

May 2019

Citizen Engagement: An Independent Review of the World Bank's Commitments in Mozambique

Ha Le, Rachel Nadelman, Anjali Sah, and Ian Evans



Produced as part of:



About Accountability Research Center (ARC)

The Accountability Research Center (ARC) is an action-research incubator based in the School of International Service at American University. ARC partners with civil society organizations and policy reformers in the global South to improve research and practice in the field of transparency, participation and accountability.

For more information about ARC, please visit the website: www.accountabilityresearch.org.

About Action for Empowerment and Accountability (A4EA) Research Programme

In a world shaped by rapid change, the Action for Empowerment and Accountability (A4EA) research programme focuses on fragile, conflict and violent (FCV) settings to ask how social and political action for empowerment and accountability emerges in these contexts, what pathways it takes, and what impacts it has.

A4EA is implemented by a consortium consisting of the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), the Accountability Research Center (ARC), the Collective for Social Science Research (CSSR), the Institute of Development and Economic Alternatives (IDEAS), Itad, Oxfam GB, and the Partnership for African Social and Governance Research (PASGR). Research focuses on five countries: Egypt, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nigeria and Pakistan. A4EA is funded by aid from the UK government. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the funder.

About ARC Publications

ARC publications serve as a platform for accountability strategists and researchers to share their experiences and insights with diverse readers and potential allies across issue areas and sectors. These publications frame distinctive local and national initiatives in terms that engage with the broader debates in the transparency, participation and accountability (TPA) field. Research publications include brief *Accountability Notes*, longer *Accountability Working Papers* and *Learning Exchange Reports*.

Rights and Permissions



The material in this publication is copyrighted under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported license (CC BY 4.0) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Under the Creative Commons Attribution license, you are free to copy, distribute, transmit, and adapt this work, including for commercial purposes, under the following conditions:

Attribution—Please cite the work as follows: Le, Ha, Rachel Nadelman, Anjali Sah, and Ian Evans. 2019. “Citizen Engagement: An Independent Review of the World Bank’s Commitments in Mozambique.” Accountability Research Center.

Translation—If you create a translation of this work, please add the following disclaimer along with the attribution: This translation was not created by the Accountability Research Center (ARC) and should not be considered an official ARC translation. ARC shall not be liable for any content or error in this translation.

Notes on Support

Support for ARC comes from the Ford Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and Open Society Foundations.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to especially acknowledge Jonathan Fox (ARC) for his ongoing review and timely feedback and Rabia Uddin for her key research contributions.

Disclaimer

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed here are those of the authors.

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
Executive Summary.....	5
I. Introduction.....	8
1.1 Background.....	8
1.2 Citizen engagement and the World Bank.....	10
1.3 Independent monitoring of CE in World Bank program design	13
1.3.1 Data collection: application of the assessment tool.....	14
1.3.2 Quantitative analysis: establishing a CE Density Scale	15
1.3.3 Qualitative analysis: the quality of commitments, based on depth and detail	16
II. Mozambique: Pilot Application of the Assessment Tool	18
2.1 Portfolio overview and analysis.....	18
2.1.1 CE Density Scale.....	21
2.1.2 Results by CE area	23
2.2 Analysis of CE commitment trends across projects	26
2.2.1 Consultations.....	26
2.2.2 Collaboration in decision-making commitments.....	26
2.2.3 Citizen feedback opportunities throughout the project lifecycle.....	28
2.2.4 Commitments to involving citizens as monitors	29
2.2.5 GRM commitments.....	31
2.2.6 Capacity building for CE commitments	33
2.2.7 CE indicator commitments	35
2.3 Analysis of commitments to measures of a potential enabling environment for CE	37
2.3.1 Proactive social inclusion commitments	38
2.3.2 Commitments to third party monitoring	40
2.3.3 Commitments to public disclosure.....	44
III. Conclusion.....	48
References	51
Endnotes	56

Acronyms and Abbreviations

A4EA	Action for Empowerment and Accountability	GRM	Grievance redress mechanism
AF	Additional Financing	GRS	Grievance Redress Service
ARC	Accountability Research Center	HEI	Higher Education Institution
BIC	Bank Information Center	ICT	Information and communication technology
CBO	Community-based organization	IDS	Institute of Development Studies
CDD	Community-driven development	IEG	Independent Evaluation Group
CE	Citizen engagement	IPF	Investment Project Financing
CSO	Civil society organization	ISR	Implementation Status and Results Report
DFID	Department for International Development	IVA	Independent verification agent
DLI	Disbursement-linked indicator	M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
DRR	Disaster risk response	NGO	Non-governmental organization
EE	Enabling environment	OM	Operational manual
ESMF	Environment and Social Management Framework	PAD	Project appraisal document
ESSA	Environmental and Social Systems Assessment	PDO	Project development objective
FCV	Fragile, conflict and violent	PF	Process Framework
FIPAG	Fundo de Investimento e Patrimônio do Abastecimento de Água/ Water Supply Asset Holding and Investment Fund	PMU	Project management unit
FY	Fiscal year	RF	Results Framework
GAC	Governance and anti-corruption	RPF	Resettlement Policy Framework
GPSA	Global Partnership for Social Accountability	SECF	Small Emerging Commercial Farmer
		WBG	World Bank Group

Executive Summary

In 2013 World Bank president Jim Yong Kim publicly promised that the institution would improve its engagement with citizens by incorporating beneficiary feedback into 100 percent of projects with identifiable beneficiaries. The goal took formal shape as the 2014 *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement* (CE Strategy), which “incorporates citizen engagement, including beneficiary feedback, specifically in its treatment of inclusion, which entails empowering citizens to participate in the development process and integrating citizen voice in development programs as key accelerators to achieving results” (World Bank 2014:1). World Bank management utilized President Kim’s promise as the basis for a new minimum institutional mandate requiring World Bank projects to incorporate at least one project mechanism to engage citizens and one indicator to monitor progress, as well as to report on the indicator by the third year of implementation.

How and to what degree is the World Bank putting its new institutional citizen engagement commitments into practice? This question guides an initiative being undertaken by the Accountability Research Center (ARC) at American University as part of the Institute of Development Studies’ (IDS) Action for Empowerment and Accountability (A4EA) investigation into how external actors can best support local processes of and conditions for empowerment and accountability. This report provides a pilot assessment of the first step in this process—the specific citizen engagement (CE) commitments in World Bank projects at the design stage. This kind of in-depth analysis is necessary but not sufficient to assess whether and how the World Bank and government partners actually implement those commitments. Such an assessment of commitments at the project design stage is intended to help design possible national, civil society organization (CSO) strategies to monitor implementation.

For this pilot assessment ARC reviewed the World Bank’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2015–17 investment project portfolios for four A4EA priority countries: Mozambique, Myanmar, Nigeria and Pakistan, which covers 57 projects that range from US\$19 million to over US\$600 million. **The country assessment presented here focuses on Mozambique, which over this three-year period had 11 operations ranging from US\$10 million to US\$90 million.** In April 2019, ARC and IDS published a comparative synthesis report on the results from all four country assessments.

This research is one component of A4EA’s broader investigation into how external actors, particularly large donors, are supporting empowerment and accountability in fragile, conflict and violent (FCV) settings. Given its institutional clout and the proportion of development assistance the World Bank administers, it is in a unique position to protect and foster the contribution of citizen voice to development effectiveness, as civic space around the world decreases. Therefore, the CE Strategy is particularly relevant for FCV settings because it provides guidance for how large-scale development projects could encourage arenas for collective citizen action, as well as state response capacity, which otherwise might be lacking.

ARC has developed and piloted an assessment tool that examines commitments to CE in World Bank projects. First, the tool covers the World Bank’s seven priority areas for citizen engagement, according to the CE Strategy. These include the following:

- Consultation during project preparation
- Collaborative decision-making during project implementation

- Citizen feedback opportunities throughout the project lifecycle
- Citizen involvement in project monitoring
- Grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs)
- Capacity building for CE
- Improved CE monitoring and results reporting

The approach then expands the scope beyond CE project mechanisms to three additional measures that ARC hypothesizes could potentially facilitate an enabling environment for CE. These include the following:

- **Measures for proactive social inclusion** (i.e., related to gender, disability, ethnicity, age, migrant status, etc.) in CE efforts
- **Third party monitoring** for project results and citizen feedback findings—which could inform CE if accompanied by
- **Proactive public information disclosure** of project results and findings from CE efforts and the project progress.

The goal of the overall analysis is to determine whether a project commits to seek a strategic approach to CE, meaning the degree to which there is the potential for synergy across the different tactics incorporated. This assessment attempts to distinguish between projects that apply the CE framework with a minimalist, “tick the box” approach and projects that commit to pursuing multiple CE approaches (“thin” versus “thick” approaches, in the language of a recent Independent Evaluation Group [IEG] study). Part of this process includes applying an original Citizen Engagement Density Scale that ranks the varied “thickness” of project commitments to CE across five categories (Robust, Comprehensive, Intermediate, Weak, and Low).

The key overarching findings from the Mozambique review include the following:

- The CE Density Scale for Mozambique FY15–17 potentially shows a trend towards improved CE integration over time. With only 11 projects approved over this period, this finding is preliminary and would need to be confirmed by investigating projects approved in FY18 and subsequently.
- More than half (55 percent, or 6 of the 11 projects) of the Mozambique portfolio qualifies as *Robust*, the highest level on the CE Density Scale. Therefore, most projects commit to at least 9 of the 10 World Bank’s prioritized CE and ARC identified enabling environment mechanisms.
- Among the remaining five projects that rank as Comprehensive, Intermediate and Weak (with no projects falling into the bottommost category Low), none commit to all three mechanisms that can create an enabling environment for CE (which includes the dimensions of proactive inclusion, third party monitoring and proactive disclosure). This shows that in Mozambique there is a correlation between the highest levels of commitment to the World Bank’s prioritized CE areas and greater commitments to measures that could create an enabling environment for CE.
- All 11 assessed projects reported having undertaken community consultations to inform project design. Yet this high level of reported citizen consultation during project preparation does not extend into commitments to engage citizens for their feedback during implementation. Six of these 11 projects (55 percent) have no documented commitments to carrying out activities to gather feedback from affected peoples during the project lifecycle.

- Over 90 percent of the Mozambique portfolio (10 out of 11 projects) committed to incorporating at least one monitoring indicator to measure the extent and spectrum of CE, which will be disclosed to the public as per Bank policy. Six projects include one indicator, two projects include two indicators, one project has three indicators, and another has four indicators to measure and monitor different aspects of CE.
- Project commitments to World Bank-prioritized areas of collaboration in decision-making processes and capacity building for CE are relatively high (82 percent, 9 out of 11 projects) followed by citizen monitoring commitments, at 64 percent. The portfolio is therefore “Thick” in terms of number of commitments in these categories; however, there is ambiguity in the project documents about how these commitments will be carried out.
- Ten of the 11 projects commit to implementing project-level GRM. Close examination of the content of the commitments shows that one-third of these projects only plan to make their complaints mechanism available to people affected by involuntary resettlement and not to other project-affected peoples. This means that for the majority of people affected by these three projects, there will be no official mechanism through which they can file project-related complaints.
- Eight-two percent of the projects commit to proactively involving women and mainstreaming gender. In contrast, other marginalized groups, such as the elderly, youth, etc. are minimally or not adequately referenced, with little specificity in project commitments.
- Of the eight projects that commit to incorporating third party monitoring mechanisms, most do so for compliance purposes, primarily to monitor safeguard compliance and project progress/outcomes. Only two of these projects committed to utilize external verification for CE activities.
- Fifty-five percent (6 of the 11 projects) commit to proactive information disclosure of project progress or results. However, only a few specify the type of information that will be disclosed or the mechanisms through which this information would be disclosed.
- Only 2 of the 11 projects commit to both third-party monitoring for CE activities and proactive information disclosure. This is a rather small percentage (18 percent) for this dual commitment, given that these two areas are complementary and build on each other in creating an enabling environment for CE.

I. Introduction

1.1 Background

“We must become a better listener,” the World Bank’s president Jim Yong Kim acknowledged during his keynote speech at the World Bank/IMF 2013 Annual meetings. He continued: “Last year we had beneficiary feedback on 34 percent of our projects. We promise that for our projects with clear beneficiaries, we will get feedback—from every single one of them, 100 percent” (Kim 2013). By announcing this to an audience of high-level government officials, President Kim committed the World Bank to improving how it engages with the people affected by its projects and to developing measurements of these achievements.

In 2014, World Bank management translated Kim’s public promise into a set of corporate requirements for citizen engagement in Investment Project Financing (IPF) operations. IPFs are the Bank’s leading lending instrument and are used for long-term operations (i.e., periods of 5 to 10 years) across all sectors, but are primarily concentrated in infrastructure, human development, agriculture, and public administration (World Bank 2018). The new CE requirements oblige IPF projects with “identifiable beneficiaries” and approved between Fiscal Years (FY) 2015 and 2017 (between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2017) to: (1) incorporate a least one citizen engagement (CE) mechanism, (2) integrate at least one indicator to monitor CE, and (3) report on the CE indicator by the third year of project implementation (World Bank 2018a).

To provide operational guidance for meeting the new institutional CE mandate and to more systematically incorporate citizen engagement into operations, the World Bank then produced the *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement* (abbreviated in this report as “CE Strategy”).¹ As laid out in the CE Strategy, the World Bank envisions citizen engagement as

the **two-way interaction between citizens and governments** or the private sector within the scope of [World Bank Group] WBG interventions—policy dialogue, programs, projects, and advisory services and analytics—that gives citizens a stake in decision-making with the objective of improving the intermediate and final development outcomes of the intervention (Manroth et al 2014:8).

