MAKING ALL
VOICES COUNT

A GRAND CHALLENGE
FOR DEVELOPMENT

Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems: Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja

Francesca Feruglio and Abrahams Misoi

TRANSPARENCY
INTERNATIONAL
KENYA

IDS Institute of
Development Studies

PRACTICE PAPER

Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems:
Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja

Authors

Francesca Feruglio is a research officer at the Institute of Development Studies, working on the Making All Voices Count programme. She manages a cohort of research grants, and provides technical inputs on their design, methods and stakeholder engagement strategies where needed. She also shares the lessons from these projects with broader audiences.

Abrahams Misoi is a national convener for Transparency International in Kenya. He coordinates the implementation of Uwajibikaji Pamoja (Accountability Together) in Turkana, Wajir, Marsabit and West Pokot. He provides technical support to county conveners and is a partner in the management of community feedback, as well as engaging in networking and fundraising for the sustainability of the initiative.

Reference and copyright

Contents

Summary

Kenya's arid and semi-arid regions have faced recurrent drought, famine and inter-community conflicts. High levels of need have led to large humanitarian relief programmes involving government and national and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

This is the context in which Transparency International Kenya's (TI-Kenya) Uwajibikaji Pamoja (Accountability Together) programme emerged. It initially aimed to provide an easy-to-use, low-cost and trusted mechanism for aid beneficiaries to make complaints or highlight service gaps, and to have their complaint dealt with, ultimately improving the impact and efficiency of aid. The system, whereby people can file a complaint by text (free) or email (or, if they have no phone or are illiterate, can get an intermediary to file a paper-based complaint form) was implemented in Turkana, West Pokot and Wajir counties, involving more than 45 state and non-state actors.

This paper summarises the process and findings of practitioner research by TI-Kenya, funded by the Making All Voices Count programme, to assess the effectiveness of Uwajibikaji Pamoja and how technology has facilitated the system. These findings – discussed in a conversation between Abrahams Misoi (TI-Kenya) and Francesca Feruglio (IDS) – indicate that the wide range of government and non-governmental bodies involved in Uwajibikaji Pamoja have made significant changes to their processes for dealing with and responding to complaints as a result of the TI-Kenya report's recommendations.

Ensuring responsiveness requires building trust and commitment among beneficiary communities, but it also requires service providers to understand how citizens' feedback can benefit service delivery and management. While technology undoubtedly plays a large part in the system's responsiveness, many beneficiaries are not reached due to illiteracy, poor mobile network coverage or lack of awareness. However, TI-Kenya argues that, rather than focusing on extending network coverage, building greater community confidence and trust in a complaints referral system is what really improves coverage and reach.

Key themes

- Using a rights-based approach to participation
- The role of intermediaries in establishing complaints platforms and making them work
- Moving beyond intermediaries towards sustainability

Setting the scene for practitioner learning

Making All Voices Count is a citizen engagement and accountable governance programme. Its Research Evidence and Learning component, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), focuses on building an evidence base on what works in technology for voice, transparency and accountability, how it works, and why (McGee, Edwards, Minkley, Pegus and Brock 2015).

The programme's practitioner research and learning grants give transparency and accountability practitioners funds and mentoring support to provide them with the space and capabilities to explore key questions that will enable them to better implement their governance projects. Most, but not all, of these practitioners are using tech-enabled approaches. This real-time applied research contributes to project learning and improved practice.

The practitioner research and learning grants support grantees to form their own learning and judgements, and the programme's series of practice papers is part of this process. Practice papers document the process of practitioner research and learning from the perspective of both the grant recipients and the programme. They are co-produced, and intended to prompt critical reflection on key learning questions that arise from the research process.

This practice paper focuses on the work of Transparency International Kenya (TI-Kenya), and particularly on a complaints referral platform, Uwajibikaji Pamoja, which TI-Kenya established to facilitate the filing, referral and addressing of complaints related to a range of essential services delivered by county government and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). In 2016, TI-Kenya was awarded a practitioner research and learning grant by Making All Voices Count to assess the effectiveness of the platform and explore lessons from similar complaints referral systems to draw evidence-based

recommendations on how to make Uwajibikaji Pamoja more sustainable and effective.

