



**IMPROVING LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY FOR
THE MDGs IN ASIA:
*PILOT OF METHODOLOGY FOR SUPPORT TO
NATIONAL POLICY AND MDG STRATEGIES***

**- TECHNICAL WORKSHOP-
15-17 OCTOBER 2007 –
AMARI WATERGATE HOTEL
BANGKOK**

WORKSHOP REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The technical consultation with the purpose to present and finalize a UNCDF-UNICEF-UNDP proposed Methodology for a study of what it takes to establish appropriate sectoral decentralization policy frameworks in order to improve local delivery of MDG based public services, was held October 15-17, 2007 in Bangkok. The Methodology was presented to teams consisting of policy-makers engaged in developing policies for local service delivery, selected research institutes, and UN representatives, from Cambodia, India, Mongolia, Philippines and Thailand.

The workshop was organized by UNICEF East-Asia Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO), UNCDF, and UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok.

The agenda and the participants list are included in Annex I and II, respectively.

2. BRIEF BACKGROUND TO INITIATIVE

Although the countries of Asia have made impressive progress in poverty reduction, much more is needed in order to achieve the MDGs. While there is a general agreement that a large part of basic public services are most effectively and efficiently delivered through decentralised arrangements, more attention needs to be paid to the policy and practical challenges surrounding the role of local governments in managing basic service delivery.

Each service sector has its own technical, institutional and financing characteristics. And within each sector, the delivery of any particular service involves an intergovernmental dimension of functions and complex financing arrangements, surrounding the different roles and responsibilities. In addition, non-state actors (formal and informal private sector, CBOs, NGOs, and religious organisations) also deliver local public services to various extents in a context of regulatory vacuums. To draw on and make the most of their engagement, both national and sub-national governments need to further review functions and roles and responsibilities so that non-state actors can effectively engage in the delivery of services.

A joint UNDP, UNCDF and UNICEF initiative has been developed aiming to broaden and inform national policy processes and to contribute to increasing regional awareness of what it takes to establish appropriate sectoral decentralization policy frameworks to improve local delivery of basic MDG-related services such as primary education, health and water, especially in the rural areas and to the most vulnerable groups.

In order to address the above issues, a Methodology has been designed that will guide sector studies to analyze divisions of responsibilities, roles and functions between central and sub-national levels of government for selected basic social services and their delivery in both direct public and regulated private provision contexts, and arrangements for the financing of these functions. They will identify key sectoral issues, compare best

practices and propose recommendations on appropriate distributions of responsibilities between national and sub-national levels and sub-national financing arrangements for the studied sectors.

This objective will be achieved through research in five countries (Cambodia, India, Mongolia, Philippines, and Thailand) and policy consultation activities with government stakeholders.

3. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the workshop was to present to policy-makers engaged in developing policies for local service delivery and country teams in the selected five countries the proposed Methodology that will operationalize the country exercises, and initiate a process of discussion and fine-tuning. It is also meant to provide a platform to discuss the evolution of the proposed initiative's activities and any other substantive and methodological issues arising.

This effort is also envisaged help to form or strengthen relationships among the various actors interested in both local service delivery and local government reform both within and across countries.

Expected Outcomes

- A pilot methodology is developed and tested with inputs from policy makers in the five participating countries, UN Country teams, Consultative Group and other resources.
- Participants explore the opportunities that a five country study provides for sharing experiences and understand the support to be derived from the UN Team.
- Agreement on priority activities for 2007/08 in five countries, with UN Teams/Consultative Group backstopping implications

Expected Outputs

- Suggestions list, prioritized, for improvements in the piloting methodology, covering partnership dynamics, selection of sectors/services, approach to diagnostic work, use of Concept Notes, schedule of activities and any other aspect deemed relevant.
- Agreed time frame (or principles that affect timing) that should guide the implementation of the piloting in all countries.
- List of priority activities for 2007/08 in five countries, with support to be provided by the UN Team/Consultative Group for each item.
- Agreed ways of communicating for best results, between all actors.