This definition establishes World Bank–fostered CE as *reciprocal* and *bounded*. It is *reciprocal* because it requires government to respond to citizen demands and not simply extract their input for consideration. Yet it is *bounded* because it applies only to government-citizen interactions “within the scope of WBG interventions” and therefore stops short of considering the implications for broader citizen-state relations and accountability.

How and to what degree is the World Bank actually embedding mechanisms for citizen engagement in project design? In 2017, the Accountability Research Center (ARC) at American University, a member of the Institute of Development Studies’ (IDS) Action for Empowerment and Accountability (A4EA) research program, launched a two-track approach to monitoring and advocacy regarding the World Bank’s fulfillment of its CE agenda.² This research comprises one component of A4EA’s broader investigation into whether and how external actors, particularly large

donors, are supporting empowerment and accountability in fragile, conflict and violent (FCV) settings. A4EA chose to focus this component on the World Bank because, even as civic space around the world is restricted, the World Bank has the potential to support government counterparts to protect and foster the contribution of citizen voice to development effectiveness. ARC's World Bank CE research therefore encompasses a two-track monitoring and advocacy approach:

- The first track aims to independently monitor *whether and how* the World Bank is integrating CE into project design. It relies on a desk review of publicly available documents to identify how individual projects commit to incorporating CE throughout the project life-cycle. This report contributes to this first track.
- The second track investigates project implementation, utilizing findings on project design commitments to CE to launch partner-led action research. It aims to monitor *how* CE commitments are *actually* being carried out in specific World Bank projects of concern to stakeholders and requires extensive field research that is informed by local knowledge.

To guide the independent monitoring process, ARC developed an assessment tool to identify the nature of the World Bank's commitments to citizen engagement as incorporated into project design. ARC's assessment tool utilizes the official project documents made public on World Bank's website to identify whether and how projects commit to

- **citizen engagement mechanisms throughout the project lifecycle:** i.e., public meetings, satisfaction surveys, participatory monitoring throughout the project life cycle; and
- **mechanisms that could facilitate an enabling environment for CE:** i.e., third party monitoring, procedures for social inclusion, and plans for proactive information disclosure.

By examining project commitments to specific CE activities along with mechanisms that strengthen the enabling environment for CE, the analysis seeks to answer two overarching questions: (1) To what degree do World Bank projects demonstrate a commitment to minimum standards for informed CE? and (2) To what degree do projects go beyond a minimalist "tick the box" approach and demonstrate that there is both depth and specificity in individual CE commitments and a potential for synergy across the range of CE commitments?

To pilot the assessment tool, ARC undertook a desk review of all publicly available program documents for the IPF portfolios (FY15–17) in four A4EA priority countries: Mozambique, Myanmar, Nigeria, and Pakistan, jointly selected with A4EA funder, the Department for International Development (DFID). These four country portfolios include a total of 57 projects that range from US\$19 million to over US\$600 million. This research has produced four independent, in-depth reports (including this one) for use by local CSOs, researchers, and policy-makers that, capture each country's unique findings, alongside a synthesis report covering the four countries' findings. To then test how the CE commitments are implemented, ARC and its in-country partner, the Bank Information Center (BIC), conducted fieldwork in Myanmar on three of the FY15–17 projects that are at the most advanced stages of implementation. The country assessment presented here focuses on Mozambique, which over the three-year period in question had 11 active operations ranging from US\$10 million to over US\$90 million.

This A4EA research recognizes that the World Bank, in contrast to other large-scale donors, rarely finances initiatives designed to target public accountability and empowerment. Instead the institution takes a more indirect approach to empowerment and accountability by funding

government-led participation in “invited” spaces (Mansuri and Rao 2013:xi) created within projects whose main objectives are typically not empowerment related. The World Bank’s approach to civic engagement has been described in the literature as induced participation because it results from government- and donor-organized and/or funded efforts to which citizens are invited to participate and may be bureaucratically managed (Mansuri and Rao 2013:xi).³

Although induced participation continues to dominate the World Bank’s approach to CE, the institution has also published extensive research that documents the shortcomings, including widespread patterns of “elite capture” of induced participatory efforts (Mansuri and Rao 2013). Indeed, the CE Strategy openly acknowledges the literature documenting these risks (Manroth et al. 2014:95; see also Haque 2008 and Gugerty and Kremer 2008). However, in the World Bank’s current efforts to mainstream CE in operations, it remains unclear whether or how projects address this key risk in design or implementation. The challenges posed by the World Bank’s primary approach to citizen participation underscores the relevance of independent assessment of whether and how meaningful spaces for citizen engagement are actually created in practice.

This introductory section continues by detailing the 2014 CE Strategy and its origins. It then delves into the Pakistan (FY15–17) assessment findings beginning with quantitative results at the portfolio level, including ARC’s CE Density Scale, and then a qualitative analysis of each of the commitments.

1.2 Citizen engagement and the World Bank

The World Bank’s 2014 CE Strategy is the outcome of more than 45 years of evolving engagement between the World Bank and civil society (for more in-depth discussion see Fox and Brown 1998; Davis 2002; World Bank 2005; Bebbington et al 2006; World Bank 2007; Weaver 2008; World Bank 2012; Manroth et al. 2014; World Bank 2018). Key precursors include the following:

- Adoption of Social Safeguard policies: In 1980, setting protections and compensation standards for people affected by project-caused involuntary resettlement and 1982, setting mandated protections for indigenous peoples.
- Publication of *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development* (1985), the first World Bank publication concerned with the roles of people and local associations in development projects.
- Formation of the Participatory Development Learning Group (1990), the first body convened to develop approaches and practices for participation in World Bank operations.
- Establishment of the Inspection Panel (established 1993, operationalized 1994), an independent accountability mechanism to which people who believe they have been adversely affected by World Bank-financed operations (specifically those financed by the International Bank of Reconstruction/International Development Association [IBRD/IDA]) can bring their concerns. The panel determines whether World Bank projects have complied with their own policies and procedures.
- Publication of the 1996 Participation Sourcebook, the World Bank’s first official how-to publication for incorporating participatory approaches into projects.
- Formation of a Social Development network and Department (1997).

- Development of guidelines for consultation with civil society (1999, updated 2002).
- Launch of the Social Development Strategy (2005) and Governance and Anticorruption (GAC) Strategies (2007 and 2012), which prioritized social accountability and demand-side governance.
- Establishment of the Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) in 2012 to build capacity for CSOs to engage in social accountability initiatives.

The overall objective of the 2014 CE Strategic Framework is

to facilitate mainstreaming of CE in WBG-supported policies, programs, projects, and advisory services and analytics to improve their development results and, within the scope of these operations, to strengthen engagement processes between governments and the private sector and citizens at the national, regional, local, or sectoral level, as applicable (Manroth et al. 2014:1).

The World Bank claims that the CE Strategy goes beyond previous efforts because it is the first formalized framework, with institution-wide reach that provides comprehensive guidance for engaging citizens from a project's inception to its completion (Manroth et al. 2014:6).

The CE Strategy outlines the following key categories of citizen engagement:⁴

1. **Consultation.** Formally, the term “consultation” in the context of World Bank projects captures engagement with citizens in the design or project preparation stage *before* an operation has been approved by the World Bank Board. The Bank describes the objectives for citizen consultations to include receiving input about the design and implementation arrangements of a development program or project, in order to contribute to improved results and sustainability. Distinct from dialogue, the World Bank defines consultation as “a more structured exchange in which the convener commits to ‘active listening’ and to carefully consider the comments, ideas, and recommendations received. ... Common consultation methods include public hearings or meetings, focus group discussions, household surveys and interviews, electronic consultations, and advisory/expert groups.” They can also include “more informal structures at the local level, such as village councils and women’s groups” (Manroth et al. 2014:42).
2. **Collaborative decision-making.** This process goes beyond consultation and integrates citizens directly into decision-making processes. The goal is to make decisions more responsive to citizens’ needs and improve the sustainability of program and project outcomes through increased citizen ownership. Mechanisms include “citizen/user membership in decision-making bodies, integrity pacts, participatory planning and budgeting, and citizens’ juries” (Manroth et al. 2014:43).
3. **Collecting, recording, and reporting on inputs from citizens.** This refers to citizen feedback collected periodically during and after implementation on different dimensions of provided services, including but not limited to effectiveness, inclusiveness, quality, delivery time, transaction costs, targeting, resource utilization, or engagement processes. Some tools utilized in projects to capture citizen inputs include “satisfaction surveys, focus group discussions, hotlines, community scorecards, citizen report cards, or SMS/online feedback” (Manroth et al. 2014:44).

4. **Complaint and grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs).** These are complaint systems through which project-affected peoples can raise concerns, queries, or clarifications related to implementation and through which complaints and grievances are addressed. This analysis focuses exclusively on project-specific GRMs, which are intended to be designed to be context-specific and not the more generic Grievance Redress Services (GRS) offered via the Bank's online portal (Manroth et al. 2014:45).
5. **Citizen monitoring, evaluation, and oversight.** Citizen monitoring goes beyond citizen feedback processes and directly involves citizens in monitoring service delivery, revenues, budget execution, procurement, contract awards, and reform policies. The philosophy behind such intensive citizen involvement is that it can increase transparency, improve efficiency of service delivery and budget execution, and reduce opportunities for corruption. Some commonly used mechanisms for citizen-led monitoring include "public expenditure tracking surveys, social audits, or citizen report cards" (Manroth et al 2014:47).
6. **Capacity building for CE.** This capacity building is specifically designed for citizens, CSOs, communities, government officials, and national accountability institutions to strengthen their engagement and participation in project implementation (service delivery, natural resource management, public financial management, and/or Community Driven Development (CDD) projects).⁵ This is considered particularly necessary for World Bank-supported operations where CE approaches are introduced for the first time and include a focus on building government capacity for sustainability of engagement processes beyond the life of a project (Manroth et al. 2014:50).
7. **Improved monitoring and results reporting.** The CE Strategy states that a key objective of the framework is to develop a better understanding of and monitoring of CE outcomes in World Bank-supported operations (Manroth et al. 2014:54–55). The Strategy emphasizes that projects would benefit from incorporating dedicated CE indicators into monitoring systems, especially within their Results Framework. (The World Bank's definition of the project Results Framework, its purpose and the mandates for public disclosure will be elaborated upon in Section 2.2.7). Furthermore, the CE Strategy suggests incorporating third party monitoring to ensure independent, accurate reporting.

The CE Strategy's status as a "strategy" rather than a "policy" means that on its own, it is not mandatory for project teams to implement it. The CE Strategy recognizes this and therefore links the recommended approaches to mandatory World Bank policies, such as those related to social and environmental safeguards. Specifically, "social safeguards" are policies that operations must follow when specialists determine that the projects will, or are likely to, work with either of two specific vulnerable populations—Indigenous Peoples or beneficiaries that may be required to involuntarily resettle. When fulfilling safeguard requirements, two CE activities—consultation during project preparation and GRMs for project implementation—become mandatory. Therefore, safeguards are viewed as an important and logical "entry point" for CE activities, which can then lead to additional opportunities to integrate and expand CE measures beyond the limited requirements set by the strategy. Furthermore, the CE Strategy identifies additional context-specific opportunities for scaling up CE.

The World Bank accompanied the release of the CE Strategy with a "corporate commitment" that "100 percent of Investment Financing Projects with IBRD/IDA funding with clearly identified beneficiaries" incorporate citizen engagement by FY 2018 (World Bank 2018a). The IPF is the World Bank's leading lending instrument and is utilized for long-term operations (i.e., periods of

5–10 years) across all sectors, but is concentrated in infrastructure, human development, agriculture, and public administration (World Bank 2018d). The corporate commitment specifies that IPFs must meet the following three benchmarks:

- A Incorporate a **minimum of one mechanism** designed to engage beneficiaries in the specific context of the project
- B Integrate a **minimum of one indicator** to monitor a particular aspect of citizen engagement during project implementation
- C Report on the **beneficiary feedback indicator** by the third year of implementation (World Bank 2018a).

Furthermore, to be considered an acceptable CE indicator, a project indicator must meet one of the following criteria:

- Clearly capture citizen feedback and in so doing report “whether there is a tangible response to close the feedback loop”; or
- Monitor the extent to which citizens are involved in decision-making related to project design, implementation and oversight (World Bank 2018a).

It is essential to recognize that the accompanying corporate commitment is what now makes CE compulsory for IPFs. Civil society observers acknowledge that this represents important progress; yet they have also expressed concern that project compliance with these minimal requirements will not ultimately lead to the operationalization of CE in World Bank projects. The minimal requirements, which oblige projects only to incorporate a single CE mechanism and indicator, allows for a “tick the box” approach to compliance. Therefore, World Bank monitoring risks falling short of capturing the extent to which projects are actually fulfilling the guidance laid out in the CE Strategy. Furthermore, the fact that projects are not responsible for reporting on results until the third year of implementation significantly limits the prospects that any citizen feedback collected will meaningfully inform implementation decisions.

1.3 Independent monitoring of CE in World Bank program design

In this context, ARC developed a methodology to determine both *whether and how* projects operationalize the World Bank’s commitments to CE in ways that tangibly contribute to empowerment and accountability. ARC’s assessment tool combines two elements: an independent assessment of how projects commit to apply the World Bank strategy’s own approach and an assessment of projects through the lens of additional relevant criteria.

The first element is based on the seven commitments laid out by the World Bank for itself, incorporating each of the areas of CE prioritized in the strategy (see Section 1.2), and investigating each area, utilizing the criteria specified in the corporate commitments.