Through this research, TI-Kenya has been able to work with partners to increase rates of participation and responsiveness, as well as undertaking a promising attempt to extend the platform to a fourth county.

This paper summarises the process and findings of TI-Kenya's practitioner research and reflects on the future of Uwajibikaji Pamoja through a conversation about the process between Abrahams Misoi, of TI-Kenya, and Francesca Feruglio, who managed the organisation's practitioner research grant.

What is Uwajibikaji Pamoja?

Uwajibikaji Pamoja (Accountability Together) is an integrated complaints referral mechanism run by TI-Kenya in partnership with more than 40 service providers, including government and development aid agencies. The system allows citizens to lodge complaints about gaps in access to a range of services provided by the government and humanitarian agencies, through a toll-free Short Message Service (SMS) line, email and walk-ins, from where the complaint is then referred to the relevant provider. The system then follows up with complainants and provides information on the status of their feedback. It is designed to complement internal feedback mechanisms set up by partners, where these exist, by making submission and receipt of complaints easier, less costly and less time-consuming.

With support from Making All Voices Count, TI-Kenya conducted research to assess the effectiveness of the Uwajibikaji Pamoja platform, and particularly the role played by technology in facilitating complaints submissions and referral. The research was conducted in Turkana, West Pokot and Wajir counties and in Nairobi from April to June 2016. It used quantitative and

PRACTICE PAPER

Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems:
Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja

Conveners are jointly recruited and managed by a joint steering committee representing and nominated by partners. Since conveners are not tied to any of the partner organisations, partners perceive them to be neutral and impartial, hence more trusted to receive and refer complaints.

qualitative methods, and comprised a literature review on social accountability and feedback mechanisms, and field interviews and focus group discussions with complainants, staff of TI-Kenya and partner organisations, and other key informants. More specifically, qualitative data were collected through five focus group discussions with TI-Kenya field staff (social auditors) and partners, and through 32 key informant interviews with partners, policy-makers, social auditors and community members. Quantitative data consisted of questionnaires to 34 TI-Kenya field staff (social auditors). Both random and purposive sampling methods were used to select respondents.

The research was strongly action-oriented and led to a significant improvement in the rate of response to complaints, as well as to the system being embedded by one of the county governments partnering with TI-Kenya.

How does Uwajibikaji Pamoja work?

The integrated complaints referral mechanism initiative was launched in Turkana county in April 2014, in West Pokot in August 2014 and in Wajir in October 2014, and brings together 46 state and non-state actors.

The arid and semi-arid regions of Kenya, where Uwajibikaji Pamoja works, are characterised by high levels of poverty due to factors such as frequent droughts, conflict, sustained high food prices and lack of options for migration (TI-Kenya 2012a). The contextual factors were exacerbated by incidents of violence and displacement following the December 2007

election and a severe drought in 2011. As the drought was declared a national disaster, the government and the international community mobilised significant investments in food aid for drought-affected populations, making it the largest component of humanitarian assistance in Kenya (Ibid.). The range of stakeholders involved in delivering aid, and the different types of policies and procedures put in place to manage it, meant a high risk of diversion and appropriation of resources. A 2011 study identified food aid, among all types of humanitarian aid, as the most vulnerable to corruption (Maxwell, Bailey, Harvey, Walker, Sharbatke-Church and Savage 2012).

Uwajibikaji Pamoja's governance structure

Social auditors act as the go-between linking communities and service providers. They receive complaints from community members, and lodge them on the Uwajibikaji Pamoja platform. The social auditor's role is critical to ensuring that communities understand their rights – including the right to file a complaint – and are informed of projects in their locality. Social auditors also mobilise community members to participate in the monitoring of projects, and produce social auditing reports for partners (implementing agencies). As they are community-based, social auditors also receive complaints and lodge them on behalf of those people who do not know how to read or write, or do not have a phone. This they do through their own phones, or through paper-based complaints forms.