Suggested Participants

- One government representative concerned with the selected services (Health, Education, and possibly others) or from Coordinating Ministries (LG, Planning, Finance, Civil Service) from each of the selected countries

- National Research Institute representatives selected to carry out the country exercises; from the 5 selected countries
- One UN Country Team representative from each country
- Members of the Consultative Group/Sectoral experts
- Other concerned UN and donor agency staff.

4. PROCESS

On the first day of the meeting country teams were requested to prepare presentations of the status of decentralization in their countries, followed by discussions. The second day of the meeting was devoted to sectoral group work. Participants were divided into three key sector groups (water, health and education) according to their expertise and preference. Within groups they discussed country sectoral experience and worked on contextualizing and fine-tuning the sectoral methodologies. On the third day of the workshop participants returned to their country teams and discussed the strategies for taking the initiative forward in their countries, including concrete next steps on developing the national research and consultative processes.

This report focuses on conclusions coming out of the discussions and agreements reached on next steps/way forward. For additional information please visit the [Initiative website](#).

5. WORKSHOP SUMMARY

DAY 1

SESSION I: INTRODUCTION

- 1) The objective of this session was to introduce the participants and their expectations of the meeting, and to briefly overview the history of the initiative and its rationale:
 - Initial discussions prompted questions on how the proposed study should best be embedded in a policy consultation process and how countries should engage in such process; substantive clarifications on the focus of the methodology (e.g. improving supply vs. demand of service delivery); and how the national processes will be linked with the regional objective to produce a comparative study of the country processes.
- 2) The session also introduced key concepts in decentralizing service delivery surrounding the assignment of inter-governmental roles & functions, and financing (as the two main problem areas that need to be addressed in the proposed methodology), and a list of key issues to be explored in the two areas in order to 'unbundle' each sector/service. This included consideration for the role of non-state actors and private funding in service delivery.
- 3) The presentation by the representative of the Rural Development Planning Commission of the Government of India provided the example of the experience with the ongoing sectoral activity mapping exercise and highlighted some of the main issues and challenges a country of India's complex federal structure and size faces

in efforts to decentralize its service delivery. These include the policy focus in India on the district level of sub-national governance; the political economy constraints of transferring functions and finances to the district level highlighting the problem that India is one of the least fiscally decentralized countries in the world; the overlaps of the various responsible ministerial bodies and the challenge to avoid replicating such structure at the sub-national level and need to not only look at the sectoral contexts of decentralizing services but also the inter-ministerial dimension of the central government bodies responsible for coordinating these services.

SESSION II: COUNTRY PRESENTATIONS

This session was devoted to country team presentations on the status of decentralization in each country, its context and history, the extent of decentralization, sectoral challenges and innovations, and relevance and status of the research project in that context.

Following are highlights of the questions and answers session that followed each country presentation:

Cambodia

- Legal system: national, provincial, and district system of deconcentration with all functions assigned from the national level. The government has only delegated power at the level of Commune.
- Roles and responsibilities of sub-national government in Cambodia still need to be defined. Currently the organic law is being drafted and there are 3 inter-ministerial teams starting to define these responsibilities with focus on how each level will contribute to social service delivery.
- The procurement and sectoral functions of Communes: funds are provided to communes, who are responsible for managing the funds and following the guidelines provided by the national committee (there are also sectoral or provincial guidelines depending upon the issue).
- Standards were developed to set some norms with respect to measuring service delivery which local governments would monitor.
- Cambodia has undertaken a Study on Local Service Delivery at Commune Level. Some experience with this study: buy-in for this study from the Ministries was a challenge: the decentralization reforms were new and the research team had little political clout to address the ministries; costing was seen as necessary, in order to confirm that decentralization is cost neutral.

Mongolia

- Before the transition, there was no tax sharing system in Mongolia. Enterprise taxes were collected to the central budget line, such as copper mining. With the introduction of public sector finance law, this was recentralized.
- The mechanism by which tax revenues are shared is centralized, -it collects from local governments and then reallocates.
- China was permitted to retain an increasing share of local government tax collection. It went so far, it was recentralized in 1994.

