



14 Ridge Street, North Ridge, Accra

Tel/fax: +233-21-239853 / 235691

Email: info@g-rap.org

Website: www.g-rap.org

G-rap 2007 Mid-Year Progress Report

January – June 2007

Contract Number CNTR 03-5188

Financial Support from:

Department for International Development (DFID, leading agency)

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

Danish Development Co-operation (DANIDA)

Royal Netherlands Government (RNE)

Technical Support from:

LTS International Ltd. (UK, leading agency)

Ernst & Young (Ghana)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.	Progress against Programme's Framework	5
1.1	Pro-Poor Policy Influencing (overall goal and purpose 8)	5
1.2	RAO Funding Base and Staffing Developments (purposes 1, 2, 9)	5
1.3	Research and Advocacy Activities (purpose 3, 4)	5
1.4	Networking and Collaboration (purpose 5, 6, 7)	6
1.5	Grant-making Systems (outputs 1, 2 and 3)	6
1.6	Learning Events and Institutional Learning (outputs 4, 5, 6)	7
1.7	G-rap Communications (outputs 7, 8)	8
1.8	Governance of G-rap	8
1.9	Engendering of G-rap	8
1.10	Monitoring & Evaluation	9
2.	Lessons Learned and Issues Requiring Attention	10
2.1	Pooled Funding and Grant Making Resources	10
2.2	Disbursement and Reporting	10
2.3	Outcome Monitoring & Strategies	10
2.4	Capacity Development, Special Initiatives and Strategic Issues	11
2.5	G-rap Governance Review	12
2.6	Communications	12
3.	Planned Activities for July-Dec 2007 (with action point list)	13
3.1	Contracts and Disbursements for 2007-2008 Core Grants	13
3.2	Funding needs for 2007-2008 and for 2008-2009	13
3.3	Phasing out of Projectised Grants	13
3.4	Governance Structure Review	13
3.5	Systems and Logical Framework	13
3.6	Monitoring and Evaluation	14
3.7	RAO Convention	14
3.8	Communication Strategy	14
3.9	Engendering	14
3.10	Programme Management	15
3.11	Overview of Action Points	15

Annexes

- Annex 1 Events and Process Log
- Annex 2 Executive Summary of Report by Ahadzie (2007)
- Annex 3 Executive Summary of Report by Stratcomm-Africa (2007)
- Annex 4 Progress against Log-frame

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Advisory Board
BUSAC	Business Sector Advocacy Challenge Fund
CBO	Community Based Organizations
CDD-Ghana	Center for Democratic Development (Ghana)
CEPA	Centre for Policy Analysis
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DANIDA	Danish Development Co-operation
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
EOI	Expression of Interest
FC	Funders Committee
FIDA	International Federation of Women Lawyers
GAIT	Government Accountability Improves Trust
GoG	Government of Ghana
GPF	Growth and Poverty Forum
GPRS-1	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
GPRS-2	Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy
GS	Gender Specialist
GSC	Gender Steering Committee
IBIS-GG&HR	Good Governance and Human Rights Programme (IBIS)
ICB	Institutional Capacity Building
ID / OD	Institutional / Organisational Development
IDEG	Institute for Democratic Governance
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
ISODEC	Integrated Social Development Centre
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDBS	Multi-Donor Budget Support
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGND	Northern Ghana Network for Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OD	Organizational Development
PMT	Programme Management Team
RAO	Research and Advocacy Organizations
RAVI	Rights and Voice Initiative
RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
SIF	Special Initiatives Facility
SIM	Strategic Issues Meetings
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
TUC	Trade Union Congress
WANEP	West Africa Network for Peace-building

Executive Summary

This mid-year progress report is based on the January to June 2007 narrative reports from G-rap grantees and represents two years of the G-rap funding cycle. In general, there is improvement in the quality of reporting from RAOs, evidence from these reports also indicates that overall CSO-Government engagement continues to strengthen. Grantees have engaged with government and donors in MDBS and GPRS processes, as well as legislative debate. The Ghana @50 celebrations allowed for retrospective work and an opportunity for government and civil society to map out future aspirations. Working relationships and dialogue amongst RAOs continues to strengthen in areas of commonality. This strengthens their ability to influence processes.

The findings of the MTR were presented and acted upon by G-rap stakeholders during this reporting period. Reporting processes were revised to half-yearly from quarterly, thus reducing the heavy reporting burden for many of the grantees. A new Special Initiatives Facility was proposed through the MTR aimed at responding more effectively to demands for joint actions to deliver on objectives that cannot be supported with the core funds provided to individual RAOs. This will be developed as part of the funding for 2008-2009.

The process of mainstreaming Gender into G-rap and the grantees was established and a successful process was initiated that will continue until the end of 2007. Advocacy for mainstreaming gender will also need to be intensified.

Based on the three preceding RAO reporting compilations (2005-2006), a more in-depth analytical report was commissioned during this period: *Review of RAO Programming and Key Policy Processes in Ghana* by Dr. William Ahadzie, the findings of which will be ready by October 2007. The field work for a G-rap inter-stakeholder communication survey was concluded by Stratcomm-Africa and findings will inform an enhanced communication strategy for the period 2008-2009.

The front loading of RAO support provided at the beginning of the programme (2005) meant that in the latter stages, new funding would need to be allocated. PMT projections indicate that this is still the case and that the original commitments made in 2004-05 will need to be supplemented to ensure that there is sufficient funds to cover core grants (at the 25-40% turnover level) until the end of Phase 1 in 2009.

As G-rap goes into the final six months of the current management period, the intensification and consolidation of networking and cooperation between RAOs and between RAOs and decision makers grows. It will be important that the learning around G-rap – as a new approach to support civic engagement in pro-poor governance processes – leverages greater results in improving governance and poverty-focused policy development.

1. Progress against Programme's Framework

1.1 Pro-Poor Policy Influencing (overall goal and purpose 8)

Over the past two years, G-rap grantees have reported marked changes in government pro-poor policy making. Changes in the policy making processes include an increase in stakeholder participation in policy making, with the government viewed as more accommodative to suggestions by stakeholders, especially CSOs.

Pro-poor policies have moved to target specific constituencies in an attempt to reduce poverty, thus taking into account the needs of special groups like the youth, people with disabilities and the urban poor. While most organisations cannot attribute these changes singularly to their efforts and programmes, they recognise their collaborative efforts in this direction.

Gender advocacy groups mention the passage of the Domestic Violence Bill and a move by the Women's Ministry to outline a strategy for the implementation of the bill as a major stride in government pro-poor policy making. Furthermore, the National Youth Employment Programme, the Rent Act and the urban poverty reduction project are mentioned as clear signs of progress, especially for the vulnerable groups of society.

Other RAOs underline the above, and add the Capitation Grant and School Feeding Programme, Social Investment Fund, activities in agricultural modernisation under the Millennium Challenge Account, National Health Insurance Scheme, improvement in access to small credit schemes and the increase of the minimum wage as evidence of government's openness to pro-poor policy making.

