

**PILOT RUN OF THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY
LEARNING-IN-ACTION PROGRAM FOR MONGOLIANS**

Prepared by the
Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific

Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

PILOT RUN OF SAclAP 3

PROCESS DOCUMENTATION 4

 Day 1 5

 Preliminaries 5

 Session 1: Good Governance 6

 Session 2: Constructive Engagement 10

 Day 2 15

 Recapitulation 15

 Session 3: Social Accountability 15

 Session 4: Public Financial Management 19

 Day 3 21

 Visit of the Dean of the Ateneo School of Government 21

 Recapitulation 21

 Session 5: Public Procurement Monitoring 22

 G-Watch Sharing on Human Rights Monitoring 25

 Session 6: Budget Monitoring and Analysis 26

 Day 4 30

 Exposure Visit to the Department of Education Bidding Process 30

 Session 8: Budget Monitoring Supplemental Session 32

 Day 5 34

 Session 9: Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys 34

Session 10: Participatory Performance Monitoring (Scorecards)..... 37

Session 11: Designing a SAC Tool (Developing Scorecards)..... 42

Day 7 43

Recapitulation 44

Session 12: Evaluation and Critique of Workshop 44

Day 8 48

Session 13: ANSA EAP’s Learning Framework..... 48

Session 14: Planning and Tasking of Workshop..... 51

DOCUMENTATION REPORT ON THE PILOT RUN OF THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY LEARNING-IN-ACTION PROGRAM-MONGOLIA

18-26 October 2010 • Pasig City, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The Social Accountability Learning-in-Action Program (SAcLAP) is a set of integrated capability building activities for targeted citizen groups and a select number of counterpart government officials in Mongolia. It aims to build understanding and competencies in adapting and undertaking social accountability approaches toward good governance. The end-goal is to integrate constructive engagement between citizens and government in monitoring the use of public resources into governance reform initiatives in Mongolia.

The Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific (ANSA-EAP) abides by learning-in-action as an operative principle in delivering this capability building intervention. It is a highly interactive process between the learners and their environment. The targeted outcome is the improvement in the competencies of participants and overall capabilities of the group of participants as learners in instituting citizen-driven change in the structure, systems, actions, and relations of key stakeholders. This is expected to result in the transformation and reform of governance practices in organizations, communities, and other institutions where the learners are located.

Learning is designed to be achieved through a blended approach, which includes services such as:

- Face-to-face workshops (Pilot run for trainers and 5-day SAc workshop)
- Mentoring and Coaching (online)
- Provision of small grants for 10 SAc pilot initiatives
- Formation of a learners group and a pool of SAc practitioners attending to a continuous learning process for improved quality and effectiveness

The World Bank Mongolia Country Office and the Partnership for Social Accountability (through Democracy Education Center as its Coordinating Organization) are the key partners in this undertaking.

PILOT RUN OF SAcLAP

A pilot run of the SAcLAP workshop was held in the Philippines last 18-26 October 2010 in Astoria Plaza, Pasig City. The pilot run aimed to: 1) customize a workshop design suited for the five-day social accountability workshop in Mongolia in November 2010 2) serve as a learning intervention for the ANSA-Convenors' Group of Mongolia *Partnership for Social Accountability* (PSA), and key allies in the government.

There were 12 participants who attended the pilot run of SAcLAP.¹ Nine of them are members of PSA which has one member from a government unit, while three are from key government offices. The participants were selected based on their training management and facilitating skills, understanding of SAc processes and tools, proficiency in English, and capacity to assist in the SAc workshop.

As designed, the pilot run of the SAcLAP workshop² covers the following sessions:

<p>Day 1 (Monday, October 18, 2010) Session 1: Understanding Good Governance Session 2: Constructive Engagement</p>	<p>Day 5 (Friday, October 22, 2010) Session 9: Public Expenditure Tracking Session 10: Participatory Performance Monitoring</p>
<p>Day 2 (Tuesday, October 19, 2010) Session 3: Social Accountability Session 4: Public Financial Management</p>	<p>Day 6 (Saturday, October 23, 2010) Session 11: Designing SAc Initiative Session 12: Evaluation and Critiquing of the Workshop – Part 1</p>
<p>Day 3 (Wednesday, October 20, 2010) Session 5: Public Procurement Session 6: Budget Monitoring and Analysis</p>	<p>Day 7 (Monday, October 25, 2010) Session 13: Evaluation and Critiquing of the Workshop – Part 2 Session 14: Planning for the SAc Workshop</p>
<p>Day 4 (Thursday, October 21, 2010) Session 7: Exposure Visit to the Department of Education’s bid opening Session 8: Exposure Visit to the Senate’s budget deliberation</p>	<p>Day 8 (Tuesday, October 26, 2010) Session 15: Training Management and Facilitation</p>

Filipino experts and practitioners in various social accountability tools had been invited to serve as resource speakers for the various sessions. Some post-session events were also held, especially during dinner time, wherein informal discussions with selected individuals were arranged.

PROCESS DOCUMENTATION

This report documents the eight days of 15 sessions held during the SAcLAP pilot run. It covered 10 regular sessions³, five supplemental sessions⁴ and four informal sessions⁵. Twelve resource speakers were utilized for the 10 regular and 5 supplemental sessions; and seven for the informal discussions. In documenting the formal sessions, this report captures the following:

¹ See list with background information in Annex 1.

² See Final Design in Annex 2.

³ Sessions 1-10

⁴ Sessions 11-15

⁵ Dinner with Cong. Henedina Razon-Abad; Dinner with Mr. Edwin Chavez; G-Watch sharing on Human Rights Monitoring; Discussion with Roy and Heidi Mendoza.

- a. individual design and flow of each session;
- b. structured learning activities employed;
- c. inputs of the resource person and workshop outputs;
- d. highlights of the discussion; and
- e. summary and assessment.

The presentations, learning exercises, references, and other materials used during each session are annexed in this report.

Day 1

Day 1 started with preliminaries that opened the workshop and, immediately afterwards, sessions on (a) Understanding Good Governance and (b) Constructive Engagement.

An informal discussion with Mr. Edwin Chavez was also held in the evening after the day's sessions.

Preliminaries

To start the workshop, preliminary remarks were delivered. These included (a) the welcome message by Dr. Angelita Gregorio-Medel, ANSA-EAP Project Director, and (b) the introductory notes on the rationale of the program, results of the learning needs analysis, and workshop design and house rules by Mr. Wadel Cabrera III, SAclAP coordinator for Mongolia.

Welcome Message. Dr. Medel emphasized the importance of context and culture in the application of social accountability tools and techniques. She explained that the pilot SAclAP workshop is important to make sure that ANSA-EAP's SAc learning resource is suited to the needs of Mongolia.

She also cautioned the participants not to expect dependence on experts. Learning-in-action requires active participants in the learning process. Since the Mongolian participants are actual SAc practitioners in Mongolia, they also have to take the role of resource persons and experts in providing input on what counts as the appropriate method or tool for promoting social accountability in Mongolia.

Introductory Notes. Mr. Cabrera emphasized the aim of the pilot run in terms of customizing a workshop design and methodology for the actual run of the SAclAP workshop in Mongolia on 15-19 November 2010. Because tools and technologies cannot be simply transferred, the existing learning resources of SAclAP must be adapted to Mongolian needs and contexts. Learning-in action is expressed by this process of customization.

Mr. Cabrera also noted the results of the learning needs assessment. The assessment showed that the participants prefer participatory mechanisms (discussion exchange) in learning, and that they are better at understanding spoken English rather than in writing or speaking English. Accordingly, Mr. Cabrera organized the participants according to buzz groups to aid in the translation during the discussions in the

workshop. He also asked the participants to write daily journals to allow them to crystallize learning from and provide feedback on the sessions.

Following the discussion of the needs assessment, Mr. Cabrera identified and presented the session topics for the workshop as laid out in the program. These topics are Good Governance (GG), Constructive Engagement (CE), Social Accountability (SAC), Public Financial Management (PFM), Procurement Monitoring (PM), Budget Monitoring and Analysis (BMA), Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS), and Participatory Performance Monitoring (Scorecards). Mr. Cabrera also mentioned the various informal sessions and activities ANSA-EAP has arranged for the participants.

Participants' feedback. The participants noted the efficient work in preparing for the workshop, especially the learning needs analysis. There was, however, a request to include *Social Watch* among the resource speakers as it was an expressed need in the assessment.

The participants also mentioned specific activities or initiatives that they find interesting and wish to know more about during the course of the workshop or stay in the Philippines. These included attending the actual budget hearing, meeting Government Watch, and the informal session with the Ombudsman. The participants also emphasized their interest in learning SAC tools for scoring and auditing government performance.

Regarding Social Watch, Dr. Medel responded by saying that the Social Watch may not yet be the appropriate example for the Mongolians because of its very technical nature.

Session 1: Good Governance

Session 1, entitled "Understanding Good Governance", expounded on the principles of good governance and why it is valuable in the respective works of the participants. It also identified pressing governance issues and challenges that the Mongolians should address.

The structured learning activities employed in the session were (a) individual reflection, (b) group work, (c) plenary, (d) presentation from the Mongolian government's perspective, (e) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Rande Cabaces, ANSA-EAP Learning and Capacity-Building Component Manager, facilitated the session. The session was conducted from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. then resumed from 2:09 to 2:58 p.m., or a total of 2 hours and 21 minutes.

Inputs of the resource person and workshop outputs

Mr. Cabaces started the session⁶ by asking the participants to write their individual reflections on good governance on metacards. They were asked to answer two questions:

⁶ See Mr. Cabaces' presentation on "Understanding Good Governance" in Annex 3.

- What is good governance to you?
- How is it important to your respective works?

Group work (with four members each) followed where group members discussed their individual responses to the two questions. Each group was tasked, based on the results of their discussion, to (a) identify the gains and issues in achieving good governance in Mongolia and (b) prepare a diagram to illustrate such gains and issues. The participants were purposely grouped according to sector: civil society, research and academe, and government.

The group responses were then presented in a plenary discussion, where participants had the opportunity to comment on the other groups' reflections. The groups' answers are presented below:

*Group 1 (CSO)*⁷. Ms. Undram Chimed, executive director of Responsible Mining Initiative (RMI), made the report for the CSO group. The group understood good governance in terms of accountability, transparency and information access, and citizen's participation; and they consider the right to assembly, freedom of expression, and organized CSOs as the gains of good governance. To them, accountability and transparency would open portals of legislative, military and social development to Mongolia.

The challenges of good governance in Mongolia include weak mechanisms for implementation, lack of knowledge and skill, and the absence of the culture of social accountability which give government leaders the opportunity to manipulate transactions according to their self-interests.

To address these problems, Ms. Chimed noted that there should be a more active and committed citizenry in the society. This would strengthen the fundamental bases for good governance, for which rules and policies are already in place.

*Group 2 (academe and research group)*⁸. Ms. Sarangerel Lkhamsuren, executive director of Infratest Research and Training Centre, reported for the Academe and Research Group. Their group understood good governance in terms of accountability, responsibility, absence of corruption, and access to information. The government should be ensuring civic participation and engagement. They must be responsive to the citizens and encourage monitoring and assessment by citizens and citizen groups.

In discussing the gains and challenges of good governance, Ms. Lkhamsuren noted that Mongolia has a positive legal environment and vibrant NGO community and civil society which help ensure good governance. The challenges they noted are the low experience of most non-government organizations in decision-making and financial sustainability, absence of mechanisms to promote good governance, and low level of civic education of the citizens.

⁷ See Group 1 (CSO) output for Good Governance in Annex 4A & Annex 4B.

⁸ See Group 2 (Research/Academe) output for Good Governance in Annex 5.

Ms. Lkhamsuren's group recommended that the government be structured for management and output generation to make it effective, efficient, and accessible. The roles of the government and NGOs must be recognized for better practice of good governance.

*Group 3 (Government)*⁹. Mr. Bazarvaani Darinchuluun, Cabinet secretariat of the Mongolian government, reported for the government organizations. For the group, good governance is citizen-centred and there is a learning environment for both the government and the civil society. Such an environment includes policies for proper training in local community schools and good execution of laws, among others.

The government group claimed to have achieved a citizen-centered government, law enforcement, political and social stability, and democracy in the country. Weaknesses, however, include poor implementation of the law, presence of political partisanship, lack of appropriate/competent personnel, and corruption.

The group recommended the importance of an expressed readiness for partnership between government and civil society and a common understanding of social accountability that comes from as many stakeholders as possible.