Philippines

- The fact that the health sector has devolved more responsibilities than education is a political issue. Teachers count the votes, so there was a fear that if teachers were transferred to local government, the voting system would be affected.
- Donors have been influence the decentralization process in the Philippines for a long time. Their help is both positive and negative. In health, donors are working on convergence sites and the result is positive. Government is agenda setting with donors more than it used to.
- Should vaccinations be devolved or not? It is okay to devolve service delivery, but not for funding, due to externality issues. When the national government was pinched for funds, it gave responsibility for public health issues to the local level. Central government cannot afford to be totally out of public health.
- What is "equal sharing"? It means that if there are 100 cities, a portion of the share (say 25%) is simply divided amongst all those cities. It gives an incentive to municipalities to demand the status of a "city."
- In the financial area, there is the costing process. Is it necessary to do this detailed costing for this study or looking at the revenue flows? In Philippines, there is national-level costing for the MDGs, but it is important for local level costing, particularly when the local level provides the service.
- Who can conduct water pricing? Local government? This is still a policy development area. It is a complex sector, even in terms of delivery. There is a quasi-private body at the local level, a local government enterprise (which covers maintenance), and the third is a fully privatized venture, usually in urban centers. At the village level, water is managed by communities in most cases. Fees collected are just enough to maintain the system. The government just recently passed a water act.

Thailand

- Are the resources collected locally underutilized? Looking at the local conditions, while there is revenue available, the incentives discourage revenue raised locally. We need a good data base in our revenue transfer formula, but the availability of the data base is one of key challenges for Thailand.
- How are social services distorted by local government? Local government is responsible to distribute the pension fund, for example. Local politicians use the fund to distribute to everyone over 60 years old, so people think the money is given by the politicians. There are many examples of this.

DAY 2

SESSION III: SECTORAL GROUP WORK

Participants were divided into sectoral groups (health, water, education). With the help of assigned recorder, presenter and chairperson, breakout sectoral group drawing on the group's collective experience had the following tasks:

- Share sectoral decentralization experience.
- Review the draft sectoral methodology together.
- Revise the sectoral methodology.

Some conclusions drawn from the discussions apply to all three sectoral groups:

- There is a need to define and agree on common terms (e.g. primary v elementary education; (rural) water supply vs. water irrigation, sanitation, etc).
- There will be a comparative synthesis of the sectoral studies.
- When approaching ministries, there may need to be an inter-sectoral approach (don't approach the same ministry on two different occasions for the same information – sector groups need to work together). There will be cases where there is one sector but many ministries.
- Gender dimension should be applied to the extent possible.
- Some templates would be useful.
- Are the interview protocols necessary? Not all countries will be doing field research, in fact most will not be. The more the countries are given at the outset, the greater opportunity for synthesis at the regional level. There might be a need for a template on questions for e.g. teachers; headmaster (in Education sector).
- A list of steps to follow could be helpful so that research teams are following the same logical flow. It may be good to have a set of questions regarding whether a service is well-placed at a particular level. Definitions of functions are also important and distinction between those that are mandated or permissive.
- There needs to be a glossary, a defined list of terms that goes across the country studies, especially with respect to finance terminology.
- On the other hand, in some areas, the countries may need to provide definitions so that comparisons make sense across countries.
- The study however needs to go beyond the templates to a methodology.
- There is a need for the project management team to ensure sharing information between the studies; travel to the selected countries may be necessary.
- Attention should be given to the private sector.
- A regional/geographic breakdown of effect of decentralization on service delivery capturing regional disparities would be useful.

Education Sector Group Work Recording

The group spent the morning session discussing the situation in each country, and the afternoon session on fine-tuning the Education Sector Methodology.

