

## ANNEX 2

### Core Grant Narrative Progress Report

**Report period** July – December 2009

**Contract Ref. No.** 03/core/22/IDEG

**Organisation** IDEG

**Contact Tel. No.** 021-506466

**Report Date** 29/01/2010

**Report Prepared by** Hannah A. Opoku Gyamfi  
**Signature & date**

**Report Approved by** Dr. Emmanuel Akwetey  
**Signature & date**

80801

=====  
**Please do not write in green coloured sections; refer to notes at last page for explanations**

- 1. Institutional/Organisation Development: Evidence of significant progress / change**  
**What are major changes in the organisation's circumstances that are likely to have impacted your outputs over the period?**
- **Organisational structure / board / management team**
  - **Strategy / planning / decision making / knowledge management**
  - **Human resource issues**
  - **Marketing / communication / public relations**

Indicators	Baseline	Prior Period	Current Period	Cumulative
<b>1. HR Management</b> i) <i>Leadership</i> <i>Executive Director</i> <i>Head of Research and Information, Head of Training and Interface and Finance Officer</i>  ii) <i>Core staff</i> <i>Research Officers</i>  iii) <i>Support staff</i>	<b>Jul – Dec 2008</b>  i) 4  ii) 5  iii) 7   --Engagement of additional interns/national service personnel to assist in delivery of the Election 2008 Project	<b>Jan – Jun 2009</b>  i) 4  ii) 5  iii) 7   --Restructuring of Admin Unit to facilitate effective program administration, e.g. Executive Assistant, Admin Officer Program, Admin Officer General & HR in place	<b>Jul – Dec 2009</b>  i) 3  ii) 7  iii) 5   <b>Recruitment:</b> 10 personnel were recruited; 1 Doctoral Research Fellow, 1 front desk officer and 1 information and Resource centre officer 7 RA's were assigned to	

		--Head of Training and interface unit resigned in May2009	two main research projects undertaken by the Institute. -Research Officer and 1 Admin Assistant resigned in August, 2009 -	
<p><b>2. Governance</b></p> <p>i) <i>Board (Members)</i> ii) <i>Committees</i> iii) <i>Documented board meetings</i> iv) <i>Management meetings</i> v) <i>Staff meetings</i></p> <p>*Board Meetings and Staff Meetings are held quarterly while management meetings are held monthly. There are also periodic programs meeting/brainstorming sessions to plan and review programs and weekly program team meetings to monitor the implementation of programs.</p>	<p>i) 6 ii) 1 committee iii) 2 iv) 6 v) 2</p> <p>Operations are overseen by a governing Council of Trustees, assisted by a Management Team of senior IDEG staff and a project advisory committee. Deloitte and Touche are the external auditors of the Institute.</p>	<p>i) 6 ii) 1 iii) 2 iv) 5 v) 2</p>	<p>i) 6 ii) 1 iii) 2 iv) 6 v) 2</p>	



viii) <i>Conflict of interest policy</i> ix) <i>Programme development policy</i> x) <i>Procurement policy</i>	ix)programme development strategy  x)procurement policy in place	vi)No major change  vii) Paternity leave incorporated  viii)No major change  xi) Modified to reflect strategic planning  x)No change	vi) No major change  vii)No major change  viii)No major change  xi)No major change  x)No major change	
4. Funding base development List long-term programmes(3yrs+) i.Elites and new poverty agenda project(Danish institute of international Studies ii.Power to the people: Making governance work for marginalised group(Christian Aid) 5 year project  iii.IDEG-CAP 2(ACBF) 4year project  List short-term programme(1 year)	i.Research-DIIS project \$171,729  ii.GTF project \$341,000  iii. \$1.7m	\$35,970.00  \$43,321.50  \$350,000.00	\$16,1170.00  \$35,883.15  \$  \$60,000.00	\$52,087.00  \$79,204.65  \$350,000.00

I. G-Rap core grant \$ SPF	i. Core grant G-Rap \$300,000	\$110,000.00		\$170,000.00
II. IBIS			\$14,285.00	\$14,285.00
III. IDASA			\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00
IV. Others			\$11,783.00	\$11,783.00
Total dollar volume of programmes	2,512,729	539,291.50	160,068.15	699,359.65
Approved dollar volumes Percentage overhead recovery				