To ground and further enrich the discussion on good governance in the Mongolian context, Ms. Sosormaa Chuluunbaatar, Adviser to the President of Mongolia on Human Rights and Public Participation, shared her views on good governance¹⁰. Notable in her presentation was the distinction between government and governance, in that the government is just one of the actors in governance, while governance refers, in essence, to sound development management. The same thinking applies to local government (as specific institutions providing service to smaller units) vis-à-vis local governance (as "life of government through formulation and execution of development ideas").

Ms. Chuluunbaatar described good governance as epitomized by predictable, open and enlightened policy-making, with a bureaucracy aiming for the common good, rule of law and transparent processes, and a strong participative civil society. It should also be characterized as consensus-oriented, accountable, responsive, equitable and inclusive, effective and efficient.

In the context of Mongolia, she underscored support for better government-civil society relationship to attain good governance. This will help correct misunderstandings about governance being the same as government; that local councilors and MPs, being representatives of the people, do not necessarily have "ownership of governance".

On the other hand, bad governance results from the weaknesses that beset the developing countries when it comes to government and administrative matters. These include low capacity to rule, centralization and top-down approach, service monopolies, social insulation, low transparency, poor

⁹ See Group 3 (Government) output for Good Governance in in Annex 6.

¹⁰ See Ms. Chuluunbaatar's presentation in Annex 7.

civic participation, and weak accountability mechanism. These were the same reasons why many of the Mongolian government's reform efforts failed.

Ms. Chuluunbaatar concluded her sharing by emphasizing the collective roles of the public, business, and voluntary sectors in balancing/checking the government and preserving social order.

Mr. Cabaces ended the session by noting how Good Governance contributes to the attainment of a Good Society wherein people's needs are met because there is improved delivery of public services, there is caring and sharing among different stakeholders toward enhancing the community's welfare, and there is equality and justice as people's rights are better protected.

Highlights of the discussion

The insights generated from the session discussions are as follows:

1. On improving the relationship between NGOs and GOs to advance good governance,

Good governance is a resounding issue in Mongolia, but the people from both civil society and government require more education on its principles and practice. Participation among the public sector, business sector, and volunteer sector is considered vital but they have yet to discover how to establish the working relationship in such participation

Ms. Undral Gombodorj asked the government participants about how "CSOs can help government establish good governance". Mr. Darinchuluun replied that both government and CSOs should understand each other's unique dynamics and that both should be clear about their goals. He suggested that CSOs start addressing the "government-CSO gridlock" by inviting people from the government to their seminars.

2. On whether SAc leads to conflict of interest or dispense with anti corruption approaches

Mongolia has set laws and policies like anti-corruption and procurement, which can serve as platforms for good governance, but they still need serious and rigorous implementation to bring about the intended benefits.

Mr. Demberel Tserenjav cautioned about a very cordial relationship between CSO and government. He asked about the place of criticism and the concern for conflict of interest in that kind of relationship. Ms. Gombodorj answered that individuals are responsible for the integrity of the relationship. Mr. Cabaces added that healthy criticisms will make the relationship work.

Mr. Tserenjav also asked if the success in social accountability dispensed the need for the anti-corruption programs of the government. Ms. Chuluunbaatar and Ms. Gombodorj argued that there may no longer be a need for an anti-corruption unit if social accountability monitoring mechanisms are already in place. Mr. Darinchuluun, on the other hand, argued that while social

accountability is useful in preventing corruption it still cannot take role of anti-corruption programs. Anti corruption programs are necessary even with the success of SAc programs.

3. On the role of Media in good governance.

Mr. Redempto Parafina asked about the role of media in good governance discussions in Mongolia, to which Mr. Tserenjav explained that the government and media companies are often in connivance with each other. Though the government does not operate its own media company, it has money to buy airtime and advance the agenda of politicians. Thus, the media in Mongolia do not really function as an instrument of transparency and SAc.

Summary

The Mongolian participants understand good governance in terms of a transparent and accountable relationship between the Government and the Civil Society in working for the common good. Accordingly, they consider the vibrant democracy, the current freedom of expression, the positive legal environment, and the strong NGO community and civil society as the gains of good governance. On the other hand there are also challenges such as political partisanship, lack of knowledge and skill, poor implementation of the law, and corruption, and low level of civic education.

To advance good governance, the participants suggested working towards a more active and committed citizenry, a more accessible, efficient, and effective government structure, a better understanding of the roles of GO and NGO and the corresponding readiness to work together, and a common understanding of SAc from as many stakeholders as possible.

The participants also raised questions about the relationship or distinction between SAc programs and Anti-corruption programs. Some said that successful SAc programs will take the place of anti-corruption projects and expressed fear that the SAc approach might lead to GO-NGO relationships that breed conflict of interest. Other participants claimed that SAc approach does not prevent healthy criticism and that anti-corruption projects may still be needed alongside SAc approaches.

The participants rated the session's content at 90.63%, process 85.62%, and resource person 92.31%. Overall, the session received a rating of 89.39%.

Session 2: Constructive Engagement

Session 2, entitled "Constructive Engagement", focused on the practical applications of constructive engagement as a way of establishing effective and result-oriented government-citizen relations. It also aimed to impart knowledge in crafting good governance agenda within the framework of constructive engagement.

The structured learning activities employed in the session were (a) experiential sharing of best practices, (b) critique of group dynamics video, (c) input presentation on the subject, and (e) discussion.

Congressman Jorge Banal, Quezon City Third District Representative, and Mr. Edwin Chavez, Executive Director of Center for People Empowerment served as sharers for the “Ordinance Creating the Quezon City People’s Council” while Ms. Aida Carpennero, Procurement Service Director of the Department of Education shared her experience of the Textbook Count program of the Department. Fr. Patrick Falguera, S.J. was the facilitator for the session at the same time he gave an input on framing and effective communication, as tools for Constructive Engagement.

It was conducted from 1:30 p.m. to 6:12 p.m. for a total of 4 hours and 42 minutes.

Inputs of the Resource Person

*People’s Council*¹¹. The session started with an experiential sharing by Congressman Jorge Banal, Quezon City District Representative, on the successful passage of the “Ordinance Creating the Quezon City People’s Council”. Cong. Banal was a city councillor when he convinced his colleagues about the need for an ordinance to make citizens participation happen. This effort eventually led to the ordinance creating the Quezon City People’s Council (QCPC).

It took one year to pass the ordinance for the QCPC. The QCPC facilitated the entry of ordinary people in the decision-making process of the city government and empowered the civil society. It also created an additional check and balance mechanism to the decision-making authority of the councilors.

Note, however, that the People’s Council is one of the many Councils in the city government. The City Council is elected and holds committee hearings. The People’s Council, on the other hand, is made of citizen volunteers and can participate in committee hearings, but they cannot vote on issues. It is non-political and non-partisan, and aims at being independent and free from political pressure.

Compared to other City Councils, Cong. Banal explained that the People’s Council serves the specific purpose of preventing corruption and protecting public interest especially against politicians who are not faithful to their sworn duty of public service.

After Cong. Banal, the civil society version of the Quezon City People’s Council story was given by Mr. Edwin Chavez, Executive Director of the Center for Popular Empowerment (CPE) a non-governmental organization at the forefront of the advocacy for participatory governance since 1993.

Mr. Chavez cited the Naga City People’s Council as the inspiration of the Quezon City People’s Council. Despite the existing model, the struggle to legislate the People’s Council had been challenging because of the size of the city and the number of stakeholders involved. It also received threats of being junked

¹¹ See presentation on Quezon City People’s Council in Annex 8.

by the council because the civil society had been perceived as competitors, if not outright enemies. Advantages that worked for civil society, which eventually led to the passage of the ordinance, included the enabling policy environment (The Local Government Code of 1991), the presence of active civil society networks which strongly and patiently pushed for it in a collaborative manner, and the presence of social capital or champions inside government who are sympathetic to civic causes.

*Procurement Monitoring*¹². The Department of Education (DepED), a national government agency responsible for providing education services to all public elementary and high schools nationwide, implemented a program that integrated citizens' participation, especially in the procurement process of the department. Ms. Aida Carpentero, Director of DepED's Procurement Service, detailed the program dubbed as "Textbook Count", which addressed the corruption and inefficiencies in the department's textbook delivery.

In her historical account, corruption in textbook procurement took the forms of overpricing, substandard quality, and ghost deliveries. Fortunately, the passage of the Government Procurement Reform Act (GPRA) in 2003 has paved the way for the active participation of civil society in various stages the procurement process.

Under the "Textbook Count", the civil society volunteers participated as monitors in the bidding, production, and nationwide delivery of textbooks. This partnership resulted in reduced textbook prices from P100.00 to P40.00 and shortened delivery period from two years to one year. It has also improved DepED's institutional integrity; from being in the "top 5 most corrupt agencies" it was later included in "top 5 cleanest government agencies".

The presence of a proactive Dep Ed executive who championed civil society participation in the process was also cited as a key factor for the success of the Textbook Count. Creativity and innovativeness in designing the program made it more acceptable and kept the project going for several years.

Dir. Carpentero summarized the actions that facilitated the success of DepED's program through the acronym MONGOLIA, which stands for M-obilize, O-rient, N-etwork, G-ood governance, O-rganize, L-earn, I-nnovate, and A-do to local setting.

*Constructive engagement: framing and communication*¹³. Fr. Pat Falguera, S.J. described constructive engagement as "the heart of social accountability". It motivates proponents and stakeholders to build camaraderie and collaborative relations that produce good results for the public. This is especially true for Asians because of their high regard for relationships, but Constructive engagement requires that good relationships also yield good results, like the cases of the Quezon City People's Council and the DepED's Textbook Count.

¹² See Dir. Carpentero's presentation on Textbook Procurement Monitoring in Annex 9.

¹³ See Fr. Falguera's presentation on "Constructive Engagement: Framing and Communication" in Annex 10.

Fr. Falguera explained that strategies of constructive engagement include 1) framing and delivery of message, 2) effective communication and 3) techniques on reframing or making toxic messages more neutral or useful, and then showed a short video illustrating constructive engagement.

The video showed a how a log blocked the road caused traffic amidst the rain. While everybody complained about the inconvenience by blowing their horns, no one got out in the rain to remove the blockage except upon seeing the effort of a child to do so. According to Fr. Falguera, the Indian Video showed that CE can be understood across cultures. Though, none of the participants know the Indian language, the message is clear: 1) some people (a champion) need to take initiative in addressing a problem and 2) collective effort is necessary to successfully address a problem.

In terms of framing and delivering a message, Fr. Falguera explained that a good message is specific and makes a clear stand through which the messenger can also position other messages (e.g. “friend or enemy”). The problem with the message may arise in the forms of data, relationship, values differences, structure, and varying interests. Data issues are of various types, namely lack of information, conflicting information, difference in interpretation, or lack of credibility. The relationship problem springs from unresolved quarrels, emotions, or incompatible personalities. Value differences result in different claims for rights, while varying interests disrupt the direction of a collective mission.

It is important for one to be aware of the “storyline” of other people, which attempts to surface the motivations of people for doing things. This avoids positioning the other side as an adversary and allows for an open and caring dialogue.

In communicating the message, active listening and reframing were the proposed techniques. Being an active listener should not be intrusive and threatening; it respects the people’s personal boundaries. Messages that are “toxic”, on the other hand, should be reframed or phrased in a more neutral way to make it acceptable to the listener.

Fr. Falguera ended by evaluating the video clips of the participants during the previous morning’s discussion in terms of the different strategies for effective communication. Through the videos, he was able to describe how many of the participants/discussants are already practicing effective strategies for communication. He also noted that the results of CE are not immediate but it is ‘a process that bears fruit later on’.

Highlights of the discussion

1. On the enabling conditions for exemplars on SAc

The participants probed conditions that facilitated the Philippine exemplars in social accountability. In the case of Quezon City People’s Council, Cong. Banal emphasized the necessity of passing an ordinance to back up the citizens’ claim to participation while Mr. Chavez

emphasized the importance of champions who supported their advocacy; in DepED, Dir. Carpentero invoked the GPRA as the policy support of citizen monitors as well as the presence of executives who supported citizens' participation.

2. On the City councils' duplication of work

Ms. Gombodorj observed that there were so many councils and Ms. Tserenjav added that the People's Council may be duplicating the work of the duly elected Council. Cong. Banal explained that the citizens' effort should have the clear intention of providing check and balance, especially in situations where institutional integrity is low. He also explained how this serves as a safeguard against politicians' tendency to represent only their friends and families once they are sworn into office.

Mr. Darinchuluun also noted how the People's Council can give lessons on how to institutionalize the participation of ordinary Mongolian citizens in governance.

