



Civil Society Capacity Building Programme Grant Closure Report



1 Grantee Identification Information

Name of Grantee: AGENCY FOR ACCELERATED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AFARD)

1.2 Title of the Project: ENGENDERING SERVICES DELIVERY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN DECENTALISED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEBBI DISTRICT

1.3 Contract Information

I	Cluster	8
II	Contract Number:	C8/A12/2005
III	Contract Signing Date	March 29, 2006
IV	Contract Closing Date	June 20, 2008
V	Grant Contract Amount	US\$ 201,018,800 (US\$ 175,575,400)

1.4 Project Officers in Charge:

	Name	Title	Contact (Phone & Email)
1	Dr. Alfred Lakwo	Programme Director	Mobile: 0772 437 175
			Landline : -
			Email: alfred.lakwo@gmail.com
2	Mr. Wilfred Cwinyai	Community Development Manager	Mobile: 0772 619 402
			Landline : -
			Email: cwinyai.w@gmail.com

1.5 Name and Signature of Organisation Leaders

Title	Name	Signature & Date
Chief Executive	Dr. Alfred Lakwo	Signature:
		Date:
Board Chairperson	Rev. Fr. Geoffrey Ocamgiu	Signature:
		Date:

1.6 Intermediary Organisation/ Person : I) First: CEFORD

II) Second: _____ III) Current: **JOHN KIZITO**

1.7 Name and Signature of the Intermediary Organisation Contact Person / Intermediary Person

Name: _____ Designation _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Part 1: Programme Report

2 Summary of the Report

2.1 General Information

2.1.1	Date of receipt of first disbursement	April 18, 2006
2.1.2	Date and Brief Summary of official programme launch (<i>Give a brief summary of when the project launch was done, where it took place, estimated number of people who attended</i>)	On receiving funds, the following were done: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project briefs were provided to district leaders • A radio talk show was held on Paidha FM • Leaflets were made and circulated during the swearing in ceremony of the newly elected district leaders
2.1.3	Date of actual start of implementation	April 28, 2006
2.1.4	Date of receipt of last disbursement	April 25, 2008
2.1.5	Date of official project closure event and accountability to the beneficiaries.	June 20, 2008
2.1.6	Geographical coverage / areas of implementation { District and Sub County (ies)}	Nebbi district (in all the 19 Lower Local Governments)

2.1.7 Number of Quarterly Progress Reports Submitted				
	Quarterly/ Periodic Reports Submitted	Date	Received Feed Back From IO (Yes / No)	Received Feed Back From PMU(Yes/No)
1	April – June 2006	<i>July 2006</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
2	August – December 2006	<i>December 2006</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
3	July – September 2007	<i>October 16, 2007</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
4	January – March 2008	<i>April 6, 2008</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
5				
6				
7				

2.2 Summary of Programme Expenditure by Category:

	Budget Category	Budget	Actual	Variance	% of Total Expenditure
2.2.1	Administration	19,680,000	17,770,000	1,910,000	9%
2.2.2	Investment	0	0	0	0%
2.2.3	Programme activities	170,738,800	176,220,200	-5,481,400	88%
2.2.4	Operational	12,600,000	5,641,042	6,958,958	3%
	Overall total	203,018,800	199,631,242	3,387,558	100%

Note: Includes PMU and AFARD co-funding

2.3 Major Achievements Realised as a Result of Being Part of the Civil Society Capacity Building Programme (CSCBP)

Please describe the achievement the organisation has realised because of being part of the CSCBP. These should be achievements not necessarily as a result of the direct project support by the CSCBP, but achieved either because of the implementation modalities, opportunities or environment created by the Programme

- *Skills development in advocacy, financial management and M&E*
- *Linkages with like-minded organizations improved*
- *Resource mobilization enhanced due to trust and credibility*
- *Increased legitimacy as the funding allowed for an a district-wide coverage*

2.4 Project Sustainability

2.4.1 Institutional Sustainability

Describe with evidence, the progress made to ensure sustainability of the project interventions at the institutional or organisational level. What measures have are in place to ensure that management systems and structures are maintained and developed further?

- *Board regulations is developed, approved, and is in use*
- *Human resource policy is under review after a participatory job evaluation was conducted*
- *Financial audit made routine and integral for all projects*
- *Improved resource mobilization skills through proposal writing e.g. AFARD was the only NGO that won the CSF grant in West Nile*

2.4.2 Implementation Level

Describe with evidence the measure taken to ensure that the beneficiary communities are empowered to meet their obligations and demand for their rights, or advocate for their needs and take personal or collective responsibility to continue getting the services that were being provided by the project. What measures are in place to ensure that the project interventions are carried forward?

- *Skills training expanded to include both Women Council Executives (WCEs), Women Councillors (WCs) and Lower Local Government (LLG) officials*
- *WCEs & WCs have built alliance to further women's needs*
- *Linkages of WCEs and WCs to Action Aid (Nebbi office)*
- *Gender responsive planning and budgeting is now adopted my most LLGs*

3 Summary of Progress and Achievements Made During the Programme Implementation (Outputs and outcome) of activities

Under this section, please report for each programme component, what was planned as an output or result, what have you done during the grant period (progress), and what has happened, or changed or what has been the benefit as a result of the progress made (Outcome). Even when there is progress registered, please report that no progress was made and state reasons why. Please note there is no limit on the outputs and outcome for you to report on

	Output <i>What outputs or results did you plan to achieve under each programme component?</i>	Progress <i>What have you done and achieved, given what you planned to do?</i>	Outcome <i>What has changed? What are the benefit arising out of the progress you made? This must answer the so what question</i>	Comments/ Remarks
3.1	Institutional Development <i>Objective: Organisational structures and systems strengthen and Operationalised in order for the grantee to become effective, efficient, credible and viable organisation by June 2008</i>			
	Project Team Building	After receiving funding, AFARD set up a team comprised of Program Manager Program officer, Finance And Administration Manager and the Programme Director.	Implementation modalities were reviewed exploring synergies between project activities	Not planned for
	Publicising the project	A summary of the project goals, objectives, key strategies was given to all LCV councillors and Executives, CAO, HoDs, RDC and all 19 LLGs A Radio Paidha talk show was held and Chair of District WCE and AFARD explained the project in depth At the swearing in of district leadership, AFARD distributed IEC materials en masse	The project was known by stakeholders WCEs and WCS elicited their support for the project (and lived up to their promises made)	Not planned for
	Train board and technical staff on governance and leadership	2 board members and a technical staff were trained in Mukono	Board regulation was formulated Board calendar was developed Board performance appraisal system developed	Planned for and implemented by PMU
	Two staff to attend training in financial management of non financial managers	The Community Development Manager and Program Director were trained in Kampala.	Financial planning and control improved	Planned for and implemented by PMU
	Two staff to attend training in M&E	The Community Development Manager and Field Officer were trained in Arua.	Project performance tracking was done systematically	Planned for and implemented by PMU

