

Imali Ye Mwana

SADC Advocacy Network on Children’s Rights and the Budget

Birchwood Hotel and Conference Centre, Johannesburg, 18-22 April 2005

Table of Contents

Monday 18 April 2005	
1. Introduction to applied budget work.....	2
2. Country presentations: The Budget Cycle	2
Tuesday 19 April 2005	
1. Budget process Advocacy issue: In country; Network	5
2. Cross country information on the budget process	6
3. Approaches to Budget Monitoring	6
4. Rights based approaches	6
Wednesday 20 April 2005	
1. Advocacy and lobbying	8
2. Impact Assessment	8
3. Participatory budgeting.....	9
Appendices	

Monday 18 April 2005

Agenda:

1. Introduction to applied budget work
2. Country presentations: The Budget Cycle: process, stakeholders and role players

Group work:

- Identify the strengths of your budget and budget process
- Identify the main flaws in the current budget system
- Identify obstacles to CS participation

3. The Budget process
 - individual country presentations

1. Introduction to applied budget work (*Appendix I*)

2. Country presentations: The Budget Cycle

(Angola: Appendix II; Mozambique: Appendix III; South Africa: Appendix IV; Swaziland: Appendix V; Zimbabwe: Appendix VI)

Presentations: Country strengths, flaws and CSO participation

Angola

Strengths are also problems

- Policies, ideas, speeches for decentralization BUT problems of implementing this
- Main source of revenue: 60%-70% are from oil revenues; 3% diamond revenue and although it should solve budgetary constraints, but the country is too concerned with its oil revenue and therefore other natural resources are neglected.
- Parliament is debating BUT debate is very weak, e.g. parliament has to approve the budget on the same day that it is tabled in parliament. The budget debate is based on the interest of groups of individuals in parliament (elite) rather than the people of Angola. There is no will to change; the budget is not detailed nor is it realistic.
- Involvement of external expertise (advisors from Brazil, Portugal, World Bank and IMF) BUT no plan for internal capacity building/ skills transfer; there is also weak consultation.
- Poor civil society participation and business accountability to pay taxes (no fiscal revenues)
- Civil society is weak (350 NGOs registered – many are Family Owned NGOs FONGOs): knowledge and capacity.
- No trust between government and NGOs – fears, poor dialogue
- No space for intervention and participation
- No freedom to speak out nor to influence

Mozambique

Strength:

- Budget information is provided by provincial governments, ministries to the Minister of Finance and Planning
- After approval, government is obliged to execute the budget

Flaws

- 50% donor dependent
- Centralised
- Sometimes teachers do not receive salaries for 6 months
- Not easy to interpret the budget – not well disaggregated
- Municipalities raise their own budgets, and reallocate at municipal level: not clear how budget is distributed

CSO participation

- Civil society very weak – and donor dependent and each donor has its own objectives and procedures and this creates different ways of implementation
- Most CSO do not feel comfortable with dealing with budget issues

South Africa

Strengths

- 3 Budget related committees
- Budget committees request CSO submissions
- Clear budget timelines/ schedule
- Strong technical skills at National Treasury
- Strong Minister of Finance
- Strong head of Reserve Bank
- Strong head of SARS
- Over expected revenue collection
- Decentralised budget system
- POATIA
- PFMA
- MFMA
- Good budget documents and information but...

Flaws

- ...not disaggregated sufficiently for vulnerable groups
- LG very poor budgeting
- Overexpenditure and under expenditure still a problem in poorer provinces
- Parliamentary powers (SCOPA)
- Budget execution: corruption by officials undermines sound budgeting by treasuries
- Link between policies, laws and budgeting
- Stronger human rights framework needed for budgeting
- Over expected revenue collection

CSO Participation

- After budget enactment
- Children only beginning prepare to participate (at LG level)
- Credible research by CSOs used by National Treasury – sometimes through submissions to parliamentary committees

People's Budget (led by COSATU) released before National Budget

Swaziland

Strengths

- All ministries are given a chance to reflect their priorities (submit budget proposals)
- Parliament debate the budget
- budget is made public through the budget speech
- PAC

Flaws

- Social schemes are ad hoc (elderly & OVC bursary)
- Doesn't correlate with the king's speech i.e., poverty reduction, decentralisation etc
- No participation of civil society
- Deficit risen from about 3% to 4.5%
- 62.95% accounted for by personnel. Is that Sustainable???

CSO participation

- No deliberate space has been created for CS participation
- CS does not demand the right to participate
- CS do not see their role in influencing the budget process

Zimbabwe

Strengths

- Portfolio committee system that allows for civil society input
- Democratized budget process in which ministries invite CSOs to input into the budgeting process
- Quarterly and bi-annual review meetings
- Introduction of a Public Finance Management System
- Largely locally funded [A challenge too]
- Gender sensitive

Challenges/Flaws

- Limited time between presentation of the budget in Parliament and the adoption of the budget
- Budget priorities not directly linked to national policies and legal frameworks.
- Level of decentralization still low
- Huge budget deficit [\$1.144 trillion in 2005]
- Consumption oriented [More of recurrent expenditure]
- Sometimes based on unrealistic revenue estimates and poor economic analysis e.g the 2005 budget estimates assumed a not less than 3% growth in GDP.

Challenges to CSO participation

- Capacity of NGOs to do sound budget analysis, offer options and make close to realistic projections [NGOs accused of presenting less objective and unrealistic proposals based on weak research findings]
- Suspicion and mistrust between government and NGOs
- Legal frameworks such as POSA, AIIPA and the recently introduced NGO Bill

Tuesday 19 April 2005

Agenda

1. Budget process Advocacy issue: In country; Network
2. Cross country information of the budget process
3. Approaches to budget monitoring
4. Rights based approaches

1. Budget process Advocacy issue: In country; Network

What is the advocacy issue (for the budget process) for your country?

Angola	Swaziland	South Africa	Zimbabwe	Mozambique
1) Capacity and willingness of parliament and government structures monitoring the budget	1) Participation of CSO in the Budget Process	1) Better disaggregation	1) Decentralisation and democratization of the budget process	1) Budget allocation for child development and OVC support
2) Civil society participation in the budget	2) Social Security policy enactment to facilitate budget allocation	2) Children's participation in the Budget	2) Realistic socio-economic policies	2) Participation of the CSOs in the debate of the state budget before it is submitted to parliament
3) Make budget more transparent and accessible	3) Use of UNCRC framework for budget allocation to children	3) Rights-based approach to budgeting	3) Information on expenditure trends	3) Decentralisation of the execution of the national budget

How will this advocacy issue be implemented?

Angola	Swaziland	South Africa	Zimbabwe	Mozambique
1) Use media to influence government and parliament; campaign targeting communities and stakeholders	1) Capacity building of CSOs (SADC network); coalition building; lobby for creation of space for CSOs to participate	1) Parliamentary committee training to request departments to provide better budget information	1) Lobby MTGs; scale up CFNBI; decentralization thrust; Media activities	1) Strengthen the vision of the relevant CSOs
2) Training of key actors: involve researchers;	2) Advocate for setting up of sectoral budget	2) CBU project 'Children participating in	2) Present realistic policy options and critiques	2) Conduct a budget study

conduct research	analysis committees by act of parliament	governance' aims to initiate children's participation in the budget		
3) Gather information from other countries who have similar experiences	3) Training of Ministry of Finance on use of the CRC – research child budgeting using CRC	3) Development of practical guidelines for National Treasury	3) Repeal unprogressive laws; lobby for attitude change	3) Promote budget literacy

What is the advocacy issue (for the budget process) for the network?

1. Raise awareness within government about the importance of civil society participation
 - a. Capacity building of CSOs, i.e. training on the budget process, experiences from the network
 - b. *Training for focal points*
2. Access to budget information including expenditure trends/ patterns
3. *The concern for safety nets for households depending on remittances (whose family member returns from out of the country infected with HIV/AIDS and unable to work).*

2. Cross country information on the budget process [Appendix VII]

3. Approaches to Budget Monitoring [Appendix VIII]

Group activity: [Mozambique/Angola; Zimbabwe/ Swaziland]

[Mozambique & Angola] [Zimbabwe & Swaziland]

Angola and Swaziland:

You are the new programme manager for your organisation and you would like to learn more from Zimbabwe/ Mozambique about the type of budget tracking they used in their previous study/ies. Write this up in a report (to be used as report back to your organisation when you return home). (45mins)

4. Rights based approaches [Appendix VIII]

Group activity: Rights based approaches to budget monitoring

1. What aspects of the budget process facilitate/ support budget monitoring within a rights-based framework?
 1. (Zimbabwe): Rights culture; enabling laws/ supportive laws (local); strong credible national constrictions; effective legal system, e.g. unbiased and competent courts; compliance with international treaties
 2. (Mozambique and Swaziland): Formulation stage - child/CSO participation use of Human Rights laws, international treaties, costing of implementation of human rights; Budget Execution – amount disbursed for implementation; expenditure; outputs

2. What aspects of your country's budget process is a barrier to budget monitoring within a rights-based framework?
 1. (Angola): Lack of transparency and the pervasiveness of corruption (lack of political will); parallel budgets; no involvement of civil society
3. Mention ways of overcoming these barriers.
 1. (Angola): more debate; involve children/ youth in the budget process; use of international treaties as means of advocating for a change; capacity building for better monitoring of the budget
4. How can you make local government budgets more accessible to the communities they affect?
 1. [Zimbabwe]: public disclosure of summary budgets in local newspapers (Rural and Urban Councils Act-law that states it is mandatory to disclose local budgets); public debates (to be supported by laws); establishment of rural information to facilitate public participation in local and national issues including budget debates; empowerment of local people to develop interest in budget information
 2. (Mozambique and Swaziland): Presentation of the budget must be – simple, disaggregated, clear and straight forward, detailed; civic education; dissemination of the budget: consider publication of the budget through huge posters (pasted in public places); printing adequate copies; copies must be distributed through local centres, churches, community halls, schools, clinics, local shops.
5. Mention ways of children participating in the budget process, policy and law making of right and making rights real. Is it possible in your country/ district?
 1. [Zimbabwe]: empowerment of children, e.g. training on children; support children's institutions, e.g. children's parliament, junior councils, children's clubs; promote child participation in meetings and workshops, e.g. more than 50% of participants in NANGO workshops are children; support children's initiatives including exchange programme (NB: the above depends on evolving capacities of children)

Wednesday 20 April 2005

Agenda

1. Lobbying and advocacy
2. Impact Assessment
3. Participatory methodology

1. Advocacy and lobbying [Appendix X]

Group activity: what is Advocacy?

- Influence
- Change
- Asking for support
- Sustainability
- Conflict solving
- Diplomacy

2. Impact Assessment [APPENDIX XI]

Group activity: Discuss the problem of impact

Group I

- How can we measure impact?

Measure results against planned activities and results using: departmental strategic plans; departmental performance monitoring frameworks; departmental logical framework

- How can it be observed?

Study poverty assessment documents, surveys, conduct visits to sites

- Why is it sometimes difficult to identify reliable indicators of impact?

If expected impact is not clearly defined: when results are qualitative; when budgets are not disaggregated.

- How many different factors can contribute to a single impact? What does this mean for impact assessment studies?

External (donors, international community, natural disasters) and internal (government and CSOs) Important to have adequate and reliable indicators and to establish the link between inputs and outcomes

Group II

- How can we measure impact?

Establish baseline; use indicators; review secondary data, conduct interviews for primary data; observation

- How can it be observed?

Budget trends and patterns; budget policies; changes in attitudes and behaviours

■ Why is it sometimes difficult to identify reliable indicators of impact?

Lack of baseline information, e.g. situational analysis; objectives not 'SMART'; lack of access to information

■ How many different factors can contribute to a single impact? What does this mean for impact assessment studies?

Global economic policies; change in national priorities; donor influence; demographic changes due to HIV/AIDS; rural to urban migration

Need to monitor other factors that impact on the assessment.

Group activity

1. Each group chooses a children's right to focus on.
2. Think of examples of programmes that aim to deliver this right.
3. Brainstorm a list of indicators that could possibly be used to measure the impact of such programmes.
4. Rank the indicators from those that would give the 'most reliable' reflection of a programme's impact to those that are the 'least reliable'
5. In your report back, explain why some of the indicators are more reliable than others.

Group I

Right	Programme	Indicator
Access to food	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutritional garden 2. Child supplementary feeding scheme 3. Public work programme (Food for workers) 	Changes in malnutrition programme (1) Changes in child mortality from 10 per 1000 (1990) (2) Changes in disease outbreak (3) Changes in children's achievement [pass rate, sporting activity] (4) Changes in level of conflicts (5) Changes in the number of street children as a result of poverty (6)

Note: numbers in brackets indicate highest number (1) as most reliable and (6) as least reliable

Group II

Right	Programme	Indicator
The universal right of access to quality primary education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure development 2. Teacher training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coverage: schools established within a radius of 5km • All teachers trained up to primary teacher certificate • Tuition fees in respect of orphans and vulnerable children provided by government • 70-80% progression to next grade

All indicators are reliable (quantity, sources of information are reliable)

3. Participatory budgeting

Group activity: each participant was tasked to read the case studies and watch the video on participatory budgets.

1. What is participatory budgeting?

- Make the rulers understand people what their share in the budget is
 - Raise awareness of the link between resources and rights realisation
 - Ensuring that policy and budgets are responsive to the actual needs of the people
2. The value of participatory budgeting
- Capacitates in monitoring budgets
 - Improves transparency and accountability
 - Reinforces citizenship
 - Accords opportunity to be advocates of own rights
 - Ensures that policies and budgets are responsive
 - Creates ownership and responsibility
 - Promotes public learning
 - Empowerment of society
3. The common contexts for participatory budgeting
- Empowered citizenry/ vibrant civil society
 - Willing/ pressurised leaders appreciate role
 - Available and accessible information
 - Supportive institutional frameworks
 - Democratic societies
4. Barriers to participatory budgeting
- No open space for civil society participation (closed environment/ society)
 - Lack of knowledge by civil society of the right to participate
 - Poor information (policies, budgets, laws) recording
 - The need by authorities and the powerful to control resources
 - Civil society: lack of knowledge about policies, laws, budgets
5. Consideration for participatory budgeting
- Children are capable of forming their views (including age and maturity)
 - In matters that affect the general public
 - Land of the laws promote participation
 - There are existing associations of marginalised people, e.g. disabled persons
 - Where there is oppression, dictatorship and no freedom of speech
 - Raise awareness of the right to participate
 - ...and the value of participation