Brief Country overviews:

Thailand

- Education is decentralized, but not fully (in fact less than 10%) – only 150 schools are under the management of the subdistrict level. They have a good ability to respond to urgent needs.
- Local administration has limited capacity to perform at subdistrict level due to lack of trust from teachers.
- There is a lack of effective information systems and data.
- A high percentage of budget (80%) goes to teacher salaries.
- Lack of teachers in rural or hardship areas; low student test scores in rural or hardship areas.
- Central government takes care of local school management via provincial officers. Recruitment is centralized, but recruitment and some teacher training is now done at the regional level. School maintenance is centralized. Education is decentralized to region but not province. All schools under the MoE will be transferred to the Ministry of Interior (MoI).
- There is no job security if the subdistrict controls the teachers. Subdistricts hire preschool teachers (called caretakers).
- The central government allows 30% of the curriculum to be determined locally although this is not normally exercised locally.
- Some preschools are managed by MoE and some by MoI. While they use the same curriculum, the quality is different. Private schools register with MoE. School standards are controlled by MoE regulation and external (non-MoE) auditing system.

Philippines

Policy

- Early Child Care and Development is provided by law – 34% survival – LG finance
- Primary education (compulsory) 69% survival – CG finance.
- Secondary education not compulsory but free – 40% survival – CG finance.
- Tertiary – 14% survival.
- Non-state provided schools are managed, monitored, and reported differently than governmental schools.

Financing

- SEF is 1% of real property values.
- SEF revenues are greater than Department of Education revenues.
- For many services, local governments *are allowed* to do service provision but are not *mandated* to do so.
- Allocation of school building is population based, but has nothing to do with outcomes. This is a problem.

Issues

- Demography - 3.2 fertility rate
- Financing – is the allocation adequate and appropriate?

- Impact – Declining participation rate and achievement rate, but sometimes government schools are performing better than private schools.
- Education reforms are being proposed now.
- Increasing demand for ICT. The question is “is this a wise investment?”
- How do you reach out to disadvantaged children?

Cambodia

- There are central level and commune councils (CC) (usually made up of 9 villages) but no districts in Cambodia. There has only been subnational government in Cambodia since 2002.
- Local administrative law recognizes CC, but doesn't assign any formal delineated responsibilities of CC for education. Their capacity is certainly at issue.
- Teacher absenteeism is a problem particularly in rural areas. Salaries are below the living wage, so students are asked to top up fees.
- CCs are currently monitoring school enrollment and dropout rates. Although not mandated to do so, CCs have taken on this role. They have to report these figures to the Mol. Village chiefs are paid to collect this data. There is follow up to get non-enrolled kids in schools.
- Data role – provide right school age to the school directors to allow school mapping
- Part of the local school support committees (an attempt to involve parents in school performance). Communes don't have a very clear role right now on these committees.
- Community Preschools (4- 5-year-olds) – there are state run ones and CC ones. They have been given responsibility to manage this. They organize money collection to buy land, monitor the school, etc. State and CC preschools have the same curriculum.
- CC schools have to report up to the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports, the Mol, and the Ministry of Women's Affairs. This is a mess and doesn't work. The performance of the state schools is better because the teachers are properly trained, but CC schools are filling a vial need.
- CCs could have much more of a role in school maintenance and management.
- At commune level, 96% of the development budget is spent on roads. Social sector spending needs to increase to 30%.
- Cambodia team wants to use this study to look at health and education to galvanize issues with Mol in order to avoid 2 parallel processes.

India

- Central Ministry of Human Resource development covers education.
- SSA is funded from this level.
- There is a great deal of discourse about the quality of SSA investments.
- 85% of education expenditure is at the state level and it is primarily on teacher salaries.
- There is a separate directorate at the state level for SSA to drive public investment and paying salaries.
- India now has a universal enrollment in primary education.
- In the 1990s, the fiscal deficit was 8% so teacher hiring was frozen. Now regular teachers are being hired in large numbers. When there was a teacher deficit, parateachers were hired. They are paid 1/3 of the salary of regular teachers. Parateachers are hired locally, so teacher absenteeism has not been as big of an

issue with them. The cadre to which teachers will now be hired is now at issue. Regular teachers are hired to the state cadre and wish to be hired to this cadre because it allows them to remain in urban centers. With very many teachers being hired right now, it is better to hire them to district cadres.