Second, the tool incorporates three additional areas that have the potential to create an enabling environment for CE. These include the following:

- Measures for proactive social inclusion (i.e., related to gender, disability, ethnicity, age, migrant status, etc.) in CE efforts.

- Third party monitoring and verification for project results and citizen feedback findings. The World Bank defines third party monitoring as: “monitoring by parties that are external to the project or program’s direct beneficiary chain or management structure to assess whether intended outputs, outcomes, and impacts have been achieved by the project. Third party monitoring is mainly used to provide an independent perspective on project or government performance. It can be conducted by CSOs, think tanks, academic institutions, media, or private firms. These organizations generally have greater skills for monitoring than community representatives” (Van Wicklin and Gurkan 2013:2).
- Proactive disclosure of the results from CE efforts and project progress, as well as the results beyond the Bank’s minimal requirements.

By examining project commitments across these 10 areas, the analysis seeks to answer two overarching questions:

1. To what degree do World Bank projects demonstrate a commitment to minimum standards for informed CE?
2. To what degree do projects go beyond a “tick the box” approach and demonstrate that there is both depth and specificity in individual CE commitments, and a potential for synergy across the range of CE commitments?

1.3.1 Data collection: application of the assessment tool

ARC’s assessment tool relies on publicly available World Bank project documents that lay out project plans, strategies and commitments that have been approved by the Bank’s Board. The principal documents utilized in the analysis include (where available) the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), the Project Information Document (PID), the Integrated Safeguards Sheets, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), and related social safeguard documents (Resettlement and Indigenous People’s Frameworks) when applicable. The World Bank requires that all the above-mentioned documents be publicly disclosed via its online operations portal.

In principle, the assessment would also include operational manuals (OMs), which all projects develop after approval to describe and codify the plans for implementation that are meant to achieve project goals. The OM is the primary resource for members of the public and government agencies to learn how project goals are translated into concrete actions. For government–society engagement, the OM translates Bank project commitments into specific actions, processes and benchmarks in each national context. This “translation” is also key for CSOs and citizens who want to observe or monitor how a project is functioning. However, the World Bank does not have an institutional mandate that OMs must be disclosed, and therefore they are typically not available to the public. In the case of Mozambique, as far as this investigation could determine, none of the 11 projects have made their OM accessible/available to the public. This means, in practice, that public access to the primary operational document that details how a project will meet the approved objectives is left to the client government’s discretion. When government agencies do not proactively disclose their specific decision-making processes or project rules and performance benchmarks, it has major implications for the prospects for informed citizen engagement and accountability.

This project assessment process is never automated, and there is a strict policy of secondary or peer review to avoid subjective decision-making about the depth and detail of individual CE commitments. Once the data have been collected from the publicly available Bank documents, they undergo quantitative and qualitative analysis. The processes for each are explained in the sections below.

1.3.2 Quantitative analysis: establishing a CE Density Scale

To answer the question of *whether* World Bank projects are operationalizing institutional commitments to CE, ARC developed and piloted a CE Density Scale that considers the seven World Bank priority CE indicators and three enabling environment (EE) indicators discussed above. The density scale builds from IEG findings that

“thick” approaches—those combining multiple tools to enable collective action and public-sector responsiveness—are more promising than “thin” approaches—those that are not matched with vertical integration of independent monitoring and oversight or do not include support to increase a government’s capacity to respond (World Bank 2018c:xiii).

A thick approach to CE commitments combines a project’s inclusion of the various CE activities laid out in the Bank’s strategy with mechanisms or practices that could create an enabling environment to further advance citizen action. The creation of an enabling environment is facilitated through the proactive social inclusion of marginalized groups in consultation processes, and the inclusion of independent/external monitoring with public disclosure of results. While the thick versus thin distinction may be intuitive and subjective, this desk review attempts to capture greater nuance by classifying the range of density of commitments according to five different categories: **Robust, Comprehensive, Intermediate, Weak, and Low**. Table 1 depicts the combined CE and EE numerical criteria for each level.

Table 1. CE Density Scale

ROBUST			COMPREHENSIVE			INTERMEDIATE			wWEAK			LOW		
CE	+	EE	CE	+	EE	CE	+	EE	CE	+	EE	CE	+	EE
7		2–3	7		0–1	6		0	4		0–1	2		0–1
6		3	6		1–2	5		0–2	3		0–2	1		0–2
			5		3	4		2–3	2		2–3	0		0–3
						3		3	1		3			
Key		CE = Citizen Engagement Indicators; Maximum = 7						EE = Enabling Environment Indicators; Maximum = 3						

A project's rating on the scale depends on a combination of its CE and EE commitments. The final tally, however, is not based on a simple total of commitments within the 10 possible CE and EE options. Rather, it results from a weighted combination of two complementary approaches to enabling citizen action. In other words, a project's thickness is based on counting the number of tools for citizen action (from zero to seven) that a project describes and then determining whether and how they have matched with efforts that create an enabling environment for CE. ARC's CE Density Scale therefore reports on how mechanisms for social inclusion, external monitoring and public disclosure can potentially reinforce the officially recognized modalities for creating enabling environments for CE and accountability.

Although the number of CE commitments is the first step in determining the thickness of a project's approach, the final determining factor is what the project contributes to the enabling environment. For example, Table 1 shows that a project that includes commitments in all seven World Bank-prioritized CE areas could fall in one of two categories: Robust or Comprehensive. Seven commitments guarantee a rank in one of the top two categories. However, these seven CE commitments, if not matched with at least two of the EE indicators, are not sufficient for a project to qualify as Robust. To be considered Robust, the project must also include commitments to at least two of the EE indicators.

1.3.3 Qualitative analysis: the quality of commitments, based on depth and detail

To answer the question of *how* the World Bank is operationalizing its commitments to CE in ways that could foster accountability and empowerment, this assessment then investigates the content of the commitments. First, the assessment considers the detail and depth with which CE mechanisms and processes are explained, in terms of how they will both operate and incorporate stakeholders so that their inputs shape project decisions and implementation. Examples of questions that guide the process of determining the depth and detail of CE mechanisms include the following:

1. **Collaborative decision-making:** For projects that commit to collaborative decision-making, do projects specify the mechanisms and/or activities through which this would be carried out during implementation?
2. **Collecting feedback:** For projects that commit to collecting citizen feedback, do descriptions of the planned mechanisms explain how feedback solicited and collected will be integrated to inform project implementation (closing the feedback loop)?
3. **GRM:**
 - a. For projects that commit to establishing a GRM, who will manage it (i.e., the same unit charged with managing the project, which could be a subject of complaints)? Will it be under the authority of, or subject to oversight by, a third party organization to avoid conflicts of interest?
 - b. What GRM data will be disclosed? Will disclosure involve numbers of complaints received and resolved? Will data that are released cover the nature of the grievances and their resolutions?

Second, the assessment considers the detail and depth with which the project commits to fostering an enabling environment for CE. The hypothesis guiding this approach is that the less precise a CE commitment is at the project design stage, the easier it becomes for project authorities to impose their interpretations. The risk therefore is that without sufficient specificity, CE plans can

be diluted into a “tick the box” exercise during implementation. For example, the assessment asks the following kinds of specific questions:

1. **Social inclusion:** For projects that commit to proactive inclusion, do they provide details on the approaches that will be used to include marginalized and/or socially excluded groups in CE activities? What groups are specifically identified and what are the mechanisms explained for reaching out to and incorporating them?
2. **Public disclosure:** For projects that commit to public disclosure, do they detail specific mechanisms for the disclosure? Does the project report the frequency of planned public dissemination activities or explain exactly what information will be shared?
3. **Funding for CE:** Has the project allocated funds to support CE commitments?

Utilizing this two-tiered approach to quantitative and qualitative analysis, ARC then determines the degree to which a World Bank project’s commitments to engaging citizens throughout its lifecycle add up to a strategic approach, which, if implemented, could tangibly contribute to empowerment and accountability.

II. Mozambique: Pilot Application of the Assessment Tool

2.1 Portfolio overview and analysis

To pilot this assessment tool and approach, ARC reviewed the World Bank's FY15–17 investment project portfolio in Mozambique, with 11 projects ranging from US\$10 million to over US\$90 million. All 11 projects have an “active” status at the time of writing this report. Table 2 shows the Mozambique FY15–17 portfolio, presenting basic operational information (i.e. year of approval, financing amount, and application of social safeguards) alongside the numerical ARC assessment findings on CE. The table is organized in descending order, from those projects with the greatest number of CE commitments to those with the fewest. Five projects (almost half of the 11) have a classification of “Additional Financing” (AF), which means that the project provides a new infusion of financing for a project that had been approved earlier, either to extend implementation or to begin a new phase.

The following section provides a picture of the overall approach taken in the World Bank's FY15–17 Mozambique portfolio for incorporating CE, showing where commitments are concentrated and/or neglected. The discussion responds to the first part of the guiding research question presented above—i.e., how does the portfolio commit to operationalizing CE at different critical moments throughout the project lifecycle? The subsequent sections cover the project-level analysis that explores the content of the range of commitments as documented. This section goes beyond the existence of a documented commitment that appears to meet the criteria of the different CE areas and assesses the commitments in terms of their potential to tangibly contribute to creating enabling environments for citizen action and bolster capacity and incentives for state response to citizen voice.

Table 2. CE overview by project, Mozambique FY15–17 (in descending order of CE commitments)

Mozambique Projects (FY15–17)	Commitment amount US\$ (Million)	Social Safeguards	World Bank CE Strategy Priority Areas							Indicators of Enabling Environment for CE			Total World Bank CE commitments	Total Enabling Environment indicators
			Consultations reported	Collaborative decision-making	Citizen feedback	Citizen monitoring	GRM	CE capacity building	Results Framework Indicator(s) for CE	Proactive social inclusion	Third party monitoring	Proactive information disclosure		
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	40	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	3
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	3
Forest Investment Project FY17	15	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	3
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	40	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7	2
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	59	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	3
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	90	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	3
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	50	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6	2

2.1.1 CE Density Scale

As described in the Introduction, thick approaches to CE commitments combine a project’s inclusion of the various CE activities laid out in the Bank’s strategy with mechanisms or practices that potentially contribute to an enabling environment for CE. ARC’s original CE Density Scale establishes parameters for understanding the variations of thickness and thinness in project CE commitments (see Table 2). The density is determined based on existence of commitments, not an interpretation of the quality or lack of quality of the commitment as documented. As already discussed, determining where a project ranks is based on a balance between planned CE mechanisms and contributions toward an enabling environment for CE, and not simply an absolute total of CE + EE commitments. For the CE Density Scale, classifications for the range of CE commitments, from highest to lowest, include Robust, Comprehensive, Intermediate, Weak, and Low.

Table 3 depicts Mozambique’s 11 FY15–17 projects in relation to ARC’s CE Density Scale. The results show that the 11 projects are ranked as follows: **Robust (6), Comprehensive (1), Intermediate (2) and Weak (2), with none falling into the Low category.**


Table 3. Mozambique FY15–17 CE Density Scale (11 projects)

ROBUST 6 projects (55 percent)	COMPREHENSIVE 1 project (9 percent)	INTERMEDIATE 2 projects (18 percent)	WEAK 2 projects (18 percent)	LOW None
<u>7 CE + 3 EE</u> Forest Investment Project FY17	<u>6 CE + 2 EE</u> Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	<u>5 CE + 1EE</u> Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	<u>3 CE + 2 EE</u> Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF) FY15	
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15		<u>5 CE + 0 EE</u> Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (AF) FY17	<u>3 CE+ 1 EE</u> The Cities and Climate Change Project - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique FY15	
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17				
<u>7 CE + 2 EE</u> Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16				
<u>6 CE + 3 EE</u> Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17				
Water Services & Institutional Support II FY16				

More than half (6 of the 11 projects) of the Mozambique portfolio qualifies as Robust, the highest level on the CE Density Scale. As explained in the Introduction, to qualify as Robust, a project can have no fewer than 9 total commitments across the 10 combined CE and EE areas. In Mozambique, three of the six projects in this top category (*Forest Investment Project [FY17]*, *Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project [FY15]* and *Social Protection Project – AF [FY17]*) committed to all 10 areas. Among the remaining three, there is no one CE or EE area that is left out. The *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Project (FY16)* includes commitments to all seven CE areas but neglects to commit to proactive disclosure of project results beyond minimal Bank requirements. The *Additional Financing for Education Sector Support* and the *Water Services and Institutional Support II* projects commit to incorporating all three enabling environment mechanisms, but each leaves out one of the seven CE areas.

The remaining 45 percent of the portfolio (five projects) are spread across the next three categories on the scale, with none falling into the bottommost category Low. Although not quite achieving Robust level, the *Emergency Resilient Recovery AF (FY17)* project comes at the top of the second highest category, *Comprehensive*, by achieving a total of eight commitments, missing plans for citizen feedback collection as well as mechanisms for proactive disclosure. The remaining projects are categorized as: *Intermediate* (*Emergency Resilient Recovery Project [FY16]* and *Emergency Resilient Recovery Project AF [FY17]*) and *Weak* (*Higher Education Science and Technology Project AF [FY15]* and *The Cities and Climate Change Project - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique [FY15]*).

Figure 1. CE Density Scale by percentage, Mozambique FY15–17




No projects outside of the Robust category commit to all three mechanisms that can create an enabling environment for CE. This shows a correlation between the highest levels of commitment to the World Bank’s prioritized CE areas and greater commitments to measures that create an enabling environment for CE in Mozambique.

The CE Density Scale shows that CE uptake does not depend on the fiscal year of approval. At the lowest level, the two projects which demonstrate the fewest CE commitments were approved in FY15. However, at the highest level, one project from FY15 and one from FY17 incorporated all seven CE indicators in their project design and implementation. Projects in FY16 fall in the middle of the ranking. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily reflect a learning curve in how projects have operationalized commitments to the seven CE areas set out by the Bank.