3. On the independence and credibility of NGOs and CSOs

The voice of ordinary citizens and/or the representation of civil society were the main messages of the exemplars. On the question of how they should relate with politicians, it was stressed that they should remain non-partisan and independent to maintain their credibility. Determining legitimate members of the council is also important. The organizations must be in existence for at least one year before they can be evaluated by the community relations office.

4. On the value of reframing and non-intrusive probing

In the unpacking of the techniques of "messaging and effective communication", one clear take-away is the idea of reframing. Even in the presence of dominance or mono-linear engagement, reframing and non-threatening feedback can help correct dialogue. It underlines careful dealing with the other party, whether government or civil society. Clarification on "non-intrusive probing" led to insights on boundaries that should also be respected to allow dialogue.

Summary

The session connected directly with the participants' concern about the need for different sectors to work together to achieve good governance. Constructive engagement makes this possible through the creation of good relationships. The concrete experiences (People's Council and Textbook Count) showed the different ways they were able to institutionalize citizen's participation in governance. While the strategies of effective communication provided guides on how to engage in dialogues that allow for partnerships, that eventually lead to good governance.

The session extended for more than an hour but the participants showed great interest about the pointers of constructive engagement like active listening and reframing of messages. Some of participants said they wanted more time to interact with each other and practice the different strategies of communication through role-playing.

The participants rated the session's content at 83.05%, process 75.80%, and resource person 92.95%. Overall, the session received a rating of 83.11%.

Day 2

Day 2 started with a recapitulation of Day 1 sessions and, immediately afterwards, sessions on (a) Social Accountability and (b) Public Financial Management.

Recapitulation

Mia Aquino from ANSA-EAP provided the recapitulation of Day 1 session highlights. She also assigned participants who will facilitate the recap for the following days of the workshop.

Session 3: Social Accountability

Session 3, entitled "Social Accountability", focused on social accountability as exemplified in various citizens' efforts to monitor government performance. It discussed the ANSA-EAP framing of SAc as well as the key actors, pillars or enabling environment, and background on the monitoring tools.

The activities employed in the session were (a) presentation of Social Accountability mapping study, (b) open space, (c) plenary presentation, and (e) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Rande Cabaces facilitated the session. Ms. Ariuntungalag Munkhtuvshin, Executive Director of Independent Research Institute of Mongolia (IRIM), presented the scoping study in Mongolia.

The session was conducted from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon for a total of 3 ½ hours.

Inputs of the Resource Person and Workshop Outputs

Mr. Cabaces started by explaining the learning objectives of the session.¹⁴ These are to: 1) understand the current social accountability practice in Mongolia 2) come up with a shared understanding of social accountability 3) and identify actions for improving social accountability in Mongolia.

Afterwards, Ms. Ariuntungalag Munkhtuvshin, Executive Director of Independent Research Institute of Mongolia, presented their study on the development of CSOs in promoting SAc in Mongolia.¹⁵ During the presentation other participants also provided relevant information on the issue.

¹⁴ See Mr. Cabaces' presentation on "Understanding Social Accountability" in Annex 11.

¹⁵ See Ariuntungalag Munkhtuvshin's presentation of mapping study in Annex 12.

Ms. Munkhtuvshin explained there has been a fast rate of growth in CSOs in Mongolia. Though the activities of CSOs are often focused on the education sector, different aspects of monitoring, such as budget monitoring, expenditure tracking, and procurement transparency, are now in place. Ms. Chuluunbaatar affirmed this claim. Five years ago where there were almost no CSOs involved in monitoring in Mongolia, but now there is currently a boom in monitoring efforts of the civil society. This growth translated into good results in the monitoring, engagement, and networking capabilities of the civil society (about 72% of Mongolian CSOs and NGOs are currently involved in networks). This also made the government listen to the civil society.

However, Ms. Munkhtuvshin said that Mongolian CSOs are still in the middle phase of maturity and they are faced by internal and external challenges. Internal challenges include issues on sustainability and lack of know-how while external challenges include weak public support.

Mr. Tserenjvav noted that the efforts to monitor budget can be improved and be made more holistic. With the growth of the Mongolian economy due to the mining industry, there is a need to check if the state's money is being used properly through budget monitoring. However such efforts of budget monitoring have been largely limited to certain areas and services.

Ms. Chimed said that they have already started monitoring medium and large scale mining companies along with how government uses the budget generated from such companies, but they are having difficulty on how to proceed because of lack of know-how. They currently lack knowledge in making correct contracts or policies and they are looking for samples from outside Mongolia like America and Australia.

Ms. Munkhtuvshin added that their NGO is currently conducting a monitoring on whether the government's money is also being spent on rural areas and on ordinary people, but they are currently having difficulties in sustaining their efforts because of difficulties in funding.

In generating the participants' ideas on implementing a social accountability initiative in Mongolia, they were thrown into an open space activity. Using metacards, they answered the question, "What am I doing and what will I do to immediately and substantively improve social accountability practice in my area of work and/or engagement?". Then, they discussed their answers with other participants by simulating the exchange of ideas in the agora or marketplace. Below are the group outputs from the open-space activity

*Group 1.*¹⁶ Ms. Chimed shared the results for the First group. For them, capacity building of the government agencies and social workers in the local community should be enhanced. Ms. Chimed reiterated the role of the media in the improvement of social accountability, stating that the media should produce interviews and talk shows that discuss and promote social

¹⁶ See Group 1 output for SAc session in Annex 13.

accountability. Moreover, CSOs should be able to bridge the relationship gaps with the government. They should pose a “non-threatening attitude” in order to build good relationships that provide an avenue for dialogue.

*Group 2.*¹⁷ Ms. Gombodorj presented for the second group. As CSOs, they would develop methodology for scoring and monitoring government performance and raise public awareness about the scorecard. The group recognized the need for government-CSO cooperation, stating that CSOs should have good relations with the government.

In addition, Ms. Chuluunbaatar suggested including social accountability in the public administration curriculum in higher education. She also noted the need to integrate anticorruption and social accountability.

To synthesize the discussion and points raised by the participants, Mr. Cabaces reiterated that good governance cannot be achieved by the government alone. Constructive engagement requires government and citizens’ participation. Both the government and civil society should avoid the pitfall of superficial citizen involvement.

Highlights of the Discussion

1. On the increase of state income and the need for budget monitoring

D. Tserenjav explained that the boom in mining industry has improved Mongolian economy and increased income. NGOs need to monitor the budget to check if that money is being used properly. While they have done monitoring on budget expenditure, D. Tserenjav explained that there is a need to have a more holistic approach to budget monitoring.

U. Gombodorj, on the other hand, also suggested a monitoring on the defense sector’s use of money for uniforms and supplies.

2. On the sustainability of CSOs and NGOs

To address the problem of funding, there were suggestions about contracting the government for the monitoring efforts. However, this option was perceived to bring about conflict of interest. M. Aquino (ANSA-EAP), on the other hand remarked that, aside from writing funding proposals, resources can also be raised through sponsorships, parties, marathons, and marketing, and volunteering, and internet donations. Dr. A. Gregorio-Medel, on the other hand, also emphasized the importance of establishing good track record to be able to mobilize resources successfully.

3. On the effects CSO growth and CSO monitoring

¹⁷ See Group 2 output for SAc session in Annex 14.

B. Darinchuluun remarked that CSOs in Mongolia should also improve in quality not only in number. He said that monitoring efforts should also look at aspects other than money. Despite the economic benefits of the mining sector for example, there are also environment factors that should be considered. He also raised the question on whether the increase in CSO monitoring has led to concrete improvement in the life of Mongolian citizens.

Along the same lines, Ms. Sengedorj and Ms. Saraa raised questions about the results of the CSO monitoring on improving public service and saving the government resources, whether efforts at monitoring have established links with CSOs advocacies.

4. On the plausibility of implementing SAc plans for Mongolia

When asked about the probability that the other Mongolians would come up with plans and concrete results similar to the ones presented in the open space plenary, Ms. Chuluunbaatar replied with some reservations. She opined that social accountability might face resistance since many do not understand it yet. There is a good chance that the Mongolian President would support social accountability because he comes from the Democratic Party. Legislative gridlock, however, might limit his powers on influencing the Parliament to take the same stance.

Summary

The Social Accountability session showed the gains and challenges of CSOs efforts to promote SAc in Mongolia. Despite the growth of CSOs and CSO monitoring in Mongolia, there are challenges related to sustainability, organizational competence, and poor public support.

With the growth of the Mongolian economy due to the boom of the mining industry, there was a consensus on the importance of budget monitoring. However, such monitoring efforts should be made more holistic; it should include sectors than mining (e.g. defense) and it should also consider non-monetary resources like the environment; Monitoring efforts should also lead to an improvement in public service and the quality of life of ordinary citizens.

After going through the open space method, suggestions on how to improve SAc initiatives in Mongolia include: 1) the use of dialogue and non-threatening attitude bridge existing gap between CSOs and GOs 2) the use of media via talk shows and TV programs to discuss SAc 3) trainings for social workers and GOs in the local community 4) the use scorecards for rating the performance of GOs 5) the inclusion of SAc in the University Curriculum. However despite the likely support of the Mongolian president, these plans are in danger of being antagonized by parliament members who are not inclined to democracy.

The participants rated the session's content at 82.19%, process 89.51%, and resource person 92.31%. Overall, the session received a rating of 87.08%.

Session 4: Public Financial Management

Session 4, entitled “Public Financial Management”, provided an overview of the Public Financial Management (PFM) cycle and some of the related issues/challenges in the Mongolian context. It also aimed to link PFM with existing monitoring works and policy reform initiatives.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) video presentation, (b) input presentation, and (c) discussion.

Ms. Nieves L. Osorio, former undersecretary of the Department of Finance and now member of INCITEGov, was the resource speaker for the session.

The session was conducted from 1:40 p.m. to 5:29 p.m. or a total of 3 hours and 49 minutes.

Inputs of the resource person

Ms. Nieves Osorio, Lead of INCITEGov’s Philippine National Budget Monitoring Project, started the session with the participants’ sharing of insights and experiences on Public Financial Management Cycle. Using metacards, the participants were asked to write three concepts that come to mind upon hearing “Public Financial Management.” Background information on the Mongolian government’s strategy for economic growth support and poverty reduction was also given, with which very few from the participants were familiar.

A video presentation on PFM was then showed; it was an attempt to simplify technical PFM terms and concepts. The PFM cycle involved planning, budgeting, expenditure, and performance assessment; it was noted that participation in the different parts of PFM cycle helps in better identification of needs.

While the discussion focused mostly on the Philippine system on Public Finance, Ms. Osorio suggested that some of its strategies may be adopted in Mongolia. It may also adopt the ones applied to independent chartered cities, extra funds and obligations given to local government, and the planning done by ministry of economic planning.

To illustrate the application clearly, there was an effort to find the counterpart of geo-political divisions of both Philippines and Mongolia. Some time was also spent explaining the Philippine bureaucratic system, especially the independent commissions.

About the planning strategies for the government sector as exemplified in the Philippines, Ms. Osorio stressed that there are no rules on what departments a government should have to implement a good PFM. According to her, it evolves depending on the needs and priorities of the national government. The

Accounting, on the other hand, should have rules, especially on designating independent mission, say the Philippine Commission on Audit (COA), to check government expenses.

In discussing audit, the resource person referred to the law that mandated each department to have its own auditing system. When the country gained a reputation for corruption, the Ombudsman and the Presidential Anti-Graft Commission (PAGC) were also instituted. Audit reports that show irregularity could be a cause for filing a complaint in the Office of the Ombudsman. Note that an agency, such as PAGC, is effective only depending on the support, including budget support, of the national leadership which may be a cultural matter.

Though the concepts of Public Financial Management Cycle and of Budget Monitoring can be exported to other countries, it has to be situated in their own PFM system and structure. The contextual differences have an effect on the implementation of policies.

Ms. Osorio gave the group activity on PFM as an assignment. She divided the participants into three groups and gave them a case study on the results-based planning and monitoring experience in Vietnam. As a guide, she also gave her reflections on the case study.

Ms. Osorio explained that the case was chosen because it showcased the active relationship between government and non-government organizations, wherein the government shifted focus from plain quantity of services to quality of services. This led to a bottom-up governing process, which required constant consultation with groups and stakeholders. The case was also evidenced-based and depended on the results of an independent statistics instead of relying on public statistics. The monitoring and evaluation tools were also defined beforehand to prevent manipulation of data. Ms. Osorio also expounded on aspects of the Vietnamese case study that reflect the different concerns of developing countries, such as decentralization, planning and management of public resources, among others.

