



Project Completion Report incorporating: G-rap 2007 Annual Progress Report

January 2007 – March 2008

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)

G-rap Management:

LTS International Ltd. (UK)

Ernst & Young (Ghana)



Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	ii
Executive Summary	iv
1. Progress against Programme's Framework	1
1.1 Pro-Poor Policy Influencing (overall goal and purpose 8)	1
1.2 RAO Funding Base and Staffing Developments (purposes 1, 2, 9)	1
1.3 Research and Advocacy Activities (purpose 3, 4)	2
1.4 Networking and Collaboration (purpose 5, 6, 7)	3
1.5 Grant-making Systems (outputs 1, 2 and 3).....	4
1.6 Learning Events and Institutional Learning (outputs 4, 5, 6)	5
1.7 G-rap Communications (outputs 7, 8).....	5
1.8 Governance of G-rap.....	6
1.9 Engendering of G-rap.....	6
1.10 Monitoring & Evaluation	6
2. Lessons Learned and Issues Requiring Attention	8
2.1 Pooled Funding and Grant Making Resources	8
2.2 Disbursement and Reporting.....	8
2.3 Outcome Monitoring & Strategies.....	9
2.4 G-rap Governance Review	9
3. Exit Period – January to March 2008	10
3.1 Disbursements for 2007-2008 Core Grants	10
3.2 Governance Structure Review	10
3.3 Logical Framework	10
3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation	10
3.5 Programme Management	10

Annexes

Annex 1 Management Events and Process Log

Annex 2 Progress against Log-frame

Annex 3 Progress in G-rap/PMT Outputs in 2007

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
GRAP	Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme
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

The third annual report for G-rap, the 2007 Annual Progress Report, represents the final report for the Programme Management Team under management of the LTS International-Ernst & Young Ghana Consortium. As such, it also represents the completion report for the contract (03-5188) for this stage of G-rap Phase 1 and includes the exit and hand over work completed January to March 2008. The report draws on the two bi-annual reporting cycles of G-rap grantees and outcomes of ongoing G-rap processes (M&E, Engendering, ICB, Communications). Reports on the outputs of these processes have been posted on the G-rap website (www.g-rap.org) to enable interested parties to benefit from the work.

No new call for expressions of interest was made in 2007; all existing core grant contracts were prolonged or renewed. The year saw a consolidation of progress and an opportunity to review processes and procedures. Systems have been reviewed and simplified over this period, with all reporting set onto a bi-annual rhythm and greater harmonization of donor disbursement systems. The Governance structure of G-rap was reviewed and recommendations for a revised Programme Board and related sub-committees were endorsed by the outgoing Board and Funders Committee. It is expected that these will be put in place during 2008.

Grantees felt that Government was becoming more responsive to calls by both civil society and development partners for greater inclusion of civil society in public policy making and through their reporting, were able to cite several cases of greater responsiveness in government policy making. The outputs of grantee research has played its part in informing policy processes and 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: programme monitoring indicates that RAOs increasingly use coalitions to work together on cross-cutting issues, although individual grantees still undertake research primarily related to their mandate. The institutional capacity building grants were phased out during 2007 following recommendations of the MTR. In assessing its impact it is clear that many ICB grant beneficiaries have strengthened organisational processes, improving their ability to undertake their research and advocacy activities.

The Engendering process was continued during 2007, with the Gender Steering Committee leading an action learning process for grantees. Self regulation and self assessment of gender impact remains a challenge for many grantees and will have to be supported further.

The successful RAO Convention discussed a range of issues, with the Trust and NGO Bill being upper most in people's minds. A joint communiqué was issued by the convention participants urging government to re-open dialogue on the form of this Bill. Lessons drawn from the Convention and a number of stakeholder consultations were condensed into two G-rap briefing papers, one on the challenges of pooled funding; the other on coalition building; prepared for broader communication purposes.

The first quarter of 2008 saw the current Programme Management Team prepare for and undertake a hand over to the next PMT and a completion of the terms of reference for the LTS International – EY Ghana consortium.