2.1.2 Results by CE area

Figures 2 and 3 below showcase each of the CE and enabling environment areas, showing how many of the projects in the Mozambique portfolio include each mechanism/activity from greatest to fewest. Figure 2 focuses on the seven areas prioritized in the World Bank’s CE Strategy, while Figure 3 highlights the ARC-identified indicators of an enabling environment for CE. The portfolio-level analysis only reports on the *existence* of commitments and not the *quality/lack of quality* of those commitments. The analysis of content will follow in the next section. However, it is important to start with the aggregate level to see the range of commitments incorporated before investigating the depth of those commitments.

Figure 2. Project-level commitments to CE, Mozambique FY15–17




Across the portfolio, the indicator *community-level consultation reported* is the only area that witnesses commitments in all 11 projects. At the lower end are indicators of *citizen feedback* and *citizen M&E*, which are important to ensure that all voices will be heard, and that project implementation is transparent, accountable and efficient. These two commitments, however,

are made in only 50–60 percent of the assessed projects (six and seven projects respectively). As a result, while **consultation with communities for input into project design appears to be the strongest CE category, citizen feedback mechanisms, from the perspectives of both respondents and monitors, turned out to be the weakest.** This raised the question of how beneficiaries are involved and engaged meaningfully throughout the project lifecycle.

As discussed in the introduction, the World Bank’s institutional mandate for CE in Investment Projects requires that projects include at least one indicator that reports on some aspect of CE in its internal reporting system, called the Results Framework. How the Bank defines the Results Framework, its purpose and the mandates for public disclosure related to indicator results will be elaborated upon in Section 2.2.7 in the project-level analysis. The assessment showed that 10 of the 11 Mozambique FY15–17 projects document one or more CE indicators. This means that more than 90 percent of the Mozambique projects have committed to fulfilling this minimum monitoring requirement.

Figure 3. Indicators of an enabling environment for CE, Mozambique FY15–17




Although not a CE area per se, Figure 3 reveals that at least 55 percent of all projects show commitments to one or more of the EE indicators for CE. The findings display project commitments to proactive inclusion at the highest level (81 percent, or 9 of the 11 projects) when assessing areas that would allow citizens to engage more actively. At the lower end of the ranking is commitment to proactively disclosing information, which accounts for 55 percent of the portfolio (6 of the 11 projects).

The World Bank’s CE Strategy asserts that third party monitors increase the likelihood that monitoring results are impartial and accurate because citizens may feel more able to report their feedback and there are no conflicting interests. Findings from our assessment show that 73 percent of the projects (8 of the 11) committed to hiring third party actors to conduct independent verification and evaluation for some portion of activities and results during their lifecycles.

It is important to note that 10 of the 11 Mozambique (FY15–17) projects apply the Bank’s social safeguard policy for Involuntary Resettlement (see Figure 4).⁶ As explained in Section 2.2, projects that trigger social safeguard policies relating to involuntary resettlement (Operational Policy/Bank Procedure 4.12) because of known or potential resettlement risks are required to include consultations with beneficiaries during project design and implement a GRM during project implementation. Furthermore, social safeguard policy requires that the community-based consultation proceedings be documented and disclosed via publications in both English and any official national languages, which are then shared in live presentations to audiences of invited stakeholders. The published documentation of these safeguard-required consultations was included in the project documents reviewed for this analysis.

Figure 4. Projects applying Social Safeguards (Involuntary Resettlement), Mozambique FY15–17



The World Bank’s social safeguard mandates pre-dated the CE Strategy and President Kim’s increased attention to these issues. In principle, they are seen as strengthening incentives for implementing certain CE activities in projects applying social safeguards. However, as noted in the World Bank’s 2018 IEG assessment of CE, the application of social safeguards does not in practice mean that these “required” CE activities are carried out well or in full or reported as expected (World Bank 2018c:21). Therefore, it remains critical to investigate what the CE commitments actually include, even while recognizing the additional mandate that the application of social safeguards is assumed to add.

2.2 Analysis of CE commitment trends across projects

The previous section provided an overall picture of how the FY15–17 Mozambique portfolio has integrated the different components of the Bank’s CE Strategy into project design. In this section, the discussion moves beyond identification of the range of CE commitments to analyze their content as far as possible, based on published plans versus evidence from implementation. The discussion will proceed according to the CE priority areas identified in the World Bank’s strategy (i.e. Consultation in project design, citizen monitoring, GRM, etc.). The next section focuses on the three ARC-identified indicators of a potential enabling environment for CE (i.e., proactive social inclusion, third party monitoring, and proactive information disclosure). Where relevant, the discussion draws on the projects that have committed to undertaking activities in those respective areas.

2.2.1 Consultations

In the context of World Bank projects, “consultation” refers to engagement with citizens in the design/project preparation stage *before* an operation has been approved by the World Bank Board. Distinct from dialogue, the World Bank defines consultation as “a more structured exchange in which the convener commits to ‘active listening’ and to carefully consider the comments, ideas, and recommendations received” (Manroth et al. 2014:42). The objectives for citizen consultation therefore include receiving input for improved decision-making in project design and implementation arrangements, which therefore should contribute to improved results and sustainability. Since citizen consultations are required for projects that apply social safeguards, this CE activity has historically been the most frequently incorporated into Bank operations.

In principle, citizen consultations undertaken during project preparation would inform the project design and implementation planning that is submitted to the World Bank Executive Board for approval. Therefore, unlike the CE data that are the basis for the rest of this report, information on consultations held with citizens comes from what Bank teams report they *have* done versus commitments to what they say they *will* do.

In the Mozambique portfolio, 100 percent of the FY15–17 projects reported holding community-based consultations during project preparation. It is important to note that 10 of the 11 projects had applied the involuntary resettlement social safeguard, which made community consultations with stakeholders/beneficiaries mandatory in accordance with World Bank policies. The project that did not apply the resettlement safeguard—the FY15 *Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF)*—determined, during project preparation that included community consultations, that there was no risk of resettlement from project activities.

2.2.2 Collaboration in decision-making commitments

Collaboration in decision-making is intended to go beyond consultations that seek input and integrate citizens directly into decision-making. The CE Strategy explains that this process seeks to “make decisions more responsive to citizens’ needs and improve the sustainability of program and project outcomes through increased ownership by citizens” (Manroth et al. 2014:43). It is important to note that the language of “collaboration” and “collaborative decision-making” as conveyed in the CE Strategy is not vocabulary that project teams use in public documents to describe specific CE efforts. Projects typically continue to employ the term “consultation” in guiding documents for participatory decision-making exercises that occur throughout implementation and not only during preparation, which is the definition of consultation used in the CE Strategy and therefore employed in this analysis.

This assessment determined that a project had committed to “collaboration in decision-making” if it described intentions and/or mechanisms that went beyond solicitation of feedback and would directly enable citizens and/or citizen organizations to be involved in decision-making processes for the project. Table 4 captures the projects in the Mozambique portfolio that include such commitments and explains what those commitments involve.

TABLE 4. Collaborative decision-making commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (9 of 11 projects)

Project title	Collaborative decision-making commitments
Education Sector Support Project (AF) 2017	Focus groups for curriculum development; community representation on school boards. Who: Individuals from community.
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (AF) 2017	Local disaster risk management committees to prepare emergency plans. Who: Local risk management committee.
Forest Investment Project FY17	Improve decision-making in the forest sector by promoting CE in a National Forest Forum, comprising government, private sector, CSOs and academia stakeholders. Who: Individuals from CSOs.
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	A participatory planning methodology and process involving community members in decision-making for multi-year plans for public works. Who: Community members.
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Focus groups for curriculum development; community representation on school boards. Project paper includes an “effort to promote citizen engagement” by including parents and communities to be involved in school governance through participation in school councils. Who: Individuals and parents.
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Participatory planning of community land-use plans will feed into relevant district- and provincial-level spatial planning activities. Who: Community-based organizations (CBOs) will create land-use plans.
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	Local disaster risk management committees (with members from affected communities) to prepare emergency plans. Who: Local risk management committee.
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Strengthened community participation in conservation area (CA) decision-making. Facilitating community involvement in decision-making regarding sustainable use and monitoring of natural resources in conservation areas. Who: Representatives from village councils or committees.
The Cities and Climate Change Project - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique FY15	Initiating transformational change through adopting an inclusive and participatory process to design and implement the AF. Who: Street vendors whose businesses may be affected by project plans for climate mitigation.

The assessment found that in Mozambique, 82 percent of the projects (9 of the 11) approved FY15–17 show commitments to collaboration in decision-making on project activities. However, stakeholders involved in the process vary by the nature of projects. Participatory planning is the primary approach to collaborative decision-making. These projects demonstrate efforts to include citizens in the process of determining how to proceed with initiatives that will benefit them. However, there is no clarity on who gets to participate and how. Therefore, it is difficult to understand whether or not direct and indirect beneficiaries are actually involved in determining activities that would benefit them.

Less than 50 percent of the projects pledging this commitment (4 of the 11) mentioned participation of community members in the decision-making process. Three projects stated that they would engage or establish local committees to decide project activities collaboratively. However, the project document does not specify who will be on the committee and how they will be selected. Two projects—the *Forest Investment Project (FY17)* and *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape (FY16)* show institutional collaboration through CSOs and CBOs. The information about how the collaborative mechanisms will be implemented and the frequency of collaboration is still described in general terms. There was no further detail on plans to make the process more inclusive or participatory.

2.2.3 Citizen feedback opportunities throughout the project lifecycle

The CE Strategy recommends that project teams solicit feedback from citizens on a vast range of issues important to project success, including “effectiveness, inclusiveness, quality, delivery time, transaction costs, and targeting, as well as on resource utilization or engagement processes” (Manroth et al. 2014:44). The CE Strategy shares examples of standard tools used for feedback collection, such as “satisfaction surveys, focus group discussions, hotlines, community scorecards, citizen report cards, or SMS/online feedback” (Manroth et al. 2014:44).

Table 5 captures the projects in the Mozambique portfolio that include such commitments to collecting citizen feedback during project implementation and explain what those commitments involve.

For meaningful citizen engagement to happen, it is important that feedback from community and beneficiaries be heard. Feedback from citizens as respondents at the first stages of project design will help World Bank staff and country clients to have a better sense of what kind of activities would best benefit the beneficiaries. In Mozambique, however, only slightly over 50 percent of the portfolio (6 of the 11 projects) demonstrate commitments to collecting citizen feedback at project level, with goals to include citizens and to measure their satisfaction with the project activities. The details of specific commitments are not consistent. Primary mechanisms of feedback collection consist of surveys, scorecards, reports and focus groups. Ongoing mechanisms to ensure continuous flow of feedback from community and beneficiaries are not mentioned or included in any project. Furthermore, details of the frequency of collecting feedback and the timing of feedback gathering are also missing.

Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16), the biggest funded project in the portfolio (US\$90 million), proposed the highest number of activities and mechanisms for thorough feedback collection, including not only a satisfaction survey in general, but also details about assessment of different types of services provided by the project. The *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)*, the smallest unded project in the portfolio (US\$10 million), though stating its commitment to the indicator, did not mention any concrete mechanisms to collect citizen feedback.

TABLE 5. Citizen feedback commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (6 of 11 projects)

Project title	Citizen feedback commitments
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	<p>Commitment: Commitment to include beneficiaries in implementation by first gathering feedback from beneficiary households.</p> <p>Mechanisms: No clear mention of what mechanisms to be utilized.</p>
Forest Investment Project FY17	<p>Commitment: Beneficiary satisfaction focus groups and surveys, conducted mid-term and at the end of the project.</p> <p>Mechanisms: Focus groups and surveys.</p>
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	<p>Commitment: To assess implementation, service quality, satisfaction with new water connections, and household perceptions/valuation of the new water service, which focuses on the degree of engagement and feedback from service users; to implementing "Citizen Voice" tools in project cities (measured in Results Framework).</p> <p>Mechanisms: Collecting qualitative data from households; beneficiary scorecards or survey in the Results Framework.</p>
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	<p>Commitment: To measure smallholder farmers' satisfaction with services provided.</p> <p>Mechanisms: Reports.</p>
Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF) FY15	<p>Commitment: Support the creation of a feedback communication mechanism between Higher Education Institution (HEI) course management and the employers about content and organization of course programs.</p> <p>Mechanisms: Beneficiary satisfaction surveys.</p>
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	<p>Commitment: Carry out socioeconomic household surveys to look at the economic conditions of the population inside the conservation areas, their buffer zones, as well as the benefits they obtain from their surrounding natural resources, and their levels of satisfaction with the conservation areas. Supplement surveys with participatory focus group as a form of data control as well as providing a participatory learning experience for the communities.</p> <p>Mechanisms: Household surveys, participatory focus groups.</p>

2.2.4 Commitments to involving citizens as monitors

According to the CE Strategy, involving citizens in project monitoring “can increase transparency, improve efficiency of service delivery or budget execution, and reduce opportunities for corruption” (Manroth et al. 2014:47). As discussed in the Introduction, the World Bank calls this category of citizen engagement “citizen-led monitoring”, even though the definition only calls for citizen participation and not leadership. For example, such approaches could limit citizens’ roles to atomized data-gathering, without involvement in agenda-setting. Therefore, ARC refers to this simply as citizen monitoring, given the lack of evidence that the citizens involved would actually have the opportunity to lead and make decisions about these processes.

Nevertheless, participation in project monitoring activities gives citizens opportunities to go beyond serving as feedback providers and take part in gathering this feedback, as well as other project-related data on progress, results and outcomes. It allows beneficiaries’ access to the big picture of project performance and service provision. Table 6 captures the projects in the Mozambique portfolio that include such commitments and explain what they involve.

