

Matrix Documenting the Peer to Peer Mutual Learning Initiative on Participatory Budgeting
By T. Mumvuma

Introduction to the Initiative	
Why this Initiative?	The Africa-Latin America Mutual Learning Initiative on Participatory Budgeting is based on the core principle of demand-driven initiatives to promote direct collaboration and learning from peers. The initiators therefore felt that there was no other better learning method in which peers directly share their experiences and ideas on what works, what does not work and why? The idea was to give the participating institutions and individuals the opportunity to be in the driver's sit to identify what they would like to learn, how they would like to learn it, from whom they would like to learn, and what lessons they can share with their peers.
Where did the original idea of the Initiative come from?	Ongoing discussions between the World Bank, CIGU and MDPESA after the set up of the two Regional Participatory Budgeting Knowledge and Action Support Facilities, that is one for Latin America at CIGU and one for Africa at MDPESA constituted the genesis of this initiative that was then formally . In these discussions it was established that a huge demand for capacity building in the area of participatory budgeting in Africa existed. A demand that was also confirmed in an earlier regional training needs assessment scan on participatory that was jointly carried out by the World Bank and MDPESA in 2004.
Whose idea was the Initiative?	The above brain storming discussions between the World Bank, CIGU and MDPESA led to the conception of the idea at the instigation of the World Bank.
What was the main purpose/objective?	The overarching objective of the Mutual Learning Initiative is to strengthen direct exchange and cooperation between Latin America and the African Continent practitioners on the subject of Participatory Budgeting. By creating and space through which PB practitioners in Latin America and the African Continent can exchange experiences and learn together, this initiative expect to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To establish an effective South-South platform for development cooperation in the field of participatory budgeting 2. Enable participating institutions to share their innovations and lessons, as well as learn from the experience of other peer organizations; and, 3. Enhance capacity in Latin America and the African Continent on the field of participatory budgeting.

<p>At the onset, what form did the designers of this initiative expect the initiative to take – in the short-term, medium-term, and long-term?</p>	<p>When the initiative was initially launched it was envisioned as a ‘quick impact’ projects. The idea was to fund a select number of projects that were completed within 6 months of star date, which was thought of as May 2008. However, because of difficulties in soliciting funding, delays in submission of proposals etc. the projects started later but still maintained their ‘quick impact’ feature.</p>
<p>Why did the initiative take the approach that it did?</p>	<p>The main objective of the initiative was to build the capacity of team members on various aspects of participatory budgeting. Although there are other pedagogical methods that could have been used, it was felt that peer to peer learning could perform better, particularly in bring to fore what works, what does not work and why?. So through peer to peer learning team members could therefore learn from first hand success stories as well as failures from fellow practitioners on the ground. In dealing with problems at hand, this kind of peer learning and mentoring was thought to be the best approach to adopt.</p>
<p>What is the significance of linking demand-supply side initiatives?</p>	<p>This will not only allow the mentor to know about the capacity building needs of the peer learner, the form the learning should take and the specific content of the training needs, but also to know as the learning progress what training material to develop and its content focus. Hence gaps can also be identified and get fill as the learning progress.</p>
<p>What is the rationale behind a LAC- AFRICA initiative? Is the experience from LAC relevant for the African Continent?</p>	<p>Latin America, particularly Brazil is the birth place and home of participatory budgeting. This means that the promotion of direct collaboration and learning from peers from Africa and Latin America on participatory budgeting is bound to be beneficial to both parties with Africa deriving more benefits than their LAC counterparts. Although the participatory budgeting models from LAC cannot be transplanted to Africa without some modification, taking context into account, they are the most ideal models to copy and learn from give the developing country characteristic of many of the countries found in the LAC region. This implies that most of the good governance, public finance and local financial management problems these countries are grappling with are much similar to what most African countries are also experiencing. Participatory budgeting experiences from LAC as one of the tools to address some of these problems are therefore bound to be highly relevant to the African context.</p>
<p>How did the initiative define “peer to peer learning”? Did this definition hold true as</p>	<p>In this initiative peer to peer learning was viewed as a form of mutual learning that helped in enhancing the value of team members to interact amongst each other and</p>