Summary

Based on these insights the group concluded that the Methodology must consider the following:

- There are multiple institutional arrangements. It is not just the MoE, but also MoI or other agencies. These cause confusion.
- The key matrix provided in the Methodology is useful for mapping out these issues
- There are capacity implications for personnel that need to be considered.
- There is a lack of consistency between functional assignments and finances in all the countries.
- Role of private sector (non-state) is not represented in the data and not supervised to formal education authorities. This needs to be included in the research methodology.
- Quality considerations – there are improvements in some countries in some areas, but decreases in quality in other areas.
- Adequacy and allocation of funds.

Water Sector Group Work Recording

The water sector group concentrated on refining the Water Methodology and agreed on the following:

- The focus should be on safe drinking water rather than the whole water sector (including irrigation etc.)
- The objective is to dissect the sector in order to identify what is upsetting delivery of drinking water to the population and reaching the poor.
- Conceptual clarity is needed: ultimate goal is actual service delivery not decentralization per se.
- Capacity framework in the water sector should be considered
- Cross-sectoral issues because of the linkages with education, health, livelihoods, employment etc.

Health Sector Group Work

This group worked directly on refining the Health Methodology.

Health Sector Methodology will only be applied in the Philippines. It will be finalized by the Philippines country team and made available to the workshop participants.

SESSION IV: COUNTRY GROUP DISCUSSIONS

This session allowed the country teams to reflect the sectoral group discussion findings in their country contexts and initiate discussions on how they foresee the research processes to develop in their countries. Some key issues that guided these discussions are: launching the piloting; developing the national research process and sectoral methodologies; communication strategy; work planning for 2007/2008; UN Team/Consultative Group support/needs; roles of key actors and communication. Each country team presented their vision of how to move the process forward in their country.

Key decisions made in terms of selection of sectors are:

- Cambodia: will focus on education initially but will use this study to galvanize issues with the relevant government partners in health sector as well, in order to avoid building parallel processes.
- India: yet to be decided. With the focus on district level planning, the methodology will have to be substantially altered to capture such focus. Follow-up discussions with UN Country Teams and Government partners will be held after the workshop.
- Mongolia: will focus on the rural water sector and specifically on drinking water supply
- Philippines: will undertake a comprehensive study of all three sectors, water, education and health.
- Thailand: will focus on the education sector, including primary and pre-school education.

SESSION V: NEXT STEPS

This session served as a platform to agree on how the country processes will move ahead based on the decisions made amongst country teams and UN project management team.

The following are the key decisions taken:

Timeframe

- UN Regional Offices will:
 - Produce the Workshop Report (November 5, 2007), to be shared by country teams with other relevant stakeholder in their countries.
 - Finalize the sectoral Methodologies based on the country teams and sectoral resource persons' inputs at the workshop.
 - Water Methodology to be completed by November 5, 2007
 - Education Methodology to be completed by November 12, 2007

- Health Methodology to be finalized by the Philippines country team and integrated in the country's research process
- Country teams will:
 - Select national partners in the 4th quarter of 2007
 - Hold Steering Committee meeting in the 4th quarter of 2007
 - Finalize the research design in the 4th quarter of 2007
 - Produce a research interim progress report – March 2008
 - Produce a final draft of the study –August 2008

Funding

- \$ 20,000 of regional funding is available per country, including international support as necessary.
- There are strong possibilities of augmenting those funds at the regional level, as well co-funding through the ongoing relevant national programmes. Other resource mobilization possibilities will be explored with interested donors.

Support of the UN Regional Offices

- The UN regional project management team has a continued key role to play in a) coordinating the progress of the country processes, and b) ensuring communication flow between countries as they progress.
- UN regional office will provide technical support through referring international resource persons; reviewing the TORs; backstopping the country processes and providing substantive input as required.
- Regional consultative group members will also be available for technical inputs related to the sectoral issues, as well as gender dimension, as necessary.
- Information flow will be ensured through the existing mailing list. The possibility of a portal for the initiative will be explored. The existing [website](#) will be maintained and operationalised as the knowledge database for all key documents emerging from the initiative.