TABLE 6. Citizen monitoring commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (7 of 11 projects)

Project title	Citizen monitoring commitments
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Commitment: Participatory monitoring during program implementation by community leaders. Mechanisms: Not specified.
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	Commitment: Local quality-of-service and financial regulatory mechanisms to enforce and monitor local regulation; local regulatory commissions; to decentralizing “some aspects” of regulatory oversight to customers. Mechanisms: Local regulatory mechanisms and commissions; local ICT instruments.
Forest Investment Project FY17	Commitment: Promotes citizen engagement in a National Forest Forum and regular and participatory evaluation of the forest sector. Mechanisms: Involvement on a National Forest Forum; participatory evaluations.
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Commitment: Project paper states that the AF project will support the ability of school councils and communities to monitor school performance. Mechanisms: Not specified.
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Commitment: Project paper states that the AF project will support the ability of school councils and communities to monitor school performance. Mechanisms: Not specified.
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Commitment: Participatory assessments as an aspect of monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Mechanisms: Participatory assessments.
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Commitment: Participatory M&E mechanism to ensure a built-in ownership and social accountability mechanism. Mechanisms: Participatory tools, including those for M&E, laid out in the project’s process framework for CE.

Between 2015 and 2017, 63 percent of the Mozambique projects (7 out of the 11) display commitments to citizen monitoring. Only one project, *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)*, had plans for concrete activities which include regulatory oversight instruments for this commitment. Meanwhile, the remaining 6 projects only mentioned or stated support and promotion of citizen monitoring, without specifying what kinds of monitoring activities and measures would be utilized throughout the project cycle and how they would be implemented.

Under this category, nearly 50 percent of the portfolio (three projects) did not specify mechanisms for citizen monitoring. These projects are categorized as AF projects. Three projects on environment and conservation-related topics (*Forest Investment Project [FY17]*, *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape [FY16]*, and *Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project [FY15]*) commit to utilizing participatory assessments and evaluations as mechanisms for citizen monitoring. Yet there was no clarity about who will participate and through which platforms. In addition, though the Bank’s definition of citizen-led monitoring is described as involving citizens in a number of monitoring activities, there remains a substantial gap between what is led by beneficiaries and what exactly they are engaged in doing collaboratively.

“Participatory M&E” is the general term that was used in most projects to express intentions to give citizens a role in monitoring activities. Yet the mechanisms to be used to facilitate this participation

remain ambiguous. A number of the assessed projects reported using similar mechanisms of adopting assessments and evaluations as a way to engage citizens in oversight.

2.2.5 GRM commitments

As with beneficiary consultation during project design, the World Bank requires all projects that have triggered social safeguards for involuntary resettlement or for indigenous peoples to incorporate a project-specific GRM (see Operational Policy/Bank Procedure 4.12). According to Bank policy, this must be accessible, free, easily understood, transparent, responsive and effective, must not restrict access to official grievance channels (such as the courts, including traditional courts), and must not cause fear of negative consequences for its recourse among users. Therefore, while all projects in a country portfolio are encouraged to include project-specific GRMs so that beneficiaries can share grievances and seek redress for unwanted project experiences, projects that involve either of these social safeguards, in principle, are required to include this specific CE mechanism. This policy nuance is important to understand the GRM results in the Mozambique portfolio (Table 7).

TABLE 7. GRM commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (10 of 11 projects)

Project title	Social safeguards triggered	Commitment to create GRM	Does the GRM include a commitment to publicly report on number/percentage of grievances reported/resolved? If so, via what commitment?
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Yes	Yes (only developed for the purpose of Resettlement Policy Framework - RPF)	No
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Yes	Yes (RPF)	No
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Yes	Yes	No
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	Yes	Yes (RPF)	No
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (AF) FY17	Yes	Yes	No
Forest Investment Project FY17	Yes	Yes	No
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Yes	Yes	Yes – Indicator in the Results Framework.
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	Yes	Yes (RPF)	No
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Yes	Yes	No
The Cities and Climate Change Project Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique commits FY15	Yes	Yes	No

The standard format for a GRM is that citizen complaints are filed at the community level and, if necessary, they will have opportunities to escalate their grievances to higher-level authorities, with the final level being the institution of the World Bank. Program documents lay out general details related to the structure and time frame and some guidelines (for example, all seven projects will accept complaints orally as well as written complaints). More specific details relating to how communities can learn about a project's GRM and tangible instructions for submitting grievances and following up, for example, are often provided in a project's operational manual.

Past Bank experience has shown that when it comes to implementation of GRMs, even when they are mandated for safeguards and with basic plans laid out in project documents, they do not fulfill document-based commitments. The CE Strategy discusses this discrepancy between GRM plans and execution and emphasizes that planned disclosure of results increases the likelihood that systems will function better.

Ten of the 11 active projects (91 percent) in Mozambique commit to having a project-specific GRM. All 10 projects involve the involuntary resettlement social safeguard so were mandated by Bank policies to create the GRM. The one project, *Higher Education Science and Technology Project AF (FY15)*, without a GRM is also the one that did not apply the involuntary resettlement safeguard.

Three of these 10 projects only apply the GRM to the people affected by resettlement, thus limiting their scope. This sub-population would represent only a small number of people affected by the project, meaning that most of those who are intended to benefit from the project would not have access to the resource. For example, the *Emergency Resilience Recovery Project (FY16)* and its AF project both pledge to set up a GRM to deal with potential grievances and dissatisfaction raised by the project-affected people in relation to the project. All grievances related to non-fulfilment of contracts, levels of compensation, or seizure of assets without compensation in the *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Project (FY16)* are supposed to be brought to the attention of relevant officers within the district resettlement committee, including local authorities (at the community and neighborhood levels), and dealt with. Finally, in the *Water Services and Institutional Support Project (FY16)*, the grievances both of displaced people and host communities concerning proposed or actual resettlement arrangements could initially be presented for local redress to local influence leaders or the community resettlement committee.

Notable GRMs in some other projects in the Mozambique portfolio include the following: the *Forest Investment Project (FY17)*'s GRM will resolve disputes that might arise relating to resource use restrictions, dissatisfaction with eligibility, community planning measures or actual implementation. The *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)* commits to developing a simple complaint mechanism/GRM to ensure that the beneficiaries have channels for any eventual grievances, particularly on payment day. It commits to instituting a GRM that will encompass transparent, timely and fair procedures to allow people potentially affected by the project to peacefully settle any possible grievance and will ensure that all complaints received from beneficiaries and other interested stakeholders related to any activity under the project are properly and promptly addressed. The *Cities and Climate Change Project - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique (FY15)* commits to establishing a formal GRM through which affected people can lodge a grievance and to help ensure a speedy and satisfactory resolution of any disputes. This project provides limited information on implementation plans beyond the basic commitment. The *Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project (FY15)* commits to instituting a GRM that builds on existing local mechanisms for settling any conflict, with the use of legal services as the last resort. It also commits to creating mechanisms that facilitate use of the GRM by vulnerable groups, including the elderly, women and youth.

Recording versus publicizing: While 10 projects document procedures for reporting and redressal of complaints or grievances (with different degrees of specificity), only the *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)* commits to making the information public by disclosing it through its Results Framework. In other words, 9 of the 10 projects that commit to creating a GRM do not include an indicator related to the GRM in their respective Results Frameworks.

Overseeing authorities: Different projects involve different agencies in the functioning and oversight of their GRMs. The *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape (FY16)* and both the *Emergency Resilient Recovery Projects (FY16 and FY17)* have their project management units (PMUs) along with multiple agencies and actors overseeing their GRMs. Two projects, both of which are additional financing to *Education Sector Support (FY16 and FY17)*, have village governments and district administration bodies overseeing the GRM. The *Forest Investment Project (FY17)*, the *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)* and the *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)* have specific agencies—the International Funds Management Unit, the National Institute for Social Action and the Water Regulatory Council, respectively—to oversee the functioning of their respective GRMs.

2.2.6 Capacity building for CE commitments

World Bank projects often incorporate capacity-building activities related to project content and management, but activities dedicated to training on CE—for implementers or participants—are far less common. This CE Strategy therefore specifically emphasizes the importance of extending capacity-building investment to include CE-related capacity building, particularly for project teams, sectors, and in country settings with limited experience incorporating meaningful citizen engagement into development operations. It includes activities specifically designed for citizens, CSOs, communities, government officials, and national accountability institutions to strengthen their engagement and participation in project implementation (service delivery, natural resource management, public financial management, and/or CDD projects). Table 8 provides further details on these CE capacity-building commitments in projects in the Mozambique portfolio.

TABLE 8. CE capacity-building commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (9 of 11 projects)

Project title	CE capacity-building commitments
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Community: A volunteer will be recruited and trained by the National Institute for Social Action to support programs and communication/liaison with communities and beneficiaries.
Forest Investment Project FY17	Community: Training for farmers/communities to equip them to make informed decisions about their land and to negotiate with investors (training for collaborative decision-making).
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Project implementers: Training of school directors to facilitate local community in supporting classroom instruction (training for collaborative decision-making).
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Project implementers: Training of school directors to facilitate local community in supporting classroom instruction (training for collaborative decision-making).

Continued

Project title	CE capacity-building commitments
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	<p>Government implementer: To develop customer service provisions such as citizen engagement, gender/disability considerations and complaint/grievance recourse (training for government to engage beneficiaries in feedback-gathering processes).</p> <p>Community: Training for local leaders in conflict management to minimize conflicts in potential resettlement.</p>
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	<p>Community: Capacity building to strengthen management skills to benefit community and to negotiate and implement beneficial partnerships with investors interested in land or other resources (training for collaborative decision-making).</p>
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	<p>Community: Building the capacity of local disaster risk management committees and communities to prepare emergency plans for disaster risk response (DRR) and management (training for collaborative decision-making).</p>
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (AF) FY17	<p>Community: Building the capacity of local disaster risk management committees and communities to prepare emergency plans for DRR and management (training for collaborative decision-making).</p>
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	<p>Institution: To support activities at the local level to improve the institutional capacity (“enabling conditions”) for communities to manage natural resources so as to facilitate income-generating initiatives.</p> <p>Community: Training and capacity building of local community members, leaders and CBOs on decision-making, accountability, transparency, local governance, business planning and management, use and management of funds, partnerships with the private sector and use of information technology, including the carrying out of capacity-building programs for the design and implementation of subprojects.</p>

The Mozambique portfolio includes commitments to building capacity for CE in 9 of its 11 projects, with certain levels of specific mechanisms or detailed descriptions of which capacities will be built and how. Only two projects under this section—the *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)* and *Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project (FY15)*—commit to implementing capacity-building measures for more than one group of stakeholders, including both institutional and community actors. The portfolio seems to focus more on building capacity on CE for community members, with seven commitments to training for community members in comparison to four commitments to strengthen skills for project or government implementers.

Types of capacity-building activities for CE vary by specific activities of the projects. The brief descriptions in project documents show potential across a variety of activities for capacity building to strengthen citizens’ ability to participate in numerous CE areas. However, the details of capacity building across the Mozambique projects are lacking. *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)*, despite having shown the most activities under this section by committing to developing customer service provisions such as CE (including gender and disability considerations and complaint/grievance recourse options) still does not state specific measures for making any of this happen. This is also the only project that considers capacity building that relates specifically to safeguards by providing training for local leaders in conflict management to minimize conflicts in potential resettlement.

2.2.7 CE indicator commitments

Results Framework is the overarching term used by the World Bank to describe the context in which results are internally measured and monitored. In practice, it includes only a small number of indicators that together are intended to explain how the project development objective (PDO) is to be achieved. What is significant is that the indicators included in a project's Results Framework must (1) explain how the data collected will be used over the course of project implementation and (2) be publicly disclosed. Therefore, if the Results Framework includes an indicator on CE, the project must disclose information publicly, at least about this particular area.⁷

As discussed in the introduction, A CE Results Framework indicator must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Clearly capture citizen feedback and in so doing report “whether there is a tangible response to close the feedback loop”; or
- Monitor the extent to which citizens are involved in decision-making related to project design, implementation and oversight (World Bank 2018a).

The discussion below will therefore consider these criteria when analyzing projects' CE indicators. Table 9 matches the projects with their respective CE indicator(s).