<p>the initiative was implemented or did the “peer to peer learning begin to take a different form?</p>	<p>therefore resulting in various advantageous learning outcomes through an opportunity to openly discuss issues, explain to each other their viewpoints, and engage in cooperative learning by working in teams on various selected participatory budgeting topics. True to the spirit of the latter definition, team members cooperatively worked together and learn from each other using various modes of communication and interaction.</p>
<p>What key questions/issues did this initiative hope to answer?</p>	<p>No specific questions were meant to be addressed by the initiative. However, the initiative was meant to enable team members to share innovations and lessons, as well as learn from the experience of their fellow peers in their chosen participatory budgeting topic. Ultimately this should therefore lead to the enhancement of capacity and competencies amongst peer learners to practice participatory budgeting effectively.</p>
<p>Design and Methodology</p>	
<p>Describe how the initiative was designed? By whom?</p>	<p>Designed by folks at the World Bank and MDPESA. A set of initiative guidelines were written that were operationalized at the Durban conference.</p>
<p>Why was this design chosen?</p>	<p>Demand driven – it was strongly felt that practitioners and persons implementing the projects and bringing PB to their cities, countries etc. should decide what projects to work on, and choose projects that are relevant to them.</p>
<p>Describe the process followed in Durban to generate the preliminary proposals (include how teams were formed, topic chosen, etc)</p>	<p>The seminar organizers defined an agenda during the Seminar to allow the participants from the African Continent to get to know each other, learn about each others interests and about the kind of progress that is being made on issues of participatory budgeting, and also exchange with their Latin American counterparts about their experience with participatory budgeting. Using the “market approach” during the course of the Seminar participants from the Africa and Latin America were invited to partner with each other to form project groups based on mutually identified thematic areas and research topics. On the basis of the latter each group was therefore asked to develop a preliminary proposal on a peer-to-peer mutual action learning activity by way of completing a template that was handed to the groups by the seminar organizers. The stages that were followed are described below.</p> <p>Hence the launch of the peer to peer initiative was done on day two’s last session on fostering mutual learning on participatory budgeting. The Session’s Objective was to launch the Peer-to-Peer Mutual Learning Program between the African Continent and Latin America. Seminar participants were given an opportunity to explain their link to</p>

