

1. It is good to do **meta**-analysis and research summaries. They are common in development economics, especially in education—where hundreds of experiments are being carried out these days. Reviews bring findings to wider audiences, including practitioners.
2. I thought the research on role of **audits** in reducing corruption is interesting. I have always enjoyed the series of papers by Ferraz and Finan on these issues in Brazil and how they link to electoral accountability.
3. Although discussed in the previous summary paper, the new review paper mentions my research which uses expenditure tracking surveys to generate data and examines the Ugandan government's newspaper campaign. The research explored how information was used to reduce capture of education funds and to improve service delivery (school enrollment). Especially, the new paper mentions that there is little subsequent research on such cases. I wanted to point out that—even if there may be little new research—expenditure tracking continues to be used by **practitioners** all over the world, both governments and donors. And newspaper campaigns inspired by Ugandan government (its Ministry of Finance) continue to be used in post-conflict contexts (e.g., Sierra Leone) where state capacity is weak.
4. This leads me to ask: How much is the current research agenda influenced by what actually happens in this arena?
5. Indeed, it would be important to work with governments on **real things** rather than carry out experiments invented by researchers, often in rich-country-based institutions. I work currently in Finland. RCTs that researchers carry out there are all based on real things, that is, what governments actually do. No one even dreams of evaluating the researchers' own interventions.
6. You encourage the study of impact of budget-related participation and transparency on **human development**. This may be a lost cause. Why? Because there are proximate causes of proximate causes and so forth. That is to say that the system is complex and deep. HD outcomes depend on so many hundreds of other things that to tease out the impact of budget

openness on the final outcomes may not ever be possible (or would require a massive number of observations to tease the statistical relationship).

7. What about using a framework in the review paper? In the past, we used to think that **public expenditures** and the services they finance working well depends on the following (kind of a framework):

Who gets the budget-- Benefit incidence?

Does the money reach the intended beneficiary-- Expenditure tracking?

Service Delivery – do service work? An example of diagnostic is SDI

Demand—do households demand/use the services?

Your review focuses on budget-making alone— its transparency and participation. Again, there are so many other things that affect outcomes. In this framework, you could ask whether budget openness improves the benefit incidence of public spending. Does it improve money reaching the intended beneficiaries? Improve service delivery? Or, make households demand services in cases where demand is weak.

8. The 2004 WDR *Making Services Work for Poor People* offers another framework.

Relationships of accountability (politics, compact, management, client power)

In each there is **delegation—finance—information—motivation**.

In this framework, you bring the **client power** relationship of accountability— **not** into service delivery on the frontline as we discussed in the 2004 WDR— but add it into the *compact* relationship of accountability.

9. You highlighted systems. An example of systems approach is RISE (Research on Improving Systems of Education) program in education. It is worth looking at.