Overall, the evidence from monitoring suggests that progress has been made towards the purposes of the Programme, and that with two years to go to the end of Phase 1, the programme is moving positively towards its goal. The opportunity to bring more donors on board and to craft a long-term solution to RAO support will need to be taken up in these last two years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The LTS International – Ernst & Young Ghana Consortium, its Programme Management Team and the international and Ghanaian experts who have provided consulting and process related support to the programme since September 2004 would like to thank the individuals and organisations with whom they have worked over the programme period. Sister fund programmes including RAVI and BUSAC, the G-rap grantees and the donor partners have all worked together with the Consortium to develop and refine G-rap as a funding mechanism over the past 3½ years. We sincerely hope that G-rap continues to grow based on the solid foundation we have laid.

1. Progress against Programme's Framework

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

According to G-rap grantees, research and associated advocacy has positively influenced government investments in implementing pro-poor policy during 2007.

Pro-poor programming by the government, such as:

- the proposal in the 2008 budget statement, to design a stabilisation fund as a measure to insulate the economy from external shocks arising from volatility in export earnings from the nation's major exports reported by IEA;
- the introduction of legislation and special programmes to enable women's access to land and credit reported by ABANTU;
- the establishment, by Government and UNDP, of mediation centres within communities to improve access to justice for the vulnerable and excluded, especially women reported by FIDA;
- the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) Programme, an interventions under the National Social Protection Strategy (NSPS) that aims at securing the livelihoods of the poor and vulnerable in Ghana mentioned by CSPS and ISSER; and
- the Northern Ghana Development fund with seed money of 25 million US dollars mentioned in the 2008 Budget reported by the Northern Ghana Network for Development (NGND);

all cover areas raised and debated by grantees. While most organisations cannot attribute these changes singularly to their efforts and programmes, they recognise their collaborative efforts in this direction.

The grantees consider that the major foci in government policy are primarily the result of the need to: a) promote more efficient delivery of public goods and services; and b) respond to calls by both civil society and development partners for more inclusion of civil society in public policy making. Whilst increases in stakeholder participation in policy making is evident, IDEG notes that Government policies have basically focused on continuous implementation of the components of the GPRS II, which seek to address poverty and create wealth. It identified some of the major government policies as: a) New Charter on Public Sector Reforms; b) the Draft Comprehensive Decentralization Policy; and c) Civic Participation in the National Budget Process.

Gender advocacy groups have mentioned 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.

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

Changes in management and organisation process were reported by some RAOs over the period. RAOs such as CSPS, CDD and WANEP have undergone some reorganisation of their Management Boards and Committees. Ark Foundation has strengthened its staff appraisal system through the use of methods such as action-

learning, reviews and incorporation into learning, Intra-office transfers and Leadership Feedback and other organizational feedback processes. There is also the strengthening of planning and budgeting processes and presentation of final accounts, Initiation of internal evaluation, Review of M&E Framework for adoption, Leadership and Management Team (LMT) and expansion, Staff salaries enhancement. IDEG reports that there exists an enhanced participatory decision making process at IDEG, rationalisation of staff function to avoid duplication, sound and effective accounting and financial management.

A Board Operating Manual to guide Board Members has been developed at FIDA. FIDA has also instituted regular staff monthly meetings with department heads and annual staff retreat meetings with operational heads in Tamale, Kumasi and Accra for all members of staff to review the organisation's strategic plan and project activities. As a result of core funding, IEA was able to maintain newly-qualified and seasoned researchers recruited the previous year. The IEA continued to improve upon its strategies to help with the internal and external marketing of its publications and programmes. There is an enhanced common understanding of organisational plans and directions within TWN. Re-organisation of operations within the Finance and Administration unit as one more step in delineating broad areas of responsibility between the HRO and Finance and Administration Head has been done.