	Train staff in resource mobilization	The Community Development Manager and Finance and Administration Manager were trained in Kampala.	Quality of proposal writing and donor targeting improved	
	Best grantee award assessment	AFARD participated in the Best Grantee assessment exercise	Internal reflection on organisational learning was conducted QUAM was embraced as a routine bi-annual AFARD assessment instrument	Early improvements made AFARD the Best Grantee Award Winner
	Interface with IP	Built working relationship with new IP. The IP visited AFARD thrice in February, March and May 2008.	Quarterly reporting (and retrospective report) improved Monitoring and evaluation indicators sharpened	
	Train District Community Development Office staff in gender mainstreaming	Trained all Community Development Officers in Nebbi district in gender mainstreaming	Gender analysis, targeting, and reporting improved in LLGs	Planned for by CDO
	Identify district-focussed gender equality indicators	Initiated the gender equality indicator discussion with Action Aid and CDO	CDO is tasked to uptake the initiative and finally secure support from Action Aid to accomplish the exercise	Internally initiated by AFARD to ensure that process-impact linkages are clear in gender mainstreaming initiatives in the district
	Facilitated IOs in Gender Mainstreaming	The PD facilitated the training of all CSCBP IOs in gender mainstreaming in Arua during the HIV/AIDS and Gender Mainstreaming	IOs improved their technical support to grantees on gender mainstreaming aspects	Planned for by PMU
	Facilitated grantees in Strategic Planning	The PF facilitated the training of CSCBP grantees in strategic planning in Kampala & Mukono training	Grantees are developing, reviewing their strategic plans	Planned for by PMU
	Lobby CSO involvement in Annual Local Government Performance Assessment exercise	AFARD represented CSOs in the annual assessment exercise in 2007 and in 2008 allowed another CSO to participate in the process	Openness of the LLG performance scoring attained Basis for public-private partnership built LLG efforts to achieve better results won	Not planned for

3.2	Empowerment Objective: <i>To build the capacity of grantee to empower vulnerable communities to actively and effectively participate in resource planning and monitoring of programmes affecting them.</i>			
	Pilot Participatory Resource Monitoring Tool (PRMT) in Panyimur SC	8 Women Council members were trained on the application of the PRMT	The trained Women Council members implemented the PRMT in 11 Primary Schools in Panyimur sub county	Further action, including advocacy, will depend on availability of funds
3.3	Advocacy Objective: <i>To strengthen the capacity of grantee to effectively influence policies and issues that affect the poor.</i>			
	Two staff to attend training in Advocacy	Field Officer and the Community Development Manager attended a one week training in Kampala	Skills gained were used by AFARD in its advocacy strategies at LLG	Officers have planned to induct other members in advocacy
3.4	Appropriate service delivery <i>Report on all objectives under the programme proposal on service delivery and also as in the M&E Framework</i>			
	Objective 1: Women Council leaders have increased knowledge and skills in gender planning, M&E, and advocacy and lobbying			
	Assess grassroots women's participation in LLG planning and budgeting processes	1 assessment was conducted and information shared with various stakeholders	The scope and demotivation of grassroots women were known Findings used as input for training manual design	Conducted with Action Aid
	Assess the capacity of Women Council structures at district and LLG levels	1 assessment on the knowledge and skills gaps of 19 Women's Council structures identified (as the District level WCEs participated in their LLGs) with respect to gender planning, M&E and lobbying and advocacy known.	Advocacy capacity of WCE known Findings used as input into the training manual design	
	Produce 50 Facilitators manuals	3 sets of 75 training manuals (25 each) suited to the needs of the target group were developed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Responsive planning and budgeting • Participatory Gender Monitoring & Evaluation • Advocacy skills 	Trainings were customized to existing needs	Training materials were shared with CDOs for internal use

	Induct 9 trainers in-house	3 One-day TOT sessions, facilitated by PD and CDM, were held for 12 trainers drawn from District WCEs, LLG staffs and AFARD team	Trainers formed a common perception of the content of the manual and were in position to disseminate the message effectively and uniformly in spite of moving in different teams	Involving local govt staff was a tactical ploy given that CDOs are instrumental players in LG planning
	Train 544 women leaders in gender responsive planning	502 Women were trained in gender responsive planning and budgeting skills	<p>WCE knew their women and human rights and roles and responsibilities as elected leaders</p> <p>WCE took up to mobilize fellow women and other leaders for LLG planning processes</p> <p>Women and WCEs witnessed increased participation in LLG budget conferences and sectoral committees meetings where budgets are decided and disbursed under closed door sessions.</p> <p>Affirmative action budgets were secured</p>	
	Train 544 women leaders in participatory gender M&E	723 people (528 women, 195 men) composed of WCE, women councillors and LLG staff and politicians were trained in participatory gender M&E importance, processes and uses	<p>Participants realised that women had to partake in LG investment M&E</p> <p>23 indicators agreed upon by the PGME were used to score every LLG, on a score scale of 0-35% for Penalty status, 36-70 considered Static, while 71-100% was a Rewarding status.</p>	LLG officials were also included to ensure that all talk and act in the engendering budget language
	Train 544 women leaders in advocacy and lobbying	622 people (544 women, 78 men) composed of WCE, women councillors and LLG staff and politicians were trained in participatory gender M&E importance, processes and uses	A strong alliance was built among WCEs and WCs and it was used to further women's interests in LLG budgeting processes	As above

	Hold 1 training evaluation	2 training evaluations were held by the training team and AFARD management to discuss what went well and what did not as well as lessons learnt	Findings provided inputs for training follow-up	
	Conduct 19 training follow-ups	38 training follow-ups were conducted by the Field Officer to assess the immediate effects of training on WCE, promises made and to assist the women to access documents they needed and gain audience with LLG officials	Women are applying some of the skills they were taught, which included: mobilisation of fellow women, and identifying core women specific issues and defend them at LLGs level	High rate of illiteracy among women prevented optimum utilisation of skills like budget analysis, budget tracking
	Objective 2: Effective participation of women in general and Women Council members in particular in local government planning processes increased			
	Conduct 1 desk review of local government planning processes	The management team visited all 19 LLG, obtained and reviewed planning guidelines, approved and actual plans and budgets and identified advocacy issues.	Pertinent information from the reviews was used in IEC materials and the training manual designs Information also provided the basis for setting Gender Responsiveness Indicators	
	Produce and disseminate 2000 posters	3500 posters were produced and disseminated	Project awareness increased	Backstopped other channels
	Produce and disseminate 2500 brochures	3500 brochures were produced and disseminated	WCE role acceptance in LLGs improved	
	Produce and disseminate 2500 leaflets	3500 leaflets were produced and disseminated	Women's participation in planning processes increased	
	Hold 19 information sharing meetings	38 information sharing meetings were held in all lower local governments to share their experiences on engaging with LLGs, key challenges ahead, and what strategies to adopt	Women's strategic engagement LLGs for engendered development and accountable LLGs improved	
	Air 3 radio talk shows & 5 radio spots	Radio talk shows (3 session) Radio Spots (55 spots)	Project awareness increased WCE role acceptance in LLGs improved Women's participation in planning processes increased	Backstopped other channels
	Conduct 19 drama shows	19 drama shows were staged at all LLGs on participatory planning and budgeting	Community awareness of their need to participate in LLG planning processes increased	The drama was customised using findings from the 2 surveys, desk review and

