

**Christian Aid
GTF Annual Report September 2008-June 2009**

1. Programme Identification Details

GTF Number	GTF301
Short Title of Programme	Power to the People: making governance work for marginalised groups
Name of lead institution:	Christian Aid
Start date:	12/08/2008
End date:	11/08/2013
Amount of DFID Funding:	£4,999,795
Brief Summary of Programme:	<p>This is a five year programme seeking to nurture the development of effective civil society movements to both empower marginalised and vulnerable people and hold community, local and national authorities to account.</p> <p>The four outputs focus on: voice and participation of marginalised groups; action and interaction with authorities; civil society working together; and experience sharing.</p> <p>The programme will focus on demonstrable impact on accountability over the five years, which will contribute to the delivery of direct benefits for marginalised groups. The programme will include activities to secure increased participation by, and government responsiveness to, marginalised groups as well as more effective civil society movements.</p> <p>It will involve partners and activities in ten countries in Africa, Asia and Middle East, and Latin America and Caribbean. In addition, a number of global activities will take place during the life of the programme.</p>
List all countries where activities have taken or will take place	<p>East Africa: Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda</p> <p>West Africa: Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone</p> <p>Latin America and Caribbean: Brazil and Dominican Republic</p> <p>Middle East and Central Asia: Iraq and Tajikistan</p>
List all implementing partners in each country	<p>Brazil</p> <p>Ecumenical Service Coordination (CESE)</p> <p>Institute of Social Economic Studies (INESC)</p> <p>Popular University (UNIPOP)</p>

	<p>Dominican Republic - Jesuit Services for Migrants and Refugees (JRSM)</p> <p>Ghana</p> <p>Social Enterprise Development (SEND) Foundation</p> <p>Institute for Democratic Governance (IDEG)</p> <p>Iraq - Rehabilitation, Education and Communities Health (REACH)</p> <p>Kenya</p> <p>Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC)</p> <p>Centre for the Rehabilitation and Education of the Abused (CREAW)</p> <p>Northern Aid</p> <p>Nigeria</p> <p>Justice Development and Peace Commission (JDPC) Auchi</p> <p>JDPC Onitsha</p> <p>Sierra Leone – SEND Foundation</p> <p>Tajikistan</p> <p>Rights and Prosperity</p> <p>Association of Scientific and Technical Intellectuals (ASTI)</p> <p>Tanzania - Hakikazi Catalyst</p> <p>Uganda</p> <p>Refugee Law Project (RLP)</p> <p>Uganda Debt Network (UDN)</p>
<p>Target groups- wider beneficiaries</p>	<p>Our projects will directly target 78,491 people, which comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor communities in Brazil, Ghana, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria Tajikistan, Tanzania and Uganda - pastoralists in Northern Kenya - Haitian migrants and their descendents in Dominican Republic - indigenous and quilombola communities and Amazon youth in Brazil - people living with HIV/AIDs in Nigeria - asylum seekers and refugees in Uganda - women in Sierra Leone and Kenya. <p>We estimate that the programme could benefit up to 14 million people if service delivery and government accountability improve and proper</p>

	policies are agreed and implemented. These figures are initial estimates and will be revised as part of the baseline process.
Lead Contact	Kevin O'Dell
Person who prepared this report	Olivia McDonald – GTF Programme Manager (seconded)

2. List of Acronyms

CA – Christian Aid
 CBOs – Community-based organisations
 CSOs – Civil society organisations
 DFID – Department for International Development
 GTF - Governance and Transparency Fund
 HAP – Humanitarian Accountability Project
 KRG – Kurdish Regional Government
 NGO – Non-governmental organisation
 NMJD – Network Movement for Justice and Development
 TGNP – Tanzania Gender Networking Project

Please note that partner acronyms are spelt out on page 1-2 above.

3. Executive Summary

Since the programme started last September, activities have commenced in the majority of countries. A number of countries have used the last few months to step back, either revisiting the partner portfolio or the project aims, whilst a number of partners have decided to use the baseline as an opportunity to reflect on project aims. So whilst some partners are in full throe and already demonstrating results, a number will be getting fully up and running in the next period.

At a programme management level, after an unfortunate delay in recruitment of the Programme Manager post, Christian Aid seconded our Corporate Strategy Leader for Accountable Governance to manage the programme. The existing log-frame was revised as part of the inception process and we will bring all GTF partners together in the UK in September (7-11) to agree the final log-frame, monitoring and evaluation framework and shared learning plan. We are keen to use this as an opportunity to reflect more broadly on Christian Aid's accountable governance work with staff, partners, DFID officials, experts and representatives of other GTF programmes and are thus planning a one-day 'Governance Conference'. One agenda item will likely be the external evaluation of Christian Aid's corporate strategy on accountable governance, including our support to partners in this area.

Overall we consider ourselves largely on-track. The next few months will be busy – coordinating the event and finalising the results framework and monitoring and evaluation plan – but we are confident this investment in time will guarantee us a strong programme that meets the needs of the communities with whom we work as well as DFID.

4. Programme Management

There were significant delays in recruitment of a Programme Manager, which in turn has meant delays in revising our overall approach and formulating our Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. This delay may, however, have worked to our advantage, as Christian Aid seconded the Senior Governance Adviser from our Global Policy and Advocacy Division, who also leads our corporate strategy on Accountable Governance, to run the programme for six months. This has not only allowed us to catch up on lost time, but to build a strong programme that goes far further in developing a strategic approach to governance and links in with other organisational research and learning initiatives. Christian Aid is currently recruiting the permanent Programme Manager, with a view to having them in post for the learning event and general handover for September 2009.

As part of the programme start-up, templates were created for common partner proposals and reports. These templates covered both narrative and financial aspects of both the proposals and reports and aim to provide some clarity within the complex programme. In addition, partnership agreements were created to take into account the special contractual arrangements for the GTF programme. These agreements form the basis of the partners', and Christian Aid's, compliance requirements.