1.3 Research and Advocacy Activities (purpose 3, 4)

Major research findings with the potential to influence pro-poor policy programming is limited to the research-oriented RAOs such as ISSER, IEA, CSPS, CDD IDEG, TWN. ISSER completed an extensive study on Land Tenure Reforms in Ghana covering the politics of tenure, customary and statutory land ownership, land market organisation, legal and institutional considerations and land and the environment. IEA's conducted research on Vulnerability and Social Exclusion, the Manufacturing Sectors and the Macro-Economy in Ghana, Diversification and Economic growth and Progress towards the achievement of the Targets of the MDGs. IDEG's research on Ghana's Decentralisation Process, CDD's Fostering Pro-Human Rights Culture: Introduction of Non Custodial Sentencing to Ghana's Judicial System and the study of the Effectiveness and Sustainability of the National Youth Employment Programme are key research works which have implications for pro-poor policy formulation.

CSPS reported the completion of its study on the early effects of the capitation grant scheme and the school feeding programme on basic education in Ghana. Findings of that research are expected to inform modification in the programmes particularly structural arrangements in the school feeding programme. The Ark Foundation also completed work on National Advocacy Partnership Project and is currently on dissemination and follow-up consultations. TWN published an article in African Agenda Magazine on Poverty in mineral rich countries due to bad mining contracts as a contribution to the debate to protect and promote better the livelihood opportunities for the poor. Other research related activities were undertaken by the RAOs. These are indicated in the Tables in Appendix 3.

RAO research activities have been complemented with intensive advocacy. Channels of advocacy have principally been workshops, lectures and seminars. RAOs have also issued policy briefs and written articles for news paper publications launched a workshop on working with District Assemblies and published 'Women's Agenda' a Newsletter on women in Ghana's 50th independence anniversary. It also

organised programmes in mentoring in governance for female Senior High School Graduates. CSPS reported on its monthly seminar series on the theme; “Social Mobilisation for Development”. CDD undertook a nation-wide education on the National Disability Act (Act 732) for all service providers. IDEG organised validation workshops on Ghanaian Youth Democracy and Development.

The IEA was very functional in its advocacy programmes over the period. The Institute ran commentaries on the 2006 Annual Progress Report and the implementation of GPRS II. There were newspaper articles and policy papers on Gender equality and poverty reduction in Ghana. The Institute also issued Democracy Consolidation Strategy Paper for the period. TWN was also instrumental in the advocacy front through its numerous publications in African Agenda Magazine. ISODEC through the budget advocacy work has engaged policy makers in several sectors of the economy on pro-poor government policies. Some of the areas that ISODEC engaged were agriculture, essential services and gender.

The current research focus appears to reflect the mandate of the organisations or of the clients who commission such studies: cross-cutting areas may be losing out as a result. The need for collaborative research, especially on issues of policy incidence is evident. The RAO convention and the learning events that will be put in place during 2008 provide an opportunity for identifying priority issues for joint research engagement.

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. During the second half of 2007, the PMT commissioned an online survey of grantees to review the relationship between RAOs and issue-based coalitions in Ghana (<http://www.mande.co.uk/ghana/Online%20survey%20of%20coalitions.doc>, and Box 1). Since 2005, the number of RAOs working in coalitions and networks has increased from 9 to 15; whilst in 2005 19 coalitions and networks were mentioned in narrative reporting, compared to 32 in 2006 and 44 identified by the online survey respondents in 2007.

Box 1: The coalitions that grantees have engaged with most:

- Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition
- National Coalition in Water
- MDG coalition
- Africa Trade Network
- Ghana Anti Corruption Coalition
- National Coalition in Domestic Violence
- Coalition on the Women’s Manifesto
- Network for Women’s Rights in Ghana.

Source: R Davies Research and Advocacy Organisations’ (RAO) and their relationships with issue-based coalitions in Ghana: The results of an Online Survey

The RAOs expressed interest in knowing more about many of the coalitions: a valuable role for the PMT may be to assist that process. Options include:

To identify representatives of the different coalitions who would be willing to make follow up contacts with the other RAOs who have expressed interest in their work.

