Network for Integrity in Reconstruction
Post war context

- **Stability** of the country in the short/medium/long term
  - Nearly 50% of post-war countries revert to war within 10 years

- **State fragility**: a dynamic political process balancing the expectations of citizens and the ability and interest of the state in delivering to them.

- **Integrity** – a function of competence, accountability and corruption control can help build more resilient, stable states.
Phases of reconstruction

1. **Potlatch**: Period of high expectations; high corruption risks; low demands for accountability

2. **Late Awakening**: Risk of entrenched corruption; high public perceptions of corruption; high internal and external demand for accountability; high risk of return to violent conflict.

Development needs (financial and technical)
- International financial assistance
- Absorptive capacity of government and society

Time

War

Peace Settlement
c.a. 0-15 years after a peace settlement
The Challenge

- Functioning states = critical, often part of the problem, but need to be part of the solution

- Anti-corruption initiatives are important for sound governance, but this focus alone is too narrow and can have negative unintended consequences
  - Evidence of success lacking – ACCs, increase government salaries, public awareness raising
Accountability Chain

The beneficiaries must be reintegrated in the accountability chain

Audit and financial accountability

X % of aid

Y%

State in Reconstruction

Actual accountability chain

- Tax Payers
  - Semi-contractual
- Donor
- Implementer
  - NGO / Company
- Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries must be reintegrated in the accountability chain
Integrity Approach

- **Address the gaps** – not just a question of financial accountability
- **Competence** – Reinforce national capacities and resources, contextualised knowledge
- **Accountability** - Focus on access to information, community engagement, local accountability mechanisms
- **Identify and mitigate corruption risks**– focus on corruption risks analysed as being particularly destabilising, collaborative governance > confrontational approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key Partners</th>
<th>Projects/Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Palestine        | Teacher Creativity Centre     | - Roads
- Schools
- Water and waste
- Library
- Parks
- Food security |
| Timor Leste      | Luta Hamutuk and community    | - Roads
- Electricity
- Veteran housing
- Health centres
- Schools |
|                  | focal points                  |                                                        |
| Liberia          | Poverty Reduction Strategy    | - Roads
- Infrastructure and basic services of the PRSTN      |
| Afghanistan      | Integrity Watch Afghanistan   | - Health centres
- Roads
- Electricity
- Police station |
| Dem Rep of Congo | FOCHI and Centre Resolution   | - Water projects
- Health centres
- Roads
- Land
- Electricity |
|                  | Conflicts                     |                                                        |
| Sierra Leone     | NMJD and IMTS                 |                                                        |
|                  |                               |                                                        |
| Nepal            | CAHURAST                      | - Water
- Health program
- Road
- Education services |
Local monitoring dynamics and initiatives

**LOCAL MONITORING GROUPS (LMG)**

**COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING PROCESS**

As implemented by IWA in Jabulsaraj since 2007

**Mobilization**

LMG training

Assistance to access info

IWA facilitation role

**MOBILIZATION**

**LMG TRAINING**

**ASSISTANCE TO ACCESS INFO**

**INFO SHARING/CHANNELING**

**ADVOCACY**

**POLICY**

1. **HOLD IMPLEMENTERS ACCOUNTABLE**
2. **EMPOWER COMMUNITIES**
3. **FIGHT CORRUPTION**
4. **INFORM THE DONORS ON THE IMPACT OF THEIR WORK**
5. **IMPROVE EFFICIENCY OF FUNDING AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**
6. **BUILD CREDIBILITY OF CITIZENS' ACTION**
7. **OFFERS AN ALTERNATIVE TO SPOILERS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**

**LOCAL MONITORING GROUP (LMG)**

**COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING PROCESS**

**SELECTION PROCESS**

Local Monitoring Group (LMG)

**MONITORING REPORT**

**REPORTING**

LMG share monitoring results with

Community

Project Implementers

State

Donors

**RESULTS**

Best practices are shared

Solutions are found to correct project

Solutions

Pressure

1. People choose

Local Monitoring Group (LMG)

2. Integrity monitoring by the Local Monitoring Group (LMG)

Survey beneficiaries' views

Obtain project documents

Field visits

Project to be monitored (corresponding to the communities' priorities)

LMG's monitoring results receive community's approval

Impact

1. Hold implementers accountable
2. Empower communities
3. Fight corruption
4. Inform the donors on the impact of their work
5. Improve efficiency of funding at the local level
6. Build credibility of citizens' action
7. Offers an alternative to spoilers at the local level
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Findings and Results

• Sustainable forums for change – service providers, local leaders and community monitors review monitoring findings and develop practical solutions

• Changing the nature of engagement – In Afghanistan, NATO working with CSOs on building integrity measures, community monitoring of police stations

• Establishment of transparent procedures and criteria for recruitment and beneficiary lists – eg. Palestine

• Govt budget allocations to address identified gaps and needs – eg. Nepal, Timor Leste

• Aid transparency initiatives +ve, but more key info still needed
Recommendations

- Greater understanding of destabilising corruption risks and integrity opportunities within state building processes
- Increase engagement of local stakeholders in aid governance (a hotline to report corruption, physical access etc.)
- Draw on local accountability mechanisms, integrate social accountability in policy and practice (eg. Shuras, DDR coms)
- Build local competences with identification and support of existing capacities (eg. Peace Dividend Trust)
- Build on MSIs and budget transparency initiatives to enable communities to access and use data (eg. TL’s ‘Transparency Portal’)
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