TABLE 9. CE indicator commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (10 of 11 projects)


Project title	CE area	Indicator
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Citizen feedback (3), collaborative decision-making (1)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of Smallholders being serviced by Small Emerging Commercial Farmers (SECF) 2. Percentage of smallholders' satisfaction with services provided by SECFs via reports 3. Percentage of client satisfaction with land administration services 4. Percentage meetings of the multi-stakeholder landscape forums with participation above the 70 percent threshold of agreed forum representatives
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Proactive disclosure (1)	1. Percentage of complete primary schools that comply with standards for transparency and accountability
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Proactive disclosure (1)	1. Percentage of complete primary schools that comply with standards for transparency and accountability
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	Capacity building (1)	1. Number of communities supported with technical assistance from CSOs for mixed school construction
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (AF) FY17	Capacity building (1)	1. Number of communities supported with technical assistance from CSOs for mixed school construction
Forest Investment Project FY17	Citizen feedback (2), collaborative decision-making (1)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share of target beneficiaries satisfied w/ info about their participation in forest and land-use decisions that affect them 2. Share of target beneficiaries satisfied w/ info about their participation in forest and land-use decisions that affect them (percent of which female) 3. Completion of activities in the annual strategic action plans of the Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Forums

Continued

Project title	CE area	Indicator
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	GRM (2)	1. Number of complaints handled in a timely manner 2. Percentage of districts with a GRM.
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	Citizen feedback (2)	1. Number of beneficiary surveys carried out 2. Implementation of 'Citizen Voice' tools in project cities
Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF) FY15	Citizen feedback (1)	1. Percentage of beneficiaries that feel project investments reflected their needs (measured by yearly beneficiary surveys) to assess participation and civic engagement
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Citizen feedback (1)	1. Index on local communities' perception of benefits from target conservation areas (Percentage)

Ten of the 11 projects include at least one indicator within their respective compliance-oriented Results Frameworks designed to measure an aspect of citizen engagement. The *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Project (FY16)* and the *Forest Investment Project (FY17)* both have two CE indicators relating to citizen feedback and collaborative decision-making, thus tracking two distinct CE areas. Collecting feedback is the most frequently occurring indicator (nine projects), followed by GRM (two), collaborative decision-making (two), capacity building (two) and proactive disclosure (two). The breakdown of these 17 total indicators among different CE activities is shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Classification of CE indicators, Mozambique FY15–17



Citizen feedback is the most frequently tracked CE activity across the Mozambique portfolio. Five projects include feedback indicators (*Social Protection [FY17]*, *Water Services [FY16]*, *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape [FY16]*, *Conservation and Biodiversity [FY15]* and *Higher Education Science and Technology [FY15]*), several committing to gather citizen feedback about multiple issues. These projects commit to collecting citizen feedback mainly through surveys designed to capture “beneficiary satisfaction” with services provided or about participatory activities. For example, the *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)* assesses beneficiary satisfaction with the quality of water supply services, utilizing surveys or scorecards, implemented by the Water Regulatory Council before and after the project. Another indicator monitors the effectiveness of the project’s ICT platform, tracking the facilitation of customer complaints and the response/resolution time. The *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape (FY16)* project uses reports to measure smallholders' satisfaction with services provided.

The additional CE areas to be measured among the Mozambique projects include the following:

- Two projects, *Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape (FY16)* and *Forest Investment (FY17)* commit to measuring collaborative decision-making. The latter project does so by tracking if the activities laid out in the annual Strategic Action Plans are completed as planned.
- Two projects (both AFs to the same parent project, *Education Sector Support Project*) commit to tracking proactive information disclosure by assessing the proportion of complete primary schools that comply with standards for transparency and accountability.
- Both the *Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (FY16)* and its second phase *Emergency Resilient Recovery Project Additional Financing (FY17)* include indicators designed to track capacity building efforts for communities involved in school construction.
- Only one project *The Social Protection Project AF (FY17)*, commits to two indicators related to its GRM.

2.3 Analysis of commitments to measures of a potential enabling environment for CE

This research is based on ARC’s hypothesis that a project’s inclusion of CE activities is not sufficient on its own to guarantee meaningful CE and therefore an “enabling environment” is needed to facilitate and shape such engagement. Although individual projects do not have the power or influence to shape the general context in which they are implemented, they can take actions that potentially (favorably or unfavorably) contribute to an enabling environment for CE. Therefore, the overall opportunity for CE is not only determined by the existence of discrete mechanisms and activities for citizens to provide input, make decisions, and be involved in monitoring, for example, but also by the circumstances in which these activities are carried out.

Although not guaranteed, projects have the potential to influence these enabling circumstances in at least three ways: (1) by fostering social inclusion; (2) by promoting accountability through incorporating independent monitoring mechanisms; and (3) by promoting transparency through disclosure of project information. The discussion below covers the assessment findings from the 11 Mozambique projects across these three areas.

2.3.1 Proactive social inclusion commitments

Groups that have experienced social marginalization and exclusion could be omitted from participatory processes unless there are proactive measures to ensure their engagement. These groups include women, children and youth, people with disabilities, the elderly, and migrants. Therefore, this section analyzes how projects commit to incorporating “proactive inclusion measures” for vulnerable groups in planned CE processes. Table 10 highlights the proactive inclusion measures within the Mozambique portfolio.

TABLE 10. Proactive social inclusion commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (9 of 11 projects)

Project title	Population group	Proactive social inclusion commitments
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Vulnerable community members, Women, Youth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scheduling training programs to account for women’s responsibilities to ensure that they are able to participate. 2. Commits to including the participation of youth, women, and vulnerable community members in internal organization and decision-making structures for CBO.
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	AIDS-affected and chronically ill people, Elderly, Orphans, Women	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New school management boards must be composed of at least 40 percent women (RPF). 2. Elderly should be adequately compensated in case of resettlement to ensure livelihood is maintained (RPF). 3. AIDS-affected and chronically ill people should be included in assessment of affected persons for compensation (RPF). 4. Orphans should be rehabilitated/trained to acquire vocational skills (RPF).
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	AIDS-affected and chronically ill people, Elderly, Orphans, Women	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New school management boards must be composed of at least 40 percent women (RPF). 2. Elderly should be adequately compensated in case of resettlement to ensure livelihood is maintained (RPF). 3. AIDS-affected and chronically ill people should be included in assessment of affected persons for compensation (RPF). 4. Orphans should be rehabilitated/trained to acquire vocational skills (RPF).
Forest Investment Project FY17	Vulnerable groups, Wives, Women, Youth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women, youth and vulnerable groups to actively participate in MSLFs. 2. Envisages the promotion of land co-titling, whereby wives and husbands have the same rights to their property.
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Women, Youth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offers 15 days of paid work per month to ensure that women, especially in households headed by women, are able to participate in the program while still being able to dedicate time to children/nutrition activities. 2. Commits to implementing projects taking special needs of women into consideration (for lactating women, women in caregiving roles, provisions for childcare) 3. Encourages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • women to take leadership roles for public works activities; • women to actively participate in savings groups; • youth to engage more in public works.

Continued


Project title	Population group	Proactive social inclusion commitments
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	People with disabilities, Women	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women will be active participants in decision-making (RPF) 2. CE capacity building for FIPAG (Fundo de Investimento e Património do Abastecimento de Água/Water Supply Asset Holding and Investment Fund) with focus on service with gender and disability considerations.
Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF) FY15	Female students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preference for the equity scholarship program will be given to disadvantaged but qualified students, particularly female students from the provinces.
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Elderly, Landless people, People with disabilities, Vulnerable groups, Women, Youth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of the Process Framework (PF) underwent an extensive stream of public consultation and participation that allowed women, youth and vulnerable groups such as landless people, the elderly and people with disabilities to voice their concerns, which have been fully captured in the design of the project. 2. Commitment to ensure GRM access for vulnerable groups, including the elderly, women and youth. 3. Project beneficiaries are gender disaggregated (30 percent) in the Results Framework (RF).
The Cities and Climate Change Project Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique FY15	Community leaders, Women	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the consultation process, during project design, the project prioritized meetings with two sub-groups: women and community leaders.

Table 10 illustrates that 9 of the 11 projects in Mozambique document commitments to proactive social inclusion. These nine projects incorporate measures primarily dedicated to efforts towards women’s inclusion, aiming to “mainstream gender” in the project design—enhancing the representation of women in various schemes and activities tailored to empower and elevate their position in the community through consultations, participatory and decision-making roles. For example, the *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)* indicates that women and girls benefit disproportionately from water service expansion through reduced time spent collecting water, so its activities are targeted towards involving women in decision-making. The *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)* also includes multiple initiatives (see Table 10) encouraging women’s inclusion and participation in its activities.

Some other project-specific, marginalized populations referenced in this portfolio include youth, elderly people, orphaned children, people with disabilities, AIDS-affected and chronically ill people, and other vulnerable groups. For example, since the active engagement of women, youth, and vulnerable groups around natural resource management is a challenge (especially for rural women who must ensure the sustainability of their households) but bearing in mind the restrictions on participation in public consultations and decision-making spaces, the *Forest Investment Project (FY17)* will encourage participation of women, youth, and other vulnerable groups in the Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Forums (MSLFs) and will track beneficiary satisfaction in its Results Framework. The two *Education Sector Support Projects* include the elderly, orphaned children, AIDS-affected and chronically ill people in their commitments. However, the depth of commitments for these groups has not been detailed in the way that it has been for women.

Women are addressed in all nine projects, followed by youth in five projects. Children are mentioned in two projects; vulnerable groups, the elderly, orphaned children and AIDS patients are mentioned in six projects' and disability has a passing mention in one project. This categorization of proactive social inclusion is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Proactive social inclusion commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (by population group)



2.3.2 Commitments to third party monitoring

The World Bank defines third party monitoring as “monitoring by parties that are external to the project or program’s direct beneficiary chain or management structure” (Van Wicklin and Gurkan 2013:2). It recommends that projects incorporate third party monitoring in order “to provide an independent perspective on project or government performance (Van Wicklin and Gurkan 2013: 2). It is because of the anticipated independence of these external monitoring entities that the incorporation of third party monitoring can potentially contribute to an enabling environment for CE.

The ARC assessment tool identifies first whether a project commits to incorporating an external third party monitoring entity (professional or community-based). If so, the assessment then ascertains the purpose for which the entity has been recruited (i.e., monitoring safeguard compliance, impact evaluation, collection of citizen feedback, etc.) and whether there is a documented intention to share findings with the public. These three steps are collectively considered to determine the potential contribution of “third party” monitoring to an enabling environment.

The assessment revealed that projects commit to third party monitoring for a range of different activities and mechanisms. While some projects include a single commitment to third party monitoring in just one area, many include multiple commitments to third party monitoring across several areas during the project lifecycle. The assessment identified five broad categories for which World Bank-supported operations utilize third party monitoring, as follows:

- (i) **Social Safeguard compliance** for projects that have been determined to involve, or have the potential to involve, resettlement and/or Indigenous Peoples.

- (ii) **Project M&E** of general project processes, results and outcomes to accompany the project monitoring undertaken by PMUs.
- (iii) **Disbursement Linked Indicator (DLI) Monitoring.** DLIs are project indicators whose achievement triggers the release of a new tranche of funds to continue project implementation. These are utilized by projects to incentivize the achievement of key program milestones and improve performance. Since funding provision is linked directly with goal achievement, the World Bank requires that these indicators be monitored by external entities. Therefore, projects that incorporate DLIs rather than traditional project indicators are required to contract third party monitoring.
- (iv) **CE activity monitoring** involves the external monitoring of CE project activities and mechanisms, designed to provide affected peoples with opportunities to provide feedback, make decisions, submit complaints (i.e., management of a project-level GRM by an entity separate from the PMU or the client government).
- (v) **Impact Evaluation** to determine whether the changes in outcomes can be attributed to the World Bank-supported project that was implemented.

An overview of project commitments across these five categories is highlighted in Table 11.

TABLE 11. Third party monitoring commitments by type, Mozambique FY15–17 (8 of 11 projects)

Project title	Safeguard compliance	DLIs	Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes)	CE monitoring	Impact evaluation	Proactive information disclosure
Forest Investment Project FY17						
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17						
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17						
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16						
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16						
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16						
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16						
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15						
TOTAL	8	2	8	2	1	5

Over two-thirds of the assessed projects in Mozambique (8 of the 11) showed commitments to incorporating some form of third party monitoring mechanism in the project design framework. All eight projects commit to at least two aspects: monitoring of safeguard compliance and overall monitoring of project progress and outcomes. Two projects (18 percent of the country portfolio), both on *Education Sector Support (FY16 and FY17)*, committed to monitoring DLLs. External monitoring of CE efforts is also only found in two projects. Impact evaluation received the least attention in project documents, with only one project demonstrating a commitment to monitoring this area. The *Social Protection Project AF (FY17)* comes across as the most robust project, wherein third party monitors are brought in for safeguard compliance, project monitoring, CE monitoring and an independent impact evaluation—thus involving third parties for four of the five categories. The details on third party monitoring commitments across the various categories are described in Table 12.

TABLE 12. Details of third party monitoring commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (8 of 11 projects)

Project title	Category	Third party monitoring commitments
Forest Investment Project FY17	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes), Proactive information disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent party undertaking a comprehensive mid-year review of the project, assessing the Results Framework indicators. • By the end of year 2, an independent party, along with the World Bank and Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development and other implementing entities, will undertake a comprehensive mid-term review of the project that will focus on assessing progress toward the impact and outcome targets and corresponding indicators (with special attention to assessing the key indicators outlined in the Results Framework). Selected thematic in-depth assessments will be identified (in year 2) and conducted as evidenced-based inputs for the mid-term review (e.g., assessing the emerging viability of the business plans that the project supports). • Final evaluation: 6 months before project completion, an independent evaluation will be conducted to identify key lessons that can be used for designing the next project.
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes), CE Monitoring, Impact Evaluation, Proactive information disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will involve a rigorous impact evaluation carried out by an independent firm. It will inform the government about the project's medium- and long-term effects on beneficiaries' welfare. • <i>Process evaluation.</i> After 12–18 months of expansion of the Productive Social Action Program, the project will finance a process evaluation to assess operations and procedures, conducted by an independent firm or consultants. • Verification of the beneficiaries' participation.