Publicising issue-based coalitions on the G-rap website, along with descriptive information about the purpose of each one (e.g. one paragraph), plus a relevant website addresses and contact email addresses, wherever available. It would also be useful to provide a list of the current organisations that are members of each coalition.

During late 2007, a lesson learning exercise was undertaken, to review the impact of GRAP on what coalitions are now achieving. The main lessons were:

- Coalitions of CSOs provide a more effective voice and demonstrate that the message is representative of a wide body of society, not just one group.
- The G-RAP RAOs have also begun to work towards helping each other to better understand key issues that can strengthen advocacy efforts and improve their impact.
- The RAO networks emerging within the G-RAP community have improved mutual respect and understanding each other's strengths. With core funding, competitive pressure has been removed and has enabled more working together on key themes. Organisations now have a better understanding of the varying roles in advocacy but presenting credible, joined-up, evidence all the way from the grassroots.
- By increasingly providing a respected, credible and coordinated CS voice, the RAO coalitions build trust, and effectively bring reality into the policy-process.
- Ad hoc policy making by central government is based on pre-conceptions of realities for local people. Getting grassroots inputs into policy is critical to make sure that Accra perceptions are adjusted to the reality of implementation for the wider population.
- Getting evidence from people very far removed from the policy process is not easy – they typically do not feel empowered to contribute. This is where a link between service provision and advocacy can be very useful.

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

No new call for expressions of interest was made in 2007; instead the Funders Committee prolonged or renewed all existing core grant contracts.

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 systems review was initiated to review these administrative provisions and identify areas for improving efficiencies. Findings of this will be incorporated into the Procedures Manual in early 2008.

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

The 3rd Annual RAO Convention was successfully held during November 2007. The focus of this Convention was “Achieving an Enabling Legislative and Regulatory Framework for NGOs/CSOs: An agenda for Good Governance in Ghana Fourth Republic.” Participants were drawn from RAOs, other CSOs/NGOs at national and regional levels, government officials, development partners, media and the general public. Key debates were held on the Trust and Non-Profit-making Civil Society Organizations Bill, the G-RAP Governance Structure, the role of the Media and the evolving character of gender in civil society organisations.

The Convention set out a communiqué calling for the amendment of the Trust and Non-Profit-making Civil Society Organizations Bill and a re-opening of dialogue between Government and civil society on this subject.

1.7 G-rap Communications (outputs 7, 8)

The G-rap website was updated, in response to changes proposed by the Mid-Term Review (e.g. phasing out of TA and ICB grants).

Newsletters were issued in January, May and September, with another due February 2008.

The G-rap Stakeholder Communication Survey by Stratcomm-Africa was concluded (Box 2) and provides a valuable stock take of perceptions on G-rap.

Box 2: Conclusions from the Communications Survey

- A shared vision is yet to be achieved among the different stakeholders about G-rap. Being a new and innovative programme, it is still subject to different interpretations and some changes in mode of operation are still underway.
- G-RAP from its inception recognized the need for communication and to evolve communication channels for meeting the need.
- The absence of a communication strategy within which to employ the various communication channels limited their effectiveness.
- Being a young programme with varied audience, stakeholders developed different perspectives about how the project should meet their respective communication needs.
- Some of the actors of the programme have been too busy to be effective in communicating G-rap to relevant audiences.

Source: Stratcomm 2007

(<http://www.g-rap.org/docs/Communication%20Survey%202007.pdf>)

1.8 Governance of G-rap

Following recommendations of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) a stakeholder consultation took place in October 2007 to test and debate changes needed in the governance set-up of G-rap. The consensus was to manage an incremental change aimed at increasing national participation, rather than rapidly moving towards an independent legal entity. Stakeholders asked that the broad strategic orientation of G-RAP should remain unchanged, with the 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

The outcome of the consultation was a proposed new governance structure, replacing the current Advisory Board and Funders Committee with an enlarged Programme Board, a small Grants Sub-Committee (SC) that reports directly to the Board. It was recommended that the Funders' Committee (FC) should function in an advisory capacity.

