the timeline and human resources required by most of the methods.
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Mozambique has been politically led by the Front for Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) party since independence from Portugal in 1975. In the most recent election, in October of 2014, FRELIMO won the majority of the vote and remains in power for an unbroken incumbency. Corruption within the government, police and businesses remains pervasive, and judicial action against corruption is weak.

Freedom of the press is legally protected, although journalists have historically been harassed and threatened, and often practice self-censorship when covering governance issues. NGOs operate freely, but face bureaucratic hurdles when formally registering and requesting information.

**Political Space: LOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of the Press</th>
<th>Voice &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Enabling Environment for CSOs</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS – RESULTS FROM CSO INTERVIEWS:**

- **Advocacy**
  - Citizen Journalism Awareness Campaigns
  - Literacy Campaigns
  - Training & Capacity Building
  - Community Marches
  - 54%

- **Rules Enforcement**
  - Legal Health Advocates
  - 8%

- **Performance Monitoring**
  - Transparency Blogging Portals
  - Community Score Cards
  - SMS Citizen Monitoring
  - 38%
In Mozambique, citizen voice and participation in governance have not been easily translated into the cultural or political fabric. Historically, the influence of the prior communist rule and one-party political domination since the democratization of the country, has meant that CSOs and media had to align with the ruling party and economic elite in order to access donors and sustain funding.

Based on the interviews with CSOs, the methods being used are still focused on capacity building, awareness campaigns, and working at the local and regional levels rather than working at the central level.

According to the CSOs interviewed, there are a number of opportunities for civil society and citizens to actively participate in governance. Recent changes in the legal framework have made it more conducive to voicing opposition about anti-corruption, human rights and gender equality. The diversity of CSOs provides various opportunities for citizens to get involved, and the funding for CSO participatory governance activities has become more harmonized. CSO interviewees talked about the expanding space for women’s rights due to the decentralization movement, although, in many respects decision-making remains centralized.

CSOs perceive that the main barrier to many methods is low capacity, both for citizen and state actors. Thus many of the activities include capacity building activities and public advocacy so that the issues and knowledge about participation is built up in the electorate. According to interviewees, one of the growing roles of CSOs is oversight, with numerous committees have been formed over the past few years. CSOs reported that most activities are still donor driven and there is little room for a vibrant and critical civil society due to the funding sources and closed political space of the government.

Although there is some citizen journalism, media criticizing the central government is risky and many journalists and media outlets cover governance issues cautiously. One of the CSOs interviewed was a citizen journalist’s organization that used university students and other young people to blog about public service issues and election issues. During the recent election, citizens were able to post pictures, send in SMS messages and call into the organization to report incidences of electoral fraud.
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SNAPSHOT – POLITICAL SPACE

The advent of the Arab Spring has catalyzed a political revolution and change in governmental power throughout Tunisia. In 2011, the Constituent Assembly was democratically elected in order to draft Tunisia’s new constitution, and has subsequently opened up the legal and financial platform for civil society. Precedually, NGOs were legally prohibited from working on political activities, but now are operating with greater freedom and advocating for women’s rights and the role of religion in the state. Although access to information has improved and is legally protected, it remains difficult due to the administrative processes. Press has also diversified, and state-led outlets have grown increasingly nonpartisan when covering governance issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Space: MODERATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of the Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS – RESULTS FROM CSO INTERVIEWS:

Breakdown of Participatory Governance Methods

- **Advocacy**
  - Community Forums
  - Awareness Campaigns
  - Literacy Campaigns
  - Training & Capacity Building
  - Citizen Journalism

- **Rules Enforcement**
  - Public Interest Litigation

- **Performance Monitoring**
  - Community Scorecards
  - Community Monitoring Committees
  - Transparency portals
  - Anti-Corruption Barometer

- **Budget & Expenditure**
  - Budget Analysis

---

3 Source of information for this summary was obtained from Freedom House: Profile of Tunisia- http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2013/tunisia#.VETamRaWG8
Tunisia has emerged from the Arab Spring revolution with a new constitution, elected officials and invigorated civil society. According to the CSO interviewees, culturally, a citizen actively participating in governance issues through organizations and specific methods remains novel for Tunisian citizens. Interviewees talked about how prior to the revolution, many people complained about policies and service delivery, but lacked a channel for collective action and a space where their voice was heard by a receptive government.

