

ANNEX 5: NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

Six-Month and Annual Reporting

version 50622

| General information | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Name of the Organisation: INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE (IDEG) | Contract Ref. No.: 01/Pro/30/IDEG |
| Report Prepared by: ADMIN/FINANCE OFFICER Signature: | Report Period: July-December 2005 |
| Report Approved by: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Signature: | Report Date: January 31, 2005 |
| | Contact Tel. No.: 233 21 506466 |
| Introductory note on the bi-annual narrative progress reporting IDEG signed a Technical Assistant Agreement with the Project Management Team (PMT) of G-RAP on July 21, 2005. The development objective of the project is to ensure an informed dialogue in support of good governance by providing forum for the private sector and civil society to work together with the state institutions on issues of importance to the development of Ghana such as the APRM and the GPRS. | |

| |
|---|
| <p>1. What changes did you see in pro-poor government policies (in design, implementation or review)? How did such change come about and what is your interpretation of the changes?</p> |
| <p>Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) II reflects a policy framework wherein government has clearly indicated areas of change. In order to broaden the scope of the review on the development strategy, IDEG organised a number of interesting activities, two of which have high potential for significant impact on policy and priority setting regarding growth and poverty reduction.</p> <p>The Institute convened the Growth and Poverty Forum (GPF), which brought together CSOs to input into the GPRS II policy document. Meetings with public officials represented an attempt by IDEG and the GPF to engage in high-level decision-making by the Cabinet via the NDPC, the development partners through participation in the CGM, and the legislators through the PRC of Parliament. In addition, the Institute also established the Governance Issues Forum (GIF) at the regional level, which promoted regional dialogues between citizens and their district/regional authorities on setting development priorities in their communities.</p> <p>What was interesting about the two pro-active approaches is that they engage public institutions and officials responsible for making decisions on and implementing programmes of development. The respective forums of non-state actors did so as a <i>unitary actor</i> with a common agenda of collectively formulated and well-articulated views on policy issues and identified set of ‘representatives’. As a result, the national budget for 2006 reflected some of the priorities that GPF and/or GIF participants had promoted.</p> <p>Needless to say, all these developments are significant to the expansion of the policy and institutional spaces for enhancing interface between state and non-state (civil society and private sector) actors. Under its 2006 work plan, IDEG will spearhead the development of the GPF and the GIF into stronger networks of civil society and private sector actors, dedicated to effective participation in national/regional/district debates, dialogues and consensus-building on public policy choices and decisions intended to simultaneously promote high rates of economic growth, accelerate poverty reduction, and improved democratic governance in Ghana.</p> |
| <p>2. Collaboration and networking</p> |
| <p>2.1 Indicate changes or progress in your working relations with the Parliament, Government Services, MDBS Partners, Donors, NDPC, District level Authorities or Services etc.</p> |
| <p>We are developing working relations with Parliament and NDPC, through dialogue. We have held a couple of meetings with the NDPC Director General, the Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Poverty Reduction, and the Consultative Group of Ghana’s Donors. At the regional level, the Institute’s Governance Issues Forum network has held discussions with district and regional level authorities that led to setting priorities for planning and budgeting purposes. We are engaged in an evolving process of fostering strong working relations.</p> |
| <p>2.2 How has collaboration been strengthened (i.e. joint campaigns, collaboration, networking) with other RAOs / CSOs / CBOs?</p> |
| <p>As a result of the Institute’s <i>Growth and Poverty Forum (GPF)</i> and <i>Governance Issues Forum (GIF)</i>, collaboration with other CSOs has been strengthened through activities aimed at creating awareness, building consensus and arriving at collective decisions on how to address the country’s development issues. It is perhaps too early to talk about collaboration with other RAOs; however, there is ongoing dialogue.</p> |
| <p>2.3 How has the credibility and legitimacy of RAOs changed in the eyes of GoG and the Ghana public? How did such change come about and what is your interpretation of the changes?</p> |
| <p>Not shared</p> |

| 3. 1 Output ranking on research and advocacy products and/or services delivered; Please rank the outputs in order of relative success, according to your own appreciation and evaluative judgment | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| # | Outputs presented in submitted Workplan | Target groups that received or used the output delivered | Documents describing output delivery | Attached Copy yes/no |
| 1 | Not shared | | | |

| |
|--|
| 4. Organisation: evidence of <u>significant</u> progress / change / results in the following areas please refer to the self-assessment formats for more detail |
| Not shared |

| |
|---|
| 5. Grant and report related issues |
| Not shared |