Highlights of the discussion

1. The video presentation on PFM has successfully simplified the terms and concepts of PFM and was considered useful and entertaining as well.
2. The participants noted the many different controls instituted to safeguard the PFM process. The technical aspects of these controls somehow require further articulation in simple language.

Summary

The PFM session brought out the complexity of the concepts and processes involved in the public financial management. The discussion focused on Philippine system for Public Financial Management, in the attempt to identify strategies that can be applied in the Mongolian context.

The participants rated the session's content at 45.90%, process 23.90%, and resource person 64.74%. Overall, the session received a low rating of 43.41%.

Day 3

Day 3 consisted of a recapitulation of Day 2 sessions and, immediately afterwards, sessions on (a) Public Procurement Monitoring and (b) Budget Monitoring and Analysis followed.

Before the start of the morning session, Dr. Antonio La Viña, Dean of the Ateneo School of Government, delivered a message to the participants. Before the afternoon session, there was also a short informal sharing on the application of social accountability in the aspect of human rights by G-Watch researchers, Mr. Chris Ocampo and Mr. Phil Recentes.

Visit of the Dean of the Ateneo School of Government

Dr. Antonio La Viña, Dean of the Ateneo School of Government, welcomed everyone and expressed his happiness in meeting the Mongolian participants. As an environmental expert, he explained that Mongolia is one of his favourite countries in the world because of its biodiversity and ecosystem. He expressed his hope that the Mongolians can learn from the strengths of Filipinos, particularly from their experience in participating in planning and implementing government policies, and their propensity to come together and help each other in times of crisis.

Recapitulation

Ms. Chimed and Ms. Lkhmsuren gave a recapitulation of Day 2's session highlights by way of a game. They tested how well participants were able to retain the terms and concepts from the previous day's activities, particularly the principles of open space.

Session 5: Public Procurement Monitoring

Session 5, entitled “Public Procurement Monitoring”, introduced the procurement monitoring initiatives and the emerging issues and key lessons from such efforts. It also discussed the importance of reforms and social accountability mechanisms in the public procurement process, mobilizing citizens in public procurement monitoring, and sharing of case exemplars from other countries.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) individual reflection, (b) group work, (c) plenary presentation, (d) input presentation, and (e) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Edward Gacusana, National Coordinator of the Philippine Procurement Network (P2N) and Coordinator of Makati Business Club’s Coalition Against Corruption (CAC), was the resource speaker for the session.

The session was conducted from 10:25 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., or a total of 2 hours and 35 minutes.

Inputs to the Discussion

Mr. Edward Gacusana began the session on “Transparency and Accountability in Public Procurement”¹⁸ by gathering the participants’ short-term (*What do you want for this morning’s session?*) and long-term (*What do you want to happen in Mongolia?*) expectations using metacards.

Expectations. The collected metacards were posted on the board and clustered in six topics, namely (1) engage, (2) transparency, (3) tools, (4) policy, (5) participation, and (6) competency.

The participants’ short-term expectations focused on learning about a) how to engage the procurement process, b) making the procurement process transparent, and c) learning procurement tools.

Long-term expectations included gaining knowledge on using Social Accountability tools to improve/ implement existing transparency projects in Mongolia (e.g. ‘glass wallet’ project).

The resource person in turn said that he expects the participants to 1) identify principles and steps of public procurement, 2) compare and contrast red flags in the process of procurement, and 3) design a procurement monitoring tool that prevents misuse of public money. The focus was on Public Reporting, Access to Information, Quality, Conflict of Interest, and Cost Estimation.

Steps and principles. The basic cycle/general framework of procurement was discussed. These covered planning, budgeting, procurement, spending, implementation, and audit. In public procurement, the government should abide by the principles of competition, accountability, transparency, fairness, efficiency, and economy.

¹⁸ See Mr. Gacusana’s presentation on Public Procurement Monitoring in Annex 15.

Mongolian Law. To help the participants better understand the Public Procurement Law of Mongolia, they were engaged in a group work where they were asked to find provisions in the Mongolian procurement law that promote the principles of public procurement.

The group reports generated the following points, as synthesized by the resource speaker¹⁹:

1. *Reporting.* There is internal reporting but no public reporting.
2. *Access to information.* It was published but the website is not functional and there is a lack of IT experts on the part of the government. There are also no clear provisions and mechanisms on how citizens can access documents from government.
3. *Quality.* There is a provision for the highest price but none for the quality.

The lowest cost bidder will win but with all its variations, it is still high in cost because of their low quality. Volunteers can check for quality (*Textbook 123*). India has volunteer road monitors. The Mongolia regulation for road warranty is 1 year (Ministry of Roads).

4. *Conflict of interest.* There are many cases wherein relatives of government officials benefit from government procurement. The parliament passed a law prohibiting open bidding (just direct contracting) without the public's knowledge (just before a holiday)
5. *Overpricing.* The contractors overprice. The law does not provide clear guidelines for items. There are provisions about normative pricing but there is room for improvement. There is a need to look at how an agency comes up with cost estimates. For example, whether the cost estimates match the specifications of project.

Red Flags. Red flags, which are the weak areas or vulnerabilities of a particular system, were discussed. These must be looked at to prevent corruption. He discussed four and gave examples for each:

1. Kickback brokers
2. Bid rigging
3. Use of front or shell companies
4. Misinterpretation of facts

Mr. Gacusana mentioned that there are many social accountability tools but it is possible to invent one's own. Some examples are participatory budgeting, public expenditure tracking, lobbying, use of surveys, advocacy campaigns, citizen's charter (the rights of people detailed at the local level, e.g. access to medicine at rural health), and e-governance (use of technology to involve people like partnerships with local media to share information about the importance of SAC).

Another exercise was given to identify red flags in the procurement cases from Indonesia, Cambodia and the Philippines. Mr. Gacusana also asked the participants to look into how those red flags are related to each other. He asked the participants to make their presentations creative.

¹⁹ See Group Output for problems in procurement in Annex 16A, Annex 16B, and Annex 16C.

Group 1 (Ms. Lkhmsuren) compared Indonesia and Mongolia in a diagram that illustrated delays due to weather conditions, overpricing, and conflict of interest.²⁰

Group 2 (Ms. Sengedorj) prepared a drawing showing Cambodia's need for code of conduct for procurement personnel and problems in the bidding process.²¹

Group 3 (Ms. Munkhtuvshin) reported about how the major red flags in Mongolia are similar to that of Philippines in terms of delays in procurement and conflicts of interest.²² Sixty per cent of parliament members own companies that create contracts with the government through direct bidding.

The resource person commended the reports and explained that the process is the first step to developing interest in the procurement process, especially since the three countries have many similarities (e.g. delays and conflict of interest).

Philippine examples. Briefly, examples of monitoring projects in the Philippines were shown to illustrate the extent of social accountability application in the country's procurement processes. These included the monitoring at the Department of National Defense, Textbook Count, Pork Barrel Watch (monitoring of Parliament members' funded projects), Internal Revenue Watch, and local government ("red plate") vehicle monitoring.

Closing. Mr. Gacusana ended by saying, "To push for changes we need to make things easier for people. One change will create waves. Focus on specific areas (red flags) may eventually affect other areas."

Highlights of the discussion

1. Discussion of red flags highlighted the anti-corruption dimension of procurement monitoring. The emphasis on prevention, on the other hand, brought out the social accountability aspect.
2. As pointed out by Mr. Darinchuluun, concerns for both price and quality should be taken into consideration in the implementation of the procurement law. It is an area of engagement that would require citizen monitors to also develop competency in quality assurance.
3. Conflict of interest is a controversial issue in Mongolia. It is helpful to see the complementation between the conflict of interest and the procurement policies, especially since many government officials also operate business companies.

²⁰ See Group 3 output for procurement in Annex 17

²¹ See Group 2 output for procurement in Annex 18A, 18B, 18C.

²² See Group 1 output for procurement in Annex 19

Summary

The session on “Procurement” made use of various activities that grounded the discussion and learning process from the participant’s experience. The input of the resource person was connected with the participants’ insights from activities on the Mongolian Procurement Law and the procurement cases from different countries. The principles of public procurement gave the participants a framework for evaluating their own (Mongolian) procurement law. The exercise on identifying red flags in the procurement cases from Philippines, Indonesia, and Cambodia enabled the participants to reflect about similar red flags that exist in the Mongolian Procurement process (e.g. delays, conflict of interest).

The participants rated the session’s content at 90.49%, process 89.16%, and resource person 93.71%. Overall, the session received a rating of 90.85%.

G-Watch Sharing on Human Rights Monitoring

Mr. Parafina introduced Mr. Chris Ocampo, a Government Watch researcher who shared their experience in using social accountability to address human rights.

G-Watch focused on whether the rights of persons deprived of liberty (PDLs) to vote were respected. PDLs include convicted criminals and those in detention centers. Mr. Ocampo explained that despite the presence of criminals’ right to vote, there were no procedures or mechanisms for them to vote. G watch addressed this problem through a partnership with the Commission on Elections and the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. Mr. Ocampo considered the project a success because: (1) PDLs secured their right to be registered and vote through a COMELEC-issued memorandum order, and 2) the government respected and implemented this right due to the presence of groups watching them. Currently, G-watch is also monitoring the right to food of internally displaced people in Mindanao who do not have the means to provide for themselves because of armed conflict.

Ms. Chuluunbaatar asked if she could meet with people involved in human rights and how SAc is applied to human rights in general. Ms. Gombodorj said it will be helpful if materials such as the powerpoint presentations and the manual for monitoring human rights compliance were provided. Mr. Ocampo mentioned that the files would be uploaded to the Ateneo School of Government website.

Mr. Phil Recentes, project head of the G-Watch human rights project, was likewise recognized.

Session 6: Budget Monitoring and Analysis

Session 6, entitled “Budget Monitoring and Analysis”, covered citizens’ engagement in budget monitoring as well as Mongolia’s experiences on budget monitoring. There was an overview on budget monitoring and analysis as an approach to promote social accountability as well as efficiency in public spending; plus an exercise on re-entry.

Mr. Cabaces introduced the session by giving the objectives, learning agenda, and the flow of the afternoon’s session. It incorporated particular budget monitoring experiences from two Mongolian practitioners.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) input presentations on Mongolia experience, (b) input presentation from the resource person, and (c) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Tserenjav Demberel, Executive Director of Transparency Foundation, and Ms. Sosormaa Chuluunbaatar, Advisor to the President of Mongolia shared their experiences on budget monitoring. Ms. Nieves Osorio, former undersecretary of the Department of Finance and now member of INCITEGov, was the resource person.

The session was conducted from 2:32 p.m. to 3:40 p.m. and from 3:51 p.m. to 5:21 p.m., or a total of 2 hours and 42 minutes.

Inputs

*Mongolia Budget Network*²³. In 2005, Transparency Foundation initiated various ways to enhance the law and make it more transparent to the public. Since 2008, the group made some improvements and led efforts to introduce reforms in the budget law. Yet, citizen’s participation in budget monitoring at the national and community level, however, is still not enough. Organizational management also did not improve.

In 2008, 12 Mongolian NGOs started the network called “Citizens’ Oversight of Budget.” It has now grown to more than 20 organizations. For this year (2010), the strategic plan of Transparency Foundation is to be action-oriented and budget-oriented. They focus on specific ministries and local government agencies.

In one case of monitoring in 2009, Transparency Foundation monitored the government of Mongolia’s purchase of 400 buses for public transportation. The buses were purchased after the Prime Minister attended to Caracas’ request for better access to public transportation. However, information gathered from media and the UB transportation office showed that 30 of the purchased buses are currently not being used because of the excess in the number of buses operating.

²³ See Mr. Tserenjav’s presentation on Mongolia Budget Network in Annex 20.

Mr. Tserenjav explained that while buying buses attended to people's needs, there are other needs in Mongolia that should be prioritized. The money spent for unnecessary buses could have also been spent on other needs. This inefficiency in budget spending was due to lack of careful budget planning.

Currently, Transparency Foundation is preparing a document on important budget information for citizens. They hope to come up with a concrete tool and mechanism for budget monitoring that can be understood by ordinary citizens (not just technicians) such as the citizen's report card.

*Budget Transparency Project*²⁴. Ms. Chuluunbaatar talked about the project to make the Kindergarden budget more intelligible and accessible to ordinary citizens. Previously, the budget is considered an agency secret. Hence, the "Glass Wallet project" was initiated to make it more transparent and intelligible to ordinary citizens. The glass wallet project aimed to make public money transparent, similar to how money is put in a glass. While the government is not used to presenting the budget to the public and it is a difficult and technical subject; the budget has to be simplified for ordinary people's understanding. Consultation, information, and good timing became important in establishing partnerships for the project.