It was proposed that the Board should be big enough to deliver the necessary quality of management and to remain quorate at all tabled meetings, without being so big as to provide a disincentive to individual members to attend. The proposals were endorsed by the incumbent Board. These proposal still need to be consolidated into a set of legal texts and implemented.

1.9 Engendering of G-rap

The Gender Steering Committee continued its work through the reporting period. While the process provided several important lessons and gains, it was not without its challenges. The course of initiating action, establishing how to proceed with RAOs, finding mutually acceptable objectives and harmonizing expectations were more involving than expected. While the key message of the importance of engendering the products as well as the operations of RAOs has been reinforced through the processes, there are certain dilemmas that need to be resolved. The review of the process by the gender specialist indicated that self-regulation required that a set of benchmarks or basic criteria were required. There has to be clear mechanisms for measuring progress, clear indicators against which progress will be measured and which will allow for consistent assessment, attribution, derivation of general lessons as well as the identification of influencing factors.

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

Bi-annual narrative and financial reports were received from grantees. Narrative and financial reports by Grantees were analysed and compiled by Programme Management, as usual, every six months. These compilations provide inputs for more in-depth analyses.

The M&E report spanning two years of funding was drafted by the end of 2007. The Grantee narrative reporting was found to be a valuable source of information for monitoring the effectiveness of the G-rap programme at goal and purpose level. The report noted that at the super-goal and goal level, long-term impact monitoring will be

required. It recommends that additional G-rap resources need to be invested in longer term impact assessment activities. It would therefore be appropriate to consider contracting an externally managed impact assessment towards the end of Phase 1 of G-rap, in 2009. Methodologies for assessment are outlined.

In terms of operational monitoring, 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).

Outcomes reporting from the ICB Grants was completed (<http://www.g-rap.org/docs/ICB/ICB%20Evaluation%20Brief%20v80206.pdf>). Main findings were that, through the ICB process:

- Internal Governance of RAOs was strengthened;
- The ICB process facilitated the access of smaller RAOs to Core funding;
- ICB's focus on process promoted the dialogue between RAOs, Donors and PMT;
- The ICB process facilitated the engendering of G-RAP.

2. Lessons Learned and Issues Requiring Attention

2.1 Pooled Funding and Grant Making Resources

Through the management and operation of the G-rap fund, a number of lessons have been learnt on the pooled funding processes. A briefing note was produced that summarised these lessons. Lessons on making pooled funding work include:

Donors need space and time to work through issues and come to agreement – between and within themselves – about systems, roles and responsibilities (the “rules of the game”), before engaging with other programme stakeholders. The bigger the pot of money and the more donors involved, the longer this is likely to take.

Donors need to be able to challenge and amend their own systems and procedures in order to follow-through with their commitments to support civil society and towards donor harmonisation.

Funding direct into G-RAP, with clear, single currency commitments and disbursement plans, is necessary for clear planning and reporting. Without this there is a lack of transparency and handover between staff is difficult. Having all funding information on one spreadsheet will be a huge improvement.

Whilst the idea of the Fund is to reduce administrative and cost burden on the donors, donors still want to understand the Programme. The balance will be different for each donor. Some may prefer to be “sleeping partners” whilst others are “hands on”, but this must be clear from the start to avoid everyone getting involved in the detail.

Donors have a duty to spend taxpayers money with accountability. This means that the Fund must operate to clearly agreed criteria. Attributing outcomes from core funding is problematic, but progress must be monitored, ideally using agreed indicators that give the donors what they need to demonstrate delivery against their wider goals.

This approach must anticipate some experimentation, learning and revision as it progresses. It is likely to take a phased approach, with donors not reducing their transaction costs immediately, but gradually handing over. Clarifying and testing expectations of all partners from the start is important.

2.2 Disbursement and Reporting

The need to streamline donor disbursement processes was recognised by the Funders Committee and a systems review was undertaken by the PMT. One lesson from this review has been the need to establish agreed mechanisms to commit and disburse funds when dealing with diverse foreign currencies whose relative exchange values vary daily. A commitment in a set currency (e.g. \$ or €) and a mechanism for setting agreed exchange rates would keep future disbursement planning simple.

