



**Addendum to  
Annual Report Guidelines  
For Governance and Transparency Fund  
Grant Holders**

**29 April 2010**

## **Introduction**

### ***.....This addendum complements but does not replace the Annual Report Guidelines of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009***

This document offers further explanation and suggestions for completing the Year 2 Annual Report by Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF) grant holders. It does not replace the Annual Report Guidelines of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009, but is intended to complement them as a result of the review of Year 1 reports and the feedback that was received. It is expected that with the greater progress of a complete year of operation that the reports this year can be more explicitly related to the format and content that is required of the Annual Report.

The importance of these reports is strongly reiterated especially as a management tool for your own internal use and to demonstrate the progress that is being made towards achieving the outputs of your programme. Importantly also, you should be in a position to demonstrate what you have learnt from implementing your different tools and methods and where successes are beginning to emerge. In this way the likely impacts of your programme and its contribution to the overall GTF can be articulated in specific and tangible ways.

The following explanations and suggestions are based on our assessment of first year reports which indicated that many organisations had difficulty in interpreting the reporting guidelines for section 1, 6, 9, 13 and Annex 1 and 6. This addendum offers additional clarification to the guidelines for these and other sections. Instructions for all other report sections remains the same. Also note, that for certain items (e.g. sections 4, 5 and 7) if there have been no changes all that needs to be stated is “no change”.

Sections that you should give most attention to are 6, 9, 13 and Annexes 1 and 6 (note that Annex 6 is now compulsory and not an optional requirement).

### **Reference documentation when compiling your annual report**

- Inception Report Guidelines 19th December 2008 (especially for GTF programme logframe)
- Annual Report Guidelines 7th April 2009
- All feedback letters received from KPMG in relation to the submission of your first Annual Report and subsequent progress reports. Please ensure you address any issues that were raised.
- This Addendum 27th April 2010
- Also, material from the postponed April 2010 workshop presentations can be incorporated in the AR where relevant

### **How do I submit my Annual Report?**

In electronic format only (in font Arial 12) using Microsoft Word by email to the GTF Fund Manager ([gtf@kpmg.com](mailto:gtf@kpmg.com)). Please do not use Adobe Acrobat format and ensure that your GTF number is stated within the subject box of your email.

Please check that this is the final version of your report and is properly quality assured (last year editorial comments and track changes were often found within the submitted documents).

If some of your annexes are in other formats (e.g. MS excel tables) these do not need to be converted but can be sent in a zipped file with your Annual Report.

**Is there a standard format for the Annual Report?**

Last year some submissions were extremely lengthy and did not respect the page limits (10-15 pages for the main narrative section of the report). Please try to be concise in your reporting and explicit in what you are intending to convey.

**Collaboration in compiling the Annual Report**

Where there are other related GTF programmes in your country, perhaps with whom you have been co-ordinating, it may be useful to share information on what you are going to present in your Annual Report (e.g. in assessment of external risks). Similarly, it may also be helpful to share conclusions on what has worked and why.

## Annual Report Format

### 1. Programme Identification Details

The Programme Identification Details section requests information on lead contacts for your programme and local partner organisations. Instead of asking you to complete the contact and partner information in this section, KPMG will send out separate spreadsheets containing the information currently on file for each organisation by the end of May 2010. Please update these spreadsheets and attach them as additional annexes to your Annual Report at the end of June 2010.

### 6. Risk Assessment

The risk assessment for your programme needs to clearly differentiate the internal risks and those that are part of the external environment and over which you will have less (or little) control. Rather than some of the lengthy narrative discussions that were submitted last year, you may find it helpful to tabulate risks showing their potential impact and probability and how you intend to mitigate these. With internal risks to the programme it is important to show how you are addressing these and overcoming any problems to effective implementation.

Such a table could be compiled as follows:

<i><b>Risk</b></i>	<i><b>Potential impact</b></i>	<i><b>Probability</b></i>	<i><b>Mitigation measures</b></i>
	High / medium / low	High / medium / low	Show how you are tackling the risk in question.