Another budget transparency initiative conducted was the monitoring of the school tea in primary schools. The Mongolian government allots 400 tugrug for each child for the free lunch. However, decision-making on how to spend that money was prone to abuse. Each school director is given 102 M tugrug a day to spend on the free lunch. The budget monitoring initiative checked how the money was spent and if the expenditure complied with the law's mandate that 25% of the lunch tea should be milk products. The monitoring initiative resulted to competition and improvement in quality service. It also helped improve local businesses.

Budget Monitoring as SAc Tool.²⁵ Ms. Nieves Osorio, Project Leader for the Philippine National Budget Monitoring, presented budget monitoring as a SAc tool. She started by asking questions regarding the Mr. Tserenjav's presentation: "Was the purchase of buses in the originally-approved budget? Did the government meet the more important needs of the citizens by buying the buses? Was the purchased quantity necessary? Was the procurement at that price reasonable?"

The questions were raised with the aim coming up with a tool/method for determining whether the purchase of buses was appropriate. Ms. Osorio said that an expert on transportation is needed to discern the demand for transportation facilities (e.g. number of people travelling at certain time). One must establish the number of buses needed in the area and at a specific time. As an example, she talked about the Metro Rail Transit (MRT) and the measures used before deciding to put it up. During such cases, feasibility studies and cost-effectiveness analysis were implemented.

Ms. Osorio cited the Mongolian experiences in budget reform, such as the Citizen Budget monitoring (Open Budget Index) & Citizen-government partnership on budget monitoring. She made several inquiries on the Mongolia budget cycle to compare it with the Philippine budget cycle. Mr. Cabrera

²⁴ See Ms. Chuluunbaatar's presentation on the Glass Wallet and School Tea project in Annex 21.

²⁵ See Ms. Osorio's presentation on Budget Monitoring as SAc Tool in Annex 22.

explained the source of the information (on the Mongolian budget cycle) and asked the participants to validate it.

Ms. Osorio proceeded to explain the Government Budgeting: the process of planning and allocating revenues, borrowed funds, and other receipts (including grants or aid) to attain the economic and social goals of the country. These were linked to two goals, namely the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and economic growth. Five budgeting concepts and principles were enumerated:

1. Plan and budget linkage
2. Balancing the budget and deficit -balancing revenues and expenditures
3. Public expenditure management
4. Medium term expenditure framework
5. Appropriation, obligation and disbursement

In the revenue, grants are not included for planning purposes but at the end of the year, it should be accounted for. In planning, only revenues and expenditures are the variables. Public Expenditure Management, on the other hand, is a key instrument of government policy that ensures the use of government resources to be consistent with country's development goals. It addresses the objectives of fiscal discipline (expenditure control), resources allocation (strategic allocation), and good operational management.

A generic budget cycle is made up of four parts:

1. Budget preparation or budget planning (by the executives)
2. Budget authorization or legislation by the congress or parliament (as to the case of Mongolia), the congress has the power of the purse; after the approval, the president will make it a law for execution.
3. Budget execution or implementation
4. Budget accountability – the CSOs are more helpful here though there also are auditors. The report can be used by civil society for performance assessment. The performance record is open to all; it can be undertaken by the congress, department of finance, or the civil citizen.

Applied Budget work as a tool should address questions on the type of citizens groups involved and the type of understanding/information necessary. Working with media and policymakers are likewise important.

Further, the resource person pointed out the two types of applied budget work, namely budget literacy enhancement and budget process and systems assessment. The former requires guides and training. The latter involves budget process and system studies, transparency and participation reports, and participatory budgeting.

Lessons in civil society budget work highlight the need to make it credible and available to policy makers the media, and the public. They should be timely, non-academic (in simple language), and regularly disseminated/presented to the targeted audience.

Highlights of the discussion

1. The experiences of the Mongolia Budget Network and the Glass Wallet Project and School Tea project are valuable starting points in making the Mongolians understand budget monitoring principles. The example of bus purchases served as a striking example of the planning defects which budget monitoring could have addressed.
2. Budgeting has a generic process that could be understood regardless of local contexts.
3. Budgeting is a complex process which must be carefully studied before it gets meaningful participation from ordinary citizens.
4. Reports about successful efforts in budget monitoring need to be disseminated for the benefit of the public. Media and policymakers are effective channels for disseminating budget monitoring reports.

Summary

The “Budget Monitoring” session showed that CSOs in Mongolia have already initiated various budget monitoring initiatives. Some of those efforts (e.g. the bus purchase monitoring) indicate that Mongolia needs improvement in budget planning and budget transparency. Other efforts (e.g. glass wallet project) aimed at making the budget more intelligible and accessible to ordinary citizens, while others (e.g. school tea project) resulted to improvement in the quality of services.

In employing Budget Monitoring as a SAc tool, the resource person explained the importance of consulting experts and feasibility studies in coming up with correct project budgeting. As a principle, the allocation, planning and expenditure of a country’s revenue should be consistent with its development goals. While the Philippines and Mongolia have different government structures, they both follow the generic budget cycle. Under this cycle, CSOs are often most helpful at the stage of budget accountability where performance assessment is open to all. Budget monitoring should address questions about the citizen groups concerned and the type of information necessary. The results of the monitoring should also be credible and accessible to the media, the policy-makers, and the general public.

The participants rated the session’s content at 76.92%, process 60.23%, and resource person 76.92%. Overall, the session received a rating of 72.28%.

Day 4

Day 4 consisted of (a) an exposure visit to the Department of Education and (b) a special session on budget evaluation.

Exposure Visit to the Department of Education Bidding Process

ANSA EAP organized an exposure visit to the Department of Education's conduct of submission and opening of bids for computer laptops. It aimed to provide direct and on-the-ground experience of social accountability application where government and citizens interface to monitor a specific government service delivery program.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) briefing-orientation, (b) direct process observation, and (c) debriefing.

Mr. Redempto Parafina, ANSA-EAP Networking Coordinator, facilitated the activity which ran from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon for a total of 2 ½ hours.

Inputs of the Resource Person

Upon reaching the Department of Education, Mr. Parafina briefed the participants about the rationale and objectives of the exposure visit to the Dep Ed bidding²⁶. The exposure visit, Mr. Parafina explained, was another active dimension of the learning process. It aimed to make the participants realize which among the actual practices in the bidding process can or cannot be applied in the Mongolian setting.

The specific stage of the process that would be observed was the submission and opening of bids, which should comply with the Philippine Procurement law's three-envelope system and pass-fail criteria. Social accountability could be directly observed as well, in view of the law's provision on the role of third-party observers in the process.

The participants were informed about the full details of the procurement at hand, including specifications, budget for the contract, source of funds, among others. Also, the function of key players and stakeholders, such as the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC), bidders, procurement service and technical working group, and observers, were explained for better understanding of the bidding process.

Guidelines on behaviour during the conduct of the bidding were also imposed on participants to avoid distracting the proceedings.

²⁶ See Mr. Parafina's presentation on and guide for Exposure Visits in Annex 23A.

The items being procured are 179 units of brand new laptop computers to be used by Dep Ed's Bureau of Alternative Learning System. The approved contract was 728,000.00 PhP. There was only one bidder, Advance Solutions Inc. and company bid at 5,641,755.12 PhP.

After the briefing, the participants witnessed the actual proceedings for the bid submission and opening. They saw the process from formally declaring quorum and authority to transact business, to recognizing individuals present, to the announcement of bidder's eligibility and adjourning the meeting. The BAC members also entertained questions from the Mongolian participants.²⁷

Immediately after the interaction with the BAC members, a debriefing for the participants followed. It was an opportunity for them to ask more questions on both the procedures and dynamics during the proceedings, and to facilitate reflection on processes that may be applicable for the Mongolian setting.

Highlights of the discussion

1. On the use of phones and other rules on bidding

The Mongolians' sensitivity to process manifested in the question on whether phone calls during bid opening were allowed. The civil society representative was seen talking over the phone during the proceedings. There was also inquiry on why there was only one bidder.

In reply, Mr. Adonis Barraquias, Chief of DepED's Procurement Service, explained that phone calls and any other distractions during the proceedings are not encouraged. There was only one bidder, which is legally allowed, probably because of the low local supply due to previous big procurement from another agency (Department of Budget and Management); only local companies could supply the laptops because of international agreement among the computer companies respecting local market coverage.

2. On the delegation of procurement tasks

Ms. Chuluunbaatar noted that the procurement responsibility takes up precious time from top executives who should be devoted to policymaking. So, she asked why procurement work is not delegated to staff. In response, Dr. Medel and Mr. Cabrera explained that another branch of government takes care of higher policies. Also, Mr. Parafina informed the participants about the institution of Government Procurement Policy Board (GPPB). The executive departments cannot just delegate procurement tasks because it is a function that involve big money and had historically been considered prone to corruption. So, procurement required accountability from top executives.

3. On the selection of bid observers

²⁷ See Dep Ed's minutes of the meeting in Annex 23B

The participants asked about the process of selecting the civil society or non-government observers. This was due to apprehensions that the government could be inviting only their preferred CSOs or CSOs could be selected despite their lack of skills to do the task. In response, Dr. Medel cited the requirement of a SEC registration to prove the organization's legitimacy. NGO accreditation may also be used as another model for ensuring NGO credibility. Mr. Lamayo, the parents' organization's representative who observed the bidding, added that the he received training on procurement from G-Watch before he started attending bids.

4. *On the influence of Civil Society Observers*

Regarding the exact status of civil society observer and their actual power to influence the process, Mr. Parafina explained that the law provided sufficient measures for this. Historically, civil society could serve as BAC member, which often resulted to loss of independence. But in the new procurement law, civil society serves as third-party observers outside the BAC. This arrangement allows them to raise issues and report them to the head of procuring agency or to the Ombudsman.

Summary

The exposure visit generated high interest among the Mongolian participants. It allowed them to attend an actual bidding process at the Dep Ed and learn from observing and talking to the people involved in the bidding process. They learned from the CSOs participation in the bidding process and proposed dialogues with the Ministry of Finance on how they can amend the procurement law. They also looked into how they can improve CSO participation in the procurement process of Mongolia.²⁸

The participants rated the session's content at 90.17%, process 86.71%, and resource person 93.01%. Overall, the session received a rating of 89.72%.

Session 8: Budget Monitoring Supplemental Session

Mr. Wadel Cabrera facilitated the budget monitoring exercise and linking input.

Inputs of the resource person and workshop outputs

Before proceeding to the supplementary session on budget monitoring, the participants requested a background on the structure of the Philippine Presidential system of government, the relationship between the legislative, executive and judiciary branches, and the process of obtaining a post in

²⁸ See Feedback about the Dep Ed exposure activity in Annex 24.

government. Mr. Cabrera drew a diagram of the structure of the Philippine government, explained how politicians get elected and the process by which cabinet members are appointed. He explained that though the legislative, executive, and judiciary are co-equal and are supposed to provide checks and balances to each other, practice shows that the President is the most powerful official of the country.

The Philippine government structure provided a backdrop for the discussion on the session on budget monitoring. It clarified the budget management cycle and the budget intervention tools shared by Ms. Osorio. Understanding clearly each stage of the cycle improves the appreciation of the possible ways to address weakness or vulnerability to corruption.

To link it with the Mongolian context, the participants were grouped into two and were tasked to do a SWOT analysis of the Mongolian budget process. They were also asked to describe their vision of what counts as an ideal budget process.

Specific questions that the participants were asked to answer were as follows.

1. What is the current budgeting practice in Mongolia?
2. How do you influence the budget practice to achieve our vision and implement SAc?

Below are the outputs for the group activity.

Group 1²⁹. The first group considered the legislative framing, single treasury accounting, existing monitoring initiative, and existing auditing mechanisms as the strengths of the budget system in Mongolia. Opportunities include the increase in NGO initiatives and the increase government's GDP. Its weaknesses, on the other hand, include centralization, top down management, lack of citizen participation, lack of fiscal discipline and enforcement (of auditing policies). This has led to threats like the misuse of money and increase in foreign debt. Accordingly, their vision for Mongolia's budget system includes budget decentralization, an improved mechanism for CSO participation, better enforcement mechanism, and a budget system more transparent to ordinary citizens.