	<p>participatory budgeting, how they can contribute to mutual learning, and identify specific issues they want to learn more. To kick start this exercise, the MDPESA Regional Director, Mr. Matovu was given an opportunity to explain the objectives of mutual learning to participants. He also indicated to them that the success of peer to peer initiative was going to depend more on the participants' 'own experiences' and that the principle should work best from simple beginnings to maturity. Dr. Vasconez, the Director of CIGU, made his presentation next. In his presentation he emphasized that the diversity of players from Africa and Latin America in the initiative, different experiences and interests should not be taken as a hindrance but should be viewed as an opportunity; one to be maximized upon in order to make sure that the peer to peer learning initiative succeeds. Last to speak was Dr. Herzog from the World Bank who emphasized the importance of this learning by doing approach. With these important points highlighted by the three speakers a pace was set towards understanding the need and benefits of peer-to-peer learning in participatory budgeting. This introduction session and the presentations by the three speakers set a firm basis for the next similar sessions on fostering mutual learning on participatory budgeting.</p> <p>In day three the last of the day was also reserved for fostering mutual learning on participatory budgeting. The Session Objective was to provide participants with the opportunity to begin discussions on areas of participatory budgeting where they want to form learning partnerships. The principle of the "market place" was put into action. Using this approach participants were allowed to interact amongst themselves and come up with areas of mutual interest for cooperation to further strengthen participatory budgeting through peer to peer learning. On the basis of the identified common areas of interest 12 project teams were formed. Each project team had anywhere from 3-8 people, with most of the teams having a partner from Latin America. The next thing was for these groups to come up with thematic areas and topics for their respective projects. As a result participants met in their various groups to frame topics and thematic areas they would want to present as areas for funding in peer-to-peer learning and to formulate preliminary proposals. By using differently coloured cards and log frames, topics were generated by the project groups and preliminary project proposals in template format were completed by each group. The resultant 12 project proposals are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Communication for inclusion and gender sensitivity of participatory budgeting;2. Linking participatory budgeting to performance based budgeting;
--	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Capacity building for budget demystification; 4. Alternative forms of communication for participatory budgeting implementation in small and medium cities; 5. A pilot engagement of peer institutions in participatory budgeting across West, East and Southern Africa on government dialogue and democracy; 6. Building capacity of social actors and enhancing trust in participatory budgeting; 7. Legal, institutional and strategic framework of participatory budgeting; 8. Rwanda study tour to Brazil and Peru to exchange experiences in linking participatory budgeting to results oriented budgeting; 9. Monitoring the impact of participatory on service delivery and infrastructure development; 10. Sharing experiences on how to integrate cultural values in the participatory budgeting process; 11. Guidelines on implementing participatory budgeting step by step; and 12. Participatory budgeting and revenue generation. <p>In the last session of day four that was also dedicated to fostering mutual learning on participatory budgeting, participants were given an opportunity to finalize, present and submit their preliminary proposals. As a consequence, participants met in their respective groups and finalized their drafted proposals and then presented them to the plenary.</p>
<p>How were the preliminary proposals reviewed and what was the selection criteria?</p>	<p>At the launch of the Africa-Latin America Peer to Peer Mutual Learning Initiative in Durban, 12 joint Africa-Latin America project proposals were submitted for funding. In reviewing the submitted templates and proposals the World Bank and MDPEA reviewing team paid particular attention to: 1) the relevance of the project title; 2) the clarity of the project proposal's general and learning objectives; 3) the relevance of the key project proposal activities in promoting peer learning between peer institutions from Africa and Latin America; 4) the suitability of both the project design and implementation plan; 5) the extent to which the project proposals incorporated and promoted inclusivity; 6) the project's expected impact; and 7) the suitability of the project proposals dissemination strategy. On the basis of the latter criteria 5-6 submitted proposals were deemed suitable for further development. However after some further reflections and discussions with the potential project funders with the World Bank Group and MDPEA, it was agreed that each of the 12 teams be given an opportunity to</p>

	prepare a full proposal.
<p>On the WB side, what was the process followed to choose final proposals, how were the teams informed, and how was a way forward identified?</p>	<p>A selection committee at the World Bank, comprised of persons from COMMGAP, BNPP, LAC Social, & SDV, reviewed the full proposals following the criteria listed above. They then chose the proposals they were interested in funding per criteria listed above and taking into consideration their trust funds requirements. Upon selection of the proposals the teams were informed and asked to make some final edits to the selected proposals, and pick an institution with whom the contract would be made. WB, in collaboration with MDPESA started drafting ToRs for each selected proposal.</p>
<p>What was the role of MDPESA and CIGU?</p>	<p>MDP-ESA and CIGU served as a Mutual Learning Initiative Help Desk. As Help Desk MDP-ESA and CIGU facilitated the Mutual Learning by way of providing technical assistance to all projects as requested by teams, motivate the teams, connect teams to other practitioners interested in the Initiative and in PB in Sub-Sahara Africa and Latin America, and facilitated communication within and between teams during the course of the project cycle, including the provision of comments and suggestions as well as facilitating the revision of submitted drafts, making follow ups on deliverables and providing close quality control of the same deliverables, co-facilitating the organization and hosting of VC dissemination events of the teams' project results, and supplying team members and other interested parties with periodic news updates of the initiative to the teams and other interested parties. In particular in the early phases of the initiative MDPESA was much involved in coaching the teams on how the peer to peer initiative will take place and also made sure that some of the project proposals did not become too ambitious as well as helping with managing team members' expectations. Also CIGU, in particular, helped in dealing with the language problem between LAC participants and their African counterparts by way of facilitating communication between the two groups.</p>
<p>Describe the implementation of the peer to peer process. Describe all the steps until dissemination VC (teams informed, feedback on final proposals, ToRs prepared, mode of communication with teams and internally, contracts generated, disbursement schedule and management, comments on report, team</p>	<p>After the Durban Africa Participatory Budgeting was successfully concluded with the launch of the Africa-Latin America Peer to Peer Mutual Action Learning Initiative in Participatory Budgeting, the implementation of this initiative followed a systematic step by step approach until the initiative's winding up in October 2009. The first step which was immediately taken by the World Bank and MDPESA project proposals review team was to read through all the 12 submitted proposals and made their preliminary selection. At this stage it felt that only 5-6 proposals were promising, but however after further</p>