### 9. Emerging impact on governance and transparency

This is an extremely important section that some grant-holders found difficult to complete in 2009, although given the early stage of your programmes this was often understandable. This year it is expected that you should be starting to have tangible evidence that can be included in this section.

Your emerging evidence should be framed in relation to the overall GTF programme logframe indicators (see Annex 2 of the Inception Report Guidelines, 19<sup>th</sup> December 2008). It is suggested that you briefly describe **two case studies** of progress achieved by your programme and identify the specific overall GTF programme indicator (e.g. 4.2, 5.3) to which they contribute.

Describe each of these two items as per the original reporting guidelines: What has changed? Who has benefitted? How the change occurred? Why has the change occurred? and helpfully, also where the change occurred? Please be as specific and explicit as possible in describing your case study with numerical figures as appropriate.

In this way, we shall be able to build up evidence for assessing the impact the Fund is making in terms of capability, accountability and responsiveness (the CAR framework) that will lead to measurable impact on improving governance and transparency.

A suggested table which you may use is shown below:

GTF programme number	
GTF programme logframe indicator to which this case study is contributing	
What is the evidence for the example given?	
What has changed? .....insert example here:	
Who has benefitted?	
How the change occurred?	
Why this change is useful?	
Where has this change occurred?	

## 10. Cross-cutting issues

This section relates to a) how the programme is targeting specific excluded groups and any positive or negative impacts in relation to these groups; and b) any positive or negative environmental impacts experienced during the reporting period. If all information relating to these aspects is already included elsewhere in the report then please provide a reference in this section to the other relevant section(s). For example, reference to “who” has benefited in section 9 or questions relating to gender, social exclusion and governance in section13.

## 13. Learning from GTF

Here the information you provide is of crucial importance to the preparation of the GTF learning papers that are being produced.

The first GTF learning paper focused on the development of tools and methods. The second learning paper will build on what has been learnt about the use and introduction of tools and methods and will focus more on the emerging impact of your work. Thus, we anticipate that section 13 of your Year 2 Annual Reports will show how you have been applying your approaches at a practical level, what key issues of governance and transparency you have been addressing and what and how you are learning from this in different contexts.

We have endeavoured to compile suggested questions for all GTF programmes to think about when writing the Year 2 Annual Report. There are two parts to this:

**Part 1: How tools and methods have been applied and how useful these have been in implementing your programme.**

- How have your programme methods or approaches responded to the risk of raising expectations on the demand side which cannot be met on the supply side?
- How has your programme engaged with political leaders and other stakeholders?
- How have you demonstrated the added value of new tools and methods within communities and with advocacy targets?
- Are there any comparative advantages (working with others) you have identified to strengthen advocacy and engagement with government and others?
- How effective have tools (e.g. scoring systems) and methods to measure performance in governance been; what achievements and risks have you identified?
- How effective have media tools (e.g. opinion surveys, facebook, radio/tv) been in your work?

**Part 2: Governance and Transparency Themes**

**There are some key overall questions that everyone needs to consider in writing this section and then a set of supplementary questions for given governance themes that you need to consider if relevant to your programme.**

***Key questions to be considered by all programmes***

- What are the key factors determining whether or not change in relation to governance and transparency is achieved in different contexts as a result of civil society interventions?
- What evidence is there of innovative practice e.g. a new way of tackling a governance issue or an unusual alliance to bring about change.
- Which intervention strategies are most influential in bringing about meaningful social change at the local, national and regional levels? Can you attribute significant social change(s) to the work funded through the GTF? Have your interventions led to the creation or strengthening of 'change agents' for example?
- Where governance and transparency are understood in different ways, describe how your programme is translating these concepts and managing local definitions and different social norms in implementing the work?

***Suggested questions if relevant (divided by governance theme)***

**1. Governance in fragile states**

- How has civil society engaged with state and non-state actors on key issues of governance and transparency within conflict and fragile states?
- To what extent are GTF programmes having to adapt standard approaches to engage and influence non-state actors in fragile states?
- How have GTF interventions ensured that powerful state and non-state actors are made to be more accountable to the local communities in conflict countries through the intervention and mobilization of civil society?
- To what extent are GTF interventions leading to a better understanding of the root causes of conflict and fragility?

- How have GTF programmes analysed and managed risks? Have they been able to identify new opportunities and challenges due to changing political environments?

## **2. Access to justice and human rights**

- To what extent have GTF interventions contributed to an increase in the understanding of human rights and ability to claim and defend rights? How has this strengthened governance and transparency at the local and national levels?
- To what extent has GTF contributed to improvements in citizen access to justice through the formal and traditional court systems?
- How have GTF programmes adapted to different interpretations of justice and human rights?

## **3. Environmental governance**

- Has GTF support to rural communities led to an increase in their influence over the governance of natural resources and led to an impact on livelihoods?
- To what extent has GTF support to better information on natural resource management through the use of scorecards and other methods led to improved governance?
- Has GTF support helped CSOs combat the impact of environmental degradation?

## **4. Addressing corruption**

- To what extent have new approaches to the reduction of corruption been successful?
- Have anti-corruption strategies and the mobilisation of popular opposition to corruption been successful in reducing its incidence?
- To what extent have approaches that increase the use of the legal system to reduce corruption been successful?
- To what extent have anti-corruption approaches led to the improvement of access to services (e.g. health, education, water and sanitation)?

## **5. Public expenditure monitoring**

- To what extent have participatory budgeting processes contributed to changes in government budget allocations to poverty-related programmes?
- To what extent has advocacy around budgeting led to changes in Government transparency and openness?
- To what extent have GTF involvements in strengthening participatory budgeting and expenditure monitoring reduced the incidence of corruption?

## **6. Access to public services**

- How have CSO interventions improved the relevance, quality and availability of essential services?
- How have governments improved their relationships with citizen users of services through CSO involvements in community mobilisation?

## **7. Decentralisation**

- What contribution is the GTF making towards strengthening the decentralisation of government decision making and service delivery?
- To what extent are GTF programmes contributing to a more transparent process of decentralised funding mechanisms?

## **8. Gender, social exclusion and governance**

- Which intervention strategies are most influential in breaking down barriers to marginalised and discriminated voices being heard by government and other power interests at different levels?
- What contribution is the GTF making towards increasing the voice of marginalised groups, what are the resulting changes in governance and transparency, and for whom?

## **9. Media and governance**

- Does media offer a broader outreach in relation to civil society mobilization around governance and transparency?
- To what extent has the media been capable of using popular culture to create space for debate?
- To what extent is the media seen as a partner and not just a tool in GTF programmes?
- How has new media made a difference in GTF programmes?

## **Annex 1 - Achievement Rating Scale**

This can be submitted in excel if appropriate and should relate to the format of your most recent logframe (see below).

Please remember to use the correct numbering in the ARS where 1 is the highest score and 5 is the lowest score (this was misunderstood by some grant-holders in the first Annual Report). Thus:

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

This section is a summary of your progress made against your logframe in the reporting year. The number used in column 2 relates to progress to date. If your programme is five years, it would be realistic to see this being 3 at purpose level. It could be one for some outputs if they are already completed however for work in progress it would be lower than this or 5 if not started yet.

The assessment of progress in column 2 should be consistent with the narrative text given in columns 5 and 6.

Any changes to the logframe should be listed in section 8 of the AR and shown in the logframe submitted with this Annual Report.

Where your logframe indicators and baselines are not fully compatible perhaps because of modifications since inception, you will need to comment on the validity of the progress that has been made against a defined starting point.

## **Annex 2 – Programme Logframe**

Please submit this as a separate document if applicable. Many grant holders showed the main logframe and country level logframes in different worksheets of an excel spreadsheet. Don't forget to mark clearly any changes made to the logframe since AR1.

## **Annex 5 – Web Update for your programme**

The photos submitted together with your annual report should reflect the progress made in the year and complement any stories or case studies. The terminology used in the AR Guidelines "Insert representative photo(s) here" was sometimes interpreted as photos of yourselves as managers. However the intended meaning was photographs which represent your programme.

The DFID GTF web site will be linked to your own web sites. It is therefore important that you keep your own sites up to date and provide interesting material in relation to the GTF programme. Where you have specific locations within your own web sites (or elsewhere) where you are showcasing the GTF, then please provide the web site link(s) here.

DFID are interested in receiving material (including other media forms, videos etc) to showcase the GTF. Please send any material suitable for the web site to KPMG.

If you are not willing to share any information disclosed in your annual report with the public for security reasons please say so either in this section or a covering letter with your annual report – please explain why the material can not be shared.

### **Annex 6 - Annual Workplan**

Last year this section was optional. However due to the importance of having a workplan for all programmes it is now obligatory. It can be submitted in the format you are currently using to plan for the next 12 months of inputs. If there are country level workplans, it may be appropriate to submit these together with an overall summary plan.



## **Addendum to the Guidance on Commissioning a Mid-Term Review (MTR)**

**29 April 2010**

## 1. Principles of the MTR

As stated in the Guidelines of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009, the MTR is primarily for you the grant holder and partners to inform future management and direction of the programme. Independence is crucial in order to see things you would not necessarily see yourselves (ability to hold a mirror up - see and view things in a different light). The MTR needs to look at scope and reach of the programme and judge value for money (effectiveness and efficiency) in relation to delivering outputs/outcomes. It is a chance for you to:

- Ensure that the programme remains relevant, realistic and achievable within the remaining timeframe and budget.
- If necessary, adjust your programme design and logframe in order to improve likelihood of impact and sustainability.

## 2. Why is a clarification needed?

The MTR Guidelines of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009 still remain valid however since they were written, changes in DFID policy including increasing demand for demonstrating results and value for money has meant that some advisory aspects on page 5 of the MTR Guidelines need to be made obligatory.

## 3. Recommended changes to MTR Guidelines

- 3.1. Page 5 – Reference is made in the Guidelines to the Achievement Rating Scale being the only part of the MTR which is obligatory, it was envisaged that the other aspects would be suggestions rather than requirements. As mentioned above, the content of the MTR format is now a requirement in order for KPMG and DFID to have an objective, independent means to assess whether or not to continue allocating GTF programme funds.
- 3.2. A cover note should accompany the MTR submission to KPMG clearly stating:
  - The quality of the report.
  - Whether the programme agrees with the conclusions and recommendations.
  - How the programme is intending to respond to the conclusions and recommendations of the MTR.

We suggest setting this out in a table:

<b>MTR Conclusions</b>	<b>Programme Response</b>
1.	
2.	
<b>MTR Recommendations</b>	
1.	
2.	

- 3.3. All MTR TORs need to explicitly state that the consultant(s) are required to address any concerns arising from the MTR as a result of feedback from KPMG.

#### **4. GTF programmes can explore ways of working together around MTRs**

It was anticipated that there would be a session in April 2010 workshop covering this. However due to the postponement of the workshop we do not want to miss the opportunity to encourage you to discuss with other programmes areas of mutual interest for example:

- Collaboration on TOR to improve the scope of work and ensure completeness of TOR given the programme context.
- Possibilities of commissioning a joint MTR across programmes operating in the same region/country. Or the same assessor carrying out multiple MTRs.

#### **5. Specific requirements for multi-country programmes**

- MTR should outline criteria for the selection of the countries being assessed.
- One report is required covering the overall programme even if not all implementing countries have been visited by the evaluation team.
- The MTR must have one team leader responsible for the compilation of the final report where there are multiple country assessments.