There have been important programme management initiatives in both East and West Africa, including recruitment of a GTF programme officer for West Africa. In East Africa, there was a workshop with all partners to try and build a common analysis and approach across the partners. As well as providing guidance on partner reporting and collecting baseline data the workshop had a session on how to integrate rights based approaches into their programmes. In West Africa, a joint country logframe was prepared in Ghana by SEND and IDEG, which has really helped the partners see how their projects interact. The partners in Nigeria are being supported to do something similar.

Christian Aid is committed to improving its downward accountability. We are half way through the HAP certification process and expect to have achieved certification by September 2009. We are focusing on improving the downward accountability in both our humanitarian and development programmes as well as actively supporting some partners to become HAP members and pursue HAP certification themselves. In this period we had initial planning sessions with the Christian Aid Humanitarian Accountability Officer and will be asking partners to develop mechanisms for information sharing, participation and complaints as part of their projects. We will map existing practice as part of the baseline process and invite the Humanitarian Accountability Officer to the September workshop to work with partners on how to improve their downward accountability mechanisms.

It is not all about our partners, however. We will plan to also finalise how we Christian Aid will ensure its accountability of the GTF programme to both beneficiaries and partners in September. One way will be the establishment of a steering committee that includes representatives of programme staff and partners.

5. Working with implementing partners

Nigeria: We shifted our support from Muslim Christian Dialogue Foundation to the Auchu and Onitsha branches of the Catholic Justice Development and Peace Commission because of the fit with our existing Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) programme. In that work we discovered that there were many issues such as

access to education, child protection, etc which our HIV partners could not take forward because of their lack of expertise in governance and advocacy work. Furthermore, because the two JDPCs are based in states where Christian Aid has programme officers located it gives us the ability to provide support and assistance to the partners. Finally we believe the partners have capacity to really influence change – they have strong influence in the states where they are based and can have national reach through their membership of a national network of JDPCs.

The JDPCs are faith-based organisations who use interfaith approaches. They will be responsible for delivering programmes at the community level and regular monitoring and review. Both JDPCs have a lot of experience in community sensitization, especially in the area of voter and civic education. They have been monitoring elections and facilitating dialogue between the electorate and the elected since 1999. They have also been involved in advocacy work and have access to state actors. JDPC Onitsha are probably stronger than JDPC Auchu but both have the capacity to learn and, with support from CA, they will be able to deliver strong local government accountability work.

The JDPCs will support communities to understand and demand their rights, facilitating dialogue between the state and the communities and in turn building the capacity of the state to respond to the voice of the communities.

Sierra Leone: We shifted our support from Network Movement for Justice and Development to SEND Foundation, a very experienced organisation in this field and arguably one of the best in the region with whom Christian Aid has worked for many years in Ghana. We are very excited by the opportunity to work with them as they expand their programme in Sierra Leone – a country that will benefit greatly from the expertise – and believe the GTF programme as a whole will benefit from SEND's experience of implementing projects in two very different contexts. The only capacity concern could have been around SEND simultaneously setting up in Sierra Leone and running this project, however this should not be a problem as the Executive Director of SEND is temporarily relocating to Sierra Leone to oversee this process. SEND Foundation will be responsible for delivery of the project and regular monitoring and review.

SEND Foundation will be focusing on increasing women's participation in formal governance structures at a community and district level.

East Africa: At the outset the East Africa programme wanted to bring two partners from each country (Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya) into the GTF. The Tanzania Gender Networking Project decided not to remain in the programme, as they were concerned the specific project would push them away from their strategic direction. The programme did not have a strong partner who could take over from TGNP in Tanzania hence the decision to support Kenya Human Rights Commission, who we feel are one of our strongest governance partners in the region.

KHRC are experienced in the development of accountability tools such as the People's Manifesto and community based monitoring of human rights violations. They are strong in community mobilization and education - for example they contributed to the inclusion of human rights education in the official school curriculum – and have international links to bodies including the UN bodies, the African Commission on Human Rights in Gambia and the International Labour Organisation.

Our partnership with KHRC is fairly new. We supported an exploratory project – research into the causes and consequences of corruption in Kenya in 2008 - and

have been impressed by the quality of their analysis. We are confident KHRC's capacity to implement this project and feel that supporting them significantly strengthens the overall GTF portfolio because of their practical skills in deploying a practical rights perspective, something other partners will inevitably learn from.

KHRC will be focusing on rights awareness training and monitoring human rights violations.

6. Risk Assessment

Risk	Likelihood	Potential impact	Mitigation
<i>Security</i>			
Actual/threatened attacks on CA / partner staff	Brazil – low Dominican Republic - medium Ghana - low Iraq - high Kenya - medium Nigeria - medium Sierra Leone - low Tajikistan - medium Tanzania - low Uganda - medium	High: - Staff and partner welfare - Ability to implement project	- Security and evacuation plans for all countries, shared with partners. - 'Remote-working' in Iraq. - Support partners to deploy most productive approach (insider vs outsider) based on context
<i>Financial</i>			
Misuse of funds by partners	Low	High: Lost programme credibility, wasted resources, reduced impact	Partner selection procedures, sound financial processes, regular monitoring and external evaluations.
Financial legislation hampers grant administration	Low	Low: Programme delays	Investigate acceptable alternative methods
<i>Operational</i>			
Legal restrictions on activities	Brazil – high Dominican Republic - medium Ghana - low Iraq - high Kenya - medium Nigeria - medium Sierra Leone - low Tajikistan - medium Tanzania - low Uganda - medium	Medium: Restricts programme implementation	- Analysis of legal framework in activity design. - Supporting partners to see how other partners have responded/adapted to restrictions. - Planned discussions on extent of risks during September partner event. - Liaison with authorities in country/CA advocacy at UK/EU level when risks arise. - CA supporting CIVICUS civil society watch programme to track this issue at a global level.