Annex I



**Improving Local Service Delivery for the MDGs in Asia:
Pilot of Methodology for Support to National Policy and MDG Strategies
- Technical Workshop-
15-17 October 2007 – Amari Watergate Hotel, Bangkok**

Background

Despite the impressive progress countries of Asia have made in poverty reduction, their achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) remains far from assured. The challenge to deliver the key MDG-related services such as primary education, health and water continues to be formidable, and not well documented.

Although there is a general agreement that a large part of basic public services are most effectively and efficiently delivered through decentralised arrangements, more attention needs to be paid to the policy and practical challenges of managing local service delivery and the finance arrangements. Each service sector has its own technical, institutional and financing characteristics. And within each sector, the delivery of any particular service involves an intergovernmental dimension of functions and complex financing arrangements, surrounding the different roles and responsibilities. In addition, non-state actors (formal and informal private sector, CBOs, NGOs, and religious organisations) also deliver local public services to various extents in a context of regulatory vacuums. To draw on and make the most of their engagement, both national and sub-national governments need to further review functions and roles and responsibilities so that non-state actors can effectively engage in the delivery of services.

In order to address these issues, a joint UNDP, UNCDF and UNICEF initiative has been developed aiming to broaden and inform national policy processes and to contribute to increasing regional awareness of what it takes to establish appropriate sectoral decentralization policy frameworks to improve local delivery of particular public services in order to achieve the MDGs. In more concrete terms, sector studies will be carried out to analyze divisions of responsibilities, roles and functions between central and sub-national levels of government for selected basic social services and their delivery in both direct public and regulated private provision contexts, and arrangements for the financing of these functions. They will identify key sectoral issues, compare best practices and propose recommendations on appropriate distributions of responsibilities between national and sub-national levels and appropriate sub-national financing arrangements for the studied sectors.

This objective will be achieved through research in five countries (Cambodia, India, Mongolia, Philippines, and Thailand) along with policy consultation activities with government stakeholders and a Pilot Methodology to be applied in key MDG sectors (education, health and HIV/AIDS).

Purpose

The purpose of the workshop is to present to policy-makers engaged in developing policies for local service delivery and country teams in the selected five countries the proposed Methodology that will operationalize the country exercises, and initiate a process of discussion and fine-tuning. It is also meant to provide a platform to discuss the evolution of the proposed initiative's activities and any other substantive and methodological issues arising.

This effort is also envisaged help to form or strengthen relationships among the various actors interested in both local service delivery and local government reform both within and across countries.

Expected Outcomes

- A pilot methodology is developed and tested with inputs from policy makers in the five participating countries, UN Country teams, Consultative Group and other resources.
- Participants explore the opportunities that a five country study provides for sharing experiences and understand the support to be derived from the UN Team.
- Agreement on priority activities for 2007 in five countries, with UN Teams/Consultative Group backstopping implications

Expected Outputs

- Suggestions list, prioritized, for improvements in the piloting methodology, covering partnership dynamics, selection of sectors/services, approach to diagnostic work, use of Concept Notes, schedule of activities and any other aspect deemed relevant.
- Agreed time frame (or principles that affect timing) that should guide the implementation of the piloting in all countries.
- List of priority activities for 2007 in five countries, with support to be provided by the UN Team/Consultative Group for each item.
- Agreed ways of communicating for best results, between all actors.

Suggested Participants

- One government representative concerned with the selected services (Health, Education, and possibly others) or from Coordinating Ministries (LG, Planning, Finance, Civil Service) from each of the selected countries
- National Research Institute representatives selected to carry out the country exercises; from the 5 selected countries
- One UN Country Team representative from each country
- Members of the Consultative Group/Sectoral experts
- Other concerned UN and donor agency staff.