The meeting of the Consultative Group of the MDBS provided useful opportunity for non-state actors for a more open dialogue with government and donors (e.g. CEPA, CDD, IDEG, IEA, ISODEC, ISSER, TUC) The Ministry of Interior provides useful support in promoting the legal framework for National and Regional Peace Councils, thus contributing to national security and stability (WANEP).

1.2 RAO Funding Base and Staffing Developments (purposes 1, 2, 9)

Processes initiated and/or promoted over the past two years under the 23 ICB Grants invested in organisational and institutional strengthening have created an environment of ongoing internal change for many of the RAOs. More attention has been paid to issues of internal management and systems, including training and professional staffing of support units. FC advised five organisations (ARK, FIDA, IDEG, NGND and WILDAF) to take the full benefit of close coaching relations with Ernst & Young to further improve their financial systems.

Investment in hi-level research staff appears to have been lower over the past six months with a gradual move to issues of communication, marketing and funding base development. Three organisations have been asked by the Funders Committee to pay extra attention to a diversification of revenue sources in 2007-2008.

1.3 Research and Advocacy Activities (purpose 3, 4)

As indicated in prior reports, RAOs continue to engage in a multiplicity of activities around gender, governance and poverty reduction as they engage the relevant authorities and stakeholders in the policy space. A quick overview of the themes and topics that RAOs engaged with is provided in this paragraph. For more detail on the broad range and diversity of deliveries, we refer to the *G-rap Fund Narrative Compilation Report 2007-Q1&2*. (see www.g-rap.org)

Gender and women's rights advocacy groups were engaged in a number of protocols promoting balanced participation in (local) government; issues of anti-violence and conflict resolution; training and legal aid for vulnerable groups and; HIV/AIDS awareness.

Apart from specific events around Ghana @ 50, which allowed for research with a retrospective view and an analysis of factors influencing growth in the past or elsewhere in the world, grantees focusing on economic and political governance did research in the areas of current economic growth factors and mechanisms, fiscal policy, inflation, public expenditure management, donor relations, debt relief, the civil service, judicial and police services, youth and education.

ISSER produced its annual *Ghana Economic Review and Outlook*, CEPA presented its national budget analysis and there was the pro-poor tracking of the national budget by ISODEC. CDD played an important role in the evaluation of the MDDBS process and outcome to date. The energy crisis was obviously featuring in a number of publications (e.g. CEPA, IEA). In a wider perspective, there were strong advocacy inputs into issues of the economic partnership agreements (EPAs, TWN), the implications of the extractive industry for development and the situation of human rights in Africa (TWN and ISODEC).

WANEP produced 4 policy briefs on countries of the sub-region for which it remains a crucial hub for situation reports, training, early warning and information transfer. In Ghana it supported peace building and conflict resolution activities in the north of the country (of the three RAOs engaged in peace building and security only one submitted its report in time to be processed).

1.4 Networking and Collaboration (purpose 5, 6, 7)

Collaboration and networking among G-rap grantees and by G-rap grantees with other state and non-state actors has increased steadily since the start of the programme. The end of two years of G-rap programming shows marked improvement in working relationships and dialogue amongst RAOs to the point of becoming a permanent and effective feature in the work of RAOs. Common issues and convergence of programme objectives continue to be the major determinants of the nature and type of collaboration. Where competitiveness for the same sources of projectised funds did lead to divergence, the shared access to G-rap core funds now appears to lead to convergence, that is to say: cooperation while maintaining diversity.

A set of tables in the *Fund Narrative Compilation 2007-Q1&2* summarizes RAO networking and collaboration over the period under review. The diversity and complexity in the relationships organizations have is remarkable. M&E consultant Rick Davies captured the connectivity in network diagrams, which are currently being updated for incorporating recent data and developments. The survey and analysis show the intensity of relations as well as the issues around which relations evolve. Depending on the type of analysis undertaken, one can see relations between different categories of actors (e.g. government services, donors, non-state actors) as well as relations between actors and issues (e.g. pillars or priority areas of GPRS). (data will be available at www.g-rap.org in December 2007)

1.5 Grant-making Systems (outputs 1, 2 and 3)

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of G-rap created space for dialogue for reviewing and improving the design of the programme, a need identified at an earlier moment in time. As a result of findings - presented already in November 2006 but confirmed in the final report presented in January 2007 – it was concluded that the programme needed to focus more on its initial objective of core support. Projectised support such

as Technical Assistance Grants and the delivery of Capacity Development Grants were to be phased out.

Partly because of the review, G-rap could not issue a new call for expressions of interest in 2007. First of all it was felt that findings of a mid-term review should inform the donor group about possible changes needed to improve the programme. Secondly, as all available funds were exhausted by allocations in 2006 and donors had stalled internal procedures to replenish funding reserves until the report was presented, no extra funds became available for new applicants. Nonetheless, at its June selection session the Funders Committee decided to prolong or renew all existing core grant contracts. Only one core grantee, FOSDA, did not manage to meet benchmarks set by the Funders Committee in June 2006 and as a result the grant contract was not renewed. At the selection session of June 2007, no new project grants and no new ICB grants were approved.

Suggestions for administrative simplification of systems and processes were discussed and adopted. All reporting was set on a bi-annual rhythm, grants were to be disbursed in equal tranches and donor systems were to be further harmonized to meet optimal pooling simplicity.

A new funding line was suggested by the MTR: the Special Initiatives Facility (SIF), aiming at responding more effectively to demands expressed by important stakeholder constituency groups, including donors and the RAO community (both existing RAOs and supplicant RAOs). The fund would privilege activities by coalitions to deliver on objectives that cannot easily be supported over the budgets of individual RAOs.

1.6 Learning Events and Institutional Learning (outputs 4, 5, 6)

Over the past two grant years, the Capacity Building Grants (ICB) allowed RAOs to invest in activities focused on raising awareness of organisation-internal processes and systems (OD). A last centrally organised and well-attended training workshop on Project Management was held in January 2007. For those that benefited from ICB processes, G-rap may have established a culture of organisational learning that could continue on the basis of internal demands, financed over core grant support. The link between leading planned change and planned learning has enabled a considerable number of RAOs to radically restructure their structures, systems and processes creating organisations which are more able to adjust to future changes on a dynamic ever-changing landscape. Many too have new awareness surrounding the dichotomy between leadership and management and the need to have organisations which encompass both. The decision of the Advisory Board and Funders Committee (following the advice of the Mid-Term Review) to phase out ICB Grant delivery by G-rap comes at a stage when the target group might actually continue investing in OD related work using their own core grant resources.