High partner staff turnover	Low	Low: Loss of programme experience, implementation delays	Sharing activities ensure institutional as well individual knowledge.
Diversion of partners to other priorities	Low	Medium: implementation delays, reduced impact	Partner selection according to capacity and organisational priorities, flexibility during emergencies.

7. M&E Arrangements

As explained in the Inception Report, Christian Aid is still developing the M&E plan and will be finalising it with partners at the global partner meeting for sharing with DFID by end September.

8. Logframe Changes

No changes to the logframe.

9. Emerging impact on governance and transparency

REACH, Iraq

REACH have provided us with two specific examples indicating the emerging impact of their project:

- **Vaccination campaign.** CBOs in Kalar district in Suleimanyah realised that although the government have plenty of livestock vaccination in stock, they were not providing this service for the community. REACH supported the CBOs to engage with the authorities resulting in the government starting a vaccination campaign in the community.
- **Rural access roads.** An important project to renovate 27.5 kilometres of rural roads servicing 12 villages in Harrier district was meant to be completed by end 2008 but had stalled. Again REACH supported local CBOs to engage with the authorities. Activities recommenced in February 2009 and have now been completed improving access in five areas.

These both represent **practice change** on the part of the government. Although the authorities had made commitments to provide these services (and had the resources to do so) they had not *implemented* them. There is a tendency for the government to hold onto resources unless they can get something in return – like votes – or to deliver them at times that are not particularly suitable for the local community. REACH and the CBOs have helped ensure that local governments not only implement their commitments, but do so in a timely manner that helps the communities.

These examples also indicate **behaviour change** on the part of the communities. Although the communities were well aware that the authorities had made these promises, it was REACH's engagement that encouraged them to take action in response, to actively claim their rights. The success of these engagements should reinforce to the communities the value of taking action in this way.

It is too early to tell from these examples if REACH's project has brought about **changes in power relations**, but REACH and Christian Aid are both confident that this is a step in the right direction, particularly in the communities' ongoing ability to organise and take collective action.

The government's vaccination programme is for all farmers, which means rich and poor farmers have **benefitted**. In this region a poor farmer is defined as someone who has only 5 livestock whilst a rich farmer has over 20. The vaccination campaign covered more than 3000 livestock in 25 rural villages, of whom 25% were poor farmers and 35% rich farmers. Specifically it has benefitted 400 farmers and their families who did not have sufficient funds to pay for the vaccination themselves.

The opening of the roads has benefitted 12 villages of 312 families (2215 persons) of which 43% are farmers (33% of whom are poor), 37% animal breeders (of whom 45% are poor), 8% are widows, 7% are government junior employees and 4% are unemployed¹. The improved roads have reduced journey time for the 28% of people that have their own transport (car, tractor etc) but have particularly helped those without transport. There is now more regular, cheaper transport out of the villages which will make it easier for people to find employment, visit extended families and access government services (for example hospital services).

REACH has achieved these changes through establishing dialogue between the communities and the government, by always being in the middle of them. Sometimes the communities they work with become disillusioned or do not have all the information to hand – for example that a certain service should be free. In the vaccination example, people knew it was vaccination season and that the authorities were meant to be providing vaccination services, but were not taking any action in response to non-delivery of those services. REACH's let people know that a couple of simple activities could persuade the authorities to act and accompany them in meetings with the authorities as necessary. The authorities suffer from a lack of planning skills, their data is out of date and they do not have regular contact with the authorities – REACH's role has been to show how engagement with the communities can help the government execute their responsibilities more effectively. So this awareness and engagement with each group is important in the success as well as bringing the two groups together.

These two changes are both **significant** because they represent basic improvements in people's lives as a result of supporting communities to engage with local authorities. It would seem all the remarkable that these are achieving in a fragile state like Iraq, however the project has actually benefitted from the Kurdish Regional Government's desire to show it is a progressive, functioning state. REACH feel confident this attitude will remain regardless of which party wins the next elections.

The key success factors are the general openness of the government, the 15 years REACH has invested to engage with the communities and REACH's approach. There do not appear to have been significant obstacles to overcome, however the an increase in violence and worsening relations between Baghdad and KRG could dramatically change the ability of REACH to deliver a successful project as could events in Turkey and Iran and instability the Middle East more broadly.

¹ Poor farmers; are those with no land or with less than 5 donums (each donun is 2500 square meter), also with no proper access to water in other word land rainfall dependant. Poor animal breeders; are those with less than 5 head of live stock (sheep, goat or cattle).

CESE, Brazil

In March 2009 the Brazilian Supreme Federal Court (STF) voted for the continuous demarcation of the land in Raposa Serra do Sol which meant that only indigenous people have the right to live there. This represents both a **practice change** on the part of government in that they are formally recognizing the rights of indigenous communities to land, a major issue in Brazil.

There is also evidence of **behaviour change** amongst the indigenous movement as a result of this legal victory. The Raposa Terra do Sol case actually generated many political divisions between indigenous communities. Some groups defended the presence of rice producers on the land whilst others wanted the land only for the use of indigenous groups. Since the victory, however, CESE has noticed changes in the dynamics of the movement. Now they seem to be more willing to talk to each other and work together. For example they have already discussed establishing a national confederation of indigenous groups.

The legal victory is also **symbolic change** that can inspire other indigenous and quilombola communities and can be seen as a step towards the government making good on its responsibilities towards indigenous communities. CESE, however, only see this as a **half victory**. The STF decision included 19 conditions which the indigenous movement had not been consulted on and are seen as un-progressive. Some of these conditions, for example, restrict indigenous rights if landowners in the region question a decision. This probably reflects the fact that power relations still favour the powerful economic groups – particularly agribusiness and landowners – rather than the indigenous communities.

The **benefits** of this victory could be massive for the 19,000 indigenous people from five different ethnicities who live in the Raposa Terra do Sol indigenous land. It also opens the opportunity for progressive responses to the 190 requests of recognition of indigenous areas all over Brazil and sets a good example for the struggles of other indigenous groups in Latin America.