Unlike other case study countries, CSOs agreed that capacity was not one of their biggest issues. Due to the population’s education level and European influence, there is a qualified workforce. And unlike the other case study countries, working for civil society or a non-profit organization is not a high paying job in Tunisia. It is common that CSO employees work part-time on the weekend or evenings. Although the capacity is not an issue, public literacy about citizen participation in governance and the methods, which citizens can use to monitor public services or participate in policy making, is low. Additionally, the government remains centralized. Local government officials are appointed and few activities focus on interactions with local governance representatives because there are only horizontal accountability mechanisms in place for these appointed officials. Following the Arab Spring revolution, international support, technical assistant and monetary investment in citizen and demand-side participation in governance has grown considerably. The space for CSOs to work opened up considerably. According to key informants, access to information is legal protected and the central government has lowered the requirements to be a registered organization thus more than 7,000 new NGOs have been created since 2011.

The distribution of participatory governance methods is less focused on public awareness, but rather monitoring public services and is the first case study country to include budget and expenditure tracking. CSO interviewees stated that public awareness was still important in Tunisia, as many of the methods are newly possible due to the opening up of political space, but due to the basic education level and communication infrastructure it is easier to raise public literacy about participatory governance. CSOs interviewees felt they had limited autonomy when choosing PG methods, because of the donor influence and support for participation in governance in Tunisia. Many of the methods currently being implemented follow the decisions of donors and large international organizations.
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SNAPSHOT — POLITICAL SPACE

Politically, Malawi has experienced a rapid change in power following the sudden death of President Mutharika in 2012. Vice President Joyce Banda took over as leader and quickly repealed many of the repressive policies that inhibited transparency and respect for human rights. Freedom of the press is legally guaranteed and under the recent administration, diversification of media sources is burgeoning. The legal and policy environment is very progressive, but implementation of these policies is inconsistent and many of them are just on paper. Access to information is also legally protected, but remain difficult to access for civil society. And corruption has been a major issue, and efforts to combat it have been relatively unsuccessful.

Political Space: HIGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of the Press</th>
<th>Voice &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Enabling Environment for CSOs</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS — RESULTS FROM CSO INTERVIEWS:

Breakdown of Participatory Governance Methods

- Advocacy & Policy
  - Awareness Campaigns
  - Issue Forum
  - Literacy Campaigns
  - Training & Capacity Building
  - Citizen Journalism
  - Community Radio
  - 29%

- Rules & Regulations
  - Legal Representation for Vulnerable pop
  - 17%

- Performance Monitoring
  - Community Scorecards
  - Citizen Report Cards
  - CSO Committees
  - SMS Community Monitoring
  - 30%

- Budget & Expenditures
  - Budget Analysis
  - PETS
  - Budget Demystification
  - 24%
Historically, the space for PG methods has been restricted by the state through direct and indirect political maneuvers, and thus work in governance has only recently started to blossom. CSO interviewees talked about when in 2011 many multilateral donors retracted funding amid concerns of deteriorating human rights and corruption due to the ‘cash-gate’ scandal, where stacks of public money were found in the living rooms of numerous political figures. Although Malawi does offer a very progressive policy environment, many of these reforms are stalled and implementation has not yet been achieved.

According to CSO informants, access to information does not inhibit CSOs from creating a space for citizens to participate. CSOs and other non-state actors are limited in what methods they can implement do to their lack of understanding of the concepts and methods. One of the major limiting factors is the capacity, although less so than in Ethiopia. Informants also mentioned that there seems to be a correlation with size of the CSO and capacity. Openness of the government to the existence of CSOs doing participatory governance work was not discussed as a barrier, although getting the central government, local government or chiefs to participate in these methods is very difficult. Overall, the capacity of CSOs is still weak, and the sustained use of participatory methods is not independent of donor influence.