What may not yet have been established sufficiently is the practice of ID: institutional development. The positioning of the individual RAO in the policy and governance arena entails a number of very concrete areas of attention which have been noted to be structurally weak in the majority of the grantees, e.g. niche development, targeted packaging of outputs, communication and information servicing, outreach via national and rural media. The individual RAO and the RAO community need to invest in an active strategy to tackle a potential "Accra based elite" danger, being itself part of the establishment it seeks to monitor, far removed from any understanding of the poor whose interests it says to represent. Additionally, with only a few RAOs linked to any national grass roots communities there are questions as to how valuable and essential an interface they are between (urban and rural) population and decision makers (see also 2.4).

The two years of funding by G-rap has resulted in an intensification and consolidation of networking and cooperation between RAOs and between RAOs and decision

makers (up-stream). A number of RAOs have also actively invested in down-stream networking (e.g. local governance). The more specialist communication-related aspects, however, will no longer be addressed centrally now that the ICB Grants are being phased out. It remains to be seen whether that will cause an essential gap.

The learning process around G-rap as a new approach to support civic engagement in pro-poor governance processes has been enriched with the Mid-Term Review, which drew out a number of valuable lessons. A number of currently ongoing studies (Ahadzie; Stratcomm; engendering) will add to the body of information on the broader process of learning in G-rap (see also Chapter 2).

1.7 G-rap Communications (outputs 7, 8)

The website of G-rap needs a thorough update to respond to changes incited by the Mid-Term Review (e.g. phasing out of TA and ICB grants); work is ongoing. Newsletters were issued in January and May, focusing on important design and governance changes the Programme is undergoing, changes in management, an update on the engendering process and on the assessment and selections for 2007-2008 taking place in the period April-June.

The G-rap Stakeholder Communication Survey by Stratcomm-Africa has been concluded. The report is currently being drafted and is expected in November. The Executive Summary has been added in the Annexes to this report.

1.8 Governance of G-rap

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) pointed to fundamental changes needed in the governance set-up of G-rap. There is recognition among all concerned parties of the need to review and revise governance arrangements with a view to clarifying lines of management and reporting, decreasing donor partner workloads and increasing national ownership.

The Advisory Board commissioned an additional consult by one of the two members of the MTR team, Dr. David Brown. The Funders Committee supported the suggestion by the Board and delivered inputs for the Terms of Reference. The additional stakeholder consultation will take place in October; a report outlining the commonly preferred scenario will be submitted in early November so that changes can be worked out before end of 2007.

CIDA has handed the chair position over to lead donor DFID, who will chair the Funders Committee over this period of important changes in governance (2007) and programme management (re-tendered before end of 2007). Issues of administrative harmonisation and efficiency still tend to take time and attention. The process of further streamlining will profit from explicit recommendations in the MTR report. A restructured governance set-up should allow for a better steering of strategy related processes. (Overview of governance meetings can be found in the events log in Annex 1)

1.9 Engendering of G-rap

The engendering process of the G-rap has now found its impetus and rhythm. The Gender Steering Committee is functioning; gender link persons were identified in all funded organisations and supported with the full commitment of all but a few Executive Directors. In the first quarter of 2007 a gender specialist was identified and contracted to coordinate the process. The work on a gender policy has started, a series of regular action-learning meetings with link persons is ongoing, gender checklists have been drafted and the G-rap toolkit is under review. In spite of initial delays in the start-up phase of the process, it is expected that a first phase of the engendering as projected in 2006 can be concluded before end of 2007. The nature of engendering being one of long-term attention and investment, the process should

be expected to be integrated into the G-rap approach to grant making and monitoring for years to come.

The Ark Foundation, Abantu, FIDA, CDD, CIDA, IEA, IDEG, ISODEC, SNV & TUC have especially contributed to the engendering process in not only supporting engendering within their own organisation but in supporting the wider engendering programme.

1.10 Monitoring & Evaluation

All reporting in G-rap is now on a bi-annual rhythm (Programme Management's own financial reporting to DFID-UK remains monthly). In general, there is improvement in the quality of reporting from RAOs, especially in the content and details of the reports. Timeliness improves but remains a challenge for some. Some attention and coaching is still needed in financial reporting, notably for those relatively new to the core type of support.

Narrative reports by Grantees are analysed and compiled by Programme Management, as usual, every six months. These compilations provide inputs for more in-depth analyses. One ongoing monitoring exercise on the basis of RAO reporting is the progressive network (and network by theme) analysis in collaboration with Dr Rick Davies. We expect his M&E report spanning two years of funding by mid-December.

Based on three preceding RAO reporting compilations (2005-2006), data were also used for a more in-depth analytical report, *Review of RAO Programming and Key Policy Processes in Ghana* by Dr. William Ahadzie. The report will be disseminated among the stakeholders to G-rap and be presented at the 2007 RAO Convention.

In its June grant making decisions for 2007-2008, the Funders Committee set a number of benchmarks. In order to intensify E&Y coaching in the financial/administrative domain, ARK, FIDA, IDEG, NGND and WILDAF were asked to continue on a quarterly financial reporting rhythm until capacity has been brought up to standards. Other benchmarks were set in the areas of strategic plan (ASDR), organisational process (ISODEC, NGND, WANEP), funding base development (ASDR, IDEG, IEA, NGND, WILDAF) and pro-poor strategy formulation (IEA).

ICB Grant outcome monitoring and reporting will not be available before November as some of the ongoing grant processes are delayed. By the end of 2007, a financial and a narrative report will be produced by programme management covering all 23 ICB Grants since inception of G-rap.

2. Lessons Learned and Issues Requiring Attention

2.1 Pooled Funding and Grant Making Resources

The need for further harmonisation of donor group systems has been reiterated in the MTR report. To give an example: currently G-rap deals with 6 different currencies and some of the transfers to the Fund account pass 4 banks changing currency several times. The question remains whether a relatively small programme (8M US\$ for 3 years from 4 donors) can effectively influence the high level aid harmonisation agenda. Unless further streamlined, current processes will keep demanding relatively high administrative time investments from both donors and management. As the managing agency will assist the donor group to streamline internal pooling processes by a systems review, there are good hopes that these inconveniences will be ironed out in the near future.

Decisions taken in June 2007 by the Funders Committee implied the urgent need for new reserves to be made available before end of 2007 to meet commitments for 2007-2008. This was foreseen in 2005 and again in 2006, but a process of replenishment of the Fund by the pooling partners was stalled, awaiting the Mid-Term Review to be concluded. Such hitches in funding flows could be.

An additional request to the Donor Group is already in the pipeline: a projection for the period 2008-2009. It is expected that the total annual grant envelop will need to grow considerably to have Core Grants meet the initially projected 25-40% of a grantee's annual income (Joint Programme Memorandum 2004 at www.g-rap.org).

In addition to that, one would expect a good number of new applicants to approach the Fund after a gap of two years between calls. A boost of the annual grant making envelop from currently 2.2M to approximately 3.5M US\$ would be advisable to meet the Programme's ambitions as laid down in its Logical Framework.

It is expected that a new call for expressions of interest will be announced in March 2008 with disbursements in July 2008. Programme management advises the donor group to approve 18 months grant contracts at this stage. This would allow for alignment with the beneficiary calendar year planning rhythms by end of 2009. December 2009 will be the end of G-rap Phase 1; Phase 2 will cover the period 2010-2015.

