NCG

Final report

Final evaluation of

Kasa

Frank Runchel

Cherub Antwi-Nsiah

Commissioned by CARE, Gulf of Guinea

January 2011

NCG

Table of Content

ABBREVIATIONS

AJADSCO	Association of Jasikan Civil Society Organisations	MDBS	Multi-Donor Budgetary Support
CARE (GoG)	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (GoG =Gulf of Guinea)	M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
CB	Capacity building	MEST	Ministry of Environment, Science & Technology
CBO	Community-based organisation	MLNR	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
CCEW	Climate Change and Environment Working Group	MMDA	Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
CDD	Centre for Democratic Development	MNE	Ministry of Mines and Energy
CEIA	Centre for Environmental Impact Assessment	MoE	Ministry of Energy
CEPA	Centre for Economic Policy Analysis	MoFEP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
CEPIL	Centre for Public Interest Law	MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
CICOL	Civil Society Coalition on Land	MTDP	Medium Term Development Plan
CIKOD	Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Organisation Development	MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
CIRMP	Community Institutional Resource Mapping Process	MTR	Mid-term Review
CS	Civil society	MWRWH	Ministry of Water Resources, Works and Housing
CSO	Civil society organisation	NCOM	National Coalition on Mining
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency	NETRIGHT	Network for Women's Rights
DEMC	District Environmental Management Committees	NGND	Northern Ghana Network for Development
DP	Development Partner	NGO	Non-governmental organisation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	NHIA	National Health Insurance Authority
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency	NHIS	National Health Insurance Scheme

	Agency	NR	Northern Region
EOI	Expression of Interest	NRE	Natural Resource and Environment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	NREG	Natural Resource and Environmental Governance
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources		
ENRAC	Environment and Natural Resources Advisory Council	NRENGO	Natural Resources and Environmental NGO Coalition
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resources Management	OD	Organisational development
EU	European Union	PB	Programme Board
FBO	Faith Based Organisations	PLWHAs	People Living with HIV and AIDS
FC	Forestry Commission	PMT	Programme Management Team
FoE	Friends of the Earth	PWYP	Publish What You Pay
FoN	Friends of the Nation	R&A	Research & Advocacy
FWG	Forest Watch Ghana	RAVI	Rights and Voice Initiative (Ghana)
GCRN	Ghana Community Radio Network	RDE	Royal Danish Embassy
GDCA	Ghana Development Communities Association	RECA	Rural Environmental Care Association
GEO	Green Earth Organisation	REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
GEMP	Ghana Environmental Management Project	RELBONET	Religious Bodies Network (Faith-based organisations Against Climate Change)
GNADO	GIA/NABIO Agroforestry Development Organisation	RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
GPRS II	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy II	RUMNET	Rural Media Network
G-RAP	Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme	SADA	Savannah Accelerated Development Authority
GoG	Government of Ghana	SANREC	Savannah Natural Resource and Environment Coalition
GWCL	Ghana Water and Sewerage Company Ltd	SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
ICB	Institutional capacity building	SLM	Sustainable Land Management
ICCO	Inter Church Organisation for Development Cooperation	SoE	State of the Environment Report
ID	Institutional development	SNV	Netherlands Development Organisations
IDEG	Institute of Democratic Government	SSF	Social Support Foundation
ISODEC	Integrated Social Development Centre	TA	Technical Assistance
ISM	Implementation Support Mission	ToR	Terms of Reference
JPM	Joint Programme Memorandum	TWN	Third World Network
KASA	"Speak Out" (Twi language)	VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreement
MASE	Media Advocates for Sustainable Environment	WACAM	Wassa Association of Communities Affected by Mining
MC	Minerals Commission	WGFC	Working Group on Forest Certification
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies	WRC	Water Resources Commission
		ZEPF	Zasilari Ecological Farm Project

Executive Summary

For the busy executive reader it is suggested to read the present summary and Chapters 7 and 8.

This final evaluation of Kasa (October, 2010) was commissioned to assess the programme in three dimensions:

- Achievement of Kasa's goal, purpose and outputs
- Identify key lessons learned and provide recommendations
- Assess effectiveness of Kasa as a funding mechanism, including governance and management structure

The Evaluation Team (ET) has used a results' chain to analyse Kasa in five dimensions: Enabling environment, institutional capacities, channels of intervention (vehicles such as campaigns, networks), changes in policy, practice, behaviour, and power relations as well as the broader development goals. This analysis concludes that CSOs have begun to fill a space in NREG, and that as a result of capacity building, funding and networking, CSOs are using the avenues created to engage directly with government agencies, especially at regional and district levels. It is noted that many of the CSOs have been active in NRE before Kasa.

The overall assessment is *that Kasa has done remarkably well for a pilot project with effectively 18 months of implementation.* Kasa has generated valuable contributions of CSOs to NRE policy formulation, and has facilitated and supported national CSO platforms on NREG. Kasa has played an important role in attempting to coordinate and support CSO advocacy. Valuable capacity building of CSOs has been delivered in areas of NREG, media, M&E, advocacy strategies and tools.

Kasa has facilitated CSOs in organising, informing and enabling poor and vulnerable communities on their rights. The CSOs have challenged national and local government, even mining and forestry industries on their practice and responsibilities. Not all of these interventions can be attributed directly to Kasa, but evidence has been demonstrated of CSOs challenging and engaging with District Authorities and national agencies (CICOL, ZEFG, GDCA for instance).

The CSOs have made important contributions and have gained recognition in terms of regular consultations and representation and vehicles and platforms have been created, inter alia as a result of Kasa. This being a pilot project, Kasa can be said to have created important inroads especially in terms of consultations and mobilising CSOs to engage in evidence based advocacy. The concrete *contributions to the purpose of the Kasa programme* however, are difficult to verify given the design of the LogFrame and the fact that the five Outputs are not all linked to its purpose. The *overall evaluation assessment* is that the CSOs do advocate for NREG, but the Kasa purpose cannot as such be verified.

Overall Conclusions

The overall assessment is that Kasa has done remarkably well for a pilot project with effectively 18 months of implementation. Kasa is relevant and has contributed to its purpose of promoting CSOs and media organisations to advocate for NREG in Ghana, through platform support, coordination and the capacity building efforts and the funding made available to CSOs through Kasa.

While CSOs cannot be said to have directly influenced NREG policies as a result of the Kasa project, CSOs have engaged with the relevant sector MDAs – with or without Kasa support, before or during Kasa. Attribution is difficult as Kasa's period is too short to show such policy influence. Avenues for potential influence and consultation mechanisms have been created and CSOs are being consulted, especially on draft policies and regulations. CSOs are more widely recognised and appreciated as partners by government.

Kasa has been successful in terms of facilitating and coordinating networks, platforms and supporting a wide range of stakeholder's participation and active contribution to NRE through these fora.

Key Lessons Learnt

Kasa has been a flexible and responsive mechanism by virtue of the strategies employed to facilitate the CSO platforms and experience sharing, in addressing emerging issues in these fora, and the ingenuity and innovation shown in particular by the CSOs in utilising project and core funds to pursue their advocacy objectives. The flexibility also has meant that there has been less focus on strategic direction and project management.

Core funding is seen as the optimal modality for supporting CSOs in research and advocacy work. Kasa's governance structure is based on a single-project single-donor concept, even though Kasa is co-funded by RNE and three INGOs. Kasa as a mechanism seems to have both an issue of *commission* (having the SC decide on grants) and one of *omission* (being unable to include CSOs on its SC). Kasa and its SC have attempted to remain as transparent as possible by establishing procedures and inviting CSOs on board. The mandates, however, are not clear to outsiders, and there is a partly justified perception that Kasa may be intransparent.

Kasa has not been very successful in addressing gender issues (highly relevant to NRE) as this has been reduced to 'women and vulnerable groups'. This is partly due to its design, and partly due to lack of focus and attention to the issue.

Kasa has supported CSOs in involving media as partners, not as news agents, and building their capacity on NRE issues has been an efficient strategy of CSOs to have much wider coverage and interest by Media in NREG issues. Kasa media training has also allowed more advanced media organisations and CSOs to expose other CSOs to strategies, products, and effective media engagement.

The ET considers that the proposed draft Kasa II Concept Note is not adequately capturing the most important lessons in feeding them into a proposal for a feasible programme design for a multi-donor CSO NREG mechanism, and the concept note does not depart from the single-donor single-project design. There is currently no agreement on a continuation of an NREG CSO support mechanism, which is unfortunate and carries a risk of the momentum gained by Kasa being lost.

1   Introduction and background

Kasa ('Speak out' in Twi) is pooled funding mechanism for supporting Civil Society Organisations to advocate for equitable access, accountability and transparency in Natural Resource Management in Ghana. Kasa is a 24-month pilot project funded by the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE)(86,5%), CARE Denmark (11%), SNV and ICCO (each 1,4%). The total budget of Kasa is 1,954,121 €. CARE Denmark has signed an implementation agreement with CARE Gulf of Guinea (GoG) authorising the latter to manage the project in collaboration with local partners (SNV Ghana and ICCO).

Kasa began its implementation in August 1st 2008 and ended 31st October 2010, thus a 2 year project with a 3 month extension period. Direction and supervision is provided by a project steering committee and the day-to-day operations are handled by a small core staff at the secretariat with the support of CARE GoG. The Consortium partners share some duties and take leadership in others. CARE is responsible for monitoring the project and ensuring programme quality and execution of project activities according to the timeline. ICCO provides overall expertise and guidance in capacity building and the implementation of the forums whilst SNV provides expertise in organizational development and capacity building of CSOs and technical advice to the

project and to CSOs. Senior staff of the implementing partners have also made contributions to the project (see Kasa Project document for details).

The Kasa initiative aims to support the development of a visible and audible civil society component specifically promoting NRE governance that will protect the interests of women, the poor, and other vulnerable peoples and guarantee sustainability of the country's natural resources, while also promoting sustainable economic growth. The components of Kasa are:

- Capacity enhancement to ensure effective advocacy for improved governance of the NRE sector in Ghana

- Grants management (core and project grants) to support evidence-based advocacy for equity, transparency and accountability in the NRE sector

- Forums and platforms for CSO coordinated engagements on NRE issues, including forums for sharing and learning, platforms for engaging with government, sector donors; and forums for analysis of policy issues for strengthening joint advocacy efforts

- Communication and Outreach to facilitate and disseminate relevant information amongst partners and stakeholders in the NRE sector and facilitating active participation of the media in reportage on NRE issues.

The project works with coalitions and networks as well as individual CSOs and media organisations that do natural resource and environmental governance or pro-poor advocacy or research work. In the long-term the project is expected to benefit the majority of natural resource dependent Ghanaians, estimated at 60-80% of the population.

Care GoG has called upon a team of one international and one national consultant to undertake a final evaluation of Kasa before its expiry end of October, 2010. The final evaluation took place in Ghana from October 11th through 27th 2010.

1.1   Background

The Government of Ghana has recently begun to pursue a policy direction that recognises the importance of natural resource and environmental governance to national development and poverty reduction. This policy direction is reflected in the Natural Resource and Environmental Governance (NREG) Programme.

The NREG Programme is a recipient mechanism for multi-donor sector budgetary support to the Government of Ghana, through a framework of priority policy objectives, benchmarks and targeted actions addressing governance issues in Forestry & Wildlife, Mining and Environment. NREG is expected to support governance reforms in the sector and contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable economic growth.

Within the NREG Sector Budget Support, the important role of civil society in natural resource and environmental governance and the need to establish a civil society support mechanism to enhance effective participation and social accountability within the NRE sector is recognised by both government and Development Partners in Ghana.   However, the DPs are yet to settle on the appropriate form and structure for civil society sector support in the NRE sector.

While exploring the most appropriate mechanism for a long-term civil society support in the NRE sector, as envisaged by the NREG programme, the Royal Netherlands Embassy, in collaboration with CARE, ICCO and SNV in 2008, supported the establishment of the present two-year pilot civil society support mechanism for the NRE sector called Kasa.

2   Objectives of the evaluation

According to the ToRs the overall objectives and main purpose of the final evaluation (see annex 1) are to:

     a.   Assess and provide information to the project stakeholders, the extent to which the expected project outputs and purpose are achieved and any possible contribution of achieved outputs and purpose to overall project goal.

     b.   To provide information to the project stakeholders, especially the Consortium, the Steering Committee and the Royal Netherlands Embassy, with which to take decisions on the future of Kasa and on the most appropriate mechanism for long-term civil society support to the NRE sector

     c.   Assess the extent to which Kasa as a pilot has managed to influence or provide a mechanism by which the CSOs can influence policies and practices in the NRE sector in Ghana

     d.   To identify lessons learnt and provide recommendations and how this could inform the operation of a long term CS support mechanism in the NRE sector.

The evaluation will examine <u>three main focus areas</u> of Kasa:

1. An assessment of the project framework and delivery mechanism in terms of design, approach, and management. This will include assessing the relevance and effectiveness of:

     a.   the Kasa grants managements;

     b.   Capacity building support and learning events

     c.   Forums/platforms for stakeholder engagement on NRE

2. An assessment of selected Kasa grant partners, in terms of the results of their NRE advocacy work in general and the contribution of Kasa to their achievement and lessons learnt

3. An assessment of Kasa's influence on the policy development and practice of the Ghana custodians of her natural resources. I.e. whether and how the NREG policy framework has been informed or influenced by any of the Kasa grantees, platforms or media interventions.

3   Evaluation Framework

The Evaluation Team (ET) has applied a results' chain to analyse five important levels: Enabling environment, institutional/organisational capacities, channels of intervention, changes in policy, practice, behaviour and power relations as well as the broader development goals. The outputs, purpose and goal of the Kasa LogFrame have been built into the results chain (see annex 2).

The added value of the results' chain is that is includes *pathways* between levels. These are mechanisms to demonstrate for example the contribution between a distinct intervention and the outcomes and overall goal. The pathways form the Consultant's hypothesis and are based on their professional judgment, in other words a *"theoretical proposition"*.

An important aim of the results chain is to identify and describe these <u>pathways</u> leading to development outcomes and to assess the extent to which individual interventions by CSOs (grantees) are likely to make a more or less direct contribution to these on an aggregated level. CSO interventions are intended to make a positive

contribution to long-term development outcomes. The nature of this relationship can be both direct and more indeterminate depending on the specific goals, for instance the pathways to better NRE and democracy may be more direct than that of poverty reduction. The ET has identified typologies of pathways leading from direct results (e.g. increased capacity of actors) to intermediate outcomes (e.g. changes in power, policy and practice of institutions) to the enabling environment outcomes of increased recognition of CSOs by state agencies.

The result-orientation of the evaluation has implied a certain focus on outcomes. These questions are being analysed in chapter 4 on LogFrame and Chapter 5 on Outcomes. Relevance and sustainability of the Kasa project have been analysed separately (see chapter 6). The issues of efficiency have been analysed both in relation to the disbursement of funds (chapter 4 and annex 3) and to project targets met (see chapter 5 and annex 3).

The ET on this evaluation makes reference to G-RAP as a CSO funding mechanism, partly because this CSO facility is still functional and widely acknowledged in Ghana, and partly because the ET has specific experience and insight in G-RAP. It is stressed here that G-RAP is not seen by the ET as the 'one and only' feasible and workable model for CSO funding. But its design is unique and its governance structures are seen as highly relevant, also in the context of NREG.

3.1   Data Collection

For data collection the ET has attempted to validate an already large pool of available information, a key source of which are the CSOs themselves (interviews, monitoring reports and other narrative reports and products).

In the ET's experience it is challenging to find external data sources to validate information from internal stakeholders in this type of evaluation. PMT and CSO staff all have a stake in the programme and information from these internal stakeholders had to be validated from at least two sources.

3.2   Evaluation Process

In response to CARE's wish to make the evaluation highly participatory the consultants have asked almost all interviewees about the perceived benefits and purpose of the evaluation. This has provided stakeholders with an opportunity to give their perspective on the purpose of the evaluation and its key questions, and provided an interpretation of the possible end-result of the evaluation. The value added of this focus was that stakeholders reflected not only on their own role in Kasa, but also on the processes around Kasa and what benefits they saw from engaging in the evaluation. This had the added benefit of linking directly to the recommendations for the future.

Some of the responses from various stakeholders were:

> - To review Kasa and see whether it has achieved its objectives there is little oversight in terms of land issues. The evaluation is to give an opening to look at programme and land rights.
>
> - Will help us grantees in seeing what we set ourselves to do
>
> - Effectiveness in delivering to the sector platform. How those platforms relate to other platforms, and whether these were going to be autonomous of other platforms. To be effective it is necessary to widen space
>
> - There is no particular focus for the Kasa project – is it meant to monitor NRE or support growth and viability of organisations in the sector?

> - We have become an authority on media engagement - other newspapers do not consider it. Needs to increasingly work to build media capacity to report on NREG issues. It is only through that that you get the civic engagement. So the next phase should get more media houses involved. Hoping this will come out from the evaluation
>
> - To find out the gaps and to learn and share successes and challenges and lessons for the future – especially for implementers
>
> - Opportunity to capture lost but useful information
>
> - Opportunity for feedback from an outside assessment – for improvement
>
> - Benefits of the evaluation are the accountability issues. Kasa is enhancing good governance and empowerment, key issues to us. Kasa has provided transparency and governance in NRE in Northern Ghana. For us, Kasa is a platform to strengthen our work in governance

Corresponding to the proposed methodology, a close dialogue has been maintained with Kasa PMT and the evaluation steering group (CARE, ICCO and SNV). The ET held several meeting with the steering group, which functioned as a sounding board in the process, where key findings, hypotheses and the evaluation process was debated and adjusted.

3.3   Documentary review

The ET has reviewed substantial amounts of material related to the overall programme as well as background material used in programme preparation; LogFrame, monitoring documents, baseline report, mid-term review report, grant award reports and progress reports. Other materials included media, official government and donor reports.

Video and photos have also been utilised as a documentation source.

3.4   Interviews and focus group discussions

The ET has used semi-structured interview guides, based on the evaluative questions, varied according to the distinct target groups identified. Focus group discussions have also been used where relevant.

The ET has also conducted two stakeholders' evaluation focus group meetings in Northern and Southern Ghana, where a number of the 27 Kasa grantees (also CSOs that were not interviewed individually) participated, as well as other CSOs and notably government representatives. Thus, the majority of Kasa grantees have fed into the evaluation and have had opportunities to discuss evaluative questions such as pathways to policy influence, recommendations for a future CSO mechanism etc.

3.5   Key Kasa stakeholders

According to the documentary review and in agreement with CARE GoG the following key stakeholders were identified:

- Main Donors (RNE and Care Denmark)
- PMT
- GoG, (key Ministries, Departments and Agencies)
- CSOs – grantees and non-grantees.
- Kasa implementing agency and consortium members - CARE GoG, SNV and ICCO

- Third parties e.g. non funding donors, external resource persons

3.6   Selection of Kasa Grantees

12 of 27 CSOs were selected for in-depth interviews based on funding type, networking and geographic location. The agreed criteria for selection were:

- Core vs project funds recipients

- Coalitions/networks, Media

- Location: Southern/Northern

- Sub-sector representation in forestry, mining and environment.

Based on these criteria the following 12 CSOs have been assessed:

GDCA	NGND
RUMNET	ZEFP
TWN / NCOM	Creative Storm
GCRN	ISODEC
Public Agenda	WACAM
CICOL	CIKOD

Over and above the grantees selected for in-depth interviews, the Evaluation Team has interviewed IDEG, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Environmental Protection Agency, Forestry Commission, Mineral Commission, and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning.

4   Assessment of Kasa's Framework and delivery mechanism

4.1   *Progress against goal, purpose and outputs in LogFrame*

The key methodology of this evaluation (Results' chain) integrates achievements towards goal, purpose and outputs of the LogFrame at five levels. The analysis is presented in chapter 5, and an overview in Annex 2.

In response to the ToRs and to provide a more stringent overview of the level of achievement of the Kasa programme against its project design (LogFrame with indicators), this section summarises Kasa's progress. Reference is made to *Annex 3 (Performance against LogFrame.)*

The Kasa project document states as the overall aim of the initiative:

> "…to support development of a visible and audible CS component specifically promoting NRE governance that will protect the interests of women, the poor, and other vulnerable peoples and guarantee sustainability of the country's natural resources, while also promoting economic growth".

On NRE governance, the project document's key justification is:

> "Poor NRE governance continues unchecked, in part, because the poor and the vulnerable are not organised or informed about their rights and responsibilities under current NRE policies, and they have not challenged power structures – national or local government, industries – to halt illegal actions and improve environmental policies and implementation".

The overall assessment is *that Kasa has done remarkably well for a pilot project with effectively 18 months of implementation.* Kasa has generated valuable contributions of CSOs to NRE policy formulation, and has facilitated and supported national CSO platforms on NREG. Kasa has played an important role in attempting to coordinate and support CSO advocacy. Valuable capacity building of CSOs has been delivered in areas of NREG, media, M&E, advocacy strategies and tools.

Kasa has facilitated CSOs in organising, informing and enabling poor and vulnerable communities on their rights. The CSOs have challenged national and local government, even mining and forestry industries on their practice and responsibilities. Not all of these interventions can be attributed directly to Kasa, but evidence has been demonstrated of CSOs challenging and engaging with District Authorities and national agencies (CICOL, ZEFP, GDCA for instance).

In response to the Terms of Reference, the evaluation has assessed the extent to which the expected purpose and outputs have been achieved. It is noted that Kasa as a pilot project has had a certain degree of freedom in adapting its activities and strategies to achieve its outputs, and was not strictly bound by its LogFrame[1]. Thus, the ET has assessed the Outcomes (using a Result's Chain – see Chapter 5), as well as the relevance of the LogFrame to achieve what Kasa set out to do.

The CSOs have made important contributions and have gained recognition in terms of regular consultations and representation and vehicles and platforms have been created, inter alia as a result of Kasa. This being a pilot project, Kasa can be said to have created important inroads especially in terms of consultations and mobilising CSOs to engage in evidence based advocacy. The concrete *contributions to the purpose of the Kasa programme* however, are difficult to verify given the design of the LogFrame and the fact that the five Outputs are not all linked to its

---

[1]   Interviews with RNE and PMT

purpose. The *overall evaluation assessment* is that the CSOs do advocate for NREG, but the Kasa purpose cannot as such be verified.

In terms of contributing to the overall goal and purpose of the project, the ET notes that none of these are measurable, neither in quantity, time nor in quality. The goal has no indicators and would be very difficult to measure.

4.2   Assessment of Purpose

"Civil society and media organisations, in a concerted effort, advocate for equitable access, accountability, and transparency in natural resource and environmental governance"

The purpose has three indicators:

1. 5+ NREG Programme targets are influenced by CS advocacy initiatives

2. 15+ outputs (studies, surveys, productions) on NRE governance issues—including impacts on women and other vulnerable groups—are conducted and disseminated by CSOs

3. 4 CS outputs, including the CS State of the Environment report, are covered by media outlets

The two last indicators concern concrete deliverables being conducted or reported on, which do inform about whether the CSOs produce such studies and reports, but not on what these are used for. The first indicator concerns direct influence on NREG's rather complex programme targets. An assessment of the influence of Kasa on NREG is outside the scope of this evaluation; however, informed by the NREG performance status in 2010, it can be concluded that some of the CSOs have been active in areas that include some of the 2009 NREG LDP targets [2]. These include forestry (VPA agreement between GoG and EU signed), Mining (Consultations with mining communities/CS and mining companies on social responsibility guidelines), Environmental protection (develop draft climate change strategy). While CSOs cannot be said to have directly influenced NREG policies as a result of the Kasa project, CSOs have engaged with the relevant sector MDAs – with or without Kasa support, before or during Kasa. Attribution is difficult here, and the Kasa implementation period is too limited to show such policy influence.

What can be said is that the government has engaged more directly with CSOs at regular sector meetings since Kasa. E.g. Minerals Commission (MC) and Forestry Commission (FC) both hold quarterly meetings with TWN, NCOM, WACAM, FWG, and these NGOs have had indirect influence on policies and practice, according to MC and FC. The avenues to policy influence in NREG seem to have been paved, and the CSOs have begun to use them – not only due to Kasa, but also due to pressure from DPs and the NREG Midterm Review process.

CSOs supported by Kasa have produced widely circulated outputs on NRE. Many concern sustainable management practices, illegal practices, and tracking of implementation – for example the committee to look at the Mining Act include TWN/NCOM, and this CSO and platform also comments on Mining and Environment Policy for EPA; a Jatropha research study by CICOL is informing Ministry of Energy, and CICOL is advocating for a clear Renewable Energy policy. [3]

CSOs are actively and meaningfully engaging with state agencies to attempt influencing NREG policies and to advocate their cause. Their evidence based advocacy contributions and outputs are widely distributed; the quality is not always consistent, and the contributions are not always appreciated by the concerned MDAs.

---

[2]   NREG Draft Midterm Review Report, Sept. 2010 (Byrd, Hiddink and Akwetey), Table 5, p 39-40
[3]   Interviews with TWN, CICOL and reports, interview with EPA.

4.3   Assessment of Outputs

Output 1

On *'CSO fora presenting results to stakeholders' (Output 1),* Kasa has organised and produced 4 CS national fora and 1 media forum, and the reports and communiqués are widely circulated. The NREG parallel review forum in March 2010 was the first of its kind in Ghana, and the resulting draft alternative CS 'State of the Environment (SoE)' report was agreed and circulated.

The most important outcome under this result is the broad CSO consultations and fora that have created cross-learning, sharing of experiences and formation of platforms around key subsectors (mining, forestry, land, fisheries, climate change, water).

Another outcome is that CSO outputs (reports, technical notes and position papers) are appreciated by some MDAs, while others find gaps in the analyses. A frequent comment is that the content of CSO reports is often found inconsistent and/or not useful. The MDAs would prefer deeper analysis, and presentation of position papers at sector meetings to make engagements more useful to them[4]. Over and above presenting papers, CSOs give feedback on performance of government agencies.[5] Government officials inform that they consult the CSOs on draft policies and regulations, which is confirmed by this evaluation. The level of consultations, and their quality and frequency do vary considerably, however. The FC seems to be the most 'advanced' or the agency most systematically engaging with and appreciating CSO input.

It is noted that circulation and dissemination of CSO products is a vehicle towards policy influence, and says little about expected effects on the target groups (media, MDAs and other stakeholders). Presenting issues is important, but does not in itself lead to any results.

Output 2

With regards to *Output 2 (20 CSOs, 10 media and 4 research representatives have demonstrated capacity to effectively advocate),* this is difficult to measure. How do CSOs 'demonstrate capacity'? The indicator (number of trainees) is not helpful. This output essentially deals with Kasa organising and providing training and capacity building to CSOs, either in workshops or one-on-one support and advice, but it does not measure capacity.

Common training events organised by Kasa for CSOs (grantees and non-grantees)

Event	Duration	No of Participants	Time
2 Kasa Capacity Building Workshops in Natural Resource and Environmental Governance (NREG) – Northern and Southern sector	3 days	? + 57	August, September 2009
2 Advocacy Training Workshops, Northern and Southern sector	5 days	27+56	December 2009, February 2010
Financial Management Training Workshop	3 days	48	May 2010
M&E Workshop	3 days	45	May, 2010

According to Kasa's Capacity Building plan, all CSOs were assessed on training needs identified based on the proposals and funding applications. The PMT and an independent evaluator scrutinised the CSOs' applications for Kasa funding in 2009 and 2010. The PMT informs that the training subjects also emerge as a result of dialogue with and regular monitoring visits to the 26 grantees.

---

4   Interview with EPA
5   Interview w FC – CIKOD has presented a 'Transparency Index' on the performance of FC, which found this a useful measure on how the agency interacts with communities.

The grantees are generally appreciative of the above training events. Some highlight that they have learned new techniques, and have in particular benefitted from the 'good practice' presentations by peer organisations, as well as on the exchange of information and experience that naturally occurs during such events.

From a learning perspective, however, none of the workshops demonstrate which concrete skills the participants have acquired. None of the workshop objectives contain active learning verbs, and thus cannot be used to assess what participants were able to do after the workshops. *Annex 4 contains a more detailed assessment* of these capacity building events, with suggestions for future improvement in terms of structure and content.

Outside the formal training sessions organised by Kasa, SNV as part of its consortium commitment, has undertaken organisational assessment and individualised coaching and mentoring of three smaller CSOs in Northern Ghana. The reported input and level of professional support is of high quality and commendable.

In summary, the Kasa initiated training events, based on the design and reporting, were generally relevant and focussed on common generic topics. The grantees report (e.g. GDCA) that they have found concrete assignments on design of advocacy useful, and that they have subsequently applied some of the acquired techniques. Kasa's reporting and the feedback to the ET as well as the grantees' own reporting make it difficult to verify what skills practice and learning was taking place *(Section 5.2 on Institutional capacities provides further analysis of the outcome of Kasa Training events)*.

Output 3

10 key CSOs utilise core funding to become more effective advocates for equitable NRE governance.

In brief, the output concerns the disbursement of core grants. Kasa has provided grants to 19 CSOs for project funding, and 10 CSOs have received core funding. As of end October, 2010, the disbursements were[6]:

- Core: a total of 716,300 GHC, 90 % of budget, 88 % is accounted for by grantees
- Project: a total of 999,730 GHC, 91 % of budget, 89 % is accounted for by grantees

- In June 2009, 100 EoIs were received, resulting in 56 applications for core and project funding. Of these, 16 got project funding and 10 got core – corresponding to an average funding rate of 46% of applications.

The ET notes that the design of the output and its indicators do not inform about <u>how</u> the CSOs are to become more effective advocates. As demonstrated under the purpose, the CSOs do advocate for NREG, and have made important advocacy contributions. The way output 2 is designed does not allow for an assessment of its outcome. The assumption is, supposedly, that coupled with the capacity building under output 2 and the platforms and fora under output 1, the CSOs would utilise core funding to be able to carry out better quality advocacy in NREG.

Output 3 has been achieved in terms of disbursing the grants. It covers the basic funding operations – development of funding manuals, application procedures, call for proposals, screening and review and assessment of applications from CSOs. Kasa has also defined detailed funding benchmarks for core grantees based on detailed activity matrices and indicators as part of their funding agreement. The reviewed benchmarks are part of CSOs' 'core business'. All grantees are obliged to submit quarterly reports, and the PMT informs that

---

6   Kasa PMT grant disbursement overview, November 2010

it tracks their progress against benchmarks quarterly, including financial reporting, which are verified before the requested disbursement of grants.[7]

The output also includes an activity 3.4: "Promote constructive CSO engagement with government through facilitation of 5 exchange meetings with core funding recipients". Since this activity is essentially covered under output 1 and 2, the ET finds that it is redundant here – all the meetings were already set up, the consultative sector groups meetings under NREG were functioning, and the fora and platforms were established.

With the project now expired it is the PMT's task to track the financial reports and prepare the final accounts and report. The April 2010 Kasa progress report informs that

> "There has also been slow implementation by some partners due to a number of reasons including poor planning and overstretched capacity of partners. As a result about 43% of total grants disbursed to partners within the period, are yet to be accounted for by partners in subsequent financial reports. The lesson from all above is that the partners' grants contract period of 12 months is not enough for partners to properly absorb their advocacy grants and there is therefore a need for an extension of their grant period by at least 2 months."[8]

The Kasa PMT's view is that the project period is too short to absorb grants, and that it should be extended to 14 months. The ET notes that the PMT at the time of editing this report is busy tracking outstanding grantees' accounting and assisting them to meet the final deadline.

The Kasa PMT has informed the ET in interviews and in reporting that it follows the established monitoring plan, and that regular one-on-one visits were organised to partners, with individual feedback, in addition to frequent telephone conversations. These visits include feedback on accounting and financial reporting. Internal CARE procurement and financial reporting procedures, as well as frequent changes in PMT staff, seem to have added to the problem of financial reporting by grantees, which again has an effect on the overall project financial reporting. [9]

Output 4

15-20 CS, research, or media organisations use small grants to advocate for equitable NRE governance initiatives, including SoE report and youth driven and media productions. The output has been achieved, in terms of allocating 19 grants for projects related to NREG, including media projects such as RUMNET, GCRN, and Creative Storm. The CSO State of environment has also been prepared, consulted between CSOs and submitted.[10]

The output is almost similar to # 3, the most salient difference being that Kasa has mapped CSO stakeholders in NRE, and embarked on a participative process with the CSOs in defining the priorities and themes for the small grants projects. Not only does this mean that the processes around the small grants have been based on the CSOs' own priorities, but also that there has been substantial differences among the CSOs in defining them. Much of the content of this activity will have been covered by events under outputs 1 and 2. The interesting feature of Kasa is this participative approach, as well as the ingenuity and the innovative content of some of the projects. For example, with Kasa small grants support[11], Creative Storm has launched the first of its kind weekly

---

[7] Kasa April 2010 progress report simply informs that the 'monitoring of benchmarks is on-going'.
[8] Kasa progress Report, April 2010, p. 17
[9] The Kasa MTR in 2009 has similar observations p. 8, and CSOs at the 2010 NREG Consultative forum raised the issue of cumbersome reporting.
[10] The ET has found no evidence that any production has been youth driven.
[11] The Environment Channel is supported by several other private and public donors, incl. the EPA, French Embassy.

Environmental Channel, a TV series for promoting environmental awareness by focussing on every-day environmental impacts, the first of its kind in the country.

Output 5

Lessons learned inform the long-term civil society advocacy mechanism for equitable natural resource and environmental governance

This output is somewhat outside the LogFrame, as it strictly speaking does not contribute to the formulated purpose. Kasa is conceived as a pilot project though, and the justification and logic behind its was precisely to gain valuable experience and draw on lessons learnt, in order to feed into a future CSO advocacy mechanism on NREG.

The ET has therefore as per the ToRs identified some key lessons learnt by CSOs and the Kasa mechanism (please refer to section 7). Similarly, the evaluation assessed the lessons learnt reported on in Kasa's progress reports, and the feedback from stakeholders at the validation workshop on 26th October. These important overall lessons learnt and outcomes could potentially be used to 'inform a future CSO NREG mechanism'.

The ET considers that the proposed draft Kasa II Concept Note does not adequately capture the important lessons in feeding them into a proposal for a feasible programme design for a multi-donor CSO NREG mechanism. One problem is that Kasa was based on a single-donor single-project design, and the draft concept note does not offer a departure from this thinking. Although the design of such a CSO mechanism is not formally a Kasa product, its absence now at end of the project does create a major obstacle and an acute breach in funding for the CSOs.

ICCO and CARE inform that they are committed to keep Kasa functional during a transition period between the pilot and a longer-term mechanism, and a budget has been drawn up to this effect.

The commitment of the two INGOs is commendable, but due to the uncertainties surrounding a future CSO NREG facility the momentum gained under the Kasa project is still in risk of petering out before the new modality has been designed. This discussion is taken up again in section 7 and 8.

4.4   Governance Structure

Kasa is funded by The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Ghana as the main donor, with CARE Denmark contributing 11% and SNV and ICCO 1,4% each. Care Denmark holds the contract between RNE and CARE for the project implementation. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) governs the partnership between ICCO, SNV and CARE Denmark/Golf of Guinea [12]. As per the MoU, CARE Denmark has delegated project management to CARE GoG. In brief, the MoU describes implementation of the project, and defines roles and responsibilities between CARE GoG, ICCO and SNV. The implementation is a joint responsibility, with CARE GoG being the lead partner with decision-making authority. The ET notes that the MoU expired end of July 2010, and that it has not been extended to cover the last three months of the project.

Kasa has a Project Management Team (PMT), with the project coordinator and three grants/capacity building/and communication managers referring to him/her. Kasa also has a small support staff, and is located separately from CARE GoG.

Kasa's Steering Committee consists of the programme coordinator, representatives of ICCO, SNV and CARE GoG, a government representative and a representative from RNE.

---

[12]   MoU for Implementation of Kasa between ICCO. SNV and Care GoG August 1, 2008 through July 31, 2010.

As part of the inception report, the PMT developed a set of draft Grant Management Guidelines, which are being used to call for EoIs, shortlist CSOs, call in CSO applications, receive, register and assess the applications, and subsequently disburse grants. The Kasa SC ultimately decides on grant allocations, based on PMT's screening and assessments. The final contracts for grants are signed between CARE GoG and the grantees. The grant management process is thus comprehensive, with the need for an external independent assessor and PMT's own screening and assessment.

The PMT informs that after the second round of calls in 2009, the SC and the Kasa partners discussed the need for revision of the grant management guidelines, but that this has not been formalised.

According to the MoU, the SC will "take a decision on funding or a refusal (based on description of reasons)", following the PMT's and the independent assessor's recommendations. Further "*The steering committee holds final decision making powers*". The ET notes that the SC thus has the final say in grant disbursement, based on the information received from the PMT. The donor representative on the SC informs that the position of RNE is 'non-committal', acting on the information being tabled by the PMT and that only in case of disagreements the SC has actually decided on grants.

Kasa as a pilot project has modelled its Grant Management Guidelines to a large extent on those of G-RAP, and the ET notes that both mechanisms have used the same independent assessor.

Kasa has no Ghanaian CSO representation in the SC. The PMT has several times – for example at the 2008 Errata Hotel CSO Forum – discussed the participation of CSOs in the SC with the organisations. There seems to be a certain resistance or suspicion amongst the CSO on participating in project management and decisions on grants, since the CSOs have been unwilling during Kasa to assume such a position. Evidently, the contentious issue is that beneficiaries do not wish to be part of a grant decision process – to deny or approve of grants to their peers. The non-participation of CSOs on the other hand renders the project governance open to suspicion of non-transparency, which has been voiced by some of the informants during this evaluation.

The missing CSO representation further makes Kasa vulnerable to criticism about grant decisions and raises the issue of accountability towards the national CSOs. All SC representatives are from INGOs, donors and government. It is unfortunate that Kasa has not been able to establish a more inclusive and transparent governance structure.

Kasa's governance structure is based on a single-project single-donor concept, even though Kasa is co-funded by RNE and three INGOs. Donors and the grant manager in the SC have not observed an 'arms-length' principle as in G-RAP, which on side opens for direct involvement in project management and on the other raises suspicions (unjust or not) about governance intransparency.

In summary of the above, Kasa as a mechanism seems to have both an issue of *commission* (having the SC decide on grants) and one of *omission* (being unable to include CSOs on its SC). Kasa and its SC have attempted to remain as transparent as possible by establishing procedures and inviting CSOs on board. The problem is that the mandates are not clear to outsiders, and that there is a partly justified perception that Kasa may be intransparent. The lesson on this dilemma is that such mechanisms have to be carefully crafted to address the issue of transparency and decision-making.

The available experience from G-RAP and RAVI seems not to have been factored into the design of Kasa or was found not found relevant in establishing Kasa's governance and grant management structures, with the notable exception of the Grant Management Guidelines. Some similarities are noted, but the grant disbursement discussed above has not been resolved.

Without hailing G-RAP as the one and only feasible CSO model, the ET observes that G-RAP operates with a more elaborate governance structure[13], the main features of which are:

- An independent grants' sub-committee (three board members) making recommendations on grant allocations to G-RAP's programme board, which takes the final decision

- An independent funders' committee (consisting of G-RAP donor agencies), which acts as advisor to the board on funding priorities and funds available, as well on fiduciary risk management and monitoring of funds.

- An independent programme board with broad CSO, donor and MP representation, which takes final decision on grants, management, direction and strategy of G-RAP. The PB includes the chair of the funder's committee.

4.5   Value added of Consortium

The Consortium members' roles during the inception phase were a mix of design, funding and capacity building. Both SNV and ICCO provided funds and technical support, while CARE contributed funding and management support. During the implementation phase, the Consortium met twice in a month. The members contributed to the ongoing strategic thinking around the mechanism and its components, processes and relationships and expected outcomes. Discussions were held to arrive at a common position to present to CSOs and also to bring forward issues from CSOs for subsequent advice to Kasa management. Since Kasa was a pilot focused on lessons learnt, the consortium had many discussions on the design of the mechanism itself. An advisory role was added to the consortium's work during implementation. The role of advisor to management was central to the Consortium's work during this phase.[14]

SNV as consortium member has also provided substantial in-kind support during the project, although it did not seem to be so prominent during the later stages of the pilot due to internal changes, which has also made it impossible for SNV to commit to the post-Kasa transition phase and a longer-term mechanism.

In December, 2009, a Kasa midterm review workshop was held. The final report from this intervention has a number of 'Operational and Design' observations, to include:

> **"Demonstrating the value-added of a consortium approach.** Each of the consortium partners have significant NREG experience, and they are making inputs into the Kasa program. For example, CARE invites Kasa partners to trainings and workshops. SNV continues to work with several northern NGOs partners with one-on-one mentoring out of its Tamale sub- office. All three consortium members sit on a committee to review grant applications and thereby make use of their collective experience in the sector. Unlike the architecture of other consortia, clearly distinct roles have not been designated however, apart from the administrative and financial management support CARE provides to the Secretariat."**[15]**

The current evaluation can confirm the last point, and also that initially there was more collaboration between the consortium members during the set-up of Kasa.

---

[13]   For details, please refer to G-RAP Ghana's website (www.g-rap.org, info@g-rap.org)
[14]   Interviews with ICCO, SNV and CARE
[15]   S. Perry: Report on Kasa Mid-Term Review Meeting, November 30-December 1, 2009, p. 8

In order not to lose the valuable contributions that SNV and other INGOs in the sector who are not contributing funds could still make to Kasa, CARE and ICCO has set up a wider group of INGO to be involved in Kasa.

The concept note for Phase II has been discussed among consortium members, but a firmed-up decision on commitments has not been made. Most importantly, the dialogue with the potential donors (RNE, EU) on Kasa's continuation has not been fruitful; a process of carefully timing and planning the termination of Kasa and continuation into a future mechanism is not evident.

In collaboration with ICCO, CARE has committed funds and staff for capacity building during an interim phase (after Kasa has expired), with or without funding from RNE. A budget has been drawn up to this effect. ICCO and CARE inform that they are committed to keep Kasa functional during the transition period between the pilot and a longer-term mechanism *(see also section 8, Recommendations)*.

4.6   Reporting

The evaluation has sampled a number of narrative reports from the Kasa grantees on core and project funding, and has also scrutinised the Kasa progress reports.

The reports from the grantees are almost invariably activity reports towards set implementation plans and objectives. Some of them capture well the progress, whilst others simply report on which activities were conducted. CARE has a requirement for quarterly narrative reporting as an accountability measure[16]. The Kasa PMT thus requests quarterly narrative reports. The reporting formats are found to be quite elaborate. The financial reporting follows the narrative, and is based on a normal practice of projections for funding for the next three months and accounting back on the previous quarter.

The PMT deserves praise for its continuous feedback to grantees on financial and narrative reporting, and grantees (with notable exceptions among the larger CSOs) have all appreciated this type of feedback, stating that it has helped them focus better and improve their internal M&E. The feedback from the PMT has encouraged them to learn and improve. The ET notes that narrative and financial accounting and reporting continues to be a problem for even larger CSOs with considerable routine - a practice of late submission of narrative and financial reporting has persisted under Kasa.

Kasa is conceived as a funding mechanism, a programme to support CSOs in NREG advocacy, and is not supposed to be managing 29 individual projects with 26 grantees. The management and implementation is the partners' own business, guided and assisted by Kasa under the general requirements and formats.

While quarterly narrative reporting is not a requirement from the main donor, Kasa has designed its monitoring system based on quarterly reporting. In the ET's experience and view, quarterly narrative reporting is a cumbersome and demanding practice on CSOs, and considerable time has to be invested. It also demands a certain level of capacity, while such frequent reporting drives the PMT and grantees into a continuous 'reporting' production and checking mode.

Quarterly financial accounting and reporting is quite normal practice and necessary to keep track of financial flows and reduce fiduciary risks.

The following quote suitably sums up the point on reporting and governance raised in this section. The statement was made at the NREG consultative forum in April, 2010:

---

[16]   Interview w PMT

"Kasa is complicating the advocacy landscape: Kasa's role as funding agency and facilitating platform splits the loyalty of beneficiary organizations between its roles. There were also questions of the frequency of reports that Kasa demands. For beneficiaries of Kasa grants, this seems to be a lot of work interfering and shifting their attention from advocacy to report writing."[17]

5   Outcomes and Impact of Kasa

5.1 Enabling environment

During the implementation of NREG, the Government of Ghana and its agencies have come to engage more directly with the CSOs both individually and through the regular sector meetings.

The NREG Mid-Term Review Report (September 2010), observes that

"CSOs that operate in the NRE sector and who were interviewed during the review acknowledge that new institutional space and mechanisms have been created during the implementation of the NREG Programme. However, they questioned the efficacy of those institutional spaces and mechanisms in fostering dialogue, participation, transparency, ownership and accountability between the agencies and non-state actors. They claimed that CSOs did not participate in the design of the NREG Programme and therefore do not feel they are stakeholders in the implementation process. They also noted that there is currently limited awareness about the NREG programme in the entire sector at the national, district and community levels."[18]

The current evaluation confirms the general observations of the NREG review team, but also notes that the CSOs have begun to fill a space provided for in NREG while the MDAs more directly acknowledge the contributions of CSOs in the sector.

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) is coordinating the entire NREG. The CSOs active in NRE are represented in the NREG Subsector meetings: Forestry, coordinated by the Forestry Commission; Mining, coordinated by the Minerals Commission and the Environment, coordinated by EPA. Further, a quarterly NRE sector group meeting, chaired by the EPA and co-chaired by one of the DPs, does have Civil Society representation. At the highest level, the recently created Environment and Natural Resources Advisory Council (ENRAC), includes one CS representative (TWN). Thus, more spaces have been created for CSOs, especially at subsector level.

NREG Subsector working groups	MDA	CSOs (not exhaustive)
Mining	Minerals Commission	TWN, NCOM, WACAM,
Environment	EPA	FoE, WACAM, TWN
Forestry	Forestry Commission	FWG, CIKOD, CICOL

CICOL is also represented on the Project World Bank's Implementation Support Mission (ISM) which has oversight of the Land Administration Project (LAP). The Minerals Commission informs NCOM on studies and its findings under NREG. It also holds regular meetings with e.g. NCOM and WACAM. MLNR is asking for CSO inputs into the formulation of LAP Phase II.

---

[17]   Kasa: Draft Report on Civil society consultative forum on NREG, 2010, p 14.

[18]   NREG Draft Midterm Review Report, Sept. 2010 (Byrd, Hiddink and Akwetey), p 34

The main change is at the district and regional levels where CSO engagements are more effective and are appreciated by the decentralised agencies. The CSOs have provided information and documentation on policies, including the NREG to decentralized departments. Examples are ZEPF's engagement with the District Assembly and the Forestry Division in Walewale and NGND, GDCA with the EPA in Tamale. GDCA has been able to re-activate the District Environmental Management Committees (Northern Province).

The following quotes from the government agencies acknowledge the roles that CSOs play and appreciation of the support

> *"We see them as bringing knowledge"*. (District Assembly, Walewale).

> *"They have provided information and promoted participation on NREG in the rural districts"*. (Reg. Dir. EPA, NR)

Government agencies see CSOs filling a gap that they would otherwise not have been able to fill and also the "watchdog" role keeps them alert and focused on their responsibilities to their constituents.

> *"We see CSOs watching us as helpful. We do invite the NGOs to the assembly meeting"* (District Assembly, Walewale).

Opportunities have also been created for MDAs to support CSOs. For example, GDCA has been able to bring all MDAs present in the North to give advice and input to GDCA on how to work and link local practices to enhance environment and link up to national policies.

5.2   *Institutional Capacities*

The ET finds that it is difficult to demarcate a before and after Kasa change in institutional capacities of the grantees due to the short duration of the support. Nevertheless, since capacity building is one of the areas of the Kasa mechanism, the ET has commented on aspects and outcomes of institutional capacities that one can assess. The activities targeted by Kasa are: training needs assessment, capacity building plan and reporting, workshops, one-on-one support and support to grantees for developing gender strategies.

Training Needs and Plans

According to the KASA Capacity building Plan, all CSOs were assessed on needs.[19] Training needs have been identified by KASA PMT and by an independent assessor, based on the CSO's proposals and funding applications[20]. These were grouped into six categories of common training needs. The plan envisaged three levels of capacity building:

   I.   Kasa PMT initiated generic trainings on cross-cutting training issues such as Advocacy, NREG and M&E

   II.   Individual partner CSO training, identified by partners and incorporated into proposals

   III.   Networks/Coalition level trainings on OD/ID issues

The capacity building plan does not include gender in the generic training, although gender cuts across all sectors in NRE and a number of grantees are working on specific women's rights in land, mining and forestry. Training events seem to be generic in nature, and reports on training events also make it difficult to verify what CSOs have learned *(See also section 4.1 (Output 2) and Annex 4 for a note on Capacity Building under Kasa)*

---

19   Draft plan for Kasa Generic Training, pg 1
20   Kasa PMT training subjects also emerge as a result of dialogue with and regular monitoring visits to the 26 grantees.

An important area of capacity building not covered above is the very thorough and detailed organisational needs assessment and individual coaching and mentoring of three grantees in Northern Region provided by SNV's Tamale office (GDCA, ZEFP, GNADO). After identifying the common training and the specific needs of each CBO, SNV requested to Kasa that they be included in the media training, as well as the other general Kasa training areas. SNV then provided intensive technical backstopping by telephone, leadership coaching, establishing work plans and monitoring these, as well as facilitation of workshops in each organisation. According to SNV, the CSOs have been very receptive and responsive. The available reports are quite detailed and narrate on high quality intensive leadership and technical staff support. As part of the agreement between the consortium partners a total of 33 days of consultant input for this intensive support to CSOs has been provided by SNV.[21]

Workshops

The ET found that Advocacy, Media and M&E training workshops conducted by Kasa have progressively improved from the first to the last in terms of clarity, content and usefulness (from 08/09 to 05/10). The last two advocacy training workshops (12/09 and 02/10) were guided by concrete workshop objectives. The methodologies have also improved, to include skills-oriented and practical sessions on definition and practice of advocacy, and relating this directly to participants' own experience.

The two workshops held in December 2009 and February 2010 appear to have had some practical skills practice and application of adult learning techniques such as linking to CSO's own constituencies, practices and drawing on participants' concrete experience with, for example advocacy campaigns. These were coupled with compelling advocacy documentaries from WACAM in this case. In addition, the February 2010 workshop offered a definition of advocacy, while the one held in December 2009 offered an 'Advocacy Index'.

The report on the M&E Workshop held in Kumasi in May 2010 shows evidence of improvement in objectives and interesting participative group work with practical application of M&E tools and experience sharing by CSOs on their M&E practice, including peer review. However, there is no documentation of tools used.

There was no training organized on research for CSOs as planned. The ET did not find any documented reason why this training on research was not done. Given the recognition of the importance of evidence based research for advocacy, training on topics such as types of research, methodologies for field research[22], research processes and documenting could have been beneficial for the CSOs, especially for the smaller grantees to improve the quality of their research.

Box 1. CSOs views on capacities built

According to the CSOs, capacities built include the following:

- Media components in proposals and budget
- M&E and Financial management
- Improved advocacy methods and tools

Box 2. Broad areas of training needs

1. Natural Resources Governance and policy related issues
2. Advocacy (policy advocacy on NRE issues)
3. Research, M&E and media engagement (communications)
4. Organisational Governance (boards, admin, Financial mgt, and strategic planning)
5. Proposal writing, fundraising and Project management
6. Training of journalists on NRE

---

[21] Interview with SNV representative, Tamale, 19/10 2010
[22] "Engaging in Field research" is one of the criteria for receipt of small grants.

Kasa has made use of the knowledge and experiences of the more seasoned CSOs in advocacy and in media by making them resource persons in some of the workshops on Advocacy and on Media. This sharing of knowledge and experience is very much appreciated by the less experienced CSOs.

Outcomes of training

The training sessions are reported to be well appreciated by most grantees[23]. Some grantees reported that they have learnt new techniques and had benefitted from the "good practice" presentations by peer organisations, as well as exchange of information and experience. GDCA is an example of a grantee that found it useful that advocacy training included concrete assignments on how to write an advocacy paper, define target groups etc.[24] RUMNET has benefitted from the exposure to NRE subjects, which was a new area to them. ZEFP, GDCA, NGND, WACAM refer to the concrete financial management and M&E training which was held in 2010 in Kumasi as beneficial in terms of defining concrete indicators and setting targets, reporting systems. These organisations inform that they have improved their financial management and book keeping practice.

From the Kasa event reports, however, the ET has been unable to verify any concrete skills transfer and learning. CSOs attest to capacities being built in various areas as a result of the trainings and one-on-one support (see Box 2).

The impact of the training events and their outcomes seem to vary according to the size and maturity of the CSOs. For smaller grantees (such as CICOL, ZEPF, etc) the advocacy training seem to have led to more effective and focussed advocacy, and outreach and effects in the communities. The larger organisations such as TWN and ISODEC have not benefitted in particular, and are also critical of the content and approach.

CSOs have gained 'respectability' and are recognised players and have been contacted by government agencies. For example, MLNR has invited CICOL for drafting of Land Administration Project (LAP) Phase II, as well as to obtain the coalition's input to the draft Land Bill. Engagements with Energy Commission are also seen as a result of the capacity building received.

On specific subjects, the quotes below illustrate the capacities built:

> *"We thought of advocacy as just giving voice but you need allies and capacity building to do good advocacy"* (CiKOD)
>
> *"Understanding what we want to do and defining specific indicators of change makes us more visible"* (CiKOD)
>
> *"Our knowledge on NRE was scanty . . .Kasa has really opened our eyes. NRE is really an issue we will take up"* (RUMNET)
>
> *"How to build in a media component and justify why you want to pay for it"*

GDCA, for example, has produced a documentary on sand-winning which has received wide media coverage – shown on TV, radio and in communities.

---

[23]   Interviews with grantees 11th - 25th October 2010 and Desk reviews of reports.
[24]   Confirmed by CIKOD

One-on-one support (monitoring and mentoring visits)

One-on-one support is provided by the KASA PMT in planning, financial management, budgeting and reporting. Support needs are distilled from project narrative and financial reports and also from discussions during monitoring visit. These are termed monitoring and "mentoring visits".

A grantee on one-on-one support:

> *"For example, the Kasa Fund manager comes here for one to two days, working on reporting and budgeting . . . Petty cash and general financial management have improved, including VAT and hotel tax."* (NGND)

Research

Kasa has supported the research activities of eleven grantees. The research covers Mining, Oil & Gas, Environment, Climate Change and Land sub-sectors. Topics include baselines and situational analyses, health risk assessments and epidemiological studies, potential dangers and challenges of bulk minerals, biofuels and land rights, oil & gas and land rights, effects of mining on livelihoods, environmental impact assessments, engagements with duty bearers on responsibilities and arising social conflicts, gender audit, as well as various topics for media production. The Civil Society State of the Environment Report (SoE) is a collaborative research effort supported by Kasa (*see Annex 8 for details of the grantees' research supported by Kasa*). A number of the researches are being carried out for evidence-based advocacy. For example, the SoE, Research on effects of sand and gravel mining on livelihoods of communities in the Northern Region (GDCA), Situational analysis on the level of community participation in mining and environmental governance in Obuasi gold mining companies to ascertain facts for engagement with duty bearers.

Beyond the number of researches supported, the ET has been unable to verify whether Kasa has contributed to improvement in the quality of research of the grantees. As discussed earlier, there has been no training or other capacity building initiatives on research. What can be verified is the contribution that the Kasa grant has made to staffing (for research) and the scope of research activities it has enabled, as well as support for dissemination of research findings. The smaller CSOs were dependent on larger CSOs to carry out research for them but with but with the grants received they have been able to use peers or network members to do the research. *"The Evidence through research of the CSOs enters the public domain"* (CICOL).

There are interesting examples of participative action research being done by GDCA, GCRN, CiCOL and CiKOD. CIKOD uses a Community Institutional and Resource Mapping Process (CIRMP) to do research:

> *"We identify the research issues with the communities", even if we take an interesting area, we get the community to buy in".*

Gender

Kasa mechanism level:

Equitable access and benefit sharing cover issues of inclusion, gender, vulnerable and marginalized, PLWHAs, Disability issues. Gender is a cross-cutting issue for forestry, land, environment, mining, climate change, desertification, water and sanitation and other NRE.

ET found that gender has been reduced to mention of "women and the vulnerable" in the Kasa project document. Even though the Kasa grant

> **Box 3. Kasa Output 1**
>
> Results of 3 CS forums promoting sustainability and the rights of women and other vulnerable groups in NRE governance are presented to at least 100 stakeholders, including government and media

management guidelines state that if an organization being assessed does not have a gender strategy/policy, KASA would support the organization. The ET notes that gender has not been taken up during the entire KASA period.

> *"Kasa has not specifically supported us"*

There is demand for gender support:

> *[During] "Capacity building assessment members asked for gender training"* (CICOL).

> *"We have had a discussion with KASA about 'to what extent can we incorporate gender and use funds'".* (ZEPF).

GDCA indicated plans to carry out gender studies and develop a strategy. This has not been followed up by the PMT or realised by GDCA.

The draft capacity building plan for generic training did not include gender although the independent assessor notes general weaknesses of organizations with respect to gender. No specific gender training has been given neither has gender featured as a crosscutting issue in other trainings.

> *"The Capacity Building Workshops for CSOs on NRE included too many issues – there was never a workshop where gender was discussed."* **(ZEPF)**

Gender has also not been explicitly discussed in any of the NREG sub-sector engagement nor on the platforms.

CSO level

There is a wide variation in grantees' gender journeys. A number of them are working on gender issues. RUMNET produces Every Woman, a page dedicated to women in 'the Advocate'. CICOL is advocating for women's rights in land. GCRN has piloted a project on gender equality in broadcasting in partnership with CENSUDI. Creative Storm has done documentaries covering gender issues with Gender, health and Women's Rights organizations, e.g. WISE, FIDA, Abantu, - "Unsafe abortions, Fresh water, Fuel, Elections, Climate change. . ." CiKOD is looking into how the traditional authority is set up to handle gender issues. NGND has undertaken a gender audit of 34 of its members with KASA grant. However, the methodology, analysis and report have not been shared with Kasa. It is also not clear whether NGND has been trained in gender audit facilitation. The network could have started with an audit of itself. NGND admits challenges with gender.

> *"Gender is captured in our own strategy as one of the areas we must develop"* (NGND)

A few grantees have had gender awareness training for staff/members, although some individuals have participated in gender training workshops. WACAM has done gender training for women in communities and set up gender desks in its four local offices. Only a few of the grantees have capacity for gender analysis (TWN, WACAM, CiKOD). There are some organisations working on Gender policies/strategy (WACAM, TWN). Others like ISODEC, CICOL, ZEPF and RUMNET have just developed or have started drafting gender policies. NGND indicates an intention to do so. These policies are yet to be translated into practice. Gender in systems and practices is not evident, although some attention is paid to Human Resource issues. For a number of CSOs, the ET found that gender is reduced to women and at best a focus on gender balance

5.3   Channels of interventions

Channels of Interventions are understood as vehicles for influence or conducting advocacy, such as sector review meetings, networks and platforms, media campaigns, public hearings or press conferences – all channels through which CSOs make their voice heard and seek accountability.

Networks and platforms

More spaces have been created for CSO to engage and influence through membership on platforms, on steering and technical committees. The Forestry platform, led by FWG, is engaging directly with the FC: (FSD, TIDD, WD, and RMSCC). There are direct consultations, consultative workshops and dialoguing. A sector review mechanism is in place with broad participation.

The Land Platform has a Land sector policy committee with CICOL as the representative. It has created a good opening for engagement. CSOs are also represented on the Land Sector Technical Committee. Ministry of Land and Natural Resources (MLNR) has sector wide review meetings, and Public Agenda/PWYP is represented on the EITI Steering Committee.

Friends of the Earth (FoE) is the CSO representative for the Environment platform coordinated by EPA. NCOM leads the mining platform coordinated by the Mineral Commission.

The CSO consultative forums on NREG (e.g. Dodowa, Oct 2009) had broad representation from all stakeholders including media and GoG and discussed substantial NREG issues. A communiqué was issued and some MDAs have acted on it. E.g. FC on mining in forest reserves. NCOM holds a National forum every year in a community, where 2,000 community members, including victims of mining related incidents/accidents, interact with government officials and discuss government policies.

At the District level GDCA organises an annual CBO Festival, an event involving all communities to discuss key issues which are of concern to CBOs. The festival is an important platform for engaging traditional rulers.

Other platforms are the District Partnership Platform, a regional platform, and SANREC coordinated by NGND.

The CS State of Environment Report

The SoE Report issued in 2010 is either not known by GoG officials or is not recognised as a quality input. However, CSOs contest this. They claim that the conditions for its production were very difficult. It was meant as providing an alternative to what GoG was reporting.

> *"The CS SoE Report is part of evidence based research and alternative to State reporting on the Environment. Initial focus is on methodology"*

> *"We wanted to learn from the process"*

This notwithstanding, CSOs in NRE could have consulted other CSOs who do alternate or shadow reports to find out about the processes involved, channels of dissemination and how to get governments or international bodies to use them. CSOs working on gender and women's rights, for example, produce an alternate report for the Commission on the Status of Women Review each year.

Publications and Productions

There are a number of publications by CSOs. Public agenda has effectively used small grants to influence decisions makers on Oil and Gas sector governance and environmental impact, dialogue with parliamentarians and organise media workshops for peers and publish on NREG issues

Creative Storm has produced well-researched, high quality, creative TV series (the Environment Channel) with strong documentary on 10 environmental issues of public interest. This production is supported by EPA, Kasa and private funders. With a low budget and a large audience (est. 500-800,000 viewers) this is the first of its kind in the country. The environmental awareness channel is the most interesting and innovative Kasa supported media event. RUMNET is in the process of developing a video documentary on desertification.

Kasa organised media awards for journalists, called the 2009 Media Awards. The awards were given out during the CSO Consultative Forum. This is an innovative pathway to create awareness and attention and to motivate journalists to cover NRE issues. The ET notes that not only has the media coverage on NRE issues increased (Kasa Media Updates), but Kasa grantees consciously involve journalists and media houses in their advocacy efforts (e.g. GDCA, RUMNET, CIKOD, NGND). There has been cross-sectoral collaboration for example between CONIWAS and CICOL. RUMNET has facilitated the creation of a network of media practitioners called MASE (Media Advocates for Sustainable Environment).

5.4   Changes in policy, practice, behaviour and power relations

According to the Kasa project document, Kasa was set up to "boost civil society's participation in and influence on NRE governance . . ."[25] A number of CSOs, for example WACAM, ISODEC, TWN, ZEPF, NGND, were already influencing policy before Kasa. It is clear that not "all policy change found can be attributed to Kasa alone", especially, when one considers the short period of the Kasa pilot.

> *"[There has not been] …. enough time and engagements to say that CSOs have started to influence a lot of policies"* (IDEG).

CSOs have been providing some inputs to government for policy formulation in the form of documents and reports. *"They have informed our positions, policies and project documents. They help us establish priorities"* (EPA, Accra). Whilst this is appreciated by some government agencies, others find gaps in the analyses provided by CSOs. The content is often found to be inconsistent and not particularly useful. Some MDAs, for example EPA in Accra, would have liked deeper analyses and presentation of position papers at sector meetings to make engagements more useful to them. CSOs also give feedback on performance of government agencies to them. It seems that Government Agencies even though they welcome CSO support do not understand or know how to formulate requests to them. CSOs and government agencies have not built an initial phase of consultations to define needs and clarify the nature of engagement. This would have made engagements more satisfying at this level.

CSOs engagements are more effective and are appreciated at the regional and district levels by   decentralized agencies. CSOs have provided information and documentation on policies, including the NREG to decentralized departments. E.g. NGND, ZEPF. *"We see them as bringing knowledge"*. (DCD, Walewale). *"They have provided information and promoted participation on NREG in the rural districts"*. (Reg. Dir. EPA, NR). Government agencies see CSOs filling a gap that they would otherwise not have been able to fill and also the "watchdog" role keeps them

---

[25]   Care, ICCO, SNV: Kasa (Speak Out in Twi)" *Poverty Reduction through Civil Society Advocacy and Environmental Governance in Ghana.* Developed by CARE, ICCO and SNV, Submitted to the Royal Netherlands Embassy. July 8, 2008.

alert and focused. *"We see CSOs watching us as helpful. We do invite the NGOs to the assembly meeting"* (DCD, Walewale).

At the district level, government agencies have included NREG issues into Medium Term Expenditure Framework/Plans. CSOs are also able to reach the communities better. Government agencies have called for a harmonization of plans and activities between the CSOs and government. agencies to make engagements between them more effective. (Forestry Division, Walewale).

Upstream - Government

CSOs are now accepted as partners in development. CSOs are represented on NREG committees, boards and advisory councils, and their input can now be said to be institutionalised. Some sectors now inform CSOs and their networks on their plans and activities and solicit comments from them.

- *"Everything we do we inform NCOM, including studies under NREG" (MC)*
- *"We have taken them as partners and ask for feedback on performance. Helps you make good delivery* "(FC)
- *Government is becoming responsive to demands of CSOs, e.g. draft Land Bill,* (CICOL)
- *Jatropha research is informing Ministry of Energy. CICOL is calling for clear Renewable Energy policy based on this research*

Sector PAFs in regions have responded to CSO assessment of their activities. CSOs are now invited to give updates on their areas of (operation) by government agencies, e.g. MoFEP, and Government participates in CSO events such as the Annual reviews. Planning practices have also changed. Planning is now done in a consultative way, bottom-up instead of top-down. Issues are taken from the communities and threaded up.

> *"We used to carry out sector activities and plans (top-down) without community involvement".* (MLRN)

At the regional and district levels the responses have been more dramatic. Forestry Division was questioned by ZEPF on its duty to establish plantations which it had not done. The issue has been taken up by the regional and national body. The result is that:

> *"We have now been asked and resourced to do that" (Forestry Division, Walewale)*

In the same district, the District Assembly has incorporated the Climate Change plan directly into their Medium term development plan (MTDP), based on ZEPF's input and involvement. At the local level, duty bearers are now sharing information more freely and willingly. Regional level CSOs hold meeting regularly with government. agencies in their sectors. (Mineral Commission)

In Dodowa, the CSOs discussed the infringements on forest reserves. *". . .they talked about forest reserves and immediately after the communiqué was issued, the Minister set up a committee to look at the issues in the communiqué"* (FC)

"There is an increase in spaces for CSOs to engage with duty bearers in regional coordinating councils."

CSO publications and reports have been found useful by government agencies *"It brings attention to the issue and if it has not been addressed, we are made to do it"(EPA).* However, government agencies do not appreciate the fact that these are most times published without consultation. Some of the content is found by agencies to be factually incorrect. They would have been appreciated it more if issues had been discussed. Government would also find it more useful if CSOs could come with position papers on issues. *"Some will not even seek your views. Sometime it is very difficult".* (MLNR).

Downstream –Communities

Grantees attest to communities now engaging duty bearers to demand accountability. There is heightened awareness by community members and empowered communities. *"Local people are beginning to understand [their rights]'* (MLNR). This has lead to increased Community management of resources with CSO and benefit sharing (MLNR). Some MDAs now involve communities in their interventions. CSOs bring out issues at the community level that agencies in the district may not notice, thus complementing government's efforts.

GCRN has opened the eyes of traditional authorities to citizens leaving the district because of adverse effects of sand winning. Directives were given to sub-chiefs with a penalty of destoolment if community engages in sand winning.[26]

In the Upper West, through CiKOD's advocacy, regional leaders have directed that all areas establish traditional women leaders and not queens. The President of the regional house of chief has written to all paramount chiefs to submit names of their traditional women leaders.

NCOM has created space for macro-meso-micro interaction and linkages. NCOM organises a national forum every year in a community, with about 2,000 community members, including victims of mining related incidents/accident to interact with government officials and discuss government policies.

5.5   *Broader development goals*

Avenues have been paved for contributing to the Kasa goal, but it is yet too early to attribute developments to Kasa. Communities are engaging duty bearers on rights and demand accountability. Women have also taken up more community ownership (GCRN). More trust has been established, echoed by both sides. CSOs are being seen as partners in development and not just critiques

> *"It has awakened us to know that almost everybody's life is dependent on NR so for sustainability we need to sustain the Environment".* CIKOD

6   **Evaluative conclusions**

6.1   *Evaluative conclusions*

The Kasa programme is relevant and has contributed to its purpose of promoting CSOs and media organisations to advocate for NREG in Ghana, through platform support, coordination and the capacity building efforts and the funding made available to CSOs through Kasa.

In summary of the analysis in Chapter 5, Kasa's main outcomes at the Results Chain levels 1 (Enabling Environment), level 2 (Institutional Capacity), level 3 (Channels of Intervention) and 4 (Changes in Policy, Practice) are contributing towards the project's purpose: *Civil society and media organisations, in a concerted effort, advocate for equitable access, accountability, and transparency in natural resource and environmental governance.* This evaluation concludes that the CSOs do advocate for improved NREG. The main problem is that the project design does not allow for a meaningful assessment of the quality and quantity of these efforts.

The policy environment is relatively conducive, although CSO-state engagements in the NREG sector subcommittees and other platforms are far from systematic and consistent. Policy making in Ghana has shifted

---

[26] Interview with GCRN Coordinator

from being very exclusive (before 2004-2003) to now more transparent and giving space for CSOs to be consulted – not least after pressure by the donors in NREG.

What can be said is that the government has engaged more directly with CSOs at regular sector meetings since Kasa. The avenues to policy influence in NREG seem to have been paved, and the CSOs have begun to use them – not only due to Kasa, but also due to pressure from DPs and the NREG Midterm Review process.

Some of the CSOs have been active in policy areas that include some of the 2009 GoG NREG LDP targets. While CSOs cannot be said to have directly influenced NREG policies as a result of the Kasa project, CSOs have engaged with the relevant sector MDAs – with or without Kasa support, before or during Kasa. Attribution is difficult here, and the Kasa implementation period is too limited to show such policy influence.

The concrete influence on NREG policies is difficult to verify, but examples of CSO influence have been demonstrated, both in terms of preparatory processes (at NREG sector meetings, e.g. draft policies an guidelines on Mining, Sept. 2010), as well as monitoring and tracking existing legislation (providing information and documentation on policies at district levels to DAs, tracking implementation of the Mining Act in local communities, e.g. on sand winning in Northern R). CSOs produce a wide range of evidence based advocacy publications and interventions that are widely circulated and generally appreciated.

Kasa's most important outcome is probably its influence as vehicle for CSOs advocacy work on NRE at regional level:

> *"CSOs are very useful to the government – they take us to task. Kasa was a wake-up call on issues of governance, accountability, sustainability, transparency. Government is spending money, and it is important for ordinary citizens to know for what purpose. District assemblies receive money – and Kasa has opened people's eyes. CSOs have role to play in all the above – they have the right and have taken the opportunity."[27]*

Alternative pathways to NREG are also demonstrated, viz.: inclusion of communities in participatory research and planning, monitoring and tracking studies, addressing governance issues and use of public resources (e.g. GDCA, CICOL, WACAM) and ensuring poor rural communities access to NRE rights and governance.

In terms of *Kasa's outputs,* the level of attainment varies.

1. CSO fora and platforms present results to stakeholders

2. CSOs have demonstrated capacity to advocate

3. Core and small grant funding used to become more effective advocates

4. Lessons learnt inform long-term CSO mechanism

These outputs are generally not measurable – it is very difficult to measure 'demonstrated capacity' or 'more effective advocates'. The CSO fora and platforms have all been realised, and are key vehicles for Kasa in terms of CSOs' participation in policy and issue based networks. Kasa has realised a broad capacity building programme for CSOs on generic project management and NREG subjects with some success, but any concrete skills and learning is difficult to verify. The core and project grants have been disbursed according to indicators, and a total of 26 CSOs have benefitted.

---

[27] EPA, Northern Regional office

Similarly, the design of the LogFrame's Output 1 leaves much to be desired in terms of gender equality. This has been reduced to 'women and the vulnerable' and has not been seriously addressed by Kasa. The issue is highly relevant to NRE since gender is a cross-cutting issue and resource access is very gender specific. In terms of addressing gender equity in and ensuring gender mainstreaming among Kasa grantees, the design of the output is inadequate and not relevant.

Gender mainstreaming has for the most part not been internalised by the CSOs – they have not moved beyond awareness into practice. A number of the organisations do have gender policies, strategies and action plans, but attitudes and behaviours have not changed.

The lessons learnt from Kasa as a pilot programme have not yet been transformed into an agreed long-term CSO mechanism, but they are available in Kasa reports and in this evaluation.

The outcomes of the Kasa programme and its general relevance have been amply demonstrated by this evaluation, especially in the areas of CSO influence on preparatory legislation processes and the recognition they have obtained in NREG. Kasa has also been successful in terms of facilitating and coordinating networks, platforms and supporting a wide range of stakeholder's participation and active contribution to NRE through these fora. The overall assessment is ***that Kasa has done remarkably well for a pilot project with effectively 18 months of implementation***.

However, the design of Kasa's project LogFrame cannot be said to be entirely relevant to achieving its goal and purpose since the project LogFrame is generally vaguely formulated and has few quantifiable indicators – or the indicators are not relevant to measuring the output and purpose.

As pointed out by all CSO respondents in this evaluation, it has to be recognised that Kasa's effective implementation period has simply been too short (about 18 months of full operation). The first grants were disbursed in the first half of 2009, due to long delays in initial project start up. This has made both grantees and PMT stressed, having to abide to short deadlines and focus on time and delivery rather than content.

What has made Kasa successful and relevant are the *strategies employed* to facilitate the platforms and experience sharing, the flexibility in addressing emerging issues in these fora, and the ingenuity and innovation shown in particular by the CSOs in utilising project and core funds to pursue their advocacy objectives.

> "A feature of Capacity Building that has become prominent is the unplanned, spontaneous day-to-day support to partners through phone calls and drop-in visits by partners to the Kasa Secretariat. This type of support is usually driven by the urgent need of a partner who feels such a need can be met by the Kasa PMT. Such one-on-one support can be on technical, Organisational Development or financial management issues. The frequency of such consultations has increased greatly and can be said to constitute a major innovation within the program. [….] The emerging challenge is to ensure that partners plan for such support so that it can be properly manage without too much pressure on KASA staff". [28]

Kasa's PMT thus has to a large extent responded to the emerging issues and requests for capacity building, particularly to the smaller grantees. The project seems to have had less focus on strategic and project management issues, but has been very responsive to the grantees' needs. Flexibility and attention to such support comes at a price. In other words, the relevance and success of Kasa is due neither to its design nor planning but

---

[28]   Kasa Narrative Progress Report, October-April 2010, p 11

to its flexibility and the way in which the project has been able to engage with CSOs and promote and support them in their quest for equitable NREG.

6.2   *Kasa as mechanism*

In section 4.4 the evaluation concludes that Kasa's governance design is not conducive to a multi-donor facility for CSO support and there is no CSO representation on Kasa's SC. Donors and the grant manager in the SC have not observed an 'arms-length' principle as in G-RAP, which opens for direct involvement in project management. In addition, Kasa's governance is – unjustly or not - perceived by some of the CSOs as not entirely transparent. The experience and model of G-RAP seems not to have been found relevant or has not been utilised for Kasa.

The CSOs participating in Kasa has debated the issue of CSO representation on Kasa several times, including in Dodowa in 2009. No firm conclusions were made and there were divided perceptions on the value. It has to be acknowledged that Kasa has not had exhaustive processes in its design. In Ghana there is a strong perception on government interference with CSO facilities, which in the view of many would corrupt the very purpose. The lessons from G-RAP are that resources can be provided by donors without the need to have firm and direct control, and that CSOs, donors and MPs can sit on a board without risk of interference – provided that the structures are properly designed (*see section 4.4 and section 7*).

6.3   *Sustainability*

The Ghanaian civil society would presumably cease to function (and at least be seriously set back) if all international DPs would leave the country tomorrow. Sustainability is among others associated with the organisational sustainability of civil organisations. The core funding from mechanisms such as Kasa and G-RAP allows CSOs to build organisational capacity with a potential for longer-term sustainability – especially in terms of providing avenues for attracting funds from other sources. CSOs under Kasa do see the coalitions and platforms as a way of pooling resources.

Kasa's core funding to CSOs has allowed building some institutional capacity and systems, to recruit programme and technical staff and as such developing a certain inertia to changes, with a potential for their long term sustainability. At local level, the CSOs note that some DAs have begun to gain a level of ownership of local consultation processes around NREG. Once DAs have resources, they would be able to develop their own by-laws and ways of engaging with communities.[29]

The outcomes and effects of Kasa in this sense will remain over time, but as advocacy and media productions are very costly interventions, the CSOs will continue to depend on external funding.

The discussion of financial sustainability of these CSO is from the ET's point of view futile. The level of activities and the costly interventions of the larger NGOs within advocacy will not be sustained over time. The CSOs would revert to project funding and depend on donor programmes to fund specific consultancies and core staff would probably be forced to leave. Think tanks and also smaller CSOs are useful as watchdogs, monitors and in providing quality advocacy that feed into key policy processes. CSOs are in particular providing links to local communities and offering valuable feedback and even services to district and traditional authorities.

---

[29]   Interview w CIKOD, confirmed by WACAM and GDCA on mining and traditional authorities

7   Main lessons learnt

The CSOs supported by Kasa have made important contributions and have gained recognition in terms of regular consultations and representation and vehicles and platforms have been created, inter alia as a result of Kasa. This being a pilot project, Kasa can be said to have created important inroads especially in terms of consultations and mobilising CSOs to engage in evidence based advocacy.

What has made Kasa successful and relevant are the *strategies employed* to facilitate the platforms and experience sharing, the flexibility in addressing emerging issues in these fora, and the ingenuity and innovation shown in particular by the CSOs in utilising project and core funds to pursue their advocacy objectives. In other words, the relevance and success of Kasa is due neither to its design or plans, but to its flexibility and the way in which the project has been able to engage with CSOs and promote and support them in their quest for equitable NREG.

Confirmed by this and several other CSO evaluations[30], core funding is the optimal modality for supporting CSOs in their voice, accountability and advocacy work. Core funding is used to support key functions of the CSOs (systems and investments, core staff, planning, strategies, networking and capacity building).

7.1   CSO engagement with sector agencies

The MC and EPA are less advanced than FC on CSO involvement. MC reports on early discussion of even draft ToRs with the CSOs involved. The MC and EPA sector review committees appear to be less efficient and more confrontational, according to the MDAs. This is also related to the level of capacity of CSOs involved, as well as on representation and coordination between the NGOs.

The overall lesson is that the nature of the government agencies and the role they have to play has an effect on the quality of the outcomes of engagement. Stakes and interest in mining are very different from forestry, where the stakeholders have the same agenda (protection of forests, afforestation, community involvement etc). The MC is more akin to an investment promotion agency, and the financial interests in that sector are substantial. The EPA is more of a regulatory, technical and policing agency, where the technical subject matter requires a deeper understanding and a higher a technical capacity.

Some of the reasons why the government-CSO mechanisms are most dynamic and productive in forestry sector are the FC's long history of donor interest and technical collaboration, incl. EU support to VPA, the current GIRAF programme, and the converging interests with CSOs and other stakeholders.

FC have realised the approach of policing was not efficient and they needed to and were willing to collaborate with stakeholders.

Historically, an effective communication between FC and CSOs has been established, including an involvement in policy directions. FC has tried to implement these, and has recognised the importance of other stakeholders, and notably the communities. FC is recognising that it is the CSOs and CBOs who are able to engage and involve the forestry and fringe communities directly.

Some of the MDAs in the sector, in particular EPA, has provided direct technical training or information sessions at various Kasa organised CSO forum, e.g. EPA's training for CSOs on EIA and SEIA.

---

[30]   Including Final Evaluation of G-RAP, August 2010

Lessons on engagement with government agencies at local and regional levels are also interesting. The successful collaboration of some of the CSOs is due to an absence of regulatory agencies e.g. EPA at the district level. The decentralisation has simply not yet reached the lower levels in the government structures; the regulatory structures are non-existent, or the DA has not yet been resourced or has not realised that it is their responsibility.

7.2 *Kasa Mechanism*

The slow project start-up of Kasa and establishing the basic grant management and reporting systems took more than six months. During this critical time, the project also suffered a high staff turnover. This has affected the time period for actual implementation of Kasa grant projects – i.e. the funds made available to grantees to undertake their advocacy and evidence activities, which has been <u>very short</u> (from April 2009 to October, 2010).

All grantees have unanimously reported that it is very difficult to show concrete results. The implementation period also makes reporting and monitoring difficult. Most grantees have found Kasa's narrative reporting and financial reporting rigid, and all would have preferred semi-annual, not quarterly reporting.

The initial project set-up and establishing of grants systems and making Kasa known to the CSO etc. is not surprising and similar to establishing other facilities such as RAVI and G-RAP. The project should have had a 6-month inception phase to allow for initial learning. CARE could have modelled Kasa more on G-RAP, especially as it is managing both facilities. If the institutional memory from the setting up of G-RAP had been brought more actively into establishing Kasa, the long lead in period and the initial 'teething' problems could probably have been reduced.

The role of providing on the one hand funding to CSOs and on the other giving advice and coordinating platforms and networks is problematic and is not well accepted by the CSOs, especially not by the larger and more advanced ones.

Some of the grantees have problems in multi-donor financial reporting, especially in case of manual accounting systems. Kasa has sought to address this through the on-site visits by PMT.

The hands-on feedback, advice and instructions from the Kasa PMT to the CSOs on financial matters, accounts, reporting and presentation of applications are appreciated by the grantees.

7.3 *Governance structures*

The design of Kasa's governance structure is based on a single-project single-donor concept, even though Kasa is funded by several INGOs and donors. This is not conducive to a multi-donor facility for CSO support in NREG.

An 'arms-length' principle has not been observed on Kasa, since the PMT and the implementing agency (CARE), as well as donors are directly involved in grant disbursement and project management.

Experience from G-RAP and RAVI seems not to have been factored into design of Kasa, or was found to be not relevant in establishing Kasa's governance structures. Consensus building amongst the key stakeholders in NREG about the future mechanism is a precondition to commence the design of a phase II.

G-RAP and Kasa having been tested, with Kasa as an evolving and learning mechanism, there is a need for a continued CSO facility under NREG to allow for an enhanced government-CSO collaboration, for accountability on both sides, and for the platforms and networks established to mature and develop.

7.4   Lessons learned from Kasa feeding into a future mechanism (output 5 of LogFrame)

The structure and representation of a future mechanism has important bearings on ownership and effectiveness as well as legitimacy, and need to be carefully elaborated with broad CSO consultations as part of the design of a future mechanism.

Through CSO fora and training events, Kasa grantees have shared valuable practice and produced functional advocacy and media strategies, which are being duplicated by other CSOs. A future CSO mechanism has been discussed several times in Kasa organised events, incl. at the 2009 Consultative NREG forum in Dodowa.

The draft concept note for a future Kasa does present some key lessons learnt and provides justification for a future specific CSO NRE platform.

The following lessons learnt in the Kasa concept note are corroborated by this evaluation and merit mention here

- Timely evidence based advocacy and policy feedback from CS to government policies and reforms. This is also confirmed by government officials, seeing CSOs under NREG as important partners in the policy formulation (FC, EPA).
- A number of initiatives in the sector (KASA, GIRAF, GHEITI, EITI) are supporting policy engagement and participation. Coordination and alignment amongst DPs, CSOs and government is necessary, but not yet evident, despite Kasa.
- Progress has been noted at the 2009 Dodowa NREG review on coordination and collaboration through lead CSOs under various sector platforms (mining, forestry, land, climate change, oil & gas etc.) The CS NREG review in 2010 (Oak Plaza, Accra), produced review of draft sector policies in important areas such as mining.
- The need for CB for increased engagement and evidence-based advocacy amongst CSOs in the sector is infinite, and the level of advocacy and analysis capacity between the actors is very uneven. (Kasa has been providing basic advocacy, media, M&E training (generic based on perceived common needs, ET's note).
- Many stakeholders have very high level of expectations as to what CSO platforms could achieve and which challenges could be taken up in such fora. Experience shows that there are limits to what can be produced and notably agreed on in these quite heterogeneous platforms.
- Consolidation of existing networks and coalitions in the sector is relevant and necessary. Kasa has been assumed or played a role of setting up coordination of such groups by the CSOs, but not without arguments and disagreements of its mandate to do so.

Key Lessons Learnt from the current final evaluation on the Kasa Mechanism

- Through the CSO fora and the advocacy and media training events, Kasa has perhaps most importantly enabled grantees to share valuable practice and produce functional advocacy and media strategies for the sector, which are being duplicated by other CSOs

- Kasa has had a certain flexibility in its response to CSOs needs and priorities – reflected in the small project grants and the emerging discussions in the NREG for a, and notably the PMT"s attention to emerging capacity building needs and other emergencies, especially smaller grantees

- Kasa has enabled smaller CSOs to seize opportunities and to participate in training on general topics and NREG review fora. Kasa has facilitated creation of avenues and conditions for NREG policy influence, and in particular for CSOs to monitor and track NREG implementation, and finally CSO engagement with local authorities at district and regional levels

- Kasa's support to media productions (TV, Radio, and printed media) has been innovative and has enabled a demystification of NRE and heightened public environmental awareness

- CSO and government representatives consider the coalitions and platforms created under Kasa as fora that will continue to exist after the project

- Kasa is seen by many government officials as a useful NGO coordination window and facility, helping to deal not with many organisations, but with one Kasa only

- CSOs at the validation workshop, backed by government representatives, even consider Kasa as a process, not a project, and pointed to the need to look beyond the project

- Kasa as a facility has been encouraged by CSOs to assume a coordinating and even activist role in forging alliances and taking up a CSO space that was not theirs to fill. Kasa is however, not a CSO, and the criticism by some of the NGOs in the sector of Kasa's role has been direct and harsh. The underlying causes include very limited funding, capacity of CSOs and the perceived legitimacy of the leading CSOs.

The criticism by CSOs of facilities such as G-RAP and Kasa assuming an activist role is legitimate. It has to be acknowledged, however, that it has been the CSOs themselves ceding this role to the agencies Kasa and G-RAP. After the initial coordination and facilitating role, the CSOs themselves should assume this host role, and not leave it to a facilitating agency. With all the CSOs competing for resources, none are comfortable with assuming the lead role – which is also a resource matter. Limited funds lead to competition, and collective responsibility becomes very tricky.

In view of all the above, the ET considers that the proposed draft Kasa II Concept Note does not adequately capture the most important lessons in feeding them into a proposal for a feasible programme design for a multi-donor CSO NREG mechanism. One problem is that Kasa was based on a single-donor single-project design, and the draft concept note does not offer a departure from this thinking. Although the design of such a CSO mechanism is not formally a Kasa product, its absence now at end of the project does create a major obstacle and an acute breach in funding for the CSOs. The momentum gained under the Kasa project is in risk of simply petering out, unless the DPs and the consortium partners of Kasa can find a way to bridge this gap until a new modality has been designed.

7.5   Capacity Building

The continuous process of nurturing CSO networks and providing sustained capacity building on evidence based advocacy and media has enabled the smaller and less experienced CSOs to obtain respect from government.

The evaluation found no evidence of non-facilitated peer-to-peer capacity building amongst CSOs. Many CSOs are actually aware that peer organisations are able to help and could provide valuable experience and even methods. E.g. in gender, Netright (member of several coalition), could provide such capacity building. In media training, and in some of the NREG subjects, Kasa has facilitated such use of peer capacity building. Initiatives from CBOs to seek such expertise by themselves seem to be very scanty.

Outside formal training sessions, Kasa (through) SNV has imparted high quality individualised coaching and mentoring of smaller CSOs. This level of engagement (from the available documentation) is efficient and covers the analysed organisational and technical capacity needs, to build confidence, have a strategic impact and bring the organisations onto a higher level. The costs associated, however, are substantial.