Group 2³⁰. The first group considered the competence of accountants, on time reporting, external auditing, presence of CSO budget monitoring initiatives, and partnerships at the local level as strengths of the budgeting practice in Mongolia. They consider government orders on budget transparency and budget monitoring, the increase in authority of province managers, the drafting of a law ensuring the participation of CSOs as opportunities for improving the budget practice. On the other hand, they consider centralization, top down planning, lack of accountability in planning, low budget literacy of citizens, and the lack of participatory mechanisms as weakness. This leads to threats like the low confidence between government and CSOs, strong influence of politicians, and limited funding for the monitoring efforts of CSOs. Accordingly, their vision for the Mongolian budget system is to be democratic and socially accountable that ultimately improves the life of citizens. This involves nationwide common

²⁹ See Workshop Outputs for SWOT in Annex 25 A

³⁰ See Workshop Outputs for SWOT in Annex 25 B

understanding of the budget, an enabling legal environment, greater public participation in the national and local level.

Day 5

Day 1 started with an ice-breaker facilitated by Mr. Wadel Cabrera and a recap from Mr. Darinchuluun, Ms. Ariuntungalag, and Ms. Oyuntungalag; and immediately afterwards, sessions on (a) Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys and (b) Participatory Performance Monitoring

Session 9: Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys

Session 5, entitled “Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys”, discussed expenditure tracking and its relevance for CSO participation. The session involved an introduction about the different methodologies for expenditure tracking and aimed to build the participants capacity through practical exercises.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) group work (shopping for a picnic, fraud detection) (b) input presentation from the resource person, (c) application of a PETS tool, (d) discussion and synthesis.

Ms. Caroline Belisario, the Supervising Technical Officer of Procurement Watch Inc., was the resource person for the session. The session was conducted from 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. for a total of 3 ¼ hours.

Inputs of the resource person and Workshop outputs

Ms. Belisario started the session³¹ through an activity entitled, “A shopping we will go”. Two groups were formed and decide on how to budget \$50 for a family picnic (to feed 25 adults and 5 children; 10 of whom are vegetarians).

The first group (reported by Ms. Chimed) spent \$43.89, while the second group (reported by Ms. Sengedorj) spent \$46.68. The first group was able to save more money, while the second group tried to address the adult members’ needs by buying beer, and in effect, saved less.

Ms. Belisario explained that the exercise demonstrated the principle behind public expenditure where people try to address the needs of the members while saving money given the limited resources. Likewise, the government should spend wisely while addressing the citizens’ needs and given the country’s limited resources. Public expenditure tracking (PET) is a tool that monitors the resources that go into the budget and how it is actually spent by the government.

³¹ See Ms. Belisario’s presentation on Public Expenditure Tracking in Annex 26.

Fraud detection is a component of PET. To illustrate this, Ms. Belisario showed two brochures of an ultrasound machine, one of which was fake. The participants were asked to identify the fake brochure and the elements that make it fake. From this exercise, it was pointed out that signs of fraud could be detected and sensitivity to the intention to mislead or hide information is crucial. Such attitude could be “a matter of mindset than routinized methodology.”

Various examples of tools used for PET were also showed. An example of civil society-initiated expenditure tracking is showcased in the video of *Bantay Eskwela*, a Procurement Watch Inc. project that monitors public school facilities. CSO monitors brought to the Department of Education’s attention the high price and poor quality of school chairs and tables. The project eventually resulted to better quality of furniture for school children.

In preparing a scorecard or report card to measure the quantifiable impact of local government services after their expenditure, the resource person shared guidelines on how to develop the tool and what to do with the results. These include framing the appropriate questions, understanding the target audience, establishing benchmarks, consulting stakeholders, and avoiding media that may misrepresent the results.

Other examples of scorecard initiatives that were cited were Bangalore’s Public Assistance Center, Malawi’s Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (monitoring of budget for education materials from district or schools), Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (community monitoring of government infrastructure projects).

DEEM or the Differential Expenditure Efficiency Measurement (DEEM), a PETS tool for measuring cost and time efficiency in government procurement process, was given particular emphasis. Its techniques include (1) the analysis of the flow of funds through an evaluation of the consistency, timing and amount of funds through data gathered from offices and agencies, 2) the analysis of product flow via the conduct of an independent market survey and a comparative analysis of prices, 3) the identification of procedural lapses via its conformity with existing laws on procurement and accounting practices.

Ms. Belisario explained that DEEM can be used to identify red flags in the procurement process. She explained that red flags do not necessarily imply an anomaly; they could be bottlenecks and gaps that could be addressed to make the procurement process more efficient. These may include payment before bidding, missing signatures in the receipt of goods, a bidding price that is the same or higher than the retail price, and a big time differential.

In determining cost efficiency, the difference between market price and the actual price of government purchase of the goods may be used. Ms. Belisario noted the general rule of thumb that government bidding price should be 20% lower than retail price because bulk procurement.

For time efficiency, an efficiency worksheet could be used to plot the actual time lines in the procurement and contract implementation. This should be compared against the prescriptions in the procurement law, or whatever is the existing policy.

For a hands-on experience on PETS and DEEM, Ms. Belisario grouped the participants and asked them to work on a particular case.

Highlights of the discussion

The insights generated from the session discussions are as follows:

1. On the reaction of the government about the results of PETS

Mr. Ulambayar asked about the reaction of the government agency upon being informed about the results of PETS. In response, Ms. Belisario explained that the general reaction of government agencies was to seek measures on being more accountable for those products and services. In the Philippines, government agencies, such as the DepEd and DPWH, were surprised about the costs and asked the corresponding offices about the estimates that went into the costing of products. In the case of India, government agencies came up with guidelines upon finding out that they will be rated for their performance. They later asked to be rated or surveyed.

2. On the methods used to mobilize volunteers

Upon being asked about the method employed for mobilizing volunteers for Bantay Eskwela, Ms. Belisario said that they did not give honorarium but instead mobilized volunteers who had a stake and interest in the goods or services being procured. Parents, for example, would also want to have their children enjoy better school furniture and they also often go to school to accompany their children.

3. On the how to establish standards for PETS.

Mr. Darinchuluun explained that there are experts in the Mongolian government who determine the standard costs and specifications of products. Mongolians CSOs have to find those standards within government agencies.

Mr. Cabrera affirmed Darinchuluun's comment and said that the government usually has those standards. Citizens only monitor if services and products were delivered according to those standards. Mr. Cabrera also mentioned how the exposure activity on the bidding process of computers at DepEd involved the definition of standards and eligibility requirements prior to the bidding process itself.

Ms. Belisario also said that even in the presence of standards from government agencies, there may still be a need to check those standards against international standards and those that can be gathered from the views of the people.

4. On the need to develop specific PET tools

Ms. Chimed emphasized the need to develop specific PET tools for their work in Mongolia. She said that the Open Society Institute (OSI) conducted a survey on the Health and Mining sector but that survey needed a specific PETS tool.

Mr. Darinchuluun, on the other hand, noted how existing scorecards in Mongolia are very general. There may be a need to focus and develop score cards on specific items or products. He also emphasized Mongolia's need for determining cost efficiency and time efficiency. He mentioned a government's transaction (i.e. *Siemens*) where the cost was higher than the retail price. DEEM and its time efficiency worksheet is also important because of the problems in the delays in procurement in Mongolia.

Summary

The activities in the session showed that the participants have a basic understanding of expenditure tracking and why public expenditure is important.

The participants expressed their need on being able to develop specific PET tools for rating the performance of certain sectors (e.g. Health and Mining Sector) in Mongolia. Some of the participants suggested developing scorecards that focus on specific products or services.

There are standards that can be obtained from government agencies, which can be used as benchmarks for PETS. Those standards may also be checked against international standards and the ordinary citizens' assessments.

Note however, that there was not enough time to the exercises (DEEM & scorecards). They specifically noted the importance of DEEM in addressing the delays in procurement in Mongolia.

The participants gave a high rating for the session on the "Public Expenditure Tracking". It was rated 95.38% for the content, 91.03% for the process, and 91.24 % resource person. Its overall rating was 92.04%. It was second to the highest rating.

Session 10: Participatory Performance Monitoring (Scorecards)

Session 10, entitled "Participatory Performance Monitoring" discussed scorecard as a means to monitor and assess government performance, its usefulness and limitations, and its different types/examples.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) gathering expectations from the participants (b) input from the resource person (c) group work on developing scorecards (d) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Simon Gregorio, a Social Development Consultant for the World Bank was the resource person for the session.

The session was conducted from 2:05 a.m. to 6:10 p.m. for a total of 3 hours and 55 minutes including the 10 minute break.

Inputs of the resource person and Workshop outputs

Expectations of participants. Mr. Gregorio started by asking the participants about their expectations about the session on scorecards. In behalf of the participants, Ms. Gombodorj said that they want to be able to develop scorecards and to identify concrete indicators in rating the performance of government agencies in Mongolia. They want to focus on one ministry (from among Ministry of Health, Education, Labor) and rate the performance of that ministry from the local level up to the city level. They aim to cover all aspects and services of that ministry and publish the results of that evaluation every year. From one ministry in a province or city, they eventually want to cover the performance of that ministry in the whole of Mongolia.

In response, Mr. Gregorio explained that rating the performance of ministries in such a large scale may be more complicated and time consuming because:

1. There are some government agencies or ministries that are not involved directly in service (e.g. budget and management, finance) but help other agencies that are involved directly in service delivery (e.g. public works, bus service). Evaluating the performance of those ministries may be challenging and require a different methodology.
2. It is difficult to make judgment about the performance of the whole organization on the basis of one aspect of its performance or through some data collected at the local level. Even if focus is given on the common complaint about that agency or the most essential service of that agency, judgments about the agencies performance is still dependent on the availability of data and practices of record-keeping.

Understanding Score Cards. Mr. Gregorio explained that scorecards are concerned with the citizens' feedback about the services they receive from the government. They deal with outcomes and perceptions from the citizens' perspective; i.e. whether their life condition has changed because of the government's service.

Score cards show which aspects of a service are most important to citizens. For example, it gives a guide on whether citizens define access to health in terms of vicinity to health centers, availability of insurance or appropriate residence permit, length of waiting time, or availability of doctors and nurses.

However, scorecards could not easily assess the effectiveness of policies. It takes a long time to assess it, and some useful policies (e.g. increased salary for government officials) may not be the priority of

citizens. For example, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the government's "child money" because the reduction of street children and the satisfaction of parents on the money they received were used for the children's food or education. The evaluation may entail a visitation of each household that received the money program, and this may take time.

The elements of scorecard are: key result area, indicators, questions for citizens, response of citizens.³² *Key result areas* are the product or service that the citizens' or end users find important. They reflect a priority of what citizens want to monitor. *Indicators* are measures of performance in those key areas or the service level standards (e.g. the skills a graduate of secondary school must have, the amount of time before the human development fund from Ministry reaches the citizens.). Questions are asked in reference to those indicators, and responses are framed according to the kind of answers desired. Also, there should be a plan about how to gather data based on those questions.

Mr. Gregorio gave an example of a scorecard that assesses the bus transportation services of the government. In this area, service standards include reliability, affordability, passenger safety and security, passenger comfort, accessibility for elderly or disabled people, and environmental friendliness. Mr. Gregorio gave questions related to each indicator and taught the participants how to formulate questions for more specific indicators. For example, questions about the availability of space for commuters can be focused specifically for peak hours.

There can be many indicators for a key area but it is important that those indicators reflect the concerns of the scorecards' audience. Those indicators should also be sensitive to differences in context. The use of influence for example by means of gifts may vary depending on the how important the gift is or the manner by which the gift is given.

There are, however, also scorecards that can be used across agencies. They can focus on perception of corruption, perception of performance, the helpfulness of staff, and the use of influence.

Group Activity

Mr. Gregorio asked the participants to make their own scorecard by: (1) identifying the ministry they want to score, (2) specifying the particular area or service of the ministry they want to focus on, (3) determining the appropriate indicators for that key area, and (4) setting the method of collecting information. The participants were divided into three groups according to the ministry they want to rate (education, health, social welfare). Below are the results of the group activity.

*Group 1: Health.*³³ The group focused on medicines delivery. The indicators they looked at were the structure of delivery, the budget allocation of ministry, the quality of medicine, and monitoring. The methodologies they chose are desk reviews, interviews, and budget monitoring.

³² See Mr. Gregorio's presentation on Participatory Performance Monitoring in Annex 27.

³³ See Group 1's output for the Ministry of Health in Annex 28A& Annex 28B.

Mr. Gregorio commented that medicines delivery is a challenging service to rate. Participants should break down the goals they want to achieve, make a diagnosis of problem to find out the gaps in current legislation, and determine the kind of legislation they want to advance. This legislation can question standards for the medicine coming in the country, accreditation of drugs, and security in customs.