The participatory governance methods more varied than the previous case study countries. However, more complex methods, including budget tracking and auditing of programs is restricted to a few CSOs. Many of the CSOs interviewed highly supported interface meetings and community dialogues for issues such as education or health care delivery. Each community has its own issues, and have a local space where they feel like they are heard and an action plan is set into motion.

Unique to Malawi is the presence of chiefs as an integral component of the local governmental system. Appointed by the central government and thus not elected nor historically accountable to their citizens. In 2014, for the first time in 10+ years, most local officials were elected rather than appointed, and thus this has opened up even further space for CSOs to implement localized PG methods.
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CASE STUDY

South Africa
2014

SNAPSHOT – POLITICAL SPACE

South Africa is one of the limited numbers of African countries to have achieved the peaceful transfer of power through successive democratic elections. South Africa has a flourishing civil society including an array of CSO networks and NGO umbrella organizations that are well supported by both domestic and international interests. Access to information is highly supported by the law, but in practice is restricted by administrative processes. Freedom of the press is protected and generally observed, although the government is highly sensitive to media criticism. Corruption is still a major problem, and many agencies have been tasked with combating it, but the enforcement and transparency is inadequate.5

Political Space: VERY HIGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of the Press</th>
<th>Voice &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Enabling Environment for CSOs</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE METHODS – RESULTS FROM CSO INTERVIEWS:

Breakdown of Participatory Governance Methods

- **Advocacy**
  - Human Rights Activism
  - Citizen Journalism
  - Training & Capacity Building
  - Awareness Campaign
  - Technical Working Groups
  - Community Mapping using GPS
  - Performance Monitoring
    - Community Scorecards
    - Citizen Report Cards
    - CSO Committees
    - Anti-Corruption Barometer

- **Budget & Expenditures**
  - Budget Analysis
  - Social Audit
  - PETS
  - Budgeting for Vulnerable Populations

- **Rules Enforcement**
  - Public Interest Litigation
  - Freedom of Information Litigation

---

5 Source of information for this summary was obtained from Freedom House: Profile of South Africa– http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2013/south-africa#.VET-YBaWG88
South Africa is a relatively open environment where questioning the government is quickly becoming a societal norm. Citizens and civil society are often involved in issues ranging from natural resource protection to health budgeting. The government is relatively decentralized, and many of the CSOs interviewed reported working at the local, district and national level.

Comparatively, South Africa is using the greatest number of methods on the most diverse number of sectors and issues. The CSO culture in South Africa is mainstreamed and citizens’ ideology of participation is accepted. Practitioners in South Africa talked about the importance of three factors for participatory governance. First, the issues civil society is working on has to be salient, and there has to be a social movement behind it where citizens care about the outcomes. Second, there has to be a community of practice, where practitioners gather evidence, because without supportive evidence what they say does not get attention. Lastly, leadership is critical to facilitating and sustaining participation in governance, and it has to come from both the state and non-state sides. Unlike other case study countries, the emphasis on evidence gathering in order for an argument to have validity is somewhat unique.

The CSO interviewees emphasized the importance of interface meetings as an effective training tool and a method that aids in holding local governance accountable. Interface meetings are effective because participants gain a better understanding of each other’s role, responsibilities and limitations. The outcome of interface meetings is often a joint action plan, and thus it is an exercise that allows for each side to clearly define their roles and responsibilities.

According to informants, another unique component of civil society in South Africa is the collaboration and coalitions between the Southern African countries. There was a coordination of efforts between neighboring countries, and most of this action was spearheaded by South Africa. South Africa also has a large training program for accountability programs. The training program facilitates capacity building in the Southern Africa region. The course takes a holistic approach to accountability, include tutorials on most of the methods used by both the non-state and state actors. The CSOs administrating the course referred to their approach as ‘Africanized’, meaning that their training material and content is tailored for what is going on in the region.
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**ANNEX 4**

**Graph 1A: Distribution of Advocacy Methods by Civic Space**

**Graph 1B: Distribution of Budget & Expenditure Methods by Civic Space**
Graph 1C: Distribution of Performance Monitoring Methods by Civic Space Category

Graph 1D: Distribution of Rules Enforcement Methods by Civic Space Category