Workshop Agenda

Day 1, 15 October

Session 1

Chair: *Dr. Chantararat Pakamas, Policy and Strategy Bureau Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, Thailand*

- 9.00-9.15 Introduction of participants
Welcome remarks
Marcia V.J. Kran, Deputy Regional Director of UNDP
- 9.15-9.45 Participant expectations
Facilitator: *Suzanne Bond Hinsz, Consultant*
- 9.45-10.15 Rationale of the regional initiative
Henrik Larsen, Regional Adviser on Local Governance and Decentralization, UNDP RCB
Mahesh Patel, UNICEF Regional Adviser - Social Policy and Economic Analysis
- 10.15-10.45 Coffee/tea break
- 10.45-12.00 Presentation: Decentralizing Service Delivery
Roger Shotton, UNCDF Regional Technical Adviser
Discussion
- 12.00-12.30 Presentation: Why India is doing sectoral activity mapping
Dr. Santosh Mehrotra; Senior Consultant and Adviser, Rural Development Planning Commission, Government of India
- 12.30-13.30 Lunch
- Country Presentations, Session 2**
Chair: *Under Secretary Mr. Austere Panadero, Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), Philippines*
- 13.30-15.00 Country team presentations: Cambodia, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand
Status of decentralization in the country: context and history, extent of decentralization, sectoral challenges and innovations, and status of the research project (15-minute presentations followed by 15 minutes of discussion)
- 15.00-15.30 Coffee/tea break
- 15.30-17.00 Country team presentations continued
- 17.00-17.30 Introduction to sectoral research methodology
Mahesh Patel

Day 2, 16 October

Sectoral Group work, Session 3

Chair: *Dr. Basandorj Davaa, Director of Research and Training Centre, Institute of Water Resource and Management, Mongolia*

- 9.00-9.15 Introduction to day 2: group work instructions
Mahesh Patel
- 9.15-10.30 Breakout in sectoral group discussions, brief presentations of country sectoral experiences, begin work on developing sectoral research protocol
- 10.30-11.00 Coffee/tea break
- 11.30-12.00 Sectoral group presentations: Debrief on progress of group discussions and experience exchange
5-minute presentations followed by 5 minutes of discussion for each group
- 12.00-13.00 Lunch
- 13.00 – 15.00 Sectoral group discussions on research protocol
- 15.00 – 15.30 Coffee/tea break
- 15.30 – 17.00 Sectoral group presentations to plenary on draft sectoral research protocol
10-minute presentations followed by 20 minutes of comments from expert panel and plenary
Expert Panel: *Sanyajit Singh, Expert on Water Decentralization; Cliff Meyers, Education Adviser, UNICEF EAPRO; Dr. Rosario Manasan, Research Fellow, Philippine Institute of Developmental Studies*

Day 3, 17 October

Session 4

Chair: *Dr. Santosh Mehrotra; Senior Consultant and Adviser, Rural Development Planning Commission, Government of India*

- 9.00 – 9.15 Introduction to the day
Henrik Larsen, Regional Adviser, UNDP
- 9.15 – 10.15 Sectoral groups continued
Refining sectoral methodology according to lessons learned from other groups and the day 2 panel's comments
- 10.15-10.30 Coffee/tea break
- 10.30 – 12.30 Country team group work: Next steps
Launching the piloting; developing the national research process and sectoral methodologies; communication strategy; work planning for 2007/2008; UN Team/Consultative Group support/needs; roles of key actors

12.30-13.30 Lunch

Next steps, Session 5

Chair: *H.E. Leng Vy Deputy Director General, Department of Local Administration, Ministry of Interior, Cambodia*

13.30-15.00 Country presentations of next steps (5-minute presentation followed by 10 minutes of discussion for each country)

15.00-15.30 Coffee/tea break

15.30-16.00 Wrap up: Next steps, expectations

Panel: *Project Management Team*

Discussion

16.00 Closure

Richard Bridle, Deputy Regional Director of UNICEF

PARTICIPANTS LIST: LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY FOR THE MDGs