			Community questioning of LLG officials as to why they are excluded from planning processes increased	training follow-ups
	Facilitate 544 Women Council Executives to attend budget conferences	384 district and LLG WCEs and WCs were facilitated to mobilise women, strategize on women's needs, build harmony among WCEs & WCs, interact with decision makers and participate in pushing such views in LLG planning processes for the purpose of influencing a more engendered budget outcomes	Alliances between WCEs & WCs strengthened Women's participation in LLG budget processes increased WC engaged executives to lobby decision makers during the final approval stages	Action Aid Nebbi contributed travel cost worth Ushs 2.5 million that complemented the allowances provided by the project and so enabled the women to complete their tasks as desired
	AFARD to participate in 19 LLG budget conferences	AFARD Field Officer attended 38 LLG budget conferences for the 2 years in order to backstop WCEs and WCs push for a more engendered budgets	Acceptance of women to participate in the planning process and women's needs to be given key priority in the budget was achieved Machination of budget processes with technical jargons reduced LLG councillors appreciated their budget mismatch given that limited services sector budget increases poverty levels	Technical staffs and political leaders who always conducted desk-based planning were forced to open to people's views
	Objective 3: District and sub county local governments are accountable and transparent during budget implementation			
	Hold 6 quarterly plan/budget follow-ups	All 19 lower local governments were visited, their plans and budgets scrutinised to find out if the final copies of the plans and budgets for 2007/08 are engendered as promised during the planning cycle	The information generated was instrumental in the advocacy and review sessions that followed	The reluctance of technocrats within LLGs especially the sub accountants to release figures on income and expenditures has proved a big stumbling block to the smooth monitoring of the flow of benefits to women

	Hold 3 half year review meetings	Held 3 review meetings to reflect on the project deliverables in terms of changes scored and challenges ahead to be addressed, and lessons learned involving WCEs, WCs, LLG officials	<p>Alliance building between WCEs & WCs strengthened</p> <p>WCEs realised the need to work without allowances</p> <p>WCEs embraced the need to actively engage in monitoring of LLG budget executions</p> <p>LLG officials appreciated the need for improved accountability obligations</p> <p>Some LLG have incorporated WCES on their monitoring team</p>	
	Conduct 19 advocacy workshops	Held 38 advocacy dialogue meetings in all LLGs. Participants included WCEs, WCs, LLG political and technical leaders, PWDs, the aged.	<p>Policy space opened for women</p> <p>Budget allocation improved in favour of services sectors</p> <p>Affricative action budget for women adopted</p> <p>LLG accountability obligation uptake improved</p>	
	Document best practices	<p>500 copies of Gender Responsiveness Audit printed and disseminated</p> <p>5 copies of a video documentary produced and shared with PMU, IO, CDO, and project staffs</p> <p>100 copies of project review report produced and disseminated</p>	<p>Advocacy issues identified therein</p> <p>Evidence for WCE to hold LLG responsive provided</p> <p>Project performance and improvement strategies shared</p>	

4. Advocacy issues addressed by your organisation

4.1 What are the advocacy issues that were tackled by the organisation?

Describe the advocacy initiatives and issue(s) that your organisation tackled during the grant period. Report on the advocacy events that took place, the advocacy process (how issues were identified, advocacy strategies used, the target groups etc), the achievements or results realised, what has changed as a result of the advocacy actions, challenges and recommendations.

The core advocacy issues engaged into during the 2 year project span were:

- *First, changing the mindset of grassroots women to effectively participate in local government planning processes. The target group for this advocacy were grassroots women together with their leaders.*
- *Second, calling LLG leaders to action in fulfilling the rights of women as do men to services and accountability. The target group for this issue were political and technical officials of LLGs.*

On both fronts, the core advocacy processes were managed as follows:

- *The baseline surveys conducted to assess: (i) the effective participation of grassroots women in policy processes; (ii) the effectiveness with which women leaders manage such processes; and (iii) LG budget management practices. These provided invaluable information that were used to identify which actors to engage and how such engagement should be done.*
- *A joint team of technical and political leaders sourced from AFARD, District Women Council, NGOs in the district, District Women Councillors, and LG staffs formed an advocacy team that designed, reviewed, and conducted routine advocacy events to win women's participation and services delivery prioritisation in budget allocations and disbursements.*
- *A core team of District Women Council Executives and Women Councillors were trained in engendering services delivery skills like gender budgeting, participatory M&E, and advocacy skills so that they can ably 'speak out for the women folks'.*
- *Mobilization of women to attend planning and budgeting meetings (depending on the LLG level) were done using a multi-communication channels – personal contacts, radio, newsprint, and drama shows.*
- *Meanwhile for LLG officials, advocacy workshops targetted opening the public space for women, resource allocation efficiency, commitments to resource disbursement, and the provision of feedbacks on approved and implemented plans and budgets.*
- *Information sharing was conducted to review successes achieved, challenges that were persistently hindering success, and to identify new strategies to achieve the project objectives*

Achievements (for details see end of project review report)

- 1. There was remarkable improvement in the WCE civic engagement effectiveness particularly in their awareness of their roles of advocacy, monitoring and identifying women's needs.*
- 2. Women's participation in the entire LLG planning and budgeting processes generally increased.*
- 3. The LLG plan and budget management also became responsive to women's needs due to the WCE's effectiveness in executing their roles. A shift occurred in services and administrative sectors budget allocation and disbursement. Apart from affirmative action budgets, gender sensitive analysis, targeting and reporting were also found to have gradually been adopted by many LLGs.*
- 4. The review also revealed there are tangible benefits that can be attributed to WCE effectiveness. LLG officials pointed that through the demands of women they were able to construct 4 maternity units and equip them with 3 placenta pits, 14 beds, 10 mattresses, 7 pieces of curtains, and 2 bath shelters; erect 4 market stalls, provide sponsorship of best performing girls in Primary Leaving Examinations, provide sanitary pads to teenage girls and play balls and drama kits.*

Challenges

- Many LLGs still use local council and Parish Development Committees to conduct village level planning. Unfortunately, these organs exclude the people from participating in the planning process.*
- On receiving IPFs, LLGs prefer to do desk planning largely in sectoral committees where non-state actors' participation is not mandated by the LGA 1997.*
- Planning in LLGs are not based on gender sensitive or even realistic targeting data*
- Provision of information especially about funds to the public is a daunting task from which LLG officials feel their authority is under undue check.*
- Local government take long to publish their approved plans and budgets. They also claim they do not have enough money to make copies to share with other stakeholders.*
- Majority of WCEs are illiterate and cannot fully fulfil their responsibilities. This leaves a big strain on the few literate ones and the overall effectiveness is affected*
- The effectiveness of Women leaders is curtailed by inadequate resources at their disposal and at the LLG levels.*