<p>incorporation of comments, tele and video conference calls, final draft report etc)</p>	<p>discussions it was felt that it makes more sense to allow all the 12 teams to further develop their proposals. A letter was therefore send to each team informing it of this result and advising it to select both the team and co-team leader for each project team amongst themselves as well as indicating the deadlines for submitting the revised proposals. To assist with the further development of each team's project proposal ideas, the template initially completed in Durban, more elaborate comments and suggestions and a more refined template that was meant to act as a guide in the proposal development process as well as the peer to peer learning participants guidelines were sent together with the letter to the teams. The letter also informed the teams the window from which the funding of their project was likely to come from and the maximum amount of funding they were going to receive from that particular window.</p> <p>The refined template which contained the guidelines for preparing the full project proposal as part of its content required teams to describe in detail the main issues or problem areas to be addressed by the proposal; outline the key objectives of the project, its justification in terms of its relevance in improving the implementation of participatory budgeting; impact and benefits, outlining key project activities in terms of project design, implementation, impact assessment, sustainability and knowledge dissemination as well as the proposal of counterpart funds to come from the teams themselves.</p> <p>Meanwhile, as the deadline for the submission of the revised project proposals was approaching, the World Bank organized a VC meeting to touch based with the MDPESA team with regards to had submitted what and what was still pending. This was a kind of planning meeting to try and come up with a detailed project proposal review strategy, discuss the next steps in terms of selecting proposals for funding, their implementation once selected and disbursement of funds. Discussions of the meeting also revolved around the anticipated challenges, for example the difficulties associated with managing communication between team members across regions, the over ambitiousness of some project proposals and problems of coaching the teams, etc. Coming up with discussion forums and ICT platforms were proposed as some of the strategies that can be put in place to mitigate some of these challenges.</p> <p>Using the guidelines/template provided by the initiative's promoters and after</p>
--	---

	<p>incorporating comments from the World Bank and MDP-ESA, teams revised their preliminary proposals to make them full proposals. 9 of the 12 teams comprising of local and national governments and CSOs from Sub-Sahara Africa and Latin America re-submitted their final proposals. The World Bank and MDP-ESA provided the 9 teams with another set of detailed comments, which the teams further incorporated and re-submitted their revised final proposals. Of the 9 re-submitted project proposals, 7 proposals were selected by the donors to be considered for funding. The selection procedure therefore involved several systematic elimination rounds of the weak templates and proposals which the project team members were either not willing to strengthen on the basis of the received comments or suggestions from the reviewers.</p> <p>For the above 7 selected project proposals, the World Bank and MDPEA review team prepared a comprehensive set of second and final round comments and suggestions that were send to the teams. These comments were split into two, viz general observations and specific comments and suggestions. Whereas general observations referred to what was observed across all the re-submitted proposals, specific comments and suggestions applied to each team project proposal only. One major weakness that was common to all the proposals was their lack of description on how the peer to peer mutual action learning plan within the confines of their proposals was going to be conducted and achieved. As a consequence one of the recommendations which offered at this stage was to request teams to include a description in their respective proposals how they planned to implement the peer to peer aspect of the proposals. The idea here was to force them to make it clearer on how exactly they were going to go about conducting and achieving this very important aspect of the initiative.</p> <p>After they have received the comments and suggestions, the teams proceed to incorporate them in their respective project proposals and re-submitted them again to MDPEA. This was followed by a teleconference between the World Bank and MDPEA project proposal reviewing team. The main objective of this meeting was to come up with an action plan for going forward with the peer to peer mutual action learning initiative. As a strategy to further force the teams to focus and narrow their revised project proposals it was agreed that a ToRs template be designed and initially get filled up by MDPEA and then later on send to teams to fill out additional information in the remain gaps. Besides clearly outlining each project proposal's objectives and impacts, the ToRs document</p>
--	--