2.2 Disbursement and Reporting

The move to bi-annual rhythms and Grant disbursement in equal tranches has solved some of the structural challenges for timely delivery of funds and reports, both at the donor side and at the receiver's end. Donor pro-activity in Fund reserves replenishment will allow further improvement of G-rap's operations.

Important changes to the initial design have now been effected, reporting pressure has been reduced and the results are satisfying all parties. A sufficiently rich body of data is being delivered in reports to allow for monitoring and steering.

2.3 Outcome Monitoring & Strategies

Now that the programme has found its momentum, in-depth analysis will be needed at a regular (annual) basis to inform decisions and strategies. As said, systems as established generate a wealth of data for analytical reviews. The level of operations, however, the complexity of the governance environment and the diversity of domains in which the Grantee community delivers its outputs are such that a relatively high level of analytical competence is needed to inform the governors of the programme.

The MTR stressed the need to refocus programme management on its role of predominantly a grant managing body and it cannot be expected that such broad range expertise be readily available within the managing team, apart from contractual compliance and fiduciary risk type of issues. The regular hiring of Technical Assistants from relevant academic backgrounds by G-rap's Governors for reviews can meet such analytical and advisory needs. It will also allow for optimal flexibility in steering the programme.

After 18 months of grant making, a few first steps were taken in this direction as tendencies will be emerging at this point of time. Dr William Ahadzie of Legon University was selected to do a first analysis of tendencies visible in RAO output against MDBS-GPRS frameworks. A draft of the report was delivered in June and a brief excerpt of findings and conclusions has been included in Annex 2 this report. The full report is expected to be disseminated in October.

A Communication Survey has been undertaken by Stratcomm-Africa and will report in November, analysing communication and information servicing issues in the complex stakeholder environment of G-rap. Annex 3 contains the draft Executive Summary.

The inventory of RAO publications (research and advocacy activities and/or products) and the analyses of coalitions and networks will be updated during the forthcoming July-December period. Together with information collected and presented from the G-rap Fund Narrative Reports and G-rap Progress Reports, the combination of data sources made available at www.g-rap.org will facilitate assessment of the effectiveness of the funding mechanism.

2.4 Capacity Development, Special Initiatives and Strategic Issues

As explained in section 1.6, the phasing out of the ICB Grant type is likely to impact upon the type of RAO initially selected into G-rap, the capacity of RAOs to optimise their effectiveness and upon the institutional development of the RAO community and its positioning in the policy and governance environment. The existing fabric of connectivity is mostly issue based and relying on personal contacts to a large extent.

Alternatively, the Mid-Term Review recommends the establishment of a funding line for cross-cutting issues, recently relabelled as the **Special Initiatives Facility (SIF)**, the funding of annual **Strategic Issues Meetings (SIM)** and additional Convention type events. As these proposals have a strong potential to enrich the underlying strategy processes and institutional dynamics, the integral text of the MTR will be presented here.

*The **SIF** "is recommended as a vehicle to respond more effectively to demands expressed by important stakeholder constituency groups, including donors and the RAO community. [...] This fund would privilege joint actions to deliver on objectives that cannot be supported with the core funds provided to individual RAOs. [...] The fund would not be available to individual RAOs, but only for consortia and groups of RAOs wishing to collaborate on policy issues, with a greater critical mass than they could have individually. The aim would be to finance activities which deal with cross-cutting issues, and require partnerships and networking, and which would not fit in with individual RAOs plans."*

The report notes that *"not all the actors in a group would have to be recipients of G-rap core grants, however. Indeed none need be, provided the strategic value is evident."*

Concerning the **SIM** it was *"recommended that an annual G-rap Strategic Issues Meeting be funded, to function specifically as a forum for strategic thinking beyond the confines of individual RAO interest. This would allow RAOs, government, donors and others to debate the future funding priorities, and to identify themes to which RAOs and consortia might wish to bid for funding. Ideas would then be fed to, and*

filtered by, the governing body, and put out to competitive tender, according to the means available. It is envisaged that this meeting would be under the organisational control of the recipient RAOs, as is presently the case with the G-rap Convention, though in close liaison with the Programme Management and Steering Committee. Like the present Convention, the Strategic Issues Meetings would be open to contributions from other parties, provided the balance between the participants and the focus on G-rap strategic thinking are maintained. The essential requirement, however, would be that the Meetings support the programme cycle of G-rap.”

The report emphasizes that this SIM type of meeting is to advance strategic thinking and dialogue by the G-rap stakeholder environment – not to define ‘G-rap strategy’.

Furthermore, “additional G-rap RAO conferences might also be held, with support from G-rap within the limits of the funds available. These might retain the ‘RAO Convention’ format, should the RAO community so choose. These would have a much broader and less focused role, examining the wider context and challenges to the RAO community in Ghana, and not being as closely linked as the Strategic Issues Meetings to the G-r funding cycle.”

It should be realised as a point of concern that the initiative for the proposed facilities and events lies predominantly with the beneficiary group, and to a lesser extent with the donor group, governors and other actors. The Advisory Board welcomed the two new options, but clearly indicated that establishment should be demand driven.

2.5 G-rap Governance Review

One of the outcomes of the Mid Term Review is the need for revisiting the governance structure of the programme. There is recognition among all concerned parties of the need to review and revise governance arrangements with a view to clarifying lines of management and reporting, decreasing donor partner workloads and increasing national ownership. The consensus is in favour of incremental change aimed at increasing national participation, rather than rapidly moving towards an independent legal entity. The broad strategic orientation of G-rap should remain unchanged, with focus on policy outcomes rather than means of delivery, applying only essential preconditions, no obligatory thematic foci, and a strong commitment to pluralism and diversity.

Lead consultant of the MTR team, Dr David Brown will be invited to do an additional stakeholder review. Aim is to have a new structure in place before end of 2007.

2.6 Communications

Being an innovative programme in its early stages, the G-rap concept is still being clarified. In line with the gradual evolution of the concept, the recent Mid-Term Review points to some necessary adjustments in the Programme’s focus. It is expected that the governance structure review, to be carried out in October, will again suggest changes.

Survey findings indicate a variety of perceptions and expectations from the various stakeholder groups, but unanimity about the value of G-rap. There is a need through improved communication to achieve coherence among stakeholders about the programme and to ensure a positive image for G-rap and its beneficiaries, as well as its governing and managing bodies.

From the analysis of the survey results, and the review of communication activities and channels used to date - currently undertaken by Stratcomm -, a strategic framework is outlined for the development of a communication strategy guiding the next phase of the Programme. The need for RAOs to become increasingly central to communication in G-rap is identified as well as the role of the PMT.

3. Planned Activities for July-Dec 2007 (with action point listing)

3.1 Contracts and Disbursements for 2007-2008 Core Grants

Contract templates need amendment in order to reflect changes in the programme (e.g. frequency in reporting). Existing contracts need an addendum to be signed. In June 2007, FC set a number of benchmarks to be met by individual grantees which needs follow-up and demands coaching activities mostly by financial experts.