	<p>AfriMAP</p> <p>UNESCO</p> <p>DIIS</p> <p>AWDF</p>	<p>“Effective Delivery of Public Services in Ghana: Focus on Education” (Ending)</p> <p>Book launch on collaborative research on “Nation-States and the Challenges of integration in West Africa”.</p> <p>Elites and the New Poverty Agenda</p> <p>Ghana Speaks on “Gendering policy in Africa: Women as critical resource in institutional Transformation”</p>	<p>Contribute to the generation of knowledge on regional integration in Africa</p> <p>Generate knowledge on the Elite view of new poverty agenda</p> <p>Different perspectives on the issue of gender elaborated</p>
<b>Donor agencies</b>	G-RAP, Christian Aid/DFID, ACBF, UNESCO, IMF, AfriMAP	Programmes in public policy research, advocacy and training efforts enhanced	Second part of 2009 program activities implemented
<b>DA (please indicate district)</b>	GIFNET in 7districts: Ajumako/Enyan/Esiam; New Juaben; Ashaiman; East Gonja, Ho and Sekondi/Takoradi.	Governance issues	<p>Validation workshop on baseline study done.</p> <p>The GIF structures in the respective GIF districts have been strengthened.</p> <p>Orientation workshops for Focal organizations on the new structures of the network held.</p>
<b>Private Sector</b>	IMF, AGI, Financial institutions, etc	“Conversations on Ghana’s Economy and Future Prospects”	Create platform to encourage critical debate on sensitive national development issues

## National pro-poor policies

Identified Policy Issue	Research/Advocacy activities in relation to the identified policy area	What are the policy gaps identified from the research conducted	What is your organisations position on these issues supported by your research	What policy alternatives do you propose and how do you hope to achieve this policy change
Good governance	<p>A comparative study - involving three African countries - coordinated by IDASA on the production and use of governance indicators in Africa.</p> <p>Traditional Authorities in Governance and Development (continued from 2008)</p>	<p>Though still ongoing, the study reveals that governance indicators exist at the level of input, process and performance. On the basis of this it is argued that governance indicators cannot be reduced to simply statistics.</p> <p>Issues of democracy in chieftaincy and extent to which it responds to the modern imperative of popular participation in decision-making &amp; development planning</p>	<p>It's imperative that institutions, departments, and policies are established to pursue good governance, with an emphasis on monitoring processes to determine the progressive realization of intentions and commitments by governments</p> <p>Chieftaincy should be brought into mainstream of constitutional democratic governance</p>	<p>Contextualization of international indicators to make them relevant at the country level. This will be achieved through the implementation of a well-crafted advocacy plan.</p> <p>Amendment of relevant policies and processes (e.g. Local Government Act, decentralisation policy), because only play advisory role—Entry points for advocacy are being examined</p>
Poverty reduction	<p>DIIS research on poverty in Ghana —“Elites and the New Poverty Agenda” (continued from 2008)</p>	<p>MDGs, PRSPs, Aid Effectiveness constitute an agenda identified by both internal and external policy makers.</p> <p>--Weakness of public admin, which lacks resources; --High dependency on donors and int'l financial institutions;</p>	<p>More policy input should be provided by relevant local stakeholders in identifying priorities and for promoting local ownership</p>	<p>Policy process alternative is to generate a more inclusive local, national and international consensus through national dialogue on how to transform Ghanaian economy</p>

		--Country ownership of development policies and what gets implemented is undermined		
Local governance reforms	GIF/GTF Baseline Study on Governance and Civic Participation at the District Level in public policy making, development planning and public accountability	--Perception of very little or no participation by citizens in policy making, development planning at the district level --Perception of adequate participation of citizens in the above processes by district official	--Disconnect between the assembly members and their constituents are blamed on the lack of a functional Unit Committee system which serves as a conduit between the citizens and the Assembly members. --Citizen's participation in the budget process has usually been limited to consultation in the fixing of rates.	-- Do further research into the perceived lack of cooperation between citizens and their duty bearers at the district level while probing the source of the disconnect. --Convene a stakeholder's conference that will bring together government officials, civil society, the private sector, and other state agencies to deliberate on the issues raised above, explore options and commit themselves to a collective plan of action.

## II. Success Story

### Briefly describe your organisation's landmark achievement this period

The Institute earlier on in the year entered into full implementation of the Phase two of its Capacity Building Project (IDEG-CAP). A number of activities were carried out during the second half of the year. These included: .

#### I. Interface Platforms

- i. The Institute introduced another interface framework titled "Reflection on Development Policies Seminar Series". This series is intended to focus on key development policy issues from the perspective of Ghana's development partners including the IMF, World Bank, etc. These meetings are designed to be held under the Chatham House Rules to create an avenue for free discourse with key civil society representative and policy makers. The first in the series came off on July 14, 2009 under the theme "Ghana's Economy and Future Prospects". The perspective of the immediate past country representative of the IMF- Mr. Arnold McIntyre-on Ghana's economy was brought to bear at the meeting.

#### II. Coalition building and Networking

- a. Ats the Local Governance Network (LOGNet) Secretariat, The institute organized planning meetings with zonal representatives to discuss capacity building and knowledge sharing workshops.
- b. IDEG worked with other steering committee members and zonal representatives for the successful implementation of the network's Capacity Development and knowledge sharing Workshops on the local governance system in Ghana. Four different workshops were held across the nation over a 2-week period. The reports from these workshops were drafted into a position paper to be reviewed and presented at the National Stakeholders meeting on the review of the decentralization system in Ghana. IDEG as the secretariat of the National Consultative Group (NCG) of the NGO Bill and acting on the recommendations of the Working Group of the NCG took a step in commissioning the production of a model NGO legislation or draft bill. Two Consultants at the University of Ghana (Professors Kumado and Quashigah) have been commissioned to draft a model NGO legislation that could serve as an alternative to the framework proposed in the Trust Bill (revised in 2008)
- c. IDEG also as the secretariat of the GPF hosted a CSO consultation with the consultant for the Ghana Joint Assessment Strategy (G-JAS) evaluation in September, 2009 to discuss civil society perspectives on G-JAS and aid effectiveness in the country.

### **III. Capacity Development Programme**

A 4-year Capacity Development Programme document has been prepared for implementation beginning 2010. The primary focus of the programme is to upgrade the interface competencies of state and non-state actors in order to improve the performance of their mutually reinforcing roles in the concurrent pursuit of poverty reduction, accelerated and equitable growth and democracy and good governance in Ghana. The programme will be implemented at the district, national and international levels.

### **IV. Stakeholder Perception**

**How has the credibility and legitimacy of RAOs changed in the eyes of GoG and the Ghana public? What is your interpretation? Is there a reference to this evidence of change?**

Ghana has observed a major shift in the policy making process for the greater part of the last decade. Increasingly government agencies have included more CSOs in their planning and implementation processes. Hitherto, policy making was seen as a preserve of government, Ministries, Departments and Agencies with the marginalization of CSOs in the process. Examples of this change process include the opening up of the budget making process to CSOs - the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning has since 2005 requested for memos from CSOs to enhance budget making in Ghana. The National Development Planning Commission has also established the cross sectoral planning groups comprising MDAs and CSOs/RAOs to review, refine and formulate medium to long term plans since the beginning of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers since 2000.

This continued trend demonstrates mutual confidence and trust and perhaps recognition of the critical role that RAOs play in the development of the nation. The outputs from the work of RAOs such as IDEG's, both at national and local levels, has consequently accorded them high credibility and a certain mandate to continue the work they do. The media in particular demonstrated a lot of confidence in the Institute (IDEG). Within the last 6 months the Institute's views have been requested on critical national issues such as elections and political parties, narcotic drugs and the image of Ghana, (re-) demarcation of districts in Ghana, prospects for the Ghanaian economy, and issues regarding aid effectiveness.

The enhanced relationship between RAOs and Government is expected to be sustained as RAOs continue to produce objective and credible policy options through evidence-based research

**V. What is your perception on the general policy making environment in Ghana**

The general policy making environment has moved from an exclusively GoG process in the past to one which seeks to promote more stakeholder participation. While stakeholder participation has generally worked more at the level of policy implementation and M&E processes, there has been less non-state participation in the national policy formulation process, save ad hoc consultations after certain policies have been decided. However, pressures from civil society and development partners seem to be opening up more possibilities for the policy making environment to be more democratic and people-centred.

**VI. Grant and report related issues**

**7.1 What issues do you wish to raise relating to the Grant or to G-RAP management?**

**7.2 What parts of the report are confidential or cannot be shared without prior consent?**

Sections 2 and 4 may be shared

### Notes on narrative reporting

In addition to this narrative report, G-rap accepts grantee organisation's own annual report, on the assumption that these reports show a relationship between annual workplans, budgets and outputs of these organisations and – if possible – impact.

G-rap however monitors a number of indicators that a Grantee's annual report may not always focus on and have designed a simple narrative reporting format to gather this data. This gives the programme managers a quick overview of progress against workplan of each grantee and of significant results in a number of relevant areas relating to the Logical Framework and objectives of the Programme.

G-rap intends to minimize Grantee's time investments in reporting, hence this concise format. Nonetheless, additional documentation can be annexed to the report for more detail.

Narrative reporting is a bi-annual contractual requirement. The deadline for report submission is four weeks after the end of the reporting period.

Completed reports need to be submitted in signed hard copy (2 signatures), as well as in electronic format using MS-Word 2003 compatible software (to: [info.grap.ghana@gmail.com](mailto:info.grap.ghana@gmail.com)).