	<p>contained a detailed budget breakdown, well defined tasks, responsibilities to be shouldered by each team member, expected outputs/products to be derived from each spelt out task, the timeframe for executing each task and the corresponding percentage of funds to be disbursed after accomplishing the task. On average, each team was expected to accomplish 3-4 tasks only. Supporting documents in the form of the CVs of all the team members were included in this ToRs document. It was also agreed that a VC meeting be scheduled in late July or early August 2008. It was also announced at this meeting that of the seven proposals, the World Bank Group was going to be in a position to initially fund four of them and the other three remained unfunded. Of the 4 project proposals that secured funding, the team working on the Revenue Generation and Participatory Budgeting Research project had already begun its implementation right away because they had a deadline to complete its implementation by June 30, 2008. The team contracted a consultant who directed the fieldwork, conducted data analysis and drafted the report.</p> <p>After the above meeting the MDPESA team member proceeded to craft the ToRs for each team, in particular clearly specifying the tasks and output/products each team was expected to work on. He then forwarded these partially completed ToRs documents to the team leaders of each project to fill out all the other remaining information gaps and to allow them to reflect on the specified ToRs and then confirm, make adjustments or refute areas they were not in agreement with. Teams were also advised to come up with detailed budget breakdowns and work plans indicating the responsibilities assigned to each team member and the corresponding resources allocated for accomplishing the assigned responsibilities.</p> <p>After the revision of the ToRs documents by all the seven teams, it was deemed fit by the promoters of the initiative to link all together through a VC meeting to update them on progress. This first meeting took place on the 8th of August 2008. Invitations to participate in this event were sent to team members and other interested parties through e-mail. The main objective of the first dissemination event was to bring together the teams from the Africa-Latin America mutual learning initiative and allow the World Bank and MDPESA to give them an update of where we were with the initiative and the way forward as a follow up to the post Durban Participatory Budgeting Seminar events.</p>
--	--

	<p>At this event the team on participatory budgeting and revenue generation which had already completed its project was also given an opportunity to present its experience in implementing the project, in particular the team's experience in hiring and using a consultant to do some of the project work, the lessons learnt and outcomes. The rest of the other team members were also given an opportunity to present their fully developed project proposals focusing mainly on; 1) the key objective of the project, 2) some quick thoughts on the design and implementation of the project, 3) what had worked well so far, what has not worked:, and 4) what would the team like more of in terms of technical assistance from the initiative's promoters.</p> <p>Correspondence between the teams and coordinators continued to take place after this first VC meeting. Whilst the three teams that had already secured funding for their projects, started to implement their projects, those that had not continue to refine their proposals and ToRs documents on the basis of comments and suggestions that were coming from the World Bank and MDPEsa review team. An additional eighty project on Participatory Budgeting Stocktaking in Brazil was also introduced during this period. As we approached the end of 2008, the Results-based Participatory Budgeting team the Participatory Budgeting Stocktaking team also managed to complete the implementation of their respective projects. The earlier completion of the participatory budgeting and revenue generation project and the latter two, prompt the initiative's promoters to call for a second VC dissemination event in March 2009.</p> <p>The second dissemination event of the 19th of March 2009 was meant to allow the three teams which had completed their projects to present their findings. These projects are:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Results-based Participatory Budgeting; Brazil Participatory Budgeting Stocktaking exercise; and Participatory Budgeting and Revenue generation.</p> <p>In each case, as was the case with the previous event, invitations to participants were sent via e-mail. The primary objective of the event was also to share the experiences and lessons learnt from the 3 implemented projects and discuss what worked and what did not in this south-south peer learning initiative. Key issues that were covered by the presenters during their presentations are:</p>
--	---

1. A brief description their project, highlighting the its design & work plan;
2. The main findings of the project;
3. The main lessons learnt from this project;
4. Giving their experience on how they think the Mutual Learning initiative can be improved & sustained.

Each presentation was followed comments, questions and suggestions by a discussant who was assigned beforehand to review each presentation. As such the organization and hosting of the event provided the team members of the three finished projects the opportunity to present their key findings and lessons learnt, whilst participants from various African and Latin American countries as well as the World Bank staff got the chance to ask questions and share their thoughts and ideas on how to improve, sustain and upscale the initiative in future.