Conveners receive and refer complaints to partners, follow up unresolved complaints, conduct outreach for awareness in the communities, train the social

PRACTICE PAPER

**Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems:
Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja**

auditors in complaints handling and referral, and coordinate stakeholders and steering committee meetings. Conveners are jointly recruited and managed by a joint steering committee representing and nominated by partners (see below). Since conveners are not tied to any of the partner organisations, partners perceive them to be neutral and impartial, hence more trusted to receive and refer complaints. Conveners coordinate the activities at county level through monthly meetings held with all partners. The meetings aim to jointly plan monthly activities, present social audit reports, identify partners available to engage in radio shows to discuss challenges in service delivery, and develop action points for implementation.

The joint steering committee is a county-level oversight structure for the platform, comprising representatives of governmental and non-governmental service providers, both national and local, nominated by partners and tasked with making decisions on the day-to-day operations of the initiative, including the hiring and supervision of conveners at county level.

The Nairobi Task Force is a national-level governance and coordination structure comprising Nairobi-based representatives of the county-based partners. This structure exists to address issues of documentation, communication and sustainability, as well as joint engagement with the national-level non-state actors and county government structures.

How the system works

Complaints are either filed directly by citizens – via SMS, online forms or printed forms – or collected and submitted by social auditors (as described above).

Once the complaints have been submitted into the web-based system, they are referred to relevant respondents (service providers), and specifically to a focal point person appointed to receive them. The focal point can either accept or dismiss the complaint. Once accepted, the complaint enters the resolution stage, wherein the respondent will address it and give feedback about its resolution. If the complaint is dismissed, the respondent has to give a reason for its dismissal, which is shared with the complainant; if he or she is not satisfied, they are entitled to re-send the complaint, and the same process is followed until feedback is given. Complaints are assigned a tracking number which allows complainants to monitor their status. If no action is taken, the convener follows up with the relevant respondent until the complaint is addressed.

The platform generates data and reports regarding the type of complaints received, disaggregated by gender, age group and sector. It also provides for a number of education and engagement activities, such as monthly community outreach and radio shows. These activities aim to:

- raise awareness among community members of their rights and entitlements and how to use the platform to submit a complaint

- collect complaints by social auditors

- provide opportunities for direct engagement between complainants and respondents through one-hour, interactive radio sessions with partnering organisations and especially county government representatives. This is for provision of information to promote transparency and accountability within their operations and to respond to community questions in real time.

From holding humanitarian actors accountable to engaging with the state using a rights-based approach

Francesca:

How was Uwajibikaji Pamoja established?

Abrahams:

The idea for the project emerged from TI-Kenya's experience with the 2011 drought response in Kenya. A study we undertook in 2012 analysed the response to the 2011 drought, particularly in relation to food aid (TI-Kenya 2012a). It focused on the arid and semi-arid lands regions, which were hardest hit with drought, famine and inter-community conflicts (Abass 2005), but which had also previously faced marginalisation by successive regimes, resulting in a high concentration of humanitarian and relief service providers (UNICEF 2015). Food aid is one of the largest components of emergency response, and in Kenya it has been the component most consistently funded by both the government and the international community.

The study shed a light on "critical flaws in the food assistance chain" and included recommendations "to specific sector players to enhance integrity, accountability and effectiveness of food assistance programming" (TI-Kenya 2012b). It found that there was a lot of support coming from different humanitarian organisations, but that beneficiaries of food aid did not have a clear, transparent or effective way to share their feedback on the gaps in aid delivery. One of the main issues was beneficiaries not knowing exactly which office to lodge a complaint to. Other challenges included the distance travelled and cost incurred by beneficiaries in order to lodge complaints to respective actors, lack of awareness of existing

mechanisms set up by different organisations, and fear of retaliation, especially when reporting corruption.

For these reasons, TI-Kenya decided to establish Uwajibikaji Pamoja as a one-stop shop for citizens to share their concerns about humanitarian aid in a way that is accessible, anonymous and safe. Secondly, later on we realised that at a broader level, the system could ensure a more participatory approach to aid programming if humanitarian actors used the feedback to inform their planning – for instance, about which areas should be prioritised and who should be involved in their programmes.

So we reached out to humanitarian organisations in the three counties where the 2012 study took place and, following consultations, we launched Uwajibikaji Pamoja in 2014.

Francesca:

The system now deals with a range of services in addition to aid delivery, as well as diverse providers, including non-state actors and county governments. How were you able to diversify the range of services covered, and include different actors?