Continued

Project title	Category	Third party monitoring commitments
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Safeguard compliance, DLI, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to independent verification of DLIs. It is expected that most DLIs will be externally verified during the first semester of 2017. • This sub-component finances the implementation of community-based early child development services through third party providers. In 2014, the Ministry of Education and Human Development signed contracts with third party providers to implement the early childhood related activities at the community level as well as with independent verification agents (IVAs) to externally verify outputs across the 5 provinces selected to receive the intervention.
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY16	Safeguard compliance, DLI, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to independent verification of DLIs on annual basis. • Disbursements for the DLIs will be made on the basis of verified results. Verification will be undertaken in ways that are both credible and sustainable by using existing government systems for oversight and monitoring. IVAs will be contracted by the Ministry of Education and Human Development on a competitive basis, complying with minimum standards of quality and reliability.
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes), CE monitoring, Proactive information disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVAs to track indicators of service quality and socioeconomic characteristics and carry out beneficiary surveys. • Results monitoring and evaluation will be carried out by FIPAG and the Water Regulatory Council. For component 3, FIPAG will engage an IVA to confirm eligible outputs, based on which FIPAG will process payments. The IVA will also track indicators of service quality and socioeconomic characteristics and carry out beneficiary surveys as part of the poverty-focused activities (to ensure targeting and to capture impacts). • The water connections will be implemented by the utilities and verified by a third party IVA contracted by FIPAG.
Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape FY16	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent final evaluation to begin six months prior to project completion.
Emergency Resilient Recovery Project FY16	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bank team will monitor implementation progress through: (a) reporting against the key performance indicators as outlined in the Results Framework; (b) The Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources individual project reports consolidated into joint reports; (c) independent verification of project activities through field visits.
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Safeguard compliance, Project monitoring (progress and/or outcomes), Proactive information disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A participatory M&E mechanism to ensure a built-in ownership and social accountability using participatory rapid appraisals.

Third party monitoring appears in 73 percent of the Mozambique portfolio—8 of the 11 assessed projects. Where this approach is combined with an explicit commitment to timely proactive disclosure of reliable, relevant and actionable findings, third party monitoring can contribute to informed CE. Of the projects that intended to include third party monitoring, five also committed to some degree of public disclosure (Table 11).

2.3.3 Commitments to public disclosure

Proactive information disclosure entails letting the public know not just about the mere existence of a World Bank project but about its ongoing activity progress and outcomes. This enabling environment indicator therefore measures whether a project proactively releases results to the public, including those from CE efforts, over and above Bank-mandated minimal requirements pertaining to Social Safeguards or Results Framework indicators. In other words, this indicator seeks to determine whether a project commits to “reporting out” its progress and results to the public rather than only “reporting up” to Bank officials and, if so, how it commits to doing so. This is a crucial aspect of the enabling environment for CE because the capacity of project-affected peoples to shape a project increases when they are accurately and appropriately informed about implementation progress and achievement. Table 13 gives details of each project’s disclosure commitments and their associated mechanisms.


TABLE 13. Proactive disclosure commitments, Mozambique (6 of 11 projects)

Project title	Proactive information disclosure commitments
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Trained in specialized software to prepare and disseminate reports and assessments. Information on program outcomes drawn from a multi-year third party impact evaluation has been disseminated publicly. Mechanism: None
Education Sector Support Project (AF) FY17	Disseminate the results of the impact evaluation in a national workshop in April 2019 at the close of the project. Mechanism: National workshop
Forest Investment Project FY17	Commitment to invest in biannual forest governance assessment; to promote citizen engagement in a National Forest Forum; regular and participatory evaluations of the forest sector including a multi-stakeholder National Forest Forum; preparation and disclosure of these biannual assessments on forest governance and forest operators. Mechanism: None
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	The Water Regularly Council collects data for each regional utility and thereafter disseminates it to the public through the IBNET database, ensuring transparency and accountability of the collected survey information and reporting for the impact evaluation. Mechanism: Website (IBNET database)
Higher Education Science and Technology Project (AF) FY15	Holding dissemination seminars and publishing records of these proceedings. Mechanism: Publications
Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project FY15	Developing a communication plans that includes ongoing communication channels maintained during project implementation to facilitate presentation of feedback and participatory monitoring. Mechanism: Communication plan

A little over half of the Mozambique portfolio (6 of the 11 active projects) commit to proactive disclosure related to at least one aspect of the project through dissemination of information about periodic result reports, assessment or evaluation. This was done through various mechanisms as shown in (Figure 7). Two projects, *Education Sector Support Project AF (FY17)* and *Water Services and Institutional Support II (FY16)*, commit to disseminating results from impact evaluations to promote transparency. The *Social Protection Project (FY17)* pledges to impart training specialized software training to allow for progress reports to be prepared and disseminated but does not explain how the data generated will be shared. Under the *Water Services & Institutional Support II (FY16)* project, the Water Regulatory Council disseminates performance data and indicators for each regional utility to the public through its IBNET database. The *Higher Education Science and Technology Project AF (FY15)* and the *Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project (FY15)* commit to using publications and a communication plan respectively to publicly share project-related information. The *Forest Investment Project (FY17)* will finance the costs associated with conducting the forest governance assessment biannually to improve decision-making in the sector by promoting CE in a National Forest Forum and regular and participatory evaluations of the forest sector. The outputs include a functioning multi-stakeholder National Forest Forum, and preparation and disclosure of biannual assessments on forest governance and forest operators. The project mentions disclosure of documents, acknowledging the benefits of this, but does not specify the mechanisms it will use to do so.

The *Education Sector Support Project AF (FY17)* project stands out in the portfolio because it commits to disseminating the results of its impact evaluation in a national workshop on a pre-defined date after project completion. This kind of specificity regarding its commitment to information disclosure demonstrates a degree of transparency and accountability that is not seen elsewhere in the Mozambique portfolio.

Figure 7. Mechanisms for proactive information disclosure, Mozambique FY15–17



Third party monitoring for CE activities and public disclosure

Given the importance of public access to accurate and timely project implementation information for fostering a conducive environment for CE, the ARC investigation examined whether and how projects planned to disclose information about the World Bank-prioritized CE activities or other enabling environment indicators. Significant for each of these areas, public disclosure has particular value for results collected by entities external to and potentially independent from, project management. ARC’s guiding hypothesis is that in projects where third party monitoring results are made public, this helps to advance a conducive or enabling environment by encouraging public accountability and transparency in project operations. As a result, these two areas are complementary and mutually reinforcing in creating an enabling environment for citizen engagement.

In the Mozambique portfolio, five of the six projects with proactive disclosure commitments also committed to utilizing third-party monitoring, although not necessarily for the same activities. However, only two projects in the Mozambique portfolio specified that they would disclose results from third-party monitoring of CE activities as a part of project-related information disclosure plan (see Table 14 and Figure 8).

Figure 8. Intersection of third-party monitoring for CE and proactive information disclosure commitments, Mozambique FY15–17 (2 of 11 projects)




Figure 8 shows that both Mozambique projects that commit to engaging third parties to monitor CE activities also commit to sharing some portion of CE results publicly. Table 14 highlights these relevant project commitments.

TABLE 14. Project commitments to third party monitoring for CE and proactive information disclosure, Mozambique (2 of 11 projects)

Project title	Third party monitoring of CE	Proactive information disclosure
Social Protection Project (AF) FY17	Verification of the beneficiaries' participation by third party.	Commitment to disseminate the data generated by project-supporting training. Information on program outcomes drawn from a multi-year third party impact evaluation has been disseminated publicly. The project will support the government in designing and implementing a strategy to carry out ongoing information and communication activities to keep beneficiaries informed about the program's activities, rules and benefits.
Water Services and Institutional Support II FY16	IVA to track indicators of service quality and socioeconomic characteristics and carry out beneficiary surveys as part of the poverty-focused activities.	Data collected for each regional utility which is disseminated thereafter it to the public through the IBNET database. This is intended to ensure transparency and accountability of the collected survey information and reporting for the impact evaluation.

III. Conclusion

This report provides the first insights into whether and how the World Bank is incorporating its CE commitments in the project design of its 11 active projects in Mozambique (FY15–17). The overarching findings from the seven World Bank-prioritized citizen engagement areas and the three ARC-identified potential areas for fostering an enabling environment are as follows:

At the portfolio and project level, findings and analysis showed a wide variation in how the 11 assessed projects commit to operationalizing CE throughout the project cycle. At the project level, 27 percent of projects (3 of the 11) pledged to achieve all seven CE indicators prioritized by the World Bank as well as all three indicators for an enabling environment for CE. However, when considering CE indicators alone, 36 percent of the portfolio (4 of the 11 projects) shows commitment in all seven CE areas. None of the projects committed to fewer than three CE areas throughout the project cycle.

Only those projects with high levels of commitments to the World Bank-prioritized CE areas commit to all three measures that could create an enabling environment for CE. Six of the 11 projects qualify as *Robust* (the highest level of the CE Density Scale), meaning that a majority of projects commit to at least 9 of the 10 possible Bank-prioritized CE and EE mechanisms. However, among the remaining five projects that rank as *Comprehensive*, *Intermediate* and *Weak* (none of the projects fall into the bottom-most category, *Low*), none commit to all three mechanisms that could create an enabling environment for CE.

Few projects, including those that document CE commitments across all areas, provide specifics on how they plan to carry out CE activities. Therefore **the “thickness” found in terms of numbers of CE commitments mostly does not translate to “thickness” in terms of specificity.** This appears to be a common trend across the Mozambique portfolio, with a lack of information on key issues such as the frequency, timing, and platforms or channels for implementing the intended activities, as well as who—in terms of which stakeholders or beneficiaries—will be involved in implementation and how they will be selected. For example, *collaborative decision-making* commitments are common across the portfolio (80 percent) but most of these projects only state that there will be “participatory planning”, without clarifying the mechanisms that would be used to make the process participatory. As a result, there is ambiguity about who would have the chance to participate and how, and whether direct and indirect beneficiaries are actually involved in determining the activities intended to benefit them. Similarly, the Bank’s definition of *citizen-led monitoring* is described as involving citizens in a number of monitoring activities. However, from the project documents, there remains a substantial gap between what activities are actually led by beneficiaries and what they are engaged in doing collaboratively. “Participatory M&E” is a general term used to express intentions to give citizens a role in monitoring activities at the project planning stage. Yet it is unclear what mechanisms or tools are to be used to facilitate participation.

More than 90 percent of the projects (10 of the 11) commit to operationalizing the minimum monitoring requirement of a CE indicator in their Results Framework. There are two projects among these that include two indicators to measure CE, one project with three indicators and one with four. Although *citizen feedback* appears at the bottom of the commitments by project, it was

utilized as an indicator to measure CE in the Results Framework in half of the 10 projects. *GRM* as a CE indicator was mentioned in only one project. No projects plan to formally measure or track *citizen monitoring* activities.

All of the ten projects that commit to implementing project-level GRMs trigger the safeguard for involuntary resettlement, but two-thirds (7 of 10) still go beyond the minimum safeguard requirements and commit to making the GRM available to all project affected peoples. The Involuntary Resettlement safeguard requires projects to adopt a GRM for individuals affected by project-induced involuntary resettlement. Therefore, since 10 of the 11 Mozambique projects trigger this safeguard it would be expected that they would have a GRM for at least the population affected by involuntary resettlement. Yet a closer examination of the commitments shows that only 3 of the 10 restrict the GRM's availability to those affected by involuntary resettlement, meaning that most of the people affected by these three projects will have no official mechanism through which they can file project-related complaints. On the other hand, the remaining seven Mozambique projects go beyond the minimum social safeguard requirements and pledge to extend GRM access to all project affected peoples. Therefore, social safeguards appear to have functioned positively as an entry point for CE, with the majority of the Mozambique portfolio committing to opening up the GRM beyond what safeguards require.

The CE Density Scale for Mozambique FY15–17 shows that the fiscal year of approval is not the main determinant of the degree to which projects integrate CE. The results captured by the CE Density Scale appear to indicate an increase in projects' incorporation of CE commitments over the course of the three years studied. The two projects from the portfolio with the fewest CE commitments, classified as Weak, are from FY15. Of the six projects classified as Robust, the highest level on the scale, half were approved in FY17. However, this does not necessarily suggest that there has been a general improvement in projects' commitment to CE over time, because the Robust category also includes one FY15 and two FY16 projects, while a FY17 project ranks third from the bottom of all the projects assessed. Moreover, since only 11 projects were approved in Mozambique between FY15 and FY17, this may be too small of a sample to observe any CE trends over time. To determine whether the density of projects' CE commitments is indeed on a positive trajectory, it would be necessary to also investigate projects approved in FY18 and beyond.

It is still unclear what role citizens are envisaged to play in M&E as the basis for constructively and proactively providing feedback for activities which are carried out to benefit them and their communities. Findings show that 64 percent of the projects (7 of the 11) committed to incorporating citizen M&E in project activities. Half of these cited participatory tools as a mechanism for M&E. The remaining half only stated that they would support and promote citizen M&E without specifying what kinds of monitoring activities and measures would be utilized throughout the project cycle and how often they would be implemented.

Commitments to enabling environment indicators

In relation to social inclusion, projects consistently commit to addressing gender, but pay little attention to other dimensions of inclusiveness. Operationalizing the gender mainstreaming at the Bank, over 80 percent of assessed projects (9 of the 11) focus primarily on including and enhancing women's representation in various CE activities. The emphasis in commitments for women's social inclusion is not just on involving women as feedback providers but also in decision-making roles. Commitments to proactively include other marginalized groups in CE efforts (such as disadvantaged people, orphaned children or those who are affected by AIDS or chronically ill) are seen in less than 20 percent of the portfolio.

Commitments to third party monitoring were found in 73 percent of the portfolio. The majority of the projects (eight) utilize third party monitoring for social and environmental safeguard compliance as well as general project monitoring. Only two projects commit to appointing independent verification agents to either monitor CE activities or DLIs, followed by a single project that commits to impact evaluation. While the potential for third party monitoring is high in this portfolio based on the number of projects, the fact that most commitments are planned for limited compliance purposes reveals that this may not in fact contribute to creating an enabling environment for CE. If these eight projects increase the ambit of their third party monitoring and further commit to disclosing their results to the public, it could encourage informed participation throughout the portfolio.