After this meeting the other 5 teams that were still implementing their projects, intensified the exercise submitting several drafts of their products to the reviewing team. The reviewing team also in turn sending to the teams several rounds of comments and suggestions. These teams finally managed to submit their final drafts towards the end of August 2009. The logical thing to do was therefore to organize the final VC dissemination event for these five projects.

This last VC dissemination event was hosted on the 3rd of Octobers 2009. The mode of invitation and the key objective of the event were the same as the March event. Team members had also an opportunity to disseminate their results, project outcomes, and lessons learnt. The projects whose findings were presented are:

- Communication for inclusion and gender sensitivity of participatory budgeting;
- Capacity building for budget demystification;
- A pilot engagement of peer institutions in participatory budgeting across West, East and Southern Africa on government dialogue and democracy;
- Monitoring the impact of participatory on service delivery and infrastructure development; and
- Guidelines on implementing participatory budgeting step by step.

	<p>As usual, these presentations were also followed by an open discussion that is a very fruitful Question & Answer session. Coming at the end of the project cycle, this event was the last formal dissemination event of the Africa-Latin America Peer to Peer Mutual Action Learning Initiative in Participatory Budgeting.</p>
<p>How did the teams work together? What was the main mode of communication? What steps were taken by WB, MDPESA, and CIGU to facilitate team work? What issues came up?</p>	<p>In the majority of cases teams worked closely together. The main mode of communication amongst the team members and between them and initiative's promoters and coordinators was the e-mail, Video Conferencing and tele-conversations. The use of a web page to provide technical assistance to project team members and the use of blogs to facilitate to communication were put in place by MDPESA, but this arrangement was not very popular with team members. Hence use of these ICT tools was very minimal for both communication and establishment of the action support help desk, which MDPESA had initially planned for.</p>
<p>How was peer to peer learning and knowledge sharing achieved? How did the teams respond to the peer to peer partnership?</p>	<p>The teams responded very positively to the peer learning partnership. For many team members this was the first time they were participating in an activity like this. Of course, there were communication and language barriers but we encouraged the team to come up with solutions to address these difficulties. Peer learning and knowledge was achieved. Some of this was achieved with regards to content but in other situation peer learning and knowledge sharing took place about how different countries do things, what obstacles they face, etc. how these obstacles are overcome, when project payments have to be distributed among several people living in different countries how can that be done well etc</p>
<p>Describe how the results from the projects completed were disseminated? (details of activities, process followed etc)</p>	<p>Dissemination was a very important component of this initiative and it was one of the core activities during at the end of the implementation of the peer to peer learning initiative. Three VC dissemination events were carried out during the life cycle of the project. The first one was carried out on the 8th of August 2008, the second one on the 19th of March 2009 and the last one on the 3rd of October 2009. In each case invitations to participate in these events were sent to team members and other interested parties through e-mail. The main objective of the first dissemination event was to bring together the teams from the Africa-Latin America mutual learning initiative and allow the World Bank and MDPESA to give them an update of the process thus far and the way forward as a follow up to the post Durban Participatory Budgeting Seminar events. At this event the team on participatory budgeting and revenue generation which had already</p>

completed its project was also given an opportunity to present its experience in implementing the project, in particular the team's experience in hiring and using a consultant to do some of the project work, the lessons learnt and outcomes. The rest of the other team members were also given an opportunity to present their fully developed project proposals focusing mainly on; 1) the key objective of the project, 2) some quick thoughts on the design and implementation of the project, 3) what had worked well so far, and 4) what would the team like more of in terms of technical assistance from the initiative's promoters.

The second dissemination event of the 19th of March 2009 was meant to allow the three teams which had completed their projects to present their findings. These projects are:

Results-based Participatory Budgeting;
Brazil Participatory Budgeting Stocktaking exercise; and
Participatory Budgeting and Revenue generation.

In each case, as was the case with the previous event, invitations to participants were sent via e-mail. The primary objective of the event was also to share the experiences and lessons learnt from the 3 implemented projects and discuss what worked and what did not in this south-south peer learning initiative. Key issues that were covered by the presenters during their presentations are:

5. A brief description their project, highlighting the its design & work plan;
6. The main findings of the project;
7. The main lessons learnt from this project;
8. Giving their experience on how they think the Mutual Learning initiative can be improved & sustained.

Each presentation was followed comments, questions and suggestions by a discussant who was assigned beforehand to review each presentation. As such the organization and hosting of the event provided the team members of the three finished projects the opportunity to present their key findings and lessons learnt, whilst participants from various African and Latin American countries as well as the World Bank staff got the chance to ask questions and share their thoughts and ideas on how to improve, sustain and upscale the initiative in future.

	<p>The last VC dissemination event for the other 5 projects that were completed later was hosted on the 3rd of Octobers 2009. The mode of invitation and the key objective of the event were the same as the March event. Team members had also an opportunity to disseminate their results, project outcomes, and lessons learnt. The projects whose findings were presented are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication for inclusion and gender sensitivity of participatory budgeting; Capacity building for budget demystification; A pilot engagement of peer institutions in participatory budgeting across West, East and Southern Africa on government dialogue and democracy; Monitoring the impact of participatory on service delivery and infrastructure development; and Guidelines on implementing participatory budgeting step by step. <p>As usual, these presentations were also followed by an open discussion that is a very fruitful Question & Answer session. Coming at the end of the project cycle, this event was the last formal dissemination event of the Africa-Latin America Peer to Peer Mutual Action Learning Initiative in Participatory Budgeting.</p>
<p>Did the initiative work as envisaged? If it deviated from the original design, explain why, and what difference did it make to achieving the goals of the initiative?</p>	<p>In general the initiative worked as was envisaged. The only deviation that occurred is that some teams from the African region were not paired by counterpart institutions from LAC. The main reason being that they chosen areas of peer to peer learning where exclusively of interest to the African team members. In terms of achieving the initially set peer to peer learning objectives not much was lost because a very beneficial learning and exchanging ideas environment amongst the African team members did took route throughout the life cycle of the projects. The high quality of the outputs from these teams is enough testimony for this.</p>
<p>Findings and Lessons</p>	
<p>What are the main lessons learned from</p>	<p>One of the most important lessons learnt from designing the peer to peer learning initiative is that the design process out to be dynamic, so some flexibility needs to be in</p>

<p>designing the peer to peer initiative?</p>	<p>built into the process. For in the initial stages of formulating the project objectives and topics the tendency by the teams was to be overly ambitious. However, with the passage of time and proper coaching teams managed to narrow down and focus their project proposal. This was partly achieved through the systematic fine tuning each project team's ToRs. Another important lesson learnt is that using the market approach to create project teams has the advantage of bringing diversity into the project teams, it sometimes creates communication problems if a team is composed of members who use many different languages.</p>
<p>What are the main lessons learned from implementing the peer to peer initiative? (describe lessons learned with regards to working with teams, communicating with teams, processing ToRs/contracts, feedback on reports, using the web and other mediums of communication, language barriers etc)</p>	<p>From a coordinator's perspective, working with so many people from two different continents with diverse cultural backgrounds and working on different aspects of participatory budgeting which they all have different levels of understanding requires a lot of patience and the continuous nurturing of team spirit in order to main team cohesion. In this case smooth communication and some bit of conflict management and resolution skills become very important prerequisites for the coordination effort to be effective. In particular to be effective in communication, the use of multi-channels helps. With the latter the use of the e-mailing systems, telephones and VC contributed to the success registered in coordinating the initiative. Also another important lesson learnt from working with project teams on such demanding initiatives, does not only require the coordinator(s) to be the chief referee, a good project team leader also makes a difference when it comes to the speed with which implementation progress and the resultant quality of the outputs. Like the coordinator, the project team leader must be a good communicator with the ability to properly assign tasks and responsibilities to each team member and effectively make some follow ups on the deliverables. Finally, timely feedback by way of comments and suggestions on submitted draft outputs by the teams also helps to captivate them thereby remaining focused on the implementation of the projects.</p>
<p>What were the main issues confronted by WB, MDPESA, CIGU when implementing the initiative?</p>	<p>One aspect that almost killed the enthusiasm of some project team members and proved to be a headache for the promoters of the initiative was the delay in securing funding for some of the projects, although this was finally solved. The other important issue was dealing with the language barrier that posed as a drag on the implementation of some of the projects. In some instances this resulted in a major communication breakdown and hence slowing down the effective participation of some team members. CIGU, however, played an important role in facilitating the communication process between team members in situations where the language problem threatened the smooth</p>

	implementation of the initiative.
What were the main things WB, MDPESA, and CIGU found most interesting about designing and implementing the peer to peer process?	The high degree of professionalism and dedication to the initiative by some of the project team leaders and their team members. Although the implementation process drag on for a long time the teams remained committed and succeeded in delivering high quality outputs. Monetary rewards indeed became of secondary importance for the teams in religiously implementing their respective projects.
What were the main highlights of working with the teams from both Latin America and the African Continent?	What I enjoyed most was the instant feedback from teams when you did sent them comments and suggestions. In most cases these were religiously addressed which in a way contributed immensely to high quality of the outputs. Also the VC dissemination events displayed the high degree of professionalisms from the teams in presenting their key findings. The mere fact that you could connect more than fifteen centres through VC and bring together more than 40 people to participate in these meetings was highly fulfilling.
What are the strengths and weaknesses of this initiative? Designing, implementing, disseminating?	One of the major strength of this initiative is its on job learning characteristic which allows the participant to directly apply the acquired knowledge to problem solving even before the full life cycle of the project is completed. In other words the whole implementation process of the initiative is action-oriented. On the other hand, a major weakness of this kind of peer to peer learning is that use of such communication modes like e-mailing, telephoning and blogging; are not good substitutes for face to face interaction where body talk can also convey very important learning messages. Virtual communication can, however, be made effective but more resources, technical resources, and non-technical resources have to go into it. If we had collaborated with the WBI Learning Specialists from the onset then we may have been able to address some of these challenges. Virtual communication is becoming more and more important in this day and age when there is so much to learn from peers but little resources for travel, especially if they are large number. Consequently, for future replication it is imperative to bring on aboard a multi-media team and e-learning/knowledge exchange team who can help set up a sustainable infrastructure for learning, knowledge sharing and communication.
If this initiative were to be scaled up or replicated what would you change/alter?	One major area of change will be a shift from the sole reliance on using the market approach in the formation of project teams to the use of regional clusters to select project teams. Africa is a very huge continent with many people of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Thus generating teams along regional clusters and then pairing them with selected team mates from LAC would create a better learning environment given the fact that in most cases African team members coming from a particular region tend to share similar problems, cultural backgrounds and regional affinity. In addition, it would be

	<p>helpful to combine the Market approach based on topic with regional clusters, this would enhance focus and also help facilitate better & more effective communication. In particular, coordination at the team level will also tend to become much easier since the much needed trust to make such initiatives work will not be difficult to establish and the distribution of resources to implement the initiatives will also not generate a lot of conflict.</p>
How can this initiative be made more sustainable?	<p>These kinds of initiatives must generate immediate noticeable benefits to the team members, particularly since they are designed to contribute to immediate problem solving at the workplace. If such positive quick returns are registered participating team members are bound to be tempted to sell the idea to larger local audience and strive to raise additional resources to up scale the initiative. Another important fact, but also closely related to the latter that team members should be really practitioners whose quest for new knowledge through peer to peer learning cannot be doubted. As potential change agents at their work place they will always be prepared to carry on with this kind of learning even in the absence of a huge amount of resources which this kind initiative tends to require.</p>
What was the response/reaction by World Bank Staff, and other external practitioners to the peer to peer mutual learning initiative on PB?	<p>World Bank Staff were very intrigued by this organic, demand-driven approach to peer learning. There were many persons who did not understand the process initially and were also a little skeptical of how a dissemination event between so many different countries can be moderated, and how can people from so many different countries and backgrounds work on one project. Upon attending the first dissemination event and reading initial drafts of the draft reports most people were surprised at how LAC-Africa cross-learning worked. Many lessons were learned from this process – what not to do if such a process is to be replicated but overall it was found that since the team members had identified their project from the onset they remained motivated to a) work on the project, b) follow-up, c) finish the project.</p>