It was suggested that the participants consult a formulary of drugs to determine which drugs are essential or non-essential. Additional indicators using morbidity and mortality could help assess whether appropriate drugs were procured. In optimizing the budget, it may also be crucial to influence policies in such a way that the vital drugs are for free, the essential drugs are subsidized while non-essential drugs are charged 100%.

*Group 2: Education.*³⁴ The group focused on providing equal opportunity to study in Universities. They wanted to determine students who acquired scholarships because they are poor or because they are children of public servants. The proposed indicators are: (1) income profile of grantees, (2) background information about the student gathered from an interview, (3) number of students who study without the aid of the scholarship and their awareness of the scholarship program when they applied to the university, (4) application process itself.

Mr. Gregorio reminded the group to pay attention to whether the scholarship is enough to cover the actual cost of university education (e.g. food, transportation, housing). The scorecards may find it difficult to measure transparency in selecting the scholars, the criteria employed, and the access to the records of the selection committee.

*Group 3: Social welfare.*³⁵ The group wanted to assess the ministry's ability to help poor families by supporting their small business initiatives. The indicators they will use are the effectiveness of announcement, selection, implementation, sustainability, auditing and monitoring.

Mr. Gregorio asked the group to distinguish which type of poor they want to support: the welfare poor, employed poor, or the business poor. Given that they want to focus on the business poor, they should also be able determine who will make a good business person (e.g. the start-up-business poor or the with-existing-business poor). He suggested that they develop indicators on how to monitor the use of the money given as capital.

In conclusion, Mr. Gregorio said that the appropriate choice of tools and indicators will depend on the Mongolian culture and context.

³⁴ See Group 2's report for the Ministry of Education in Annex 29A & Annex 29B.

³⁵ See Group 3's report for the Ministry of Social Welfare in Annex 30A & Annex 30B.

Highlights of the discussion

The insights generated from the session discussions are as follows:

1. On the difference between scorecards and satisfaction surveys

On Ms. Gombodorj's question about the difference between scorecards satisfaction surveys, Mr. Gregorio said that they are almost the same for they are both about people's perception. Scorecards, however, can include the budget and its scoring matrix also has to be specific for each service standards.

2. On international standards for scorecards

Questions were raised about international standards and where they could be obtained. In reply, Mr. Gregorio that information can be acquirement from the internet (he promised to give them the website link). Despite those benchmarks he reminded the participants to benchmark with similar countries, or countries with practically the same profile as that of Mongolia. An accurate scorecard will also depend on the available resources of the agency. The health system of Cuba for example is difficult to use as a benchmark for third world countries. Determining the appropriate benchmark may also entail some form of budget analysis.

Summary

The participants found the discussion on developing scorecards very useful, which was indicated clearly by the request for extension of the session. The resource person explained the complications of the participants aim of coming up with general scorecards (e.g. rating the performance of all government agencies in all aspects of its services) by asking them questions that reveal the limitations of proposed indicators.

The participants made actual scorecards for the ministry of health, education, social welfare. Guidelines had been suggested on how they could further develop their scorecards by clarifying their target area, informing them of the difficulties they might encounter, and suggesting other methodologies and alternative indicators.

The session received the highest overall rating of 97.12%; it got the highest rating for content at 96.77%, process 97.12%, and 97.69% resource person.

Session 11: Designing a SAC Tool (Developing Scorecards)

Session 9, entitled “Designing a SAC Tool”, was an exercise for the participants to start developing their scorecards for Mongolia.

The learning activities employed in the session were (a) group activities and (b) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Simon Gregorio, resource person for the scorecard, facilitated the session. The session was conducted from 11:16 a.m. to 3:40 p.m. Excluding lunch break, it lasted for 3 hours and 24 minutes.

Inputs of the resource person and workshop outputs

Mr. Gregorio explained that the kind of ministry and the kind of service performed by that ministry determine the type of scorecard. For example, scorecards appropriate to service ministries may not be appropriate for enforcement or regulation-type ministries. However, there are scorecards that may be used across agencies. These include scorecards to assess the ministries’ budget, procurement, and access to information.

General scorecards are good for influencing policies. Specific scorecards, on the other hand, focus on citizens. General scorecards have limited effectiveness because they are broad and ineffective without the presence of support group. Also, citizens usually care only about the service they get, not the overall policies that made those services possible. Mr. Gregorio emphasized that the choice on which type of scorecard to develop still depends on the participants.

The participants were asked to form two groups. One group focused on indicators of the performance of a particular ministry in general, while the other group focused a specific service of a particular ministry.

*Report of Group 1.*³⁶ The first group focused on the monitoring of the reconstruction of maternal hospitals. Their target groups were the workers and customers. Their indicators were the service delivery satisfaction of workers, citizens/customers, procurement, budget expenditure tracking. Steps in developing the scorecard include preliminary interview, pilot testing, improving QRE, evaluating QRE and the final reporting. In gathering information, they will use QRE, individual interview and focused group discussion. The content of QRE are on reconstruction quality, environment and hygiene or cleanliness.

*Report of Group 2.*³⁷ The second group developed a general scorecard that rated all ministries of the government. The indicators were budget, procurement, access to information, participation and rules and regulation. Their chosen methodologies were document review and interviews.

³⁶ See Group 1’s output on specific scorecard in Annex 31.

³⁷ See Group 2’s output on a general scorecard in Annex 32.

The targeted outcome was an assessment of each ministry's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions on how to address the problem.

Highlights of the discussion

The session discussions generated the following insights:

1. On who benefits with the use of scorecards

Scorecards are important for both the government and citizens. Scorecards reflect feedback from citizens yet they are designed to be able to rate the performance of government agencies or services. Because of this dual concern, Mr. Tserenjav asked whether scorecards are important to citizens or to government.

Mr. Gregorio explained that scorecards are beneficial to both citizens and government. The government can use the results of scorecards to assess and improve its performance. Citizens, on the other hand, are able to convey their sentiments through the scorecards. However, there is a need to make the scorecards independent and objective so they will be credible. Many governments object to scorecards because they think that it is meant to criticize them. Showing that scorecards are objective is one way of dealing with this negative attitude of government on scorecards.

2. On deciding whether to develop a general or specific scorecard

Even as specific scorecards are more advantageous than general scorecards, there was a consensus to develop both general and specific scorecards for Mongolia. Mr. Darinchuulun said it might be better for the group to make specific scorecards. General scorecards usually require technical experts and some background on macroeconomics (e.g., knowledge about how the inflation rate affects the performance of the labour industry). A score card on a specific service or product may be more practical. Yet, some of the participants still insisted on having an experience on developing general scorecards for the session.

Day 7

Day 7 started with recap about what the participants learned for the last 6 days of workshop. The day was designed to evaluate and critique the workshop.

Recapitulation

Ms. Sengedorj and Ms. Bayarmaa asked the participants to write one key concept they learned from the various sessions on good governance, constructive engagement, social accountability, and PFM and from the social accountability tools e.g. procurement monitoring, budget monitoring, PETS and the citizen score card.

These were some of the insights raised:

1. Good governance means achieving of development outcomes and the process for it to be achieved is constructive engagement.
2. Concepts like 'non-threatening' 'reframing' remind us that government and NGOs are friends not foes - partners who have the same goal. Citizens and the Government need to sit down and understand each other in the spirit of dialogue.
3. Constructive engagement involves a partnership that makes room for criticism. CSOs can still criticize government yet remain constructively engaged.
4. SAC should be understood by stakeholders from the same perspective to move forward.
5. Identifying areas for participation in the PFM cycle can help in developing SAc tools for Budget monitoring, PETS and citizen scorecards.

Darin reminded the participants that their way of being socially accountable is by using the knowledge they have gained from the workshop when they go back to Mongolia.

The participants then gave a video presentation of the pictures and happy experiences they had in during the workshop as a way of expressing their gratitude to ANSA-EAP.

Session 12: Evaluation and Critique of Workshop

Session 9, entitled "Evaluation and Critique of Workshop" involved discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the SAclAP workshop design and their recommendations on how the design can be improved.

Mr. Wadel Cabrera III facilitated the session. The session was conducted from 9:05 to 12:48 for a total of 3 hours and 53 mins.

Inputs of the resource person

Mr. Cabrera explained that there is a need to assess and critique the SACLAP workshop even if ANSA-EAP has already conducted it in Cambodia. The pilot workshop-training is a test run to be able to adapt SACLAP to the needs of Mongolia. Hence, it is important to get feedback from the participants and respond to all those feedback to customize SACLAP for workshop in November.

Mr. Cabrera asked the participants of the pilot workshop to go through each session and identify the strengths and weaknesses of each workshop. He also asked for recommendations on how they will design and run the SACLAP workshop in November to suit the participants' needs. Mr. Cabrera asked the participants to write their comments using metacards: strengths on yellow cards, weaknesses on green cards, and recommendations on pink cards. Below are the feedback gathered for each session.³⁸

Session 1 (Good Governance). The participants said that the structure of the session and the group activities were planned well. They also found the definitions were easy to understand which therefore resulted to good discussions. They also liked how the facilitator came up with a good synthesis of the different ideas that surfaced during the session. They also appreciated how ANSA-EAP's experiences in the Philippines and in the region were contrasted with the Mongolian experience of good governance. However, the participants found the schedule too tight and too long. Lastly, despite adhering to a learning-in-action approach to the workshop, the participants suggested to have inputs/sharing given before group activities.

The participants suggested the following: a) Retain Ms.Chuluunbaatar's lecture of good governance from Mongolian context and then make use of open space for the plenary b) Start with the participants conception of good governance before and after the lecture c) give more practical cases of good governance d) send the power point and learning materials in advance e) integrate break time. d) encourage the participation of everybody

Session 2 (Constructive Engagement). The participants liked Fr. Pat's presentation and the sharing of best practices from the Philippine experience. However, the participants found the time for the session insufficient. They did not have enough opportunity to interact with each other for the role playing.

The participants recommended the following: a) bring Cong. Banal, Mr. Chavez, Ms. Carpentero, and Fr. Falguera to Mongolia. (*ANSA-EAP said they will bring video still of their inputs instead),

³⁸ See "Matrix of Metacards for Workshop Evaluation" in Annex 33.

b) give more time to role playing and case sharing c) Translate the Indian video of CE into Mongolian.

Session 3 (SAC). The participants appreciated how the open space method immediately gave the participants an initial plan on what they can do in Mongolia. They also found the videos very helpful. It is also not detailed enough to ensure a common understanding of SAC

The participants suggested that: a) SAC session should come prior to CE b) Dr. Gregorio-Medel (together with Ms. Gombodorj) should run the session on SAC c) give time to discuss other conceptions of good governance other than those framed by World Bank d) translate the SAC videos into Mongolia e) use the interface with government officials (Darin, Tunga, Sosormaa) within the training itself to promote SAC in Mongolia f) compare Mongolian laws and regulations related to SAC to what the Philippines have and emphasize Mongolian context during the process of comparison.

Session 4 (PFM cycle). The participants said that they liked PFM video. They also liked the fact that the resource person was both an expert and a practitioner on PFM intervention. They also found her presentation very informative. The participants suggested the further simplification of the PFM input. They also considered whether to invite an expert on PFM from the Mongolian Ministry of Finance or from a consultant from World Bank UNDP instead to give them an input about the PFM from the SAC perspective.

Session 5 (Procurement Monitoring). The session was grounded because it started with an analysis of Mongolia's Procurement Law. The participants also liked: the way the session was structured, the knowledgeable resource person, the cases were from different countries. However, the participants disliked how the session was cut short because of other activities (i.e. remarks by Dean La Vina and the assessment of PFM).

The participants want to: a) keep the design intact b) bring Edward to Mongolia and focus on the possibility of amending specific parts of the Mongolian Procurement Law c) invite Procurement expert from Mongolia d) ensure that the participants and resource persons that will be invited have a predisposition towards constructive engagement.

Session 6 (Budget Monitoring). The participants liked the fact that the resource person was knowledgeable and that she attempted to tie her input with Mongolian experiences. However, they did not like the methodology. There were many tools mentioned without focusing on one specific tool, and they found actual cases of budget monitoring insufficient.

The participants recommended that: a) Tserenjavi and Darin will be prepare budget monitoring experiences in Mongolia b) there should be an exercise for using concrete tools in particular cases c) Prepare a more interesting and short presentation

Session 7 (PETS). The session was run as designed and there was interaction among participants during the input. The participants thought that the resource person was good. The exercises

were challenging and they appreciated the case work on DEEM. They said it was the session where supply met the demand. The lesson responded to participants needs and they found it easy to understand. However, the participants felt that there was not enough time for the DEEM exercise.