No	Name	Title/Organisation	Email Address
Cambodia			
21	Somchai Yensabai	Programme Manager, Governance Unit, UNDP	somchai.yensabai@undp.org
22	Dr. Suwan Pintanon	Legislative Officer, Department of Personnel, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport Local Planning & Budget, Department of Local Administration	n_angkearoth@yahoo.com suwan@thaicaladmin.go.th
23	Kwunshewa Wannapintu	Educational Officer, Ministry of Education	kwunshew@hotmail.com
24	H.F. Leng Vy Chayanit Wangdee	Deputy Director General, Department of Local Administration, Ministry of Social Policy Analysis Assistant, UNICEF	dola.vv@online.com.kh cwangdee@unicef.org
Resource Persons			
25	Rita Kees Saryajit Singh	Water, Community Action for Child Rights, UNICEF Water expert	reesw@unicef.org ssinghrai@gmail.com
26	Jacinta Barrins Suzanne Bond Hinsz	Decentralization advisor, UNDP Consultant	jacinta.barrins@undp.org szuzanne@isra.ir
UNICEF EAPRO			
India			
27	Richard Bridle	Deputy Regional Director	rbridle@unicef.org
28	Santosh Mehrotra	Head Rural Development, Planning Commission	santosh.mehrotra@nic.in
29	Maresh Patel	Regional Advisor, Social Policy	mipatel@unicef.org
29	Sural Kumar	Programme Officer, UNDP	sural.kumar@undp.org
29	Mark Henderson	Regional Advisor, Water and Sanitation	mhenderson@unicef.org
Mongolia			
30	Cliff Meyers	Regional Advisor, Education	cmeyers@unicef.org
31	Dr. Basandori Davaa Wing-Sie Cheng	Director of Research and Training Centre, Institute of Water Resource and Management Regional Advisor, HIV/AIDS	basandoreen@mongol.net wcheng@unicef.org
32	Steve Atwood	Regional Advisor, Health, Nutrition and Water	satwood@unicef.org
33	Zhaihayar Zensunyadar	Deputy Director of the Water Authority, Ministry of Nature and Environment	zhaihayar@water.mn
34	Daranee Boonyasopon	Social Policy and Economic Analysis Assistant	dboonyasopon@unicef.org
Regional Centre in Bangkok (UNDP/UNCDF)			
35	Marsia Kran	Deputy Manager, Regional Centre, UNDP Bangkok	marsia.kran@undp.org
36	Henrik Fredborg Larsen	Policy Advisor, Decentralization, UNDP	henrik.larsen@undp.org
37	B. Ganzorig Roger Shotton	Cabinet Secretariat, Department of Central Government Administration Regional Technical Advisor, UNCDF Asia	ganzorig@pms.pms.gov.mn roger.shotton@undp.org
38	Dejana Popic	Programme Specialist, Decentralization, UNDP	dejana.popic@undp.org
Nepal			
39	Batdelger Luuzan	PPPSD Policy Specialist	batdelger.luuzan@undp.org
39	Mariana Stirbu	Project Officer, Social Policy, UNICEF ROSA	mstirbu@unicef.org
40	Niloy Banerjee	Capacity Development Advisor	niloy.banerjee@undp.org
Philippines			
41	Roohi Metcalfe	Gender and Governance Specialist	roohi.metcalfe@undp.org
42	Under Secretary Austere Panadero	Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG)	apanadero@dilg.gov.ph
42	Ashley Palmer	Capacity Development Consultant	Ashley.palmer@undp.org
43	Dr. Rosario Manasan	Research Fellow, Philippine Institute of Developmental Studies	rosmasan@yahoo.com
43	Dr. Kullawan Arphasirrat	Programme Assistant	kullawan.arphasirrat@undp.org
43	Wilfredo Nisam	Chief, PID Section, UNICEF	wfnisam@unicef.org
UNESCO			
44	Labu Abu-Duhou Chantarat Pakamas	Senior Advisor, Education Policy and Reform Policy & Strategy Bureau Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education	Labu.duhou@unescothkk.org chantarat@neumsa.com
18	Dr. Sakon Varunyuwattana	Associate Professor, Thammasat University	sakon227@yahoo.com
19	Dr. Duangmanee Laovakul	Assistant Professor, Thammasat University	duangmanee@econ.ac.th
20	Dr. Pongthorn Wrasai	Lecturer, Thammasat University	pwrasai@gmail.com