CESE is an ecumenical organization that since its creation, 40 years ago, has been supporting hundreds of projects from people's movements in promotion of human rights, citizenship, democracy, access to natural resources and respect for cultural diversity in Brazil. One of its main **ways of working** (and the approach of their GTF project) is to support small projects. Currently it supports about 400 such projects. This includes CIR (Conselho Indígena de Roraima - Indigenous Council of Roraima) and COIAB (Coordenação das Organizações Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira – Coordination of the Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon). These two organisations played a major role in securing the recognition of this community to their land rights.

One reason for the success of this case was the involvement and support of different sectors of the social movements – both in Brazil and overseas. The movement also linked up with environmentalists. The communities own an ancestral knowledge about the land they live in and are important actors in the preservation of local ecosystems. Voting at STF came at the highest peak of deforestation of the Amazon forest (the whole area of Roraima state, where Raposa Terra do Sol is located, is part of the Amazon) so the recognition of the role the indigenous communities play in its preservation and conservation clearly played a role. Because of this the legal case was particularly timely.

The opponents to this particular case argued that once the rice growers left, grain production - and therefore broader economic development - would be compromised.

However the indigenous movement developed a strategic response to this concern. In May 2009, CESE financially supported an exchange between Movimento dos Sem Terra (MST - the Brazilian landless movement), La Via Campesina (the international peasant movement), and the people of Raposa Terra do Sol. They travelled from the southern tip of Brazil, Rio Grande do Sul state, to Roraima, in the border with Venezuela, teaching people how to plant organic rice in a sustainable *and large scale* way, taking into account soil properties and local biodiversity. As a result the attitude of Brazilian newspapers changed - audiences now understand that that indigenous land can promote development, but in a more sustainable way.

The main **challenge** of this victory has been on public perceptions. The opinion evident in the media and public discussion is that Raposa Serra do Sol is too big for its population (1.7 million of hectares for 19,000 people). However CESE respond that Brazil has 8.5 million kilometres of land and 81% of its 180 million people are urban based, so there really is sufficient land to allow people rights to their ancestral land. CESE has been working to help people understand and overcome their stereotypes and prejudices towards indigenous people. Their campaigning activities also involve production of materials, advocacy capacity development for indigenous groups and lobbying in the Brazilian Parliament in the capital, Brasilia.

Only time will tell the **significance** of this particular case. Although the current federal government has shown good intent towards the rights of traditionally excluded minority groups, it has not achieved many of its objectives, particularly those around demarcation of indigenous lands. It has been a very slow process and CESE argue this stems from the excessive influence of powerful economic interests in the country.

Both these examples contribute to the **DFID results framework** as follows:

Purpose – 2.1 and 2.2

Accountability – 5.1

Responsiveness – 8.1

10. Cross-cutting issues

Nothing to share with DFID at this stage, but we will explore these issues – bringing in Christian Aid's advisers on gender and downward accountability - as part of the global partner event in September.

11. Progress towards sustainability (year 2 onwards)

Not applicable at this stage.

12. Innovation

The most innovative activity to date is probably the survey by Rights and Prosperity in Tajikistan to assess opportunities for people to influence and make the authorities. The report is still in draft form and the research was limited by the refusal of a number of respondents to answer survey questions – perhaps a finding in and of itself. However, the findings are of interest and will definitely shape the evolution of the project:

- The legal framework in Tajikistan makes provision for people to participate in public affairs, make appeals to national/local state bodies and public associations, be received by MPs and officials, access information and be part of local self

governance. Public debate and public associations are allowed and the government has committed to establish consultative advisory bodies.

- However, people are not always aware of these rights and do not trust that these laws apply equally to rich and poor citizens.
- The government does not always follow the rules they have set up. For example MPs/civil servants officials do not always receive citizens as obliged by national laws.
- There is often no enabling framework to support government officials to meet these commitments. For example, there is little training for officials on how to respond to a complaint.
- Information is often difficult to access. The law allows officials to classify information and there is very little engagement with the media to proactively disseminate information.

Rights and Prosperity have developed a number of recommendations that will form the basis of their project and we will ask them to share their findings in the September meeting.

From the proposals there are a number of initiatives that look quite innovative. We will report on the how these initiatives have fared in further reports:

- Nigeria: Our experience is that partners who combine service delivery and local advocacy are often very successful, but linking service delivery partners (in this case orphans and vulnerable children) with more political, advocacy focused organizations is not common practice and is definitely an innovative aspect of CA's GTF portfolio (most linking tends to be *between* advocacy organizations).
- Ghana: The IDEG bottom-up model of facilitating discussion on governance issues at a community level then bringing together representatives of these Governance Issue Fora at a regional and national level will be interesting to track.
- Brazil. CESE's small projects fund allows it to strategically support groups of indigenous and quilombola communities that are *already organized* around issues of concern. It will be interesting to work with CESE to see how far support for isolated cases contributes to bigger change with these two very marginalized groups.
- Dominican Republic: Many groups who assist migrants who suffer extreme discrimination focus their efforts in the receiving country. It will be interesting to see if JRSM's emphasis on influencing the Haitian authorities and building links with progressive groups (academics, civil society, religious groups) will provide a further route to challenge violence and discrimination suffered by Haitian migrants in Dominican Republic.

Finally, partner documents show a clear focus on using the media to communicate with target communities. This includes radio shows in the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Uganda and Kenya, TV in Dominican Republic, a film festival in Kenya and video advocacy in Kenya and Uganda.

13. Learning from GTF

Some initial lessons and areas where we would like to carry out more active learning and reflection with partners are outlined below.

- **Lessons about the overall project or programme design**

We believe one of the strengths of this programme is that it does not seek to control *what* partners do but rather focuses on *how* they do it. Rather than telling partners to run projects on, say, women's budget monitoring, they have focused on a particular group or issue that feels most relevant to them. There was, however, a significant time gap between developing initial partner proposals for the original GTF bid and the

start of the programme last November. Rather than immediately starting to fund the projects as outlined in the proposal, the programme would have benefited from taking some time to re-assess the coherence of the overall programme. The lesson we will take from this is to start any new global programme with a programme mapping exercise to assess coherence and alignment. In lieu of a Programme Manager this could be undertaken by a consultant. We do not think this will harm the overall Christian Aid programme however, because of the high level of commitment by partners and staff to make adjustments as necessary to ensure a strong programme that delivers for both local communities and for DFID. It does, however, mean changes for many of the partners, not necessarily in activities but definitely in what and how they should report to Christian Aid and which issues they should give most attention to.

▪ **Lessons about working with partner organisations**

One of the challenges in delivering a coherent global programme is to enable our partners to identify needs and develop and implement appropriate, country specific responses, while ensuring sufficient commonality of approach to enable global learning. One of the initial tasks of the programme manager has been to review all partner proposals and action plans for coherence with the revised logframe and results focus. This is a very busy time as we refine and focus the programme, and the risk is that many communications come as directives from London. Such an approach could clearly harm the trust developed between Christian Aid country staff and partners. We have therefore attempted to approach dialogue with partners in a more open manner, initially reflecting on the project with country staff and then providing written feedback sheets to partners that are iterative, probing and suggestive rather than comments on the proposal or new forms to complete. We hope that this will help partners see *why* we are asking what we are and that it will help strengthen and build trust. We will reflect back on the effectiveness of this in future reviews.

▪ **Lessons about risk assessment and management**

Reports from Iraq and Brazil both identified concerns about restrictive laws and practices on civil society operations. New regulation in Brazil challenges the rights of quilombolas communities to self-identification as an ethnic group within the Brazilian society as well as a reported trend to criminalise social movements. A new NGO law being developed in Kurdish Regional Government. The draft is now going through parliament and REACH are worried concerned that the final law may well use a national security as an excuse to control civil society. REACH and a number of agencies are involved in extensive lobbying to ensure this does not happen. Christian Aid is very aware of the trend to increased restrictions on civil society organisations and we are considering how we could pilot more active management responses – akin to our country security plans – as part of the GTF programme. We will definitely allocate some time in September to discuss this issue in more depth with partners.

Annex 1 - Achievement Rating Scale

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings
- 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = not achieved

Please complete this template in summary form to provide a uniform assessment of progress against your stated objectives.

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year being assessed	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
<p>Purpose To nurture the development of effective civil society movements to both empower marginalised and vulnerable people and hold community, local and national authorities to account.</p>	3	<p>P.1 Evidence of more effective action by marginalised groups to claim their rights and/or hold authorities to account in all 10 GTF countries (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p> <p>P.2 Evidence of improved engagement by authorities targeted by GTF projects in mechanisms and processes for dialogue with marginalised citizens in X / 10 GTF countries</p> <p>P.3 Pro-poor policy decisions made as a result of GTF activities in X / 10 GTF countries</p> <p>P.4 Examples of successful collective CSO action</p>	<p>P.1 To be determined</p> <p>P.2 To be determined</p> <p>P.3 0/10</p> <p>P.4 0/10</p>	<p>Cannot measure at this stage – awaiting baseline data</p> <p>Cannot measure at this stage – awaiting baseline data</p> <p>2/10. Iraq, REACH and Brazil, CESE</p> <p>0/10. No clear evidence of success but a number of</p>	<p>It is really too early to report against these indicators, not least because a number of projects are still starting up and the baseline data is currently being collected. 12 of the 18 partners are to fully commence activities in the next period because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CA programme staff and partners wanted to use this period to revisit project design ▪ Partners want baseline surveys/needs analysis to inform design of activities ▪ Partner changes (as detailed in section 5 above) <p>▪ However, we have two good examples to share for P.3 that are documented in section 9 above.</p>

		involving GTF partners in X / 10 GTF countries		initiatives have commenced	
<p>Output 1 Partners give marginalised groups, including women, indigenous communities, migrants, the elderly and people living with HIV (PLHA), the skills, information and confidence to demand their rights.</p>	3	<p>1.1 Increase in representation of marginalised groups in decision making processes from X% to Y% (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p> <p>1.2 Evidence of marginalised people actively claiming their rights in all 10 GTF countries (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p>	<p>1.1 To be determined</p> <p>1.2 To be determined</p>	<p>0/10 partners</p> <p>3/14 partners</p>	<p>Again, it is too early to show significant results at a programme level at this stage; however we have some early indications of success for indicator 1.2. The Brazilian and Iraqi examples outlined in section 9 above both came from participating communities actively claiming their rights. In addition, JRSM have directly supported 33 people to secure various forms of personal documentation which are essential if they want to claim rights to public services in Dominican Republic.</p>
<p>Activities (State the main activities in relation to each budget heading and ensure that you have shown which outputs they relate to.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline surveys • Needs analysis and prioritisation • Rights awareness • Accessible information re government responsibilities/ commitments • Training and tools development • Leadership training • Establishment of structures for community • Capacity building of new/existing structures • Public awareness re 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All baseline surveys currently underway ▪ 0/6 carried out needs analysis (doing in conjunction with baseline research) ▪ 1/14 started rights awareness activities. ▪ 4/13 begun providing information re government responsibilities/ commitments ▪ 2/9 partners have started training activities. ▪ 3/7 have established new structures 	<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CESE – supported 13 different projects, including publishing information to help Quilombola communities get their land registered. ▪ JRSM developed a manual on migration law and are using it with migrant communities. They have also provided advocacy training and organisational development support to leaders of migrant organisations ▪ SEND Ghana – established the Upper West poverty monitoring network, sensitised people on the Ghana Schools

		marginalisation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4/9 started building capacity of structures ▪ 2/5 launched awareness raising campaigns 	<p>Feeding Programme and trained 55 people in use of SEND's Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNIPOP have used training, campaigning and theatre to enable young people in Cotijuba to reflect on their environment, responsibilities and relationship with the authorities.
<p>Output 2 Partners influence and hold authorities accountable at a community, local and national level, bringing the voices of marginalised groups into policy decisions, monitoring how far relevant authorities are responding to their needs and challenging them when they fail to do so.</p>	2	<p>2.1. X new fora / mechanisms to enable citizens to influence, monitor and/or hold government to account are created</p> <p>2.1. Evidence that new and existing fora / mechanisms to enable citizens to influence, monitor and/or hold government to account function regularly and actively in all 10 GTF countries</p>	<p>2.1 0</p> <p>2.2 To be determined</p>	<p>3/6 partners</p> <p>4/14 partners</p>	<p>Again, it is too early to show significant results at a programme level at this stage; however we have some early indications of success</p> <p>2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ REACH established CBO-government issue based coordination groupings in 8 local authority areas on roads, education, watsan, support returnees/IDPs, poverty/vulnerability and livestock management ▪ SEND Ghana set up 9 District Monitoring Committees, comprised of each of which has 2 women, 1 young person, 1 disabled person, 1 farmer, 1 traditional leader, 1 religious leader, 2 focal NGO representatives, 1 member of district assembly and official <p>2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ INESC co-led the Clean

					<p>Profile campaign to restrict candidates who are involved in judicial processes during the municipal elections in October/November 2008 – the message was widely spread by media and civil society but impact is still being assessed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEND Ghana – in Sissala East District the District Implementation Committee and Schools Implementation Committees were not functioning properly but now meet regularly to discuss Ghana Schools Feeding Programme.
<p>Activities (State the main activities in relation to each budget heading and ensure that you have shown which outputs they relate to.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research, analysis, monitoring • Training state officials • Advocacy • Use of legal system • Public campaigning 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5/12 carried out research or set up monitoring system ▪ 0/5 have started initiatives to train officials ▪ 6/14 have already undertaken advocacy initiatives ▪ Evidence of 1/3 legal case ▪ 2/3 public campaigning activities 	<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CESE supported the Kutukara Yanomami Association to document and disseminate issues re Yanomami tribe and the Apolima Arara people to mobilise and engage with the authorities regarding their land rights ▪ INESC published proposals on political system reform and began surveying MPs on these proposals. ▪ JRSM has managed to get access to a number of high level meetings with government, up to Presidential levels, to express their concerns and find out more about the government's

					<p>planned activities/policies toward Haitian migrants. JRSM also established a system to monitor rights violations and facilitated development of civil society proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rights and Prosperity published their research on the opportunities for citizens rights to participate in public administration and began dialogue with government officials on the findings
<p>Output 3 Civil society organisations (CSOs) work together effectively and use key oversight institutions such as parliament, the media and research institutes.</p>	4	<p>3.1 Evidence of joint analysis, planning and initiatives: 3.1.1 between CSOs 3.1.1 between CSOs, media, parliamentarians and/or research institutes</p> <p>3.2 Evidence that relevant targets (government, MPs etc) perceive these initiatives as effective</p>	<p>3.1.1 0/10 3.1.2 0/10</p> <p>3.2 N/A</p>	<p>6/14 partners</p> <p>1/14 partners</p>	<p>Too early to report back whether targets perceived initiatives as effective, however a number of initiatives are underway (details below). During our mapping of the projects we noted that quite a few partners are focused on supporting smaller organisations who are part of their project, rather than themselves linking more strategically with other CSOs (of a similar level), media, parliamentarians and/or research institutes. We scored this a 4 accordingly and will make this an area for discussion with partners in September.</p>
<p>Activities (State the main activities in relation to each budget heading and ensure that you have shown which outputs they relate to.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish policies and positions from dialogue and monitoring - Coordinate strategies for action and advocacy - Alliances with academics 		<p>2/9 have developed positions from joint dialogue 4/9 have developed joint strategies 1/3 have linked with academics</p>	<p>Highlights include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ INESC – is coordinating the Platform for Political Systems Reform, comprised of 25 varied Brazilian groups and made links with anti-

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alliances with media - Alliances with parliamentarians - Linking with other CA GTF projects in-country 		<p>2/7 have linked with the media 0/4 have linked with parliamentarians 4/15 have developed formal links with other CA GTF partners in country</p>	<p>corruption groups for the Clean Profile campaign</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ JRSM built links with Haitian organisations and academics and brought together various organisations to initiate a campaign for constitutional reform ▪ REACH coordinated with over 14 other NGOs in KGG to ensure proposed new NGO law helped rather than hindered civil society
<p>Output 4 Experiences of partners shared within and across regions, and disseminated throughout Christian Aid and more widely.</p>	2	4.1 Partner experiences are documented and made available across Christian Aid and partner network	4.1 0	0 experiences have been documented as yet but on-track as learning event planned for September.	The September meeting will provide an opportunity to begin documenting experiences as well as agreeing how we plan to approach this in the lifetime of the project.
<p>Activities (State the main activities in relation to each budget heading and ensure that you have shown which outputs they relate to.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold Global Sharing Events - Establish 'virtual' sharing platforms - Agree and implement joint partner activities - Measure impact - Disseminate both within and outside the programme 		<p>0/3 global sharing events 0/1 'virtual' sharing platforms 0 joint partner activities planned 0 impact assessments 0 dissemination</p>	All the activities bar impact assessments will be carried out or planned by end September

Annex 2 – Programme Logframe

Project summary	Measurable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
<p>Goal: To help citizens hold their governments to account, through strengthening the wide range of groups that can empower and support them.</p>	<p>G.1 Evidence of improved government delivery of services / material benefits to marginalised groups in all 10 GTF countries (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p>	<p>G.1 Assessments with communities and key informant survey at years 3 & 5; partner monitoring reports</p>	<p>Goal to super goal: Macro-economic conditions and global and regional political and social pressures do not hinder longer-term embedding of a culture of accountability.</p>
<p>Purpose: To nurture the development of effective civil society movements to both empower marginalised and vulnerable people and hold community, local and national authorities to account.</p>	<p>P.1 Evidence of more effective action by marginalised groups to claim their rights and/or hold authorities to account in all 10 GTF countries (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p> <p>P.2 Evidence of improved engagement by authorities targeted by GTF projects in mechanisms and processes for dialogue with marginalised citizens in X / 10 GTF countries</p> <p>P.3 Pro-poor policy decisions made as a result of GTF activities in X / 10 GTF countries</p> <p>P.4 Examples of successful collective CSO action involving GTF partners in X / 10 GTF countries</p>	<p>P.1 Assessments with communities and key informant survey at years 3 & 5</p> <p>P.2 Assessments with communities at baseline, years 3 & 5; partner monitoring reports</p> <p>P.3 Partner monitoring reports; key informant survey at years 3 & 5</p> <p>P.4 Partner monitoring reports; key informant survey at years 3 & 5</p>	<p>Purpose to goal: Authorities do not respond to greater effectiveness of civil society by reducing space within which civil society is able to operate.</p>

<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Partners give marginalised groups, including women, indigenous communities, migrants, the elderly and people living with HIV (PLHA), the skills, information and confidence to demand their rights.</p>	<p>1.3 Increase in representation of marginalised groups in decision making processes from X% to Y% (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p> <p>1.4 Evidence of marginalised people actively claiming their rights in all 10 GTF countries (disaggregated by gender, age, disability and other vulnerable group)</p>	<p>1.1 Assessments with communities at baseline, years 3 & 5; partner monitoring reports</p> <p>1.2 Assessments with communities at years 3 & 5; partner monitoring reports</p>	<p>Outputs to purpose:</p> <p><i>Security</i> Security measures prevent actual/threatened attacks on CA / partner staff</p> <p><i>Financial</i> Avoidance of misuse of funds by partners</p> <p>Financial legislation does not hamper grant administration</p> <p><i>Operational/Political</i> Legal restrictions on activities</p> <p>High partner staff turnover does not limit learning or implementation</p> <p>Focus on marginalised groups doesn't create resentment in population.</p> <p>Partners are not diverted to other priorities</p> <p>Greater effectiveness of civil society does not stimulate restrictive measures</p> <p>Avoidance of project capture by non-target groups</p>
<p>2. Partners influence and hold authorities accountable at a community, local and national level, bringing the voices of marginalised groups into policy decisions, monitoring how far relevant authorities are responding to their needs and challenging them when they fail to do so.</p>	<p>2.1. X new fora / mechanisms to enable citizens to influence, monitor and/or hold government to account are created</p> <p>2.1. Evidence that new and existing fora / mechanisms to enable citizens to influence, monitor and/or hold government to account function regularly and actively in all 10 GTF countries</p>	<p>2.1 Partner monitoring reports</p> <p>2.2 Assessments with communities and stakeholders at baseline, years 3 & 5; partner monitoring reports</p>	
<p>3. Civil society organisations (CSOs) work together effectively and use key oversight institutions such as parliament, the media and research institutes.</p>	<p>3.3 Evidence of joint analysis, planning and initiatives: 3.1.1 between CSOs 3.1.1 between CSOs, media, parliamentarians and/or research institutes</p> <p>3.4 Evidence that relevant targets (government, MPs etc) perceive these initiatives as effective</p>	<p>3.1 Partner monitoring reports</p> <p>3.2 Survey of targets of joint initiatives at years 3 & 5</p>	

<p>4. Experiences of partners shared within and across regions, and disseminated throughout Christian Aid and more widely.</p>	<p>4.1 Partner experiences are documented and made available across Christian Aid and partner network</p>	<p>4.1 Programme administrative data & publications / communications; reports from global learning events</p>	<p>Cultural differences do not impede cross-regional learning Security considerations do not impede participation in events</p>
<p>Activities:</p> <p>Outputs 1 and 2. <i>Supporting marginalised groups to demand their rights, and increasing government responsiveness.</i></p> <p><u>1a. Awareness, skills, knowledge</u> Marginalised groups set priorities, building legitimacy and mobilising communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline surveys • Needs analysis and prioritisation • Awareness-raising activities • Training and tools development <p><u>1b. Organisation</u> Participation and responsibility of marginalised groups in the structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of structures (Complaint Institute, Observatory, CBOs etc) • Capacity building of structures (new and established) <p><u>2. Action and Interaction</u> Relations with state at different levels of authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and analysis of policy, policy implementation, resource allocation and distribution, laws and their implementation, abuse of power, impact of these issues on the marginalised groups. • Establishing/supporting forums for exchange with the state • Capacity-building of state on working with marginalised groups, and awareness-raising of needs. • Advocacy • Use of legal system <p>Output 3. Strengthening civil society networks. 3.a. Support the formation and development of community and district organisations and networks 3.b. Establish policies and positions from dialogue and monitoring 3.c. Engage with, raise the capacity of, and influence relevant authorities</p>			

- 3.d. Coordinate strategies for action and advocacy
- 3.e. Raise the capacity of relevant constituencies through a range of techniques

Output 4. *Experiences of partners shared and disseminated.*

- 4.a. Hold Global Sharing Events
- 4.b. Establish 'virtual' sharing platforms
- 4.c. Agree and implement joint partner activities
- 4.d. Measure impact
- 4.e. Disseminate both within and outside the programme

Annex 3 – Annual Financial Report

Your Annual Financial Report must present actual expenditure against your agreed detailed budget (not the summary budget used for Funding Requests). Expenditure variances in excess of 10% of the agreed budget must be explained as separate notes to your financial report.

A3.1 Programme Identification

1. GTF Reference No.	GTF-301
2. Organisation Name	Christian Aid

A3.2 – Reporting Period

1. Start of Period	01 April 2008
2. End of Period	31 March 2009

A3.3 – Funds received from DFID during Reporting Period

Payment No.	Date Received	Amount - GBP
Payment 1	28/10/2008	395,025.00
Payment 2	12/02/2009	14,441.67
Total received during Period		409,466.67

A3.4 – Expenditure during Reporting Period

(Grants to Partners)

Agreed Budget Lines	Agreed Budget for Period	Actual Expenditure for Period	Variance	Variance %
Christian Aid staffing	13,598.00	10,327.15	-3,270.85	-24.05%
Christian Aid travel costs	2,333.00	2,439.74	106.74	4.58%
Christian Aid support costs	5,768.00	6,525.13	757.13	13.13%
Output 1 - Knowledge, awareness and organisation	136,165.00	117,216.62	-18,948.38	-13.92%
Output 2 - Action and Interaction with Authorities	140,535.00	101,731.00	-38,804.00	-27.61%
Output 3 - Civil society working together	42,450.00	46,138.38	3,688.38	8.69%
Output 4 - Experience sharing activities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Total for Period	340,849.00	284,378.02	-56,470.98	-16.57%²

² There was a delay in hiring the Programme Manager, whose hiring started in April and missed the year end cut off. Regarding grant transfers, those figures relating to Outputs 1 – 3, there were continued delays in starting a few projects though this is expected to catch up during this financial year.

(Partner expensed³)

Output 1 - Knowledge, awareness and organisation	105,146.24
Output 2 - Action and Interaction with Authorities	78,582.98
Output 3 - Civil society working together	33,668.31
Output 4 - Experience sharing activities	0.00
Total for Period	217,397.53

A3.5 – Expenditure to Date (31 March 20yy) since start of Programme**(Grants to Partners)**

Agreed Budget Lines	Agreed Budget for Period	Actual Expenditure for Period	Variance	Variance %
Christian Aid staffing	13,598.00	10,327.15	-3,270.85	-24.05%
Christian Aid travel costs	2,333.00	2,439.74	106.74	4.58%
Christian Aid support costs	5,768.00	6,525.13	757.13	13.13%
Output 1 - Knowledge, awareness and organisation	136,165.00	117,216.62	-18,948.38	-13.92%
Output 2 - Action and Interaction with Authorities	140,535.00	101,731.00	-38,804.00	-27.61%
Output 3 - Civil society working together	42,450.00	46,138.38	3,688.38	8.69%
Output 4 - Experience sharing activities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Total for Period	340,849.00	284,378.02	-56,470.98	-16.57%⁴

(Partner expensed⁵)

Output 1 - Knowledge, awareness and organisation	105,146.24
Output 2 - Action and Interaction with Authorities	78,582.98
Output 3 - Civil society working together	33,668.31
Output 4 - Experience sharing activities	0.00
Total for Period	217,397.53

³ See separate annex, *Partner Expense reports*

⁴ As above, there was a delay in hiring the Programme Manager, whose hiring started in April and missed the year end cut off. Regarding grant transfers, those figures relating to Outputs 1 – 3, there were continued delays in starting a few projects though this is expected to catch up during this financial year.

⁵ See separate annex, *Partner Expense reports*

Annex 4 – Materials produced during the reporting period

This is an initial list of materials identified in the partner annual reports.

Item	Date	Title or description of material	Access web site (if any)
1.	March 2009	JRSM: Training manual for migrant workers in national migration laws and international legislation sanctioned by the Dominican Republic	
2.	February and March 2009	JRSM: Rights education for migrant communities on radio (Same Gender and Border Solidarity) and TV (Border Solidarity)	
3.	February 2009	JRSM: Promotional materials to Haitian migrants and Dominicans of Haitian descent about the importance of having legal documentation and how to get it	
4.		CESE: A special edition of 'Quilambo's Land Magazine' was supported by CESE giving people a step by step guide to get land registered under new government rules	
5.		INESC: Second edition of the proposals of the Platform for Political System Reform published	
6.		Rights and Prosperity: Efficient civil society promotion to support marginalised and vulnerable groups and ensure accountability of communities, local governments and authorities at the national level. Draft report of research published:	
7.	October 2008	SEND Ghana: SEND's Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Manual revised and upgraded for use in monitoring Ghana Schools Feeding Programme	

Annex 5 – Web Update for your programme



The 18 partners Christian Aid is supporting through the Governance and Transparency Fund all started project activities in this period. Although still early days, we have had some early successes.

In Kalar district, Sulemaniyah, Northern Iraq REACH has supported communities to get the authorities to run a vaccination campaign. As a result 400 poor farmers have not had to pay money they could not afford or leave livestock vulnerable to disease. In Harrier district in Erbil, REACH helped communities get the authorities to complete a road project that had been delayed. This has benefited 880 poor farmers, animal breeders, widows and unemployed people who can now access jobs and services in the urban areas.

In Brazil, CESE supported the 19,000 indigenous people of Raposa Serra do Sul to a legal recognition of their land rights by the Brazilian Supreme Federal Court. CESE see this as a *half-victory* because the judgement included conditions that could become obstacles to individual claimants. However, it is seen as a symbolic victory that can help inspire other indigenous communities and unit the indigenous movement as well as a potential indication of a more responsive attitude from the Brazilian government.

In the next year we expect to gather many more examples like these from the community level, as well as initial evidence that such examples are combining to bring about changes in power relations at a regional or national level.

Annex 6 - Annual Workplan

Until September our focus is on the following:

- Recruitment of Programme Manager
- Supporting partners to carry out baseline research
- Analysing results of baseline research
- Working with partners to adapt and refine their project plans
- Organising the September learning event
- Reporting back to DFID with final log-frame, monitoring and evaluation framework and partner learning plan.

Plans beyond September will be developed at the September event so we propose to provide DFID with a six-month interim work-plan by the end of September to accompany the documentation described above.