Recommendations

- Central government should revisit LGA especially the restrictions on non-state actors' participation in sectoral committee meetings.*
- There is need to develop gender mainstreaming guidelines and induct women leaders and LLG officials in its use.*

- *The district need to develop critical ‘gender equality indicators’ as a basis for targeting and accounting on the extent to which decentralized development promotes gender equality in the district.*
- *Institutionalize gender responsiveness audit*
- *Ensure funding support for WCE operations are integrated in the IPFs given to LLGs*

4.2 Advocacy Issues Initiated by the Community

Describe advocacy issues (if any) that have been initiated by the communities as a result of the work of the grantee or arising from the community empowerment carried out by the grantee. Describe the process, and outcome of such advocacy initiatives

Issue definition

Women Council Executives advocated on a number of issues (that were mainstreamed in the core issues above) namely:

- *Operating in unison with Women Councillors as both are women and should ideally promote women’s interest.*
- *The participation of Women Council Executives in sectoral committees during planning and budgeting processes.*
- *The involvement of Women Council Executives in sectoral committees during plan and budget execution stage.*

Processes management

- *WCEs and WCs always used information sharing meetings as avenues to identify what affect them most and how to solve such issues*
- *They also always ensured that they work in collaboration*

Outcomes

- *A strong alliance was built between the District Women Council Executives and District Women Councillors to the extent that they jointly, with AFARD support, secured funding from Action Aid Nebbi office to mentor lower local government women council structures.*
- *In a number of LLGs, WCEs are now involved in both sectoral committee planning and PAF monitoring processes.*
- *These have yielded responsiveness from the LLG officials who now appreciate the need for working with women leaders for an engendered development.*

5. Project Management Major Challenges

Describe the project management specific issues and challenges your organisation faced during programme implementation, how they impacted on the programme, and how were these challenges dealt with? Such issues may include for example staffing and retention, asset management, functioning of the Board, etc. Please categorise the challenges such as:

Institutional/ Implementation Arrangement Challenges

- Inability to synchronize financial disbursement in line with LLG budgeting cycle affected the effectiveness with which AFARD and WCEs/WCS could mobilize the community to effectively and timely participate in the budgeting processes. Often times, funds were sent way after much of the planning activities have been completed. (AFARD had to strategize in ensuring that the WCEs/WCs effectively engaged with LLG officials at the sectoral committee levels).

Project Management Challenges

- Issues that were beyond the project and were forwarded to the National Steering Committee were never addressed. (AFARD had to capitalise on existing strengths).

Project Design Challenges

- The project by design focussed at the LLG levels yet it should have started at the village level. (AFARD had to ensure that the LLG WCEs/WCs reached out to parish level and used other proxy methods to tap into village level ideas and needs).

Political environment challenges

- NIL

5.5 Any other (Specify)

5.6 In view of the above challenges, and based on the lessons learnt, if you were to design your own project again, how differently would you do it?

- Ensure fund disbursements are strictly in line with the LLG budget cycle.
- Treat national level issues as risk factors.
- Target fewer LLGs but starting from village level

6 Lessons Learnt

6.1 Lessons Learnt on Institutional Development

- *Joint board and staff training improved governance*
- *Needs-driven technical staff training improves services delivery quality*

6.2 Lessons Learnt on Empowerment

- *PRMT is not new to PRA-conversant organizations. Besides, it can be adapted to many different uses.*
- *PRMT requires time and enough funding for it to take root in the community*

6.3 Lessons Learnt on Advocacy

- *Effective advocacy requires credible information*
- *Information sharing meeting is a good avenue for alliance building and advocacy strategy identification*
- *Putting the affected constituency at the forefront of an advocacy issues improves responsiveness to their plight*
- *Requisite skills development among advocates improves advocacy outcomes*

6.4 Lessons Learnt on Service Delivery

- *Government officials only stubbornly fail to respond to community needs yet under pressure they yield to delivering services*
- *The scope of local government services delivery is dependent on the size of funds at their disposal.*

6.5 Lessons Learnt on Sustainability

- *Capacity building of grantees helps build sustainability.*
- *Sustainability strategies should be in-built in programming.*

6.6 Lessons Learnt on Monitoring and Evaluations

- *Baseline studies are inevitable for a relevant M&E framework to be designed*
- *Integrating M&E framework in periodic reporting improved progress tracking and informs future programming*

6.7 Lessons Learnt on PRMT

See empowerment above

6.8 General Lessons Learnt

Participatory review meetings help bring actors within the LLGs closer together since misconceptions and wrong opinions are dispelled, and weaknesses on the part of either team (LLG or WCEs) are pointed out in an open manner that does not result into animosity

Majority of political and technical leaders in LG lack skills for undertaking gender responsive budgeting and M&E. This leads to compartmentalisation rather than mainstreaming gender issue in planning

Conducting joint training for WCEs, politicians and technical staff is an avenue for building effective advocacy and a sustainable co-governance

7 Design of the Civil Society Capacity Building Programme

Please give your honest views on the design of the CSCBP, basing on the lessons learnt and implementation experience.

- 7.1 Describe the positive aspects of the programme design
 - *Enabling grantees undertake baseline studies*
 - *Integrating grantee programme support with institutional capacity building*
 - *Mediating PMU and grantees with IPs*
 - *Alerting grantees of calls for proposals*
 - *Regular sharing meetings*
- 7.2 Describe the challenging (negative) aspects of the programme design
 - *At the start, tying disbursement to all grantee performance delayed timely funding of some organizations whose activities were time-specific (like AFARD with local government budget cycle management)*
- 7.3 If you have to design the same programme, describe how differently it would be done to achieve maximum benefits
 - *See 5.6*
- 7.4 Give your comments on the effectiveness of the implementation arrangement of the programme in terms of the following:
 - 7.4.1 Fund request and disbursements arrangements
 - *Fund request tools made it easy to requisition funds*
 - *Telegraphic transfers hastened fund disbursements often delayed by inter-bank transaction delays.*
 - 7.4.2 Fund Accountability Arrangement
 - *IOs/IPs hastened reporting processes and reduced would-be delays in ensuring that reports are quality to warrant next release.*
 - 7.4.3 Quarterly Progress Reporting Arrangement
 - *Sharing of reports with IO/IP improved the quality of reporting*
 - *Simplified reporting framework eased meeting of submission deadlines*
 - 7.4.4 Any Other (Please specify)

8 Assessment of Performance

Please give your assessment of the performance of the different structures of CSCBP implementation, indicating the success and failure at each level:

