

ANNEX 5: NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT**Six-Month and Annual Reporting**

Version 50622

General information	
Name of the Organisation: Ghana Center for Democratic Development	Contract Ref. No.:01/CORE/10/CDD
Report Prepared by: Peter Owusu-Donkor Signature: <i>Peter Owusu-Donkor</i>	Report Period: January – June 2006
Report Approved by: Prof. Emmanuel Gyimah-Boadi Signature: <i>Emmanuel Gyimah-Boadi</i>	Report Date: 2006-07-13 Contact Tel. No.: 784293

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?

GPRS II and the President Special Initiative projects have been basically geared towards the rural sectors of the country. These programs have specifically been designed to assist in stabilising the rural economy which invariably produces a greater percentage of raw materials both for local consumptions and for exports. The programs have been made possible with multiple donor support. Some level of pressure from research and advocacy NGOs has also contributed to the government paying attention to pro-poor programs. Some donors specifically require the inclusion of pro-poor policies in government programs that are donor driven. The yet to be disbursed MCA is a typical example.

We authorize G-RAP to post this information on its website Yes

2. Collaboration and networking

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.

The Center has intensified its activities to help build the capacity of the parliamentary support staff under the program *Strengthening Parliamentary Processes in Ghana*. The program has already begun to yield positive results and is reflected in the quality of the services provided by the parliamentary support staff to the Members of Parliament (MPs) and the institution of Parliament. This program has also enjoyed the collaboration and enthusiastic support of the MPs.

The Center has enjoyed positive relations with donors, particularly USAID, G-RAP and FNF. This partly is due to the fact that CDD has been able to ensure that its programs are executed in accordance with obligations contracted with donors and achieve positive impact on beneficiaries. Relationship with state and governmental agencies has been very good. This is reflected in the solicitation of inputs from CDD by Government (e.g., Disability Bill and yet to be passed Whistleblowers Bill, Right to Information Bill, Trust Bill, National Identification System).

CDD has held joint programs to explore ways of deepening decentralization with staff of the District Assemblies, the National Association of Local Government (NALAG), the Parliamentary Committee on Local Government and Rural Development and the Committee on Social Welfare,. In April 2006 the Center conducted a round table discussion in collaboration with Cape Coast Municipal Authority on *Strengthening Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assembly Accountability*. CDD has also been invited by many Government Organizations (e.g. NDPC, National African Peer Review Council Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, Ministry of Manpower, Youth and Employment etc) to participate in many important discussions of sector issues. The Center has always been represented by a strong technical team in these meetings and made substantial submissions.

2.2 How has collaboration been strengthened (i.e. joint campaigns, collaboration, networking) with other RAOs / CSOs / CBOs?

Collaborations have been strengthened through the formation of informal networks of NGOs engaged in or focused on similar issues. Currently, the Center is collaborating with IBIS in the Center's preparations to monitor the upcoming local level elections. CDD and IBIS have also initiated a project to form a network of organizations that are involved in decentralization programs. CDD collaborated closely with the Ghana Federation for the Disabled (GFD) to push for the passage of the Disability legislation. The Center has also been collaborating with the GFD and the Action for the Development of the Disabled to enhance the participation of persons with disability in the district elections. G-RAP has made possible formal networking of RAOs and fostered the ability of RAOs to get involved in each other's. A program on *Women's Participation in Local Level Elections* is being planned in collaboration with WILDAF.

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?

The GOG tends to view most RAOs as baneful or useful according to the programs respective RAOs pursue. The AGs office, for instance, has responded poorly to RAO programs related to programs for anti-corruption and post-National Reconciliation Commission (NRC) institutional reforms. But the Ministry of Youth, Manpower and Employment, Ministry of Finance and NDPC as well as CHRAJ and SFO have favorable opinion of the Center's programs stemming mainly from the quality of the Center's technical contribution to deliberations and policy making (examples include the disability bill).

The growing and significant involvement of some RAOs in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of government-initiated programs such as the MCA, GRPS, APRM, the national identification system etc is a recognition of the credibility and utility of RAOs/CSOs/CBOs. It also confers some level of legitimacy to RAOs/NGOs/CBOs.

The public generally has a credible opinion on RAOs because they consider the RAOs as watchdogs through which the reality of good governance and democracy can be realized

We authorise G-RAP to post this information on its website

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	Deepening Decentralization – Round Table Discussion on “ <i>Advocacy for legal reforms to enhance flexibility and efficiency of local government elections and structures</i> ”	Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and the Environment. Electoral Commission, NALAG, Parliamentary Committee on Local Government. IBIS, Media	Concept Paper/Report of the program compiled by a rapportuer	Will be forwarded later
2	Anti-Corruption Promotion – <i>Exploring and deepening the linkages between corruption and Human Rights</i>	CHRAJ, Human Right/Law Professionals, academia, CHRI, Media	Concept Paper and rapportuer’s report	Will be forwarded later
3	Anti-Corruption Promotion – <i>SFO Review – Empowering the SFO through a review of the SFO act.</i>	CHRAJ, Human Right/Law Professionals, SFO academia, CHRI, Media	Concept paper and rapportuer’s report	Yes
4	Round table discussion on <i>Making the Labor Law Work: The Role of Employers and Workers</i>	National Labor Commission, Ghana Medical Association, Ministry of Manpower, Youth and Employment, Labor Organizations, Parliamentary Committees labour Consultant, Media	Proposal and repportuer records	Yes
5	Annual Liberal Lecture – <i>Is Ghana Ready for Subsidiarity?</i>	Government Institutions/Ministry of Local Government, Decentralization and Environment, academia, other NGOs, Media	Concept paper and rapportuer’s report	Will be forwarded later
	Parliamentary Support Program – Technical Assistance on Designing and Administering Research Instruments	Research Staff of the Research Department of Parliament	Designed Research Instruments for gathering information on the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament	Yes
3.2 Please explain the basis of the ranking; what criteria were you using for the ranking? Attendance, Media coverage and Public Reaction				
The ranking are based on attendance by the targeted groups, media coverage and public reactions				
We authorise G-RAP to post this information on its website				Yes

4. Organisation: evidence of significant progress / change / results in the following areas	
4.1 Strategy, planning, decision making, knowledge management	
Planning of programs and detailed program activities is comprehensive but there may be isolated cases where planning is done on ad hoc basis because such collaborative programs come in unexpectedly. Decision making basically rest with the Executive Committee. Knowledge management has not officially been formalized – more on person to person level.	
4.2 Funding base development and financial management	
Funding base is typically through solicitation with proposals. No other means have been developed to raise funds at the moment. A business plan in working progress addresses some of the funding generating issues. Administrative and Financial management are effective and other accounting procedures are strictly adhered to in a more transparent manner.	
4.3 Recruitment, development and retention of staff; HR planning; incentives	
Recruitment of staff is slow but competitive. The retention rate is very high. Staff development is through external short programs organized by other organizations. In addition, staff, especially new recruits, is trained sufficiently to undertake their specific responsibilities. Incentives can be very attractive or less attractive depending on where comparison is made.	
4.3 Organisational structure, board, management team	
The Board of Governors play an overall supervisory role and are at the top of the organizational structure. Next to the Board is the Executive Committee made up of three officials who are also the final decision makers in any major activity. Daily activities of CDD are supervised by the Executive Director and his associate and also the treasurer. Three sectional heads also assist in the administration of the Center through supervisory roles.	
4.4 Marketing, public relations, communication	
The Center does not embark on any specific marketing strategy. Generally information on CDD is shared with other organizations through publications particularly the annual reports. Officially there is no PR person. Most of the PRs are done by the Exec. Director, a board member or the HOP. The Center is currently trying to recruit a PRO. Generally, relationship with the public especially the media has been very good.	
We authorise G-RAP to post this information on its website	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Grant and report related issues	
5.1 Details of any notable challenges or unexpected developments encountered during the reporting period. Indicate the reason for such change and what impact this could have on the execution of your original Annual Workplan as attached to Grant contract.	
Scheduling of programs and implementation has been efficient	
5.2 Please indicate any issues you wish to raise relating to the Grant or to G-RAP management, monitoring or financial procedures.	
PMT should be given the flexibility of coming up with proposals on programs which they deem necessary that are overlooked/not being tackled by any RAO. Such programs could be assigned to some RAOs to implement.	
We authorise G-RAP to post this information on its website	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

5.3 Please indicate any aspects of this report which are confidential and should not be communicated beyond G-RAP without prior consent.	
[Authorization received by PMT on 4/12/07 to share all contents]	