The participants want to: a) make the exercise on PETS more simple and with assistance of a resource person or facilitator b) Ground PETS into Mongolian experience, c) give PETS cases outside other than procurement d) skip exercise on shopping and focus on DEEM exercise.

Session 8 (Scorecards). The session met their demand for tools. The participants affirmed the expertise of the resource person. He was able to connect with participants and can use Mongolian terms. His familiarity with Mongolian context enabled him to relate the scorecards to all the sectors in Mongolia. The participants also appreciated his ability to provide good reflection or feedback on their scorecards. The participants did not note any weakness on the session.

The participants recommended that: a) exercises be conducted prior to the session b) go through all steps of developing score cards c) focus on the analysis and synthesis of collected data.

Highlights of the discussion

Participants were likewise asked to give feedback on other aspects of the workshop, such as on facilitation and workshop management, administration and logistics, and the participants themselves. The responses from the participants are documented as follows:

- *Facilitation and training management.* The participants found the facilitators very responsive to their concerns and needs (e.g. hiring a translator). Some perceived as good organizers. Others expressed their appreciation by write notes like 'good' 'amazing' and 'terrific'. However, the participants also commented about the informal meetings that were cancelled and the lack of synthesize for some sessions. The participants also said that the facilitators gave so many input to the point that the participants can no longer go around the city. Dr. Gregorio-Medel also noted the concern to maximize the participants' trip to the Philippines had inclined them to overload input. However, this might overwhelm participants and make them forget the most important and relevant inputs.

They suggested that the facilitators manage the process of sessions so discussions will not drag. The participants also said they can improve in time management by limiting the time for other sessions so that more time can be given to important activities or sessions (e.g. DEEM etc).

The facilitators explained that they may have packed too much session to the point of sacrificing time and relaxation. Some sessions were not synthesis because the session had already

extended for lunch or dinner and people were already exhausted. However, they still acknowledged the importance of synthesizing after each session and the plan of integrating non-working breaks in between sessions. The facilitators also explained that they often have no control over the schedule of resource persons invited during the informal sessions. Many of them confirmed attendance but eventually did not come for because of emergency meetings (e.g. truth commission). Some of them also cancelled at the last minute.

- *Admin and Logistics.* The participants were almost unanimous expressing their appreciation for the admin and logistic staff. The participants found the staff very hardworking, hospitable, nice and friendly.
- *Participants (Self Assessment.)* The metacards for the participants assessment of their own performance showed that they found learn from each other (GO-NGO) and establish partnerships. They participated actively and learned while having fun at the same time.
- *Main Learning Experience.* Participants consider the concepts and skills they acquired in from the session on scorecards and constructive engagement as the most useful learning experience. (There were 8 metacards on scorecard and 5-8 metacards on CE.) They found discussion on the different SAC tools very useful, as well the examples on the CSO participation in procurement.

Day 8

Day 8 of the workshop was meant to help the participants prepare for the 5-day SAc Workshop in Mongolia. One session was on ANSA EAP's Learning framework and the facilitation skill required from the Conveners Group to help run the workshop and the other session was Planning for the November workshop.

Session 13: ANSA EAP's Learning Framework

The session on "ANSA EAP's Learning Framework"³⁹ involved a discussion of learning in action and a reinforcement of key concepts and skills learned from the workshop.

³⁹ See Mr. Cabaces presentation on ANSA's Learning Framework in Annex 34.

The learning activities employed in the session were: (a) input from the speaker (b) group activities (c) discussion and synthesis.

Mr. Randee Cabaces facilitated the session. The session was conducted from 8:39 to 11:22 for a total of 2 hours and 43 mins.

Inputs of the resource person and Workshop outputs

The session began with Mr. Cabaces explaining ANSA's learning framework, after which, participants were made to go through group activities to enhance their facilitation skills, especially on asking probing questions.

Probing questions (Activity 1) Mr. Cabaces differentiated probing questions from clarificatory questions. Clarificatory actions are answerable by yes or no. They are often 'what' questions and they put an end to the discussion. Probing questions, on the other hand, are open ended. They are often the 'how' and the 'why' questions. Probing questions are essential tools for a dialogue to flourish.

Addressing re-entry issues (Activity 2). After letting the participants finish the first activity on asking probing questions, Mr. Caceres asked the participants to form two groups and use *learning-in-action* to discuss how they are going to deal with re-entry issues, i.e. the particular SAC issues they will face when they go back to their own organizations in Mongolia.

For each group, Mr. Caceres asked the participants to take on the role of a resource person, facilitator, and members. The resource person will present the re-entry issue and think of possible solutions to that issue, the facilitator will ensure the flow of the discussion. The members, on the other hand, will use probing questions to help the resource person come up with answers to their issue.

The first group was made up of Ms. Tsetsgee, Ms. Sarangerel, Ms. Bayarmaa, Ms. Ariuntungalag, Ms. Sengedorj. Ms. Sengedorj was the resource person, Ms. Tsetsgee was the facilitator, and the rest were members. The second group was made up of Ms. Gombodorj, Ms. Chimed, Mr. Ulambayar, Mr. Darinchuluun and Ms. Oyuntungalag. Mr. Ulambayar served as the resource person, Ms. Chimed was the facilitator, and the rest were members.

The participants were given up to an hour to go through the activity. After which, they were given a 5 minute break before starting the sharing before the plenary. The resource persons were made to report about their proposal. Then, feedback was back given for the resource persons, the facilitators, the members, and the activity as whole.

Outputs for Activity 2

Group 1 output on improving Mongolian Civic Education. Ms. Sengedorj, the resource person for the first group, said that her re-entry issue was how to improve the civic education of

Mongolians. Many Mongolians, especially the youth, leave the burden of governance to the government alone and do not want to participate. The University she comes from, Mongolian State University (MSU), is a center for Education Studies in Mongolia. Most teachers who teach in the primary and secondary education study in MSU. Educating these teachers will have a big effect on improving the civic education of citizens so they will be encouraged to participate in governance.

The options for achieving this objective were either to incorporate SAC concepts into existing courses or through an 'independent formal introduction' of SAC as a curriculum in the University. The formal introduction of SAC in a separate curriculum may face some opposition from the faculty (in math and sciences). The second option, however, is more plausible since they have faculty members who have grounding in democracy and SAC and who have more freedom to change their course description. Social science teachers (e.g. political science and sociology) may be able to integrate SAC concepts into their existing curriculum. They can ask these faculty members to develop their existing curricula and course description and then encourage students to take their course by publishing the course descriptions in the University website, posting them in University bulletins, organizing events and public lectures about SAC. Though there is no need for immediate approval, they hope that information about the importance of SAC will reach the decision-making body of the University and that they would support the development of an independent SAC curriculum in the long run.

Ms. Tsetsgee, who acted as the facilitator of the group, said that Ms. Sengedorj gave a good and clear presentation of issues. She gave good answers to questions on how the teachers can possibly apply SAC in the curriculum. She clarified the strengths and limitations of each option so it became easy for them to identify appropriate solutions. She showed mastery of the topic and made the topic very interesting for everybody.

Ms. Sengedorj said that the members from her group demonstrated good probing skills. Their questions were open-ended and logically sequenced.

Group 2 Output on introducing SAC to health workers. Mr. Ulambayar, the resource person for the second group, said his re-entry issue is how to introduce and integrate SAC to the training project he will conduct for public social workers involved in health. To do this he proposed a training program design. First he will ask for participants' understanding of SAC (ask 8-9 people from the 15 participants) and introduce the four pillars of SAC. Then he proposes to talk to them about problems in the hospital and elicit ideas about possible solutions while reminding them of constructive engagement. Then he plans to use the Indian Video on SAC to give the participants an idea that partnership is the only way to make things possible. Then he will give each of the participants' candies and ask if the candies taste great. If they say yes, he will say that partnership/SAC is greater than the candy.

Mr. Cabaces praised Mr. Ulambayar for coming up with a detailed design of the program and for presenting different strategies for conveying his message. Mr. Cabaces commended how Mr.

Ulambayar's effort to start from where the participants are by finding out the participant's understanding of SAC and relating them to concrete issues.

Ms. Chuluunbaatar said that the facilitator for their group (Ms. Chimed) helped the presenter articulate his ideas and remind the members of their task by reframing their attitude. On the other hand, Mr. Ulambayar said that he found the questions of his members difficult; he also found it difficult to connect his ideas theirs.

Overall feedback. Mr. Cabaces observed that the topics of the resource persons are easy. The members have a general knowledge of their field so it was easy to engage in discussion. They noticed how they became active participants in coming up with answers to an issue (Ms. Tsetsgee).

Mr. Cabaces ended the activity by explaining learning-in-action as ANSA's learning framework. Learning in action takes off from learner's experiences to identify tools and action points relevant to their experience. Though resource persons have expertise and knowledge on a particular field, that knowledge cannot just be downloaded. There has to be learning from a community of practitioners. Hence, there has to be mutual learning between the learner and the expert; learning in dialogue with a community of practitioners.

Session 14: Planning and Tasking of Workshop

Session 9, entitled "Planning Tasking workshop" involved the assignment of tasks for the SACLAP Workshop in November.

Mr. Wadel Cabrera III facilitated the discussion. The session was conducted from 11:23 to 1:05 for a total of 1 hours and 41 mins.

Inputs of the resource person

Mr. Cabrera presented a matrix of the draft design of the SACLAP workshop in Mongolia based on the recommendations of the participants.⁴⁰ The matrix contained the tasks arising from the recommendations for each session, and it likewise included a listing of which task will be done by ANSA-EAP, by the Partnership for Social Accountability Network in Mongolia, and the representatives from the Mongolian government.

⁴⁰ See the matrix of tasks prepared by Mr. Cabrera in Annex 35.

Highlights of the discussion

Below are the major tasks and recommendations that have been agreed upon for each session in the coming SAclAP workshop on November.

1. Materials Preparation

- DEMO will be in-charge of preparation, translation, and reproduction of the workshop kit/learning materials. ANSA-EAP, through Mr. Cabrera, will e-mail all the learning materials to DEMO by November 4, translate the materials from Nov. 5-12, and reproduce the materials by Nov 13.

2. Documenters/Translators

- Ms. Tin Aquino will be in charge of the running documentation from the ANSA-EAP side. While the ANSA-Mongolia convenors group will take turns for the running documentation in Mongolian. The documenter for the day will likewise be in-charge of the recap for the following day.
- DEMO will hire the video documenter and provide the tapes and supplies. ANSA-EAP will pay for the video documenter.
- ANSA-EAP will request World-Bank for an additional translator since there are many participants in Mongolia.

3. Facilitators/Resource Persons

- Ms. Ariuntungalag will be in charge of improving the SAC mapping study
- Dr. Medel will discuss Philippines experience of SAC.
- Ms. Sengedorj will discuss SAC from the Mongolian context.
- Ms. Gombodorj will facilitate the session on CE.
- Mr. Darinchuluun will invite an expert from the Ministry of Finance for the PFM cycle
- Mr. Gacusana will be in charge of procurement monitoring together with Ms Otgonjargal, a Mongolian expert on Procurement Monitoring. (c/o Tsetsgee).
- Mr. Tserenjav will provide Mongolian examples/cases of budget monitoring.

4. Accommodating and orienting the participants about CE

- Mr. Cabrera also asked the ANSA-Mongolia convenors group if accommodation will be provided for to prevent them from being late.
- ANSA-EAP asked the ANSA convenors group to make sure that the participants in Mongolia are ready for constructive engagement. They can do this via a pre-workshop orientation or by calling them and informing them about the method and aim of the SAclAP on constructive engagement.

5. Accommodating the ANSA-EAP team

There will be about 6-7 resource persons and training team members from the Philippines.

6. Program design

- The SAC session should come prior to the CE session.

- Allocate more time for the score cards session and cut time from PFM by simplifying the PFM cycle.
 - Mr. Cabrera asked help to make sure that the exercises are finished. There should also be breaks (as opposed to working breaks)
 - DEMO, headed by Mr. Gombodorj, will be in charge of the training team and logistics There should be an effort to finish all the sessions in time. They agreed to start from 9:00 am and end at 6:00pm.
 - Mr. Gombodorj will be the over-all manager for the SACLAP workshop in November.
7. Side Events
- Ms. Gombodorj will be in charge of meetings with the parliament, if any.
 - Ms. Oyuntungalag will be in charge of social and cultural events.