8.1 Intermediary organisation

8.1.1 What were the positive aspects or benefits of the intermediary organisation?

- *Coordination of grantees with PMU*

8.1.2 What were the challenging aspects of the intermediary organisation?

- *Unclear and unshared ToR that made it difficult to demand for services from IOs as their mandates and goal posts kept on shifting*

8.1.3 What changes would you recommend in the intermediary organisation arrangement?

- *It is cost-effective and time-efficient to work with IPs*
- *Start with a clear ToR which must also be shared with grantees so that grantees can demand for their entitlements should the IP fail to deliver mandated services.*
- *Allow grantees to assess IP performance bi-annually.*

8.1.4 Describe how helpful the intermediary organisation was with regard to the following:

- I) Mentoring and coaching
Nil
- II) Provision of technical support
Nil
- III) Monitoring and evaluation
Nil
- IV) General project implementation
Nil
- V) Feed back on reports
Somewhat helpful with critical reading!
- VI) Any other (specify)

8.2 Project Management Unit

Describe whether and how PMU was helpful or added value with regard to the following:

8.2.1 Technical support and general project implementation

8.2.2 Financial management and disbursement

- *Trained staffs in financial management skills*
- *Provided on-coaching in financial management through queries*
- *Supported organizational financial audits*

8.2.3 Institutional development

- *Trained Boards hence improving governance and leadership*
- *Trained staffs in requisite skills that improved services delivery*

8.2.4 Empowerment

- *Introduced staff to PRMT management skills*
- *Funded (partially) PRMT operationalization that exposed staffs to PRA, co-governance, and gender analytical skills*

8.2.5 Service delivery

- *The co-funding enabled grantees' a wider services delivery outreach*
- *By promoting linkages PMU enabled grantees to tap into fellow grantee potentials e.g. AFARD and KADO, KIIDA*

8.2.6 Monitoring and evaluation

- *Provided training on M&E and enabled grantees redesign their M&E focus*
- *Provided M&E reporting guidelines that enabled routine tracking of progress*

8.2.7 Grantee Forum

- *Valuable experiences were shared and this helped improved cross-learning and performance*

8.2.8 Feed back on reports and issues raised by grantees

8.2.9 Comment on the PMU'S performance, management and methods of work, giving both the positive and challenging attributes

The PMU team exhibited:

- *Effective consultation with grantees on the direction and pace of the programme*
- *Openness to new ideas such as when other grantees where delaying fund disbursement*

9 Promotion of the Visibility of the European Union

Describe the strategy used by the organisation to promote the visibility of the European Union

- *Use of logo in the design of the project letterheads*
- *EU logo was also used in all IEC material and T-shirts production as well as other publications from the project studies*
- *Part of the project message during every workshop was devoted to about EU – CSCBP’*

10. Status of Monitoring Indicators for the Grantees from M&E Frame - For each indicator in the monitoring and evaluation framework, please provide the baseline and report on the status of the indicator

	Indicator	Baseline as of: 2006	End of project status as of : March 2008	Remarks
10.1	Institutional Development Component			
	objective: AFARD structures and systems strengthen and operationalised and they in order to become effective, efficient, credible and viable organisation by June 2008			
10.1.1	Minimum standards / requirements for NGO certification attained by Dec 2007	AFARD meets and adheres to 37 of the 54 QUAM Standards relevant for NGOs	52 of 54 met	3 remaining are 42,54 and 55
10.1.2	Functional and effective Boards attained by June 2007	BOD not giving sufficient attention to AFARD	Board is fully functional and effective	
10.1.3	Funding base increased by 20% from 2006 to 2008	Ushs 1 Bn	Ush 208 M	Base year was unique given that UNICEF the major funder in 2006 provided 60% of our budget. It has now withdrawn from the West Nile sub region.
10.1.4	Adherence to documented accounting manuals and systems attained by June 2007 (Accounting manuals & systems must meet the minimum standards as stipulated in the Grantee accounting manual)	Accounting manual not complete and not endorsed by the BOD, Financial reporting not perfect, Resource mobilisation strategy not documented	Accounting Manual in use	Financial, Accounting, Asset Management & Procurement guidelines are in place
10.1.5	Adherence to the documented human resource manuals and systems attained by Dec 2007 Human resource manuals must meeting the minimum standards spelt out in QUAM	Job descriptions and terms of service for volunteers not specified	HR Policy under review in line with QUAM	Job evaluation conducted. Organogram restructured, and waiting operationalization
10.2	Empowerment Component			
	Objective: Capacity of AFARD built to empower vulnerable communities to actively and effectively participate in resource planning and monitoring of programmes affecting them.			
10.2.1	At least two community based monitoring and evaluation meeting carried out in one sub county in year 2007/8	PRMT not yet introduced to AFARD	1	Only done in Panyimur where PRMT was piloted
10.2.2	Documented decisions taken during the community based monitoring meetings at the	No documentation	1	Report shared with communities but not LLG

	Indicator	Baseline as of: 2006	End of project status as of : March 2008	Remarks
	sub county level			due to lack of funds
10.3	Advocacy Component			
	Objective: To strengthening the capacity of participating CSOs to effectively influence policies and issues that affect the poor.			
10.3.1	Advocacy strategy/plan & budget & its tracking mechanism developed by June 2007	There was no advocacy plan in place	2	2 main advocacies were conducted in all LLGs
10.3.2	Documented process, experiences and results of the advocacy campaign carried out by the organisation as part of the advocacy plan	Documentation of advocacy campaign on engendering budget supported by HURINET was done	1	Project review report produced and shared with all LLGs
10.4	Service Delivery Component			
10.4.1	Objective 1: Women Councils leaders have increased knowledge and skills in gender planning and M&E, and advocacy/lobbying.			
	# of WCEs that have documented and presented core women issues during LLG planning cycle	0	519	Target = 70. Adopted even at parish levels
	# of WCEs that are monitoring LLG budget implementation and commitments for affirmative action	0	95	Target = 50. Only those at SC levels are actively involved
	# of WCEs with an advocacy plan for engendered services and are implementing them	0	0	Target = 10
10.4.2	Objective 2: Effective participation of women in general, and Women Council members in particular, in local government planning processes			
	% of women participating in village level planning	8.1%	74.9%	Target = 40%
	% of women participating in Parish level meetings	2.6%	65.8%	Target = 40%
	% of women participating in LLG budget conferences	3.3%	58.4%	Target = 40%
	# of WCEs holding meetings with LLG Sectoral Committees	0	19	Target = 10
10.4.3	Objective 3 District and lower local governments accountable and transparent during implementation			
	# of LLG whose sectoral plans have gender disaggregated targets	0	18	Target = 10.

	Indicator	Baseline as of: 2006	End of project status as of : March 2008	Remarks
	# of LLG plans/budgets that have planned for, and funded, affirmative action	0	19	Target = 10.
	# of LLG with plans which have at least one Gender Responsive Statements	0	18	Target = 16.
	# of LLG allocating at least 65% of their budget for Services Sectors versus Administrative	0	14	Target = 10.
	# of LLG with popular versions of their plans and budgets	0	0	Target = 6
	# of LLG providing popular versions of their plans and budgets to WCEs	0	3	Target = 6
	# of LLG communicating about approved plans and budgets to lower units	0	3	Target = 6
	# of LLG providing regular update on cash inflows and expenditures to WCE	0	0	Target = 9
	# of LLG disbursing funds taking into account the proportions within the approved budgets	0	14	Target = 8
	# of LLG reports with gender disaggregated data	0	18	Target = 10

11 Local Government Perspective of the Implementation of the Project by the Grantee

The Local Government either at district or sub county level is requested to give their perspective of the implementation of the project by the grantee. If the grantee has grantee has implemented the project in more than one Sub County, the perspective should be given by the Chief Administrative Officer or his or her delegated District Officer. If the project was in being implemented in one Sub County, then the perspective should be given by the Sub County Chief or his /her assigned officer

11.1 Partnership between the grantee and the Local Government

Please comment of the partnership and collaboration between the local government and the grantee.

11.2 Contribution of the project

What changes or improvements have been brought about in the community (in the area project areas) as results of the implementation of the project by the grantee?

11.3 What changes would you recommend in the implementation of the project?

12 Community Assessment of the Implementation of the Grantee Contract

12.1 How has the grantee promoted the participation of the community in planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the project?

12.2 What benefits has the community realised as a result of implementing the project by the grantee?

12.3 Any other comment about the implementation of the project

13 The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of this Project. Do you have any objection to this report being published on the Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so please state your objection here

I) I have no objection:

Name: _____ Title _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

II) I object to the publication of this project: Name: _____

Title: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____

Part II: Financial Report

1. Total Approved grant: UGX 175,575,400

2. Uncommitted fund as at close of grant contract : NIL

(This money should be refunded to CSCBP)

3. Disbursements

Disbursement	Date	Amount Disbursed	Amount Used	Receipt issued to PMU.(If yes indicate receipt no)
1 st	18/4/2006	29,262,567	29,262,567	
2 nd	16/8/2006	36,578,208	36,578,208	1
3 rd	21/3/2007	43,893,850	43,893,850	
4 th	12/7/2007	43,893,850	43,893,850	54
5 th	21/12/2007	10,973,463	10,973,463	106
6 th (PRMT)	24/12/2007	2,000,000	2,000,000	107
7 th	25/4/2008	7,461,954	7,461,954	153
Total		174,063,892	174,063,892	

Note: Total excludes UGX 3,511,508 retained at PMU for joint Audit & Evaluation

4. Amount Disallowed

Quarter (Disbursement)	Amount	Reason
1 st		

5. Re-allocations

Activity	Original Cost (A)	Reallocation (B)	Revised budget ©	Remarks
Personnel cost	16,800,000	700,000	16,100,000	Adjusted to 5.5
Internet connection/telephone cost	2,880,000	1,210,000	1,670,000	Adjusted to 1.6
1.1 Capacity assessment of women councils	4,262,200	100,000	4,162,200	Adjusted to 1.6
1.2 Training manual development	3,097,500	-	3,097,500	
1.3 In-house ToT	437,600	-	437,600	
1.4 Training mobilization	3,093,200	-	3,093,200	
1.5 Training in gender planning skills	18,403,800	-	18,403,800	
1.6 Training in gender M&E skills	10,933,800	(1,612,200)	12,546,000	
1.7 Training in advocacy and lobbying skills	10,933,800	(600,600)	11,534,400	
1.8 In-house training evaluation	1,212,300	-	1,212,300	
1.9 Training follow up	8,556,600	4,502,200	4,054,400	Adjusted to 1.6, 1.7, 2.3 and 3.1
2.1 Desk reviews	1,115,000	-	1,115,000	
2.2 Personal trip to LLGs	2,300,000	-	2,300,000	
2.3 IEC production costs	11,200,000	(200,000)	11,400,000	
2.4.1 Information sharing meetings	8,520,000	-	8,520,000	
2.4.2 Other channels	15,400,000	-	15,400,000	
2.4.3 Facilitation for WC to participate	9,400,000	1,050,000	8,350,000	Adjusted to 3.1
2.4.4 AFARD participation	6,026,400	2,226,400	3,800,000	Adjusted to 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3
3.1 Quarterly follow-up of LLG plans	9,150,000	(5,461,000)	14,611,000	
3.2 Half year Review meetings with women	13,533,600	(953,200)	14,486,800	
3.3 Advocacy and lobbying meeting	25,688,000	(2,033,000)	27,721,000	
3.4 Documenting best practices	5,475,000	(2,500,000)	7,975,000	
3.5 PRMT	2,000,000		2,000,000	
5.1 Auditing costs	7,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	Adjusted to 3.3, 3.4 and 5.5
5.2 Evaluation costs	5,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000	Adjusted to 5.5
5.5 Bank charges <i>et al</i> (at 5%)	600,000	(1,041,042)	1,641,042	
TOTAL	203,018,800	3,387,558	199,631,242	

Note: A does not equal to C because of the UGX 3,511,508 retained at PMU for joint Audit & Evaluation

6. Summary of income and expenditure for the full grant period

**AGENCY FOR ACCELERATED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
(AFARD)**

**Summary of income and expenditure for the
period 1st March 2006 – 28th June 2008**

EU-CSCBP-Disbursements		172,063,892
PRMT		2,000,000
AFARD's Contribution		<u>25,567,350</u>
Total Income		199,631,242
Expenditure		
Administrative cost		
Personnel cost	16,100,000	
Internet connection/telephone cost	1,670,000	
Subtotal Administrative costs		17,770,000
Programme Activities		
<i>1.1 Capacity assessment of women councils</i>	4,162,200	
<i>1.2 Training manual development</i>	3,097,500	
<i>1.3 In-house ToT</i>	437,600	
<i>1.4 Training mobilisation</i>	3,093,200	
<i>1.5 Training in gender planning skills</i>	18,403,800	
<i>1.6 Training in gender M&E skills</i>	12,546,000	
<i>1.7 Training in advocacy and lobbying skills</i>	11,534,400	
<i>1.8 In-house training evaluation</i>	1,212,300	
<i>1.9 Training follow up</i>	4,054,400	
<i>2.1 Desk reviews</i>	1,115,000	
<i>2.2 Personal trip to LLGs</i>	2,300,000	
<i>2.3 IEC production costs</i>	11,400,000	
<i>2.4.1 Information sharing meetings</i>	8,520,000	
<i>2.4.2 Other channels</i>	15,400,000	
<i>2.4.3 Facilitation for WC to participate</i>	8,350,000	
<i>2.4.4 AFARD participation</i>	3,800,000	
<i>3.1 Quarterly follow-up of LLG plans</i>	14,611,000	
<i>3.2 Half year Review meetings with women</i>	14,486,800	

<i>3.3 Advocacy and lobbying meeting</i>	27,721,000	
<i>3.4 Documenting best practices</i>	7,975,000	
<i>3.5 PRMT</i>	2,000,000	
<i>Subtotal project activity costs</i>		176,220,200
5.1 Auditing costs	3,000,000	
5.2 Evaluation costs	1,000,000	
5.5 Bank charges <i>et al</i> (at 5%)	1,641,042	
<i>Subtotal Other costs(operational)</i>		5,641,042
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		199,631,242
Surplus/Deficit		-

7. Inventory of asset procured under the grant

(This section should be an extract of the assets register and should be reported in a tabular form as below. Fixed assets refer to long term assets held for use and not expected to be converted to cash in the current or upcoming fiscal year such as motor vehicle, motor cycles, computers, furniture etc)

Item	Asset No.	Specifications	Date of purchase	Purchase value	Condition

Name of Grantee: AGENCY FOR ACCELERATED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Financial report for the period (18/04/2006-28/06/2008)	Contract : Number C8/A12/2005								
	Implementation period: April 2006 to June 2008								
	Budget as per workplan for the period			Re- Allocations	Expenditures				Variances
	Unit (a)	Unit cost in Ushs (b)	Budget cost in Ushs (a)*(b)	Allowed reallocation	Total expenditure of the period in Ushs ©	Cummulated) expenditure before the current period in Ushs (d)	Cummulated expenditure(from start of implementation to present report (c+d)	(a*b)-©	
1. Administrative costs (2)									
Programme officer (50%)	24	250,000	6,000,000		750,000	5,000,000	5,750,000	250,000	
Programme Manager (100%)	24	250,000	6,000,000		750,000	5,000,000	5,750,000	250,000	
Accountant (50%)	24	200,000	4,800,000		600,000	4,000,000	4,600,000	200,000	
Internet connection/ telephone cost	24	120,000	2,880,000		-	1,670,000	1,670,000	1,210,000	
Subtotal Administrative costs			19,680,000		2,100,000	15,670,000	17,770,000	1,910,000	
								0	
2. Investment costs[3]									
								-	
								0	
Subtotal investment costs								0	
								0	
4. Project / Activity costs[4]									
Gender responsiveness skills enhancement								0	
<i>1.1 Capacity assessment of women councils</i>								0	
Transport cost	20	100,000	2,000,000		-	1,900,000	1,900,000	100,000	
Stationery (writing kits)	1	2,200	2,200		-	2,200	2,200	0	

Stationery (report writing)	1	160,000	160,000			-	160,000	160,000	0
Radio announcements	10	10,000	100,000			-	100,000	100,000	0
Personnel costs	40	50,000	2,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
			4,262,200			-	4,162,200	4,162,200	100,000
<i>1.2 Training manual development</i>									0
Stationery (design materials)	1	185,000	185,000			-	185,000	185,000	0
Fuel (generator)	50	2,250	112,500			-	112,500	112,500	0
Photocopy costs	2,500	200	500,000			-	500,000	500,000	0
Binding costs	50	6,000	300,000			-	300,000	300,000	0
Personnel costs	40	50,000	2,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
			3,097,500			-	3,097,500	3,097,500	0
<i>1.3 In-house ToT</i>						-		-	0
Meals	9	5,000	45,000			-	45,000	45,000	0
Stationery (writing kits)	8	2,200	17,600			-	17,600	17,600	0
Performance allowance	7	25,000	175,000			-	175,000	175,000	0
Personnel costs	4	50,000	200,000			-	200,000	200,000	0
			437,600			-	437,600	437,600	0
<i>1.4 Training mobilisation</i>									0
Radio announcements	20	10,000	200,000			-	400,000	400,000	(200,000)
Transport cost	20	100,000	2,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Personnel costs	10	50,000	500,000			-	250,000	250,000	250,000
Letters of invitataions	1,966	200	393,200			-	443,200	443,200	(50,000)

			3,093,200			-	3,093,200	3,093,200	0
<i>1.5 Training in gender planning skills</i>									0
Personnel cost	76	50,000	3,800,000			-	3,800,000	3,800,000	0
Transport cost	38	100,000	3,800,000			-	3,800,000	3,800,000	0
Training kit	19	95,000	1,805,000			-	1,805,000	1,805,000	0
Writing kit	544	2,200	1,196,800			-	1,196,800	1,196,800	0
Printing paper	19	10,000	190,000			-	190,000	190,000	0
Folder files	544	500	272,000			-	272,000	272,000	0
Hall	38	50,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Meals	1,088	3,000	3,264,000			-	3,264,000	3,264,000	0
Trainees allowances	1,088	2,000	2,176,000			-	2,176,000	2,176,000	0
			18,403,800			-	18,403,800	18,403,800	0
<i>1.6 Training in gender M&E skills</i>									0
Personnel cost	38	50,000	1,900,000			-	2,050,000	2,050,000	(150,000)
Transport cost	19	100,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Training kit	19	95,000	1,805,000			-	1,805,000	1,805,000	0
Writing kit	544	2,200	1,196,800			-	1,614,000	1,614,000	(417,200)
Printing paper	19	10,000	190,000			-	190,000	190,000	0
Folder files	544	500	272,000			-	367,000	367,000	(95,000)
Hall	19	50,000	950,000			-	950,000	950,000	0
Meals	544	3,000	1,632,000			-	2,202,000	2,202,000	(570,000)
Trainees allowances		2,000	1,088,000			-	1,468,000	1,468,000	(380,000)

	544								
			10,933,800			-	12,546,000	12,546,000	(1,612,200)
<i>1.7 Training in advocacy and lobbying skills</i>									
Personnel cost	38	50,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Transport cost	19	100,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Training kit	19	95,000	1,805,000			-	1,805,000	1,805,000	0
Writing kit	544	2,200	1,196,800			-	1,368,400	1,368,400	(171,600)
Printing paper	19	10,000	190,000			-	190,000	190,000	0
Folder files	544	500	272,000			-	311,000	311,000	(39,000)
Hall	19	50,000	950,000			-	950,000	950,000	0
Meals	544	3,000	1,632,000			-	1,866,000	1,866,000	(234,000)
Trainees allowances	544	2,000	1,088,000			-	1,244,000	1,244,000	(156,000)
			10,933,800			-	11,534,400	11,534,400	(600,600)
<i>1.8 In-house training evaluation</i>									
Meals	9	5,000	45,000			-	45,000	45,000	0
Stationary (writing kit)	9	2,200	19,800			-	19,800	19,800	0
Stationery (design materials)	1	185,000	185,000			-	185,000	185,000	0
Fuel (generator)	50	2,250	112,500			-	112,500	112,500	0
Photocopy costs	1,250	200	250,000			-	250,000	250,000	0
Binding costs	50	6,000	300,000			-	300,000	300,000	0
Personnel costs	6	50,000	300,000			-	300,000	300,000	0
			1,212,300			-	1,212,300	1,212,300	0

1.9 Training follow up									0
Transport	57	100,000	5,700,000			-	2,700,000	2,700,000	3,000,000
Stationery (writing kits)	3	2,200	6,600			-	4,400	4,400	2,200
Personnel costs	57	50,000	2,850,000			-	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,500,000
			8,556,600			-	4,054,400	4,054,400	4,502,200
Mobilisation to participate in local governments' planning processes									0
2.1 Desk reviews									0
Stationery (report writing)	1	140,000	140,000			-	140,000	140,000	0
Fuel (generator)	90	2,500	225,000			-	225,000	225,000	0
Personnel costs	15	50,000	750,000			-	750,000	750,000	0
			1,115,000			-	1,115,000	1,115,000	0
2.2 Personal trip to LLGs									0
Transport cost	10	100,000	1,000,000			-	1,600,000	1,600,000	(600,000)
Personnel costs	10	50,000	500,000			-	700,000	700,000	(200,000)
Letters of invitations	2,000	400	800,000			-		-	800,000
			2,300,000			-	2,300,000	2,300,000	0
2.3 IEC production costs									0
Posters	10	400,000	4,000,000			-	4,000,000	4,000,000	0
Brochures	10	270,000	2,700,000			-	2,700,000	2,700,000	0
Leaflets	10	150,000	1,500,000			-	1,500,000	1,500,000	0
Dissemination transport	20	100,000	2,000,000			-	1,800,000	1,800,000	200,000
Personnel cost	20	50,000	1,000,000			-	1,400,000	1,400,000	(400,000)

			11,200,000			-	11,400,000	11,400,000	(200,000)
<i>2.4 Awareness creation</i>									0
<i>2.4.1 Information sharing meetings</i>									0
Transport cost	19	100,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Stationery (Training kit)	19	100,000	1,900,000			-	1,900,000	1,900,000	0
Meals and allowances	544	5,000	2,720,000			-	2,720,000	2,720,000	0
Personnel costs	40	50,000	2,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
			8,520,000			-	8,520,000	8,520,000	0
<i>2.4.2 Other channels</i>									0
Radio talk shows	3	450,000	1,350,000			-	1,350,000	1,350,000	0
Radio spot	5	150,000	750,000			-	750,000	750,000	0
Radio drama			-			-	-	-	0
Drama shows	19	700,000	13,300,000			-	13,300,000	13,300,000	0
			15,400,000			-	15,400,000	15,400,000	0
									0
<i>2.4.3 Facilitation for WC to participate</i>									0
Transport at sucounty level in budget conferences	1,088	5,000	5,440,000			-	5,700,000	5,700,000	(260,000)
Transport at district level	198	20,000	3,960,000			-	2,650,000	2,650,000	1,310,000
			9,400,000			-	8,350,000	8,350,000	1,050,000
									0
<i>2.4.4 AFARD participation</i>									0
Transport cost	40	100,000	4,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Stationery (Training kit)	12	2,200	26,400			-	-	-	26,400
Personnel costs		50,000	2,000,000			-			200,000

	40					1,800,000	1,800,000	
			6,026,400			- 3,800,000	3,800,000	2,226,400
			-					0
Advocacy and lobbying local governments								0
<i>3.1 Quaterly followup of LLG plans</i>			-					0
Transport	57	100,000	5,700,000			- 9,500,000	9,500,000	(3,800,000)
Stationery	4	150,000	600,000			- 761,000	761,000	(161,000)
Personnel costs	57	50,000	2,850,000			- 4,350,000	4,350,000	(1,500,000)
			9,150,000			- 14,611,000	14,611,000	(5,461,000)
<i>3.2 Half year Review meetings with women</i>								0
Transport cost	38	100,000	3,800,000			- 4,845,000	4,845,000	(1,045,000)
Stationery (writing kits)	1,088	2,200	2,393,600			- 2,096,800	2,096,800	296,800
Meals and allowances	1,088	5,000	5,440,000			- 3,347,000	3,347,000	2,093,000
Personnel costs	38	50,000	1,900,000			- 4,198,000	4,198,000	(2,298,000)
			13,533,600			- 14,486,800	14,486,800	953,200
<i>3.3 Advoacay and lobbying meeting</i>			-					0
Personnel cost	76	50,000	3,800,000			- 3,800,000	3,800,000	0
Transport cost	38	100,000	3,800,000			- 3,800,000	3,800,000	0
Training kit	38	95,000	3,610,000			- 3,610,000	3,610,000	0
Writing kit	1,140	2,200	2,508,000			- 2,926,000	2,926,000	(418,000)
Printing paper	38	10,000	380,000			- 380,000	380,000	0
Folder files	1,140	500	570,000			- 665,000	665,000	(95,000)
Hall	38	50,000	1,900,000			- 1,900,000	1,900,000	0

Meals	1,140	3,000	3,420,000			-	3,990,000	3,990,000	(570,000)
Participant's allowances	1,140	5,000	5,700,000			-	6,650,000	6,650,000	(950,000)
			25,688,000			-	27,721,000	27,721,000	(2,033,000)
<i>3.4 Documenting best practices</i>			-						0
Information collection	1	500,000	500,000			-	500,000	500,000	0
Report design costs	1	300,000	300,000			-	300,000	300,000	0
Publishing	115	25,000	2,875,000			2,500,000	2,875,000	5,375,000	(2,500,000)
Video documentary	1	1,800,000	1,800,000			-	1,800,000	1,800,000	0
			5,475,000			2,500,000	5,475,000	7,975,000	(2,500,000)
PRMT	1	2,000,000	2,000,000			-	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Subtotal project activity costs			170,738,800			2,500,000	173,720,200	176,220,200	(5,481,400)
5. Other costs (operational)									0
5.1 Auditing costs	2	3,500,000	7,000,000			1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000	4,000,000
5.2 Evaluation costs	1	5,000,000	5,000,000			-	1,000,000	-	4,000,000
5.3 Translation, interpreters			-			-	-	-	0
5.4 Financial services (bank guarantee costs etc.)			-			-	-	-	0
5.5 Bank charges et al (at 5%)	24	25,000	600,000			526,489	1,114,553	1,641,042	(1,041,042)
								-	0
Subtotal Other costs(operational)			12,600,000			3,026,489	2,614,553	5,641,042	6,958,958
Total cost to be bone by AFARD		13%	25,443,400			25,567,350		25,567,350	(123,950)
Total cost requested		87%	175,575,400			172,063,892		172,063,892	3,511,508
7. Total costs of the Project (1+2+3+4+5)			203,018,800			7,626,489	192,004,753	199,631,242	3,387,558
Bank interest yield during the period									

9. Declaration

I declare that the information presented here is true and fair and has been prepared from our financial records and information supporting this report will be availed when and whenever required by the donor or his representatives.

i. Name: _____

Signature : _____

Date: _____

ACCOUNTANT

ii. Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR