

## **ASSESSMENT REPORT**

### **“Government Accountability Improves Trust” (GAIT)**

**Presented to the U.S. Agency for International Development  
Democracy and Governance Program  
Accra, Ghana**

**by**

**Kwesi Appiah  
Robert J. Groelsema  
Avril Kudzi  
Ted Lawrence  
Elsie Menorkpor  
Louis A. Picard (Team Leader)**

**December 8, 2003**

**Public Administration Service  
438 4<sup>th</sup> Street NE  
Washington, DC USA  
20002  
Phone: 202-546-5880  
Fax: 202-546-7888  
[www.pasdc.org](http://www.pasdc.org)**

The team wishes to acknowledge the support of officials in the Government of Ghana in Accra and in the nine districts visited. The cooperation of civil society organizations and civic unions was essential to the completion of our work. The team also thanks the U.S. Agency for International Development, other development partners and development cooperants. The views reflected in this document are those of the assessment team alone and not the U.S. Government.

## Table of Contents

|   |      |
|---|------|
| 1. Executive Summary                                    | 1    |
| 2. An Overview of Findings                              | 3    |
| 2.1. GAIT Achievements                                  | 3    |
| 2.2. Issues   | 4    |
| 2.3. Prospective Recommendations                        | 5    |
| 3. Background to Current Activities                     | 12   |
| 3.1. An Overview of Objectives                          | 12   |
| 3.2. Background   | 12   |
| 3.3. Decentralization                                   | 14   |
| 3.4. Program Background                                 | 17   |
| 3.5. The Current Program                                | 19   |
| 4. The Assessment Report                                | 22   |
| 4.1. Timeframe and Methodology                          | 22   |
| 4.2. Deliverables                                       | 25   |
| 5. A Retrospective Examination of CLUSA/GAIT Activities | 26   |
| 5.1. The GAIT Methodology                               | 26   |
| 5.2. GAIT Achievements                                  | 31   |
| 5.3. Issues and Concerns                                | 33   |
| 5.4. Decentralized Governance                           | 36   |
| 5.5. Civil Society                                      | 40   |
| 5.6. CLUSA/GAIT   | 41   |
| 6. Prospective Recommendations                          | 45   |
| 6.1. Overview   | 45   |
| 6.2. Strategic Objectives                               | 48   |
| Appendices  |      |
| Acronyms  | i    |
| Persons Consulted                                       | iii  |
| References  | x    |
| Scope of Work   | xiii |
| Inception Report  | xix  |
| Interview Instruments                                   | xxxi |

## 1. Executive Summary<sup>1</sup>

1.1. Between October 20 and December 1, 2003 a six person team carried out an assessment of the current USAID Democracy and Governance efforts in Ghana. The assessment team sought, overall, to determine the nature of the impact and the effectiveness of the GAIT Program<sup>2</sup> as implemented by the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA). There were three components of the activity. The USAID Mission in Ghana intended to utilize information generated by this assessment to equip it to (1) evaluate the GAIT program's (2001-2003) impact; (2) establish baselines and targets for the next three years of its Democracy and Governance strategic objectives (SOs) and (3) sharpen its strategic focus for its new country strategic plan (CSP) 2004-2010.

1.2. The overall goal of GAIT has been to promote a partnership between district assemblies and civil society in Ghana. The cornerstone of CLUSA's activity has been the selection of facilitators for each target district and support for establishment of civic unions which link together primary civil society organizations (CSOs) at the district level. CLUSA has sought to assist district assembly officials and members and to assure them that civic unions would be non-confrontational and supportive and would focus on CSO goals for the deepening of respect for citizen rights and responsibilities.

1.3. The assessment team has found that the level of discourse on associational life is higher in the GAIT districts than in the non-GAIT control districts the assessment team visited and an awareness of civic rights and responsibilities is being created. The role of the facilitators in sensitizing and publicizing the process has been critical. Overall, the GAIT program has made a very good start in the districts where they are

---

<sup>1</sup> The team leader, Dr. Louis A. Picard is a specialist in governance and capacity building and is Professor of governance and international development in the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh and is President of Public Administration Service; Dr. Robert Groelsema, is a specialist in democracy and governance in the Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, Office of Democracy and Governance USAID, Washington D.C.; Dr. Kwesi Appiah is Executive Director of the Civic Foundation (Accra, Ghana) and Senior Lecturer at the University of Ghana and specializes in civil society and governance; Avril Kudzi is a specialist in democracy and governance in the USAID Mission to Ghana; Ted Lawrence is legislative support specialist with the USAID Mission to Ghana and Elsie Menorkpor is an education specialist with the USAID Mission in Ghana.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the program supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development is "Government Accountability Improves Trust." USAID's cooperant in this project is the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA).

working. The new aspiring civic unions are beginning to have an impact on community life and a level of trust has started to develop between civil society and district government.

1.4. It is the view of this assessment team that the goals defined by USAID Ghana in its 2004-2010 Country Strategy report and in its current implementation documents are appropriate, realistic and, based upon the GAIT experience, can be implemented. Governance and advocacy strategies need to be sharpened through a needs assessment process which is built into the activity. Measurement of impacts should be built into the activity itself on a realistic cost basis. Between 2004 and 2010, USAID intends to provide a broad spectrum of support to civil society and local government in selected districts throughout Ghana. The purpose is to increase the capacity to sustain and improve deliberative democratic processes. Activities in the post-GAIT period will include a series of awareness building activities, combined with capacity building support for civil societies in order that they can network with and lobby district government. Training and the provision of technical assistance for district government is needed in areas of revenue generation, budgeting, strategic planning and cross-sector support, particularly in the education sector.

1.5. The primary focus of the next phase of Democracy and Governance should continue to be on support for civil society. To what extent should the next generation USAID also support local government structures and local government officials, including capacity building for district government officials? In part the answer to this depends upon government and donor priorities and the coordination of these efforts. The view in this report is that, as in GAIT, focus should be on those structures and processes where government and civil society interaction, cooperation and policy dialogue are likely to occur.

## **2. An Overview of Findings**

### **2.1. GAIT Achievements**

2.1.1. Overall, the GAIT program has made a very good start in the districts where it is working. However, the gains realized are fragile, and if no effort is made to maintain links to existing GAIT districts in the coming strategy period, these gains could be lost with the civic unions (CUs) dissolving in most districts. A more realistic period of engagement needs to be thought through that allows for phased withdrawal as districts meet certain benchmarks.

2.1.2. Specific achievements under GAIT include:

1. There is an increased awareness of government policy and government processes after training has occurred. A major difference over the last three years is that in a number of districts the district assembly (DA) is better able to engage with civil society.
2. The civic union is a vehicle that can meaningfully engage the DA. One of the effects of GAIT has been a better understanding of the way to access district assemblies. Before the establishment of CUs, it was not clear to civil society leaders as to how to approach the DA.
3. CLUSA carried out a baseline survey in July 2001 and every six months surveyed civil society organizations (CSOs) in order to determine the extent to which GAIT activities were able to meet their objectives. It is clear that they have carried out a significant number of activities, though the data is less than clear as to how that impact is measured.
4. Support for town meetings and other efforts at information sharing and question and answer sessions involving DAs are empowering events. An increased level of trust has developed within district assemblies about the goals of civic unions. Trust has also increased between civil society and district government. This has led to increased revenue generation, improved service delivery, prompter payment of user fees, and more transparency and accountability overall.
5. Facilitators have clearly had at least a short term impact on civil society capacity to engage district government. In at least one

GAIT district, a counterpart to the facilitator, a district assembly GAIT officer has (informally at least) been identified by the District Chief Executive (DCE) as a point of contact thus in the short run institutionalizing civic union-district assembly relationships during the CLUSA/GAIT period.

6. Organizational development and training activities have been made available to both civil society organizations and district assemblies at district, and to a limited extent, sub-district levels. Those interviewed have a positive view of these activities.
7. Some district assembly officials have noted that a major benefit from GAIT is that communities have come to better understand the rules and regulations and limitations of government. The GAIT program also has allowed the DA to interact (to a limited extent) with sub-district (area and zonal) structures on the ground.
8. CSO advocacy activities with the district assembly have started in a number of the original (first generation) GAIT districts. GAIT has been able to involve a number of organizations in dialogue with DA officials in order to raise concerns about local government and develop channels that can be used to ensure that civil society views are heard.

2.1.3. Overall, during the three years of GAIT activity, there has been increased sensitivity to and understanding of the need for advocacy and public, non-profit and private partnership cooperation on the part of both civil society and statutory bodies at the district level.

## **2.2. Issues**

2.2.1. Under GAIT, CLUSA's methodology is incremental. However, the end-goal of their activities is not entirely clear. What should the civic unions look like at the end of GAIT? What are the sustainability issues that they will face? This uncertainty makes it difficult to think about "graduation" or even a phased withdrawal. CLUSA needs to make clear its end of activity status, its "end game," as it approaches the third year mark of its three and a half year GAIT cooperative agreement.

2.2.2. Reporting under GAIT is somewhat problematic. Reports, such as the CLUSA baseline data results, give many numbers and list many activities, but there is not enough available information in terms of background and analysis. An important activity management issue is the amount of information collected under GAIT and the nature of the

reporting responsibilities. Reporting requirements need to be clear and balanced. In the preparation of reports there are two extremes: the mere listing of activities on the one hand and the production of large research style reports on the other. There are both minimal standards and a maximum overload beyond which material cannot be absorbed. Unanalyzed lists of activities are difficult for those not involved in the process to follow. CLUSA needs to work on the way that it analyses and reports on its activities. In future, measurement of impacts should be built into the activity itself on a realistic cost basis.

2.2.3. There are two sustainability issues that predominate with regard to the CLUSA methodology. First there is the issue of the facilitators who provide strong leadership and a high energy level. In the short run they are good value for money. In the long run it is doubtful that the facilitators' role can be maintained after the end of USAID support.

2.2.4. More broadly the institutionalization of new civic union structures is a sustainability issue. CLUSA does provide modest matching funds for the development of income generation activities for civic unions. This strategy should be encouraged and continued to be utilized, though again this will have implications in terms of post-program sustainability. Donors might be encouraged to see CUs as potential grantees or as contractors for services at the district level.

### **2.3. Prospective Recommendations**

This section is organized to fit within the framework of USAID's strategic objectives (SOs). There is considerable overlap in the recommendations, however, and where there is a nexus between government and civil society these issues are noted earlier rather than later.

2.3.1. Enhanced responsiveness of key governance institutions to citizens at the national level (SO 5 – Intermediate Result 1).<sup>3</sup> The goal here is to link up district and sub-district institutions with national governance processes. Under GAIT there have been examples of support for activities that connect district activists to their Members of Parliament (MPs) through visits to Parliament and other efforts to link MPs to their districts. Under this category, where feasible and of high priority, we recommend that these activities be continued and that efforts be intensified to:

---

<sup>3</sup> Reference is to USAID's Strategic Objectives (SOs).

1. Increase engagement of MPs in district assemblies where they are statutory members and to engage both MPs and regional representatives at the district level.
2. Link capacity building at national and district levels, including decentralized planning through regional and national development conferences, National Advocacy Committee on Good Governance (NACOG), etc. which would include MPs, DAs and national and district level NGO opinion makers.
3. Provide support for annual meetings between MPs and district representatives perhaps in town meeting sessions.
4. Sponsor candidate debates during the 2004 and 2006 elections.
5. Seek greater involvement of DA members and staff in educational support matters.
6. Work with MPs to increase community involvement on health and economic mobilization activities.
7. Consideration might be given to sharing this report with other donors for use of a donor retreat on support for decentralized governance and civil society in Ghana.

2.3.2. Strengthened district assembly capacity for democratic governance (SO 5 – Intermediate Result 2). There are a number of specific prospective areas of support to consider in the next phase of decentralized governance and civil society activities. These are:

1. Examine the extent to which the next generation of activity (post-GAIT) might provide some support for sub-unit statutory and non-statutory structures on a pilot basis, in terms of human and material capacity, as part of a self-help, bottom up strategy. If post-Gait activity is targeted at 25-30 districts then the answer is no. Activities should not be targeted at the sub-district level. If significantly fewer districts are targeted some sub-district activity may be advisable. Some districts are further along in terms of their thinking about sub-district structures.
2. Given the inability of a community to sustain activity after “graduation,” a three year time frame may not be reasonable for support to civic unions. One suggestion is to develop a strategy of phased withdrawal of the GAIT districts over a longer period rather than an abrupt ending of support.

3. Governance and advocacy strategies need to be sharpened. To what extent should next generation USAID support focus on supporting and utilizing local government structures, accessing local government officials, including capacity building for district government officials? The view in this report is that, as in GAIT, primary focus should be on those structures and processes where government and civil society interaction, cooperation and policy dialogue are likely to occur.
4. Heavy emphasis should be, where feasible, to link USAID efforts into the broader context of decentralization and civil society efforts in Ghana. The future cooperant should be encouraged to engage closely with other development partners engaged in this sector.
5. Where appropriate, there should be a focus on mediation and conflict resolution techniques vis-à-vis the interface between district assemblies and civil society.
6. There should be support for civic and public involvement in budget development and review processes at the district level. Revenues are said to be reviewed by the Budget and finance sub-committees and the Executive Committee, not the substantive statutory committees or civil society organizations. Developing a specific plan for targeting transparency and the deliberative process in terms of planning and budgets will need to address this issue.
7. Consideration should be given to the development of a specific sub-component of activity dedicated to the dissemination of information to and input from civil society. Focus should be on the proposed devolved composite budget process. Ultimately this budget is to include both district assembly activities and the deconcentrated budgets of government departments such as agriculture, health and education. The composite budget has not yet been implemented and even the timing of various budget cycles remains different. Efforts to support the development of the composite budget process should be consistent with Ministry of Finance existing guidelines. This could include specific program development work on best practice revenue generation systems, data collection, and the nature of user fees. This should include the establishment and maintenance of DA census database, including financial service delivery and revenue collection.

8. Accountability is based upon access to information. The media appears to be underutilized here. There is currently little opportunity for citizens or civil society groups to access information about the operations of district government. The post-GAIT cooperant should develop cost-effective ways to support information dissemination within district government including an exploration of the prospects for local government “one stop shops” for information dissemination to ensure public involvement on the nature of the budget, planning and tendering processes. This might include simple publications in civic union information centers in support of the new Freedom of Information Bill moving through parliament. A simplified information dissemination system could be part of a civic union office function.
  
9. Training and organization activity will need continued support. Technical skills remain very low at the district level in both district governments and civil society. Capacity needs include technical skills in non-profit management, basic business principles, basic accounting, contracts and tendering principles. During the post-GAIT activity, the cooperant should target capacity building in areas of local government administration which bridge and support district assembly and civil society interactions. Training support should be considered (based on a realistic needs analysis) in the following areas:
  - Civic union strategic planning activities, community interactive planning, public-private collaboration and simple rapid appraisal techniques, organizational development for district assemblies in local government administration including local government finance, training for committees and staff of DAs, including the dissemination of information, task based research and analysis, the role of the committee in the budget making process, committee response to community, leadership training, and information dissemination;
  
  - Program and project monitoring and evaluation, project design and proposal writing;
  
  - Grants management, proposal development, tendering and contracting out;

- Information dissemination including the dissemination of information, task based research and impact analysis; and
  - Technical support for those responsible for contracting out on the tendering process and on the functions of tender boards including support for transparency of the contracting out process.
10. An important district assembly target should be the finance and administration and other statutory sub-committees. Workshops and technical support on the role of sub-committees in gathering information, investigation and information transfer should be considered as well as support to involve civil society in the budget review process;
  11. Explore the idea of U.S. Peace Corps volunteer assignments to civic unions to serve as technical assistance agents (e.g. for database management), as mobilization agents, providers of technical assistance support for organizational development activities and proposal writing.
  12. Provide support for project design and implementation with national service persons or others to work with and perhaps to replace facilitators (as a bridging mechanism) as part of a GAIT or post-GAIT phased withdrawal;
  13. Consideration should be given for support of an activity to better incorporate women into district government structures.

2.3.3. Improved sectoral advocacy performance (SO 5 – Intermediate Result 3). Focus here is likely to be on the health, economic growth and agricultural development sectors. Possible areas of support include:

1. To the extent feasible, given the limited availability of computers, joint training activities on database management, budget, planning, interactive technology skills, and monitoring and evaluation for sector specialists should be made available to operational managers of intermediate and primary level civil society organizations as well as for district assembly officials and technical staff of DAs.
2. Continued support for the use of public forums for members and officials of district assemblies and the civic unions and their partnership activities.

3. Continued support for community wide civic engagement activities such as town hall and other public meetings. These are essential building blocks to democratic governance including the involvement of women in civic engagement activities.
4. Consideration should be given to allowing non-tendering civil society representation on tendering boards. This would require statutory changes which might be introduced either by government or through a private member bill.

