

## Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

**Title: STRENGTHENING TRANSPARENCY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS PHASE 2**

**Programme Value: £22.87 million** (DFID Contribution is £15m and the rest is contributed by the EU (£2.92m) and DANIDA (£4.95m) ) **Review Date: Feb 10<sup>th</sup> 2017**

**Programme Code: 204657** **Start Date: 19/02/2015** **End Date: 30/09/2020**

### Summary of Programme Performance

Year	2016	2017						
Programme Score	A	A						
Risk Rating	Medium	Major						

### Summary of progress and lessons learnt since last review

Overall the programme has made good progress since the last review. The Service Provider (SP) achieved the key targets for the inception period, however the Steering Committee (SC) and Funders Committee (FC) extended the inception period in order to strengthen aspects of programme governance. The December 2016 Ghana elections provided the opportunity for STAR to conduct an election call and test some of the policies and procedures it had established during inception. This means that even though formal implementation only begun in October, barely four months ago, it is possible to see tangible evidence of citizens influencing change to advance democracy and accountability.

### Actions taken on Last Review:

Recommendation from Last Review	Action Taken
1. Review the capacities of all SC members and take a decision on remuneration	Not completed. Terms of Reference (TORs) for the SC include a clause on remuneration. This will be discussed at the February Retreat. The Annual Review is of the view that remuneration may increase the expectation of time demands on SC members which may not be realistic. The time demands expected of the SC and their capacity to respond should be discussed and agreed at the February retreat as this is critical to increasing the pace and momentum on the Road Map. This same consideration should be applied to new members currently under consideration. Also refer to Recommendation 7 below.
2. Outputs from the Political Economy Analysis (PEA) and the Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) Strategy should be practical and user friendly	Completed. Technical Approach paper prepared to operationalise PEA. GESI tools identified which will enable practical operationalisation of GESI strategy.
3. The proposed Strategic Framework for Continuous Learning (COPL) should dovetail with Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) functions and have well-established feedback loops	Completed. The COPL strategy has been finalised after consultations with key stakeholders. The Strategy specifically provides for capturing evidence and lessons from STAR's M&E processes and feeding these into learning processes.
4. The Programme Management Team (PMT) should start to define the framework for managing grants and how it will interlink with other Inception	Completed. A light touch review by PMT and Mango (consortium member) was done in April 2016 following the recommendations from the 1 <sup>st</sup> review in February 2016. Further to that, PMT also updated the manual in November

Phase deliverables	2016, based on comments on the extension inception phase report. Key elements of strategies on GESI, due diligence and communications mainstreamed in Elections call through applications templates, assessment criteria and outreach to applicants.
5. The M&E Framework should incorporate the requirement for the SC to connect directly to grant funded programmes and beneficiaries through field visits to assess first-hand the effectiveness and impact of their decision-making on grant proposals.	Completed. Current draft of TORs provides for SC engagement through field visits to support their decision making.
6. Review the extent to which SC/PMT decision-making is informed by technical expertise provided by consortium partners.	Not completed. The consortium has provided significant technical inputs during the inception phase such as the GESI strategy and tools, the PEA and the Technical Approach paper. The SC used the GESI strategy and tools in decision making on the GESI call. In addition, the Draft Case Statement developed by Social Development Direct (SDD) in January 2017, which elaborated on the original Options Paper, informed discussions by the SC in their January 2017 meeting on the national entity.
7. The SC to set clear timelines to consider, decide and test options for the national entity.	Completed. The SC has completed a Road Map with a timeline for the implementation of the key activities. However, some of these activities have been delayed. This Review has recommended that the SC and SP quickly get on track and stay on track.
8. The risk assessment and mitigation strategy should be completed by end February 2016	Completed. Risk registers have been developed and submitted to the SC and FC during the inception phase.
9. The proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System should be subjected to an independent review, commissioned by DFID	Not completed. This review recommends that DFID commissions this review by mid-year. At this time the M&E Systems would have had ample opportunities to be tested by the elections call.

The key lessons learnt since the last review are included in this Template under Section B: Key lessons

### Summary of recommendations for the next year

- Timing of Next Annual Review
  - The next Annual Review currently scheduled for February 2018 should be brought forward to October 2017. This is because implementation began in October 2016 and it would be more appropriate for the review schedule to coincide with the implementation start date.
- Output 1: STAR's CCC Role
  - Use the Communication Strategy and the September 2016 Convening Coordinating and Catalysing (CCC) paper to broaden Stakeholders' understanding of the CCC role of STAR.
  - Use the consultation process on the national entity to raise awareness of STAR's CCC role but also to explore whether STAR's legitimacy to convene and coordinate stems primarily from its role as grant maker.
  - STAR to conduct a Stakeholder Survey to determine their perception of STAR's CCC role. This should to be preceded by a determination by STAR of who it considers its stakeholders to be.
- Output 2: Partnerships

- STAR's communication with Grant Partners (GPs) should emphasise the added value of STAR beyond grantmaking to include roles such as a "connector" and "door opener."
- Output 3: Funding Mechanism
  - Take forward the sustainability work stream in 2017 building on lessons from STAR I, as this should also inform the nature of partnerships.
  - Set and enforce a clear timeframe for redeeming unused funds upon completion of projects, as part of the closure arrangements.
  - Clarify the process of decision making with respect to themes for calls so that they reflect the priorities of the different stakeholders while being agile enough to respond to emerging "Magic Moments"
  - In line with lesson learning from STAR Ghana Phase 1, agree a ceiling for the number of grants which can be effectively managed as further calls for GESI and Media are progressed, in line with the financial management capacity of the PMT.
- Output 4: National Entity
  - The SC should delegate operational and logistics management of the Road Map implementation to the SP/PMT or other consortium member to manage. However, the presence of at least one key SC member will be necessary to give the process credibility and generate trust within civil society. In other words, the SC has to be the face of the consultations and provide strategic leadership in determining the right approaches, but logistics and technical support can be provided by the SP or other consortium member.
  - Urgently increase momentum on implementation of the Road Map. The output of the process should be a clear articulation of what Ghanaian Civil Society needs/wants and, based on that, identification options for the SC and the FC to agree on by September 2017, at the latest.
  - Expectations to be managed about what will be in place by September 2018 and eventually in 2020. Next year (2018), the national entity may not be an institution that is ready to hit the ground running. Rather, it might need strengthening for a few years as it imbeds governance, management and organisational systems in place. Similarly, after 2020, it will be an independent entity in terms of local ownership and governance but it may still be dependent on donor funding given the nature of work around citizen engagement on accountability issues.
  - Finalise SC TORs at February 2017 Retreat. Keep tasks focused on strategic oversight and what is realistic in terms of time demands. If management oversight is included as per the Business Case, this should be linked to the SC's ability to provide strategic oversight. For example, the SC may review the annual workplan to ensure it enables the programme to achieve its overall outcomes. Half-yearly, the SC may also engage with SP and PMT to assess whether the programme is on track to achieve its outcomes. However, it should not be necessary for the SC to review quarterly workplans and budgets. This should be the role of the SP who is legally contracted to ensure effective management of the programme.
  - Maintain DFID as a full member of the SC, as the representative of the FC until such time as the entity, and new governance arrangements, are in place. This creates more opportunity for dialogue on critical issues before decision making occurs and it minimises the impression of a hierarchy between the Funders Committee and the Steering Committee.
  - Include the SP in SC meetings as an observer. This strengthens shared understanding and dialogue on issues considered by the SC. This is also important because the SP has the contractual obligation to manage STAR and thus provides leadership in the implementation of the decisions made by the SC.
  - Maintain some level of continuity of SC membership during the next few years as the consultation process ensues and the new entity is put in place. This is to ensure that there is a certain level of trust within civil society in the consultation process and the new entity when it is being established. For this to happen, the leadership and presence of key SC members will be critical during implementation of the road map. The new entity would then have a different governance structure and members would be expected to be different.

- Output 5: Communities of Practice and Learning
  - Support GPs to develop an organisational learning culture as part of the capacity building.
- VfM and Financial Performance:
  - Finalise Value for Money (VfM) Strategy by end March 2017 at the latest.
  - Provide GPs with training and support on VfM.
  - Monitor understanding and application of VfM principles by partners, through a sample of election call grantees.
  - DFID to work with STAR-Ghana to agree on the disposal process
- M&E:
  - Commission independent review of M&E systems.
  - Revise the wording of the following log frame indicators to make them clearer and easier to measure:
    - Outcome Indicator 1
    - Output Indicator 2.1
    - Output Indicator 2.2
    - Output Indicator 2.3
    - Output Indicator 4.2
    - Output Indicator 5.1

## A. Introduction and Context (1 page)

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	<a href="https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204657/documents">https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204657/documents</a>
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	<a href="https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204657/documents">https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-204657/documents</a>

STAR-Ghana (Strengthening Transparency, Accountability and Responsiveness in Ghana) is a five-year programme (2015-2020). The programme's overall budget is £22.87 million, made up of funds from DFID, DANIDA and EU as part of a pooled funding arrangement.

STAR-Ghana's goal is to develop a vibrant, well-informed and assertive civil society able to contribute to transformational national development and inclusive access to high quality, accountable public services for all Ghanaian citizens. The business case provides for the following three programme outcomes:

- Support "citizens' ability to influence change";
- Support the creation, utilisation and institutionalisation of spaces for collective civil society engagement in order to increase responsiveness of the executive and key state institutions at both local and national levels – in other words "magic" transformative spaces identified and used"; and
- Credible national organisation in place (clear governance structures, capable financial and strategic management).

The programme is being implemented by a DFID-contracted service provider, which is responsible for implementation during the first three years. In the fourth year, management will be transferred to a body corporate Ghanaian-led entity and the service provider's role will be to provide strategic advice and quality assurance.

An SC has been constituted to lead on the overall management, strategic oversight and direction of STAR-Ghana. DFID Ghana, as the lead donor, has contracted Christian Aid to provide technical expertise, administration and grant management. Christian Aid leads a consortium comprising: MANGO, Social Development Direct, On Our Radar, the Overseas Development Institute and Nkum Associates. Christian Aid is represented in Ghana by a PMT.

The core objective of this second phase of STAR-Ghana is to further develop an active and constructive citizenry in Ghana. Though previous programmes, including STAR Phase 1, achieved good results and made positive impact, there is the need to increase systematic and strategic level impact. STAR therefore has a dual focus to:

- Catalyse the efforts of citizens towards systematic change on specific issues; and
- Work towards the creation of a Ghanaian run corporate body to sustain support beyond the programme.

At the end of this Phase, DFID and other donor contributors would have provided a full decade of support to strengthening the demand side of governance in Ghana. Thus, the STAR approach has a strong focus on sustainability, including establishing a more diverse resource base by attracting private sector investment. STAR 2 is expected to achieve the following results:

- Contribute to improved governance in a deteriorating context;
- Innovative ways to enable citizens engage actively and constructively on policy, service delivery and accountability issues piloted and tested;
- More effective civil society in Ghana, including better analysis, better communication/engagement and better collaborations between policy/think tanks, civil society citizens and Parliament; and
- A Ghanaian owned, credible, strategic and fundable organisation in place by end of year 3, and managing the project during years 4 and 5.

The focus of the inception period of the programme was the 2016 Presidential and Parliamentary elections. This was done alongside the development of the programme's strategic framework and outlining plans for implementation. The Election Call was implemented through selected civil society organisations (including the media and faith-based organisations), with support from STAR-Ghana to provide civic and voter education, domestic elections observation, and parallel voter tabulation in the electoral process. The Programme also funded the high profile Presidential Debates organised by Ghana Broadcasting Corporation.

## **B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **Annual outcome assessment**

The outcome of the STAR-Ghana programme is: "Increased effectiveness of citizens influencing change that advances democracy, accountability and social inclusion through Civil Society Organisations." Only a few months into implementation, it is too early to provide an assessment of achievement of this outcome. However, evidence is emerging from the support provided under the election call of GPs strengthening the ability of citizens to increase democracy and accountability in Ghana. In this respect, it can be stated that the Programme is adequately positioned to achieve the outcome.

### **Overall output score and description. A- Output Met Expectation**

The September 2016 milestones for all indicators and their respective Outputs were met as follows:

- Convenings held to catalyse action by stakeholders;
- GPs under the election call state that STAR is playing a strong CCC role;
- STAR has high quality strategic partnerships with Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) such as Ghana Federation of the Disabled, NORSAAC, CitiFM and Blogging Ghana;
- GPs have good quality partnerships with Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) to influence policy such as the Electoral Commission (EC) and the National Commission on Civic Education (NCCE);
- Majority of Election Call projects met their planned outcomes;
- GPs are developing systems to ensure their sustainability;
- A road map is in place to prepare options for the national entity; and
- Stakeholders state that STAR is playing a good learning role and they are applying their learning.

### **Key lessons**

Some of the key lessons learned by stakeholders during the period include the following:

- The importance of effective management of the transition from one institution to the other. There is a need to better document lessons, practices, procedures so handing over is smooth and the institutional memory is preserved. The continuity of the Programme Manager helped in this case, but systems should have been in place to ensure this was done more effectively. This should be kept in mind in the transition from STAR 2 to a national entity.
- There is a need to rethink the approach to civil society capacity strengthening. Piecemeal technical support is not effective, as evidenced by the surprisingly low quality of proposals and systems of the CSOs. It should have been higher for the type of capacity development they were given. The ones who have shown a demonstrable increase in capacity were the grantees who received sustainability call grants where capacity development provided as part of more holistic support to the organisation. This learning should be reflected in the roll-out of the capacity building strategy this year.

### **Key actions**

See recommendations above.

**Has the logframe been updated since the last review?**

Yes. The logframe has been changed by adding in an Output 5 on Communities of Practice and Learning (COPL). Activities on learning were previously embedded under Output 1 which was on the CCC and Learning role. As the emphasis of the programme is on learning, STAR decided to separate Learning from the CCC output so that the programme's progress in this area could be effectively monitored and measured.

**C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING** (1 page per output)

<b>Output Title</b>	<b>STAR Ghana providing effective convener, coordinator and catalyst (CCC) role</b>		
Output number per LF	1	<b>Output Score</b>	A
Risk:	Not indicated in log frame	Impact weighting (%):	25%
Risk revised since last AR?	N	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	Y

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
1.1 Number of convenings by STAR-Ghana to catalyse action by stakeholders on strategic national issues	4	<p>4 convenings held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dialogue on 'Credible and peaceful elections: A prerequisite for Africa's progress'. (June 2016)</li> <li>• Learning event for the election call to learn and share lessons and good practices amongst GPs and with key state actors (EC, NCCE, Judiciary, Police) in the electoral processes. (July 2016)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting prior to the scoping study for GESI. (August 2016)</li> <li>• Convening meeting prior to Media call to discuss key areas and entry points. (August 2016)</li> </ul>
1.2 % of stakeholders stating STAR-Ghana is playing a strong/very strong a) convener, b) coordinator and c) catalyst role	<p>a) 40%</p> <p>b) 40%</p> <p>c) 40%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAR is yet to conduct a stakeholder survey which will enable a more indepth assessment of this milestone.</li> <li>• As this was a light touch review, the assessment could only be done using the sample of 4 GPs met. Out of this group, all (100%) stated that STAR was playing a strong a) convenor role; b) coordinator role; and c) catalyst role.</li> <li>• STAR should determine who its stakeholders are and based on that conduct a stakeholder survey to assess the perception of its CCC role.</li> <li>• However, it not clear how many non-grant partners are familiar with STAR's CCC role.</li> </ul>

**Key Points**

- A number of convenings were held during the inception period. These enabled STAR to effectively play its CCC roles. Some of the important convenings included:
  - The GESI Consultation (August 2016)
  - Media Consultation (August 2016)
  - Learning Event (July 2016)
- GPs stated they appreciate the CCC role of STAR. For example, the Learning Event enabled Election Call grantees to identify other stakeholders who were either doing similar things or with whom they could develop strategic collaborations. GPs also mentioned the value of the dialogue in the Media and GESI consultations.



- STAR has clarified and unpacked what the CCC role means. This was done in the Non-Grants Strategy in June 2016. STAR elaborated in another paper in September 2016 on the CCC and Learning role, which went further to provide actions to roll this out.
- **However**, it is early days and it is likely that STAR is still seen primarily as a grant maker. At least one CSO who was NOT a grant partner said that they had no idea what STAR's CCC role was about even though they had engaged with STAR a few times.
- There is also a bigger question about whether STAR's legitimacy to play the CCC role is derived primarily from its role as a grant maker. As stated "*STAR cannot convene in isolation.*" CSO member. In the past, STAR has convened actors that they were not funding such as the private sector and government, because of its track record, the value it brings to discourses on critical national issues and the standing and the gravitas of some members of the SC. However, with a resource starved civil society, there may be unwritten assumption that unless STAR has money to fund actions arising from the issues around which it convenes, coordinates or catalyses CSOs, then it's legitimacy to play this role could at times be questioned.

### **Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)**

The previous Annual Review recommended that SC members take a decision on remuneration. Terms of Reference for the SC should include a clause on remuneration. This recommendation was agreed and actioned by the SC and PMT. This will be revisited the February Retreat. The Annual Review is of the view that remuneration may increase the expectation of time demands on SC members which may not be realistic. This should be discussed at the February retreat and a shared understanding reached of the time demands expected of the SC.

### **Recommendations**

1. Use the Communication Strategy and the Sept 2016 Convening Coordinating and Catalysing (CCC) paper to broaden Stakeholders' understanding of the CCC role of STAR.
2. Use the consultation process on the national entity to raise awareness of STAR's CCC role but also to explore whether STAR's legitimacy to convene and coordinate stems primarily from its role as grant maker.
3. STAR to conduct a Stakeholder Survey to determine their perception of STAR's CCC role. This should to be preceded by a determination by STAR of who its Stakeholders are.

<b>Output Title</b>	<b>Effective strategic partnerships in place with policy level organisations (MDAs, Sector Ministries and Political Parties) and Parliament</b>		
Output number per LF	2	<b>Output Score</b>	<b>A</b>
Risk:	Major	Impact weighting (%):	15%
Risk <i>revised</i> since last AR?	N	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	Y

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>
Quality of strategic partnership between STAR-Ghana and CSOs to address systemic issues (score 1-5; 1 - Very high 2- High 3- Average, 4- Low, 5- Very Low)	4	<i>Indicator is not clear.</i> However, the Review Team has interpreted it to mean the average quality of strategic partnerships between STAR-Ghana and CSOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSOs interviewed gave STAR a score of 1-3 reflecting high quality partnerships. The election call has 5 strategic partners, whose projects focus on addressing systemic issues relating to Ghana's electoral system.</li> </ul>
Quality of partnerships between STAR-Ghana GPs and MDAs to influence policy on systemic issues (score 1-5; 1 - Very high 2- High 3- Average, 4- Low, 5- Very Low)		<i>Indicator is also not clear.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many election call grantees reported average to high quality relationships with Government stakeholders.</li> <li>All but 3 of the 38 Election GPs implemented short-term projects. The short-term nature of these projects affected the development of long-term strategic partnerships with MDAs. However, the majority of GPs have developed collaborative relationships with MDAs focusing on the management of the 2016 elections.</li> </ul>
Quality of Parliamentary oversight and engagement with citizens (score 1-5; 1 - Very high 2- High 3- Average, 4- Low, 5- Very Low)	4	<i>Indicator is also not clear.</i> Still too early to measure. Programme engagement with Parliament did not commence during the inception period because it coincided with the transition from the 6 <sup>th</sup> to the 7 <sup>th</sup> Parliament. However, during the extended inception period, the programme developed a Parliamentary strategy and a Parliament Scoping Study. This will lay the ground for implementation of this work stream this year.

### Key Points

- Election call grantees rank the quality of partnership with STAR highly. Factors for rating include:
  - Accessibility: Can always be reached to provide support in grant management.
  - Willingness to listen: Don't impose their position.
  - Support to connect with Government stakeholders.
  - Ability to provide support beyond grant making. As stated by one respondent, "The strength in STAR is not in the funding." STAR's provision of capacity development as it engages with partners is appreciated because this is something that small organisations usually find difficult to get support for.
- As noted earlier, many election call grantees reported average to high quality relationships with Government stakeholders such as the EC and the NCCE. Good examples of partnerships included:
  - Sky media/EC/NCCE on voter education;
  - African Women Lawyers Association with the police on laws of elections and ethical policing during the elections; and
  - Ghana Broadcasting Corporation (GBC)/NCCE in support of the hosting of the presidential debates.
- The short-term nature of election projects limited the ability to develop long-term strategic partnerships with key Government agencies. Accordingly some GPs rated the quality of

partnerships with MDAs not as high. For example, one GP had so much difficulty with the EC initially that they had to ask the British High Commission for assistance.

- STAR can play a critical role as a connector or “door opener” in the development of these partnerships but this is not fully appreciated by all GPs. In the case mentioned above, the GP didn’t think to ask STAR for assistance with the EC but rather chose to go the High Commission.

#### **Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)**

- Last Annual Review stated that the PEA and GESI Strategy should be practical and implementable and used by the SC. A technical approach paper has been developed to operationalise the PEA. In addition, GESI tools identified to operationalise the GESI strategy.

#### **Recommendations**

1. STAR’s communication with GPs should emphasise the added value of STAR beyond grantmaking to include roles such as a “connector” and “door opener.”

<b>Output Title</b>	<b>STAR Ghana funding mechanisms effectively managed, helping projects to address locally salient issues (Expected outcomes)</b>		
Output number per LF	3	<b>Output Score</b>	<b>A</b>
Risk:	Moderate	Impact weighting (%):	20%
Risk revised since last AR?	No	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	No

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>
% of projects evaluated as meeting expected outcomes (including embedding GESI)	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of these indicators is based on the election call during the inception phase.</li> <li>Review of the 20 final reports from the elections call indicated 80% achievement of objectives. This was corroborated by the interviews with selected GPs and programme quarterly monitoring visits.</li> <li>Projects also reflected good outreach in terms of social inclusion. Grant partners indicated that the STAR support influenced their perspective on GESI and this will impact on their programming moving forward. Specifically, 13 out of the 36 (36%) GPs awarded the election grant, had a focus on GESI.</li> </ul>
% of partners with systems in place to ensure sustainability	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grants were awarded to partners with basic systems standards in place to check internal controls, statutory and legal compliance to ensure sustainability. 6 of the 36 grant partners, (ISODEC, Millennium Child, National Catholic Secretariat, NORSAAC and Socioserve) already have either M&amp;E manuals or financial manuals that guides programme implementation and financial processes. Monitoring visits by the PMT promoted strengthening of GPs institutional capacity which enables them to be more sustainable. An example is ensuring GPs have sustainable M&amp;E systems.</li> <li>This may not be sufficient to embed sustainability.</li> <li>Current practice/process of redeeming unused funds when GP project ends is a risk that should be better managed.</li> </ul>

### Key Points

- About 36 GPs received funding during the election call aimed at promoting a credible 2016 elections in Ghana. A scoping study preceded the launch of the Elections call, to ensure that programme support targets areas and issues likely to lead to disputed elections. Feedback from GPs demonstrate achievement of project outcomes. Projects also reflected good outreach in terms of social inclusion. An example is Blogging Ghana's outreach to the Weija Leprosarium.

- Quarterly monitoring visits by the PMT promoted strengthening of GPs institutional capacity which enables them to be more sustainable. An example is ensuring GPs have effective M&E systems. However, learning from STAR I is that sustainability is best addressed holistically rather than through piecemeal capacity building on specific issues.
- The PMT is yet to redeem unused funds from GPs, one month after project implementation ended. This process should be accelerated to minimise the risk involved.
- There is a lack of clarity around how decisions are made with respect to choice of themes for calls. GESI
  - A GESI strategy has been developed with tools identified to support implementation.
  - The strategy looks both inward (STAR) and outwards (Partners).
  - Lessons were learned from STAR 1 about the value of both mainstreaming GESI and having a specific GESI call. Therefore a specific GESI call is underway with the Technical Reference group too support it.
  - STAR has recognised the need to have in house capacity on GESI. Therefore, plans are underway to recruit a Senior GESI Officer.
  - The SC has established a GESI Advisory Technical Group (GTAG).
  - STAR has recognised the need to differentiate between Gender and Social Inclusion.

### **Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)**

The previous Annual Review recommended that the M&E Framework should incorporate the requirement for the SC to connect directly to beneficiaries through field visits to assess first-hand the effectiveness and impact of their decision-making on grant proposals. It was noted that the current draft TORs for the SC include a clause for the SC to connect to beneficiaries occasionally as part of their strategic oversight.

### **Recommendations**

1. Take forward the sustainability work stream in 2017 building on lessons from STAR I, as this should also inform the nature of partnerships.
2. Set a clear timeframe for redeeming unused funds upon completion of projects, as part of the closure arrangements.
3. Clarify process of decision making with respect to themes for calls so that they reflect the priorities of the different stakeholders while being agile enough to respond to emerging “Magic Moments”
4. In line with lesson learning from STAR Ghana Phase 1, agree a ceiling for the number of grants which can be effectively managed as further calls for GESI and Media are progressed, in line with the financial management capacity of the PMT.

<b>Output Title</b>	<b>STAR Ghana established as a Ghanaian owned, strategic and sustainable institution</b>		
Output number per LF	4	<b>Output Score</b>	<b>A</b>
Risk:	Major	Impact weighting (%):	25%
Risk revised since last AR?	Y/N	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	Y

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>
Level of readiness for Institution (including transitional plan and exit strategy and readiness)	Options for National Institution under preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options paper prepared by SDD, consortium member.</li> <li>SC retreat held in which options were discussed in March 2016.</li> <li>Options discussed again in August 2016 SC meeting.</li> <li>Preparation of SC Road Map completed in September 2016.</li> <li>Reference Group established.</li> </ul>
Capacity of STAR-Ghana Institution – as measured by SC set up, Staff in place, Funding, Structure, Governance ad Road map.	0	N/A since what is being referred to is the national institution.

## Key Points

### Road map to National Entity:

Though momentum was initially slow, a number of activities took place. They include:

- Preparation of Options paper by SDD, a consortium member;
- Discussion of Options by SC in March 2016;
- Further analysis of options and discussion of road map held in August 2016 SC meeting;
- Preparation of SC Road Map completed in September 2016; and
- Establishment of a Reference Group.

The SC Road map envisioned that consultations would have begun in the latter part of 2016, so activities are somewhat behind schedule. It is evident that implementation of the Road Map will require significant operational support which cannot be handled by SC. The SC states that it is aware of its limitation in this respect and is willing to delegate operational and logistics support.

### Role of Steering Committee

There has been a lack of shared understanding between key stakeholders about the roles of the SC. This is not surprising given the complexity of the governance arrangement within the programme. Nevertheless, this has led to a significant delay in finalisation of the TORs of the SC and other entities, namely the FC and the SP. Draft TORs have been recently circulated for comments which will be finalised at a retreat in February.

The Review team found that TORs contain quite a large number of tasks for the SC which may not be realistic given the time commitments required. The TORs also provide for remuneration of SC members which gives the impression of management body than a group that provides strategic advice and guidance.

The Steering Committee is in the process of identifying new members. For example, the Members of Parliament will be changed since there has been an election and names have been circulated representing different sectors of society such as the private sector. The appointment of new SC members by DFID is subject to FC and SC endorsement.

## **Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)**

- The previous Annual Review recommended that there should be a review of the extent to which SC decision-making is informed by technical expertise provided by consortium partners. Consortium have provided significant technical inputs during inception such as the GESI strategy and tools, the Political Economy Analysis and the Technical Approach paper. The GESI strategy and tools were used in decision making on the GESI call. In addition, the Draft Case Statement developed by SDD in January 2017, which elaborated on the original Options Paper, informed discussions by the SC in their January 2017 meeting on the national entity.
- The previous Annual Review also recommended that SC should set clear timelines to consider, decide and test options for the national entity. These have now been established in the Road Map.

## **Recommendations**

### **Road map to National Entity**

1. The SC should delegate operational and logistics management of the Road Map implementation to the SP/PMT or other consortium member to manage. However, the presence of at least one key SC member will be necessary to give the process credibility and generate trust within civil society. In other words, the SC has to be the face of the consultations and provide strategic leadership in determining the right approaches, but logistics and technical support can be provided by the SP or other consortium member.
2. Urgently increase momentum on implementation of Road map. The output of the process should be a clear articulation of what Ghanaian Civil Society needs and based on that identification options for the SC and the FC to agree on by September 2017, at the latest.
3. Expectations to be managed about what will be in place by September 2018 and eventually in 2020. Next year (2018), the national entity may not be an institution that is ready to hit the ground running. Rather, it might need strengthening for a few years as it imbeds governance, management and organisational systems in place. Similarly, after 2020, it will be an independent entity in terms of local ownership and governance but it may still be dependent on donor funding given the nature of work around citizen engagement on accountability issues.

### **Steering Committee TORs**

4. Finalise SC TORs at February 2017 Retreat. Keep tasks focused on strategic oversight and what is realistic in terms of time demands. If management oversight is included as per the Business Case, this should be linked to the SC's ability to provide strategic oversight. For example, the SC may review the annual workplan to ensure it enables the programme to achieve its overall outcomes. Half-yearly, the SC may also engage with SP and PMT to assess whether the programme is on track to achieve its outcomes. However, it should not be necessary for the SC to review quarterly workplans and budgets. This should be the role of the SP who is legally contracted to ensure effective management of the programme.
5. Maintain DFID as a full member of the SC, as the representative of the FC until such time as the entity, and new governance arrangements, are in place. This creates more opportunity for dialogue on critical issues before decision making occurs and it minimises the impression of a hierarchy between the Funders Committee and the Steering Committee.
6. Include the SP in SC meetings as an observer. This strengthens shared understanding and dialogue on issues considered by the SC. This is also important because the SP has the contractual obligation to manage STAR and thus provides leadership in the implementation of the decisions made by the SC.
7. Maintain some level of continuity of SC membership during the next few years as the consultation process ensues and the new entity is put in place. This is to ensure that there is a certain level of trust within civil society in the consultation process and the new entity when it is being established. For this to happen, the leadership and presence of key SC members will be critical during implementation of the road map. The new entity would then have a different governance structure and members would be different.

<b>Output Title</b>	<b>Communities of Practice and Learning (COPL) established functioning effectively and learning for change</b>		
Output number per LF	5	<b>Output Score</b>	<b>A</b>
Risk:	Moderate	Impact weighting (%):	15%
Risk revised since last AR?	No output in previous AR	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	No output in previous AR

<b>Indicator(s)</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Progress</b>
% of stakeholders stating STAR-Ghana is playing a strong/very strong learning role ( <i>score 1-5; 1 - Very high 2- High 3- Average, 4- Low, 5- Very Low</i> )	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted previously on Output 1, STAR is yet to conduct a stakeholder survey to assess the perception of the CCC and Learning Role. Since this was a light touch review, assessment was done based on the small sample of GPs interviewed.</li> <li>100% of GPs interviewed said they appreciated the support STAR is providing in facilitating learning.</li> <li>Learning Event mid-way through implementation of Election Call was found to be very useful by participants.</li> <li>Quarterly visits also provided a space for reflection and learning for GPs.</li> </ul>
No. of learnings documented and shared annually	0	N/A Still too early
% of GPs demonstrating application of learning from COPLs	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20% milestone reached which is approximately 7 out of 38 Election call GPs.</li> <li>6 GPs are demonstrating application of their learning through increased collaborations. (see details below)</li> <li>Another 3 organisations, NORSAAC, BEWDA and CALID, are using data tracking tools which they learned about during a STAR monitoring visit.</li> </ul>

### Key Points

- Learning Event held mid-way through implementation of Election Call was considered very useful by participants. As noted earlier, the evaluation of the event showed that 75 % of the participants said it provided them the opportunity to learn new things.
- The Quarterly monitoring visits also provided a space for reflection and learning for GPs. M&E was an area that was repeatedly mentioned by GPs in which learning occurred.
- There is some evidence that GPs are applying the learning they gained. Examples include:
  - The use of tracking tools for data collection by NORSAAC, BEWDA and CALID.
  - Grant partner collaboration after the learning event, e.g.
    - GBC/NORSAAC – Mock voting exercise videos from NORSAAC aired by GBC.
    - Blogging Ghana/Abantu – Media space for tweeting and comments on Scorecard launch.
    - GFD/TV3 – TV3 provided airtime to GFD to talk about accessibility of Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) towards election 2016.
    - NORSAAC/CALID – Collaborated as front runners for the civil society coalition on governance for the election 2016.
    - CitiFM/ CDD – Collaboration for parliamentary debates.



- IMANI/Odekro – IMANI developed a methodology for selecting targeted constituencies and districts for the research.
- While learning is happening on specific issues, it is not clear that a holistic approach to learning has been adopted. Many CSOs do not have a learning culture, thus the while specific skills and knowledge may be acquired it may not systematically be put in practice, sustained or spread beyond the concerned individuals.

### **Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)**

The previous Annual Review recommended that Strategic Framework for Continuous Learning should dovetail with M&E functions and have well established feedback loops to ensure learning is actually utilised as part of programme implementation. The COPL strategy has been finalised after consultations with key stakeholders. Additionally, the COPL is measured as an output area in the logframe

### **Recommendations**

- Support GPs to develop an organisational learning culture as part of the capacity building support.

## D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

### Key cost drivers and performance

The programme uses a hybrid payment method - fees, grants and expenses are based on actuals. A portion of the fees are based on Payment by results.

The key cost drivers to the programme are grants to CSOs, capacity building to grant partners management, fees, office running and equipment among others. This has not changed from what is envisaged in the Business Case.

**Table 1.1: Distribution of Key cost Drivers from October 2015 - January 2017**

<b>COST ITEMS</b>	<b>AMOUNT ( GBP)</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE ( %)</b>
<b>Management Cost</b>		33%
<i>Fees</i>	972,748.05	
<i>Expenses<sup>1</sup></i>	427,016.84	
<b>Main Programme Cost</b>		67%
<i>Grants to CSOs</i>	2,262,644.88	
<i>Support to Grants<sup>2</sup></i>	527,918.46	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,290.328.23</b>	<b>100%</b>

### VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case

The VfM indicators in the business case will be measured throughout the lifetime of the programme. As programme implementation has just started, it is too early to measure progress but the indicators remain relevant. The programme has prepared a draft VfM strategy and GPs are required to report on progress with VfM during the quarterly visits of the PMT. However, the focus of such reports have been overly on economy. The VfM strategy requires immediate finalisation with steps to operationalise with grant partners. Training for partners in this area is recommended. In addition it is recommended that partners are supported to identify indicators for measuring the 4 Es (economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity) quarterly.

### Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money

It is too early to assess performance of VfM measures as the programme has only recently started inception. However, the programme's strategic focus on coordinating, convening and catalysing provides a good framework for maximising value for money outcomes. Partners receiving the election grant highlighted how STAR's role in convening and coordinating helped improve the effectiveness of their interventions.

### Quality of financial management

Project implementation is still at an early stage, hence adequately assessing available financial systems is not practical. Quarterly narrative reports (which include brief financial information) have been provided to DFID and no financial concerns have been identified so far. Plans are underway to recruit a firm to undertake a full annual financial audit, commencing in April 2017.

<sup>1</sup> This is made up of office running cost, travel, equipment, professional fees etc.

<sup>2</sup> This is made up for Technical Assistance to support the Grantees, lesson learning, communication and other grant administration cost

The PMT has developed a grants manual which outlines the processes for managing grants by GPs. During the elections call, a due diligence was conducted on all organisations who responded to the grants call, which included an assessment of the adequacy of the partner's financial systems, ahead of consideration for grant approval. It was however unclear how rigorously the programme team ensured sub-grantees also had adequate systems to safeguard donor funds. Processes for swift returns of unused funds at the end of the project were also unclear, at the time of the AR, as the project was yet to retrieve unused funds from GPs who have completed projects under the elections call.

The programme utilises the Christian Aid financial systems and their accounts are included in the wider Christian Aid financial audits. The recent audits did not highlight any issues of concerns with the STAR programme.

DFID has scrutinised invoices and timesheets and where discrepancies have been identified and has ensured these have been rectified by Christian Aid before payments were made. Christian Aid has shown improvements in their submission of financial information and supporting documents in a timely manner. However, there is the need to ensure that the expenses stated on the invoices are detailed to enable adequate assessment for various indicators including VfM. Forecast performance for the project has been within the acceptable threshold of +/-10%

Date of last narrative financial report	Not applicable – yet to be commissioned
Date of last audited annual statement	Not applicable – yet to be commissioned

## **E: RISK (½ page)**

### **Overall risk rating: Major**

The Programme was rated medium risk during the business case approval stage. It has since been reclassified as Major during DFID's reclassification of risks from 3 categories to 4.

### **Overview of programme risk**

The Programme Director is responsible for overall risk management and reports quarterly on updates of risk management. Risk management in the programme is based on the recognition that the programme must innovate and take risks, particularly to engage citizens and non-traditional partners. It is also based on the lessons from the first phase of the programme, particularly around managing fiduciary risks. The programme has utilised information from the political economy analysis, embedding them in on-going programme implementation.

The programme prepared a risk profile for all 38 GPs receiving grants through the elections calls. This was monitored quarterly, with increased attention to partners classified as high risk.

The key risks and assumptions identified at the business case stage (which remain relevant) include:

- Political space remaining constant or decreasing significantly;
- STAR 2 not being able to drive innovation effectively;
- STAR 2 not maintaining credibility with other parts of civil society as well as with citizens, Parliament and government;
- Non-performance of the service provider;
- Inability of the SC and PMT to take full responsibility for the programme;
- Transition from STAR 1 to STAR 2 in terms of staffing (retention of key staff from STAR1) and implementation delays/contracting a new service provider; and
- Non successful transition to a new body corporate (year 3).

### **Outstanding actions from risk assessment**

There are no outstanding actions from the risk assessment.

## **F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Delivery against planned timeframe**

There has been some delays with implementation of the road map for the national entity. However the SC has committed to speeding progress in this area. The Inception Phase originally planned to end in April 2016 was extended by a further three months to September 2016 to enable the programme further strengthen some key deliverables to begin implementation.

### **Performance of partnership (s)**

All partners have continued to demonstrate significant commitment to implementation of the programme. However, difficult relationships and misunderstandings/lack of clarity around the proposed changes to governance arrangements impacted implementation of this workstream. Finalising the TORs for all

partners involved in the programme is required as soon as possible for smooth and effective governance of the programme.

### **Asset monitoring and control**

DFID carried out a physical verification of assets held by the STAR-Ghana Programme in March 2016 as part of DFID Ghana's routine annual physical asset verification exercise and noted some discrepancies in the completion of the asset inventory template which was revised and submitted to DFID in January 2017. As stated in the previous review, the office premises for the STAR-Ghana 1 programme and other assets such as vehicles, computers, furniture etc. were retained. However, the last asset verification also noted that a couple of assets (including those that were transfer to STAR-Ghana from RAVI and G-rap) were no longer in good conditions and recommended that those assets be disposed of and taken out of the asset inventory.

### **Recommendations: DFID should work with STAR-Ghana to agree on the disposal process**

As part of programme monitoring, the programme team is expected to submit an updated asset inventory as part of the quarterly progress report, which includes GP assets. This will be monitored as part of the expenditure verification exercises to ensure that they exist and that they are being used for the purpose for which they were acquired. In addition, the programme will also be subject to the annual office wide physical assets verification exercise scheduled for March 2017

## **G: CONDITIONALITY**

### **Update on partnership principles (if relevant)**

Although the Partnership Principles (PPs) are not directly relevant to STAR Ghana, since none of the funds are channelled through Government, STAR Ghana does have the potential to bolster Government commitment to the PPs, through its role in supporting civil society and citizenry to hold Government to account.

## **H: MONITORING & EVALUATION**

### **Evidence and evaluation**

The programme has a dedicated M&E senior officer. The M&E system and manual was developed during the Inception Phase. GPs are required to have M&E systems to track progress of their interventions. The previous annual review recommended an independent review of the M&E systems to be commissioned by DFID. This has not yet been done and it's recommended that this is done as soon as possible to receive the required assurances of the current M&E systems. Particular attention should be the assessment of the measurability of proposed indicators and the scope for more quantitative indicators as opposed to qualitative indicators. Further assessment of the possibility of disaggregated indicators shows progress with equity and efficiency will be useful.

The logframe has been revised a number of times. However, the final version has a number of indicators that are not clear. It thus recommended that the wording of the following log frame indicators is revised to make them clearer and easy to measure:

- Outcome Indicator 1
- Output Indicator 2.1
- Output Indicator 2.2
- Output Indicator 2.3
- Output Indicator 4.2
- Output Indicator 5.1

## **Monitoring progress throughout the review period**

Since the last Annual Review the programme has submitted a full inception phase report, one quarterly progress report and an annual report covering progress towards achieving the logframe milestones.

DFID Ghana holds monthly programme update meetings with the STAR-Ghana team to monitor progress on activities and to ensure appropriate linkages with related programmes. In addition there are meetings with the Programmes Director and the Chief Operating Officers of Christian Aid on an ad-hoc basis. There are also separate quarterly meetings with the SC and the FC<sup>3</sup>.

As the programme has transitioned to implementation phase, DFID will be conducting expenditure verifications on the programme to enhance fiduciary risk mitigation measures. The first verification exercise is schedule for July 2017.

Apart from DFID's monitoring, the STAR-Ghana programme team also conducts quarterly monitoring visits to all grants partners to assess progress with interventions as well as discussing outcome.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is made up of the donors of STAR-Ghana (DFID, the EU and DANIDA)