Abrahams:

While at the beginning we were focusing on humanitarian assistance alone, when we started engaging with people in the field, we saw that there were many gaps in the delivery of services provided by the government (both county and national) and non-state actors. We then started discussions with people working in different

Humanitarian actors are now putting accountability at the core of service delivery, and have a lot to gain from being part of a system like Uwajibikaji Pamoja. The main benefit is that it makes it easier for them to receive and manage feedback from people without having to reach out to the community.

departments in county governments about service delivery systems, slowly trying to bring them on board and be part of Uwajibikaji Pamoja. It required a lot of sensitisation on how it may be beneficial to them.

Most humanitarian actors are now putting accountability at the core of service delivery, and have a lot to gain from being part of a system like Uwajibikaji Pamoja. The main benefit is that it makes it easier for them to receive and manage feedback from people without having to reach out to the community. On the one hand, humanitarian staff are not keen to come 'on the ground' because it may put them on the spot; on the other hand, citizens are afraid to bring their grievances forward in public because of risks of retaliation. Using Uwajibikaji Pamoja means that the respondent does not directly get in touch with the complainant, which builds confidence on both sides.

As of today, TI-Kenya has signed 20 memorandums of understanding (MoUs) with partners in Turkana, 18 in West Potok and 22 in Wajir. These partners are a mixture of county government departments – of which there are up to ten in each county – and local and international NGOs.

Francesca:

What worked in engaging with government partners?

Abrahams:

Getting the buy-in from county governments has been harder and required more effort, but the legal framework on people's participation is strong. The 2010 Constitution of Kenya is grounded on the principles of democracy and people's participation, and the devolution process it triggered created room for people's participation at county level (Government of Kenya 2016). Based on these constitutional principles, the recent Public Participation Bill (2016) could be a major step forward in implementing the constitutional right to participation. Under the Bill, public authorities at national and county levels would need to ensure "reasonable and meaningful" opportunity for the public to participate in decision-making processes – for instance, legislative processes. Also, every public body will be required to develop specific guidelines on public participation in line with the general national guidelines.

In the areas where we work, we see the value of this policy framework: during community forums a lot of attention is placed on complaints referral and a participatory approach to development. This leads to people being keener to send complaints and to government authorities more committed to respond to them – and also to implement something like Uwajibikaji Pamoja.

Francesca:

Within this background, what was the purpose of the research funded by Making All Voices Count?

Abrahams:

We decided to undertake this research with the idea of exploring the possibilities of handing over the management of Uwajibikaji Pamoja to the partners, ensuring its sustainability once funding ends. The aim was to hear from all staff involved, both in TI-Kenya and in partners, as well as users

of the platform and other stakeholders. We asked them what works well and what doesn't, and used their answers to formulate action-oriented recommendations for partner organisations.

The research findings provided us with a solid ground for improving the responsiveness and effectiveness of the platform, as well as ushering in adjustments that would make it sustainable by embedding it into the government structure – in consonance with the government's legal obligations to gather and respond to citizens' feedback. In other words, we are capitalising on the opportunities opened up by the new Bill to scale the adoption of Uwajibikaji Pamoja by other county governments, and for this to happen through a more sustainable model (see below).

Building 'teeth' and political will for improving responsiveness to citizens' complaints

Francesca:

Taking a closer look at some of the research findings, one of the main challenges in implementing Uwajibikaji Pamoja has been the poor responsiveness rate. The research report identifies the main reasons for low responsiveness. First, MoUs with partners lack the 'teeth' (power) to enforce sanctions when complaints are not addressed. Second, there is weak commitment overall to addressing complaints from partners who are responsible for resolving them.

Could you talk a bit more about these challenges? Were there key distinctions between non-governmental humanitarian actors and government authorities in the way they responded to complaints – or did not respond?

Abrahams:

Some partners – both NGOs and government agencies – were not really committed to utilising the platform because they had their own internal complaints referral systems in place. Though Uwajibikaji Pamoja was set up to complement existing grievance mechanisms, in some instances the duplication of systems created confusion, causing complaints to be left unattended.