7.6   Media engagement

Involving media as partners, not as news agents, and building their capacity on NRE issues has been an efficient strategy of CSOs to have much wider coverage and interest by Media in NREG issues. RUMNET, GDCA, CICOL are examples. Kasa media training has also allowed more advanced media organisations and CSOs to expose other CSOs to strategies, products, and better media engagement.

Kasa's media component has enabled and facilitated CSO's gaining a much larger space and easier access to media and has created an increased interest by mainstream media in NRE issues. Similarly, the continued focus on NRE issues by e.g. RUMNET, Creative Storm has at different levels heightened the public awareness and created sustained focus of media on NRE issues.

7.7   Policy influence and direct CSO engagement

The CSOs' limited understanding of the needs, requirements and mechanisms in Government, and vice versa on the challenges and positions of CSOs, in combination lead to not very effective and sometimes unproductive subsector consultation meetings. Government would like deeper analysis, presentation of papers at sector meetings, and better consultations with CSOs. The EPA e.g. give the CSOs time to present positions on papers in the sector working group, but they do not find the presented papers consistent or useful. The EPA is not consulted on papers and issues the CSOs are advocating on. CSOs on their side are unhappy with the rigidity and short deadlines, and lack of understanding by the MDAs of CSOs' condition makes the collaboration rather difficult.

Clearly, a deepened and more structured dialogue to understand the positions and the needs and requirements on either side is required.

7.8   Upstream-Downstream linkages in policy-practice

Examples have been found in the forestry sector of CSO research informing Min. of Energy, and of district division of forestry being questioned by CSO on its duties and subsequently resourced to establish plantations.

Through advocacy, traditional leaders in UWR have instructed all areas to establish traditional women leaders (CIKOD). Several agencies have informed that a heightened awareness on NRE issues has lead to empowered communities and better knowledge of rights (EPA, MLNR).

7.9   INGOs

The INGOs and major CSOs in the sector need to clarify their positions and roles when engaging in processes of supporting platforms, networks and proving resources. Legitimacy and representation has been a contentious issue in Kasa. In a future NREG support mechanism, the CSOs and the INGOs need to come to an understanding of representation and which role they can and should play.

Each of the partners needs to think carefully about the roles in various consultation fora, especially when decisions about representations are to be made.

7.10   Gender

On gender, Kasa's design and performance has not been adequate. Output 1 simply covered 'women and other vulnerable groups'. The project should have had concrete outputs and indicators addressing access to resources and women's participation in decisions on their own resources. Gender cannot be treated as simply a cross-cutting issue; a serious approach should address "women's limited or lack of decision making". Kasa has not taken up the challenge and addressed this resource issue – partly due to the design, but also due to a prioritisation.

The CSOs in NREG do have some examples of gender equality approaches and research on access to resources, but these are relatively few CIKOD, NGND. GCRN has an interesting and innovative project on gender equality in radio broadcasting and community involvement.

Few grantees have gender policies and strategies, but some of them have started the process, including and audit of all organisations in NGND's network. Gender mainstreaming is not evident in systems and practices of the CSOs. The CSO have some knowledge and are interested, but there is no CSO that takes the lead and starts working seriously on the issue, even though it is a requirement as per Kasa grant guidelines and even part of the funding. Several NGOs in the networks of the organisation do have the capacity to provide peer review, training and consulting services.

8   Recommendations

The DPs (RNE in particular) in the NRE sector are very keen on supporting a future CSO support mechanism. An actual design of a future mechanism has not been agreed upon, and there is currently no bridge to close the gap between the end of Kasa and the launching and final agreement on a future mechanism.

In the immediate future, Kasa's lessons learnt, the NREG platforms and the CSOs participation will inform the continuous discussions until it is agreed what specifically the DPs can and will support. The budget lines and deadlines are tight so there is an urgency to design the mechanism.

The government sector agencies interviewed during this evaluation have expressed their unanimous support to Kasa and to the CSOs participating in the platforms and discussions. Kasa as a modality, even a process, was seen as very important to the NREG by the MDAs present. It was even suggested that funds could be made available from the NREG budget in support of CSO engagement.

The final evaluation validation workshop on the 26th of October *endorsed a proposal by CARE and ICCO* to finance - on an interim basis and to ensure that momentum is not lost amongst the CSO - the operation of a 'bridging' arrangement, providing:

✓   Support to sustain the functioning NREG platforms

✓   A Consultant/coordinator to manage the transition period

✓   Support for a number of selected KASA processes, such as dissemination of the CSO SoE report

CARE has made it very clear that the funding is not unlimited, and that the INGOs will neither determine where the 'bridge' would lead nor what will pass over it.

Recommendations

1. A sector specific NRE CSO support mechanism should be maintained to ensure constructive engagement with government in NREG and to build on experiences and lessons learned under Kasa. To take care of the collective interest, the mandate of such an NREG CSO facility must be clearly defined. The services of an agency should enhance the capacity of CSOs to influence and deliver evidence-based advocacy and increase their visibility.

2. Based on lessons from this evaluation and Kasa, G-RAP and Ravi, it is recommended that an independent external consultant design a CSO NREG sector support mechanism (to include draft governance and financing, basic LogFrame and budget as a minimum.) The design should include but not be limited to:

   ✓ Longer term (4-5 years) timeframe to enable delivery on purpose, goal and broader outcomes

   ✓ Model should be G-RAP, which has proven resilient and independent

   ✓ A new 'Kasa' must have CSO/grantee representation on programme board to ensure ownership

   ✓ A CSO support mechanism should not play the role of managing and representing, nominating on behalf of CSOs

   ✓ DPs should keep a sound 'arms-length' principle

3. Given the criticism expressed by some of the CSOs about Kasa's role in advocacy, the CSOs in the NRE sector should use the existing networks and platforms in the sector to agree on coordination and representation in the key NREG subsector working groups and other platforms. The CSO should receive funds from a future facility to enable them realise this representation.

4. Consultation mechanisms should be improved on the sector review committees and the overall NREG committee.

   ✓ DPs should facilitate the process by supporting capacities and promote technical dialogue

   ✓ CSOs representatives and government officials in these fora should inform and explain what they need, in which form evidence, feed-back or technical documents, position papers etc. should be, and why these inputs are important

   ✓ It is suggested to experiment with a simple "structured dialogue" method, or similar, to develop form and content

   ✓ Joint capacity building on technical NREG subjects (government + CSOs) such as the EPA has provided could be a model

   ✓ More frequent meetings, if feasible, would be very helpful

CSOs own Recommendations:

From the present evaluation, a lucid perspective is provided from one of the grantee workshops that captures the condensed sentiments of the CSOs present:

Kasa should be roaring like a lion to empower CSOs with resources to carry out policy and community advocacy

Duration of Kasa should be increased to 5 years with mid-term evaluation

Specific Capacity Building recommendations

5. Future 'Kasa II' workshops should be designed using Instructional Objectives to ensure focus on skills transfer and learning. (see Annex 4 for details)

   ✓ Workshops should be structured to meet set learning objectives

   ✓ Evaluation should be against the objectives – not how people feel

   ✓ Reporting on workshops should be against objectives, using guidelines

   ✓ Facilitation and reporting on Capacity Building workshops:

   ✓ Provide structured guidelines for facilitators /consultants of workshops

Gender Specific Recommendations

6. In a future CSO core funding programme, capacity building on gender and rights based programming, as well as practical support to CSOs to do gender programming, should be integrated in the programme design and approach, using a matrix on gender and power relations (See Annex 11). Such an approach would enable CSOs (all categories) to capture how their activities are contributing to changes in gender relations at the policy level, in the lives of target groups and in their own organisations.

7. A future mechanism should have a specific output and indicators addressing "women's limited or lack of decision making" in NRE.

8. A future CSO mechanism should include basic gender training course for grantees – include awareness raising, gender mainstreaming and gender analysis with skills building

9. CSOs should organise jointly with government. in existing platforms discussions on gender issues in NRE thematic areas and experiences with mainstreaming engagement with government. to influence policy, etc

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR END OF PROJECT EVALUATION OF THE KASA PROJECT

I)   BACKGROUND

TRENDS IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN GHANA

Ghana's natural resources are her major wealth and assets. Indeed, Ghana depends heavily on natural resources and the environment for national growth and development However, environmental and natural resource depletion present a major threat to fulfilling Ghana's growth and poverty reduction efforts.

Natural resources are diminishing at an alarming rate. Recent estimates of the cost of degradation suggest that an equivalent of 10 percent of GDP is lost annually through unsustainable management of the country's natural wealth (forests, wildlife, fisheries, minerals and land resources). Ghana lost about 80% of its forest cover between 1909 and 1990 and continues to lose forest cover at an alarming rate of 65,000 ha per annum.

Ghana's natural resources are overexploited and continue to decline in both quantity and quality. Inappropriate crop production practices, mining, and wood processing are adversely affecting forests and savanna woodlands. Ongoing soil erosion and a decline in soil fertility undermine food and agricultural production. (Ref. Report No: 36985-GH. Ghana Country Environmental Analysis. September 06, 2006).

Civil society organizations have for several years advocated for sustainable management and good governance of Ghana's natural resources, but have gained insufficient support and commitment from Government authorities. However this situation has begun to change in recent times.

THE NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE (NREG) PROGRAM

With the sustained pressure of civil society organizations, the support of Development partners and with the recent discovery of oil in Ghana, the importance of good governance and sustainable management of Ghana's natural resources has gained centre stage as a national development issue that has a direct bearing on development and poverty reduction.

The Government of Ghana has thus begun to pursue a policy direction that recognizes the importance of natural resource and environmental governance to national development and poverty reduction. This policy direction is reflected in the Natural Resource and Environmental Governance (NREG) Program.

The NREG Programme is a recipient mechanism for multi-donor sector budgetary support to the Government of Ghana (GoG), through a frame work of priority policy objectives, benchmarks and targeted actions addressing governance issue in Forestry & Wildlife, Mining and Environment. NREG is expected to support governance reforms in the sector and contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable economic growth.

Within the NREG Sector Budget Support, Government and Development Partners recognise the important role of civil society in natural resource and environmental governance in Ghana, and the need to establish a civil society sector support mechanism to enhance effective participation and social accountability within the NRE sector. Development Partners are yet to settle on the appropriate structure and form, for civil society sector support in the NRE sector.

While exploring the most appropriate mechanism for long-term civil society support in the NRE sector as envisaged in the NREG programme, the Royal Netherlands Embassy, in collaboration with CARE, SNV and

ICCO supported the establishment of a two-year pilot civil society support mechanism for the NRE sector, called "Kasa". Kasa (which also means "*to speak out*") is a NRE sector specific support mechanism for CSOs to facilitate civil society participation and evidence-based advocacy for good governance of Ghana's Natural resources and the environment.

II)   THE KASA PROJECT

PROJECT NAME

KASA – Poverty Reduction through Civil Society Advocacy in Natural Resource and Environmental Governance in Ghana

PROJECT GOAL

To contribute to reduce poverty through improved Natural Resource and Environmental Governance in Ghana.

PROJECT PURPOSE

To facilitate the concerted effort of Civil Society and Media organisations in their advocacy for equitable access, accountability, and transparency in Natural Resource and Environmental Governance

PROJECT COMPONENTS

- **Capacity enhancement**
  Kasa's capacity building program component was designed to support and coordinate   civil society learning initiatives and opportunities to enhance their institutional, organizational and individual capacities to ensure effective advocacy for improved   governance in the NRE sector in Ghana.

- **Grants management**
  Kasa has provided core and project grants to a limited number of CSO's to support evidence-based avocacy for equity, transparency and accountability in the NRE   sector.

- **Forums and platforms for CSOs coordinated engagements on NRE issues:** this include forums for sharing leaning from CSOs research and evidence based advocacy work, platforms for engagement with Government, sector donors; and forums for analysis of NRE policy issues and strengthening CSOs joint advocacy efforts.

- **Communication and Outreach**
  Through the communications and outreach component, Kasa has facilitated the   dissemination   of relevant information amongst partners and stakeholders in the NRE   sector. Kasa has further facilitated active participation of the media in reportage on   NRE issues.

PROJECT STRATEGIES

i)   Promotion of evidence-based research and advocacy on NREG policy and NRE issues in general
ii)   Management and disbursement of core and project grants to a limited number of civil society, research and media organizations, to conduct advocacy activities in selected thematic areas in the NRE sector
iii)   Facilitation of platforms for information sharing and for civil society engagement with government and development partners on NRE issues

iv)   Support to capacity enhancement activities of CSO's for effective advocacy on NRE issues
v)   Documentation of lessons learnt to inform a longer-term CSO advocacy mechanism for Natural resource and Environmental governance in Ghana

EXPECTED PROJECT OUTPUTS

- Results of three civil society forums promoting sustainability and the rights of women and other vulnerable groups in NRE governance are presented to at least 100 stakeholders, including government and media
- Over twenty (20) civil society organizations, ten (10) media, and four (4) research representatives have demonstrated capacity to effectively advocate for equitable NRE governance
- Ten (10) key CS organisations utilise core funding to become more effective advocates for equitable NRE governance
- Fifteen to twenty civil society, research, or media organisations use small grants to advocate for equitable NRE governance initiatives, including one State of the Environment report and one youth-driven environmental-awareness media production
- Lessons learnt inform the long-term civil society advocacy mechanism for equitable natural resource and environmental governance.

PROJECT DURATION, BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT

Kasa is a two-year project with a total budget of about EUR 1.9million funded largely by the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Accra, with contributions by CARE, ICCO and SNV.

The implementation of Kasa is being managed by a consortium of CARE (Lead), ICCO and SNV. Strategic oversight is provided by a project steering committee and the day-to-day operations are handle by a core staff at the secretariat with the support of CARE Ghana..

III)   THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF FINAL EVALUATION OF THE KASA PROJECT

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Kasa project in terms of a possible civil society support mechanism within the NREG Policy framework and in the NRE sector of Ghana in general. It is intended to generate knowledge and experiences / lessons from KASA's implementation and how this could inform the design of a long term CS support mechanism in the NRE sector.

The final external evaluation of the project will examine overall project design and implementation results, including the effects of CSO's NRE forums and platforms, and capacity building activities for influencing NRE policies and management issues. It will also assess the performance of selected Kasa grant recipients in their advocacy work.

The evaluation's main objectives are to:

a) Assess and provide information to the project stakeholders, the extent to which the expected project outputs and purpose are achieved and any possible contribution of achieved outputs and purpose to overall project goal.
b) To provide information to the project stakeholders, especially the Consortium, the Steering Committee and the Royal Netherlands Embassy, with which to take decisions on the future of

Kasa and on the most appropriate mechanism for long-term civil society support to the NRE sector

c) Assess the extent to which Kasa as a pilot has managed to influence or provide a mechanism by which the CSOs can influence policies and practices in the NRE sector in Ghana

d) To identify lessons learnt and provide recommendations and how this could inform the operation of a long term CS support mechanism in the NRE sector.

MAIN FOCUS AREAS AND SOME KEY QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED

The evaluation will examine three main aspects of Kasa:

2. An assessment of the project framework and delivery mechanism in terms of design, approach, and management. This will include assessing the relevance and effectiveness of:
   a. the Kasa grants managements;
   b. Capacity building support and learning events
   c. Forums/platforms for stakeholder engagement on NRE
3. An assessment of selected Kasa grant partners, in terms of the results of their NRE advocacy work in general and the contribution of Kasa to their achievement and lessons learnt

4. An assessment of Kasa's influence on the policy development and practice of the Ghana custodians of her natural resources. I.e. whether and how the NREG policy framework has been informed or influenced by any of the Kasa grantees, platforms or media interventions.

The evaluation may be guided by key questions including the following:

1. Relevance (significance and adequacy of project design and approach)
   - *Was the project design relevant and worthwhile, given the situation that the project was intended to address?*
   - *How relevant was the project outputs towards its purpose and goal?*
   - *How relevant and effective were the institutional arrangement / partnerships for the delivery of the Kasa project (ie .INGO Consortium etc.)?*

2. Effectiveness (achievement of target project results) and efficiency *(how result were achieved)*
   - *To what extent has Kasa contributed towards its longer term goals?*
   - *Have the expected outputs been achieved? Why or Why not?*
   - *How efficiently were resources used towards achieving Kasa's goals and outputs?*
   - *How do the kasa grant recipient rate their own advocacy performance during the period? To what extent have their incorporated/addressing the gender dimension of NRE in their work.*
   - *How do the kasa grant recipients and other stakeholders rate performance of the kasa project?*

3. Impact / effects of the project
   - *What developments and outcomes within the NRE sector can be plausibly associated with the Kasa project intervention?*

- *Whether and how the NRE sector and the NREG policy framework has been informed or influenced by any of the Kasa grantees, Kasa platforms or media interventions?*
- *Have there been any unanticipated positive or negative consequences of the project? Why did they arise?*

4. Sustainability of the outputs and outcomes
    - *Can the achieved outputs and outcomes be sustained after the project funding to ensure continued impacts? Why or Why not?*
    - *How do the initial funders of Kasa (and other stakeholders in NRE sector) see the future of the kasa initiative and whether it will be worthy of their continued support?*

5. *Lessons learned*
    - What lessons can be drawn from Kasa that inform the operation of a long term support mechanism for civil society organisations in the NRE sector.

PROPOSED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be led by an external consultant working with a local consultant. The external consultant will identify / suggest the local consultant to work with and this must be agreed by both Kasa PMT and external consultant.

It is expected that the evaluation will comprise analytical and participatory processes including the following:

- Review of project documentation and related documents on NREG: this will includes NREG documents, Kasa project design documents, progress reports, mid-term Evaluation report, workshop reports, etc.
- Review and analysis of CSOs' involvement in NREG implementation in Ghana over the project period;
- Conduct interviews with, Kasa consortium and Steering Committee members, Kasa funders and project management team (PMT)
- Interview of key other stakeholders including ENR sector group members, and relevant Govt. agencies.
- Field visits and discussions with CSOs that received funding from KASA
- A validation workshop with Kasa grantees and other stakeholders
- The consultants may propose additional methods of conducting this evaluation.

EXPECTED OUTPUT FROM CONSULTANT

- Interested consultants should respond with a statement of eligibility and availability for this assignment (including CVs and fee rates and a brief proposed approach)
- Review and comment on the draft TOR with the Kasa team to finalize the TOR-content and the best approach for the evaluation exercise. The consultant will then prepare (finalise) a detailed process plan, which would be agreed with Kasa Project Management Team.
- Present key findings to Kasa stakeholders at a validation workshop on 27th October 2010,

- Submit a Draft Evaluation Report to Kasa PMT by 3rd November 2010
- Submit a Final Evaluation Report by 12th November 2010, incorporating feedback from client

QUALIFICATIONS OF CONSULTANT(S)

The Consultant(s) should have the following qualification and skills:

- The team should have considerable experience in designing qualitative and quantitative monitoring and evaluation processes and in evaluating development programmes.
- The consultant should have at least a Masters Degree or equivalent qualification in any of the social sciences with at least 5 years post qualification experience in conducting similar exercises.
- Knowledge of the NRE sector, the NREG process in Ghana and CSO engagement in NRE within a decentralization context will also be an advantage
- Demonstrated knowledge, experience and skills in assessing civil society research and policy advocacy initiatives
- Familiarity with CSO funding initiatives in Africa
- Demonstrated experience in facilitating reflecting learning and action sessions
- Demonstrated experience in utilizing participatory approaches.
- Strong communication, documentation and presentation skills.
- Demonstrated experience in Project review and evaluation

TIME FRAME

Nineteen (19) payable consultancy days over the period from 4th October 2010 to 12th November 2010.

Summary of key processes:

Date	Activity
Week from 4th October 2010	Preparatory planning meetings, literature review, meeting with CARE DK, meeting with Kasa staff
Week from 11th October 2010	Commencement of field / partners visits, stakeholder interviews etc. in addition to partners' reports / documents analysis
Week from 18th October 2010	Continue stakeholder interviews including travel to Northern Ghana etc. in addition to partners' reports / documents analysis
Week of 25th October 2010	Debriefing, preparation and presentations at stakeholder validation workshop on the 27th October 2010, preparation of draft evaluation report
Week of 1st November 2010	Submission of draft evaluation report by 3rd November 2010
Week of 8th November 2010	Client feedback of draft report and submission of final evaluation report by 12th November 2010.

CONTACT PERSONS

CARE Ghana: Zakaria Yakubu, Yakubu.Zakaria@co.care.org, tel. +233 (21) 923271, cell +233 244 330 957. Key contact person for all thing related to the evaluation.

CARE Danmark: Rolf Hernø, Program Coordinator, rhernoe@care.dk, tel + 45 35 200 100, cell +45 27 53 83 01. Contact person for contract issues and general introduction to Kasa.

Annex 2: Results' Chain

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
Enabling environment	Purpose: CSO and media organisations advocate for equitable access, accountability and transparency in natural resource and environmental governance	NREG Consultative group meeting (recent, 2010) NREG Review Meeting Kasa Consultative forum on NREG Oct 2009 Sector Review Meetings, such as Mineral Commission on Draft Guidelines and Policies on Mining (June, Sept. 2010)	GoG engaged more directly with the CSOs both individually and through the regular sector meetings. E.g. MC informing NCOM on studies, findings, under NREG, quarterly meetings held with TWN, NCOM, WACAM MOFEP is coordinating the entire NREG, where CSOs are represented from the three sectors Main change is at the regional and district levels where CSOs engagements are more effective and are appreciated by the decentralized agencies. They have provided information and documentation on policies, including the NREG to decentralized departments. E.g. NGND, ZEPF. - *"We see them as bringing knowledge"*. (District Assembly, Walewale) - *"They have provided information and promoted participation on NREG in the rural districts"*. (Reg. Dir. EPA, NR) Govt agencies see CSOs filling a gap that they would otherwise not have been able to fill and also the "watchdog" role keeps them alert and focused - *"We see CBOs watching us as helpful. We do invite the NGOs to the assembly meeting"* (District Assembly, Walewale)
Institutional Capacities	Output 2: CSOs receiving core funding and project funding from Kasa are able to advocate for equitable NRE governance Media and researchers are utilising info from and/or cooperating w KASA grantees:	Kasa Advocacy training workshops Capacity Building workshops on NREG Core grant and small project support	**Training** According to KASA Capacity building Plan, all CSOs were assessed on needs. Training needs have been identified based on the proposals and funding applications - common training needs – 6 categories Training events seem to be very generic in nature. Report on training events makes it difficult to verify what CSOs have learned. **Workshops** Advocacy, media and M&E training workshops conducted have progressively improved from the first to the last in terms of clarity, content and usefulness (08/09. to 05/10). The last two advocacy training workshops (12/09 and 02/10) were guided by concrete workshop objectives. The methodologies have also improved, to include skills-oriented and practical sessions on e.g. definition

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
	Public Agenda special issue – Natural Resource Monitior RUMNET – The Advocate SKYY News		and practice of advocacy, and relating this directly to participants' own experience. The two workshops in 12/09 and 02/10 appear to have had some practical skills practice and application of adult learning techniques such as linking to CSO's own constituencies, practices and concrete experience with e.g. advocacy campaigns. Coupled with compelling advocacy documentaries (from WACAM in this case). In addition, the 02/10 workshop offered a definition of advocacy; and the 12/09 one, an 'Advocacy Index'. The M&E Workshop report (05/10, Kumasi), has also improved objectives, and interesting participative group work with practical application of M&E tools and experience sharing of CSOs on their M&E practice, including peer review. No documentation of tools used. There was no training organized on research. **One-on-one support** One-on-one support is provided by the KASA PMT in planning, financial management, budgeting and reporting. Support needs are distilled from project narrative and financial reports and also from discussions during monitoring visit. These are termed monitoring and "mentoring visits". The training is reported to be well appreciated by some grantees, and KASA reports. However From the event reports, the ET has been unable to verify <u>any concrete skills transfer and learning</u>. According to the CSOs capacities built include: - Media component in proposals and budget - M&E and financial management - Improved advocacy methods and tools - NREG thematic cross learning For smaller grantees (e.g. CICOL, ZEPF, etc) the advocacy training seem to have led to more effective and focussed advocacy, and outreach and effects in the communities. CSOs have gained 'respectability' and are recognised players and contacted by e.g. MLNR, invitations for

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			drafting new land policies (LAP II). Also engagements with Energy commission as result of Cap Bld.
			<u>Advocacy</u>
			"We thought of advocacy as just giving voice but you need allies and capacity building to do good advocacy" (CiKOD)
			M&E
			"Understanding what we want to do and defining specific indicators of change makes us more visible" (CiKOD)
			<u>Media Training</u>
			"How to build in a media component and justify why you want to pay for it"
			GDCA produced documentary on sand winning – shown on TV – wide media coverage and community impact
			Other media:
			-"*unplanned budget for media coverage and engagement*"
			<u>One-on-one mentoring-monitoring visits</u>
			E.g. funding manager here for one-two days, working on reporting and budgeting
			- Petty cash and general financial management has improved, including VAT and hotel tax.
			-They explain links to indicators and reports and why. (NGND)
			<u>Media updates</u> – appreciated by all grantees. It exposes them to other areas
			"Exposes us to other areas other than land rights. Mining, forest rights, etc" (CICOL)
			<u>Research</u>
			- The smaller organizations are dependent on smaller organizations to their work but with grants they have been able to use peers or network members to do the research .g. CICOL
			- Interesting examples of participative action research e.g. GDCA, GCRN, CiCOL, CiKOD. CIKOD uses– a Community institutional and Resource Mapping. Process - *"We identify the research issues with*

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			the communities", even if we take an interesting area, we get the community to buy in". - "The SoE Report is the only evidence-based research carried out - "No research was carried out to produce evidence-based advocacy" - The Evidence through research of the CSOs enters the public domain Gender Equitable access and (benefit sharing) - issues of inclusion gender, vulnerable and marginalized, PLWHAs, Disability issues. Cross-cutting issue, Rights, etc ET found that this has been reduced to mention of "<u>women and the vulnerable</u>". The grant guidelines states that if an organization being assessed does not have a gender strategy/policy, KASA would support the organization - Few CSOs had gender policies. E.g. TWN, WACAM - Others like ISODEC. CICOL, ZEPF and RUMNET have just developed or have started drafting gender policies. These are yet to be translated to practice. - Gender not taken up during the entire KASA period. *"Kasa has not specifically supported us"* - Draft plan for generic training did not include gender although independent assessor notes general weaknesses of organizations with respect to gender. No gender training has been given neither has gender featured as a crosscutting issue in other trainings. *"Capacity Building Workshops for SBOs on NRE – include too many issues -- never a workshop on gender"* **(ZEPF)** - There is some demand for gender training. *"Capacity building assessment – members asked for gender training"* CICOL. *"We have had a discussion with KASA – to what extent can we incorporate gender and use funds".* (ZEPF) - A few have had gender awareness training for staff/members, but in a number of them, ET found that gender reduced to women and at best a focus on gender balance. - E.g. In terms of activities, some coalitions have members working on gender – Climate change, gender in land, etc -- CiCOL GCRN has piloted on gender equality in broadcasting in partnership with CENSUDI. RUMNET has *an Every Woman section* in The Advocate. Creative Storm has done documentaries covering gender issues with Gender, health and Women's Rights organizations. E.G WISE, FIDA, Abantu, - *"Unsafe abortions, Fresh water, Fuel, Elections, Climate change. . ."* CiKOD is looking into how the traditional authority is set up to handle gender issues

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			- Although Few grantees have capacity to, undertake gender analysis does not exist, except in a few grantees such as TWN, WACAM, CiKOD - NGND has attempted to do a gender audit of 34 of its members with KASA grant.(methodology, analysis and report). Are they trained in gender audit facilitation? The network should have started with an audit of itself "Gender is, *captured in our own strategy as one of the areas we must develop*" - Gender in systems, practices and culture was not evident to ET – some attention to HR issues by some CSOs
Channels of intervention	Output 1: Results of 3 CS forums in NRE governance presented to stakeholders, media, GoG Output 4: 15-20 CS, research & media organisations use small grants to advocate for NRE governance initiatives	CS Forums Evidence based reports Journalist awards Media Coverage Oil & Gas Platform	Networks and platforms: - The Forestry platform (led by FWG) is engaging directly with FC: (FSD, TIDD, WD, RMSCC). Direct consultation, consultative workshop, dialoguing. Effective Sector Review Mechanism in place with broad participation - Land Platform: Land sector policy committee (CICOL representation) – good opening for engagement. Land sector technical committee. Ministry of Land and Oil & Gas: Sector wide sector review meeting, EITI Steering Committee - The CSO consultative forums on NREG (e.g. Dodowa, Oct 2009) had broad representation from all stakeholders incl. media and GoG and discussed substantial NREG issues. Communiqué issued and some MDAs have acted on it. E.g. on mining in forest reserves (FC). The CS State of Environment Report The SoE Report issued in 2010 is either not known by GoG officials or is not recognised as a quality input. However, context and the conditions for its production were very difficult. It was meant as providing an alternative to what GoG was reporting. "The CS SoE Report is part of evidence based research and alternative to State reporting on the Environment. Initial focus is on methodology" " WE wanted to learn from the process" Publications and Productions - Public agenda have effectively used small grants to influence decisions makers on Oil and Gas sector

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			governance and environmental impact, dialogue with MPs, organise media workshops for peers and publish on NREG issues
			- Creative Storm has produced well researched, high quality, creative TV series (Environment Channel) with strong documentary on 10 environmental issues of public interest. The production is supported by EPA, Kasa and private funders. With low budget and large audience (est. 500-800,000 viewers) this first of its kind environmental awareness channel is the most interesting and innovative Kasa supported media event.
			- The 2009 Media awards to journalist, awarded during the CSO Consultative Forum, is an innovative pathway to create awareness and attention. Also, the ET notes that not only has the media coverage on NRE issues increased (Kasa Media Updates), but Kasa grantees consciously involve journalists and media houses in their advocacy efforts (e.g. GDCA, RUMNET, CIKOD, NGND)
			- Cross-sectoral collaboration. E.G CONIWAS/CICOL
			- Creation of network – (MASE) Media Advocates for Sustainable Environment
Changes in policy, practice, behaviour and power relations	Purpose: CSO and media organisations advocate for equitable access, accountability and transparency in natural resource and environmental governance Outputs 3 & 4 (as above	Adaptation /use by GoG NRE agencies of CSO proposals and presentations (advocacy efforts)	**POLICIES** Not all policy change found can be attributed to Kasa alone. *"Not enough time and engagements to say that CSOs have started to influence a lot of policies"* (IDEG). Some organisations were already influencing policy before KASA, e.g. WACAM, ISODEC, TWN, ZEPF. CSOs have been providing some inputs to govt. for policy formulation – documents and reports.*"They have informed positions, policies, project documents. They help us establish priorities"*. (EPA, Accra) Whilst this is appreciated by some government agencies, others find gaps in the analyses. The content is often found not consistent and useful. MDAs would have liked deeper analysis, presentation of position papers at sector meetings to make engagements more useful to them (E.G EPA, Accra). In addition, CSOs give feedback on performance of govt agencies. Govt. Agencies do not understand/know how to formulate requests to CSOs. CSOs engagements are more effective and are appreciated at the regional and district levels by decentralized agencies. CSOs have provided information and documentation on policies, including the NREG to decentralized departments. E.g. NGND, ZEPF. *"We see them as bringing knowledge"*. (DCD, Walewale). *"They have provided information and promoted participation on NREG in the rural districts"*. (Reg. Dir. EPA, NR). Govt agencies see CSOs filling a gap that they would otherwise not have been able to fill and also the "watchdog" role keeps them alert and focused. *"We see CSOs watching us as helpful. We do invite the NGOs to the assembly meeting"* (DCD, Walewale). At the district level, govt agencies have included NREG issues into MTEF/MTDP. CSOs are also able to reach the communities better. Govt agencies have called for a harmonization of plans/activities, between the CSOs and

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			govt. agencies to make them more effective and have a wider impact (Forestry Division, Walewale).

Concrete policy influenced:

- Contributing to review of *Minerals & Mining Act 2006 (Act 703)*
- *National Action Programme to Combat Desertification* - has been made public as a result of CSO advocacy (ZEPF)
- CICOL is leading discussions on *the Land Bill*
- Committee to look at *Mining Law* (TWN/NCOM) also comments on Mining & Environment Policy for EPA
- Jatropha research informing Ministry of Energy. CICOL calling for clear *Renewable Energy policy*.
- CSO input into *National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, and into EPA National Water Policy*
- CSOs now on boards and advisory councils: *Environment and Natural Resource Advisory Council*
- CSO communiqués, statements have led to changes in some policy decisions in the mining and forest reserves. After communiqué is issued, policy decision makers look at the issues. Influenced review of *National Forestry Policy* (FC)
- ISODEC on *Legislation for transparency and accountability requirements in NR*. Submitted to govt for discussion, govt. has accepted that bill under EITI. Developed draft bill, MoFEP and companies have asked that the draft bill be revised to take care of our concerns.
- *SADA Process/Act* , NGND

PRACTICES & BEHAVIOUR

Upstream- Govt

- CSOs now accepted as partners in development. CSOs are represented on NREG committees. CSO input now institutionalized. Some sectors now inform CSOs and their networks on everything they do. Get their comments (MC) *"Everything we do we inform NCOM, including studies under NREG" (MC)*
- *"We have taken them as partners and ask for feedback on performance. Helps you make good delivery "*(FC)
- *Govt becoming responsive to demands e.g. draft Land Bill,* (CICOL)

  Sector PAFs in regions have responded to CS assessment of their activities. CS now invited to give updates of their areas of (operation). E.g. MoFEP

- *"They have informed our positions, policies, project documents. They help us establish priorities"* (EPA)
- Govt participates in CSO events-annual reviews, etc

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
			- Planning is done in a <u>consultative way, bottom-up instead of top-down.</u> Issues are taken from the communities and threaded up. *"We used to carry out sector activities and plans (top-down) without community involvement".* (MLRN) - At the local level - duty bearers now sharing information more freely and willingly - - Regional level CBOs meeting regularly with govt. agencies in their sectors. (Mineral Commission) - In Dodowa, the CSOs talked about forest reserves. *". . .they talked about forest reserves and immediately after communiqué, minister set up a committee to look at the issues in the communiqué"* (FC) - Increase in spaces for CSOs to engage with duty bearers -- Regional coordinating councils - CSOs (ZEPF) questioned Forestry Division on its duty to establish plantations which it had not done. Issue has been taken up by regional and national. *"We have now been asked and resourced to do that"* (Forestry Div, Walewale) - CSO publications/reports have been found useful by govt agencies *"It brings attention to the issue and if it has not been addressed, we are made to do it "* (EPA) - However, govt agencies do not appreciate the fact that these are most times published without consultation. Some of the content is found by agencies to be factually incorrect. They would have been appreciated it more if issues had been discussed. Govt would also find it more useful if CSOs could come with position papers on issues. *" Some will not even seek your views. Sometime very difficult".* (MLNR) <u>Downstream –Communities</u> Grantees attest to communities now engaging duty bearers to demand accountability - Increased Community management of resources with CSO - benefit sharing (MLNR) - Govt now involves communities in their interventions - Heightened awareness /empowered communities – *"local people are beginning to understand [their rights]"* (MLNR) - CSOs bring out issues at the community level that agencies in the district may not notice (complementary) - NCOM National forum every year in a community. 2,000 community members, including victims of mining related incidents/accident to interact with govt officials and disseminate govt policies (space for macro-meso-micro interaction and linkages) - In the Upper West through CiKOD's advocacy, regional leaders have directed that all areas establish traditional women leaders and not queens. President of regional house of chief has written to all paramount chiefs to submit names of their traditional women leaders.

Level of the result chain	Areas of change (based on LogFrame)	Pathways Identified	Findings and Conclusions
Broader development outcomes	Goal and Purpose NREG programme targets are influenced by CS advocacy initiatives	Poverty orientation: - Kasa grantees advocate on behalf of vulnerable groups -Inclusion (e.g. advocacy and research) -Alignment of programmes/projects to NREG policies	Avenues have been paved for contributing, but it is too early to attribute developments to KASA - Communities engage duty bearers on rights and demand accountability - Women have taken up more community ownership (GCRN) - CSOs now viewed as partners - More trust has been established echoed by both sides - *"It has awakened us to know that almost everybody's life is dependent on NR so for sustainability we need to sustain the Environment".* CIKOD

Annex 3: Performance against LogFrame

Description	Indicators	Assessment Oct. 2010	Comment
Goal Contribute to reduce poverty through improved natural resource and environmental governance in Ghana	None	Unverifiable	It is surprising that at Overall Goal level, the Kasa project has NO INDICATORS
Purpose: Civil society and media organisations, in a concerted effort, advocate for equitable access, accountability, and transparency in natural resource and environmental governance	5+ NREG Programme targets are influenced by CS advocacy initiatives	GoG has engaged more directly with CSOs at regular sector meetings. E.g. MC, FC, under NREG, quarterly meetings held with TWN, NCOM, WACAM "CBOs are useful – they take us to task, whip us in line. Bring to mind governance, accountability, transparency."(FC and EPA, N. Region). Not enough time and engagements for KASA grantees to have influenced policies yet. Consultations in sectors: CSOs have had indirect influence on policies and practice, according to MC and FC. At local level, the DAs have been directly influenced by CSOs in NREG mgmt practice	Kasa Implementation period is too short to show policy influence against NREG targets ET observes that several informants (incl. grantees) are very critical of Kasa's activist role in forging coalitions, and calling on grantees to establish sector W. groups. After initial coordination, CSOs could have assumed this role – not Kasa. Collective responsibility is very difficult
	15+ outputs (studies, surveys, productions) on NRE governance issues—including impacts on women and other vulnerable groups—are conducted and disseminated by CSOs	All CSOs supported by Kasa have produced outputs on NRE, and they are widely circulated. Many concern sustainable management practices, illegal practices, and tracking of implementation. Examples: - National Action Programme to Combat Desertification - NAPCD has been revived as a result of CSO advocacy (ZEPF) - CICOL is leading discussions on the Land Bill - Committee to look at Mining Law (TWN/NCOM) also comments on Mining & Environment Policy for EPA - Jatropha research informing Ministry of Energy. CICOL calling for clear Renewable Energy policy.	Definition of 'women and other vulnerable groups is problematic' Direct attribution to Kasa is difficult due to short implementation period

Description	Indicators	Assessment Oct. 2010	Comment
		- CSO input into National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, and into EPA National Water Policy	
	4 CS outputs, including the CS State of the Environment report, are covered by media outlets	Media have covered the CSO SoE report and the major CSO NRE fora.	The ET notes that the SoE report is not well-known in sector agencies, and some officials find it of little use.
Output 1: Results of 3 CS forums promoting sustainability and the rights of women and other vulnerable groups in NRE governance are presented to at least 100 stakeholders, including government and media	# participants in each forum	4 CS national level fora and 1 media forum organised. Wide circulation is noted, and fora have issued communiqués and CSO inputs are available. The NRE parallel review forum in March 2010 is first of its kind. The resulting CSO SoE report produced. Broad CSO consultations have created cross-learning, sharing of experiences and formation of platforms around key subsectors (mining, forestry, land, fisheries, climate change, water)	The ET notes that the circulation and dissemination of the products is a vehicle towards policy influence, and say little about expected effects on the target groups (media, MDAs and other stakeholders).
	# government, other NRE stakeholders, and media informed of results	CSO outputs are appreciated by some gov't agencies, others find gaps in analyses. Content is often found inconsistent and/or not useful. MDAs prefer deeper analysis, presentation of position papers at sector meetings to make engagements more useful to them (e.g. EPA, Accra). In addition, CSOs give feedback on performance of govt agencies. Govt. officials inform that they consult the CSOs on draft policies etc.	The ET notes that PRE-CONSULTATIONS with Govt officials on CSO position papers and reports before public release is non-existent.
Output 2: 20+ CS, 10 media, and 4 research representatives have demonstrated capacity to effectively advocate for equitable NRE governance	# representatives trained in at least one module (women) List of modules and participants	The training is reported to be well appreciated by some grantees and in Kasa Reports. However, from Kasa event reports, the ET has been unable to verify any concrete skills transfer and learning. • Training needs identified based on proposals and funding applications - common training needs – 6 categories • Training events seem generic of nature. Reports on	The Output is difficult to measure: How do CSO's 'demonstrate capacity' This output essentially deals with training and cap. building, either in workshops or one-on-one support and advice. The ET finds it problematic that it is difficult to verify learning and skills transfer

Description	Indicators	Assessment Oct. 2010	Comment
		training events makes it very difficult t verify concrete learning Advocacy, media and M&E training workshops conducted has progressively improved from the first to the last in terms of clarity, content and usefulness. ***Grantees report to have acquired learning and better practice:*** Advocacy *"we thought of advocacy as just giving voice but you need allies and capacity building to do good advocacy" (CiKOD)* M&E *"Understanding what we want to do and defining specific indicators of change makes us more visible" (CiKOD)* Media Training *"How to build in a media component and justify why you want to pay for it" CiKOD)* One-on-one support: The PMT in addition undertakes regular one-on-one support visits to partners, provides feedback on reporting and financial management. This is part of Kasa monitoring system. Most grantees appreciate this form of direct feedback. Some CSOs are very critical though on style and content of this advice. In addition to common training, SNV as consortium member has undertaken detailed assessment and individual mentoring and coaching of 4 N CBOs. The reported input and level of professional support is of high quality and commendable	
Output 3: 10 key CS organisations utilise core funding to become more effective advocates for equitable NRE governance	# CSOs articulated SMART advocacy objectives and strategies related to specific NREG policy objectives, including impacts on women and other vulnerable groups,	19 grantees have received project funding, 10 Core funding. Core: 716,300 GHC, 90 % of budget, 81 % is reported Project: 999,730 GHC, 91 % of budget, 74 % is reported	Women and vulnerable groups may be covered by target groups of CSOs, but ET cannot find specific evidence in reports Coupled with the capacity building under Output 2, the assumption is that the grantees use core funding to become more effective

Description	Indicators	Assessment Oct. 2010	Comment
	media, and lobbying government		advocates for NREG governance
	# organisations' outputs or events covered by media		ET has not had opportunity to investigate coverage
	% core funding benchmarks met overall		Detailed funding benchmarks are set for core grantees, based on detailed activity matrices and indicators, as part of CSOs' core business
Output 4: 15-20 CS, research, or media organisations use small grants to advocate for equitable NRE governance initiatives, including one State of the Environment report and one youth-driven environmental-awareness media production	% small grant funding benchmarks met overall	Same as output 3	No media production is seen to be youth driven?
	# and description of advocacy initiatives or outputs covered by media		
	# CSOs articulated SMART advocacy objectives and strategies related to specific NREG policy objectives and impacts on women or other vulnerable groups		
Output 5: Lessons learned inform the long-term civil society advocacy mechanism for equitable natural resource and environmental governance	# CS, research, and media organisations who integrated lessons learned into their advocacy strategies and activities	Through the CSO fora and the advocacy and media training events, Kasa grantees have shared valuable practice and produced functional advocacy and media strategies, which are being duplicated by other CSOs. Collaboration w G-RAP on 2009 Oil & Gas platform also produced position papers and best practice sharing. A Kasa II Concept draft concept note discussed in SC and produced	This output reaches beyond Kasa and is not linked to Purpose, but valuable experience and practice has been documented
	# and list of CSOs participating in national and regional NREG Programme meetings		The ET notes that the indicators and some activities have little or no relation to output 5 (e.g. activity 5.1, 5.3)

Annex 4 - Note on Capacity Building and Advocacy Training by Kasa by ET

The ET notes that Kasa's reporting on the workshop for grantees and stakeholders: 2 Advocacy Training, 2 NREG training, one financial management training and one M&E workshop (output 2, Activity 2.2), has progressively improved from the first to the last (August 2008 to May 2010).

The reporting on workshops on capacity building on NREG, advocacy, financial management and M&E training for Kasa partners has improved in terms of clarity, content and usefulness. The first workshops reports are very general and broadly focussed on NREG, with good debate and reflection among the participants), but no concrete learning and skills training is reported on. The first workshops had very broadly defined workshop objectives, mainly focussing on provision of technical information and practices by presenters to audience and plenary discussions.

Conversely, the last two advocacy training workshops (Dec 2009 and Feb. 2010) were guided by concrete workshop objectives. The methodologies have also improved, to include skills-oriented and practical sessions on e.g. definition and practice of advocacy, and relating this directly to participants' own experience. The two workshops in December 2009 and February 2010 thus appear to have had some practical skills practice and application of adult learning techniques such as linking to CSO's own constituencies, practices and concrete experience with e.g. advocacy campaigns. Coupled with compelling advocacy documentaries (from Wacam in this case), the participants must have left with concrete suggestions and tools for how to improve their advocacy. The 2010 workshop in addition offered a definition of advocacy, and the 2009 one an 'Advocacy Index'.

The M&E Workshop report (May 2010, Kumasi), equally has improved objectives, and interesting participative group work with practical application of M&E tools and experience sharing of CSOs on their M&E practice, including peer review. There is however no documentation in the report of the tools used.

From a formal instructional training and learning perspective, however, none of the workshops demonstrate which concrete skills the participants have acquired. None of the workshop objectives contain active learning verbs, and thus cannot be used to assess what participants were able to do after the workshops.

Example: Objectives of the February 2010 Advocacy Training Workshop:

- An enhanced conceptual clarity of policy advocacy and NRE policy Advocacy issues,
- Enhanced skills and techniques to design, plan and implement effective policy advocacy on identified issues in the NRE sector.
- Participants reflected on their practice and assessed their organizations' and networks' capability to carry out effective advocacy on NRE governance issues.

These objectives beg the question of what the participants were able to do after the workshop? How would the participants demonstrate 'enhanced conceptual clarity' – or 'enhanced skills and techniques to design, plan and implement…'?

Information objectives (to provide people with concrete documentation, policies and their practical application) are of course legitimate. But participants will not LEARN anything from this – they will have the information and guidance on how to use it. The first objective is in this category.

The following two objectives above are essentially focussed on enhanced skills and reflection of own practice and self-assessment. Again, there are no concrete action verbs. How were the skills exercised – and what were they? Self-assessment is a powerful learning mechanism, but it is not linked to what the participants would do with it afterwards.

Suggested example of Instructional Objectives

The objectives could have been phrased this way to demonstrate SKILLS and LEARNING:

At the end of the workshop, the participants would be able to

- Explain key elements of current, effective NRE policy advocacy, based on A,B,C, information and guidelines, and demonstrations of concrete examples of advocacy (by e.g. WACAM, TWN).
- Identify the essential steps in concrete advocacy in NRE, and based on this, their own experience, and examples and tools provided, design and plan one concrete basic advocacy campaign on an identified subject.
- Carry out one practical, participatory written group assessment of current own organisational or network practice and capacity to undertake effective advocacy on NRE governance issues, based on Advocacy Index tool provided. (The assessment will be subject to peer review by group participants, demonstrating concrete suggestions on improvement).

Evaluation of workshops

None of the evaluations reported in the workshops were related to the workshop objectives. Thus, it has not been demonstrated that the workshop objectives set were actually achieved. Rather, evaluations focussed on CONTENT and PROCESS, in a very generalised way:

On content:

1. Informative/useful
2. Met my expectations
3. Addressed important issues in my line of work/advocacy
4. Like to follow up on the discussed ideas
5. Plan to collaborate with other stakeholders
6. Will like Kasa to hold similar workshops

As all participants strongly agreed or agreed on the above points, the score does not tell the organiser anything about what was the concrete outcome of the learning.

The workshop *process evaluations* are not very positive, apart from statements like 'good discussions and group exercises, process was participatory enough, or film shows and photos were very useful'. Again, no concrete information on WHAT worked and WHY.

Instead, if the Kasa team had assessed the workshop against the above suggested objectives, (and organised the workshop accordingly, obviously) concrete learning skills and practice would have been demonstrated. This again would require current testing as to whether these skills had been acquired.

In summary, the organisation, facilitation and practical skills transfer in Kasa training events could be substantially improved, using simple techniques and 'Performance-based Learning Objectives'[31]. It is also suggested that much more structured sessions be organised according to the set objectives, and that facilitators are given concrete instructions as to how they must prepare for their presentations and HOW they should ensure that skills are being practiced.

---

[31]   See e.g. Robert F Mager: Preparing Instructional Objectives, 3rd ed., CEP Press, Atlanta, 1997

Annex 5   Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies with which Grantees engage

National Level
Chamber of Mines
Community Water and Sanitation Agency (CWSA)
Commission for Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ)
Environmental Protection Agency
Forestry Commission
Ghana Water Company Ltd (GWCL)
Land Administration Project
Lands Commission
Minerals Commission
Ministry of Energy
Ministry of Environment , Science and Technology
Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRDE)
Ministry of Water Resources, Works and Housing
Water Resources Commission
Natonal Disaster Management Organisation (NADMO)
Regional/District Level
Community Water and Sanitation Agency (CWSA)
District Assembly
Forestry Services Division
Regional Coordinating Council
Regional Environmental Protection Agency

Annex 6. List of Key policies influenced by Kasa grantees

Leading discussions on *Land Bill*	CICOL
Jatropha research informing Ministry of Energy	
Calling for clear Renewable Energy policy – invited by Energy Commission	
Calling for inclusion of targets, outcomes and indicators for Land in NREG programme Matrices	
Oil and Gas - EITI Steering Committee	Civil Society Coalition for Oil and Gas/ISODEC
Legislation for transparency and accountability requirements in NR. Developed draft bill and submitted to government for discussion under EITI. MoFEP and companies have asked for a revision.	
Calling for Monitoring Indicators for Environmental Sanitation	CONIWAS
Advocating for government to make commitments to water sector practical by channel budget to development of water and hygiene	
EPA National Water Policy	CONIWAS NGND
Through Environmental Series, Vice President has formed a Plastic Pollution Coalition. EPA and Ministry using series for outreach	Creative Storm
Review of Minerals & Mining Act 2006 (Act 703)	NCOM
Attorney General to set up ministerial policy to see whether legal aid could be given to the affected communities	
Comments on Mining and Environment Policy for EPA	
Committee on Mining Law	
EPA Guidelines for Oil and Gas	
NDF + Savanna Development Authority (SADA) bill (10/07/2010)	NGND
National Action Programme to combat Desertification. Abandoned since 2003, but NGND took it up and criticized that it had been abandoned. Included it at national level consultations. Has been taken up again and piloted in 6 districts in the North	NGND ZEPF
CSO input into National Climate Adaptation Strategy	NGND
Increase in compensation from mining companies for communities affected by human right abuses	WACAM
Input into new Forestry and Wildlife policy development - Forestry and Wildlife master Plan	FWG/CR,CICOL,GEO,TWN, FoE
A number of CSOs on NREG boards, advisory councils, technical committees, etc	FWG, FoE, NCOM, l

Annex 7: List of KASA Grantee Networks/ Platforms/Coalitions

1.	Alliance on Fisheries
2.	Climate Change and Environment organizations Working Group (CCEW)
3.	Association of Jasikan Civil Society (AJADSCO)
4.	Artisanal Mining Network
5.	Coalition Against Human Rights Abuses in Mines
6.	Civil Society Coalition on Land (CICOL)
7.	Civil Society Coalition on Fisheries
8.	Coalition on Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS)
9.	Creative Storm Networks
10.	Civil Society Organisations Against Privatisation of Water
11.	CSO Platform on Oil and Gas
12.	Datoyili Women's Coalition
13.	Faith-based Organisations Against Climate Change (REBONET)
14.	Forest Watch Ghana (FWG)
15.	Ghana Community Radio Network
16.	Local Governance Network (LOGNET)
17.	Media Advocates for Sustainable Environment (MASE)
18.	National Coalition Against Privatisation of Water
19.	National Coalition on Mining (NCOM)
20.	Natural Resources and Environmental NGO Coalition (NRENGO)
21.	Network on Climate Change
22.	Network for Women's Rights (NETRIGHT)
23.	Northern Ghana Network for Development (NGND)
24.	Regional Level Functional Platform on Agriculture
25.	Savannah Natural Resource and Environment Coalition (SANREC)
26.	Rural Media Network (RUMNET)
27.	WERENGO?
28.	Working Group on Climate Change?

Annex 8. List of KASA Supported Research Activities of Grantees

Name of Partner	Research activity supported	Sector / NREG Issues
1. Centre for Environmental Impact Assessment (CEIA)	Human health risk assessment and epidemiological studies from exposure to toxic chemicals in tarkwa – nsuaem municipality, prestea huni valley district and cape coast metropolis, Ghana The overall goal of this project is: ▪ to assess cancer and non – cancer human health risk from exposure to toxic chemicals via oral and dermal contact of surface/ground water, soil and sediments from mining ▪ to determine the number of cancer and non – cancer health cases that has been reported to health institutions in the study area which are as a result of exposure to toxic chemicals from mining operations. ▪ Contribute to CSO evidence-advocacy for responsible mining in Ghana.	Mining
2. ISODEC	BASELINE STUDY IN SIX OIL DISTRICT IN WESTERN REGION Base line survey in selected communities in the following districts (Jomoro, Nzema East, Wassa West, Shama Ahanta East, Mpohor Wassa East and Ahanta West)	Oil& Gas
3. TWN	▪ Conduct research into bulk minerals sector to determine its potentials and challenges ▪ Undertake review and analysis of environmental impact assessment processes in Ghana in support of advocacy	Mining and environment
4. Ghana Developing Communities Association (GDCA)	Research on effects of Sand and Gravel mining on livelihoods of communities in Northern Region	Environment
5. Association of Jasikan District Civil Society Organization (AJADSCO)	*Baseline Survey on NREG in Jasikan District:* A survey to ascertain the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices in relation to the environment and natural resources management in Jasikan District. This will inform advocacy for improve environmental and forest resource management bye-laws and practice in the area.	Environment and forestry
6. Social Support Foundation (SSF)	Conduct a situational analysis on the level of community participation in mining and environmental governance in Obuasi gold mining communities to ascertain facts for engagement with duty bearers.	Mining and social conflicts

Name of Partner	Research activity supported	Sector / NREG Issues
7. CIKOD	Research and advocacy on the potentials and dangers of mining on the livelihood of communities in Upper west region

Key methodology include the Community Institutional and resources mapping (CIRM) . This is a community led action research where community representatives will lead in collecting community perceptions about the mining operations and the possible positive and negative effects on their socio-cultural, economic, environmental and spiritual lives | Mining & environmental impact assessment issues |
| 8. NGND | ▪ A gender audit of NREG NGOs in order to support engender their programs and organisational structures.

▪ A rapid assessment of human activities and impact on NRE and flooding in flood prone areas along the White Volta in Northern Ghana | Gender

Environment |
| CICOL | ▪ Research on Jatropha plantation (biofuels) and land rights in Ghana

▪ A Study on assessing the implications of Oil and Gas on Land rights in the Western Region: a case of Jomoro District. | Land |
9. Development Institute	Research on and Advocacy for the review of Act 538 of 2000 (Forestry Plantation Development Fund (FPDF)), to reverse biodiversity losses and forest degradation.	Forestry
10. Consultants Facilitated research	CSO State of the Environment report 2010	Forestry, mining, climate change, land and environment etc.
11. Creatives Storm. RUMNET, PA, GCRN and SKY Media	Various research for environmental films production (the Environment Channel by Creative Storm), other research for media productions and publications (print, radio and TV).	Various

Annex 9 - Workshops with Grantees in Northern and Southern Sectors

Workshop for Southern Sector, Friday, 15ᵗʰ October 2010

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Opening by KASA
   i. Purpose of workshop is to contribute to the KASA evaluation process
   ii. Short period: inception was in 08/08 after which main activities started
   iii. We want to draw on your experiences in the sector
   iv. Introduction – organization and what you are doing in the sector

2. Purpose of evaluation (ET):
   i. What has been achieved – logframe outcomes and output
   ii. Recommendations for the future
   iii. Policy influence
   iv. Key areas: Capacity building, learning, platform, funding, advocacy

3. Programme
   i. Session 1: Review of Platform and Advocacy in NRE
   ii. Session 2:KASA mechanism
   iii. Session 3: Reflection
   iv. Session 4: Recommendations and best ideas as for the future

B. SESSIONS

Session 1: Review of Platform and Advocacy in NRE

1. *What are the mechanisms in place for engagement/discussion with relevant Govt. Authority?*
2. *What have been important inroads or effects of the combined advocacy efforts of the platform – what changes have you noticed? Can they be documented?*
3. *What was your role and participation in the CSO State of the Environment report?*
4. *Leadership and representation of the consultation process: Who has played a lead role? What is the effectiveness, acceptance and accountability of leaders of platforms?*
5. *What has worked well – what could be improved?*
6. *What is/ has been Kasa's role in supporting the platforms?*

Group presentations

- **Forestry**

Mechanisms for Engagement/Discussion with relevant Govt.

1. MLNR – FC: (FSD, TIDD, WD, RMSCC). Direct consultation, consultative workshop, dialoguing. Which mechanisms are in use?

important inroads or effects of the combined advocacy efforts of the platform

2.   Effects and inroads of advocacy: share experiences and payment of fire belt constructions.

3   CSO SoE Report: Recognized that all represented and made inputs

4   Leadership of platforms and consultations: Inadequate consultation by lead group, especially after Dodowa meeting ineffective. But after Oak plaza thematic areas emerged and provided input into SoE report – more effective

5   Effective CB workshops, Advocacy workshop, M&E (in Kumasi), training on fin. Management, seeking out individual CSOs

6   Role in supporting platforms: establishing broader platforms, funding

Land, Oil & Gas

1   Mainstreaming issues: extractive industry. Land: Land sector policy committee (CICOL representation) – good opening for engagement. Land sector technical c'ttee. Ministry of Land and …
Oil & Gas: Sector wide sector review meeting, EITI Steering C'ttee

2   Inroads, effects: Some inroads in terns of MDAs being more receptive to criticism, recognition of CSOs as DPs. Responsiveness and acceptance, attitude changes
Oil& Gas: 90% of CSOs proposal being incorporated in Revenue mgmt bill being drafted.

           CSOs capacity has improved tremendously.

           MoFEP adapted by MoFEP as mandatory process.

3   SoE – Roles. Both sides produced papers on state of affairs

4   Platforms: National: Review meetings, NRE review meeting
CICOL on land rights' issues

           ISODEC on oil & gas.

           Legitimacy – we have the leg. It is effective, but the mandate is quite loose. Two way communication, we expect members to feed into the platforms. Nut it has become a one way communication from the secretariat to the members

5   Learning has taken place, info sharing, legitimacy, networks of CSOs and partners. Capacities have improved, also GoG – indicator is EITI submissions by CSOs.

6   Need funding - we need to research into areas – more research needed. Our capacity on R&A must be built. Also direction of the sector, piloting these mechanisms. Kasa's role: facilitated network – CSOs now are represented in the networks. Monitoring on the sector – was very loose – GoG know now that CSOs are watching. Kasa is monitoring and bring to our intention.

Mining

1   Individual organisations: NCOM platform, local govt structures, Small scale mining c'ttee. MDAs in Mining (MC) Chamber of Mines.

Mainstreaming issues: extractive industry.

2   Contributing review of Minerals & mining act 2006 (Act 703).
Increase acceptance of govt. institutions
Increased media coverage, Kasa media updates has been very helpful. Kasa media awards in NRE
Increased capacity of CSOs through sharing & info. Increased knowledge of mining regulations, policies and laws.
Increased understanding and acceptance of small scale mining and regulatory processes

3   SoE – input to report, contributing.
Participation in Kasa NRE forum and provided inputs

4   NCOM – representation is maximum (score 5 of 5). Leadership among the platforms – 2 out of 5, Accountability 1 out of 5.

5   <u>Worked well</u>: Creation of platforms and discussion for a; increased media coverage; Openness and info sharing amongst stakeholders; strengthened collaboration amongst CSO actors. Enhanced advocacy among CSO actors in mining
CB, process facilitation, financial contributions, increased media presence & reportage, strengthening collaboration among CSO actors.

        <u>What can improve</u>: Better accountability of members and leaders, poor communication, constituency, funding

6   Cap. Building, facilitation, financial contribution, info sharing

Climate Change

1   Govt stakeholders: MoE/EPA, NCCC – CSO repr. (FOE)
EPA desk on CC

        RELBONET (FBOs in CC)

        ENRAC – CSO rep

        NRE sector review and own annual parallel CSO sector reviews

        Annual CSO Parallel review of NRE

2   CSO rep to be strengthened on NCCC
Emerging CSO platforms, e.g. Abantu, FWG, Working group on Env + CC (needs strengthening)

        CSO input to nat'l adaptation strategy

        CSOs and FBOs coordinated engagement on CC –

        Increased awareness of CSos on local level – a long way to go.

3   Role limited on SoE – participated but new platform

4   we have just composed a Mgt team + advisory board after broad consultations (even w religious bodies). Coord. Of diverse FBO to a common platform (RELBONET)

5   What Worked well:

Coordination and participation + NRE forum + capacity build/info sharing

What could be improved: Strengthen WG on on EN/CC to facilitate CD + coordination

Short notice by MDAs to CSOs on mtgs + other initiatives

6 Role of Kasa:
Effective coordination,

Info sharing, inclusiveness

Recognition of relevance of stakeholders

Water:

1 Stakeholders
Water resource commission

MoE/EPA

MWRWH

CWSA/GWCL

Mechanisms of engagement

Institutionalised annual conference (MDG conference series)

Representation on board and Steering C'ttees

Policy dialogues

Media engagement – public agenda has been outstanding

Env and Nat Resource Advisory Council

Sector annual review – Water and NRE sectors

CSOs parallel review of NRE

Subsector group meetings

2 Inroads & effects
National climate change cttee w CSO representation

Increased recognition on CSOs and climate change and water – rapid growth of CSOs in sector

Strong CSO input into EPA National Water Policy

Cross sectoral collaboration under the platforms – how CONIWAS is related to CICOL and NCOM – very important, cross discussions, radio programmes

Sector MDAs now mainstreaming climate change in their work

Increased awareness on issues on climate change among CSOs and communities

3 CONIWAS reviewed water resource component of SoE

4   Leadership of CONIWAS is elected – they are accepted
         Representative c'tee at Kasa level – coordinated by Kasa – effective and acceptable

5   What worked: Kasa coordination role has been very effective, good selection and acceptable
         Mechanisms for participation

         NRE Forums

         Capacity build scope beyond grantees – spill over effect

         Engagement strategies

         Recognition by Govt that CSOs better organised now

         What could be been improved

         Mobilisation of CSO in terms of internal network

         Capacity of networks to continuously engage

         Scope and Size of grants

6   Kasa's role: Resource provision, Training, Resource persons, Facilitation and coordination,
         information clearing house (has shortened distance)

Session 2: Surprising Encounters (funneling) – KASA as a mechanism

1. Dyads for 10 minutes to review the questions – come up with responses -- one card per questions
2. Two dyads join and discuss for another 10 minutes – sort out their responses prioritise
3. Cards taped on flipchart by questions.
4. Plenary – presentations (aim for less cards)
1. Learning opportunities:
    a. Sharing of research findings and CSO capacity building
    b. Formal training, in financial, media updates, review meetings
    c. Training workshops, monitoring &E training, financial capacity building
    d. Discussion on platforms, networking, information sharing, review meetings and media updates
    e. Learning and monitoring visits and review (joint and periodic reports)

2. Advocacy capacity:
    a. Enhanced knowledge and utilization of action research
    b. Enhanced evidence-based research
    c. Broadened scope of our constituents
    d. Has helped to clearly define advocacy levels and strategy (approach)

3. *Was taken out because participants gave responses on it in the previous session*

4. KASA as a funding mechanism

    a. Provided logistics to facilitate work
    b. Very useful, timely and continuous feedback support for grantees but less flexible
    c. Helped sustain roles we play in advocacy
    d. Helped improve internal control and governance systems – more transparency and accountability
    e. Mentoring/Monitoring visits has improved reporting, facilitation and monitoring skills
    f. Sustain partners' advocacy roles, improve internal control and governance systems

5. Advocacy & Capacity building/ Learning- organization level
    a. Incorporation of media in advocacy
    b. Improve records keeping and financial management and practices
    c. Learned the techniques and advocacy on forestry/climate change
    d. To engage the media and train them to be able to report on and promote NRE issues

Session 3 – skipped because of time constraints

Session 4: Future Recommendations for a future CS Support mechanism (10 minutes) using cards

Process

1. Form 3 groups
2. Give out pictures (equal numbers)
3. Group review recommendations (7 statements) from the October 2009 KASA forum
4. Groups reflect on these and come out with recommendations
5. Choose picture to reflect the idea
6. Blank flip charts for them to stick the recommendations/pictures.
7. Group paste according to similar ideas
8. Presentations- we note the issues they talk about

Results: Issues/Recommendations

1. Facilitate engagement with duty bearers at the national level – to KASA
2. Provide capacity and technical support at higher level – national and international
3. Coordinate research, documentation and information sharing
4. CSO peer review
5. For KASA to leave indelible footprints in NRE sector, it should be continued
6. The mechanism – in terms of funding should be well divided among the different sectors because they all have a role to play in achieving the recommendations of the NREG sector
7. Capacity building and technical support should be directed at thematic areas to meet specific needs
8. Use musicians, artists, footballers and actors to catch the attention of Ghanaians -- famous people (*Comment – should KASA be doing this? Should we not be doing this in our platforms Isn't KASA to coordinate? Does not mean KASA will implement. This was clarified that it does not mean KASA should implement*)
9. Focus, sector, -- we agree that KASA should be branded as an advocacy org for NRE sector. We agree with 4 cardinal principles of focus. In addition, the funding mechanism must be looked at in terms of the time frame. For advocacy, these orgs will need a longer time frame; should be global
10. Funding – more attention should be given to more core funding rather than more project funding. Focus on project makes us lose a handle on our own institutions capacity. Timeliness of delivery of funds. A lot of the grantees are weak. KASA II

11. Relax requirements for core in KASA II. In KASA I only big ones got it because of this
12. Broaden programmes –KASA has a clear defined on forestry, envt, mining focus. Should be global – natural resources in general
13. Flexibility – matrix is set. Sector should be flexible to embrace emerging issues
14. Up scaling -- link it to other CSOs in the country – funding (size of budgeted and broadening of programme scope)

Questions on GHARI.