2.3.4. Increased community advocacy for and contribution to quality education (SO 8 – Intermediate Result 4). The focus here is likely to be on community groups. These groups, and in particular the Parent-Teacher Associations, and School Management Committees, have a handbook which is well organized and clearly presented. Training in the use of this handbook should be continued. Specific proposed support activities include:

1. Support for strengthened civil society participation in District Education Oversight Committees (DEOCs) particularly involvement in the budget prioritization and approval process.
2. Education uses a rapid appraisal method called SPAM or School Performance Appraisal Meetings to draw up School Performance Improvement Plans. This is an area which should receive continued support during the post-GAIT period.
3. Exploration of the utility of District Education Planning Teams (DEPT) and DEOC oversight support and how it can be linked to social services and (where they exist) education sub-committees of the DA. This should be part of a needs analysis for the community involvement in the education sector which should be carried out as part of the next phase of activities in 2004.
4. Targeted for support should be DEOC, DEPT and interactions among key education stakeholders including support for the district assembly oversight processes in the education sector where they exist.
5. Involvement of civil society organizations in DEPT, DEOC and Department of Education (DOE) deliberations and monitoring and evaluation activities.
6. Support for School Management Committees in terms of oversight and policy debate.

7. Support for civic education engagement in the schools possibly involving the National Council for Civic Education or the National Advocacy Committee on Good Governance (NACOG).

### **3. Background to Current Activities**

#### **3.1. An Overview of Objectives**

3.1.1. USAID/Ghana is preparing to launch a new country strategic plan (CSP) for the period 2004-2010. Among the key cross-cutting themes in this CSP are decentralization and the role of civil society, local government in Ghana's social, economic, and political development and the potential for integrating USAID's education sector community based efforts into its Democracy and Governance activities.

3.1.2. An important partner in this effort has been the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA), which since February 1, 2001 has implemented the Government Accountability Improves Trust Program (GAIT). During the design of the CSP, the Mission expressed its interest in an assessment of GAIT.

3.1.3. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Ghana assembled a six person team (an assessment team) to assess its civil society/local government strengthening program--GAIT begun in February 2001.<sup>4</sup> The team worked between October 20 and December 1, 2003, three weeks of which were in-country from October 26 to November 15.

3.1.4. In addition to a retrospective analysis of GAIT, the team was mandated to assess the continued validity of the strategies underlying USAID's previously conducted and ongoing activities in the civil society and local governance area. The findings and recommendations of this assessment are designed to help the Mission plan its future assistance in this area.

#### **3.2. Background**

3.2.1. Throughout its history as a centralized state, in the colonial and post-colonial era, Ghana functioned as a centralized administrative state. Both during the colonial and in the post-colonial periods, education, health, infrastructure development and tax collection were primarily central government concerns. Local treasuries and administrative staff

---

<sup>4</sup> Previous DG assessments were conducted in 1994 (sector-wide), 6/20-7/30/1999 (Performance and Impact of DG SO4: "Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input"), Jan-Feb/2002 (USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Activities Impact on Political Change: 1994-2002); Oct-Nov/2002 (Ghana Decentralization Assessment). The Jan-Feb/2002 assessment covers activities through December 2001, but given that CLUSA/GAIT began on February 1, 2001, the assessment team focused most of its analysis on activities from 1994-2000.

for traditional authorities and councils came late in the colonial period. When it created elected district councils in 1948, central government nominated up to one third of the councilors to ensure traditional and moderate representation. This was a pattern which continued into the independence period and down until the present day.

3.2.2. Ghana during the colonial period had three separate historical, institutionalized patterns of governance. These were:

1. In the South, direct rule in the former colony area. Traditional leaders were used as government agents.
2. In the Central area (Ashanti), parallel rule with a strong hierarchical monarchy. There had been only limited colonial interference here.
3. In the North, indirect rule. Colonial administrators introduced administrative, judicial and financial structures early within traditional administrations.

3.2.3. The issue, as the Gold Coast approached independence, was the potential for federal or at least devolved regional and district structures demanded by the central Ashanti area, a demand rejected by Kwame Nkrumah, the first President of Ghana. The immediate local governance concern was the control of local fees due traditional leaders. As a result of the failure to create devolved local government, Ghana has been characterized by a highly centralized political system for the past 45 years.

3.2.4. Throughout the years that followed independence, there was no agreed upon definition of decentralization, and no common vision of a desirable end-state for decentralized government evolved. Historically, prior to 1985, most civil society organizations became disengaged from the state. The informal sector grew rapidly in the early 1980s, as the economic crisis deepened and drove Ghanaians to subsistence agriculture. Related self-provision activities stimulated a large scale “exit” from the formal economic sector and from governmental controls. Thousands of primary associations came to dominate associational life with trading networks coming to dominate in both rural and urban Ghana. Twenty-five years later, many, if not most CSOs are likely to remain disengaged from the state system for some time. Civil society organizations are important since many Ghanaians continue to place more faith in informal NGO networks than in official government channels.

3.2.5. Structural adjustment programs brought Ghana 5% growth during much of the 1980s and then slowed down after 1992. Free market economics was balanced by populist and anti-western rhetoric during the early part of this period. Ethnic tensions remained high through the 1990s, particularly in parts of the Northern section of the country.

3.2.6. By the early 1990s, the government austerity program was in trouble as the country approached elections. The economy was in decline and inflation was up. Foreign investment had declined. However, stock market gains had remained high. Capital gains and real production, on the other hand, were low. Privatization continued and by the mid-1990s the country's gold mines had been privatized and internationalized. In the last few years Ghana has enjoyed only modest economic growth.

3.2.7. For more than thirty years Ghana was characterized by periods of one party rule, weak civilian regimes and multiple military interventions. It was only after 1992 that Ghana began to move towards democratic governance. Following the 2000 elections, Ghanaians began to consolidate their democracy through responsive and decentralized political institutions.

### **3.3. Decentralization**

3.3.1. Since 1992, Ghanaians both in and out of government have discussed decentralization policies. To critics, support for decentralization in Ghana has been more vigorous in word than in deed. To those less critical, the decentralization exercise has been designed to be incremental, and based on the capacity of district authorities to take on new responsibilities. The Government of Ghana (GOG) says that it is concerned that there be adequate qualified personnel in place at all levels of government at the end of the decentralization process.

3.3.2. As part of the decentralization process, Ghana has identified the creation of a Local Government Service and a capacity building process that will strengthen district government, the establishment of a district level composite budget process that is transparent and participatory, the development of and institutionalization of arrangements for decentralized program implementation and the development of processes for partnership between district government and civil society organizations in the development planning process.

3.3.3. Several issues remain crucial to decentralization governance in Ghana. The first involves the creation of the Local Government Service and operationalization of the Secretariat. This will, as one district

assembly member noted, “dramatically change the district government system. Then, the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD) will be able to better control (in support of district government) staff directly assigned to district assemblies....”

3.3.4. A second issue, related to the above, relates to deconcentration of responsibilities to several of Ghana’s line ministries and the concern both in the districts and in the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development that there is a reluctance of national and regional level officials to accept the authority of district assemblies, DCEs and the District Coordinating Directors (DCDs). Decentralization from a sectoral perspective in reality has focused on administrative deconcentration rather than political devolution.

3.3.5. The third issue relates to the development of Composite Budgets. A composite budget is an integrated district budget system which synthesizes and harmonizes expenditure and revenue estimates of all the departments of the district assembly. The District Assembly Common Fund budgets need to be devolved to district assemblies and reviewed through the committee system of DAs. At the national level, there appears to be little interest in district level fiscal decentralization. All the central government control mechanisms are still in place. Nor are donors interested in this issue. While fiscal decentralization to district assemblies has been limited, districts have some funds where there is discretionary authority. These funds would allow for the introduction of decentralized budget systems. However, as yet district assemblies do not utilize the power and influence they have available to them.

3.3.6. Influence from the districts to the national government remains weak. Civic education is at a low level given the weakness of civic advocacy organizations. Decentralization in Ghana, as one district level respondent in local government put it, “is too much supply driven. Ghana governments, including the current one, have decided that this is a good way to go. However, decentralization may also increase the potential for corruption.” Some Ghanaian academic observers interviewed are not optimistic about the further institutionalization of decentralization as there is some resistance from within the civil service to political and even further administrative decentralization. In any event, there is unlikely to be much done before 2005, after the elections.

3.3.7. A fourth concern area relates to the development of partnerships between statutory and non-statutory bodies at district level. USAID since 1994 has been involved in the fourth program area of the National Decentralisation Action Plan, designed to promote the participation and deepen the association between district assemblies, civil society

organizations, private sector organizations, faith based organizations and traditional authorities. The establishment of district level civic unions, supported by USAID, seeks to enjoin district officials and district assemblies to interact with civil society organizations and to enable sub-district structures to be based upon popular participation to better articulate community needs.

3.3.8. It is important to keep in mind that decentralization requires reforms at both the national and the district level. One problem often noted with regard to sub-national government in Ghana is that there is only limited authority and funding given to district statutory authorities by the national government. There are too many unfunded mandates. DAs only have exclusive authority in the areas of sanitation, trash removal and waste management. Other delegated responsibilities include some infrastructure development, regulation of economic activities and tax collection. On the other hand, though district level authority is inadequate, there is some room for district level decision making in district assemblies. This existing authority is underutilized by district government.

3.3.9. Overall, the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development is seen by close observers to be very weak but at the same time inflexible about devolution, demanding more than can currently be managed. Under decentralization, development programs are intended to be a shared responsibility between government, district assemblies, civil society organizations, the private sector and communities. There are not clearly defined separate spheres of responsibility. District government authority has not been clearly defined though it is assumed that they should have direct responsibility for infrastructure development, the provision of local public services (water, sanitation and waste removal), the regulation of local level economic activities and income generation.

3.3.10. What has been created in Ghana is a system of mini-parliaments which in theory have wide ranging authority over all aspects of government but in fact have actual distinct authority over almost none. What was required was a mode of decentralization which established specific discrete (not shared) responsibility for local government that ensures separate statutory authority over certain areas that is not shared between central and local government. Following from this, there needs to be resolution of the non-democratic pattern of appointing 30% of the DA members, the proscription of party identification at district level as well as having an appointed District Chief Executive. Overall, what is needed in Ghana, according to one advisor on decentralization, is government reform not promises of devolution.

### **3.4. Program Background**

3.4.1. USAID support for decentralized governance and civil society evolved out of the STEP program (Supporting the Electoral Process Project). The International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) began providing support for the electoral process in Ghana in 1994. On July 1, 1997 USAID, through its cooperant IFES, began support for “Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level.” (ECSELL).

3.4.2. ECSELL’s objectives were to strengthen civil society at the grassroots, to increase civic advocacy, and improve the responsiveness of district assemblies to community needs. It had as its primary objectives to:

1. Increase the capacity and effectiveness of civil society organizations to shape public policy within a more competitive political process
2. Increase civic advocacy.
3. Improve the responsiveness of district assemblies.
4. A fourth objective was added prior to the 2000 elections: to improve the quality of political debates for parliamentary candidates contesting the year 2000 elections in 20 of Ghana’s parliamentary constituencies.

The ECSELL project worked in 20 districts throughout Ghana (2 districts in each of ten regions of the country) and employed a field team of 20 participant observers, as well as the Accra-based project staff, who conducted training sessions, organized auxiliary meetings, provided technical assistance to CSOs and local government, carried out extensive monitoring and evaluation, and administered a modest grants component.

3.4.3. The activities to achieve the above objectives were originally designed as a two-step process. First was a series of training workshops that took place between the end of 1997 and the end of 2000. The two-day workshops included training in the areas of:

1. Structure and function of local government, the role of civil society in a democracy, and preparation for meeting CSO or local government counterparts.

2. Attitudes and behaviors in support of democracy, team building and collaboration among CSOs, and an enabling environment to enhance CSO/DA communication and common problem solving.
3. Strategic planning, resource management, and linking CSOs/DAs.
4. Financial management and proposal writing skills.
5. Preparation for grant program, set up joint civil society/DA grant making mechanisms.

3.4.4. The second step was to give the newly trained CSO and local government officials a chance to practice their skills via a small-grants program. IFES was to set up joint CSO/government boards in each of the districts in which the activity functioned and grants were to be vetted by this board and included matching funds from the district assemblies themselves.

3.4.5. There was some disagreement between IFES and USAID at the time of implementation of the second phase of the project over the small grants component. This was a function of what USAID viewed as IFES' concentration of grant money targeted at general community development and economic growth oriented projects and not Democracy and Governance (DG) specific activities. For their part, IFES believed that they had communicated their intentions from the start of the activity and further had represented the broad nature of the grants to project participants. There appears to have been mixed messages sent and the issue of grants and the use of sitting fees, both attributed to ESCCELL, linger during the current activity period. In the end, IFES implemented a more restrictive grant-vetting process that targeted DG specific activities. As one senior cooperant coordinator in ESCCELL put it, "we appeared to be changing the promises made during mid-stream."

3.4.6. The activity was closed at the end of March 2001 after having been funded at the level of 1.9 million U.S. Dollars for the period of the activity. In the districts where ECSELL operated there is now only limited awareness of the activity. The shift in cooperant, relatively early into the civil society support activity, because it was accompanied by a change of philosophy and methodology, meant that there was some loss of activity impact, and the identification of USAID as the support agent, between the ESCCELL and GAIT periods. This sort of dislocation is almost inevitable when there is a pre-mature disengagement of the sort which IFES/ESCCELL represents.

### **3.5. The Current Program**

3.5.1. Support for decentralized governance began more than six years ago. However, prior to 2001, the impact of this activity was limited. A second phase of support for decentralized governance and civil society support began on February 1, 2001 under the title, “Government Accountability Improves Trust” (GAIT). The GAIT grant largely continued the work of the “Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level” (Project ECSELL), implemented by IFES since July 1, 1997. The new cooperant was the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA). The activity is scheduled to end in July 2004.

3.5.2. The overall goal of GAIT is to strengthen civil society and district governance. CLUSA identified its methodology as assisting communities to take responsibility for the management of their local resources and community public services. The organization, which is part of the U.S. based National Cooperative Business Association (and founded more than 80 years ago), identifies self-help, self reliance (bootstraps) as the basis of economic empowerment and self-governance.

3.5.3. GAIT initially was funded for a two year period and was extended for a further eighteen months in December 2002. CLUSA’s stated goal with regard to Democracy and Governance (DG) is as follows: CLUSA support for local governments should include strengthening of public service management capabilities to enhance the ability of local government to mobilize resources and to promote dialogue between civil society organizations (CSOs) and local governments (LGs) and the communities each serve.

3.5.4. There have been variations in GAIT strategies, objectives and approaches in the twenty GAIT districts as reflected in the various district strategic planning workshop processes. CLUSA sees its activity as demand driven and asserts that the goal is the involvement of large numbers of citizens in the governance process. Its methodology is self-described as bottom up. CLUSA’s overall priorities in its approach to Democracy and Governance are self identified as 1) expansion of advocacy roles in civil society organizations and the creation of civic unions. (Its CUs do not give grants); 2) LG accountability and transparency; 3) more efficient service delivery; 4) enhanced revenue collection; 5) a political culture of citizen participation.

3.5.5. As part of its strategy, CLUSA/GAIT replaced the participant observers with young, well educated facilitators who became the foundation of the program in the districts where they operated. Five out

of the 30 selected are women. The specific activity objectives identified in CLUSA's Ghana project included the following in 2001:

1. Increase the capacity of Ghana CSOs to advocate the interest of their members to local government.
2. Increase government responsiveness to citizens at the local level.
3. Promote transparency, accountability and anti-corruption in local governance institutions.
4. Increase voter turnout and political participation of CSOs at all levels of government.

3.5.6. The long term goal is increased capacity for advocacy within civil society. Though these objectives changed slightly over time they continue to represent, in broad outline, CLUSA's overall concerns.

3.5.7. These objectives mirrored those of the ECSELL activity with an added dimension – concern for transparency, accountability and anti-corruption at the local level. The GAIT first generation of activity occurred in 8 of the 20 districts that ECSELL worked in and GAIT used similar (though modified) organizational and training techniques to pursue the project's objectives.<sup>5</sup> These included:

1. CSO capacity building training in strategic planning and management.
2. Promotion of formal CSO networking through support for civic unions in each of the ten project areas and networking between civic unions around the country.
3. Support for town meetings that brought together civic union members, district assembly representatives, and citizens to express concerns and air various community issues.
4. The provision of modest matching grants to CUs.

3.5.8. The shift from ECSELL to GAIT was not smooth. In several districts where IFES ECSELL operated, CLUSA/GAIT had to in part either start over or significantly restructure the civic union.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ten districts were added in January 2003 including a former ECSELL District, Nadowli. This makes a total of 20 districts targeted to this point under GAIT.

3.5.9. In 2002, CLUSA/GAIT received \$50,000 from the USAID's Health program, provided to organize health fairs (at market days) to heighten awareness of health prevention issues. This pilot activity might have illustrated the potential for sector buy-ins to Democracy and Governance support activities, an option currently under active consideration by USAID education sector specialists. Little was done by USAID Ghana or CLUSA to capture this pilot experience however.

3.5.10. In part, the focus of this assessment is to determine the extent to which the USAID Mission concurs with the bottom up strategies in the current GAIT strategy and wishes to continue these priorities under the new country strategy (2004-2010). Additionally, it will consider the breadth and depth of the intervention, sectoral versus regional focus, ideal levels of activity (district, sub-district, regional), and institutions and structures that merit more attention in the mission's strategy.

## **4. The Assessment Report**

### **4.1. Timeframe and Methodology**

4.1.1. The assignment began on October 20 with five days of preparatory work by the team leader in Washington, DC. Members of the team were available for research and analysis from October 27 through November 14. An inception report was submitted to USAID Ghana on October 27. An oral briefing and a draft report were delivered on November 14 and the final report was to be delivered on December 8.

4.1.2. The assessment team sought baseline data of USAID supported efforts for the last three years as delivered by the Cooperative League of the United States of America (CLUSA). Baseline data was to be analyzed within the context of the efforts made by USAID Ghana for the six years prior to the current time frame (1994-2000). A limited amount of data was provided by CLUSA on November 20, 2003. The data purports to show that all targeted results have been more than completed. However, in examining the data, the team found it difficult to determine empirically how the data was gathered. Better reporting of the methodology used in gathering the data would have helped. What can be said is that significant activity has taken place in all GAIT districts during the life of the GAIT program. USAID Governance and Advocacy strategies need to be sharpened through a needs assessment process which is built into the activity. Measurement of impacts should be built into the activity itself on a realistic cost basis and reflected in the performance monitoring plan. This is an activity that might be handled by a foreign service national in the mission.

4.1.3. The limited available baseline data has been complemented and supplemented by interviews and focus group sessions with key stakeholders within USAID Ghana, CLUSA and the Government of Ghana (GOG), district authorities and district level civil society stakeholders in a representative sub-grouping of districts supported by the program with selected interviews, to allow for comparison with information from control districts not currently involved with the activity.

4.1.4. The overall concern which has guided this assessment is the search for a balance between statutory and civil society organizations as democratic governance in Ghana evolves. The majority of councilors are elected through a democratic process. Civil society organizations also represent community based interests. Both statutory and non-statutory bodies are part of the building blocks of democratic

governance. In order to meet the goals of the USAID Mission in both assessing existing activity and planning for the future, the analysis here is divided into two parts – a retrospective analysis which evaluates past performance of USAID supported activities under GAIT, and a prospective analysis which makes recommendations on future priority period under the new country strategic plan.

4.1.5. It should be noted that the numbers of targets and targeted activities involved in GAIT are a factor in assessment. Large numbers make it difficult to measure impact. Methodologically rigorous pre- and post-testing or baseline analysis takes time, energy and specialized knowledge and extra resources that may impact upon available resources and were beyond the scope of this assessment. Smaller numbers make impact measurement less problematic. It is essential that in future, analysis of the impact of activities be built into the program itself.

4.1.6. Ultimately, given the restraints of time and resources, the assessment team opted for a basic methodology that included qualitative stakeholder interviews, focus groups and rapid appraisal techniques supplemented by an analysis of USAID and cooperant reports and data. There were several factors in determining the extent to which the team sought qualitative as opposed to quantitative data and considers the possibilities of a small “n” limited in-depth sample of districts. Focus groups were targeted to consist of 5-6 people but ranged from less than four and up to fifteen people. Proposed interview targets, where available, were identified as follows:

1. District Level – Statutory

- District Chief Executive
- Presiding Member of District Assembly
- District Coordinating Director
- Chief Financial Officer
- Chief Planning Officer
- Chief Budget Officer
- District Education Oversight Committee Member
- Health Management Team Head
- Member, Social Services Sub-Committee
- Members who profile the make up of assemblies – at least one woman, one younger member, two appointed including at least one traditional member
- Representatives of line ministries: DEO, DAO, DHO
- Other significant stakeholders identified in the field

## 2. Civil Society – Non-Statutory

- Trade and Professional Associations
- Producers Cooperatives
- Farm Based Organizations
- Faith Based Organizations
- Women’s and Youth Organizations
- USAID/CLUSA supported civic unions
- District based intermediate NGOs
- Other significant stakeholders identified in the field

## 3. National and Washington Offices

- IFES – Washington
- CLUSA – Washington
- USAID Ghana – Director, Deputy Director, Program Officer, Team Leader, SO Team Heads, DG Team
- Other Donors- DANIDA, CIDA
- NGOs – CLUSA, IBIS, National Coalition on Good Government and others identified in Accra
- Government – Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Director (or representatives)
- International Decentralization Advisor

4.1.7. Targeted Districts – USAID supported cooperants, first IFES and then CLUSA, established district level programs as follows: IFES in 1998 established programs in 20 districts; CLUSA in 2001 established 10 district programs and a further 10 district programs were introduced in 2003 with a total of 20 districts through the life of the program. In this assessment the following districts were targeted for interviewing:

### CLUSA/GAIT Districts:

- Kassena Nankana (Upper East Region)
- West Mamprusi (Northern)
- Berekum (Brong-Ahafo)
- Afigya Sekyere (Ashanti)
- Suhum (Eastern)

### Control/IFES (non-GAIT) Districts

- Gomua (Control) (Central Region)
- Soga Kofe/South Tongu (IFES/Edu.) (Volta Region)

### New GAIT Districts

- Builsa (Upper East)<sup>6</sup>
- Jaman (Satellite) (Brong-Ahafo Region)

### **4.2. Deliverables**

The following deliverables were committed to under this activity:

1. An inception report which provides the detailed methodology for the study.
2. An oral briefing to the Mission on major findings of the team.
3. Draft written report;.
4. Final report.

---

<sup>6</sup> Interviews were conducted in all of these districts except for logistical reasons Builsa District was substituted for East Mampusi.

## **5. A Retrospective Examination of CLUSA/GAIT Activities**

### **5.1. The GAIT Methodology**

5.1.1. The assessment team sought to determine the nature of the impact and measure the effectiveness of the GAIT Program. The overall goal of GAIT has been to promote a partnership between district assemblies and civil society in Ghana. The cornerstone of CLUSA's activity has been the selection of facilitators for each target district and the support or establishment of civic unions which link together primary civil society organizations (CSOs) at the district level. CLUSA has sought to assist district assembly officials and members and to assure them that civic unions would be non-confrontational and supportive and would focus on CSO goals for the deepening of respect for citizen rights and responsibilities.

5.1.2. There is a self-serving strategy from within district assemblies that has defined statutory/non-statutory relationships at the district level. As one observer in a non-GAIT district put it, "The DA should involve CSOs in the decision-making so that CSOs will go along with decisions made and will not resist them." However, in this district, according to interview sources, the DA often has been unwilling to invite civil society groups to budget discussions and in general does not consult with civil society groups.

5.1.3. Because of this challenge, initially at least, GAIT tended to focus on the establishment of a one way information flow from district assemblies to civil society. This is despite a concentration of technical support on civic unions. DAs share their views with civil society but remain less willing to allow civil society organizations to share their views with district authorities. Are they equal partners in the district development process operating on a level playing field? And given that only district assemblies have (at least in part) an electoral base to what extent should they be? In over half of the districts surveyed there remained problems or tensions between civil societies and district government. Though progress has been made, civil societies are not yet full partners with district level statutory bodies.

5.1.4. At the beginning of the GAIT project, CLUSA identified four strategic objectives: 1) increased capacity of CSOs to advocate the interest of members; 2) increased local government responsiveness to citizens at the local level; 3) improved governance, transparency and accountability in local government; and 4) increased voter-turnout and political participation of CSOs. In its December 2002 extension

proposal, CLUSA modified their goals in order to increase the capacity of civil society organizations to 1) identify and achieve their own specific objectives; 2) advocate the interests of their members to local government especially with reference to health, education and economic growth; 3) increase local government responsiveness to citizens at the local level; and 4) promote transparency and accountability in local government. In effect they appear to have dropped their first objective and added the concern for transparency and accountability (new objective four).

5.1.5. Based on observations in the field, and a review of project documents, the assessment team identified three clusters of CLUSA activities:<sup>7</sup>

1. Confidence Building Activities:

- a. Concern here is to build rapport with the district assembly members and officials. These confidence building activities include establishing rapport with and become involved with DA concerns and problems and to assist DAs in the achievement of their stated goals. Initially, the facilitator visits several assembly meetings, assists at efforts at revenue mobilization (and by inference tax collection,) and undertakes public relations activities for the DA administration.
- b. Support for revenue mobilization appears to have been one of several important confidence builders. One official noted GAIT support for “Revenue collection Re-sensitivity.” With regard to the promotion of tax collection (or as it is often referred to in Ghana – revenue mobilization), several district officials claimed an increase in revenue collection as a result of GAIT/civic union support (a 30% increase in one district). Another DA official noted, “They [CUs] help us to find money. GAIT makes us to understand we have a common voice” with regard to tax collection.
- c. Revenue mobilization support has been provided in almost all GAIT districts. GAIT begins by organizing a workshop with the district finance office for revenue collectors and then sponsors public meetings in support

---

<sup>7</sup> Clustering activities in this way helped the team to get a better sense of the nature of activities that were on-going on the ground. This breakdown is not inconsistent with the objectives stated by CLUSA in their various reports.

of tax collection. This was part of a national effort. Districts then were encouraged to draw up action plans for revenue improvement. Trucks and vans were then sponsored which went around villages to campaign for payment of taxes as part of a development strategy. Almost all districts have supported district assembly efforts to collect taxes. Districts have appreciated this. However, this strategy could backfire if the public perceives that the tax system is unfair and/or wasteful. It should also be borne in mind the very limited resources that local tax payers have at the district level. There is a very low resource base for significant revenue generation.

d. There is also concern to increase citizen awareness of civic issues, reduce tension between civil society and district level government institutions, and undertake confidence building activities directed at the community level to stimulate self-help activities. Specific examples include:

- Organizing town or community meetings
- Public promotion of revenue mobilization
- Organize briefings on security issues
- Sponsoring of self-help activities
  - waste collection
  - sanitation efforts
  - market and litter clean up<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Organizational Development, Support and Training Activities:

a. This includes in new districts the establishment of civic unions or, where they exist, the strengthening, restructuring and/or restoration of civic unions. These activities include the identification and enrollment of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and the registration of civic unions with the district authorities. civic unions are associations of CBOs that function as intermediate or umbrella organizations at the district level. Supported by GAIT, a few CUs have taken the first steps toward the identification and establishment of sub-civic unions and sectoral sub-committees. Sub-CUs in some cases appear to double as (or at least are largely

---

<sup>8</sup> It should be kept in mind that some of these events might occur naturally.

made up of) self help units.<sup>9</sup> Sub-CUs as community based structures have not yet been exploited.

b. GAIT organizes several training events a year. The CLUSA facilitator organizes training activities in the district. Training opportunities are made available to civil society organizations (as well as training for CLUSA district facilitators) and for the district assembly. At the district level, CLUSA facilitators do some of the more general training and have gone through training of trainer programs. Outside consultants are hired to conduct more specialized training workshops. Examples of these activities include:

- Strategic Planning workshops including the definition of CU purpose and functions, advocacy, group network creation and maintenance;
- Financial management skills including revenue collection, and workshops on the budget process;
- Revenue mobilization training;
- Governance including the nature of local government, workshops on elections, and transparent government;
- Organization development including proposal writing, leadership skills, basic accounting, and record keeping;
- Budget and financial management training; and
- Training in strategic planning methodologies.

3. Pre-Advocacy Activities – civic unions, through GAIT have set up town forums, statutory/non-statutory meetings and workshop events, and seek to disseminate governance information. CLUSA aspires to have specific community forums on specific issues such as education and health. These are only in the

---

<sup>9</sup> The team had some trouble identifying the nature of sub-civic union groups. They appear to have developed for different purposes in different districts and this influenced the way that they have begun to become institutionalized. If a strategy is proposed to focus on the sub-civic union level, a better understanding of the nature and purpose of these groups will be needed.

beginning stages in first generation GAIT districts. Major pre-advocacy goals include:

- a. Linking up statutory and non-statutory bodies at the district level.
- b. Attempts to include DA members and technical officials in workshops.
- c. Encouraging CU and civil society interaction with district assembly political and administrative leadership.
- d. Establishing a process to support district assembly transparency in terms of district finances, budgets and plans.

5.1.6. Civil society leaders join the CU for a mixture of reasons. Some have economic interests, while others want to know about government or the tax system. Still others see the CU, at least in part, as a social organization. According to one respondent, “If you live in town, you must join so you can benefit from the advantages of being a part of the group.” There are some leaders who want more information about government. According to another respondent from a civil society organization in the central part of the country, “I wanted to know about the DA and in the past month since I joined, they have had two programs on what the DA does. The civic union helps me to better understand district government.”

5.1.7. Linked to the above, CLUSA sees three stages to its involvement in district governance. The first stage is the animation stage, where there is intense involvement aimed at building trust. The second stage is facilitation where the focus is on organizational development and capacity building. The final stage is a consulting stage, where CLUSA officials are available as needed. In this last stage, CLUSA plans to withdraw its facilitator to part time involvement in two or three districts in a circuit rider model. This strategy will need to be incorporated into a phased withdrawal of facilitators from the districts.

5.1.8. Interviews suggest that CSO leaders see the civic union as a vehicle to both inform and communicate with district assemblies and, through GAIT, seek training for district assemblies and staff in order that they may be more responsive to their organizations. At the sub-structures level, area, zonal and unit committees are invited to GAIT supported training activities including training in local government systems and citizen participation in local government as well as to

increase their own organizational capacity. In a few districts, there were public hearings on the district medium term development plan, and on the 2003 budget.

## **5.2. GAIT Achievements**

5.2.1. The level of discourse on associational life is higher in the GAIT districts than in the non-GAIT control districts the assessment team visited and an awareness of civic rights and responsibilities is being created. The role of the facilitators in sensitizing and publicizing the process has been critical. Overall, the GAIT program has made a very good start in the districts where they are working. The new aspiring civic unions are beginning to have an impact on community life and a level of trust has started to develop between civil society and district government. As one source noted, “After the initial friction and skepticism from the DCE, the DCE is now very receptive to any ideas from the GAIT office.”

5.2.2. In the GAIT districts relationships between district government and civil society have improved. According to one District Chief Executive, he is able to “call on GAIT and get the tailors, barbers, and artisans to meetings.” Another respondent noted, “The CU provides us an opportunity to help our groups and community, e.g. an awareness of roles functions and responsibilities of the district assembly and the role that the DA plays in community development.” GAIT also has, in the short period of time that it has been active, done much to stimulate civil society organizational development at the district level.

5.2.3. An assessment close to the beginning of the GAIT activity suggested that among the first steps to be taken “there needs to be a mix of awareness building activities, support for district assembly networking and lobbying, and [in-country] technical assistance and training to increase local revenue generation and improved service delivery capacity at the district level.” GAIT effectively has done much of this.

5.2.4. A caution is in order. The gains realized are fragile, and if no efforts are made to maintain links to existing GAIT districts in the coming strategy period, these gains will likely be lost with the CUs dissolving in most districts. A more realistic period of engagement needs to be thought out that allows for phased withdrawal as districts meet certain benchmarks. USAID’s expectation of what has been achieved under GAIT needs to take into account the types of groups that exist at the district level.

5.2.5. During the almost three years of GAIT activity specific achievements include:

1. There is an increased awareness of government policy, and government processes after training has occurred. A major difference over the last three years is that in a number of districts the DA is better able to engage with civil society. As one district official put it, “GAIT has been good. It provided helpful workshops on leadership, DA functions; we had visits to Parliament, workshops on management skills, communication skills; with the civic union we are able to come together and solve problems and now we can propose things to the DA. The DA sees the civic union as an advisor.”
2. GAIT has begun to approach the finance and administration committees and has tried to involve CUs in both budget review and planning meetings. Getting district budgets presented in public has been a major achievement of GAIT. This process has just begun though the process is impeded because the government’s budget cycles are not in harmony.
3. There were many in civil society focus groups who felt that the DA had become more transparent about fund management and budgetary processes as a result of GAIT. In a number of districts, the DA promised that it would share the new district plan with civil society organizations.
4. The civic union in most districts is a vehicle that can meaningfully engage the DA. One of the effects of GAIT has been a better understanding of the access process to district administrations. Before the establishment of CUs, it was not clear how to approach the DA. This is no longer the case in the GAIT districts. As one civil society leader noted, “GAIT helped us to know how to approach people in local government.”
5. Support for town meetings and other efforts at information sharing have occurred. Question and answer sessions are empowering events. GAIT sponsored town meetings are judged a success in many districts. According to one DCE, “It has not been easy to organize a community Durbar [village meeting] but with GAIT’s help it’s been easier and it gives us opportunities to engage communities.” GAIT’s role as an honest broker in organizing town hall meetings and people’s assemblies should not be underestimated.

6. An increased level of trust has been developed within most district assemblies about the goals of civic unions.
7. Facilitators have clearly had at least a short term impact on civil society capacity to engage district government. In at least one GAIT district, a counterpart to the facilitator, a district assembly GAIT officer has (informally at least) been identified by the District Chief Executive (DCE) as a point of contact thus at least in the short run institutionalizing civic union-district assembly relationships during the CLUSA/GAIT period.
8. Organizational development activities have been made available to both civil society organizations and district assemblies at district, and to a limited extent, sub-district levels.
9. Some district assembly administrators have stated that a major benefit from GAIT is that communities have come to better understand the rules and regulations and limitations of government. The GAIT program also has allowed the DA to interact with sub-district (area and zonal) structures on the ground.
10. CLUSA carried out a baseline survey in July 2001 and every six months has surveyed CSOs to determine the extent to which GAIT activities were able to meet their objectives. It is clear that they have carried out a significant number of activities, though the data is less than clear as to how the impact of these activities is to be measured.
11. CSO advocacy activities with the district assembly have started in a number of the original (first generation) ESCCELL/GAIT districts. GAIT has been able to involve a number of organizations in ways to raise concerns about local government and channels that can be used to get civil society concerns heard. The goal of one CU included the campaign for the construction of public latrines, clinics and the provision of water.

5.2.6. Overall there is increased sensitivity to and understanding on the part of both civil society and statutory bodies at the district level for advocacy and public, non-profit and private partnership and cooperation.

### **5.3. Issues and Concerns**

5.3.1. It is important to understand the kind of CSOs that exist at the district level. There are most often not the democracy and

governance/human rights focused groups that some might imagine there are. Instead, they tend towards economic associations (hairdressers, tailors, chop bars, farmers association, etc), professional associations (GNAT, CSA, Nurses), self help associations (that often can be very similar to farmers associations), religious groupings (choir groups, women's ministries), and a few organizations that represent disadvantaged groups (blind, disabled).

5.3.2. The district level associations are made up of people with little primary education. GAIT has done well in the incorporation a cross section of these groups in civic unions. Aspirations based on models of civil society expect that more of one kind of grouping being represented may fail to recognize the reality of what is on the ground in Ghana. The basic reality that exists at the district level must be recognized. Most people are exclusively concerned with bettering their economic situation. Linked to this, one must then have realistic expectations of the time scale for building meaningful engagement of these groups given their starting point. There must be recognition of the difficulty of the operating environment. This said, one must have a realistic expectation about group affiliation to CUs a realistic time scale for GAIT engagement and on what it takes to build meaningful relationships with grassroots civil society groups.

5.3.3. According to one development partner interviewed, who was knowledgeable about GAIT, there was both admiration for the courage USAID had in tackling civil society concerns and a sensitivity with regard to the GAIT methodology through which it seeks to develop civil society largely based on an aspiring entrepreneurial class membership. This is a challenging set of goals. If one targets associational life at too low a level than one is likely to miss what the development partner labeled "an aspiring middle class," more likely to be found (if at all) in regional capitals and larger towns. At this point CSOs, of necessity, focus on service delivery and economic opportunity. Civil society in Ghana has not moved beyond a "union" stage in the economic sense and some village level organizations are likely to be susceptible to patron-client relationships. As a result, their advocacy capacity remains very weak.

5.3.4. Most students of associational life suggest that democracy requires a stable middle class membership in civil society groups, a situation which does not yet exist in Ghana. For this reason, some argue that for civil society to develop, donor technical assistance should focus on existing social and human rights organizations in the larger urban areas. In Ghana, an alternative approach to civil society practiced by another donor was to work with more organized district and regional

level civic organizations (“meso level” organizations) that have clear goals, some capacity and can act as intermediate units to support grassroots advocacy. GAIT has decided not to work in urban areas and the absence of an aspiring rural middle class has led to the creation of civic unions in the districts where it works. In the view of this assessment, despite the risks of targeting too low, the GAIT approach offers a bold methodology to support entrepreneurs and professionals at the district and sub-district level.

5.3.5. Turning to the civic unions, there are differences in the organizational levels of the various CUs in terms of sub-district penetration and the extent to which stakeholder groups and committees have developed as counter-parts to district assembly sub-committees. GAIT district stakeholder committees on education, health, and economic growth, seem for the most part to be in the early stages of development. Most of them see their role as information sharing.

5.3.6. GAIT takes an empirical and very incremental approach to sub-committees, seeing a need to organize them in order to know what to do in a particular situation. These are very early days. It is not always clear as to how CU sub-committees interact with civic unions. Only in one district visited, were there active sub-committees in health and education. Where there are active sub-committees of the CU, the members tend to be primarily professionals from the organizations represented on the sub-committee. These members sometimes find it difficult to differentiate between the general work of the CU and the specific work of the sub-committee and the work of the individual members in their jobs.

5.3.7. Most of the members of CUs have serious resource concerns for their own organizations and are struggling to access means of support to make them viable. Some attention must be given to this. While the future program will most likely not be able to give direct support to these organization, there must be recognition of this problem with some time and effort given to help organizations access other support funds while recognizing that the building blocks of the CUs remain weak. They are in the early stages of development as organizations and this is one of the factors that contribute to the fragility of the civic unions.

5.3.8. Civic unions do not have access to financial resources. While CLUSA does not have a grants program for CBOs, they do have a modest matching grants policy in support of GAIT supported civic unions. The purpose of the matching grants is to support financially self-sustaining activities. At the time of the assessment, ten small matching grants have been made (all less than \$1000.00) totaling

\$2,635.00. This strategy for supporting civic unions should be encouraged and consideration should be given to the expansion of this support in latter phases of USAID Democracy and Governance activities.

5.3.9. In discussions with civil society leaders it was clear that some did not understand the way that local government worked, how the common fund was set up, and the utility of taxes – seeing them as a direct loss on the part of the individual with no gain for the community. In the views of many of those interviewed in several districts, the staff and the members of the DA still did not consult civil society on most issues. These issues will need to be addressed in future activities.

5.3.10. Civil society continues to express concern about the openness of district assembly members and staff. As one CS leader noted, the DA needs training on how to relate with civil society. Another put it more bluntly, “Assemblies need training.” According to another source, “They [DA’s and Civil Society] have to work in tandem with each other.” Ensuring cooperation between district assemblies and civil society still requires a great deal of work.

5.3.11. The assessment team has identified a number of specific concerns with regard to GAIT activities. Many of these are beyond the immediate influence of CLUSA and rest on broad governmental efforts at decentralization. Others focus more directly on CLUSA/GAIT activities. The assessment team’s concerns can be divided into three parts: decentralized governance, civil society, and CLUSA/GAIT issues.

#### **5.4. Decentralized Governance**

5.4.1. Capacity building and human resource development efforts in district government are at the beginning stages. Staffing of local government is a severe problem in Ghana. There are only one or two professionals in each organizational unit and in several districts vacancies are more than 50%. Local government departments have no resources, no computers, and no capacity to undertake comprehensive strategic planning or to train their staff. There are no recognized standards for capacity building. All the donors have different methods and goals. There is no way to measure skills. The capacity of members and officials remains low in the districts visited, though assembly members and their staff do receive standardized orientation training sponsored by other donors and organized by the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Local Government. This is a major concern, but it is largely beyond GAIT control. Broad efforts are being made to address

these concerns through the National Decentralization Action Plan (NDAP).

5.4.2. Following from the above, there is a need for both a needs analysis and a substantive training plan for district level capacity building. To this point, district strategic planning exercises tend to be broad and generic. There is a lack of local institutional partners and agents especially in terms of capacity building for local government. The NDAP advocates and supports this process and USAID might consider supporting this laudable effort.

5.4.3. There remains within civil society a residual concern that some in district government see civic unions as focusing primarily on watchdog, whistle blowing activities. In a few districts there remained a certain amount of tension between CUs and DAs. In one district, a district assembly informant said, “We have not had a very good start. We felt uncomfortable with the civic union at first.” Both assembly members and technical staff have expressed concern that they avoid confrontational meetings. In some cases district assembly members and administrators may remain suspicious of CUs. According to civil society sources, district assembly members and officials are not always willing to attend and participate in GAIT sessions. A climate will need to be created at the district level for the acceptance of the increased advocacy that is likely to occur as a result of sustained support for civil society.

5.4.4. The majority of the CUs visited find DAs to be less open than they would like them to be. The DAs by contrast seem to be impressed by the CUs. This is most likely because the bulk of the CU activities to date have been ones that serve the needs of the DA such as revenue collection, clean-up, etc. While the DAs have only begun to respond to the concerns of the CUs in a limited way, district officials still do not see local government primarily as a service provider.

5.4.5. To reiterate, there continues to be tension between civil society and district government in a number of GAIT districts. According to one civil society source, “District government is not easily approachable. The District Chief Executive intimidates people by screaming at them.... The civic union has not attended any decision-making activities in the district assembly.” As another civil society leader has noted, “People have problems with the DA-the DA does not like to attend questions and answers, town meetings, or any meeting that is seen as [even potentially] confrontational.” In the control, non-GAIT districts civil society is perceived as particularly distant from statutory bodies and the

relationship of civil society groups to district government is much more passive.

5.4.6. Much remains to be done in ensuring planning and budgeting transparency. At this stage, civic union and CSO leaders seek to review plans and budgets in advance rather than have active involvement in the planning and debate process. Most first generation civic unions have held public budget hearings. This is an appropriate strategy given the newness of CUs.

5.4.7. District budgets are small with only limited program money. Most of the budget targets salaries, utilities, maintenance and construction. However, the autonomy or discretionary authority which is available is not always utilized by district officials. While it is true that district government lacks sufficient authority and fiscal resources to initiate and implement policies and programs, it is also the case that district statutory bodies do not always utilize the power and influence available to them. This is an area where GAIT and post-GAIT support for decentralized financial management skills could prove very useful.

5.4.8. Any discussion of local revenue mobilization must take into account the limited resource base from which the proposed revenue gains will be drawn and a recognition that the economic situation of the various districts varies significantly. If there is expectation of serious revenue mobilization increases, it might be worthwhile to make an effort to project at what level individual districts are at now – for example 60% of revenue collected may, or may not be possible. Mechanisms need to be developed to determine what sort of gains can be realistically expected in local government revenue collection.

5.4.9. It is not clear how much effort GAIT has devoted to the involvement of other district assembly sub-committees in the budgetary process. Sectoral sub-committees of DAs, except the finance and administration sub-committee, continue have little access to and input into the budgetary process. This is an area where post-GAIT support could be helpful.

5.4.10. In some cases, technical officers in deconcentrated departments<sup>10</sup> are not well informed on the nature of civic union activity while in others they are very responsive. The oversight committee in health has no involvement by civil society members. Both are seen as (and function as) technical committees. While the District Education

---

<sup>10</sup> These are ambiguously referred to in Ghana as decentralized departments thus exacerbating the understanding of the term.

Oversight Committee (DEOC) has civil society membership, officials on the committees suggest that their influence is often limited.

5.4.11. In terms of education, the social services and education sub-committees of the DA discusses issues such as membership of School Management Committee (SMCs) and Parent-Teacher Association (PTAs) and school enrollment. Members suggest the sub-committee also functions as a mobilization group to communities in the area of education. They target the community level input rather than the district assembly. Education officials see the GAIT activity as supportive of their efforts since civic unions are able to call communities together. As one official put it, “Every term at the end of the term there needs to be a Durbar to sell education in the district. GAIT is helping to organize Durbars. Access to communities through Durbars is very important to us.”

5.4.12. The DEOC works through the DCE and his/her executive staff. It has no direct relationship to the social services sub-committee which in the districts visited has not invited the DEPT or the DDE to meet them. In the view of the DEPT membership in one district the social services sub-committee is not working; in other districts the sub-committee appeared overwhelmed.<sup>11</sup> DEOC concerns include enrollment and community outreach. Grassroots structures such as PTAs and SMCs are not fully functional and while there is a district level association of PTAs and SMCs they are seen as not working by many of those interviewed in the target districts. They do not often send a representative to other district committees.

5.4.13. Most importantly, there needs to be a clarification of district assembly responsibility for the provision of public services and there needs to be more clarity on specific rather than shared responsibility for district assemblies. At issue remains the extent to which central government has a meaningful commitment to significant “load shedding” to local government as part of the decentralization process. This all takes place against the backdrop of limited discretionary funds available to DAs to undertake real development plans and limited opportunities for significant gains in local revenue mobilization. The budget process has not yet been decentralized. A major constraint on district authority is the low resource base of the rural population and the inability to generate revenue.

---

<sup>11</sup> Some districts have formed separate sub-committees for health and education to address problem.

## **5.5. Civil Society**

5.5.1. There was some discussion within the team as to whether, in some districts, the membership of civic unions might be too narrow. This was a view presented in an earlier assessment of USAID democracy efforts in Ghana. One team member felt that there appeared to be a predominance of professional associations<sup>12</sup> (teachers and nurses) and commercial networks, including small scale business people and that this may have long term governance implications. It is a fact of life in rural Ghana that there are few active grassroots social and human rights organizations compared to economic groups in CUs and it is likely at this stage that they cannot develop at the district and sub-district levels. Gender groups, physically handicapped, youth groups, and social development foundations appear to be at the beginning stages. In future, where these social groups exist, they may be priority targets for training and organizational development efforts. As has been noted above, however, CLUSA/GAIT needs to deal with the reality of the districts on the ground and in the view of the team there is an adequate social base for the civic unions in the targeted districts. All of the members of the assessment team agreed that USAID in post-GAIT civil society activities should not artificially create new social organizations.

5.5.2. There remains only a limited understanding of the nature of local government and the way local government works among the membership of CSOs. Civil society members do not always distinguish between district assembly members and technical staff nor do they understand the responsibilities of the DCE and DCD. Such issues as the relationship between members and technical officials and the sensitive issue of appointed as opposed to elected members were both noted by CSO representatives. In one district, the district assembly officials did not appear to know who were elected or appointed members sitting in a meeting with the assessment team. Following from this, there is not a clear distinction made in some districts between district assemblies and district administration.

5.5.3. Both advocacy and transparency and accountability are important concerns and ultimately the goal is to ensure input from civil society organizations to local government. While in some GAIT districts progress has been made, this remains more an aspiration than an achievement within the GAIT districts.

---

<sup>12</sup> There is a dilemma with regard to the professional associations. In some districts active CU members come from GNAT and other professional bodies. While they bring much to the table, the danger is that they will be transferred to another district, and this will result in a great loss to the CU.

5.5.4. Civic unions have undertaken the preparation of District Strategic Plans for Accountability and Transparency (DISPATs). These came out of Stakeholder Strategic Planning Workshops (SSPWs). At issue is the extent to which DISPATS have become operational within civic unions. SSPWs tend to be broad and generic in their findings and not entirely operational. Nor does there appear to be an adequate monitoring of their work, leading to the appearance of non-operational activities appearing in their plans.

5.5.5. The GAIT district stakeholder committees (on education, health, economic growth) all are, where they exist, in their early stages of development. Their role seems unclear with the majority seeing the committees playing an information-sharing role with their fellow CU members on the sectors that they are covering. They do not seem to play any real monitoring function of these sectors nor do they engage with the de-concentrated department. It may be some time before such engagement is possible and this must be linked to the CU members themselves seeing this as a desired objective. Those interviewed see their role as playing an education/information sharing function.

5.5.6. Given the different histories within the districts, it is not surprising that there are different levels of achievement among the CLUSA/GAIT districts visited, particularly their ability to engage statutory bodies in policy discussions.

## **5.6. CLUSA/GAIT**

5.6.1. Some memory was lost because of the activity name change and support activities when the project was changed from ESCCELL to GAIT. It might be wise to try to avoid a name change from GAIT to something else at least for “public domain purpose,” as the shift is made in 2004 to a follow on activity. Within the current activities there are some problems of identification between GAIT, and the civic union and the methodologies behind GAIT;

5.6.2. CLUSA’s methodology is based on a “bootstrap approach” which is incremental and open ended. At issue is the extent to which strategic planning can be incorporated in this process and the extent to which the USAID Mission is comfortable with this incremental process. As an earlier assessment has put it, CLUSA’s method is “long-term and ripens gradually.” An observer of GAIT has put it, “CLUSA’s bootstrap approach is gradual, time consuming with a slow burn out rate but it is also open ended.” The end-goal of their activities is not entirely clear. What should the civic unions look like at the end of GAIT? What are the

sustainability issues that they will face? This uncertainty makes it difficult to think about “graduation” or even a phased withdrawal. CLUSA needs to make clear its end of activity status, its “end game,” as it approaches the third year mark of its three and a half year GAIT cooperative agreement. An important issue is the extent to which USAID is willing to accept the incremental approaches and small successes in the DG area without a clear vision of end of activity goals.

5.6.3. CLUSA/GAIT numbers can be somewhat confusing and the amount of data available to the assessment team was limited. In one example, the numbers registered for hearings at three GAIT meeting on the development plan were said to be 4,130 participants, 5,946 people and 259 people respectively. These seem to be large numbers but it is not clear with these kinds of numbers that anything could happen in such a meeting but for people to listen to officials.

5.6.4. Baseline and impact analysis is important and some information is available. Attention needs to be given by the cooperant to ensure a better analysis of and measurement of the impact of its activities during the last part of the project. Reporting requirements should include analysis as well as a mechanistic reporting of activities.

5.6.5. Reporting, data gathering and data analysis under GAIT is somewhat problematic. Reports give many numbers and list many activities but there is not enough in terms of analysis. An important activity management issue is the amount of information collected under GAIT and the nature of the reporting responsibilities. Reporting requirements need to be clear and balanced. Two extreme positions are the mere listing of activities on the one hand and the production of large research style reports on the other. There are both minimal standards and a maximum overload beyond which material cannot be absorbed. Unanalyzed lists of activities are difficult for those not involved in the process to follow. A strategy to measure impact and a methodology for reporting it should have been part of the CLUSA scope of work.

5.6.6. CLUSA has a story to tell. It needs to clearly put forth that story including its methodology in a manner that is accessible, realistic and manageable. It is clear that CLUSA is willing to expand their methodology and is open to new approaches. Given this, its efforts need to be accurately and clearly documented and not exaggerated either in writing or in discussions. In one district the facilitator appeared to exaggerate CLUSA’s impact and took credit for activities that were clearly sponsored by other organizations. The CLUSA story should include the success of its health fair activities supported by the USAID

health sector and other experiments that have been tried during the last three years.

5.6.7. Given the limited time involved, and the disruption that occurred because of the change of cooperant, efforts in district level governance and civil society support remain limited if more than at the pilot stage of activities. With less than a year left in the current cooperative agreement, focus should be on bringing along those districts where efforts are just beginning. Following from this, planning needs to begin now to ensure a smooth transition to the new set of activities scheduled to begin in 2004.

5.6.8. There are two sustainability issues that predominate with regard to the CLUSA methodology. First there is the issue of the facilitators who provide strong leadership and a high energy level. In the short run they are good value for money. A number of the facilitators placed by CLUSA into the districts appeared to be and were portrayed as very active. In one case a senior district official described the facilitator in his district as “outstanding.” There is a dilemma with regard to the facilitators. They have been one of the driving forces behind the high level of activity in each district to date and have played a critical role in building the relationship with the DA. However, the challenge is to come up with a way for them to gradually withdraw and have someone within the CU step up and fill their shoes. The difficulty is simply that the CU does not have the potential to support someone to work in such a capacity full time, (and at the pay level of the facilitator) and it is unlikely that someone living in the district would have the free time available to volunteer for such activities. In some cases, there may be a professional (i.e. civil servant of some sort, or a teacher) who is under-employed in their current position and so may be able to devote such time. However, where most active members are farmers it is hard to imagine that they will be able to consistently find the time to devote for this type of activity. There is also a danger that the facilitators, though Ghanaians, may appear to be outsiders with no links to existing CSOs, undermining CLUSA’s claim to a bottom up strategy.

5.6.9. In terms of sustainability, facilitators are expensive (\$6,000 per year), with two assigned to second generation districts. The maintenance of two facilitators (post-activity) at this cost is clearly not sustainable. The question is can GAIT build adequate capacity in a two to four year period sufficient to institutionalize and sustain district government and civil society engagement. The issue of capacity and sustainability should be addressed in USAID post-GAIT activities.

5.6.10. More broadly, the institutionalization of new civic union structures is an issue. CLUSA does provide (or can provide) modest matching funds for the development of income generation activities for civic unions. This capacity should be explored and utilized though again this will have implications in terms of post-program sustainability.

5.6.11. There remains some misunderstanding of the nature of GAIT. Despite attempts by CLUSA to clarify the issue, there is a perception by many CSO members and leaders that CUs can or should give grants or loans. It should be emphasized that GAIT operates in a difficult environment and has done a remarkable job of supporting civil society and governance activities in a relatively short period of time. Nonetheless, the failure of GAIT to provide mini-grants and expense money for meetings remains a sensitive issue.

5.6.12. Within GAIT, it is not clear to what extent there is an expressed concern to address gender issues in terms of decentralized governance. There needs to be some attempt to capture gender issues and better disaggregate them. At issue is the extent to which GAIT should target a portion of its support expressly for gender issues, in terms of training, membership, leadership development for women in both district assemblies and civic unions, as well as in terms of professional staff within district assemblies. Is this a subject for civic education and support within schools? Should there be a sub-committee of the district assembly which focuses on gender (or children's) issues? These are issues which should be addressed as part of the planning for post-GAIT activities.

5.6.13. GAIT satellite programs have not gotten off the ground yet. The one satellite we visited does not have a CU or any kind of umbrella organization and CLUSA/GAIT has only begun to work with the district assembly and sponsored a few meetings. According to one technical officer from the DA, "An awareness of the DA functions has been provided to the public and as this continues the members of the DA could both help and be helped in the GAIT activities." It might be considered that the satellite activities are a "bonus," achieved at low cost. However, given the lateness of the GAIT project cycle, and the pressing needs in the 20 existent programs, it may not be wise to pursue the satellite option at this point until the model is better thought through. Ultimately, given the short time period left on the cooperative agreement, priorities will need to be set judiciously and strategically.

## **6. Prospective Recommendations**

### **6.1. Overview**

6.1.1. Between 2004 and 2010, USAID intends to provide a broad spectrum of support to civil society and local government in selected districts throughout Ghana. The purpose is to increase the capacity to sustain and improve deliberative democratic processes. Activities in the post-GAIT period will include a series of awareness building activities, combined with capacity building support for civil societies in order that they can network with and lobby district government and training and technical assistance for district government in areas of revenue generation, budgeting, strategic planning and cross-sector support particularly in the education sector.

6.1.2. There are several donors including DANIDA, GTZ, DFID, CIDA and UNDP which support local government, governance and/or civil society development. This noted, it is important to place decentralized governance and democracy as supported by USAID in a broader context. All USAID cooperants, present and future, should be required to engage closely with other development partners involved in this sector.

6.1.3. There is an overall issue with regard to sub-district (zonal, area and unit level) support that should be noted in some detail. There is some support within GAIT for activity at these levels within civil society and within sub-districts. Yet it is not clear to what extent sub-district structures can be made viable as levels of government at this juncture. Most DAs cannot pay basic expenses for sub-district structures such as salaries. The problem with supporting sub-districts is that district level government may be so weak that it cannot interface with sub-district bodies and there is no funding to strengthen them. This suggests that primary focus should be on district assembly level capacity until they are up and running though, perhaps in conjunction with other donors, the door should be left open to support, on an experimental basis, the development of sub-district institutions and processes.

6.1.4. There may be some opportunity to link some meso-level human and social rights CSOs with CU activities into sub-district structures in collaboration with other donors. This would not require significant training, but rather can be focused on emphasizing the process of engagement and can be modeled on basic town meeting style activities that would occur at the sub-district level.

6.1.5. The issue in large part is one of breadth versus depth. The choice is between broader country wide coverage and more geographically focused and in depth, institution based (and perhaps) more cost-effective coverage moving from regional level down through district, area/zonal and unit levels. Ultimately, at issue in terms of district government is whether sub-structures at area, zonal and unit levels, are viable at this juncture. Empowering sub-district government structures and CBOs is likely to require some form of financial support/sustainability mechanism since many are farming and trading groups which focus on income generation rather than advocacy. At sub-district levels, district assemblies cannot even afford to pay basic expenditures, such as salaries.

6.1.6. Linked to this is possible concern for the initiation of too many activities in a short period of time and whether this can dilute institutionalization of efforts. CLUSA already supports a great many activities in the districts where it operates, and does so, on demand, and to some extent, on an ad hoc basis. While this kind of flexibility is laudable it is not always clear what the strategic goals are. The number of activities and targets (large and small) affect the ability to measure impact. Given the enormous need and the limited resources, it is vitally important that priorities be set in the use of funds during the new activity period.

6.1.7. There remain differences both within civil society and district government over a clear definition of decentralization and the implications of deconcentration versus devolution at both central and to a lesser extent district levels. There remains much to be done to identify an end status with regard to local-central relationships. In addition, district assembly members and officials may not always have a clear understanding of civil societies and the way they function.

6.1.8. There will need to be training for both district assemblies and civil society in the principles of governance and civil society. In addition, there will be specific modules for financial, administrative and technical capacity. In order to do so, however, there will need to be a systematic assessment of district government capacity. Such an exercise is planned, but as yet it is not clear when and how district assemblies will be assessed in terms of capacity. USAID should consider support for this assessment to be sponsored by a consortium of development cooperants.

6.1.9. Financial self-sufficiency will be important for civic unions over the next several years. CUs like most civil society organizations in Ghana do not have the capacity to write proposals in order to generate funding. Nor do most have the capacity to implement or bid on program

or project activities. An appropriate area of support (post-GAIT) could be in the areas of grants management, proposal development and contracting out.

6.1.10. Given the need for public access to information on local government activities, consideration should be given to the development of a specific sub-component dedicated to the dissemination of information to and input from civil society input to the proposed devolved composite budget process, the medium term expenditure system, the use of various funding mechanisms, and the formula for distribution to district government. The composite budget has not yet been implemented and even the timing of various budget cycles remains different. However, DAs are not at this stage “mini-parliaments.” There is no clear control over sector budgets, hiring or dismissal authority. Efforts to support the development of the composite budget process should be consistent with Ministry of Finance existing guidelines. This could include specific program development work on best practice revenue generation systems, data collection, and the nature of user fees. This should include the establishment and maintenance of DA census database, including financial service delivery and revenue collection and in conjunction with standards understood by and bought into by donors.

6.1.11. Accountability is based upon access to information. There is currently little opportunity for citizens or civil society groups to access information about the operations of district government. With regard to the proposed new legislation requiring access to information, the districts are not prepared to or capable of giving out such information. There will be a strong need for an information desk at the district assembly or in the civic union to provide the rapid access to information which appears envisioned under the freedom of information bill. USAID should consider whether or not support for freedom of information and civic education should be a part of its decentralized governance activities.

6.1.12. In order to assist the Mission in its planning, observations and recommendations here are addressed, as they relate to each of the four intermediate results strategic objectives that are likely to be of concern to USAID activity over the next three to six years with regard to the provision of a broad level of support for decentralized governance and civil society. Given the problem of identification of the GAIT program and the loss of identification that occurred at district level in the transition from ESCCELL to GAIT, as noted above, it might be wise to try to avoid a name change from GAIT to something else at least for “public domain purpose,” as the shift is made in 2004 to a follow on activity.

## **6.2. Strategic Objectives.**

6.2.1. There are four strategic objectives that will be addressed in the remainder of this report. They are:

1. Enhanced responsiveness of key governance institutions to citizens at the national level;
2. Strengthened district assembly capacity for democratic governance;
3. Improved sectoral advocacy performance; and
4. Increased community advocacy for and contribution to quality education.

6.2.2. Enhanced responsiveness of key governance institutions to citizens at the national level (SO 5 – Intermediate Result). The goal here is to link up district and sub-district institutions with national governance processes. Under GAIT there have been examples of support for activities that connect district activists to their MPs through visits to Parliament and other efforts to link MPs to their districts. In the post-GAIT period, activities will be designed to seek regional and district level input into national level deliberative processes and specifically to engage MPs and regional representatives in district level deliberations.

6.2.3. It is important to understand the limited engagement of MPs in district affairs and the difficulty that this implies for USAID's concerns in this strategic objective. Given this limited engagement the goal in future should be to work towards opportunities where they offer themselves. Given the other priorities for future governance activities it may not be realistic for a future grantee to engage MPs directly for decentralized governance activities. For the legislative specialist at USAID to promote MP involvement in districts on top of all the other activities that are being undertaken in Parliament will also be difficult.

6.2.4. Under this category, where opportunities present themselves, we suggest that national level activities be continued and that, if feasible and of high priority, efforts be intensified to:

1. Increase engagement of MPs in district assemblies where they are statutory members and to engage both MPs and regional representatives at the district level.

2. Provide support for annual meetings between MPs and district representatives perhaps in town meeting sessions.
3. Link capacity building at national and district level through regional and national development conferences that include MPs, DAs, national and district level NGO opinion makers.<sup>13</sup>
4. Work with MPs to increase community involvement on health and education.
5. Consider using civic unions as non-partisan vehicles to support electoral debates during the 2004 and 2006 elections and to request that the cooperant at the time support these activities (similar to those which occurred in 2000). GAIT and its successor program can play a positive role in mediating the political environment at the district level.
6. At the national level, the National Advocacy Council on Good Governance (NACOG) was constituted in 2001 to aggregated interests of the 10 civic unions in the GAIT program districts. There may be some potential for the development of national-district level linkages through modest support for NACOG.
7. Consideration might be given to sharing this report with other donors for use of an inter-donor/cooperant retreat on support for decentralized governance and civil society in Ghana.

6.2.5. Strengthened district assembly capacity for democratic governance (SO 5 – Intermediate Result 2). There are a number of specific prospective areas of support to consider in the next phase of decentralized governance and civil society activities.

1. Civic union strategic planning activities, community interactive planning, public-private collaboration and simple rapid appraisal techniques, training for committees and staff of DAs, including the dissemination of information, task based research and analysis, the role of the committee in the budget making process, committee response to community, leadership training, and information dissemination.

---

<sup>13</sup> This was suggested by a district Chief Executive suggested that GAIT should sponsor an annual district development conference which involved both civil society and district government at the regional level. This might lead to a National Regional Development conference with an equal mix of civil society and statutory representation.

2. Organizational development for district assemblies in local government administration including local government finance.
3. Training for committees and staff of DAs, including:
  - The dissemination of information, task based research and analysis, the role of the committee in the budget making process, and committee response to community;
  - Program and project monitoring and evaluation, project design and proposal writing;
  - Proposal development, grants management, tendering and contracting out; and
  - Information dissemination including the dissemination of information, task based research and analysis,
4. An important district assembly target should be the finance and administration and other statutory sub-committees. Workshops and technical support on the role of sub-committees in gathering of information, investigation and information transfer. It is essential to involve civil society in the budget review process.
5. Explore the idea of U.S. Peace Corps volunteer assignments to civic unions to serve as technical assistance agents (e.g. for database management), mobilization agents, technical assistance support for organizational development activities and proposal writing.
6. Provide support for project design and implementation with national service persons or others to work with and perhaps to replace facilitators as part of a GAIT or post-GAIT phased withdrawal.
7. The post-GAIT cooperant should develop cost-effective ways to support information dissemination within district government including an exploration of the prospects for local government “one stop shop” for information dissemination to ensure public involvement on the nature of the budget and planning process. The role of the district information/public relations officer should be examined in this connection. Information dissemination might include simple publications in civic union information centers in support of the new Freedom of Information Bill moving through parliament. A simplified information

dissemination system could be part of a civic union office function.<sup>14</sup>

6.2.6. Improved sectoral advocacy performance. (SO 5 – Intermediate Result 3). Focus here is likely to be on the health, economic growth and agricultural development sectors. Possible areas of support include:

1. To the extent feasible, given the limited availability of computers, joint training activities on database management, budget, planning, interactive technology skills, and monitoring and evaluation for sector specialists, district assembly officials and technical staff of DAs, along with operational managers of intermediate and primary level NGOs located in district.
2. Support for the use of public forums for members and officials of district assemblies and the civic unions.
3. Continued support for civic engagement activities such as town hall and other public meetings. These are essential building blocks to democratic governance.
4. Continued support for the mobilization for revenue collection by CUs and training for revenue staff. It is important to provide civic union leadership with information on the nature of the tax and expenditure system.
5. Among skills needed, the management of contracts and tendering boards was mentioned. CSOs are not members of tender boards though it has happened that CU members have bid and won government tenders. The role of CSOs in ensuring transparency in contracting is an area worthy of investigation and capacity building support. Technical support should be provided for contracting out and the tendering process and tender boards including support for transparency of the contracting out process.
6. Given the inability of a community to sustain activity after “graduation,” a three year time frame may not be reasonable for support to civic unions. One suggestion is to develop a strategy

---

<sup>14</sup> Consideration might be given to support for tele-cottages, and simplified push button (computer based) programs, including interactive software. The LOGON model (Local Government On Line) includes “One Stop Shopping” for information on local governance includes simple publications, posters, public information presentations; simple software programs designed to demonstrate basic principles of governance, the use of advocacy, information rights, the functioning of district government bodies and administrators and the functioning of committees.

of phased withdrawal of the original GAIT districts rather than an abrupt ending of support.

6.2.7. Increased community advocacy for and contribution to quality education. (SO 8- Intermediate Result 4) Within the education sector there is a clear need to provide support for community involvement through Parent-Teacher Associations and School Management Committees. The question is how? One answer would be to begin the support process with a needs analysis on the importance of (and nature of) community involvement in education matters at the beginning of the new USAID activity in 2004. In most districts, there is little civil society influence over education bodies including DEOC which is mandated to provide oversight on both infrastructure projects and personnel decisions. At best, the education sector committees can play an information-sharing role.

6.2.8. The focus here is likely to be on support for community groups. These groups, and in particular the Parent-Teacher Associations and the School Management Committees, have a handbook which is well organized and clearly presented. Within the education sector there is a clear need to provide support for community involvement through Parent-Teacher Associations and School Management Committees. The question is how? One answer would be to begin the support process with a needs analysis on the need for and nature of community involvement in education matters at the beginning of the new USAID activity in 2004.

6.2.9. In most districts there is little civil society influence over education bodies including DEOC which is mandated to provide oversight on both infrastructure projects and personnel decisions. At best, the education sector committees can play an information-sharing role.

6.2.10. Possible support activities include:

1. Support for strengthened civil society participation in district level education institutions including the District Education Oversight Committees (particularly involvement in the budget prioritization and approval process).
2. Exploration of the utility of DEPT and DEOC oversight support and how it can be linked to social services and (where they exist) education sub-committees of the DA.

3. Targeted for support should be DEOC, DEPT and interactions among key education stakeholders including support for the district assembly oversight processes where they exist.
4. Involvement of civil society organizations in DEPT, DEOC and DOE deliberations and monitoring and evaluation activities.
5. Support for School Management Committees in terms of oversight and policy debate.
6. Determine the need to support for district level PTA/SMC associations.
7. Strengthen the grants process to education support structures, statutory and non-statutory, through Democracy and Governance activities.
8. Provide advocacy training for education support structures, statutory and non-statutory.
9. Support for civic education engagement in the schools possibly involving the National Council for Civic Education or the National Advocacy Committee on Good Governance.
10. Education uses a rapid appraisal method called SPAM or School Performance Appraisal Meetings to draw up School Performance Improvement Plans. This is an area which should receive continued support during the post-GAIT period.
11. Undertake activities to encourage greater involvement of DA members in educational support matters.

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix One

### Acronyms

| <u>Name</u>  | <u>Acronym</u> |
|--|----------------|
| Canadian International Development Agency                    | CIDA           |
| Civil Society Associations                                   | CSA            |
| Civil Society Organization                                   | CSO            |
| Civic Union  | CU             |
| Community Based Organizations                                | CBO            |
| Cooperative League of the USA                                | CLUSA          |
| Country Strategic Plan                                       | CSP            |
| Danish International Development Association                 | DANIDA         |
| Democracy and Governance                                     | DG             |
| Department of Education                                      | DOE            |
| District Agriculture Office                                  | DAO            |
| District Assembly  | DA             |
| District Chief Executive                                     | DCE            |
| District Coordinating Director                               | DCD            |
| District Director of Education                               | DDE            |
| District Education Office                                    | DEO            |
| District Education Oversight Committee                       | DEOC           |
| District Education Planning Team                             | DEPT           |
| Department of Foreign International Development              | DFID           |
| District Health Office                                       | DHO            |
| District Strategic Plans for Accountability and Transparency | DISPAT         |
| Enhancing Civil Society at the Local Level                   | ECSELL         |
| Ghana National Association of Teachers                       | GNAT           |
| Government Accountability Improves Trust                     | GAIT           |
| Government of Ghana  | GOG            |
| German Technical Assistance                                  | GTZ            |
| International Foundation for Electoral Systems               | IFES           |
| Local Government   | LG             |
| Local Government On Line                                     | LOGON          |
| Member of Parliament   | MP             |
| Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development           | MLGRD          |
| National Advocacy Council on Good Governance                 | NACOG          |
| National Decentralization Action Plan                        | NDAP           |
| Non-Governmental Organization                                | NGO            |
| Parent-Teacher Association                                   | PTA            |
| School Management Committee                                  | SMC            |
| School Performance Appraisal Meetings                        | SPAM           |
| Stakeholder Strategic Planning Workshops                     | SSPW           |
| Strategic Objective  | SO             |

Supporting the Electoral Process Project  
United Nations Development Programme  
United States Agency for International Development

STEP  
UNDP  
USAID

## Appendix Two

### Persons Consulted<sup>15</sup>

#### Washington and Accra

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Jim Alrutz        | Regional Director for Africa, CLUSA  |
| Ellen Asante      | Assistant Accountant, CLUSA  |
| Emmanuel Boateng  | Accountant and Administrator, CLUSA  |
| Joseph R. A. Ayee | Dean, Faculty of Social Studies, University of Ghana   |
| Thomas C. Bayer   | Director of Programs, International Foundation for Electoral Systems                         |
| Sharon L. Cromer  | Mission Director, USAID Ghana  |
| Robert Foote      | Decentralization Coordinator, Canadian International Development Agency, Accra, Ghana        |
| E. Gymah-Boadi    | Executive Director, Ghana Center for Democratic Development                                  |
| Tracey Hebert     | Democracy and Governance Program Officer, USAID Ghana  |
| Matthia Z. Naab   | Country Representative, International Republican Institute                                   |
| Robert G. Nsiah   | National Coordinator, FIT  |
| Albert Nyarko     | Results Package Manager  |
| Anthony Owusu     | Principal Rural Planning Officer, Planning, Budgeting and Monitoring and Evaluation Division |
| Kwame O. Bonsu    | Coordinator, Decentralization Secretariat  |
| Susan L. Palmer   | Senior Prog. Officer, International Foundation for Election Systems                          |
| Fred Pappoe       | Senior Prog. Officer, Danish International Development Agency                                |
| Steffen Rasmussen | Country Director, IBIS- Danish Solidarity and Development Org.                               |
| Papa Sene         | Chief of Party, Ghana, CLUSA   |
| Stephen Snook     | Former Ghana Representative, IFES  |
| Hans van Rijn     | DANIDA Advisor to Decentralization Secretariat   |
| Jenny Walker      | Program Quality Manager, Catholic Relief Services, Ghana                                     |

#### West Mamprusi District

##### Local Government

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Baba Zakaria      | District Finance Officer                 |
| Musah Issah       | District Coordinating Director           |
| Amadi Abduf Karim | District Chief Executive                 |
| Mahama Osman      | Chairman, Social Services Sub-committee  |
| Zakari Iddi       | Secretary, Social Services Sub-committee |
| Kande Ibrahim     | Member, District Assembly                |
| A.B. Mahama       | Member, District Assembly                |
| Yahaya Mu-azu     | Member, District Assembly                |
| Abusalam Fuseini  | Member, District Assembly                |
| A.B. Mahama       | Teacher (GES), DEOC member               |
| Dan Balagwor      | GES, DEOC member                         |

---

<sup>15</sup> Either by interview or through focus groups. Those listed are representative of Civil Society members met.

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Adam Amadu    | Ghana Health Service, District Health Mgt. Team          |
| S. Sofu Abu   | Disease Control Officer (GHS), District Health Mgt. Team |
| Gabriel Gakpo | Accountant (GHS), strict Health Mgt. Team                |

Civil Society

|                      |                                |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Issah Munhammed      | GAIT Facilitator               |
| Seth B. Imoro        | Member, Gbimsi Sub-Civic Union |
| Pauo Dukunigu        | “                              |
| P.W. Gumah           | “                              |
| Tia Fusheta          | “                              |
| Alberta H. Lamisi    | “                              |
| Rachia Lamisi        | “                              |
| Cynthia Abagali      | West Mamprisi Civic Union      |
| Issifu Mumuni        | “                              |
| Issifu Mohammed      | “                              |
| Zaza Abudo           | “                              |
| Eunice Salifu        | “                              |
| Haruna Abubakari     | “                              |
| Esther Lariba Tubiga | “                              |
| Adam A. Abass        | “                              |
| Yamusah Abdulsalam   | “                              |
| Alhassn Zakaria      | “                              |
| Sulley Jacob Jubuni  | “                              |
| Nii Takie Welbeck    | “                              |
| Wahabu Iddrisu Tanko | “                              |

**Kassena Nankana District**

Local Government

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| George Danyani    | District Chief Executive                             |
| Abdul Karim Seidu | Budget Officer                                       |
| Cosmos Yanori     | District Finance Officer                             |
| Mary Kay Atigre   | (GHS) Acting District Public Health Director         |
| Edgar Draha,      | District Deputy Director of Agric                    |
| Phillip Agamba    | Acting District Director of Education,(GES)          |
| E. Chegeweh       | Chairman Works sub-committee, elected AM             |
| Philip Babachuweh | Chair Agric committee, elected AM                    |
| Helen Vorodam     | Chair for women and children committee, appointed AM |
| Andrew Abase      | Chair sub-committee on health                        |
| Stephen Akwulpwa  | Chairman, District Education Planning Team (DEPT)    |

### Civil Society

|                      |                                   |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Jonathan Avogo       | GAIT Facilitator                  |
| Rebecca Attaguba     | MOCASS Civic Union Secretary      |
| Sajage A. Braimah    | Member MOCASS                     |
| Babere Knseh         | Assistant Secretary of MOCASS     |
| Patrick B. Ayirekeli | Assistant organizer of MOCASS     |
| Millicent Adateke    | President and Treasurer of MOCASS |
| Ben R. Bagnatu       | Patron of MOCASS.                 |
| Francis Kwayire      | Member of MOCASS                  |
| Juliet Kose          | “                                 |
| Alex Njonah          | “                                 |
| Phillip Owtawang     | “                                 |
| Idrissu Aisha        | “                                 |
| Beatrice Lulati      | “                                 |
| Sanjage Braimah      | Coordinator, MOCASS               |
| Andy Murphy          | NCRC, Bolgatanga                  |

### **Builsa District**

#### Local Government

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| James Argarlic    | Chief Executive                                       |
| Ibrahim Alhanssan | District Coordination Director                        |
| William Ateng     | Assistant Director, Finance & Admin., GES             |
| Kweku Anangah     | District Finance Officer                              |
| Wallace Azuntaaba | Deputy District Director, Ministry of Agriculture     |
| Cletus Atuk       | AM Planning subcommittee                              |
| Thomas Alonsi     | AM Justice and security subcommittee                  |
| Nab Afuiang       | AM works  |
| Umaru Salifu      | AM, environment and health                            |
| Timothy Alhanssan | AM works  |
| J. H. Akanpatulsi | Presiding Member, and Chief Regional Planning Officer |

### Civil Society

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Raymond Danso      | GAIT Coordinator      |
| Esther Antwi Adjei | Member of Civic Union |
| George Addo        | “                     |
| Moses Darko        | “                     |
| Daniel Quayenortey | “                     |
| Alfred L. Sackitey | “                     |
| Gladys Ansah Kumi  | “                     |
| A.K. David         | “                     |
| David Tetteh       | “                     |
| Stephen Narteh     | “                     |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Josephine Koram   | “ |
| Sarah Opukuwa     | “ |
| Hodzi Dade        | “ |
| Benjamin Adjei    | “ |
| Esther Nartlay    | “ |
| Seth Youngson     | “ |
| Thomas Awenseba   | “ |
| Francis Ampawar   | “ |
| Matilda Atim      | “ |
| Jacob Atambila    | “ |
| Anabiem Ayidibey  | “ |
| Cecilia Azantilow | “ |
| Lamisi Patrick    | “ |
| Ferdinand Afoko   | “ |
| Richard Alandu    | “ |

### **Brong Ahafo District**

#### Local Government

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Kwabena K. Yeboah | District Chief Executive   |
| N. Asante-Darko   | District Coordination Director                                   |
| George Osei-Poku  | District Planning Officer  |
| Edward Acquaye    | District Engineer  |
| Evans Dankyira    | “  |
| George P. Mensah  | Deputy District Chief Executive                                  |
| Simon Kofi Yegoah | District Assembly Member, Works Sub-Committee                    |
| Emmanuel Vandyke  | Acting District Director of Health                               |
| Nana Osei Kumi    | District Assembly Member and Chair of works Sub-Committee        |
| I.K. Agyei        | Presiding Member District Assembly                               |
| Nana Osei Antwi   | District Assembly Member and Chair Social Services Sub-Committee |
| Stephen Arhin     | DA Member and member Works Sub-Committee                         |
| Asare Boabeng     | DA Member and member Social Services Sub-Committee               |
| George Osei-Poku  | District Planning Officer  |
| Edward Acquaye    | District Engineer  |

#### Civil Society

|                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Eddie Bennet Afful | GAIT Facilitator           |
| Nana Amadoo        | Vice Chair of the CU       |
| Juliana Yeboah     | Secretary of the CU        |
| Charlotte Aidoo    | Member CU                  |
| Kwe No Te          | Financial secretary for CU |
| Kofi Owusu         | Member of CU               |
| Sewa Lydia         | Member of CU               |
| Nana Afia          | Member of CU               |

|                 |              |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Amenyam P. Duah | Member of CU |
| Adjei Mensah    | Member of CU |
| Emmanuel Asare  | Member of CU |

### **Jaman District**

#### **Local Government**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| J.B. Bening      | District Chief Executive                  |
| Patrick Frimpong | District Planning Officer                 |
| Antwi Boasiako   | District Planning Officer                 |
| Kwame Gariba     | District Water and Sanitation Team Leader |
| Victor B. Okrah  | District Engineer                         |

### **Afigya Sekyere District**

#### **Local Government**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Ben Abankwa       | District Chief Executive  |
| Samuel Adjei,     | Director, Director, District Health Administration              |
| William Osei      | Deputy Director Ministry of Agriculture                         |
| Duah Boamah       | District Finance Officer  |
| Kwadwo Oforu      | District Planning Officer                                       |
| Elizabeth Konadu  | District Assembly Member, Sub-Committee on Justice and Security |
| Kwadwo Owusu      | DEPT AD Supervisor  |
| Antwi E.Boasako   | DEPT Basic Education Coordinator (DES)                          |
| Jonathan K. Safo  | DEPT Examinations Coordinator (DES)                             |
| J.Y. Atwereboamah | DEPT Financial Administrator (DES)                              |
| J.O. K. Oppong    | DEPT School Headmaster  |
| R.B. Awaitey      | DEPT School Headmaster  |
| Kojo Prah         | District Director of Education                                  |
| Agyei Sarpong     | DEPT Community Participation Officer                            |

#### **Civil Society**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Kwame Agyekum       | GAIT Facilitator                               |
| Daniel Mensah       | Secretary of District CU                       |
| Kweku Agyemong      | Civic Union Member                             |
| BF Kusi             | “  |
| Yaw Kwankye         | “  |
| Joseph Baah         | “  |
| Leticia A.Boasiakoh | “  |
| Ahmed A.Sadique     | “  |
| Nana Osei Kwadjo    | Vice President of the CU                       |
| Phillip Adu Gyanti  | Member of Civic Union, Education Sub-Committee |
| Yaw Bio Karikari    | Zonal Civic Union Member                       |

Yaw Antwi Civil Society Representative

### **Suhum District**

#### Local Government

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Edward Gbinnye     | District Coordination Director                 |
| Ampong K. Williams | District Finance Officer                       |
| Antobre-Boateng    | District Director Health                       |
| Seth Aboagye       | District Information Officer                   |
| Yaovi Dotse        | District Director Agriculture                  |
| Ernest O. Amuako   | Assistant Director ED in charge of Supervision |
| E.C. Asante- Akufo | Presiding Member District Assembly             |
| George A. Addy     | AM   |
| Frederick Ofofu    | AM   |
| Onoma E. Odei      | AM   |
| Joseph A. Dantey   | AM   |
| RK Aboagye         | AM   |
| Gladys Ansah Kumi  | AM   |
| Paul Som Abedi     | AM   |
| Agnes L. Owusu     | AM   |

### **South Tongu District**

#### Local Government

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Henri K. Hevi      | Budget Officer of the District Education Service |
| Joseph T.K. Azagle | Basic Education Officer, member DEOC             |
| Emmanuel Tefe      | District GNAT Secretary, Member of DEOC          |
| Edward Ketemi      | AM Works Sub-Committee                           |
| Patrick Mensah     | Presiding Member                                 |
| Anthony Adadji     | AM Finance and Administration Sub-Committee      |
| Moses C.K. Awude   | District Environmental Health Officer            |
| Samuel K. Kitteh   | District Planning Officer                        |
| Odei A. Francis    | District Finance Officer                         |
| C.J. Babe          | District Director Agriculture                    |
| James K. Martey    | District Coordination Director                   |
| Joseph T.K. Azagh  | Representative of District Education Director    |
| Henry K. Hevi      | District Budget Officer                          |
| Margaret Dzakpasu  | District Health Directorate                      |

#### Civil Society

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Thomas K. Agbi  | Civil Society Representative and Member IFES Civic Union |
| Emma Ameble     | Civil Society Representative                             |
| Anthony Adjadji | Civil Society Rep. and former IFES Participant Observer  |

Albert Apetorgbor NCCE Coordinator

### **Gomoa District**

#### Local Government

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Yaw Adu-Asamoah    | District Coordinating Director, Gomoa                 |
| Beatrice Annan     | Public Health Officer, Ghana Health Service           |
| Francis K. Nutakor | District Director of Agriculture                      |
| I.I. Baido         | Assistant Director of Education, GES                  |
| Samuel Eshun       | Assistant Director of Education and QUIPS Coordinator |
| Eric Akobeng       | District Budget Officer                               |
| J. Arthur          | Assembly Member, Security and Justice Sub-Committee   |
| Fred O. Abbah      | AM Chair of Finance and Administration Sub-Committee  |
| Ben K. Afful       | AM Chair of Works Sub-Committee                       |
| Richard Yorke      | Accounts Officer, NCCE                                |
| Paul Nyarkoh       | Assistant Field Officer, NCCE                         |
| Stephen A. Yeboah  | Public Education Officer, NCCE                        |
| Abubaki K. Nyame   | Assistant Field Officer, NCCE                         |

#### Civil Society

|                       |                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Alhaji O. Fukyama     | Civil Society Representative |
| Isaac Eduful          | “                            |
| Taw Absbam            | “                            |
| C. Frempong Mensah    | “                            |
| Saeed Kassim          | “                            |
| Ibrahim Kasim         | “                            |
| Yusif Ibrahim         | “                            |
| Samuel Qaysah         | “                            |
| Capfaindistice Inkoom | “                            |
| Simon Tetteh          | “                            |
| T. Glover             | “                            |
| John Miensah          | “                            |
| Napoleon Donkor       | “                            |
| Thomas B. Arthur      | “                            |
| Cephas Nrizer         | “                            |
| Gladys Ahimah         | “                            |
| Jethro Mensah         | “                            |
| James Quansah         | “                            |
| Sarah Geyebi          | “                            |
| J.B. Essidfie         | “                            |
| Emmanuel Iffu         | “                            |

## Appendix Three

### References

Activities Undertaken by the International Foundation for Election Systems: Final Report (Washington, D.C. IFES-Partial Document, n.d.).

Application for the Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program Extension: Program Description (Accra, Ghana: Submitted to the USAID Mission to Ghana by the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA)-DBA National Cooperative Business Association, December 2002).

Mahama Ayariga and Ted Lawrence, Opportunities and Challenges in Civil Society Participation in Law Making: The Case of the National Health Insurance Bill (Accra: Unpublished Paper, 2003).

Joseph Ayee, Decentralization and Good Governance in Ghana (Accra, Ghana: Prepared for the Development Assistance Section, Canadian High Commission, May 2000).

Cooperative League of America, Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program, Quarterly Report, July 01-September 30, 2003 (Accra, Ghana: Submitted to USAID Ghana, September 30, 2003).

DWAP Capacity Analysis (Accra: Draft Document-Canadian International Development Agency, n.d.).

Final Report on Activities Undertaken by the International Foundation for Election Systems Under a USAID Cooperative Agreement, No. 641-0133-A- 00- 4028-00 Covering the Period October 1994 to December 2000 (Draft Document, no date).

Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana), 2001 Annual Report (Accra: CDD, 2002).

Ghana Education Service: SMC/PTA Handbook: Improving Quality Education Through Community Participation (Accra: Community School Alliances Project- A Collaboration Between USAID and the Government of Ghana in Enhancing Quality Teaching and Learning in Basic Schools, January 2001).

Ghana: The New Local Government System (Accra: Government of Ghana, n.d.).

Ghana Program Data Sheet, 641-004 (Washington, D.C.: USAID, 2002).

Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program-Strategic Directions & Action Plans for the 10 Participating Districts (Accra: CLUSA, n.d.).

Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program- Support to the Community Health Planning and Services (CHPS) Program (Accra: April 1-June 30, 2002).

Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program: Quarterly and Annual Reports, February 1, 2001- September 30, 2003 (Accra: CLUSA, 2001-2003).

An Introduction to the CLUSA Program in Africa (Washington, D.C.: CLUSA, n.d.).

IBIS Ghana/West Africa: Performance Report 2002 (Accra, Ghana: IBIS, 2002).

Invitation to Attend a Presentation by Papa M.D. Sene On USAID's GAIT Program (Washington, D.C.: CLUSA, April 17, 2002).

Kassena Nanakana District Assembly Budget for Year 2003 (Government of Ghana: Kassena Nanakana District Assembly, 2003).

Local Government Service Bill (Accra: Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, n.d.).

National Decentralisation Action Plan (NDAP): Towards a Sector-Wide Approach for Decentralisation Implementation in Ghana (2003-2005) (Accra: Prepared by the Decentralisation Secretaria, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, September 2003).

NCBA Annual Report, 2002 (Washington, D.C.: NCBA, 2002).

Stakeholders Planning Workshop, Ania-Buluk Civic Union (Builsa District, Ghana: 2003).

Stakeholders Strategic Planning Workshop for the Movement of Collective Associations (MOCASS) (Kassena-Nankana District, Ghana: GAIT Program, 21-22 March 2003).

Sue Nelson, J. Michael Turner and Beatrice Duncan, Assessment Report: USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Program – June 20-July 30, 1999 (Accra: Prepared for the Program Office, USAID/Ghana, July 20, 1999).

Zeric Kay Smith, Robin Silver, Dan Green, P.K. Mensah, USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Activities Impact on Political Change: 1994-2002 (Washington, D.C.: Management Systems International, December 2002 revised edition).

Stephen L. Snook, Joseph R.A. Ayee, Kwame Bofo-Arthur and Ernest Aryheetey, Civil Society and Local Government in Twenty Districts in Ghana: Surprises, Problems and Opportunities (Accra: March 1998).

Thematic Programme Support Document: Programme for Good Governance and Human Rights, Ghana (Copenhagen, Denmark: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, September 2003).

USAID/Ghana Country Strategic Plan (2004-2010)- Empowering Ghanaians Through Partnerships to Build a Prosperous Nation (Accra, Ghana: USAID, May 2003).

## Appendix Four

### Scope of Work

#### **Assessment of “Government Accountability Improves Trust” (GAIT)**

##### Overview

##### I. Summary

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Ghana seeks the services of short term consultants (an Assessment Team) to assess its civil society/local government strengthening program--GAIT (Government Accountability Improves Trust), begun in February 2001<sup>16</sup>, and to assess the continued validity of the strategies underlying USAID’s previously conducted and ongoing activities in the civil society and local governance area. The findings and recommendations of this assessment will help the Mission plan its future assistance in this area.

##### II. Purpose and Objectives

The Mission intends to utilize information generated by this assessment to equip it to

- (1) evaluate GAIT program (2001-2003) impact ;
- (2) establish baselines and realistic targets for its DG SO;
- (3) sharpen its strategic focus for its new Country Strategic Plan (CSP).

##### IV. Background

USAID/Ghana is preparing to launch a new CSP (2004-2010). Among the key cross-cutting themes in this CSP is decentralization and the role of civil society and local government in Ghana’s social, economic, and political development. An important partner in this effort has been the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA), which since February 1, 2001 has implemented GAIT. During the design of the CSP, the Mission expressed its interest in an assessment of GAIT. GAIT began on February 1, 2001 under a grant that largely continued the work of the “Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level” (Project ECSELL), implemented by IFES since July 1, 1997.

---

<sup>16</sup> Previous DG assessments were conducted in 1994 (sector-wide), 6/20-7/30/1999 (Performance and Impact of DG SO4: “Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input”), Jan-Feb/2002 (USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Activities Impact on Political Change: 1994-2002); Oct-Nov/2002 (Ghana Decentralization Assessment). The Jan-Feb/2002 assessment covers activities through December 2001, but given that CLUSA/GAIT began on February 1, 2001, the assessment team focused most of its analysis on activities from 1994-2000.

## ECSELL

The program which proceeded GAIT was IFES' "Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level" (Project ECSELL) which began on July 1, 1997 and had as its primary objectives:

- 1) to increase the capacity and effectiveness of civil society organizations to shape public policy within a more competitive political process,
- 1) to increase civic advocacy, and
- 2) to improve the responsiveness of District Assemblies (DA) (Snook et al 1999,
- 3) A fourth objective was added prior to the 2000 elections: *to improve the quality of political debates for parliamentary candidates contesting the year 2000 elections in 20 of Ghana's parliamentary constituencies*

The ECSELL project worked in 20 districts throughout Ghana (2 districts in each of the ten regions of the country) and employed a field team of 20 participant observers as well as the Accra-based project staff who conducted trainings, organized auxiliary meetings, provided technical assistance to CSOs and local government, carried out extensive monitoring and evaluation, and administered a modest grants component.

The activities to achieve the objectives were originally designed as a two-step process. First was a series of training workshops that took place between the end of 1997 and the end of 2000. The two-day workshops included training in the areas of:

1. Structure and function of local government, role of civil society in a democracy, and preparation for meeting CSO or local government counterparts;
2. Attitudes and behaviors in support of democracy, team building and collaboration among CSOs, and enabling environment to enhance CSO/DA communication and common problem solving;
3. Strategic planning, resource management, and linking CSOs/DAs
4. Financial management skills and proposal writing skills
5. Prepare for grant program, set up joint civic DA grant making mechanisms

The second component was to give the newly trained CSO and local government officials a chance to practice their skills via a small-grants program. IFES was to set up joint

CSO/Government boards in each of the districts in which the activity functioned and grants were to be vetted by this board and include matching funds from the District Assemblies themselves.

There was some disagreement between IFES and USAID at the time of implementation of the second phase of the project. This was a function of what USAID viewed as IFES' concentration of grant money targeted at general community development and economic growth oriented projects and not DG specific activities. For their part, IFES believed that they had communicated their intentions from the start of the activity and further had represented the broad nature of the grants to project participants. In the end, IFES implemented a more restrictive grant-vetting process that targeted DG specific activities.

The activity was closed at the end of March 2001 after having been funded at the level of 1.9 million USD for the period of the activity.

### CLUSA / GAIT

On February 1, 2001, The Cooperative League of the U.S.A. (CLUSA) was awarded a grant that largely continued the work of the ECSELL project in civil society strengthening and local government capacity building. The activity's name is Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program and was funded for two year period. The activity objectives are:

- 1) Increase the capacity of CSOs to advocate the interest of their members to local government
- 2) Increase government responsiveness to citizens at the local level
- 3) Promote transparency, accountability and anti-corruption in local governance
- 4) Increase voter turnout and political participation of CSOs

These objectives mirror those of the ECSELL activity with an added dimension of transparency, accountability and anti-corruption at the local level. The GAIT activity operates in 10 of the 20 localities that ECSELL worked in and GAIT uses similar (though modified) organizational and training techniques to pursue the project's objectives. These include:

1. CSO capacity building training in strategic planning and management

2. Promotion of formal CSO networking through support for Civic Unions in each of the ten project areas and networking between Civic Unions around the country
3. Support for Town Meetings that bring together Civic Union members, District Assembly representatives, and citizens to express concerns and air various community issues

The GAIT activity has recently been expanded to include assistance provided to a set of local level community health CSOs who will be given training and technical assistance to allow them to more effectively engage with District Health officials. Because the GAIT program is so recent, although the assessment team was able to observe current activities, the impact of these activities are less evident and are not addressed below.

#### The Assessment Report

#### V. Members of the Assessment Team: (Resumes to be Attached)

- Team Leader: Specialist in Governance (International Consultant Dr. Louis A. Picard, University of Pittsburgh)
- Team Member: Specialist in Civil Society, Dr. Robert Groelsema, (Democracy and Governance Specialist,) USAID, Washington
- Team Member: Specialist in Decentralization Dr. Joseph Ayee, (Department of Political Science, University of Ghana)
- Team Member: Specialist in Non-Governmental Organizations\_ Avril Kudzie (USAID Ghana)
- Team Member: Specialist in Legislative Support. Mr. Ted Lawrence, USAID, Ghana)

#### VI. Assessment Statement of Work.

The following areas of responsibility and activity have been identified. Additional Inputs will be provided by the five person team:

- Responsibility of Team Leader:
  1. Overall responsibility for design, organization and implementation of this assessment and preparation of all written reports that will make up this assessment

2. Preparation of an Inception Report which provides an agreed upon methodology for the team's approach to the research activity;
  3. Preparation scopes of work for each of the other members of the team;
  4. Supervise and Coordinate the research undertaken for the assessment;
  5. Preparation of a request for information document to be presented to both USAID Ghana and CLUSA of information needed in order to prepare and analyze baseline data;
  6. Presentation of Findings to the USAID Mission
  7. Preparation of Draft and Final Reports
- Timeframe: The Assignment will begin on October 20 with five days of preparatory work in Washington DC. Members of the team will be available for research and analysis from October 27-November 14. An inception report will be submitted to USAID Ghana on or about October 17 or the first day that the team has been assembled in Accra.. An oral briefing and a draft report will be delivered on or about November 14 and the final report will be delivered on December 1.
  - Assessment Design and Methodology
    1. A five person team will carry out an assessment of the current USAID democracy and governance efforts in Ghana
      - (1) evaluate GAIT program (2001-2003) impact;
      - (2) establish baselines and realistic targets for its DG SO;
      - (3) sharpen its strategic focus for its new Country Strategic Plan (CSP).
    2. The assessment will include the collection and analysis of Baseline Data of USAID supported efforts for the last three years as delivered by the Civic League of the United States of America (CLUSA)

- a. This data will be analyzed within the context of the efforts made by USAID Ghana for the six years prior to the current time frame (1994-2000)
  - b. Baseline data will be supplemented by Interviews with key stakeholders within USAID, Ghana, CLUSA and GOG, District Authorities and District level stakeholders in a representative sub-grouping of districts supported by the program with selected interviews, for comparison in districts not currently involved with the activity
3. Following from the retrospective analysis, the team will examine the prospects for future USAID support for democratic governance for the period 2004-2010. This analysis will include specific recommended activities in the following areas:
  1. Training and technical assistance for civil society and community based organizations
  2. Technical assistance, training and capacity support for District Assemblies
  3. Support activities that facilitate the interface between educational advocacy groups and local government and educational advocacy organizations including School Management Committees, Civic Unions, Parent Teacher Associations and District Education Offices
  4. Identify blockage points and units and organizations that need capacity building in order to ensure that District Assemblies and local governments can respond to the inputs and requests of civil society and community based organizations

## VII. Deliverables

1. An inception report, including and expanded Scope of Work, which provides the detailed methodology for the Study (to be submitted on the first working day the team is in the field)
2. Oral Briefing to the Mission on major findings of the team
3. Draft Written Report
4. Final Report

**Appendix Five**

**Inception Report**

**Assessment of “Government Accountability Improves Trust” (GAIT)**

**Presented to the U.S. Agency for International Development  
Ghana**

**Prepared by Dr. Louis A. Picard**

**Professor  
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs  
University of Pittsburgh  
and  
President  
Public Administration Service**

**and**

**Dr. Robert J. Groelsema  
Civil Society Analyst  
Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance  
Office of Democracy and Governance  
U.S. Agency for International Development**

## Overview

### Summary

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Ghana has assembled a five person team (an Assessment Team) to assess its civil society/local government strengthening program--GAIT (Government Accountability Improves Trust), begun in February 2001.<sup>17</sup> In addition to a retrospective analysis of GAIT, the team will assess the continued validity of the strategies underlying USAID's previously conducted and ongoing activities in the civil society and local governance area. The findings and recommendations of this assessment will help the Mission plan its future assistance in this area.

### Purpose and Objectives

The Mission intends to utilize information generated by this assessment to equip it to

- (1) evaluate GAIT program (2001-2003) impact ;
- (2) establish baselines and realistic targets for its DG SO;
- (3) sharpen its strategic focus for its new Country Strategic Plan (1904-1910- CSP).

### Background

USAID/Ghana is preparing to launch a new CSP (2004-2010). Among the key cross-cutting themes in this CSP are decentralization and the role of civil society and local government in Ghana's social, economic, and political development. An important partner in this effort has been the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA), which since February 1, 2001 has implemented GAIT. During the design of the CSP, the Mission expressed its interest in an assessment of GAIT. GAIT began on February 1, 2001 under a grant that largely continued the work of the "Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level" (Project ECSELL), implemented by IFES since July 1, 1997.

ECSELL- The program which preceded GAIT was IFES' "Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level" (Project ECSELL) which began on July 1, 1997 and had as its primary objectives to

1. increase the capacity and effectiveness of civil society organizations to shape public policy within a more competitive political process,

---

<sup>17</sup> Previous DG assessments were conducted in 1994 (sector-wide), 6/20-7/30/1999 (Performance and Impact of DG SO4: "Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input"), Jan-Feb/2002 (USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Activities Impact on Political Change: 1994-2002); Oct-Nov/2002 (Ghana Decentralization Assessment). The Jan-Feb/2002 assessment covers activities through December 2001, but given that CLUSA/GAIT began on February 1, 2001, the assessment team focused most of its analysis on activities from 1994-2000.

2. increase civic advocacy, and
3. improve the responsiveness of District Assemblies (DA) (Snook et al 1999,
4. A fourth objective was added prior to the 2000 elections: *to improve the quality of political debates for parliamentary candidates contesting the year 2000 elections in 20 of Ghana's parliamentary constituencies*

The ECSELL project worked in 20 districts throughout Ghana (2 districts in each of the ten regions of the country) and employed a field team of 20 participant observers as well as the Accra-based project staff who conducted training sessions, organized auxiliary meetings, provided technical assistance to CSOs and local government, carried out extensive monitoring and evaluation, and administered a modest grants component.

The activities to achieve the objectives were originally designed as a two-step process. First was a series of training workshops that took place between the end of 1997 and the end of 2000. The two-day workshops included training in the areas of:

1. Structure and function of local government, role of civil society in a democracy, and preparation for meeting CSO or local government counterparts;
2. Attitudes and behaviors in support of democracy, team building and collaboration among CSOs, and enabling environment to enhance CSO/DA communication and common problem solving;
3. Strategic planning, resource management, and linking CSOs/DAs
4. Financial management skills and proposal writing skills
5. Prepare for grant program, set up joint civic DA grant making mechanisms

The second component was to give the newly trained CSO and local government officials a chance to practice their skills via a small-grants program. IFES was to set up joint CSO/Government boards in each of the districts in which the activity functioned and grants were to be vetted by this board and include matching funds from the District Assemblies themselves.

There was some disagreement between IFES and USAID at the time of implementation of the second phase of the project. This was a function of what USAID viewed as IFES' concentration of grant money targeted at general community development and economic growth oriented projects and not DG specific activities. For their part, IFES believed that they had communicated their intentions from the start of the activity and further had represented the broad nature of the grants to project participants. In the end, IFES implemented a more restrictive grant-vetting process that targeted DG specific activities.

The activity was closed at the end of March 2001 after having been funded at the level of 1.9 million USD for the period of the activity.

CLUSA / GAIT- On February 1, 2001, The Cooperative League of the U.S.A. (CLUSA) was awarded a grant that largely continued the work of the ECSELL project in civil society strengthening and local government capacity building. The activity's name is Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT) Program and was funded for two year period. CLUSA's stated Goal re. Democracy and Governance is as follows: CLUSA support for local governments should include strengthening of public service management capabilities to enhance the ability of local government to mobilize resources and to promote dialogue between CSOs and LGs and the communities each serve.

CLUSA's overall priorities are:

- a) Expansion of advocacy roles in civil society organizations;
- b) LG accountability and transparency;
- c) More efficient service delivery;
- d) Enhanced revenue collection;
- e) A political culture of citizen participation

The specific activity objectives identified in CLUSA's Ghana project include the following:

- 1) Increase the capacity of Ghana CSOs to advocate the interest of their members to local government
- 2) Increase government responsiveness to citizens at the local level
- 3) Promote transparency, accountability and anti-corruption in local governance
- 4) Increase voter turnout and political participation of CSOs

These objectives mirror those of the ECSELL activity with an added dimension of transparency, accountability and anti-corruption at the local level. The GAIT activity operates in 10 of the 20 localities that ECSELL worked in and GAIT uses similar (though modified) organizational and training techniques to pursue the project's objectives.<sup>18</sup> These include:

1. CSO capacity building training in strategic planning and management

---

<sup>18</sup> Thirty new target districts were targeted in February of 2003 and work has begun in a number of them.

2. Promotion of formal CSO networking through support for Civic Unions in each of the ten project areas and networking between Civic Unions around the country
3. Support for Town Meetings that bring together Civic Union members, District Assembly representatives, and citizens to express concerns and air various community issues

The GAIT activity has recently been expanded to include assistance provided to a set of local level community health CSOs who will be given training and technical assistance to allow them to more effectively engage with District Health officials. Because the GAIT program is so recent, although the assessment team was able to observe current activities, the impact of these activities are less evident and as yet the results are not in on this pilot work:

In part, the focus of this assessment is the extent to which the USAID mission concurs with the bottom up strategies in the current democracy strategy and wishes to continue these priorities under the new country strategy (2004-2010).

#### The Assessment Report

Timeframe: The Assignment will begin on October 20 with five days of preparatory work in Washington DC. Members of the team will be available for research and analysis from October 27-November 14. An inception report will be submitted to USAID Ghana on or about October 17 or the first day that the team has been assembled in Accra. An oral briefing and a draft report will be delivered on or about November 14 and the final report will be delivered on December 1.

#### Assessment Design and Methodology (Research Instrument)

1. A five person team will carry out an assessment of the current USAID democracy and governance efforts in Ghana
  - (1) evaluate GAIT program (2001-2003) impact;
  - (2) Identify and establish baselines and realistic targets for its DG SO;
  - (3) sharpen its strategic focus for its new Country Strategic Plan (CSP).
2. The assessment will include the collection and analysis of Baseline Data of USAID supported efforts for the last three years as delivered by the Civic League of the United States of America (CLUSA)
3. Baseline data will be analyzed within the context of the efforts made by USAID Ghana for the six years prior to the current time frame (1994-2000)

4. Baseline data will be supplemented by Interviews with key stakeholders within USAID, Ghana, CLUSA and GOG, District Authorities and District level stakeholders in a representative sub-grouping of districts supported by the program with selected interviews, for comparison in districts not currently involved with the activity
5. The analysis will be divided into two parts, retrospective data which evaluates past performance of USAID supported activities under GAIT, and prospective analysis which makes recommendations on future priority period under the new country strategic plan
6. The following base line (impact) data will be sought by the Assessment Team. The baseline year will be 2000 while the project duration year will be 2003.

#### 1. District Assembly

- a) District Assembly engagement of Central Government on district issues: numbers of incidents and nature of central government responses. Source: Views of informed sources and data from CLUSA
- b) Number of DA projects requested by CSOs (CLUSA and District Assembly records)
- c) Amount of locally generated income (taxes, fees, etc) collected by District Assemblies (DA Records)
- d) Number of public hearings held on district level financial reports (CLUSA and District Records.)

#### 2. Civil Society Organizations

- a) Civil Society Organization Perceptions of improved transparency and accountability in District Assembly structures (CLUSA and District CSO Sources)
- b) CSO reports that they have monitored the use of DA funds (CSO Sources)
- c) CSO perceptions that DA wants inputs (Informed Interviews)
- d) CSOs reports of numbers of advocacies on sectoral and women's issues (Informed Interviews)
- e) Number of CSOs registered and potentially available to receive sub-grants (CLUSA)

- f) CSOs that have improved management and administrative capacity (Informed Interviews)

3. The following Retrospective Issues will be examined during the course of this assessment:<sup>19</sup>

- a) The team will determine the extent to which DAs have increased capacity to respond to demands of CSOs as a result of GAIT activities
- b) How has the capacity of district level political actors figured into the D-G process in terms of capacity building efforts.
- c) Information will be sought on the nature of the process used to develop the District Development Plan. This should include input from civil society, input from political leadership, linking proposed service delivery with tax collection strategies;
- d) The assessment team will attempt to determine the links between and among civil society organizations, both vertically and horizontally and capacity of civil society organizations to receive and give grants.
- e) What has been the impact of HRD/training efforts: 1) number of training activities, workshops and seminars supported, 2) networks developed and supported, 3) Town meetings and public forums held and supported. Data needed should include input information, output data and Impact (sustainable change) information
- f) The utility of Civic Unions as umbrella or network groupings;
- g) The qualitative impact of training as seen by trainers, selected trainees, curricula, and post training evaluations
- h) Overall: The numbers of targets are a factor in assessment. Large numbers make it difficult to measure impact. Smaller numbers make impact measurement less problematic. Question: What are the possibilities of a small “n” limited sample (and perhaps) qualitative approach
- i) Methodologically rigorous pre-and post-testing or base line analysis takes time, energy and specialized knowledge and extra resources that may impact upon available resources.

4. Following from the retrospective analysis, the team will examine the prospects for future USAID support for democratic governance for the period 2004-2010. This analysis will include specific recommended activities in the following areas:

---

<sup>19</sup> These questions and issues will serve as a prototype questionnaire for the assessment team.

- a) Identification of potential training and technical assistance activity in support of civil society and community based organizations
  - b) Identification of potential technical assistance, training and capacity support for District Assemblies
  - c) Potential support activities that facilitate the interface between educational advocacy groups and local government and educational advocacy organizations including School Management Committees, Civic Unions, Parent Teacher Associations and District Education Offices
  - d) Identification of blockage points and units and organizations that need capacity building in order to ensure that District Assemblies and local governments can respond to the inputs and requests of civil society and community based organizations
2. The following Prospective Issues will be examined during the course of this assessment
- a) The extent to which USAID wants to support public sector decentralization resources and people;
  - b) The assessment team will project the community based, bottom up model into the future to see whether support for civil society input and activity continues to fit with USAID policy;
  - c) The team will seek to determine the extent can buy-ins from other projects (education, health and poverty alleviation occur within the framework of d-g activities without distorting the d-g goals;
  - d) To what extent is the health pilot activity implemented by CLUSA is a model for future sectoral interface with decentralized governance activities
  - e) What is the potential for training in grants and contracts management and contracting out for LG and CS managers
  - f) How important are the sustainability and institutionalization issues re. choices for activities to support
  - g) What is the relevance of concerns for checks and balances within a parliamentary system for district assembly structures? Of similar concern is the issue of imposed non-partisanship of District Assembly members. The overall issue is the importance of statutory structural changes in governance institutions
  - h) Existing documentation suggests that Local Government faces a severe shortage of skilled personnel. The question to be addressed: How, when and by whom is DA

capacity to be assessed. To what extent should USAID become involved in capacity building activities at local government level

- i) Does USAID's concern for capacity building include the ability to plan, manage and contract out program and project management activities (project management and evaluation);
- j) Given the many needs that have been identified what strategy will be used to identify USAID priorities given funding limitations;
- k) How important is the "self-management" community based approach based upon self-identified interest, to the mission? How does this relate to the statutory authorities at district, regional and national levels;
- l) What "management skills" are considered priorities in terms of d-g in the 204-2010 period for both civil society and local government
- m) What would be the importance of structural changes such as the creation of a unified local government personnel system or the creation of a district manager or Council secretary to take the place of the central government District Council Executive.
- n) The report will discuss the appropriateness of support for Ghanaian institutions that are essential to successful implementation of decentralization reforms. These potentially include the Institute for Local Government Studies, the National Center for Civic Education and the Ghana Institute for Management and Public Administration. The use of sub-grants and contracting (and the use of competitive bidding will be examined.
- o) The assessment team will examine the use of sub-grants and contracts to institutionalize capacity building and to build local organizational strength
- p) The team will identify a series of Coordinated activities to support decentralized governance and civil society interface with district government during the six year period of the new U.S. AID Country Strategic Plan.

## Interview Targets

### Proposed Sample Districts

USAID supported groups, IFIS and CLUSA established district level programs as follows:

|              |        |              |
|--------------|--------|--------------|
| IFIS         | (2000) | 20 Districts |
| CLUSA        | (2001) | 10 Districts |
| “            | (2003) | 10 Districts |
| Proposed New | 2004   | 20 Districts |

In addition one or more Satellite Districts will be created.

### Suggested Target Districts

Twelve Districts located in different parts of the country have tentatively been targeted for investigation. These are:

- Kassena Nankana
- West Manprusi
- Berekum
- Afigya Sekyere
- Jasikan
- West Dagomba (Control)
- Sogakope (New District)
- Gomua (Control)
- Mapong (New District)
- Nzema East
- Wa
- Tolon (New District)
- At least on satellite district

This list is tentative but at least eight districts will be visited including six of the ten districts where CLUS has been working during the life of the project.

### Proposed Interviews:

All interviews will be qualitative in nature. However some Council members may be interviewed in small groups.

District Level- Statutory

- District Council Executive
- Presiding Member of Council
- District Coordination Director
- Chief Financial Officer
- District Education Oversight Committee Member
- Health Management Team Head
- Members who Profile Make up of Council- At least one woman, one younger member, two appointed including at least one traditional member
- Representatives of line ministries: DEO, DAO, DHO

### Civil Society

Trade and Professional Associations  
 Producers Cooperatives  
 Farm Based Organizations  
 Women's and Youth Organizations  
 USAID Supported Civic Unions  
 District based Intermediate NGOs

### National and Washington Offices

IFIS –Washington  
 CLUSA- Washington  
 World Bank Desk Officer for Ghana

USAID Ghana- Director, Deputy Director, Program Officer, Team Leader SO Team heads, DG Team

Other Donors- DANIDA, GTZ, CIDA

NGOs- CLUSA, IBIS, National Coalition on Good Government

Government- Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Deputy Ministers for LG and RD, International decentralization advisor

Members of the Assessment Team will be as follows: (Resumes to be Attached)

- Team Leader: Specialist in Governance (International Consultant Dr. Louis A. Picard, University of Pittsburgh)
- Team Member: Specialist in Civil Society, Dr. Robert Groelsema, (Democracy and Governance Specialist,) USAID, Washington
- Team Member: Specialist in Decentralization, Dr. Emmanuel Akwetey, Consultant

- Team Member: Specialist in Non-Governmental Organizations\_ Avril Kudzie (USAID Ghana)
- Team Member: Specialist in Legislative Support. Mr. Ted Lawrence, USAID, Ghana)
- Responsibility of Team Leader:
  1. Overall responsibility for design, organization and implementation of this assessment and preparation of all written reports that will make up this assessment
  2. Preparation of an Inception Report which provides an agreed upon methodology for the team's approach to the research activity;
  3. Preparation written scopes of work for each of the other members of the team;
  4. Supervise and Coordinate the research undertaken for the assessment;
  5. Preparation of a request for information document to be presented to both USAID Ghana and CLUSA of information needed in order to prepare and analyze baseline data;
  6. Presentation of Findings to the USAID Mission
  7. Preparation of Draft and Final Reports
- Deliverables: The following deliverables are committed to under this activity.
  1. An inception report, including and expanded Scope of Work, which provides the detailed methodology for the Study (to be submitted on the first working day the team is in the field)
  2. Oral Briefing to the Mission on major findings of the team
  3. Draft Written Report
  4. Final Report

## **Appendix Six**

### **Interview Instruments:**

#### **Interview Questions for Local Government**

1. How many committees do you have?
2. How often do you meet?
3. Who are the members of the committees?
4. What kind of interaction do you have with CSOs?
5. What issues have CSO's brought to you?
6. How did you handle these issues?
7. Who initiated/organized the town meetings
8. How can things be organized to improve your interaction with CSO's?
9. Do you have a development plan?
10. What are your preferred channels of communications with CSO's?
11. Tell as about an activity that you involved CSO?
12. What do you see as the primary role of the DA and CSOs?
13. What are the main issues facing your district?
14. What training have you received?
15. How has the training changed the way you do business? or has not?
16. What additional training do you need to do you job better?
17. Have you heard about GAIT activities?
18. Have you participated in any GAIT activities? What are they?
19. What has changed since you participated in the GAIT program?
20. How do you see the role of CSO in the future?

## **Interview Questions for the Civic Union Groups**

1. How did the civic union come to be formed?
2. What is/are the advantage(s) of coming together?
3. What are some of the common problems or goals of the CSOs in this district?
4. What are some of the under currents of these problems?
5. How was (were) the problem(s) addressed when you (CSOs) came together / How did the GAIT program help you to solve the problems?
6. What are some advantages of the GAIT program?
7. What are some of the activities of the civic union?
8. How is the civic union organized?
9. Is the civic union registered?
10. What are some of the critical issues (problems) of the civic union?
11. What contributions do the individual CSOs make to the civic union?
12. Are there any problems of the civic union that the district assembly (DA) can handle?
13. How many forums have you organized?
14. How do individual CSOs collaborate outside the CSOs?
15. What is your understanding of the roles of the various actors of the assembly?
16. Are you aware of the District Development Plan?
17. Do you talk to the DA or give feedback about the services they provide?
18. Have you been given any training by GAIT?
19. Which ways can the civic union assist your individual organizations in future?