Overall, NGO partners were more likely than government agencies to address complaints. Government agencies usually take a lot of time to act on the feedback received due to very bureaucratised procedures and the tendency to 'bounce' complaints from one department to another. Uwajibikaji Pamoja is intended to ensure consistent follow-up by relevant respondents, but during the research, partners observed that the MoUs were not clear about the expectation for ensuring that the referred cases are handled. For instance, MoUs do not provide a time-bound period within which complaints need to be addressed. This inherent weakness of the system has contributed to low rates of response; during the time of the research, out of 2,000 complaints received, only 20% (about 400) had been addressed.

Partnerships are based on the expectation that partners respond to the complaints, but if this doesn't happen, the risk in the long run is that community members will lose confidence and motivation in filing complaints.

Francesca:

On the basis of these findings, what steps are you taking to build 'teeth' and political will?

Ensuring responsiveness requires building trust and commitment to the system, and having partners understand how citizens' feedback can benefit them.

Abrahams:

Partners were appreciative of the recommendations that emerged from the research report, which have led to significant improvements in responsiveness.

Overall, ensuring responsiveness requires building trust and commitment to the system, and having partners understand how citizens' feedback can benefit them. During the monthly coordination meetings with county partners, the convener now stresses the importance of responding to complaints, not only because "it's the right thing to do", but also because citizens' feedback can help in planning and implementing programmes. While this was happening before the research, it was given greater emphasis because it came out as a way of enhancing the rate of complaint resolution.

Complaints can be used to identify structural gaps in service delivery as well as to inform decisions that will make programmes more successful because they are based on the actual needs of the community. So, an effective complaints referral and response mechanism can be a way of ensuring adapting management within service delivery programmes.

We are investing a lot of effort in working with government agencies to have them understand that citizens' feedback can bring a lot of value to service delivery. We are focusing on training focal points within partner organisations on how to use the platform, and helping them to see it as a tool useful to them. We have seen it improving over the years: while many partners were sceptical at first, there is now stronger buy-in.

Lastly, in terms of developing more 'teeth', we introduced a time-bound period of seven days within which respondents need to provide feedback about complaints.

These steps have led to an increase in responsiveness: since the launch of the report in April 2017, the number of complaints successfully addressed has reached 50% (1,000, up from the 400 that were being addressed at the time of the research).

Francesca:

For TI-Kenya, responsiveness means both addressing specific gaps in service delivery faced by complainants, and responding by adapting strategies and interventions. During your follow-up with partners, how do you strike a balance between individual and collective complaints? And what does it actually mean to close the feedback loop?

Abrahams:

For us, a feedback loop is really closed when complainants are satisfied with the feedback received. The system gives an opportunity to say if you're happy with the feedback or not. If they say yes, it will be treated as resolved. If they say no, then the convener will follow up with it. Concretely, it depends on the kind of complaint raised. Sometimes it may require providing information, other times taking an action.

In terms of striking a balance between individual and collective complaints, many times when complaints are raised by an individual, these are symptomatic of issues that affect the wider community – and that's what we focus on. When following up with relevant authorities, we put a lot more weight behind it when the issue has a collective impact. For instance, in some cases we physically visit the respondent to discuss a specific problem affecting the community.

Most of the complaints are sent through SMS because it's convenient, anonymous and it can be done anywhere and anytime. This means that when people can choose between SMS and other forms, such as walk-in and paper forms, they will choose SMS.

Tech and non-tech approaches for inclusive participation

Francesca:

Throughout the research, the added value of technology in Uwajibikaji Pamoja emerged clearly. Technology plays a role for both facilitating reporting of complaints by citizens, and for referring large amounts of data to a large number of stakeholders; these things are easier, quicker and cheaper with an online platform. But the research has also found that a large percentage of the population is not reached by the system due to illiteracy, poor network coverage and lack of awareness. TI-Kenya is heavily involved in on-the-ground efforts to overcome these barriers. How are tech and non-tech strategies being combined to increase reach?

Abrahams:

The role of tech in Uwajibikaji Pamoja is very critical. In most places where we work, telephone networks cover about 75% of the population. Generally speaking, people have developed a lot of trust in tech. This is demonstrated by the fact that most of the complaints are sent through SMS because it's convenient, anonymous and it can be done anywhere and anytime. This means that when people can choose between SMS and other forms, such as walk-in and paper forms, they will choose SMS.