2. No one from Dodowa wanted GHARI
3. Position confirmed that no GHARI – mechanism should be sector specific

Management Structure (KASA PMT):

4. Questions did not cover Management arrangement of KASA. Think of it for individual interviews and during validation

C. CONCLUSION
1. ET- thanks
2. KASA PMT - closing

Workshop for Northern Sector, Wednesday, 20th October 2010

D. INTRODUCTION
1. Opening by KASA
    i. Purpose of workshop is to contribute to the KASA evaluation process
    ii. Short period: inception was in 08/08 after which main activities started
    iii. We want to draw on your experiences in the sector
    iv. Introduction – organization and what you are doing in the sector

2. Purpose of evaluation (ET):
    i. What has been achieved – logframe outcomes and output
    ii. Recommendations for the future
    iii. Policy influence
    iv. Key areas: Capacity building, learning, platform, funding, advocacy

3. Programme
    i. Session 1: Review of Platform and Advocacy in NRE
    ii. KASA mechanism
    iii. Session 3: Reflection
    iv. Session 4: Recommendations and best ideas as for the future

E. SESSIONS

Session 1: Review of Platform and Advocacy in NRE

Duration 1 ½ hours

Group presentations

Forestry Wildlife Organic agriculture

SANREC, MASE,

1   Mechanisms

Formal informal, workshops, seminars, radio discussions, publications

2   Changes/Inroads

Mutual collaboration, community mgmt of resources, Increased stakeholder participation and awareness on NRE issues, recognition of stakeholders rights.

Documentation: Yes, minutes, CBO reports

3   Leadership: Generally open platforms, feedback mechanisms, M&E in place

Website: helped to hold persons responsible, introduction of panelist, enhanced forms of documentation, radio discussions

4   What went well

Relationships & collaboration, Recognition of efforts & roles, information sharing, openness of some govt. officials

Could be Improved:

Standardise accountability measures

Sharing of resources, Openness, bureaucracy

Climate Change and Environment

- *CC working group*
- *NGOs in land and mining*
- *Regional level functional platform on agriculture – through ZEPF*

7   Data gathering from mechanisms, district levels, platforms created at regional level established functional platforms of CBOs and e.g. EPA. Issues are passed through the relevant national or regional platforms for consultation.
            National action programme to combat desertification (NAPXX): The doc on NAP has been made public as a result of effective advocacy by CSOs in NREG

8   Inroads and effects
            Communities now engage duty bearers to demand accountability
            Space for CSOs to engage w duty bearers – e.g. Bolgatanga Reg Coordinating Council improved relationship with media and publicity.
            What has changed:

9   Leadership of platforms: openness of duty bearers to share info freely and willingly. Organising the platforms for engagements: Duty bearers and the right holders – what is transparency and accountability about.

4   Involvement and participation of CSOs in sector platforms – improved accountavbility & transparency
           What did not work well: Access to top officials difficult. Frequent staff movement in agencies
           What could be improved: More interaction between CSOs and govt agencies
           More capacity building of CSOs in CC and Env.

Natural Resource Environment and mining

SANREC, MASE, ENRINGO

7   Mechanisms - Meetings seminars, regular and qtly meetings, seminars, resource persons, data collection and community sensitization

Regular meetings with DAs (quarterly)
CBOs individually meeting w EPA, FC, land commission
Sharing vital info/data, financing some DA's activities on NRM
Good collaboration govt agencies and CSOs
Promoting accountability, transparency
Review and incorporate NREG issues into MTEF/MTDP

3   Leaders accepted by both GoG and CBOs – all CBOs had track records on collaboration w GoG
            Regular meeting schedules
            Rotational leadership, constitution
            Good link between the CBOs, communities and govt.
            Accountability, transparency

4   Worked well
            Collaboration CSOs-Govt
            Advocacy through media

Improved: Advocacy with people
Community entry techniques should be sharpened

8   <u>**Session 2: Surprising Encounters (funneling) – KASA as a mechanism**</u>
   5. Dyads for 10 minutes to review the questions – come up with responses -- one card per questions
   6. Two dyads join and discuss for another 10 minutes – sort out their responses prioritise
   7. Cards taped on flipchart by questions.
   8. Plenary – presentations (aim for less cards)

Presentations

   6. Learning opportunities:
      a. Sharing of research findings and CSO capacity building
      b. Formal training, in financial, media updates, review meetings
      c. Training workshops, monitoring &E training, financial capacity building
      d. Discussion on platforms, networking, information sharing, review meetings and media updates
      e. Learning and monitoring visits and review (joint and periodic reports)

   7. Advocacy capacity:
      a. Enhanced knowledge and utilization of action research
      b. Enhanced evidence-based research

     c.   Broadened scope of our constituents
     d.   Has helped to clearly define advocacy levels and strategy (approach)

8.   Was taken out because participants gave responses on it in the previous session

9.   KASA as a funding mechanism
     a.   Provided logistics to facilitate work
     b.   Very useful, timely and continuous feedback support for grantees but less flexible
     c.   Helped sustain roles we play in advocacy
     d.   Helped improve internal control and governance systems – more transparency and accountability
     e.   Mentoring/Monitoring visits has improved reporting, facilitation and monitoring skills
     f.   Sustain partners' advocacy roles, improve internal control and governance systems

10.   Advocacy & Capacity building/ Learning- organization level
     a.   Incorporation of media in advocacy
     b.   Improve records keeping and financial management and practices
     c.   Learned the techniques and advocacy on forestry/climate change
     d.   To engage the media and train them to be able to report on and promote NRE issues

Session 3 – skipped because of time constraints

Session 4: Future Recommendations for a future CS Support mechanism (10 minutes) using cards

Process

9.   Form 3 groups
10.   Give out pictures (equal numbers)
11.   Group review recommendations (7 statements) from the October 2009 KASA forum
12.   Groups reflect on these and come out with recommendations
13.   Choose picture to reflect the idea
14.   Blank flip charts for them to stick the recommendations/pictures.
15.   Group paste according to similar ideas
16.   Presentations- we note the issues they talk about

Results: Issues/Recommendations

15.   Facilitate engagement with duty bearers at the national level – to KASA
16.   Provide capacity and technical support at higher level – national and international
17.   Coordinate research, documentation and information sharing
18.   CSO peer review
19.   For KASA to leave indelible footprints in NRE sector, it should be continued
20.   The mechanism – in terms of funding should be well divided among the different sectors because they all have a role to play in achieving the recommendations of the NREG sector
21.   Capacity building and technical support should be directed at thematic areas to meet specific needs

22. Use musicians, artists, footballers and actors to catch the attention of Ghanaians -- famous people (*Comment – should KASA be doing this? Should we not be doing this in our platforms Isn't KASA to coordinate? Does not mean KASA will implement. This was clarified that it does not mean KASA should implement*)

23. Focus, sector, -- we agree that KASA should be branded as an advocacy org for NRE sector. We agree with 4 cardinal principles of focus. In addition, the funding mechanism must be looked at in terms of the time frame. For advocacy, these orgs will need a longer time frame; should be global

24. Funding – more attention should be given to more core funding rather than more project funding. Focus on project makes us lose a handle on our own institutions capacity. Timeliness of delivery of funds. A lot of the grantees are weak. KASA II

25. Relax requirements for core in KASA II. In KASA I only big ones got it because of this

26. Broaden programmes –KASA has a clear defined on forestry, envt, mining focus. Should be global – natural resources in general

27. Flexibility – matrix is set. Sector should be flexible to embrace emerging issues

28. Up scaling -- link it to other CSOs in the country – funding (size of budgeted and broadening of programme scope)

F. CONCLUSION

Annex 10. Validation Workshop Participants

Validation Workshop, Tuesday, 26ᵗʰ October 2010
Coconut Grove Regency Hotel

Names of Participants	Organisation	Position
1. Julius Awaregya	GNADO	Project Manager
2. Esi Johnson	ICCO	Facilitator
3. James K. Bonfah Jnr	YPAG	Executive Director
4. Abdallah Kassim	RUMNET	Executive Director
5. Abdul-Karim Ziblin	WUDZA	Programme Manager
6. Hardi Tijani	GDCA	Project Officer
7. Delle Kpebesan	RUDEYA	Executive Director
8. Wilson Arthur	Skyy Media Group	Executive Director
9. Akpene Y. Dzadza	ISODEC	Policy Assistant
10. Banuoku F. Daniel	CIKOD-WA	Regional Co-ordinator
11. Hannah Owusu Koranteng	WACAM	Deputy Executive Director
12. Alhaji Braimah Issaka	AJADSCO	Chairman
13. Odeefuo K. Berchie	Skyy Media Group	Cameraman
14. Ismail Lansah	NGND	Executive Director
15. Adwoa Pabby	GCRN	Programme Officer
16. Gloria M. Akaba	Development Institute	Project Officer
17. Irene Mensah	Public Agenda	Reporter
18. Abdulai Darimani	TWN-Africa	Programme Director
19. Solomon Kusi Ampofo	FON	Project Officer
20. George Gyapong	AJADSCO	Programme Accountant
21. Alhassan Zariatu	NGND	Programme Officer
22. Samuel Obiri	CEIA	Executive Director
23. Bossman Owusu	Tropenbos International Ghana	Communication Director
24. Alfred Fosu	KWC/RUDEYA	Programme Co-ordinator
25. Nana Nkansah	ACE Ghana	Programme Co-ordinator
26. John Sitor	Care/Kasa	M&E Officer
27. Kingsley Bekoe	FWG/Civic Response	Co-ordinator
28. Issifu Sulemana	ZEFP	Environmental Programme Officer
29. Eric Cab-Beyuo	MOFEP	Assistant Economist
30. Louis Acheampong	Social Support Foundation	Executive Director
31. Oppon Sasu	Forestry Commission	Team Leader
32. Beauty E.Agbavor	WGFC-Ghana	Communication Manager
33. Asamoa William	CIKOD-WA	Programme Officer
34. Samuel Eworyi	RECA	Project Manager
35. Babatunde Tijani	CONIWAS	Programme Officer
36. Asaah Mohammed	CARE-GIRAF	Project Manager
37. Roland Awelinga	Public Agenda	Marketing Manager
38. Steve Manteaw	ISODEC/PWYP	Co-ordinator
39. Baba Tuahiru	CARE-ALP	Advocacy Manager

Names of Participants	Organisation	Position
40. Richster Ammarfio	Civil Society Alliance on Fisheries Agenda	Co-ordinator
41. Theophilus Dei	Civil Society Alliance on Fisheries Agenda	Member
42. Emmanule Larby	CROG	Member
43. Mawuko Fumey	SNV- GHANA	Advisor
44. Abraham Laryea	Skyy Media Group	Accountants
45. George Awudi	FOE-GH	Co-ordinator
46. Oliver Eleeza	CARE	IMAM
47. Robert Amo	CARE	OD Advisor
48. Richard Antwi Bediako	RECA	Executive Director
49. Prof. Thomas Akabza	University of Ghana/TWN	Research Co-ordinator
50. Afurika Juvenal	CARE	ACD
51. Uwe Worus	WARMU/CARE	DRD-PQ
52. Charles Agboklu	RELBONET	Co-ordinator
53. Kafui Demlarbe	Civic Response	Administrator
54. Dr. Kwesi Owusu	Creative Storm Network	Co-ordinator
55. Kyeretwie Opoku	Civic Response	Co-ordinator
56. Abena Amponsaa Baafi	CARE-KASA	Administrative Secretary
57. Zakaria Yakubu	CARE-KASA	Kasa Co-ordinator
58. Kwami Ansre	CARE-KASA	Capacity Building Advisor
59. Matthias Aneinini	CARE-KASA	Grants Manager
60. Frank Runchel	NCG - DK	Evaluation Team
61. Cherub Antwi-Nsiah	NCG Local Consultant	Evaluation Team

Annex 11. List of Persons Interviewed

Name	Organisation	Category
1. Mr. Zakaria Yakubu, Coordinator		Kasa PMT
2. Mr. Kwami Ansre, Capacity bldg & Learning Mgr.		Kasa PMT
3. Mr.Mathias, Grant Manager	CARE	KASA PMT
4. Mr. John Sittor, M&E Manager		KASA PMT
5. Mrs. Esi Johnson, Programme Manager	ICCO	KASA Consortium
6. Mrs. Sarah Agbey, Natural Resource Management Advisor	SNV	
7. Mr. Balma Yakubu Issaka, Capacity builder for Northern CSOs		
8. Mrs. Lilian Bruce, Programme Officer	CICOL	Grantee - Core
9. Mr. Dornu Nartey, Exec. Director, Land for Life		
10. Mr. Dramani, NCOM Coordinator	NCOM/TWN	Grantee, Core, Project
11. Dr. Yaw Graham, Exec. Dir, TWN		
12. Ms. Wilna Quemayne, Coordinator	GCRN	Grantee, Project
13. Dr. Steve Manteaw	ISODEC	Grantee, Project
14. Dr. Steve Manteaw	Public Agenda	Grantee, Project
15. Ms. Rosemund Kumah, Advocacy & Communications Officer		
16. Abu Ibrahim		
17. Yakubu Abdullah		
18. Dokunepo Ashiku		
19. Abdulai Suweidu		
20. Khadijah Iddrisu		
21. Mariam Adama		
22. Gambi Philip		
23. Abdul Rahman Fatsim		
24. Imoro Jaoni	GDCA[32]	Grantee, Project
25. Dokenesu Salifu		
26. Mahama Ziblim		
27. Mr. Chief and entourage		
28. Mr. Ishmail Lansah, Executive Secretary	NGND	Grantee, Core
29. Mr. Mohammed Abdul-Jabary, Programmes Officer		
30. Ms. Zariatu Alhassan		
31. Mr. Abdallah Kassim, Exec. Dir	RUMNET	Grantee, Project
32. Mr. Alhassan Imoro, Media Director		
33. Mr. Issifu Sulemana Jobila , Environment Programme Coordinator, Walewale, West Mamprusi District		
34. Mrs Debe Lamisi, Sugru Vella Women Association Wulugu		
35. Mrs Mary A. Kungazori, Yameriga Tree Growers Assocaition, Tongo, Talinsi-Nabdam District, UE/R	ZEPF	Grantee, Core
36. Hon. Gladys Lariba Mahama, Assembly Woman, Naliarigu, East Mamprusi District		
37. Mr Yambil Timothy, Bilfalco, Food Security Programme Officer, Bunkpurugu, Bunkpurugu-Yunyoo District		
38. Issah Abudulai, Presiding Member, Presiding Member of West Mamprusi District Assembly, West Mamprusi District		

[32] Included a Chief and his entourage

39. Yakubu Iddrisu, Cpywd, Executive Director, Tamale Metropolis/Nanumba South District		
40. Mr David Agongo, ZEPF, Executive Director, Walewale, West Mamprusi District		
41. Mr James Sampana, ZEPF, Organic Agricultural Education Officer, Walewale, West Mamprusi District		

Name	**Organisation**	**Category**
42. Dr. Kwesi Owusu, Coordinator	Creative Storm	Grantee, Project
43. Mrs Hannah Owusu-Koranteng	WACAM	Grantee, Core
44. Mr. Daniel Banuoku, Coordinator & Facilitator for KASA	CIKOD	Grantee, Project
45. Mr. William Asamoah, Programme Manager, Giraf		
46. Mr.Elijah Danso, Senior Prog. Officer, Envt & Water	RNE	Donor
47. Dr. Sean Doolan , Advisor Climate Change & Environmental Governance	DFID	Development Partner
48. Dr. Ton Vonder Zon, First Secretary, Environment & Water Advisor		
49. Mr. Graham Gass		
50. Mr. Oppon Sasu, Donor Relations	FC	Government Agency/Sector Partner
51. Ms. Sheila Naah	MoFEP/NREG Secretariat.	
52. Mr. Afenu	MC	
53. Ms. Christina Asare	EPA	
54. Mr. Macdanus Younnis	MLNR	
55. Hon. Sulley Abudu Zakaria, District Chief Executive, West Mamprusi	District Assembly	Local Govt
56. Mr Alhassan Ziblim Al-Hassan, District Coordinating Director, West Mamprusi	District Assembly	Local Govt
57. Mr. Martin Olaga, Division Officer, West Mamprusi	Forest Division,	Local Govt Agency
58. Mr. Abu Iddris, Regional EPA Director, Tamale	EPA	Local Govt agency

Participants for Southern Sector Workshop, 15th October 2010

Name	Organisation
1. Abena Amponsaa Baafi	CARE-KASA
2. Zakaria Yakubu	CARE-KASA
3. Kwami Ansre	CARE-KASA
4. Mathias Anenini	CARE-KASA
5. Frederick Ato Armah	CEIA
6. Richard Antwi-Bediako	RECA
7. Alfred Fosu	KWC/RUDEYA
8. Patrick Apoya	CONIWAS
9. John Sitor	CARE-KASA
10. Louis Acheampong	Social Support Foundation
11. Lillian Bruce	CICOL
12. George Gyapong	AJADSCO
13. Akakpo D. Brain	Development Insitute
14. Gloria M. Akaba	Development Institute
15. Solomon Kusi Ampofo	FoN
16. Charles Agboklu	RELBONET
17. Steve Manteaw	ISODEC/PWYP
18. Beauty E. Adjavor	WGFC-Ghana
19. Wilna Quarmyne	GCRN
20. Frank Runchel	Evaluation Team/NCG DK
21. Cherub Antwi-Nsiah	Evaluation Team/NCG Local Consultant

Participants for Grantees' Northern Sector Workshop, 20th October 2010

Name	Organisation
22. Balma Yakubu Issaka	SNV Tamale
23. Mohammed Abdul-Jabary	NGND
24. Abass Salifu	L.O.Y.A
25. Bukari Issaku	SNV Bolga
26. Julius Awamegyai	GNADO, Navrongo
27. Jacob Kabanda	Wildlife Division , Bolga
28. Raphael Ali	Tuwodep, Tuna
29. Joseph Wuni	CBFP, Walewale
30. Ebenezer Djabatey	Forest Commission, Tamale
31. Francis Npong	MASE, Tamale
32. Ali Mohammed Iddris	SFA, Tamale
33. Salifu Mahama	GDCA, Tamale
34. Isaac Songya	MASE, Tamale
35. Joseph Ziem	MASE, Tamale
36. Abdul-Karim Ziblim	WUZDA, Tamale
37. Issifu Sulemana Jobila	ZEPF, Walewale
38. Zariatu Alhassan	NGND, Tamale
39. Yakubu Iddrisu	CPYD
40. Issah Abdulahi	District Assembly
41. Abdulai Kassim	RUMNET
42. Ayishetu Mickey I	CARE
43. Samuel Obiri	CEIA
44. Kwami Ansre	Kasa/CARE
45. Zak Yakubu	Kasa/CARE
46. Frank Runchel	Evaluation team
47. Cherub Antwi-Nsiah	Evaluation team

Annex 12 – Field Evaluation Programme

Date	Activity	Team members	Remarks
20 October	9:00 AM Kasa Grantee Workshop – Northern Sector	FBR, CAN	Bigiza, Tamale
	4:00 PM ET meeting with Kasa team – Zak, Kwami	FBR, CAN	Bigiza
21 October	6:30 AM – 9:00 AM – Travel to Accra	FBR, CAN	
	10:00 AM Creative Storm – Dr. Kwesi Owusu	FBR, CAN	Creative S
	2:00PM Forestry Commission – Oppon Sasu, Donor relations	FBR, CAN	FC
	6:00 PM Graham Gass, DFID	FBR	Telephone
22 October	9:00 AM Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – Christina Asare	FBR, CAN	EPA
	10:50 AM Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources (MLNR) – Macdanus Younn	FBR	MLNR
	11:30 AM CIKOD – Daniel Banuoku, Kasa Project Facilitator; William Asamoah, Giraf	CAN	Kasa office
	2:00 PM Meeting with Kasa PMT	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
	3:30 PM Meeting with reference group Kasa PMT and SNV – Mawuko Fumey	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
23 October	1:00 PM ET Reporting	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
24 October	ET Home –base Reporting	FBR, CAN	home
25 October	9:00AM WACAM – Mrs. Hannah Owusu-Koranteng	FBR	Tema
	9:00 AM CR/FWG – Kyeretwie Opoku/Kingsley Bekoe - no show	CAN	Adjiringano
	11:00 AM Preparation for Validation Workshop	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
	4:00 PM Briefing Kasa PMT	FBR, CAN	Kasa office

26 October	9:00 AM Validation Workshop	FBR, CAN	Coconut Grove
27 October	9:00 AM ET meeting	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
	11:00 AM Meeting with Kasa PMT, CARE & ICCO	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
	1:00 PM Reporting	FBR, CAN	Kasa office
	6:00 PM FBR leaves		

Annex 13 – Gender and Power Relations Matrix

MATRIX FOR PROGRAMMING, DEVELOPING INDICATORS AND MONITORING

GENDER MAINSTREAMING / RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH[33]	POWER RELATIONS			
	POWER TO *(power to claim rights)*	**POWER OVER** *(address power relationships and let poor and vulnerable groups challenge unjust use of power)*	**POWER WITH** *(power to work with others)*	**POWER WITHIN** *(to understand their situation, the options available and to make choices to change their circumstances)*
Division of labour/Workload/Drudgery)				
Access to and control over productive resources and the physical environment (education, information, training, tools, credit, etc)				
Power sharing and decision making (household, community, district, region, national, int'l)				
Awareness, Promotion and Protection of the rights of women				

(Left vertical label: CHANGES IN GENDER RELATIONS ENVISAGED)

---

[33] "RBA as a framework that integrates the norms, principles, standards and goals of the international human rights system into the plans and processes of development; and as an approach characterised by methods and activities that link the human rights system and its inherent notion of power and struggle with development". Boesen, J.K. and Tomas Martin. 2007. *Applying A Rights-Based Approach: An Inspiration Guide for Civil Society*. The Danish Institute of Human Rights.