1. PMT arranges amendments / addendum of grant contracts.
2. PMT follows up on benchmarks, provides coaching inputs and reports to FC.

3.2 Funding needs for 2007-2008 and for 2008-2009

Additional funds will have to be allocated timely by the donor group in order to meet commitments for the current grant year. Furthermore, the donor group will have to prepare budget for grants for the period 07/2008-12/2009. This 18 month grant period concludes the first 5-year phase of G-rap. At the same time it will align the grant cycle with the calendar year rhythm.

3. PMT provides details of exact budget needs for 2007-2008.
4. FC takes decision which donor provides additional funds for 2007-2008.
5. PMT will prepare projections for 7/2008 - 12/2009 and for the donor group in November 2007.

3.3 Phasing out of Projectised Grants

A number of the 2005-2007 ICB Grant processes were delaying and have not yet been concluded. Some coaching by the OD specialist will be needed there. The same goes for 3 Project Grants. All non-Core Grants should be concluded and reported on by the end of 2007. A comprehensive G-rap Capacity Development Report will be concluded before end of 2007, describing the process, outcome and lessons learning of 23 Institutional Capacity Building Grants over the period '05-'07.

6. PMT coaches remaining ICB grantees towards conclusion of their processes.
7. PMT will set a deadline for remaining ICB grants (those not yet transferred).
8. ICB and TA grant processes/activities will be concluded and reported on by PMT before end of 2007.

3.4 Governance Structure Review

Lead consultant of the MTR team, Dr David Brown will be facilitated by PMT to do an additional stakeholder review among the G-rap direct stakeholders.

9. Additional stakeholder consultations will take place in October (RAOs).
10. Consultant will report in early November, outlining the commonly preferred scenario, so that changes can be worked out before end of 2007.
11. Aim is for AB and PMT to have a new structure in place well before the change of Programme Management Team, at the end of March 2008.

3.5 Systems and Logical Framework

Systems for grant making including reporting have to be adapted to reflect the MTR changes to the programme's systems and procedures (engendering inputs will conclude this process). Once all elements to be changed have been identified and confirmed, the programme's Logical Framework (version June 2005) can be amended.

12. PMT incorporates MTR changes where necessary (systems etc.; website).
13. PMT together with M&E consultant prepares draft update of Logical Framework.

3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

The report by William Ahadzie (2007) is an example of the type of analytical exercises that can be undertaken on the basis of data generated by G-rap systems. It is expected that the currently ongoing engendering exercise will enhance the body of baseline data for gender focused monitoring in future.

14. M&E consultant will include data of the 4th batch of narrative reports by RAOs (2007-Q1&2) in the network analysis generated from earlier reports.
15. M&E consultant does an additional online survey on non-state actor networks in Ghana which will balance findings from the initial baseline survey (2005) and findings from reporting.
16. A conclusive M&E report over the first three years of G-rap will be presented by consultant in 2007.
17. Gender Specialist will present findings from stakeholder analysis in the Gender Report, forming a baseline for sustained engendering process.

3.7 RAO Convention

The 2007 Convention has been planned for November; the formula will likely follow earlier successful conventions in 2005 and 2006. Themes have not yet been determined (expected in September), but are likely to revolve around the position of non-state actors in the governance environment in Ghana. Dr. Rose Mensah-Kutin will be the Convener and Convention Coordinator is Mrs. Rosaline Baatuolkuu, starting preparations early October.

18. PMT will finalise TOR and contract the Convention Coordinator.
19. Convention Coordinator will facilitate all preparations.
20. Convention Convener will moderate selection of theme(s), date and venue.

3.8 Communication Strategy

The G-rap Stakeholder Communication Survey report will analyse expectations, perceptions, issues, potentials and best practice in inter-stakeholder communications. The survey includes findings of the September 2005 Inter-stakeholder Workshop, but also looks beyond the immediate environment of those engaged with G-rap, broadening the scope of communication and information servicing to the national perspective. The draft Executive Summary has been included in the Annexes to this report to allow for some insight in findings from the survey. It is expected that communication and information servicing will become an increasingly important domain for G-rap in the years to come.

21. Stratcomm-Africa will present its final report in November including an outline for a communication strategy and guidelines for a more elaborate set-up for 2008-2009.
22. PMT will disseminate it to the immediate stakeholders of G-rap and put it on its website.
23. PMT will consult Board on a way to use the report for dialogue / workshop.

3.9 Engendering

The implementation of the engendering programme is on track for completion in December 2007 – when the Gender Specialist will deliver a final report outlining what has been achieved and what needs to be achieved. The Gender Policy, Toolkit, Checklists are all scheduled for completion in November 2008 following a participatory analysis by gender specialists both within the G-rap programme and within the wider RAO community. The Gender Policy itself has a wider potential audience than G-rap RAOs and could benefit and be of interest to NGOs and Civil Society organisations in general.

24. Final report on the engendering process, outcome and learning will be produced by Gender Specialist(s). Report will address follow-up planning.
25. Systems, tools (etc.) and website will be amended where necessary.
26. GSC-PMT: Gender Policy will be presented, discussed, adopted, disseminated and put on website.

3.10 Programme Management

Apart from the above mentioned Management will be focusing on the following:

27. PMT will raise awareness around SIM and SIF (new funding line for 2008-2009);
28. PMT prepares hand-over for new management team taking over in March 2008.

3.11 Overview of Action Points (some timelines extending into 2008-Q1)

	Description of activity	Actor	Timeline	Status 30/11/07
1	Amendment of grant contracts	PMT → FC	July 07	✓
2	Follow-up on benchmarks, coaching inputs and report to FC	PMT → FC	Jan 08	
3	Exact budget needs for 2007-2008	PMT → FC		
4	Additional funds provision to cover shortfall for 2007-2008	FC	Nov 07	ongoing
5	Funding needs projection 7/2008 - 12/2009 for FC	PMT → FC	Dec 07	
6	Coaching remaining ICB grantees towards process conclusion	PMT	Sept-Oct 07	ongoing
7	Deadline for remaining ICB grants (those not yet transferred)	PMT	Dec 07	
8	ICB and TA grant processes/activities concluded and reported	PMT	Dec 07	
9	Additional Govern. Review stakeholder consultations (RAOs)	RAO reps	Oct-Nov 07	✓
10	Consultant report on preferred scenario		Nov 07	✓
11	New structure in place well before the change of PMT	AB-FC-PMT	Jan 08	
12	MTR changes incorporated in systems, formats, website ...	PMT	Nov 07	✓
13	Proposal for update of Logical Framework	M&E - PMT	Dec 07	
14	Update network analysis with data 2007-Q1&2	M&E	Nov 07	ongoing
15	Online survey on non-state actor networks in Ghana	M&E-PMT	Sept-Oct 07	✓
16	Conclusive M&E report over the first three years of G-rap	M&E	Dec 07	
17	Gender stakeholder analysis (baseline sustained engendering)	GS	Dec 07	
18	PMT will finalise TOR and contract the Convention Coordinator	PMT	Sept 07	✓
19	Convention Coordinator will facilitate all preparations	Coordinator	Sept-Nov 07	✓
20	Convention Convener: selection of theme(s), date and venue	Convener	Oct 07	✓
21	Stratcomm-Africa: communication survey, final report	Consultant	Nov 07	final draft
22	Disseminate (21) to immediate stakeholders & via website	PMT	Dec 07	
23	Strategy to use (21) report for dialogue / workshop	PMT-AB-FC	Jan 08	
24	Final report engendering process, plus follow-up planning	GS	Dec 07	
25	Systems, tools (etc.) and website engendered	PMT-GS	Jan 08	
26	Gender Policy presented, discussed, adopted, disseminated	GSC-PMT	Jan 08	
27	PMT will raise awareness around SIM and SIF (2008)	PMT	Jan-Mar 08	
28	Hand-over for new management team arriving end of March 2008	PMT	Jan-Mar 08	

ANNEX 1 G-RAP Management Events Log January - June 2007

Date	Activities
	Governance
10/01	Donor Group meeting (approval of semi-annual reporting and disbursements)
07/05	Donor Group internal meeting
20/06	Funders Committee Selection Session for Grant year 2007-2008
	Mid Term Review
22/01	AB-FC meeting on Mid-Term Review findings and conclusions
29/03	RAO-FC-AB-PMT meeting on MTR findings, formulating shared advice to AB
12/04	AB meeting on MTR findings and decisions on way forward
	Management support
25-30/03	Back-stopping visit LTS Programme Director, Paddy Abbot
	Grant selection process and (re-)assessments
24/04-14/05	RAO self re-assessment period
20/06	FC Selection session
	Engendering process
25/01 & 12/02- 15/02 & 01/03- 10/05 & 15/06	Gender Steering Committee and RAO Gender Link Action-Learning meetings
	Grant making, resources
20/06	Donor Group unanimously decided not to approve World Bank PRSTF Grant
	Institutional environment
19/01 & 29/05	Meetings of Sister Funds BUSAC, CEF, GAIT, G-rap, IBIS, RAVI
	Learning Events
15-19/01	5-day course in Project Management for RAOs (by PMI institute)
	Institutional Capacity Building (ICB)
22/03	M&E session with ICB Grantees (at SNV)
	Communication
22/02	Newsletter 7 (17/01/07), Newsletter 8 (07/05/07) Start collaboration with Stratcomm for stakeholder Communication Survey website user statistics can be found at: http://www.g-rap.org/statistik/www.g-rap.org
	Reporting and M&E Systems
19/03-	RAO Outcome Analysis by William Ahadzie (1 st draft 04/06/07)
	Programme Management
01/02/07	Mrs Evelyn Akar starts as new Programme Administrator with PMT
30/06/07	Ms Diana Odame leaves the PMT for an assignment with NIB

ANNEX 2

Review of RAO Programming and Key Policy Processes in Ghana Excerpt from Executive Summary of Report by Dr William Ahadzie (2007)

Review of RAO narrative reporting over the period July 2005 – December 2006

Key Lessons

Among the lessons learned is that dialogue and participation have aided effective collaborative relationships. Coalitions around specific issues (water privatisation, education, GPRS policies) have emerged. Collaboration has also been secured vertically (between RAOs, policy makers, development partners and external institutions). These have advanced engagement. Also the credibility and legitimacy of RAOs continues to grow in the eyes of the GOG and the public because RAOs conduct groundbreaking research and make authoritative pronouncements on a wide range of issues. It is noted further that policy makers seem to be more open to policy recommendations from RAOs. A more open and participatory process is gradually replacing the practice of unilateral policy making. GPRS II had provided a better opportunity for RAO engagement than GPRS I. Virtually all RAOs have participated in diverse ways in the formulation of GPRS II. This has enabled the inclusion of civil society input in developing the framework. RAOs served in the Cross-Sectoral Planning Groups (IDEG, ABANTU, IEA, CDD, ISODEC), and provided advice (CEPA) and memoranda on specific issues. The TUC participated at the high end; serving as a member of the National Development Planning Commission itself.

Recommendations

The RAOs have not covered the entire policy ground. There is need to move from a marginal to a more direct engagement with the MDDBS process. This review points to the need to redesign the report format to allow RAOs to report on the specific areas of the GPRS/MDDBS they engage and also on the nature of the engagement. The reports should focus on what has specifically has been done to engage these major policy frameworks - which constitute a core objective on the G-rap fund. The reduction in the frequency of reporting suggested during the Mid-Term Review is endorsed by this study.

With regard to the substance of engagement, RAOs should focus increased attention on decentralisation. Local government brings governance closer to citizens. It offers citizens the opportunity to hold public office holders accountable and it leads to better pro-poor service delivery.

Advocacy for mainstreaming gender will need to be intensified. Public resource allocation is still gender-neutral, a factor which accounts in a large measure for the weak effectiveness that has been characteristic of public finance targeted at pro-poor development.

ANNEX 3

G-rap Stakeholder Communication Survey Executive Summary (draft) of Report by Stratcomm-Africa (2007)

The report reviews the communication challenges and perceptions in the G-rap stakeholder environment after two years of operations. From the onset, the importance of coherence in inter-stakeholder communication around the G-rap concept has been recognized, especially as the innovative nature of G-rap was likely to generate a variety of perspectives from stakeholders. The need for a communication framework to guide the work of the various actors, including the management of the programme as well as the RAOs, the key programme beneficiaries, has been acknowledged and is frequently mentioned in G-rap discussions and documentation.

Executive Summary

G-rap is an innovative attempt at pooling together donor funds to enable Research and Advocacy organisations to be effective in undertaking research and advocacy activities that will facilitate pro-poor policies and hold government accountable.

This report proposes a strategic framework for a G-rap communication component. It takes account of the planned framework for communication activities since the inception of G-rap, what has been already put in place for communicating G-rap as well as findings of a stakeholder survey. It draws on programme documents such as the Logical Framework, annual reports, review reports and reports on events to analyze the gap between the conceptual and factual underpinnings of the programme on the one hand and the perceptions, opinion and expectations of its diverse stakeholders on the other.

In general, G-rap as a programme has come very far since its introduction. The PMT as the managing secretariat for the programme has been the hub of communication activities. Through channels such as the G-rap website and publications in the form of annual, review and mid-year progress reports the PMT has sought to interact with the various stakeholders. Communication activities have included the RAO conventions and Stakeholder review meetings for diverse stakeholders – Research and Advocacy Organisation, Funders Committee, Advisory Board, Strategic partners, policy makers and CBOs as well as the general public.

Being an innovative programme in its early stages, G-rap is still being clarified and a recent mid-term review is leading to some changes in focus. Survey findings indicate a host of perceptions and expectations from various stakeholders but unanimity about the value of G-rap. There is a need through improved communication to achieve coherence among stakeholders about the programme and to ensure a positive image for G-rap and its beneficiaries, as well as governing and managing bodies.

From the analysis of the survey results and review of communication activities and channels used a strategic framework is outlined for the development of a communication strategy in the next phase of the programme.

The need for RAOs to become increasingly central to communication in G-rap is established. The continuing role of the PMT in this evolution is also clarified.

ANNEX 4

PROGRESS ON G-RAP OBJECTIVES

The G-rap Logical Framework will be updated to meet MTR changes; update is planned for 2007-Q4

Objectives	Indicators	Observations
<p>1. RAOs that have been given access to G-RAP capacity building grants are able to gain better access to funding</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. # of RAOs gaining access to core funding increases 2. # of RAOs gaining access to funding from new sources increases 3. # of RAOs gaining access to increased funding from their existing sources increases 	<p>1. No new Core Grants could be allocated in this period. All but one existing Core Grant contracts were extended or renewed.</p> <p>2 & 3. N/A (funding base analysis done on annual basis). FC set benchmarks for funding base development for 5 grantees for 2007-2008 grant year.</p> <p>Note that the ICB Grant type is being phased out in 2007(MTR advice to stop delivery of ICB Grants has been adopted by Advisory Board and Funders Committee).</p>
<p>2. RAOs are more able to attract, retain, motivate and develop capable staff</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progressive improvements of professional competence of researchers hired by RAOs 2. Improved performance of existing staff 3. Mean duration of vacancies declines over time 4. Sick leave rates decline 5. Length staff contracts grows 6. Gender balance of staff improves 	<p>1-5. In 2005 Grantees reported important recruitments and improved contract conditions, including training schemes. In 2006 we see a general picture of consolidation in staff retention. In 2007 we see some research staff recruitment, and a further strengthening/recruitment of fin/admin staff. Incentive packages remain an issue for organizations to compete with donor institutions, corporate environment and I-NGOs.</p> <p>Detailed data on points 2, 3, 4, 5 are not being collected. Influx of young talent still appears to be too low to be able to meet growing (hi-level) demands in near future.</p> <p>6. Engendering process of G-rap ongoing. To date no structural collecting and analysis of data has been done. Limited body of baseline data available for future analysis. Anthology of RAO publications (see 3.2 here below)</p>
<p>3. RAOs generate high quality evidence-based research based on robust primary sources</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peer Review assessments improvement over time 2. RAO references cited in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • government and parliament policy documents • donors and civil society in their dialogue with GoG 3. Publications gender sensitive 	<p>1. Collaborative research may still be a sensitive issue, due to long history of competition for funds and for staff. Even though cooperation between RAOs grows, peer review processes are rather ambitious at this point in time.</p> <p>2. GoG publications tend not to state source information. Anthology of RAO publications is currently updated (>150). The anthology has not yet been officially presented (to parliament, government, donors, media). The listing of titles and resumes will improve (inter)national access to RAO publications. Some RAOs now start making publications electronically accessible. IEA has launched new Journal.</p> <p>3. RAO gender peer group currently emerging (action-learning approach). Too early for measuring impact (more realistic to be measured in 2009).</p>

<p>4. RAOs package evidence based research and use it in targeted advocacy activities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different messages are sent to different audiences. Not broadcast to all. 2. Diversity of info products increases over time 3. Timeliness improves 4. Targeting differentiates by gender 	<p>In period 2008-2009 attention should be paid to these aspects (see also point 3 here above).</p> <p>1-2. A more comprehensive communication strategy input may be needed for most of the RAOs. In 2006, about 30% of the RAOs invested in structural ICT improvements.</p> <p>Consult and/or training for enhanced marketing strategies, branding, funding base development and publicity may have received limited attention during the past years of RAO projectised existence. We see only limited use of local radio.</p> <p>3. Core support in 6-monthly instalments (from 2007 onwards) improves autonomy and allows for better exploiting “advocacy windows”.</p> <p>4. Not yet analysed (see also above: 2.6 and 3.3)</p>
<p>5 Improved cooperation between RAOs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More RAOs share a widening range of information 2. # of joint funding proposals increases 3. # jointly managed advocacy campaigns increases 4. # of non-G-RAP funded RAOs included in above trends also increases 5. RAOs more engaged with gender focused RAOs and networks 	<p>1 & 3 & 4. The Baseline Survey Network Analysis shows connectedness, but not yet the quality behind it as time-depth is still too limited. In November 2007, additional data collated from 4 batches of narrative reports (2005-2007) combined with data generated with the help of an additional web-based survey will allow for better spotting tendencies.</p> <p>Intensity of contacts between RAOs has grown through G-rap, also between RAOs that previously had no structural relations. RAO websites and the G-rap website facilitate access to information, both internally and for international research.</p> <p>2. From 2008 onwards, a new G-rap funding line will be established: the Special Initiatives Fund (SIF) targeting coalitions and networks (see Section 2.4).</p> <p>5. A network of ‘RAO gender link persons’ connecting all G-rap funded RAOs meets regularly in action-learning setting. An inter-RAO Gender Steering Committee has been established; action plan projected for 2007 ongoing.</p>

<p>6. RAOs build up a strategic set of relationships with CBOs.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. # of partnerships between RAOs and CBOs increases – overall 2. New relationships are planned (not just happening) 3. Strategically irrelevant relationships with CBOs are ended. 4. Existing relationships are prioritised. and this informs allocation of RAO resources 5. RAO agendas encompass local and regional issues. Not just national level issues 6. Grassroots CSOs draw on RAO analysis for advocacy work 	<p>1-4 The indicators may be too detailed and ambitious to monitor on. Collaboration is multiple and is reported to have intensified; most successfully so around shared issues. An additional web-based survey on networks and coalitions will be initiated by G-rap in October 2007.</p> <p>Issue or region based networking involving RAOs plays a major role in vertical linking of RAOs with CBOs (e.g. GPF, GIF, LOGNet, NETRIGHT, Forest Watch, NGND, ILGS-RAO collaborations in training of DA staff and others).</p> <p>5. There is RAO engagement with downstream networks, but a more structural engagement with decentralisation and region specific issues may get an extra stimulus via the new SIF funding line (see section 2.4 of the report).</p> <p>In 2008, the NGO legislation issue, national elections and the high-level forum on aid effectiveness may trigger a wave of intensified nation-wide networking and collaboration.</p> <p>6. Not enough significant evidence available at this date for analysis; tendencies visible (e.g. gender networks, LOGNet, ILGS etc.).</p>
<p>7. RAOs build up a strategic set of relationships with government, parliament and MDDBS donors</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. # of partnerships between RAOs and government, parliament and MDDBS donors increases - overall 2. New relationships are planned (not just happening) 3. Existing relationships are prioritised, and this informs allocation of RAO resources 	<p>1-2. There is a remarkable tendency towards more formal settings e.g. through the Women's Manifesto and DV Bill, GPRS-2 and MCA processes, the national budget statement and discussions, Trust/NGO legislative issue, the Whistle-blower and Disability Bills, NYEP, Decentralisation and LAP programmes. The MDDBS process still provides little access for non-state actor participation or inputs.</p> <p>3. Tendencies are still young for sound analysis; tendencies are confirmed by Ahadzie 2007 report on RAO delivery against frameworks such as GPRS. (see annex for excerpt)</p>
<p>8. The credibility and legitimacy of RAOs is improved, in the eyes of GoG and Ghana public</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More RAO documents are referred to in GoG publications 2. GoG and parliament contract RAOs for their services 3. RAOs are increasingly invited to debate policy issues on radio and TV 	<p>1. There is clearly a growing and more substantive collaboration among RAOs in the GPRS process; the 2006 and 2007 national budget discussions did not really provide enough time, yet joint CSO/RAO contributions did find more space than ever before.</p> <p>In general, RAOs report that GoG is more open for non-state actor inputs in pro-poor governance and policy processes.</p> <p>2. Tendencies towards more institutional settings are visible, but generally remain dependent on political opportunity for GoG and the personal networks of RAOs.</p> <p>3. Data on radio and television appearances have not been collected; a number of RAOs keep track of their media appearances. Such data can be used for analysis.</p>

<p>9. RAO autonomy is not undermined through participation in G-RAP</p>	<p>1. RAOs are able to criticise G-RAP, and its funding partners 2. Diversity is maintained in RAO research & advocacy agendas 3. Diversity in funding sources is maintained (Purpose 1)</p>	<p>1. Critical attitude from the beneficiaries is generally constructive and the interstakeholder dialogue has well settled; the G-rap governance set-up will be reviewed by stakeholders (donors and beneficiaries) with help of consultant in September-October 2007. 2. Core support to RAOs appears to have lead to a broader programmatic diversification of topics and issues addressed. The number of themes and coalitions is impressive. Consecutive analytical exercises such as the Ahadzie 2007 report will be needed to determine trends and impacts. 3. Analysis done on an annual basis (see 2006 Annual Progress Report, Annex 3, Financial Overviews).</p>
---	--	---

<p align="center">PROGRESS ON G-RAP / PMT OUTPUTS</p> <p align="center">The G-rap Logical Framework will be updated to meet MTR changes; update is planned for 2007-Q4</p>		
Outputs	Indicators	Observations
<p>1. G-RAP provides RAO donors with an attractive multi-donor funding mechanism which improves aid delivery</p>	<p>1. Existing donors fulfil initial commitments 2. Number of participating donors increases over time 3. G-RAP % management overheads are less than (a) direct funding by donors, (b) comparable multi-donor funding mechanisms</p>	<p>1. All initial commitments (2004) allocated; additional funds needed before October 2007. New commitments are to be made by the donor pool to be able to make commitments for period 2008-2009 up to end of Phase 1 (Dec 2009) 2. Donor group decided not to invite new donors into the pool until MTR findings and recommendations are implemented. 3. Systems have been simplified and now work smoothly between PMT and beneficiaries. Donor group is in the process of further harmonizing systems to tackle challenges in inter-donor group operations and between donor group and programme management. Systems review for the pool foreseen for 2007-Q4 / 2008-Q1.</p>
<p>2. G-RAP provides Core Funding to RAOs for three to five year periods</p>	<p>1. G-RAP provide at least \$75,000 per year per RAO, to at least 5 RAOs per year, for at least 3 years 2. These target will be revised, as donor funding increases</p>	<p>1. Done 2. Currently in discussion</p>
<p>3. G-RAP provides Once-Off grants to RAOs to enable them to become eligible for core funding</p>	<p>1. G-RAP provide between 10% - 15% of total grant value to emerging RAOs each year. 2. This target will be revised, as donor funding increases</p>	<p>1. Target was met (see 2006 Annual Progress Report for details). A number of the projectised grants (TA) were delayed and still in the process of being concluded (Nov 2007). 2. Has been revised (MTR): all projectised support has been phased out as per July 2007.</p>

4. G-RAP provides Capacity Building Grants to RAOs	1. G-RAP provides 5% to 15% of the total annual grants budget for Capacity Building Grants 2. This target will be revised, as donor funding increases	1. Target was met (see 2006 Annual Progress Report for details). A number of the projectised grants (ICB) were delayed and still in the process of being concluded (Nov 2007). 2. Has been revised (MTR): all projectised support has been phased out as per July 2007.
5. G-RAP provides on-demand technical assistance to RAOs	1. G-RAP provides a maximum of 10% of PMT technical staff time to RAOs on demand	Technical coaching mostly on fin/admin matters ongoing. Technical staff investment has been higher during the inception phase, but goes down now that G-rap systems have become familiar to most grantees.
6. G-RAP provides capacity building to RAOs through third parties	1. Minimum 10 days and max. of 25 days per RAO, per 1 year grant. 2. Completion of OD plan. The above to be provided to at least 12 for Year 1 RAOs 3. This target will be revised, as donor funding increases	Targets met in previous period (2006-Q3&4). Note that all existing projectised support will be phased out as per July 2007, including technical assistance and capacity building grants. Coaching by PMT staff in the financial-administrative domain is likely to continue in order for new grantees to be able to comply with non-projectised, core funding reporting requirements (see sub 5, here above).
7. G-RAP promotes and facilitates relationships between RAOs and other stakeholders	1. Feedback of survey findings to RAOs (+ # participants in survey) 2. Number and scale of collective events aided by G-RAP	1-2. Where and when solicited, G-rap provides assistance. Apart from the well-attended RAO Conventions and inter-stakeholder dialogue meetings around the further refinement of the G-rap concept, such specific demands are rare. Training and learning events organised by G-rap do provide settings for meeting and networking. Most networking appears to be financed on the basis of Core Grants or other funding sources.
8. G-RAP publicly communicates G-RAP's objectives, achievements, information resources, issues, participating stakeholders, etc	1. # of Ghanaian and international members of emailing list grows 2. # of copies of Newsletter distributed to RAOs, INGOs, donors, parliamentarians and others. 3. # of visitors to Website grows 4. At least 1 RAO Convention /yr 5. Increase in requests for information made to G-RAP office	1. The website is the primary instrument for information, currently under review to incorporate all changes incited by the MTR. 2. The first Newsletter in October 2004 was sent to 70 addresses. Number 8 of April 2007 reached more than 150 stakeholder addressees 3. Progressively growing numbers. For more details: www.g-rap.org/statistik/www.g-rap.org 4. The 2 nd RAO Convention took place in October; the 3 rd is planned for Nov 2007. 5. The website appears to service needs; requests by phone, email or visits approx.10/week. G-rap is widely understood to be a funding mechanism for CSOs with a well-established track record in research and/or advocacy with a national impact.