2.3 Outcome Monitoring & Strategies

Dr William Ahadzie of Legon University undertook an analysis of tendencies visible in RAO output against MDBS-GPRS frameworks based on 2005 and 2006 reporting, and followed this with a compilation of the narrative reports for July-Dec 2007. This provided a valuable over-view of the outcomes of RAO grantee activities.

The Communication Strategy was completed and will provide a basis for taking communication further in the next two years of the programme.

The inventory of RAO publications (research and advocacy activities and/or products) has been maintained and an archive of all relevant documentation generated thus far has been produced.

2.4 G-rap Governance Review

The governance review was undertaken in October 2007 and reported on in 1.8 above.

3. Exit Period – January to March 2008

3.1 Disbursements for 2007-2008 Core Grants

Funding forecast for 2008 was provided and the first quarter funds disbursed. Once replenishment is made (due April 2008) the next replenishment can be made by the in-coming PMT.

In order to ensure timely submission of reports, PMT will not disburse 2008-Q1 to RAOs before reports over 2007-Q3&4 are submitted. Time was short to close all related processes before management hand-over. Remaining G-rap Funds were transferred into a new Fund Account operated by the new PMT.

An announcement of the 2008 call for expressions of interest for G-rap Fund (Core and SIF) was made in the Ghana media in early March 2008.

3.2 Governance Structure Review

Following the Governance Review, a series of inter-stakeholder Strategic Issues Meetings (SIM) were proposed as a forum for determining focus of the Special Initiatives Facility (SIF). PMT assisted the Board to organise the first SIM in February.

3.3 Logical Framework

The PMT prepared a revision of G-rap's Logical Framework (simplification of version June 2005) and this was presented to the Board at beginning of March.

3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

Both the engendering process and three years of M&E in G-rap were finalised in March 2008 by presentation of the final reports. A conclusive M&E report over the first three years of G-rap was presented by M&E consultant and the Gender consultant presented a comprehensive engendering process report.

3.5 Programme Management

A hand-over document was produced by the PMT for the in-coming Team and the Fund Procedures Manual was updated, based on lessons learned from the previous year.

Hand-over to the new management team was made by end of March 2008.

ANNEX 1

G-RAP Management Events Log 2007	
Date	Activities
	Governance, Mid-Term Review an Governance Structure Review
10/01& 02/10	Donor Group meetings
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
07/05	Donor Group internal meeting
08-17/10	Governance Structure Review by Dr David Brown (ODI)
15/10	AB extra-ordinary meeting with David Brown
17/10	FC-RAO extra-ordinary meeting with David Brown
	Grant making
24/04-14/05	RAO self re-assessment period
20/06	FC Selection session for Grant year 2007-2008
20/06	Donor Group unanimously decided not to approve World Bank PRSTF Grant
25/09	DANIDA funds G-rap directly (no longer via DFID)
	Institutional environment
19/01 & 29/05 & 04/10	Sister Funds meetings (BUSAC, CEF, GAIT, G-rap, IBIS, RAVI)
22-23/11	Annual RAO Convention 2007 at M-Plaza
	Learning Events
15-19/01	5-day course in Project Management for RAOs (by PMI)
	Engendering process
Jan-Dec.	Gender Steering Committee and RAO Gender Link Action-Learning meetings: 25/01,12/02, 15/02, 01/03,10/05,15/06,19/07, 31/07, 28-29/08, 12/09, 24/09, 24/10, 25/10, 06/11
22/03	Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) M&E session with ICB Grantees (at SNV)
	Communication
Regular	Newsletter 7 (17/01), Newsletter 8 (07/05), Newsletter 9 (27/09)
22/04-15/10	Stratcomm Stakeholder Communication Survey and Strategy Development
Sept - Dec.	Website review, phased incorporation of MTR programme design changes
18/09-22/12	Knowledge-Base: Anthology of RAO publications and products update

Reporting and M&E Systems	
28/09	RAO Outcome Analysis by William Ahadzie (1 st draft 04/06)
07/09-12/12	Online Survey Monkey on RAO coalitions around GPRS and MDBS

ANNEX 2
PROGRESS ON G-RAP OBJECTIVES in 2007

Revised Logical Framework will be introduced in 2008

Objectives	Indicators	Observations
RAOs that have been given access to G-RAP capacity building grants are able to gain better access to funding	# of RAOs gaining access to core funding increases # of RAOs gaining access to funding from new sources increases # of RAOs gaining access to increased funding from their existing sources increases	The ICB Grant type has been phased out in 2007 and all processes under G-rap funding have been concluded. A comprehensive ICB Report as well as a ICB Brief have been presented and can be downloaded at www.g-rap.org
RAOs are more able to attract, retain, motivate and develop capable staff	Progressive improvements of professional competence of researchers hired by RAOs Improved performance of existing staff Mean duration of vacancies declines over time Sick leave rates decline Length staff contracts grows Gender balance of staff improves	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. Detailed data on points 2, 3, 4, 5 are not being collected. 6. Engendering process of G-rap concluded. A limited set of baseline data available for future analysis in G-rap Gender Report 2006-2007.

<p>RAOs generate high quality evidence-based research based on robust primary sources</p>	<p>Peer Review assessments improvement over time</p> <p>RAO references cited in Government and parliament policy documents</p> <p>Donors and civil society in their dialogue with GoG</p> <p>Publications gender sensitive</p>	<p>1. Collaborative research still incidental; peer review processes ambitious at this point. Joint advocacy activities in coalition settings may gradually trigger joint/complementary research.</p> <p>2. GoG publications tend not to state source information. Anthology of RAO publications is currently updated (>200). The listing of titles and resumes can be downloaded at www.g-rap.org and 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>RAOs package evidence based research and use it in targeted advocacy activities</p>	<p>Different messages are sent to different audiences. Not broadcast to all.</p> <p>Diversity of info products increases over time</p> <p>Timeliness improves</p> <p>Targeting differentiates by gender</p>	<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. Point of attention for period 2008-2009.</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) has improved autonomy in planning 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>	<p>More RAOs share a widening range of information</p> <p># of joint funding proposals increases</p> <p># jointly managed advocacy campaigns increases</p> <p># of non-G-RAP funded RAOs included in above trends also increases</p> <p>RAOs more engaged with gender focused RAOs and networks</p>	<p>1 & 3 & 4. Baseline Survey Network Analysis combined with additional data collated from 5 batches of narrative reports (2005-2007) and with data from additional web-based survey shows intensification of collaboration.</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, the new G-rap funding line will be established: the Special Initiatives Fund (SIF) targeting coalitions and networks (see Section 2.4). This will boost current trends</p> <p>5. 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; negotiations to continue all is with new management expected.</p>
<p>RAOs build up a strategic set of relationships with CBOs.</p>	<p># of partnerships between RAOs and CBOs increases</p> <p>New relationships are planned (not just happening)</p> <p>Strategically irrelevant relationships with CBOs ended.</p> <p>Existing relationships are prioritised. and this informs allocation of RAO resources</p> <p>RAO agendas encompass local and regional issues. Not just national level issues</p> <p>Grassroots CSOs draw on RAO analysis for advocacy work</p>	<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.</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-Saturday Institute and others).</p> <p>5. There is RAO engagement with downstream networks; more structural engagement with decentralisation and region specific issues may get extra stimulus from SIF funding line. 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 MDBS donors</p>	<p># of partnerships between RAOs and government, parliament and MDBS donors increases - overall</p> <p>New relationships are planned (not just happening)</p> <p>Existing relationships are prioritised, and this informs allocation of RAO resources</p>	<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.</p> <p>The MDBS process has become more open through participation in the Consultative Group.</p> <p>3. Underlined by Ahadzie 2007 report on RAO delivery against GPRS framework.</p>
<p>The credibility and legitimacy of RAOs is improved, in the eyes of GoG and Ghana public</p>	<p>More RAO documents are referred to in GoG publications</p> <p>GoG and parliament contract RAOs for their services</p> <p>RAOs are increasingly invited to debate policy issues on radio and TV</p>	<p>1. Almost all RAOs report that GoG is more open for non-state actor inputs in pro-poor governance and policy processes. More invitations, more positions on committees.</p> <p>2. Yes, but still dependent on political opportunity for GoG and personal networks of RAOs.</p> <p>3. Data on radio and television appearances have not been collected structurally; a number of RAOs keep track of their media appearances; potential source for analysis.</p>
<p>RAO autonomy is not undermined through participation in G-RAP</p>	<p>RAOs are able to criticise G-RAP, and its funding partners</p> <p>Diversity is maintained in RAO research & advocacy agendas</p> <p>Diversity in funding sources is maintained (Purpose 1)</p>	<p>1. Critical attitude from the beneficiaries is generally constructive and the inter-stakeholder dialogue has well settled. G-rap governance set-up will be reviewed by stakeholders (donors and beneficiaries) with help of consultant in September-October 2007.</p> <p>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.</p>

ANNEX 3: PROGRESS ON G-RAP / PMT OUTPUTS IN 2007		
Outputs	Indicators	Observations
1. G-RAP provides RAO donors with an attractive multi-donor funding mechanism which improves aid delivery	<p>Existing donors fulfil initial commitments</p> <p>Number of participating donors increases over time</p> <p>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. New commitments being made by the donor pool for period 2008-2009 up to end of Phase 1 (Dec 2009); PMT proposed a boost of up to 50% of the annual grant envelop (from 2.2M US\$ to > 3M US\$ annually).</p> <p>2. No new donors joined; there are likely sufficient reserves among existing donors.</p> <p>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 among donor group. Systems review to be concluded 2008-Q1.</p>
2. G-RAP provides Core Funding to RAOs for three to five year periods	<p>G-RAP provide at least \$75,000 per year per RAO, to at least 5 RAOs per year, for at least 3 years</p> <p>These target will be revised, as donor funding increases</p>	1. Done
3. G-RAP provides Once-Off grants to RAOs to enable them to become eligible for core funding	<p>G-RAP provide between 10% - 15% of total grant value to emerging RAOs each year.</p> <p>This target will be revised, as donor funding increases</p>	<p>1. Target was met (see 2006 Annual Progress Report for details).</p> <p>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	G-RAP provides 5% to 15% of the total annual grants budget for Capacity Building Grants This target will be revised, as donor funding increases	1. Target was met (see 2006 Annual Progress Report for details). 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	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 gradually goes down now that G-rap systems have become familiar.
6. G-RAP provides capacity building to RAOs through third parties	Minimum 10 days and max. of 25 days per RAO, per 1 year grant. Completion of OD plan. The above to be provided to at least 12 for Year 1 RAOs This target will be revised, as donor funding increases	Targets met in 2006. All projectised support has been phased out as per July 2007. 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.
7. G-RAP promotes and facilitates relationships between RAOs and other stakeholders	Feedback of survey findings to RAOs (+ # participants in survey) 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. In 2008-2009 networking will also be financed over the new Special Initiatives Facility.

<p>8. G-RAP publicly communicates G-RAP's objectives, achievements, information resources, issues, participating stakeholders, etc</p>	<p># of Ghanaian and international members of emailing list grows</p> <p># of copies of Newsletter distributed to RAOs, INGOs, donors, parliamentarians and others.</p> <p># of visitors to Website grows</p> <p>At least 1 RAO Convention /yr</p> <p>Increase in requests for information made to G-RAP office</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The website is the primary instrument for information; it now contains a public archive. 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 3rd RAO Convention took place in November 2007. 5. The website appears to service needs; requests by phone, email or visits growing slowly to approx.15/week.
--	---	--