A little over half (55 percent) of the projects commit to proactive information disclosure. Since such disclosure is not mandated by the Bank as a requirement to fulfill the CE Strategy, there is no standard of how to disclose information. Due to different representation of public disclosure commitments in each project, they can not necessarily be easily compared. Details of commitments to publicly disclose information to citizens therefore only reflect a project-based direction to do so. Six projects pledged commitments to public disclosure through dissemination of information via multiple mechanisms with a varying degree of specificity.

Five projects commit to both third party monitoring and subsequent disclosure of project-related information or results to the public. Of these, only two commit to external monitoring of CE activities and proactive information disclosure. These two areas are complementary and if utilized consistently across the portfolio, third party monitoring could make an important contribution to informed citizen participation, but only if projects commit to proactive, timely dissemination of the findings.

References

Works Cited

- Bebbington, Anthony, Michael Woolcock, Scott Guggenheim and Elizabeth Olson. 2006. *The Search for Empowerment: Social Capital as Idea and Practice at The World Bank*, Hartford: Kumarian.
- Davis, Gloria. 2004. *A history of the social development network in The World Bank, 1973 – 2003*. Social Protection discussion paper series; no. 56. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved January 2, 2019 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/806361468779696310/A-history-of-the-social-development-network-in-The-World-Bank-1973-2002>).
- Fox, Jonathan and L. David Brown, eds. 1998. *The Struggle for Accountability: The World Bank, NGOs and Grassroots Movements*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Gugerty, Mary Kay, and Micheal Kremer. 2008. "Outside Funding and the Dynamics of Participation in Community Associations." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3): 585-602.
- Haque, M. Shamsul. (2008) "Decentering the State for Local Accountability through Representation: Social Divides as a Barrier in South Asia." *Public Administration Quarterly* 32(1): 33-58.
- Kim, Jim Yong. 2013. "One Group, Two Goals: Our Future Path." Keynote Speech presented at the World Bank Group Annual Meetings Plenary, October 11, Washington, DC. Retrieved June 27, 2018 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/speech/2013/10/11/world-bank-group-president-jim-yong-kim-speech-annual-meetings-plenary>).
- Manroth, Astrid, Zenaida Hernandez, Harika Masud, Jad Zakhour, Miguel Rebolledo, Syed A. Mahmood, Aaron Seyedian, Qays Hamad, and Tiago Peixoto. 2014. *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations: Engaging with Citizens for Improved Results (English)*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. Retrieved June 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/266371468124780089/Strategic-framework-for-mainstreaming-citizen-engagement-in-World-Bank-Group-operations-engaging-with-citizens-for-improved-results>).
- Mansuri, Ghazala and Vijayendra Rao. 2013. *Localizing Development: Does Participation Work? Policy Research Report*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Van Wicklin III, Warren A., and Asli Gurkan. 2013. How-to notes: participatory and third party monitoring in World Bank projects - what can non-state actors do? (English). Governance and Anti-Corruption (GAC) in projects: Dealing with governance and corruption risks in project lending. Washington DC; World Bank. Retrieved November 15, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/863281468337280255/How-to-notes-participatory-and-third-party-monitoring-in-World-Bank-projects-what-can-non-state-actors-do>).
- World Bank. 2005. *Empowering People by Transforming Institutions: Social Development in World Bank Operations*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved January 2, 2019 (<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1164181732580/SDStrategy-Full.pdf>).

World Bank. 2007. *Strengthening World Bank Group Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption*. Washington: DC: World Bank. Retrieved January 2, 2019 (<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/Resources/GACStrategyPaper.pdf>).

World Bank. 2018a. "Citizen Engagement." Retrieved June 27, 2018 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/what-we-do/brief/citizen-engagement>).

World Bank. 2018b. "Community-Driven Development Overview." Retrieved September 17, 2018 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/communitydrivendevelopment#2>).

World Bank. 2018c. *Engaging Citizens for Better Development*. Independent Evaluation Group, Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved June 27, 2018 (https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/Evaluation/files/Engaging_Citizens_for_Better_Development_Results_FullReport.pdf).

World Bank. 2018d. "Products and Services." Retrieved September 10, 2018 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/products-and-services>).

Desk Review Resources (by Project)

Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape (FY16)

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Agriculture and Natural Resource Landscape Management Project: Environmental and Social Management Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/856011468274193422/pdf/SFG2030-EA-P149620-Box379881B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-4-5-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique - Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Management Project: Environmental Assessment: Pest Management Plan (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/326321468274193114/pdf/SFG2029-EA-P149620-Box379881B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-4-5-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique - Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Management Project: Resettlement Plan: Resettlement Policy Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/320361468053664605/pdf/SFG2031-RP-P149620-Box394883B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-4-7-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Management Project (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/160861467817940751/pdf/PAD1497-PAD-P149620-OUO-9-IDA-R2016-0161-1-Box396267B.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Management Project: P149620 Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 01 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/984981477500330699/pdf/ISR-Disclosure-P149620-10-26-2016-1477500316808.pdf>).

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Agriculture and Natural Resources Landscape Management Project: P149620 Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 02 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/773361493415347803/pdf/ISR-Disclosable-P149620-04-28-2017-1493415338115.pdf>).

Education Sector Support Project AF (FY16)

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Education Sector Support Project: Additional Financing (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/281791495480151135/pdf/MOZAMBIQUE-PAD-05152017.pdf>).

Emergency Resilient Recovery Project (FY16)

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project for the Northern and Central Regions (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/769781468188952055/pdf/PAD1553-PAD-P156559-IDA-R2015-0252-1-Box393202B-OUO-9.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project for the Northern and Central: P156559 - Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 01 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/638191468323074740/pdf/ISR-Disclosable-P156559-02-09-2016-1455070125816.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project for the Northern and Central: P156559 Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 02 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/688711474643661988/pdf/ISR-Disclosable-P156559-09-23-2016-1474643651057.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project: Environmental Assessment: Environmental and Social Management Framework for the Northern and Central regions (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/391051481874066505/pdf/SFG2773-EA-P156559-Box396338B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-12-15-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project: Environmental Assessment: Environmental and Social Management Framework; Pest Management Plan (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/669941481776625322/pdf/SFG2744-EA-P156559-Box396338B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-12-13-2016.pdf>).

Emergency Resilient Recovery Project AF (FY17)

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project: Additional Financing (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/374711484074991397/pdf/MZ-Project-Paper-01042017.pdf>).

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project: Additional Financing - Resettlement Plan: Resettlement Policy Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/254371513524135015/pdf/SFG3890-RP-Box405317B-P161559-PUBLIC-disclosed-12-17-17.pdf>).

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Emergency Resilient Recovery Project: Additional Financing - Environmental Assessment: Environmental and Social Management Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/108721513523534410/pdf/SFG3872-EA-Box405317B-P161559-PUBLIC-disclosed-12-17-17.pdf>).

Forest Investment Project (FY17)

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Forest Investment Project (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/374901487522968695/Mozambique-Forest-Investment-Project>).

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique Forest Investment Project: Environmental Assessment: Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/310611511291647807/Strategic-environmental-and-social-assessment>).

Rodrigues De Aquino, Andre. 2017. *Mozambique Forest Investment Project: P160033 - Implementation Status Results Report: Sequence 01 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/416201494606640168/Mozambique-Mozambique-Forest-Investment-Project-P160033-Implementation-Status-Results-Report-Sequence-01>).

Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project (FY15)

World Bank. 2014. *Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/414931468286479626/pdf/PAD7720PAD0P13010Box385345B00UO090.pdf>).

World Bank. 2014. *Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project: Environmental and Social Management Framework (Vol. 2): Quadro de gestão de pragas (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/148421468059929705/pdf/E46220V20PORTU0Box385304B00PUBLIC0.pdf>).

World Bank. 2014. *Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project: Resettlement Plan: Plano de Reassentamento (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/561321468062078913/pdf/RP16840PORTUGU0Box385304B00PUBLIC0.pdf>).

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project: P131965 - Implementation Status Results Report : Sequence 01 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/561451468060532000/pdf/ISR-Disclosable-P131965-02-19-2015-1424374383631.pdf>).

Rodrigues De Aquino, Andre. 2015. *Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project: P131965 Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 02 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/796241468057281693/pdf/ISR-Disclosable-P131965-08-13-2015-1439501718575.pdf>).

Higher Education Science and Technology Project AF (FY15)

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Higher Education Science and Technology Project: Additional Financing Resettlement Plan; Resettlement Policy Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/877921468323072293/pdf/RP17610AFRORPF0Box385453B00PUBLIC0.pdf>).

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Higher Education Science and Technology Project: Additional Financing Environmental Assessment; Environmental and Social Management Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/694741468120849931/pdf/E47630AFROESMF0Box385453B00PUBLIC0.pdf>).

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Higher Education Science and Technology (HEST) Project: Additional Financing (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/986221468058488198/pdf/PAD12960PAD0P1010Box391420B00OUO090.pdf>).

Social Protection Project AF (FY17)

World Bank. 2017. *Mozambique - Social Protection Project: Additional Financing (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/891281493844809037/pdf/Project-Paper-Documents-Disclosable-Version-P161351-2017-02-27-cleande-03012017.pdf>).

The Cities and Climate Change Project - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of Mozambique (or Cities and Climate Change PPCR AF (FY15))

World Bank. 2015. *Mozambique Cities and Climate Change Project: Pilot Program for Climate Resilience Additional Financing (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/889211468061732271/pdf/817190PJPR0P14010Box385329B00OUO090.pdf>).

Water Services & Institutional Support II (FY16)

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Second Phase of the Water Services and Institutional Support Project: Environmental Assessment: Environmental and Social Management Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/266591468275697715/pdf/SFG1814-EA-P149377-PUBLIC-Disclosed-2-10-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Second Phase of the Water Services and Institutional Support Project: Resettlement Plan; Resettlement Policy Framework (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/996361468058490877/pdf/SFG1813-RP-P149377-PUBLIC-Disclosed-2-10-2016.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Second Water Services and Institutional Support Project (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. (Project Appraisal Document/PAD). Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/865851467994666409/pdf/PAD1453-PAD-P149377-IDA-R2016-0043-1-Box394870B-OUO-9.pdf>).

World Bank. 2016. *Mozambique Water Services & Institutional Support II: P149377 - Implementation Status Results Report; Sequence 01 (English)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Retrieved November 27, 2018 (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/244441467222861460/pdf/ISR-Disclosed-P149377-06-29-2016-1467222848670.pdf>).

Endnotes

1. See <https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/consultation-template/engaging-citizens-improved-resultsopenconsultationtemplate/materials/finalstrategicframeworkforce.pdf>, accessed 21 February, 2019.
2. The World Bank Group encompasses five distinct international organizations including: **The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)** and **the International Development Association (IDA)**, which work primarily with governments; **the International Finance Corporation (IFC)** and **the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA)**, which support private sector investment, and **the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)**, which adjudicates investment disputes that arise international private sector companies and governments. This CE investigation focuses on the two government-serving WBG branches, **IBRD** and **IDA**, which together are most commonly known collectively under the umbrella moniker the “World Bank”. This oftentimes confusing title of World Bank for just two of the five entities that comprise the WBG results because “the IBRD and IDA constitute the World Bank proper, while the ICSID, IFC and MIGA are ‘affiliates’ that ‘are closely associated with the World Bank’” (Bebbington et al 2006:10). Owned and managed by its 189 country members, IBRD/IDA (henceforth referred to as the “the World Bank”) provided 71 percent of the WBG’s 2017 global financial assistance (\$42.1 billion of the total \$59 billion provided, World Bank 2017:4). The primary vehicles through which the World Bank provides financial assistance are autonomous projects, also called operations.
3. Induced participation is differentiated from organic participation, which can be spontaneous or, when organized, done so “by civic groups outside government, sometimes in opposition to it” (Mansuri and Rao 2013:xi).
4. The CE Strategy describes categories of citizen engagement mechanisms as follows: *Consultations; GRMs; collecting, recording, and reporting on inputs received from citizens; collaboration in decision-making; citizen-led monitoring, evaluation, or oversight; empowering citizens with resources and authority over their use; and citizen capacity building for engagement* (Manroth 2014:31). The ARC assessment includes all CE Strategy categories except “empowering citizens without resources and authority over their use” for several key reasons. First, as described in the strategy, the only kinds of Bank projects that are in the position to implement mechanisms in this category are those designed to be community driven development and therefore does not pertain the majority of World Bank operations. By creating a CE category that only projects utilizing a CDD approach can fulfil, the strategy privileges this particular development model and creates a high-level category into which, by definition, no other types of projects could reach. Furthermore, this framing takes for granted that the kinds of participatory mechanisms that comprise CDD approaches will lead to empowerment among those participating in the project. Although this study does not discount the benefit of CDD approaches and the embedded participatory opportunities it creates, it does not accept the underlying premise that by their implementation empowerment is achieved (see Mansuri and Rao 2013). Therefore, the ARC assessment did not utilize this category, understanding that participatory mechanisms that are part of the design of CDD operations will be captured in the other categories.
5. CDD is defined at the World Bank as “an approach that gives control over planning decisions and investment resources for local development projects to community groups” (World Bank 2018b).

6. Mozambique does not legally categorize any of its different ethnic populations as “indigenous” and therefore this social safeguard does not apply in the World Bank’s Mozambique work.

7. The World Bank requires that the outcomes for indicators included in a project’s Results Framework be made public. However, the process by which these results are considered to meet this requirement is through bi-annual Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs). These short documents which typically include basic numerical reporting and minimal accounting of process or explanatory detail, are made available only via the project pages of the World Bank’s website.

www.accountabilityresearch.org



American University
School of International Service
4400 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington, DC 20016
www.accountabilityresearch.org