That said, people who are unable to directly lodge complaints via SMS – either because they don't have a phone or coverage, or because they are illiterate – are supported by local social auditors who fill in log-sheets and later on lodge them in the system. Social auditors are embedded in the community and therefore very accessible to other people living there.

Wider reach and use of the platform is a huge issue but I don't think this is due to poor network coverage. Also, patchy network coverage needs to be looked at in perspective, as technology is rapidly expanding to include traditionally 'low-coverage' areas and the number of connected people is likely to improve.

Wider outreach should instead be achieved by building stronger awareness about Uwajibikaji Pamoja. For this reason, TI puts a lot of emphasis on educating community members about their rights, including that of reporting / complaining. The impact of this is clear – we have noted that most of the complaints reported by individuals through SMS are sent immediately after community awareness forums held by social auditors and / or conveners. In particular, social auditors are selected by community members, live in the community, and are accessible and trusted. Additionally, local-language radio shows overcome barriers of literacy and geography, while providing an opportunity for directly interacting with respondents by calling in during the show. Similarly, on-site visits by conveners – sometimes along with partners – are extremely valuable.

Building community confidence and trust in the system is really what improves coverage and reach. In fact, the more outreach we do, the more community forums we get; the more interactive radio we have, the more complaints we receive. The challenge is that the areas where we work are huge and require a lot of resources.

Francesca:

Furthermore, on inclusion, the research found that only 17% of complaints are reported by women. What steps are you planning to take?

Abrahams:

While reporting by women is extremely low, we should consider that many of the issues reported relate to women and children (e.g. children not receiving immunisation, girls not being allowed to go to school), and that women often raise these issues through men's phones. So, women's voices are being represented, but indirectly, and to a lesser extent than men's. Finding appropriate ways to reach women – for instance, by encouraging women's participation and incorporating equality and anti-discrimination messaging in wider outreach activities – would be important steps to increasing representation.

Getting sustainable: making intermediaries redundant?

Francesca:

A clear factor of success that emerges from the research is the intermediation role played by TI-Kenya, which goes much beyond referring complaints to relevant partners, to engaging with both sides of the equation by encouraging people to voice their complaints and the partners to address them. What are you aiming to achieve in the long run?

Abrahams:

Yes, stakeholders look at TI as a respected, non-partisan organisation that is able to mediate between complainants and respondents. For us, this intermediation means constantly educating and sensitising complainants, partners and individual respondents on the need to trust and use the system.

With partners, perceived neutrality is essential for the system to work: conveners are trusted because they are perceived as neutral, not belonging to either side of the equation – they are not staff of partner organisations, nor members of the communities receiving the services. On the other hand, the platform is still seen by some partners as TI-led, and this lack of ownership makes it difficult

for some actors, especially county governments, to be held accountable.

With community members, social auditors are the key actors educating people on the platform and supporting them in filing complaints. As I mentioned, outreach requires a lot of resources, but the fact that social auditors belong to the communities where they work ensures that awareness and capacity is being built locally, and should be sustainable. Some social auditors have begun seeing the importance of operating independently from us, and that's what is going to be crucial in the long run. We want to get to a point where communities don't need our support and outreach to file complaints. Basically, the goal is to have the system work without us.

Francesca:

Yet considering the paramount role that TI-Kenya is currently playing, ensuring sustainability of the platform seems quite challenging. What are your plans for ensuring that Uwajibikaji Pamoja can run without TI-Kenya?

Abrahams:

Sustainability is challenging but we have quite solid reasons to think that it is achievable. The

PRACTICE PAPER

Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems: Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja

constitutional right to participation, along with the strong learning and practical recommendations that emerged from the research, give us both a framework and the tools for working towards sustainability.

In May 2016 we began forging relations with Marsabit county government, which, on the heels of the new Participation Bill, had expressed interest in the Uwajibikaji Pamoja model. We held a number of meetings over several months to discuss the nature of our partnerships and the essential characteristics of the platform. As we saw the findings of the research and the growing interest of Marsabit government, we thought: let's quickly embrace this opportunity to make sure we do it the right way. So, in light of the recommendations on sustainability, we decided that in the Marsabit case the conveners would be appointed by the government (rather than by TI), that there will be one focal point in each department in charge of service delivery (rather than one for the whole county government),

and that the system is embedded in the county government's infrastructure.

The uptake of this revised model in Marsabit gave us leverage to apply some of the recommendations in the other counties where we were already working. In Wajir, for example, focal points have now been appointed in each department, and we are holding discussions with county government to embed the system, as they have both the legal duty and the resources to implement a system like this.

Likewise, in Marsabit, TI will still play a strong role in engaging with communities on the ground, such as through radio shows and field visits, with a view to ensuring that community members will eventually be able to lead the process from their end.

Obviously, the impact is not going to take place in one or two years, it will take longer. But I believe we are getting closer.

PRACTICE PAPER

Trust, responsiveness and sustainability in complaints systems:
Transparency International's experience with Uwajibikaji Pamoja

References

Abass, A.M. (2005) 'Drought in Kenya and National Development', Arid Lands Resource Management Project, Special Programmes, Office of the President, www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/drought/docs/ADAF2005_2.6_Abass.pdf (accessed 16 October 2017)

Government of Kenya (2016) *County Public Participation Guidelines*, Nairobi: Ministry of Devolution and Planning and Council of Governors, www.devolutionplanning.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/County-Public-Participation.pdf (accessed 13 October 2017)

Maxwell, D.; Bailey, S.; Harvey, P.; Walker, P.; Sharbatke-Church, C. and Savage, K. (2012) 'Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Assistance: Perceptions, Gaps and Challenges', *Disasters* 36.1: 140–60

McGee, R. with Edwards, D.; Minkley, G.; Pegus, C-M. and Brock, K. (2015) Making All Voices Count Research and Evidence Strategy, Brighton: IDS

TI-Kenya (2012a) *Food Assistance Integrity Study: Analysis of the 2011 Drought Response in Kenya*, Nairobi: Transparency International, www.transparency.org/files/content/pressrelease/2012_TIKenya_FoodAssistanceIntegrityStudy.pdf (accessed 5 October 2017)

TI-Kenya (2012b) 'Learning from the 2011 Drought Response: Integrity and Accountability Critical in Enhancing Effectiveness of Food Assistance Efforts', Press release, 21 March, Nairobi: Transparency International, www.transparency.org/news/pressrelease/20120321_drought_response (accessed 5 October 2017)

UNICEF (2015) 'Kenya Country Office Humanitarian Situation Report: April-June, 2015', https://reliefweb.int/report/kenya/kenya-country-office-monthly-humanitarian-situation-report-april-june-2015 (accessed 16 October 2017)

About Making All Voices Count

Making All Voices Count is a programme working towards a world in which open, effective and participatory governance is the norm and not the exception. It focuses global attention on creative and cutting-edge solutions to transform the relationship between citizens and their governments. The programme is inspired by and supports the goals of the Open Government Partnership.

Making All Voices Count is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Omidyar Network, and is implemented by a consortium consisting of Hivos, IDS and Ushahidi.

Research, Evidence and Learning component

The programme's Research, Evidence and Learning component, managed by IDS, contributes to improving performance and practice, and builds an evidence base in the field of citizen voice, government responsiveness, transparency and accountability (T&A) and technology for T&A (Tech4T&A).

About Making All Voices Count practice papers

The Research, Evidence and Learning component has produced a series of practitioner research and learning grants to support a range of actors working on citizen voice, T&A and governance to carry out self-critical enquiry into their own experiences and contexts. The main output of each grant is what the practitioner learns and applies to their own practice. Practitioners can also decide to produce their own written outputs. The purpose of the practice papers, written on completion of each grant, is to capture the essence of that learning process through a reflective dialogue between programme staff and funded partners, to share with a wider audience of peer practitioners and policy-makers.

Web   www.makingallvoicescount.org
Email   info@makingallvoicescount.org
Twitter @allvoicescount

About Transparency International Kenya

Transparency International Kenya (TI-Kenya) is a not-for-profit organisation founded in 1999 in Kenya with the aim of developing a transparent and corruption-free society through good governance and social justice initiatives. TI-Kenya is one of the autonomous chapters of the global Transparency International movement, which are all bound by a common vision of a corruption-free world.

Implemented by: