

**Governance and Transparency Fund  
Annual Report 4**

**Reporting period: 1 April 2011 – 31 March 2012**

Project Reference Number: GTF003

Date submitted: 29 June 2012

Submitted by email to [gtf@kpmg.com](mailto:gtf@kpmg.com)

Format: WORD document

**Table of contents**

<b>1. Programme Identification Details .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Acronyms.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. Programme Management .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. Working with implementing partners .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Risk Assessment .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. Monitoring and Evaluation ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>8. Logframe changes .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>9. Emerging impact – short articles .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>10. Cross cutting issues .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>11. PROGRESS TOWARD Sustainability .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>12. Innovation .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>13. Learning from GTF .....</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex A1 Achievement rating scale .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex A2 Programme Log frame, approved.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Annex A3 Financial report .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Annex A3.6 Value for Money (VfM) requirement.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Annex A4 Materials produced .....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Annex A5 Web Update.....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Annex 6 Annual Work plan for 2012/13.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Annex 7 Local partner list .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Annex 8 Main contacts list.....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Annex 9 Short articles .....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Annex B1 Programme budget all years .....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Annex B2 Politically sensitive information .....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Annex C1 Outstanding issues .....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Annex C2 Risk Assessment tables .....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Annex D1 Learning exchange.....</b>	<b>135</b>

## 1. PROGRAMME IDENTIFICATION DETAILS

GTF Number	GTF003
Short Title of Programme	Increasing government accountability in conflict zones through public participation in policymaking
Name of Lead Institution	Conciliation Resources
Start date	03/09/2008
End date	02/09/2013
Brief Summary of Programme:	A five-year programme seeking to support changes in governance by enabling conflict-affected groups to better participate in decision-making processes to determine 'the way things are done', thus affecting institutional change. It aims to contribute to more effective governance and better prospects for sustainable peace in four project areas – West Africa (Sierra Leone, Guinea, Liberia), northern Uganda (with Southern Sudan), Caucasus (Georgian/Abkhaz context) and Fiji; and to greater understanding of how to improve governance in conflict contexts.

<p>List all countries where activities have taken or will take place</p>	<p>Liberia Guinea Sierra Leone Uganda Southern Sudan Georgian/Abkhaz context Fiji</p>
<p>Target groups and wider beneficiaries</p>	<p><b>West Africa</b></p> <p>Through our main implementing partners, the project will be of direct benefit to up to 15 community and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) from Sierra Leone, Guinea and Liberia, primarily working in border communities. The wider beneficiaries would include the constituencies and reach of these organisations.</p> <p><b>Georgian-Abkhaz context</b></p> <p>The target groups are communities affected by conflict in the Georgian-Abkhaz context, including Georgian IDPs and returnees to Gal/i. The estimated number of beneficiaries are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displaced Georgians living in at</li> </ul>

	<p>least 12 collective centres (c.1,200 individuals) and their wider communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Abkhaz civil society actors including young people and journalists, taking part in events, c. 300 people.</li></ul> <p>The population of Georgians displaced from Abkhazia is estimated between 200,000 and 250,000 and the population in Abkhazia, including Gal/i is estimated at between 170,000 and 240,000.</p> <p><b>Fiji</b></p> <p>The indirect beneficiaries of this project will be the citizens of Fiji, an estimated 950,000 people, but the more direct beneficiaries will number in the region of 4-5,000 in term of direct participation in CCF-convened events.</p> <p><b>Uganda/ South Sudan</b></p> <p>The wider beneficiaries are estimated to be around 10,000, those reached through the project's sensitisation activity.</p>
--	--

Person who prepared this report	Name: Jonathan Cohen Address: Conciliation Resources Telephone: 020 7359 7728 ext 230 Email: <a href="mailto:jcohen@c-r.org">jcohen@c-r.org</a>
---------------------------------	--

## **2. Acronyms**

ARLPI	Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative (Uganda)
CBO	Community based organisation
CCF	Citizens' Constitutional Forum (Fiji)
CDD	Community driven development
CDF	County development funds (Liberia)
CEO	Chief executive officer
CENCAD	Centre for Capacity Development (W Africa)
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (Fiji)
CHP	Center for Humanitarian Programmes (Abkhazia)
CR	Conciliation Resources
CSO	Civil society organisation
DFID	Department for International Development (UKAid)
DPD	District Platforms(s) for Dialogue (West Africa Programme)
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECAP	East and Central Africa Programme (of CR)
FCAS	Fragile and conflict affected states/situations
ENCISS	Enhancing the Interaction and Interface between Civil Society and the State (Sierra Leone)

GTF	Governance and Transparency Fund
IDP	Internally displaced person/ people
JAW	Joint analysis workshop
JPC	Justice and Peace Commission (Uganda)
LDI	Liberia Democratic Institute
LFA	Logical framework analysis
LRA	Lords Resistance Army
LSG	Local self governance
MDGs	Millennium development goals
MRA	Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees (Georgia)
MRU	Mano River Union (West Africa)
MTR	Mid term review
NGO	Non government organisation
PCP	Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding (Fiji)
PD	Programme Director (for each CR regional programme)
PER	1) Public Emergency Regulations
PPA	Programme Partnership Arrangement
PRDP	Peace Recovery and Development Plan (for northern Uganda)

PWD	People/person with disability
SYH	Sukhum Youth House (Abkhazia)
UJCC	Uganda Joint Christian Council
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNSW	University of New South Wales

**Terms used:**

The CR GTF funded **programme** is operational in four **project** areas. The terms programme and project are used in this report to refer to the overall programme and the projects respectively.

CR works in cooperation with local and national **partners**, when partners are mentioned these are the various organisations CR works with and supports.

### 3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Context:** In year 4 there continued to be no major violent conflicts in the four regions of operation, other than South Sudan. Mano River Union countries experienced local border tensions over land settlement in the Yenga area. In the Georgian-Abkhaz context the Geneva negotiations process continued but with little progress, and political developments on either side of the divide saw increased polarisation. In Fiji people hoped that the constitutional development process will provide a legitimate and inclusive means for their participation in developing a national governance framework and a roadmap for a return to democracy. Participating communities in east and central Africa continue to be affected directly by the LRA, or are recovering from years of displacement.

**Action with partners:** Over a dozen diverse CSOs continued to be assisted by CR's staff and associates to interpret and respond to the specific support needs of vulnerable people.

Across the regions exchanges of learning between partners have been consolidated following the joint analysis workshop (JAW) in year three, with valuable dialogue between regions on how the displacement of marginalised communities plays out in relation to governance in different contexts.

**Results:** Rating of progress towards achieving objectives at the purpose level averages 2.75, ranging from 2 to 4 per region. Output ratings average 3, with a low of 4 for Fiji and 2 for ECAP. As in previous years the changing political context was challenging.

The overall purpose of increased public participation in policymaking leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability in conflict-affected regions is moving forward in each region. There are notable contributions to the three GTF accountability indicators to overall learning as follows:

#### **1. Citizen's knowledge and participation (GTF Indicator 4.2):**

In the four project areas substantial levels of participation of people and their organisations affected by very different violent contexts were achieved. CR continued tailoring its approaches to the needs of diverse vulnerable groups.

Public awareness and skills of people to dialogue and demand their rights to information and accountability of government officials has been achieved in the target border districts in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone. This results in development funds reaching local communities, who have been able to decide to spend funds on priority development areas, for example in Liberia building schools and providing other services efficiently and with accountability.

In four municipalities the IDP Synergy network members set up mechanisms for civil society engagement in budget monitoring. IDPs have successfully fed into annual budget allocations that will benefit local IDP communities directly: e.g. public money was allocated to open and maintain a kindergarten in Potskho-Etseri.

In Fiji the Citizens' Constitutional Forum maintained and expanded workshops to educate communities to advocate for human rights, good governance and greater racial tolerance. Education and awareness was expanded to rural communities formerly with limited understanding and engagement resulting in their increased participation in local politics and greater awareness of constitutional processes.

In South Sudan women started to organise themselves into tiers of community groups, achieving formal registration with government, access to resources available for community development and monitoring accountability in their use.

## **2. CSOs influence on policy decisions and more effective watchdog institutions (GTF Indicator 4.4)**

During Year 4 CR has expanded, created and used innovative methods to inform and influence policy making with outstanding results – most notably in Fiji where the move towards constitutional reform can in part be attributed to the work of CR's partners.

By working in border districts in Sierra Leone and Liberia it has been possible to encourage policy makers and administrators to learn from each other about the stresses experienced by border communities. Local groups, which include women who are the most harassed at borders, are forming solidarity groups to confront malpractice by officials. Liberian Ministers are now seeking opportunities to learn from Sierra Leone how CR and partners have helped improve democratisation processes in ways that recognise and include citizens.

IDPs were better able to participate in election campaigning in Georgia, which can be attributed in part to increased activity of GTF civil society partners through the IDP Synergy network. In Abkhazia the capacity of ethnic Georgians living in the Gal/i region to raise awareness about their needs and their rights was increased. Addressing challenges of governance and corruption became part of political debate.

CR's GTF partners' can take considerable credit for aiding in the creation of the changes in Fiji's political context through continuous and consistent advocacy combined with direct engagement with the Fiji government resulting in the lifting of the emergency regulations and commencing a constitutional development process,

The Citizens' Constitutional Forum continued to address some of the fundamental longer-term issues impeding people's participation in governance in Fiji. The organisation maintained and expanded its use of media and direct education workshops to educate in and advocate for human rights, good governance and greater racial tolerance in Fiji.

In South Sudan the groundwork was started on building connections between civil society and regional government in LRA affected areas. This is a precursor learned from experience in northern Uganda and elsewhere for effective influence by civil society on government.

### **3. Strengthening voices of vulnerable people (GTF Indicator 4.5)**

The year saw increasing emphasis across the programme on helping those with little power – women, widows, ethnic minorities, youth, and the displaced - voice their concerns and participate at least in local level political processes.

The creation of and support to two district platforms for dialogue (DPDs) in Liberia has enabled marginalised people to participate in meetings with district planners, to influence decisions on allocation of funds and monitor its use.

In Sierra Leone and Liberia the cultural limits on female and youth participation in political processes is being challenged, with evidence of their increased participation in decision making and holding of office at least at local levels.

The displaced and marginalised communities on both sides of the Georgian-Abkhaz divide are making their voices heard through membership of local groups. Cooperation through the Synergy IDP network provides opportunities for grassroots needs to be expressed to policy makers.

Extension of awareness raising and education to rural communities of Fiji is reducing the gap between them and educated urbanites, who hold greater influence on government decision making.

In northern Uganda a major post conflict concern is the denial of rights to land of women for cultural reasons, widows and youth because they are unaware of the land boundaries. Ethnic minorities also are excluded from land due to the Government increasing the number of local authorities and so creating ethnic divides formerly absent. Partners have included these vulnerable people as monitors and paralegals, thus increasing their confidence and status to speak out for their rights.

**Monitoring, evaluation and learning:** Monitoring of CR and its partners' work is highly participative with much emphasis on joint reflection and feedback of results into planning of actions that support partners and communities plan and re-plan their work to meet rapidly fluid and changing contexts. The LFA for the GTF programme was revised in line with advice from the GTF/UKAid managers during the year, with the addition of "smarter" indicators.

It remains a challenge to develop monitoring systems across conflict transformation work such as that of CR that can capture quantifiable results. This challenge is being addressed through the recruitment of an additional CR director of planning and organisational performance supported from UKAid PPA funds. This is providing increased support to drawing lessons from the GTF programme to share with others working in fragile and post conflict recovery contexts. Assessment of overall progress from work

across the regions will also be met through further attention to the programme's comparative learning objectives and indicators, building on the two JAWs and subsequent learning exchanges already held.

**Risks:** External risks remain disproportionately higher than internal risks, reflecting A) the stability and continuity of CR staffing and B) that partners are almost exclusively of the communities affected by the conflict, rather than national or local level NGOs staffed by development workers.

**Schedule and delivery:** The programme purpose will be achieved within the remaining time frame: civil society capacity will be built as planned and will be skilled to continue to address transformation of conflict towards development. The goal of the programme to contribute to achieving sustainable peace in target regions is in all regions a process that will extend beyond the GTF supported period of the programme. As the programme continues the gains in knowledge and experience from the GTF work will increasingly inform CR's broader strategic plans: the recently approved CR Strategic Framework 2012-14 includes two key priority areas linked to the aims of the GTF programme – public participation and governance.

#### **4. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**

Programme Directors for all CR regional projects remain unchanged, providing continuity and consistency of management and direction.

#### **5. WORKING WITH IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS**

**West Africa:** Two of the programme partner organisations are undergoing transitions: in Liberia the Executive Director of the LDI is studying abroad. So the Head of Programmes, since inception of GTF, is Acting Director. This has not affected vision and the quality of project implementation.

The Executive Director of CENCAD in **Sierra Leone** resigned to pursue a political career. The Programme Officer who has worked since GTF started is now Acting Director. The transition has some challenges and requires that CR monitor and support the new director to meet the programme objectives and targets.

The Executive Director of AGENDA in **Liberia** signed up for part-time course and this has affected AGENDA's capacity to implement the GTF programme effectively. Communication has been very challenging coupled with the fact that they are duplicating efforts with the LDI, a partner also working in Kolahun district. The decision was taken to end the partnership with AGENDA and in place enhance efforts on supporting cross border civil society networking in the three target countries.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:** Toward the end of year 3 Synergy fundraised for a small grant from the East-West Management Institute, which provides additional resources to support GTF-related activities in year 4. In February 2012 a 'Synergy Support Officer' was recruited for **Tbilisi** who will help Synergy members build fundraising capacity.

A partner, who had been leading on some of the research work on governance, was appointed de facto Deputy Foreign Minister in **Abkhazia**. As a result the project lost a key collaborator who is difficult to replace. This has caused some delays implementing CHP's planned activities in year 4, which have been rescheduled into year 5.

**Fiji:** A part-time contract programme support position was created during the reporting period to provide added programme management support to the Fiji partners. The position is based in Fiji.

**ECAP:** JPC and ARLPI's capacities have improved to enable them to implement project activities in Uganda. Totto Chan continues to coordinate activities in South Sudan, complementing and linking with partners in northern Uganda, but still needs substantial support. In South Sudan, Totto Chan works with a network of community based women's groups, traditional and religious leaders.

## **6. RISK ASSESSMENT**

The numbers of internal and external risks, their impact and probability ratings are summarised in the following table:

Project	Internal risks						External risks					
	Impact			Probability			Impact			Probability		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
West Africa	1	2	0		2	1	2	2	1	0	4	1
Georgian - Abkhaz context	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	3	0.5	0	2.5	1.5
Fiji	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	1
ECAP	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>

The high proportion of external to internal risks (14:5) identified by KPMG/UKAid last year is a reflection of the fragility and uncertainty of the contexts in which the programme works. A low level of internal risks is also in line with the high level of commitment of staff and volunteers in partner organisations, who are local to the areas in which the projects are implemented, rather than “professional” development workers deployed from national civil society organisations. No risks are deemed to be of high probability, though a significant number (5.5 external and 2 internal) would have a high impact on the programmes.

Detailed risk assessment tables for each programme, including mitigation measures are at Annex C2.

## **7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS**

Monitoring of fragile state work is challenging. Within projects a great deal of participative monitoring and reflection is used to reflect on progress and achievements, reevaluate contexts and plan and re-plan activities (see paras below for examples). There are limited overall frameworks for M and E across CR’s work as an organisation, though lessons and experience are drawn on strongly to inform CR’s publications, such as the Accord series, which are held in high regard by UKAid conflict advisers and others. An additional Director for Planning and Organisational Performance has now been recruited with resources from the UKAid PPA grant. The post holder will introduce planning and monitoring frameworks that will be applied in the last stages of GTF programme

implementation, helping CR staff and partners articulate achievements against the more quantifiable as well as qualitative indicators that are now in the LFA. The MTR, as well as KPMG/UKAid feedback has contributed to this move. These steps should enable CR to be in a leading position in systems for assessment of fragile state and post conflict work.

**West Africa:** CR organises partner CSO and local CBOs in joint sessions in which they are able to share experiences as a monitoring mechanism to address gaps in programme implementation and to track significant change. Quarterly visits by the PD to partner organisations enable her to receive updated information on project implementation. Joint field visits by the PD and partners to target districts and communities track significant impact and adjust activities each quarter.

**ECAP:** Community meetings (Barazas) are used to understand and generate communities' views and opinions e.g. their perceptions of Peace and Recovery programmes. Government officials and community leaders are normally invited to participate and respond to questions from community members. In northern Uganda focus group discussions draw lessons learnt and collect information on local monitoring progress. This is generating data on representations to the Government on successes and failures of the reconstruction plans at local levels.

## 8. LOGFRAME CHANGES

On 1st November 2011 KPMG approved changes to the logframe. The changes were to realign objectives and indicators to fit movements in context and direction of activities, the “smartening” of indicators to measure progress where feasible and adjustments to reflect the practicalities of collecting information. These changes were fully discussed with the KPMG GTF manager, Mike MacDonald, and addressed written feedback in his letter responding to Annual Report 3 of August 30<sup>th</sup> 2011 and the table 6.1 therein.

## 9. EMERGING IMPACT – SHORT ARTICLES

See Annex 9 for short articles demonstrating impact in the **Georgian-Abkhaz context** and **Fiji** programme. In addition the ECAP regional work provides examples of significant impact. In West Africa the building of capacity and networks better able to engage in policymaking processes and to act as leaders in conflict-affected border communities through project activities moved in the right direction as partners increased their local engagement and their capacity to mobilise communities and link them to policy makers.

Collectively the programme contributed key experience and lessons to the CR ACCORD series publication *Paix sans frontières - building peace across borders*, as well as contributions from three of the four regional GTF supported programmes<sup>1</sup>.

**ECAP:** The project facilitated excluded groups of local communities in dialogue processes with their local leaders on either side of the Uganda South Sudan border. This has resulted in communities in Madi Opei (Ugandan side) and Tserenya (South Sudan side) and their leaders acknowledging major causes of raised tension between them as: cross-border criminality, rape, harassment by border officials demanding visa fees of US\$ 50 for all travellers, and disputes over farmland in areas where the border is not clear. Resulting from the dialogues, cross border communities and their leaders have agreed that travellers should get temporary permits as proof of local residence to waive the visa fee. There is evidence that community relations have improved since the arrangements were put in place one year ago, cross-border criminality between communities has declined, and reports of rape reduced as people cross at border points instead of through bush tracks.

Engagement with policy makers at the local government level, various embassies and government departments with partners has improved the collective understanding of policy-making mechanisms and donor strategies. It has contributed to increasing the relevance and impact of advocacy through messages that link to the priorities and strategies of audiences; increasing contacts between project partners and local level policy-makers; and building relationships and networks. The result is increasing recognition of CR and partners as important actors in the region.

The incidence of violence is reducing through dialogue between Government officials and conflict affected communities. Partners JPC and ARLPI, because of the work they do in communities, are respected and have the trust of communities. For example, in a recent incident, in a village called Apar (located in Amuru district, northern Uganda), the Uganda Wild Life Authority decided to forcefully evict communities that had lived in the area for generations - claiming that the area was protected area (game reserve). JPC lobbied the local government in Gulu, parliamentarians from northern Uganda and Uganda police senior officers (that were overseeing the brutal eviction exercise) to visit the area and meet local residents. On 15 February the visit took place. Following the meeting the eviction exercise was halted until the Government comes up with a proper boundary demarcation; Ugandan police promised to investigate the killing of one person and local leaders undertook to monitor the situation to ensure that forceful eviction does not continue.

Through April and into May, partners worked with communities in Apar to present petitions to their local leaders. Furthermore, partners worked with paralegals to train them on alternatives to violence. A committee of local leaders that was formed during the community dialogue session on 15 February met with President Museveni in April 2012. JPC held a strategy session with the leader of Gulu Local Council to help him frame the issues from community perspective ahead of his meeting with the President. At

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.c-r.org/sites/c-r.org/files/22\\_Cross%20border%20peacebuilding\\_201101\\_ENG\\_F.pdf](http://www.c-r.org/sites/c-r.org/files/22_Cross%20border%20peacebuilding_201101_ENG_F.pdf)

the meeting with the President, he (the president) directed that all evictions be stayed until further notice. In addition, the local leaders in Amuru asked the Ministry of Lands to ascertain ownership and title of the land in question. The land title from the Ministry of Lands clearly indicated that the land belonged to the Amuru district (formerly part of Gulu district). The latest JPC's monitoring visit confirmed that slowly residents who had earlier been evicted were returning and services such as schools were re-opening.

## **10. CROSS CUTTING ISSUES**

Year 4 saw increasing emphasis across the programme on helping those with little power – women, widows, ethnic minorities, youth, and the displaced - voice their concerns and participate at least in local level political processes. Lessons and ideas were shared between two regions (ECAP and the Georgian-Abkhaz context) working with IDPs, though in different contexts. This demonstrated vividly the value of exchanges of experience as a means to think out of the box in solving difficult challenges.

**West Africa:** The GTF project has contributed positively in increasing the participation of previously marginalised groups such as women and youth groups in the border communities: in Liberia in Kolahun and Tewor districts in County Development Fund (CDF) project identification processes to the extent that two of the last school expansion projects that were identified and implemented with the CDF 2010-2011 budget particularly in Kolahun was pushed through as a result of pressure from the district women to have the school expanded to accommodate the increasing student population in the district.

In the northern part of Sierra Leone, women are restricted from political space. Through the programme, the DPDs have created space for women to express their interests in contesting for leadership positions, in chieftaincy and are also contesting for recognition for political party candidature.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:** Key focus remains support to Georgia's displaced communities, both internally displaced in Georgia proper, and – to a lesser degree - Georgian returnees in the Gal/i region of Abkhazia. Both are still regarded as part of the most vulnerable groups in the respective societies. (See previous annual reports.)

**Fiji:** Fiji's rural communities, in particular indigenous Fijian communities marginalised from political processes, have a limited ability to influence national and local government decision-making. To a large degree this limited capacity to influence stems from a lack of knowledge of good governance, and rights and responsibilities as citizens.

The Citizens' Constitutional Forum continues to target these communities with education workshops. The workshops consist of a combination of community / village workshop (47 in the reporting period), community leader workshops (5 in the reporting period) and local community based organisation workshops (4 in the reporting period). The workshops build fundamental knowledge on good governance, human rights and multiculturalism.

The education includes community learning in areas such as local accountability and transparency systems, the importance of participation in community decision-making, along with education on their rights as Fiji citizens.

As a follow-up to each of these workshops CCF conducts follow-up community workshops working with the local community in developing local action plans to further good governance in their community.

**ECAP:** A recent dynamic in northern Uganda has been targeting of widows and young people by the powerful land grabbers. So partners in northern Uganda increased focus on land disputes involving widows and young people. Widows are targeted by family members - because the patriarchal society fails to recognise the rights of widows. Families headed by young people are targeted because most grew up in IDP camps and do not know their land boundaries, so unscrupulous people take advantage of this. Through the project, community volunteers (paralegals) and the network of religious and cultural leaders have been trained to deal with land related disputes/ conflicts. The project provided training of community volunteers, young people, women, local leaders to develop their skills in land mediation.

## 11. PROGRESS TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is difficult to assess collectively across the regions as starting points for partners in their awareness and capacity differ significantly as do the contexts, in which they work and the skills required. Progress in year four was therefore mixed so this is presented by region as follows:

*Partners' capacity to sustain impact.*

**West Africa:** In Sierra Leone, the partners have developed their capacities to plan participatively and use community assessment tools for district development planning. These practices have been used to improve the relationship between the DPDs and the Councils. In Kailahun the DPD responded to an expression of interest and got funds from the UKAid/EU supported ENCISSE programme to implement a micro-credit project, demonstrating increased fund raising abilities.

Lessons learnt on working on governance in transition countries in the Mano River Union will be documented and shared to inform future programme development in the region.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:** After receiving additional expert training, the Synergy network took their co-operation with local authorities a step further in establishing mechanisms for IDP organisations to take part in budget monitoring and, in two cases, annual budget allocations to benefit displaced communities in three regions. In the final GTF year these showcases will be further built on and multiplied to become good and sustained practice in terms of civic participation in local governance in Georgia. This structural change is meant to last beyond the lifetime of the project.

**Fiji:** There was a substantial increase in the capacities of the Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding (PCP) during the reporting period, in particular the recruitment of new facilitators and trainers, increasing their capacity to facilitate training and dialogue. PCP also recruited a dedicated programme manager to develop improved organisational systems and processes, along with improved programme oversight and management.

The Citizens' Constitutional Forum (CCF) maintained its organisation size during the reporting period, with five programmes teams: education, legal, research, communications and youth.

**ECAP:** Partners have improved capacities in administration, programming, financial and narrative reporting. Skills sets have increased in promoting alternatives to violence and mediation of community disputes, especially land disputes, among the partners and the individuals they work with. These are resources that will remain in the communities and partner organisations after GTF support. There have been notable improvements in the overall financial management and accountability and activity planning among partners. These improvements will remain within partner organisation after GTF support ends.

*External events impacting positively or negatively on the sustainability of programme outputs.*

Apart from Fiji there were no significant events with impact on the regional projects.

**Fiji:** On the first of January 2012 the Fiji government lifted the Public Emergency Regulations (censorship and assembly restrictions), which were in place since early 2009. They also announced the commencement of a constitutional development process, in the lead up to elections in 2014.

The lifting of the PER, and the relative 'opening' of societal rights in **Fiji**, in particular the substantial opening of the media, has removed ongoing threats on CR's Fiji partners, and has substantially increased the Citizens' Constitutional Forum's capacity to advocate through the media for broader public participation in sustainable democratic change in Fiji.

Likewise the commencement of the constitutional development process has provided the CCF with an important opportunity to aid the people of **Fiji** to participate in the formation of the nations constitution.

*Collaboration, networking, and influencing public opinion for sustainability.*

**West Africa:** LDI has used its leverage to create space at the national level at the Ministry of Internal Affairs for the DPDs/CBOs to engage with the Office of the County Superintendent on how the Project Management Fund of the County Development Fund is administered in their Kolahun district.

At a CR policy dialogue event in Monrovia, Liberia's Minister of Internal Affairs made a request that CR and its partners facilitate a learning exchange in which their Sierra Leonean counterparts will share lessons and experiences on the decentralisation and local governance process.

CR's GTF partners in both countries have already been engaging with the decentralisation processes and so now have an opportunity to facilitate a high level learning exchange.

In **Liberia** LDI has collaborated with other CSOs on various platforms to lobby and dialogue to influence policies: for example, the CSO Poverty Reduction Tracking Network, and LDI also are leading the civil society Liberia Oil and Gas Initiative to monitor the oil sector and call for reforms around the oil policy act and on environmental issues.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:** CHP in **Abkhazia** have continued to promote their research results and recommendations in regard to local governance reform through the media: research results were debated among civil society and officials at round table events, which were covered online and on Abkhaz TV. As a result issues of governance and anti-corruption, and civil society's role in this regard, have entered the public domain in Abkhazia, and raised public awareness to specific problems and possible solutions. Public support to and interest in promoting civic participation has grown and is essential for sustainable change.

*Capacity of relevant national institutions in terms of skills, resources and political space to sustain the impact of the programme.*

**West Africa:** The decentralisation secretariat in **Sierra Leone**, which used to be semi-autonomous, has now been integrated as a unit of the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. The secretariat will now function with government funding and be supervised by the ministry. This has implications on how civil society can engage with the unit.

Local Government authorities at the district and county levels in **Liberia** are appointed by the presidency. Through the GTF activities in the target districts the local government authorities have learnt to adapt to the tenets of accountability, democratic governance and transparency. However, this could be derailed by change in local government administration in the absence of a Decentralisation Act. The situation is similar in Guinea where the president appoints military leaders to represent him locally.

**ECAP:** In **Uganda**, the political space for civil society to act is getting narrower. CSOs that raise issues that are critical of Government are perceived to be in cahoots with the opposition parties. Such CSOs are also threatened with de-registration. The Minister of Internal Affairs, threatened to de-register one NGO, Uganda Land Alliance, unless it publicly apologised to him. Other organisations and individuals have adopted a culture of self-censorship to avoid confrontation with authorities.

In South Sudan, there is increasing crack down on independent media and harassment of journalists by security agencies and Government. This is muzzling the development of an independent media. Civil society organisation remains very weak.

*Dependence for sustainability on reforms or actions by others that are beyond immediate control.*

**West Africa:** The current political ambiance and ongoing will of government for democratic reforms in **Sierra Leone** and **Liberia** creates a conducive environment for civil society engagement. Again the Accra Agenda for Action stipulates a civil society involvement and so governments have become increasingly flexible to this. In the current New Deal, each Peacebuilding

Configuration for the respective fragile countries such as Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone monitors the improvement of justice and security, governance and peace. The recognition of the role of the civil society as strategic partners in development and democracy aids CR and partners sustain the GTF project.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:** As reported last year, programme success in the **Caucasus** is still dependent on progress with the new 'law' on LSG that was expected in **Abkhazia** by the end of 2011 but was delayed due to change and re-structuring of de facto government last year. CHP finalised recommendations to reform LSG that factored in feedback from members of city councils in all regions of Abkhazia. For the final year partners have planned round table events and other activities to ensure civil society influence on this reform process.

**ECAP** Monitoring government responsibilities provides some models that can be adapted for the volatile situations in northern **Uganda** and across the border in **South Sudan**.

Partners have developed sound conflict and governance intervention strategies based on in-depth analysis of the key conflict drivers, and frequent updates of risk scenarios, as well as identification of emerging opportunities. There is evidence of increasingly strong coherence between the conflict and governance analysis, intervention options, and the choice of activities proposed by partners. Since most partners have extensive networks and outreach amongst the Lords Resistance Army (LRA) affected communities, there is potential to influence attitudes and perceptions, and contribute positively to conflict transformation.

## 12. INNOVATION

*Differences from past work with partners, new approaches or testing approaches in new contexts.*

**West Africa - District Platforms for Dialogue (DPDs):** as local initiatives to engage the local government authorities and influence policy change and or change in attitudes to implement effective policies is a new approach in the work of civil society in **Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone**. The norm has been that national level CSOs engage with policy actors and not local groups and organisations.

Organising periodic joint analysis and learning workshops, partner exchanges and developing governance analysis between local government officials and communities has provided the leverage and safer spaces for dialogue.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context – student meetings:** In year 4 of the project, CHP has taken its work with Georgian students who study at the university in Sukhum/i a step forward: they facilitated a series of meetings with the students and their representatives in the Abkhaz 'parliament'. While bringing communities and vulnerable groups together with decision-makers is a method that CR and partners have used consistently in the past, for this particular group of youth from the Gal/i region, this type of interaction was

unique and new. And it helped boost their civic awareness and motivated them to set up a basic institutional base in Gal/i for small-scale civic initiatives, with GTF support.

**ECAP – conflict analysis including governance issues:** There is a strong coherence between CR's conflict and governance analysis that emphasises the local conflict and governance dynamics and their approach to induce locally anchored change. CR follows a paradigm of change that identifies organisations and people at the local grassroots level as key change drivers. These organisations and people have extensive networks and outreach amongst the communities and also Track I and II responses. The existing connections of change drivers have the potential to influence attitudes and perceptions, and address the root causes that have contributed to fuelling the conflict. These change drivers are capable of influencing key players and processes at several levels, from the local to regional and national, thus reflecting the comprehensiveness of in this network approach.

*Innovation for the country or region in scale, scope of operations, or new methods.*

**West Africa:** Implementing a cross-border regional programme through the GTF is an innovation. The different security and administrative cultures of countries either side of borders needs to be understood if citizens are to be helped to gain fair treatment. Facilitating participative meetings between communities crossing borders and the officials from either side has enabled bad practices to be discussed and abuses of power to be challenged. Judging when it is necessary to bring evidence to the attention of higher-level officials is an important skill to deploy to achieve positive and not negative results for citizens in border areas.

**ECAP:** Dialogue sessions between civil society and Government officials provide opportunities to ask questions, get clarifications and also for CR and partners to explain their work and collect feed back.

As for West Africa, cross border work involves engaging and promoting dialogue between the governments, traders' associations, civil society, customs officials, and tax authorities in both countries. CR believes that engaging groups that would otherwise not talk to each other and making a connection between these groups and communities is an innovation itself.

The ECAP visit (see Annex D1) was initiated by Georgian partners and for the first time gave actors in the South Caucasus the opportunity to compare and discuss issues of displacement and governance with peers from African contexts.

*Use of new Technology – Social Media - The Citizens' Constitutional Forum Fiji.*

Under media censorship in **Fiji**, CCF's ability to use conventional media (TV, radio and newspaper) for advocacy was badly affected. In response the organisation turned to other forms of communications to get their messages across, including the use of special events, theatre and paid newspaper advertisements.

One of the most effective methods used by CCF during the reporting period was social media. Their use of social media was particularly important in engaging with Fiji's youth, specifically Fiji's urban politically active youth. Under censorship, assembly

restrictions, and with no accessible means to participate in Fiji's governance, this group has been suffering a high degree of disaffection and increasing frustration.

In order to engage with this important group, CCF substantially increased its Facebook group page activity (<http://www.facebook.com/groups/177335582880/>). Through word of mouth and social media networking CCF greatly increased the number of group page members (currently 1,339). In order to encourage members to engage in debate, group discussion and learning on-line, CCF's group page moderators and staff periodically raise debate topics typically related to human rights, good governance and multiculturalism in Fiji.

This social media approach has enabled these active Fiji youth to engage in peaceful activism and debate, otherwise denied under emergency regulations.

### 13. LEARNING FROM GTF

Cross-region learning is mainly shared through interaction between CR programme directors, the Joint Analysis Workshops (JAWs), and exchanges between partners stimulated by PDs and the JAWs. As planned there was no JAW in Year 4, but the activities agreed in JAW 1 were taken forward, most notably the visit of partners from ECAP to the Georgian-Abkhaz context.

*Key factors that determine the ability of civil society organisations to have an impact on governance and transparency.*

CR GTF programme regions are mostly regional in the sense that they work to support citizens across borders or boundaries disrupted by conflict. In the MRU the legacy of conflict, the presence of ex-combatants and the behaviour of border officials render the borders insecure. In the case of ECAP the Lords Resistance Army continues to use the porosity of regional borders to disrupt and harass communities. Displacement of peoples in the Georgian-Abkhaz context and ongoing political tensions greatly affect free movement of populations. CR has drawn together and published during year 4 a set of learning points from the GTF and other cross border work managed under other programmes. Fiji, although not a border context also contributes to these lessons. The key points include:

**Thinking outside the state - Develop peacebuilding strategies and capacity that can 'think outside the state':** To function effectively, peacebuilding initiatives beyond and below the state need to be strategically linked.

**Building peace beyond the state:** Adjust regional policy according to local contexts, interests and institutions. Regional diplomacy or organisations can help sensitivities over sovereignty, reduce perceptions of unequal power and bring practical assistance in delivering peace dividends.

**Building peace below the state - Invest in borderlands:** Deepening state-society relations in conflict-prone borderland areas can strengthen governance and counter alienation of borderland communities. Governments should invest in legitimate cross-border movement and trade. Border management should involve local populations and promote accountability for inclusive and transparent border security governance.

**Promoting 'trickle-up' of sub-state peacebuilding - Support cross-border community networks:** Cross-border community networks can develop local collective resilience as conflicts morph and spread into new forms and territories. Official and unofficial international support can help to revive traditional cross-border community structures that have been disrupted or destroyed by violence, carrying legitimacy and authority from the past.

**Tap into local actors and opportunities** - Local and international civil society partners can help to identify traditional leaders and other community 'entry points' as well as unexpected or neglected peacebuilders such as among displaced populations. Civil advocacy can open doors when regional diplomatic channels are blocked.

**Prioritise regional conflict prevention and resolution:** Regional organisations should focus more on conflict prevention and sustainable resolution, working with governments and civil society networks to facilitate local participation and buy-in to peace processes.

**Draw on local knowledge:** Communities have the insight and incentive to contribute to cross-border peacebuilding. Policymakers should develop mechanisms to gather local perspectives on conflict dynamics and potential peacebuilding responses.

**Amplify local voices:** International partnership, with governments, inter-governmental bodies, NGOs or the media, can build collective community peacebuilding capacity. International policymakers need to develop programmes that link civil society networks to regional processes.

**Single workshops for community education are not sufficient means to achieve understanding and changed behaviour:** Based on a survey of 47 community education workshops in Fiji conducted by CCF in year 4 it was learned that the 47 adult community education workshops in three target provinces, failed to show significant difference in knowledge and understanding on these topics between previous workshop participants and a control group (i.e. people who never attended a CCF workshop). This suggests that workshop learning is temporary, with participants losing most or all of this knowledge shortly after workshops. Interestingly, there was a significant difference in civic activity between both groups. In comparison to the control group, workshop past-participants were 10-12% more likely to have been in contact with local or national government institutions to attain or demand services. Past participants are also more likely to report crime and to engage in community group activities.

The survey suggests that CCF does need to review their education programme and how to deliver knowledge and understanding, the survey also suggests that providing a space for communities to come together to discuss local and national issues (such as

human rights and good governance) does stimulate attitudinal change, spurring an increase in individual and group participation in governance issues.

Building on the two JAWs, structured opportunities to capture further lessons from across the programme will be planned with the participation of CR's Policy, Practice and Communications team and other staff and stakeholders.

**ANNEXES**

**ANNEX A1 ACHIEVEMENT RATING SCALE.**

**West Africa**

<b>Objective Statement</b>	<b>Achievement Rating for year</b>	<b>Logframe Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline for Indicators</b>	<b>Progress against the Indicators<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	--	---

<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>By 2013 in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea the West Africa Centre for Capacity Development (CENCAD) and up to fifteen civil society organisations (CSOs) are better able to engage in policymaking processes and to act as leaders in conflict-affected border communities as a result of the project activities.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>By 2013 partners resources and expertise have increased and they can produce sound and practical policy recommendations reflecting interests and needs of communities in target border areas.</p>	<p>Partners are not yet identified as a regional resource or consulted regularly by governments and other CSOs. The potential to contribute to policy analysis exists but is not being fully developed.</p> <p>CENCAD has established contact with key ministries and institutions.</p>	<p>Partners in Liberia are regularly invited and consulted on issues relating to the decentralisation process.</p> <p>Partner on Sierra Leone and Guinea still not consulted by government</p> <p>There is still no coordinated approach among CSOs in the Mano River Union regarding engagement in policy-making processes.</p>	<p>CSO Partner in Liberia has developed tools for assessing governance, and trained DPDs to use them. Yet to develop policy guide for influence. LDI is part of the civil society network on governance and development.</p> <p>CENCAD in Sierra Leone now need to use governance barometer for gathering information to develop guides for policy meetings. CENCAD sill needs to establish contacts with key ministries.</p>
---	----------	--	---	--	---

<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p>4. Up to 15 CSOs have a better understanding of how to hold their local and/or national governments to account and influence policy debate on the issues that affect border communities.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>In Liberia and by 2011 targeted CSOs make recommendations on key issues that affect border communities as part of the government's public consultation on decentralisation.</p>	<p>Together with the DPDs, Liberian partner has done assessments and come out with various reports with which they have engaged at both the district and national level.</p>	<p>Partner in Liberia has been engaging with the media and in various forums to with assessment reports on governance situation in border communities (score card system)</p>	<p>CSO and DPDs in the border districts have used the right to information space to demand accountability from government at the district level.</p>
<p>5 An increase in the level of analysis and policy recommendations produced by targeted CSOs on the needs of conflict affected border communities made available to policymakers</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>5.1 In Liberia and by 2011 targeted CSOs make recommendations on key issues that affect border communities as part of the government's public consultation on decentralisation.</p>	<p>CSOs and the DPDs continue to assess the governance situation and make recommendations to government's consultations.</p>	<p>If the CSO partner and DPDs develop the policy recommendations, they will be able to make an improved impact.</p>	<p>LDI and the DPDs are currently engaging with information from scorecards and will need to articulate policy messages targeting the decentralisation process in Liberia.</p>

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	4	5.2 In Guinea by 2012 CENCAD and targeted CSOs produce research and make recommendations on key issues that affect border communities as part on the country's transition to democracy	CENCAD has produced the research but the report has come later in the day.	If CENCAD is able to work with the DPDs to conduct assessments using the governance barometer as done in Liberia, they will have update information to engage policy actors.	CENCAD is currently working with the DPD at Forecariah to influence Government actions on mining companies however this is not in a structured manner to upscale their influence. Updated information will enable effective engagement in Guinea.
	5	5.3 By 2013 project partners produce a joint report and a set of recommendations on key sub-regional issues that can improve governance and accountability in border areas.	Partners decided to plan for a lessons learnt and documentation of their experiences on the 5-year project. CR will facilitate the process in the next year.	If partner CSOs and their local groups share their work together they can identify areas for documentation and dissemination.	In the coming year, partners will facilitate lessons learnt and sharing at firstly country and then at the MRU level.

<p><b>Activities</b></p> <p>Update survey on situation of border communities in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone</p> <p>Field work in border communities in targeted districts in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone</p>				<p>With continuous assessment of the situation the DPDs and the partners are able to update and validate information with which they engage with state actors on specific border security and governance issues.</p>	<p>Liberian partners continue to work with the DPDs to do assessments that inform their engagements.</p> <p>Partners on Sierra Leone and Guinea need to update their assessments. Through partner joint learning this has been identified as a need for Sierra Leone and Guinea for the coming year.</p>
<p>Capacity building</p> <p>Facilitation</p> <p>Training of CBOs and DPDs</p> <p>Training of DPDs together with government officials</p> <p>Staff capacity building</p>				<p>CSO partners have successfully mobilised CBOs and communities in conflict-affected districts into DPDs who facilitate more outreach that enabled the partner CSOs to reach various community groups to sensitise them on the situation of their communities and how to engage with officials for change.</p>	<p>6 DPDs in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea have been trained to do more outreach and engage at the district level to influence policy actors.</p>

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

Documentation and Publication				CSOs and DPDs will engage more effectively when they produce policy guides based on the governance assessments. CSOs are yet to develop these and publicised them to receive the attention of national policy makers.	Partner capacity to develop policy guides is limited. Partners should coordinate and make publications at the joint and regional level.
				Partners have been working in the districts for 4 years now. Effective follow up and field monitoring continues to enable the DPDs ground their learning and begin to engage with policy actors more effectively.	CSOs are unable to do effective follow-ups due to limited funds. CR continues to encourage follow up monitoring as part of activity plans. In the coming year, partners and DPDs will organise lessons learnt sessions.

Georgian-Abkhaz context

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>2. Increased public participation in policymaking leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability in conflict affected regions.</p>					

	2	<p>2.2 (Georgian-Abkhaz conflict regions) New and/or improved legislation, government practices and mechanisms by the end of 2013 that better address the needs and concerns of target groups, reflect partners' recommendations and enable citizens to hold governments to account.</p>	<p>Dialogue processes between civil society and policymakers in the target regions of Georgia proper (Tbilisi, Imereti, Zugdidi) and Abkhazia are in place at various levels, but not institutionalised; they depend largely on personal relations.</p> <p>A Coordination Council for the local administration and NGOs in Gal/i has only recently been established and does not yet function effectively.</p> <p>Considerable number of shortfalls and lack of transparency in Georgian legislation with regard to IDP status, settlement and privatisation procedures.</p> <p>Lack of legal provisions with regard to corruption and transparency in Abkhazia.</p> <p>In many cases no public dialogue prior to legal projects in the Georgia- Abkhazia context; decision-making procedures and respective responsibilities are often not clearly defined and transparent, and therefore</p>	<p>LSG in Zugdidi instituted a position exclusively responsible for IDP issues. Formerly such a position had only existed at the local outfit of the Abkhaz government in exile (yr 1);</p> <p>At least 10 cases in Imereti and Samegrelo, where local authorities consulted IDP communities before finalising decisions on resettlement (yr 2);</p> <p>Local steering committee on IDP issues (<i>Synergy</i> represented) together with INGOs successfully lobbied for clear principles and guidelines in regard to resettlement processes, which led to improved procedures and practice (in the course of yr 3);</p> <p>3 cases where local authorities improved policies and/or practice in regard to waste management/litter pollution in Abkhaz regions as response to youth advocacy campaigns (yr 3);</p>	<p>Delays in all activities in Abkhazia due to untimely death of de facto president and pre-term elections elections.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---

			difficult to monitor and access.	<p>Recommendations drawn up and presented to improve mechanisms for public participation and accountability in Abkhazia (yr 2-3);</p> <p>Study commissioned to draw up recommendations in regard to LSG in Abkhazia (yr 3);</p> <p>Recommendations on LSG and anti-corruption finalized (yr 4); publication and advocacy expected in yr 5;</p> <p>Precedents set in 3 Georgian regions for IDPs' involvement in budget monitoring (yr 4)</p>	
6. Target communities in Georgian-Abkhaz societies are aware of their rights and possibilities as citizens and empowered to		6.1 At least five 'success stories' at the end of year 2 (March 2010), where IDPs managed to improve their conditions through addressing state institutions.	IDPs in collective centres are generally not aware of and/or do not believe in official procedures to address state institutions with their concerns	By March 2010, local authorities have included IDP communities in decision-making processes in regard to re-settlement and privatisation issues, e.g. in Kutaisi, which has created ownership by the IDPs, as well as transparency and credibility for the decision-making process; over 30	Two major problems remained unresolved because the local authorities in charge, although very supportive and co-operative, did not have sufficient funds at their disposal.

<p>solve their problems by addressing government officials and state institutions</p>				<p>concrete problems in eleven collective IDP centres that had been identified in year 1 were being tackled and solved in most cases.</p>	
	<p>3</p>	<p>6.2 By the end of project (March 2013) at least three civic initiative groups are established in the Gal/i region, with particular involvement and growing ownership of local youth groups and co-operation with youth groups in Sukhum/i.</p>	<p>There is hardly any interaction between youth in the Gal/i region and the rest of Abkhazia, which leads to lack of awareness to the specific situation in Gal/i among Abkhaz youth, and lack of confidence among Gal/i youth to engage and make their voice heard.</p>	<p>A series of focus groups and interviews has taken place in the Gal/i region in order to establish first contacts with potential activists and officials in 5 communities and an overview of priority areas to work on (yr 1)</p> <p>Gal/i youth took part in Abkhazia-wide seminar series on public participation and small-scale campaigning (yr 2);</p> <p>4 initiative groups were formed to start working on particular issues in the Gal/i region (yr 3);</p> <p>A round table with participation of local civil society and authorities took place to initiate constructive debate and dialogue, and draw attention to concrete</p>	

				<p>problems in the Gal/i region (yr 4);</p> <p>Meeting was organised for Gal/i students with delegates in Sukhum/i;</p> <p>Basic office space equipped for civic youth initiative to operate in Gal/i (yr 4)</p>	
	2	<p>6.3 Increased participation of IDPs as voters in the target communities - (Tbilisi, Zugdidi, Imereti) during local elections in Georgia (scheduled for spring 2010)</p>	<p>Overall voter turnout in local elections 2006: Kutaisi – 35.51%, Tsqaltubo – 52.31%, Khoni – 46.25%, Zugdidi – 35.94%, Khobi – 73.01%, Poti – 43.33%, Ozurgeti – 48.68%, Batumi – 34.79%</p> <p>Approximately 35% of IDPs took part in local elections 2004 as voters, 57.1% in Imereti, 26% in Samegrelo, 25.5% in Tbilisi (figures are based on UNDP report of May 2004)</p>	<p>Overall voter turnout in local elections 2010:</p> <p>Kutaisi – 34.29%, Tsqaltubo – 39.37%, Khoni – 61.09%, Zugdidi – 37.27%, Khobi – 54.35%, Poti – 51.51%, Ozurgeti – 53.57%, Batumi – 40.11%</p> <p>Out of 70 IDPs in three collective centres in Zugdidi 40% cast their vote in 2010 elections.</p>	<p>Against expectations, UNDP (or other international organisations working on IDP issues in Georgia) did not monitor local elections from the perspective of IDP participation. Therefore, direct comparable data is not available. Therefore, overall turnout figures in the target regions from both local elections are provided to indicate overall trend. In addition, Synergy surveyed IDPs in three collective centres in Zugdidi</p>

					they've been working with.
	1	6.4 Quarterly assessments show that the currently unusually high number of media reports on IDP issues does at no point across the lifetime of the project decrease by more than 10% in at least 3 Georgian newspapers, as well as 2 national TV channels. <sup>2</sup>	<p>Media reports in March 2009: 4 articles on IDP status, 4 contributions assessing performance of the Anti-Crisis Council, 4 contributions commenting on government's performance, 4 contributions on opposition's activities;</p> <p>April 2009: 4 articles about conditions in new settlements and status of new IDPs, 1 on Abkhaz Government in Exile and its relation to IDPs; May 2009: 5 contributions on conditions of new IDPs, 3 on international support, 1 on meeting between MRA official and IDPs</p>	<p>Media reports in <b>May-June 2009</b>: 7 articles on socio-economic issues and integration;</p> <p>4 on policies and authorities' performance; 1 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>July-Sept 2009</b>: 25 articles on socio-economic issues and integration; 14 on policies and authorities' performance; 5 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Oct-Dec 2009</b>: 27 articles on socio-economic issues and integration; 14 on policies and authorities' performance; 5 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Jan-Mar 2010</b>: 30 articles</p>	

<sup>2</sup> At the moment, due to recent events, great attention is brought to IDP issues in Georgian media. However, this does mostly refer to the situation of 'new' IDPs. One of the expected results of this project is to make sure IDP issues do not disappear from the agenda of national media as soon as housing has been established for the 'new' IDPs and that there will be permanent coverage and monitoring of the implementation of the IDP strategy and action plans throughout the lifetime of the project. Since coverage is currently unusually frequent, this indicator does not foresee a quantitative increase in media reports.

				<p>on socio-economic issues and integration; 13 on policies and authorities' performance; 3 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b><i>Apr-Jun 2010:</i></b> 17 on socio-economic issues and integration; 16 on policies and authorities' performance; 11 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b><i>Jul-Sept 2010:</i></b> 29 on socio-economic issues and integration; 22 on policies and authorities' performance; 11 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b><i>Oct-Dec 2010:</i></b> 22 on socio-economic issues and integration; 18 on policies and authorities' performance; 3 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b><i>Jan-Mar 2011:</i></b> 22 on socio-economic issues and integration; 19 on policies</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>and authorities' performance; 8 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Apr-Jun 2011:</b> 9 on socio-economic issues and integration; 6 on policies and authorities' performance; 10 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Jul-Sept 2011:</b> 12 on socio-economic issues and integration; 12 on policies and authorities' performance; 7 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Oct-Dec 2011:</b> 15 on socio-economic issues and integration; 20 on policies and authorities' performance; 8 on involvement of int'l community</p> <p><b>Jan-Mar 2012:</b> 16 on socio-economic issues and integration; 16 on policies and authorities' performance; 8 on</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				involvement of int'l community	
7. Creation of new, and improvement of existing, policies and programmes which address the concerns of conflict-affected communities in Georgia-Abkhazia, as a result of more effective formal and informal mechanisms for public participation.	3	7.1 Political party platforms, public policies and programmes that are being developed and amended during the project period in Georgia, are more responsive to the needs, ideas and views expressed by the IDP network: e.g. National Action Plan on IDPs and its implementation (ongoing assessments on a yearly basis); representation of IDP network members in MRA steering committee (as of April 2009);	National strategy on IDPs is very vague; no clear legal definitions for IDP status; National Action Plan on IDPs is being elaborated, while in practice some elements of it are already being implemented; steering committee on IDP issues is being established in March 2009, initially without IDP network members participating; privatisation law does currently not provide for IDPs that do not live in collective centres.  Annual state budget allocations to support IDPs in private sector: 2008 120 million 2009 60 million 2010 29 million; IDPs receive duplicated	In year 1 the IDP advocacy group members have held regular consultations with MRA advisors, who declared their feedback was taken into account for the elaboration of the NAP;  Advocacy group has cooperated with steering committee on IDPs; as of year 2: cooperation with legal experts on concrete issues: legal experts provide legal consultation for IDPs; they have rendered support in legal issues regarding privatisation processes in over 10 collective centres in Imereti and Samegrelo, as well as Tsqneti and Borjomi; advocacy group together with local and int'l NGOs successfully lobbied for clear regulations/ principles	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

		<p>corrections of privatisation law (by March 2010). (Further focal areas will be defined on a yearly basis according to development of concrete needs.) Annual state budgets as of 2011 allocate increased resources to IDP support in private sector, compared to year 2010;</p> <p>Respective responsibilities and types of support rendered by Abkhaz Government in Exile (AGE) and LSG are clarified by the end of year 3 (March 2011)</p>	<p>financial support from various institutions, namely the AGE and LSG, without sufficient coordination between the two.</p>	<p>in regard to resettlement in year 3; IDP network delegated Georgian Young Lawyers Association to represent local civil society at national steering committee (yr 4); preparations under way to collaborate with political parties on IDP policies around parliamentary elections scheduled for October 2012</p>	
	2.5	<p>7.2 Civil society's initiatives for laws are being approved by decision-makers in Abkhazia: e.g. correction of</p>	<p>There is no anti-corruption programme in Abkhazia; no policy that obliges officials (excluding election candidates) to sign declaration of income; election code does not provide</p>	<p>Corrections to the election code approved, e.g. in regard to rights for civic domestic observers (yr 1);</p>	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

		<p>election code (end of 2009); declaration of income (end of year 2); national programme/'law' on corruption (end of project)</p> <p>Administrative code (March 2012): services offered by municipality and Interior Ministry need to be coordinated and streamlined; roles clearly defined</p> <p>Self-governance: mechanisms for decentralisation (March 2012): elect heads, not appoint them; councils should take part in decision-making processes from outset</p>	<p>rights for civic domestic observers</p> <p>Administrative code: penalties for violations of sanitary services mentioned in code, but procedures not defined;</p> <p>self-governance: heads of LSG are being appointed, not elected;</p> <p>LSG admin makes decisions – council has to approve or disapprove</p>	<p>Recommendations drawn up in regard to LSG and anti-corruption (yr 4); follow-up activities planned for yr 5</p>	
	3	7.3 Local population in at least 1 community in	No participatory budgeting in local communities	Practice of participatory budgeting/budget monitoring established in 3 Georgian	

		Abkhazia takes part in budgeting decisions at the end of project (March 2013).		regions (yr 4)	
8. Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations in the target communities to engage in advocacy, policy dialogue and monitoring	1	8.1 By 2013, at least 20 local and international networks, organisations, and state institutions consider and promote the IDP network as valuable resource for recommendations and assessments of IDP issues in Georgia.	IDP network is being consulted and promoted on occasion by CR, Transparency International (TI), Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA); there is dialogue on specific issues with the MRA and some LSG officials.	<p>Each year more international organisations (e.g. CARE, DRC, UNDP, UNHCR, NRC, Transparency International, Amnesty International) have consulted IDP network (hereafter: Synergy) advocacy group to receive information about current IDP issues in Georgia; EUMM personnel in Tbilisi, Zugdidi and Khashuri have consulted Synergy members and turned to them to solve problems of IDPs in the region;</p> <p>All key officials in MRA and LSG in Zugdidi, Imereti and Tbilisi are aware of the work of Synergy and hold regular consultation with network members;</p> <p>In order to give the network a more effective voice and be more clearly visible, the</p>	

				network members have drawn up a clear portfolio for their work for year 3; an information flyer about the network was published and disseminated.	
	2	8.2 A 25%+ increase of the number of proposed and implemented projects on a yearly basis by CBOs, especially youth groups in Abkhazia (in Sukhum/i and Gal/i districts) promoting good governance and transparency.	No systemised engagement in transparency and good governance issues among Abkhaz civil society; mainly 4 CBOs have led related initiatives: CHP, AIS (Association Inva-Sodeystvie) AWA (Abkhaz Women's Association), Democracy Institute in Gal/i. They have targeted the following issues: Law on Freedom of Expression (in co-operation with Article 19); Law on Gender Equality (adopted in 2009); establishment of public counselling services for citizens (supported through International Alert); improve rights of persons with disabilities; improve civic participation mechanisms; the role of the media in forming public opinion.	Issues of governance and transparency are more adequately represented in Abkhaz media and are being reviewed by authorities;  Clearer concept among CBOs of the way everyday problems of citizens are linked to weak governance;  Youth initiatives have been successfully carried out: active involvement of youth groups in the 'Voters' league' and in preparing advocacy campaigns	

<b>Activities - Georgian/Abkhaz context</b>	<b>Judgement Statement</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
Output 6		
Meetings relating to research and policy work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CHP held 13 consultation meetings with local administrations and city councils, as well as local population in seven Abkhaz districts to discuss reforms on LSG, proposed by CHP, and receive feedback and support.</li> </ul>	
Info exchange/mentoring meetings for CBOs in Abkhazia including Gal/i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Six students from the Gal/i region met with members of the Abkhaz parliament and local administration in Gal/i in June 2011 to exchange perspectives on the situation in Gal/i and make them aware of the newly established youth initiative;</li> <li>- 18 students from Gal/i took part in a 2-day training 'What is civil society' as a result of which they articulated and prioritised problems in the Gal/i region and started three small initiatives accordingly, which were supported through CHP's micro-grants.</li> </ul>	

<p>Advocacy work with IDP community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through newly established resource centre, resettled IDP community of Potskho-Etseri received access to computer with internet, and a library, and is enabled to solve bureaucratic and legal problems in relation to unemployment, schooling, living conditions, etc. The facility is actively and regularly being used by 150 IDPs, mostly youth;</li> <li>• Precedents for participatory budget monitoring established in three local communities after weekly meetings between IDP activists and local authorities;</li> </ul>	
<p>Output 7 Research work on governance issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication (in Russian) with recommendations on LSG and European standards of governance finalised.</li> </ul>	
<p>Support to IDP advocacy group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total of 48 meetings of IDP advocacy group with network members and LSG representatives in three regions to jointly set up mechanisms for budget monitoring.</li> </ul>	
<p>Output 8 IDP network meetings</p>	<p>6 Synergy network meetings (April 2011, May 2011, October 2011, December 2011, January 2012, March 2012) carried out in Tbilisi and Zugdidi; main topics: co-operation with LSG and budget monitoring; Exchange of experience of public participation and displacement with colleagues from Uganda and South Sudan; IDPs' role in peacebuilding; How to consolidate achievements of GTF project and draw lessons (Selected sessions were attended by representatives of local NGOs, INGOs, EU Delegation, British Embassy, Think Thanks and Universities.)</p>	

<p>Financial and technical support to CBOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• With support from CHP six students from the Gal/i region set up an initiative group and carried out three small projects to raise awareness to problems of families with many children, improve conditions of local schools and start a discussion club for young people from neighbouring villages in the Gal/i region. They are now planning to register their initiative group as an NGO in Gal/i.</li><li>• 10 issues of Synergy supplement published in nation-wide newspaper Rezonansi to promote IDP issues and Synergy network among mainstream Georgian readers. 8 issues this year were funded through EU project; March and May 2011 issues funded through GTF, featuring Synergy advocacy group and new Resource Centre in Potskho-Etseri, among other things.</li><li>• 3-day seminar by civic experts from Perm for CHP and other Abkhaz civil society actors on aspects of civic participation in decentralisation processes.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

**Fiji**

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators <sup>1</sup>	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>2. Increased public participation in policymaking leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability in conflict-affected regions.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>2.3 (Fiji) By 2013 civic engagement in national public policy debates on constitutional and legislative reforms will extend beyond the capital city of Suva and national NGOs and this will result in greater government responsiveness which in turn will increase long-term political stability.</p>	<p>2.3 Currently with Parliament suspended civil society engagement is limited due to concerns of endorsing the military’s “doctrine of effective control.”</p> <p>2.3 In the Freedom House, ‘Freedom in the world’ report 2008, Fiji has the following rating:</p> <p>Political rights: 6</p> <p>Civil Liberties: 4</p> <p>2.3 Fiji’s baseline ranking in the World Bank ‘world wide governance’ rating for government effectiveness is 35.5 (2007 rating).</p>	<p>After three years of reduced public participation in policy making, as a result of emergency regulations imposing media and assembly restrictions, this reporting period saw a significant shift with the lifting of these restrictions and the announcement of the commencement of a constitutional development process.</p> <p>CCF was at the forefront of advocating for this change both indirectly through workshops and public lectures, and through engaging directly with the government of Fiji on the emergency restrictions and the commencement of the</p>	<p>Although the positive changes in the context in Fiji (lifting of emergency regulations and the commencement of a constitutional development process) happened quickly, there was a three-year history of advocacy for these changes, along with dialogue and engagement with the government of Fiji toward achieving this change.</p> <p>This positive shift in the Fiji context does have the possibility of being reversed. In particular with the</p>

				<p>process.</p> <p>At the end of the reporting period CCF had adjusted their community education programme and media approach to educating and encouraging the people of Fiji to participate in the up-coming process.</p>	<p>military government's reaction to new political voices as Fiji moves into a more open and socially inclusive future</p>
<p>9. Increased understanding and use of, the concepts of good governance, human rights, citizenship and Fiji's Constitution.</p>	4	<p>9.1 A 4% increase, year on year, in the rural population's ability to express and explain these concepts, within the 3 target provinces (Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra).</p>	<p>Percentage of the population, by province, with an understanding of specific concepts of human rights, multiculturalism, citizenship and Fiji's Constitution.</p> <p>The baseline survey was conducted by the UNDP in 2008, This information will be passed to CCF by the end of March 2009</p>	<p>The UNDP survey conducted in 2008 was never received by CCF, and is embargoed by the UNDP, so the intended baseline is not obtainable.</p> <p>CCF conducted a separate community based survey (called 'Scratching the Surface') to assess the progress against this indicator.</p> <p>Evidence from this survey suggests that participants</p>	<p>The survey conducted by CCF, including 750 respondents from CCF target areas, including workshop ex-participants and a control group.</p> <p>The results have led CCF to re-evaluate their grassroots workshop programme, and to recruit an expert in community education to work with the</p>

				<p>(91%) had seen some positive change from the CCF education workshops and that they feel they have an increased knowledge of good governance, human rights, and citizenship.</p> <p>But when compared with the survey control group the actual increase in understanding was small or relatively insignificant.</p>	<p>organisation for a period of two years.</p>
	4	<p>9.2 2% year on year increase in ability to express and explain these concepts in the urban communities in Fiji.</p>	<p>Percentage (pending survey) of the urban community population, with an understanding of specific concepts of human rights, multiculturalism, citizenship and Fiji's Constitution</p>	<p>As with 9.1 above, the UNDP survey conducted in 2008 was never received by CCF, and is embargoed by the UNDP, so the intended baseline is not obtainable.</p> <p>As part of the ('Scratching the surface') survey a significant amount of respondents, who had experienced some form of CCF media</p>	<p>No comments.</p>

				<p>material (TV, Radio and newspaper) felt that they had learnt something or changed their attitude.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 77% for Radio</li> <li>- 66% for TV</li> <li>- 59% for newspaper</li> </ul>	
	4	9.3 Specific evidence in 60% of target communities (communities in Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra) of increased civic activity, by 2013.	Specific evidence of civic activities in the target communities (e.g. requests to public bodies etc.) (Information pending).	<p>As sourced from the CCF survey ('Scratching the surface') there was significant evidence of an increase in individuals making demands from government institutions post CCF workshops. A 10-12% increase in workshop ex-participants making demands from government institutions in comparison to the control group (non-participants)</p> <p>There was also evidence of an increase in people's willingness to report crime, question leaders and participate in collective civic action (e.g. community activities, campaigns etc.)</p>	<p>As captured in 'Learning from GTF' section, the fact that workshop participants have an increased willingness to part-take in civic action and make demands of government institutions, yet display a limited increase in understanding of human rights and good governance is interesting.</p>

	3	11.1 A modest (3%) year on year increase in public acceptance of the concept of multicultural citizenship in the three target provinces (Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra).	(as above)	As discussed above, the “Scratching the Surface” community level survey conducted by CCF indicated little if any improvement in this indicator. Specifically there appeared to be a limited increase in community level understanding of the multiethnic dimension of citizenship in community workshop ex-participants.	As with above CCF will be analysing how to change their education programme through recruiting an expert in community education to work with the organisation for a period of two years.

***GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources***

11. Improved political stability, through an increased acceptance of Fiji's cultural diversity.	5	11.2 A 20% decrease in incidents of racism, hate crimes and discrimination by 2013.	The number of race related crimes, reported to the police to be assessed.  Baseline to be collated in April 2009.	No information collected due to difficulties in obtaining data.	The police no longer include any racial categorisation in crime reports. For example, acts of sacrilege are now reported as vandalism and property destruction only.
	5	11.2 A 20% decrease in incidents of racism, hate crimes and discrimination by 2013.	The number of race related crimes, reported to the police to be assessed.  Baseline to be collated in April 2009.	No information collected due to difficulties in obtaining data.	The police no longer include any racial categorization in crime reports. For example, acts of sacrilege are now reported as vandalism and property destruction only.

*Please note that there is no output 12, this was removed as part of the adjustment to the Fiji-section of the logframe in December 2009.*

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

Activity - FJ	Beneficiary	Judgement Statement	Comment
Output 9: Increased understanding and use of, the concepts of good governance, human rights, citizenship and Fiji's Constitution.			
47 x Community Education Workshops: One-day interactive workshops on Human Rights, Good Governance, and Citizenship.	i-Taukei and Indo Fijian communities in Ba, Naitasiri, Tailevu and Ra provinces.	The workshops create a safe space for people to share their thoughts and feelings about the country under military rule. . Information collected will form baseline data to measure changes in attitudes and behaviours. This research led to the publication of the "Scratching the Surface" report which received large media interest.	
5 x Community Leader Conferences: A one day workshop with community and provincial leaders in the Tailevu, Naitasiri, Ba, and Ra provinces aimed at increasing understanding of human rights, democracy and good governance.	i-Taukei community leaders.	These workshops have been received well by the leaders. However the activity is limited to information sharing and more work is needed to ensure that knowledge is put into	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

		action, such as through facilitating the development of action plans.	
Ongoing website upgrade	Broader community	Website data indicates over 10,000 visitors to the site since 2011.	
2 x Lectures by international experts. 1, launch of “Constitution Making and Reform” book, plus a side event with Yash Ghai (one of the book’s authors) and 1 public lecture, in partnership with USP, presented by Professor Cheryl Saunders. The lecture topic was on “ <i>Constitution Making in the 21<sup>st</sup> century</i> ”.	Government, political leaders,	The forums created a space for actors who may not normally meet, under the current political context, to come together and debate issues (e.g., FWRM challenging the Attorney General during the forum; ex-PM Qarase protesting against the Attorney General by walking out during the latter’s presentation).	The visit by Yash Ghai allowed for a reconnection between him and the Attorney General of Fiji, the latter having been a student of Yash Ghai’s. Yash Ghai was subsequently named the Chair of the Constitution Commission for Fiji.
Security Force Training: Managed by PCP, this training is aimed at increasing knowledge of human rights, conflict analysis, gender analysis, and dialogue, as well as providing trauma management. 3 training workshops were held in September and December of 2011, and January of 2012, with 28	Police, military, prison services.		

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

<p>officers from the prison, police and RFMF. All of them were officer level- no one was as high as captain or major.</p>			
<p>4 x NGO and CBO Capacity Building Workshops: These 2 day workshops aim to raise awareness and understanding of human rights, citizenship and good governance, as well as how to counter racism and promote multiculturalism.</p>	<p>NGO and CBO</p>		
<p>9 x National Budget Advocacy Workshops: Aim to educate citizens on the processes of the national budget, enhance community participation in the budgetary process, and support advocacy on budget issues.</p>	<p>General community</p>	<p>These workshops have helped to prepare budget submissions and to subsequently track government spending (e.g., successful submissions re: a water project, and roads project, and school project).</p>	<p>Workshops explicitly link budgets to MDG.</p>

Output 10: Fiji has an agreed pathway towards a fair, representative and sustainable democracy, based on inclusivity and respect for the Rule of Law			
Dialogue Fiji: 3 dialogue events conducted. 2 divisional dialogue events in Central and Eastern divisions, and 1 national conference held on Sept 14-16 and included participants from Government, CSO, and communities. Discussion focused on Land, Education, Multiculturalism, PER, Dialogue, Reconciliation, Leadership, Poverty, and Natural Disasters.	Government, Community leaders, general population		
CCF Research: 2 monitoring reports on militarism and government performance and policymaking. 12 monitoring reports on government decrees and legislation. 1 research report titled <i>"Fiji Land Research – Issues and Challenges"</i> .  <i>Findings noted a large, new economic activity in informal land dealings. 2 new research projects started: Peace and Governance Barometer, and Youth Research and Advocacy Project.</i>	International community, development partners, NGO partners, CCF staff and board.	In general, the reports have been used by various partners and CCF as advocacy tools. For example, UK lawyers used the Law and Justice report as a source for critique. The Fiji Land Research report was poorly developed and of limited use.	
International advocacy: involves supporting CCF to conduct advocacy for changed policy approaches towards Fiji within the international community:  3 international advocacy trips. Trip by CEO to	CCF, International Community, Donors	Advocacy trips have contributed to changes in donor funding priorities and the nature of the	

<p>present to Diaspora and Department of Foreign Affairs. Trip by CEO to NZ to attend the Lowy Institute conference during the Pacific Islands Leaders Forum meeting. 1 trip by the CEO to Sydney and Canberra, including visits to AusAID and UNSW.</p>		<p>funding provisions by challenging the international community on their stance towards Fiji (e.g., AusAID providing direct funding for constitutional work).</p>	
--	--	--	--

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

<p>Peace Media: 1 workshop completed, conducted by Jake Lynch from the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies and the University of Sydney.</p>	<p>Journalists</p>	<p>The desired target participants (director/editor level) did not attend; rather only junior staff, therefore having a limited impact.</p>	
<p>Government Dialogue Training: Workshop, conducted by PCP, aimed at improving knowledge and skills in conflict analysis, negotiation and dialogue. In July 2011, one government dialogue was held for 27 Deputy permanent secretaries. Sue Williams was the facilitator. In March 2012, PCP held a mediation/negotiation skills training workshop at which replaced the Permanent Secretary dialogue training. 30 people attended the workshop, consisting of 5 majors, 9 from the SFCCO Public relations team, the rest were civil society-NGO, Trade Unions, Private sector. PCP took part as participants, and it was facilitated by UNDP- Tracy Vennings and Janet Murdoch.</p>	<p>Senior government officials, civil society organisations, private sector organisations.</p>		
<p>Output 11: Improved political stability through an increased acceptance of Fiji's cultural diversity</p>			
<p>Ongoing work on CERD submission</p>	<p>Government, General population</p>		

<p>CCF Youth Program: Various activities aimed at building understanding of multiculturalism, human rights and citizenship among youth in Fiji. Activities during the reporting period were 4 youth workshops.</p>	<p>Young People primarily in Tailevu, Ra and Naitasiri</p>	<p>Workshop content has been weak and CCF has received negative feedback on this.</p>	<p>Steps have been taken by CCF management to improve workshop content including ensuring that content plans are developed and presented to staff for feedback before conducting workshops; clearly linking workshop activities and content to programme objectives; and including more creative workshop activities.</p>
--	--	---	---

ECAP

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Progress against the Indicators <sup>1</sup>	Comments on changes over the last year, including unintended impacts
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>Increased public participation in policymaking leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability in conflict affected regions.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>By 2013, two CSOs and at least 6 target communities in northern Uganda are monitoring and contributing to legislation, policies, Government programmes and practices that affect their needs and grievances; Changes to first drafts of at least 2 pieces of legislation reflect concerns and priorities of CSOs and communities</p>	<p>2.4 The February 2009 survey by Uganda Governance Monitoring Platform (UGMP) concluded that the democratic process and human rights situation in Uganda stagnated between 2004-2008. In the same period transparency and accountability regressed. Access to public information is limited, while the regressive NGO policy limits the operations of civil society organisations.</p>	<p>At the local level, CR and partners have been raising issues that affect communities. Local government are responding to most of the issues raised by communities and including them in their programs. However policy change at the national level is yet to be fully realised</p>	<p>Over the last years, partners have reached out to policy makers at the national level. Most of the time, some of the policy makers respond to the demands of civil society (especially when it has a wide spread grassroots support). However, this is yet to be translated into a policy or practice change at the national level.</p> <p>At the local and district level (Uganda) and state level (South Sudan), there is increased interface between partners and the policy makers at that level. The district (Uganda) and state (South Sudan) and lower level local governments are responding to partners and communities demands. The challenges remains at the national level- where the voice of civil society is yet to be heard.</p>

<p>Outputs</p> <p>Increased ability of civil society in Northern Uganda and South Sudan to hold Government and state institutions accountable.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>13.1 By 2010 12 workshops in six target areas have informed communities about the content and relevance of the PRDP for northern Uganda.</p> <p>13.2 By 2013, partner organisations are monitoring the implementation of recovery plans and have made practical recommendations (one joint report, two submissions on policy and programme recommendations to parliamentary committees and the Office of the Prime Minister) on measures to meet the needs of communities.</p>	<p>At a community level, less than 20% of the population interviewed by JPC GANAL are aware of PRDP. Among the policy makers at the district level, there is a general understanding of PRDP (what the plan is about), although less than 5% understood the funding mechanisms.</p>	<p>In northern Uganda, significant improvements have been made. Almost all workshop participants have heard about PRDP and are aware of its intentions. The lessons learnt have been fed into the design of PRDP II (that is still in the design stage). In South Sudan, the planning frameworks are still in their infancy hence remain unclear to majority</p>	<p>The programme has supported partners to continue engaging decision makers at the local level. PRDP remains a framework within which we engage policy makers. We have targeted 20 communities to sensitise them on PRDP and monitor its implementation. The opinions of PRDP monitors are respected and acted upon by local leaders.</p> <p>Partners are increasingly seen as actors in reducing community tensions. For example, JPC was able to avert potential crisis when they resolved the Apar crisis. They facilitated community dialogue involving Uganda Police Force, Parliamentarians from northern Uganda; Local Government leaders, Uganda Wild Life Authority - to account for the eviction in Apar village. The eviction was later stayed following the intervention of JPC - that involved the participation of local Governments, Uganda Police Force, Uganda Wild Life Authority and Parliamentarians.</p>
<p>Page 64 of 139</p>					

<p>Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations to engage effectively with governments and policymaking processes.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>15.1 Four partners have attended three workshops on policy development and advocacy skills and received 20 hours of support to improve their policy development and advocacy skills.</p> <p>15.2 By 2013, four partners have attended 4 workshops on conflict analysis and received 10 hours per year of support to improve their skills and knowledge.</p> <p>15.3 By 2013, 6 civil society groups cooperating across the Ugandan-Sudanese border have on at least 4 occasions presented joint ideas, analysis and views to policy</p>	<p>Civil society in the region is largely ineffective in holding governments to account. They lack skills and access to information. Political participation and interaction with government is still very low and official information is not made available regularly</p> <p>Although stronger and more active, civil society in the region is still largely ineffective in holding governments to account. Political participation and interaction with government is still very low and access to public information is still limited. Government departments are not taking necessary steps to provide information as provided for by Access to Information Act 2005.</p>	<p>We continued to witness improvements in organisational capacities of partners (planning, management, conflict and governance). Partners have continued to develop sound conflict and governance analysis, and appropriate responses. Partners have continued to engage with policymakers.</p>	<p>There has been an improvement in advocacy skills among partners. In South Sudan, CR organised a training of Totto Chan and her partners in advocacy. Working closely with CR and Saferworld, Totto Chan successfully hosted an advocacy event on that attracted the participation of the Vice President, six ambassadors, parliamentarians and civil society actors. In all 48 people attended a day-long event (on community participation to resolve conflicts in South Sudan).</p> <p>In July 2011, four partners from South Sudan were trained on conflict analysis by the Rift Valley Institute.</p> <p>The cross-border dialogue and advocacy at the Uganda – South Sudan border point of Madi Opei (Uganda) and Tserenya (South Sudan) has helped to reduce cross-border criminality, incidences of rape and eased community tensions.</p>
--	----------	--	--	--	--

<p>Activities</p> <p>1. Peace Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) Monitoring</p> <p>2. Training community leaders on alternatives to violence</p> <p>3. Community sensitisation/ dialogues on land conflicts</p> <p>4. Mediation of land conflicts</p> <p>5. Cross-border dialogue</p> <p>6. Advocacy at the local, district and national levels</p>				<p>The activities are relevant to community needs. All stakeholders (local leaders, other NGOs and community leaders participate in all activities</p>	<p>In the coming months we will re-enforce advocacy at the national level</p> <p>We will increase the amount of support to partners in South Sudan</p> <p>Increase documentation</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--

Annex A2 Programme Log frame, **approved**

Goal	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>1. More effective governance contributing to sustainable peace in target countries</p>	<p>1.1 Risk of conflict or instability as a result of poor government accountability and responsiveness is reduced in conflict-affected areas in Uganda, Mano River countries, Georgia-Abkhazia context and in Fiji over project period.</p> <p>1.2 By 2013 opportunities and means for public participation in decision-making and policy development, including by communities in conflict-affected regions, will have increased.</p>	<p>1.1 Country reports: ICG CrisisWatch and Country Reports, Economist Intelligence Unit Country Reports, US State Dept reports, donor reports.</p> <p>1.2 World Bank's annual Worldwide Governance Indicators (esp. Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Government Effectiveness indicators).</p>	<p>All of the geographic areas in this programme could fall back into violent civil war. They are also all in 'difficult neighbourhoods' and unrest in one could affect progress on governance in another. In addition factors that could inhibit the political will to reform could include the impact of the global economic recession and any weakening in international community/donor commitments to governance objectives, as in the MDGs.</p>

Purpose	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>2. Increased public participation in policymaking leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability in conflict-affected regions.</p>	<p>2.1 By 2013 in <b>Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea</b> the West Africa Centre for Capacity Development (CENCAD) and up to fifteen civil society organisations (CSOs) are better able to engage in policymaking processes and to act as leaders in conflict-affected border communities as a result of the project activities.</p>	<p>2.1 Questionnaire about policymaking processes administered to all partners to assess knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political relationship between MRU countries continues to allow cooperation across borders</li> <li>• Representatives of governments are willing to engage with civil society actors and to consider CR and local partners recommendations</li> <li>• Absence of violent hostilities in target countries</li> <li>• Non-violent electoral transitions in the regions</li> </ul>

	<p>2.2 At least 2 cases of new and/or amended legislation, and 20 examples of changes in government practice and mechanisms by the end of 2013 in at least 2 policy areas (resettlement/privatisation; local self-governance) that address the needs and concerns of target groups in the Georgia-Abkhazia context, reflect partners' recommendations and enable citizens to hold governments to account.</p>	<p>2.2 Focus groups, round tables, interviews with civic activists and local administrations;</p> <p>2.2 Body of legal documents, media screening;</p> <p>2.2 Publication of draft laws prior to first hearing;</p> <p>2.2 protocols and coverage of public hearings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representatives of relevant (including de facto) state institutions at national and local levels, as well as political parties are willing to consider and adopt suggestions from CR and local partners.</li> <li>• Abkhaz NGOs are prepared to continue involvement in a project that involves the IDP community, which could be used against them within their own society</li> <li>• Anti-democratic tendencies and/or political instability in Georgia, Abkhazia or both do not grow to a level that makes project work on transparency and governance issues impossible.</li> <li>• State policies such as the Georgian "Law on</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

	<p>2.2 At least 2 cases of new and/or amended legislation, and 20 examples of changes in government practice and mechanisms by the end of 2013 in at least 2 policy areas (resettlement/privatisation; local self-governance) that address the needs and concerns of target groups in the Georgia-Abkhazia context, reflect partners' recommendations and enable citizens to hold governments to account.</p>	<p>2.2 Focus groups, round tables, interviews with civic activists and local administrations;</p> <p>2.2 Body of legal documents, media screening;</p> <p>2.2 Publication of draft laws prior to first hearing;</p> <p>2.2 protocols and coverage of public hearings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representatives of relevant (including de facto) state institutions at national and local levels, as well as political parties are willing to consider and adopt suggestions from CR and local partners.</li> <li>• Abkhaz NGOs are prepared to continue involvement in a project that involves the IDP community, which could be used against them within their own society</li> <li>• Anti-democratic tendencies and/or political instability in Georgia, Abkhazia or both do not grow to a level that makes project work on transparency and governance issues impossible.</li> <li>• State policies such as</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<p>2.4 By 2013, two CSOs and at least 6 target communities in northern Uganda are monitoring and contributing to legislation, policies, Government programmes and practices that affect their needs and grievances; Changes to first drafts of at least 2 pieces of legislation reflect concerns and priorities of CSOs and communities</p>	<p>2.4 Focus groups, questionnaires and interviews with Government officials at the sub-county, district and national level.</p> <p>2.4 Uganda Governance Monitoring Platform (UGMP) annual survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-scale war does not resume and there is sufficient stability to begin reconstruction and other peacebuilding work.</li> <li>• Continued progress in deepening democracy in Uganda, including toward improved decentralisation and multi-party politics.</li> <li>• The application of Government policy on NGOs does not restrict the activities of partners and CSOs in target communities.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

**Geographic programmes**

<b>West Africa</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Important Assumptions</b>

<p>3. Partners demonstrate increased capacity to contribute to policymaking and research in the region.</p>	<p>3.1 From a 2008 baseline of no such engagement at the border regions, by 2013,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three lead CSOs in Sierra Leone, Guinea, and Liberia work with about five civil society platforms, each made up of about 9 community-based organisations (CBOs) in border districts to influence government actions on decentralisation and governance in fragile states</li> <li>• Three CSOs would have in-house capacities to comment and engage on specific policy issues in relation to governance and fragility.</li> <li>• At least one lead CSO has designed frameworks to analyse governance situations and for enabling border communities engage with policy level on decentralisation issues affecting them.</li> </ul>	<p>3.1 Organisational capacity assessments (beginning and end of project)</p> <p>3.1 One-to-one structured interviews with staff (beginning, interim, end)</p> <p>3.1 Focus groups with a sample from the border communities, CSOs and government officials (beginning and end of the project)</p>	<p>Outputs 3- 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No return to full-scale armed conflict or hostilities within and/or between the countries that impedes ability to cooperate across borders and address security and development issues through governance processes.</li> <li>• Governments are (a) willing to address security &amp; development concerns and (b) engage with civil society to develop ways to address them.</li> <li>• Project is able to maintain regular access to rural communities in targeted areas</li> <li>• Training providers are able to build necessary capacities, despite divergent skill and knowledge levels among CSO members</li> </ul>
---	--	--	--

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

			<p>and staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CR is able to provide necessary support for its professional &amp; organisational development.</li> </ul>
	<p>3.2 By 2013 partners are consulted regularly by both government and other CSOs as a regional resource and contribute directly to policy analysis and formulation at different governance levels in the sub-region.</p>	<p>3.2 Invitations and minutes of official meetings attended by partners</p> <p>3.2 Co-authorship research and briefing papers</p> <p>3.2 Interviews with key informants</p> <p>3.2 Media coverage</p>	
<p>4. Up to fifteen civil society organisations (CSOs) have a better understanding of how to hold their local and/or national governments to account and influence policy debate on the issues that affect border communities.</p>	<p>4.1 By 2012 up to fifteen CSOs targeted through project activities understand their rights, policy development processes, and strategies for engagement with decision makers in order to address issues affecting their communities</p>	<p>4.1 Fieldworker diaries/reports (which answer indicator-related questions)</p> <p>4.1 Focus groups</p> <p>4.1 Triangulation</p> <p>4.1 Reports from trainers</p> <p>4.1 Ranking with community members</p>	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

		4.1 Anecdotal evidence (case studies)	
	<p>4.2 In the 2012 presidential and legislative elections in Sierra Leone the needs of the conflict-affected communities are publicly debated during the campaign as a result of targeted CSOs engagement and recommendations.</p>	<p>4.2 CDs/tapes of radio discussions during electoral campaign with CSOs as guest speakers</p> <p>4.2 Reports and minutes of official meetings where CSOs recommendations are discussed</p> <p>4.2 Media coverage during electoral campaign which specifically mentions project partners engagement and contribution</p> <p>4.2 Community meetings to obtain feedback on CSOs performance</p>	
	<p>4.3 In the 2012 Presidential and House of Representatives election in Liberia the needs of the conflict-affected communities are publicly debated during the campaign as a result of targeted CSOs engagement and</p>	<p>4.3 CDs/tapes of radio discussions during electoral campaign with CSOs as guest speakers</p> <p>4.3 Reports and minutes of official meetings where CSOs recommendations are discussed</p>	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	<p>recommendations.</p>	<p>4.3 Media coverage during electoral campaign which specifically mentions project partners engagement and contribution</p> <p>4.3 Community meetings to obtain feedback on CSOs performance</p>	
	<p>4.4 By 2013 a network of CSOs and researchers across the MRU are able to jointly engage and influence policies on the key issues affecting their communities as a result of joint forum discussions, exchange visits and research activities.</p>	<p>4.4 Reports of exchange visits</p> <p>4.4 Research produced by CSOs involved in the project</p> <p>4.4 List of network members</p>	
<p>5. An increase in the level of analysis and policy recommendations produced by targeted CSOs on the needs of conflict affected border communities made available to policymakers.</p>	<p>5.1 In Liberia by 2011, two CSOs and two CBOs make at least one set of recommendations each on key issues that affect border communities as part of the government's public consultation on decentralisation.</p>	<p>5.1 Policy documents with recommendations submitted by CSOs to government institutions in charge of the decentralisation process in Liberia</p> <p>5.1 Community meetings to obtain feedback about CSOs performance</p>	

<p>5. An increase in the level of analysis and policy recommendations produced by targeted CSOs on the needs of conflict affected border communities made available to policymakers.</p>	<p>5.1 In Liberia by 2011, two CSOs and two CBOs make at least one set of recommendations each on key issues that affect border communities as part of the government's public consultation on decentralisation.</p>	<p>5.1 Policy documents with recommendations submitted by CSOs to government institutions in charge of the decentralisation process in Liberia</p> <p>5.1 Community meetings to obtain feedback about CSOs performance</p>	
	<p>5.2 In Guinea by 2012 targeted CSOs produce research and make recommendations on key issues that affect border communities as part of the</p>	<p>5.2 Research materials</p> <p>5.2 Community meetings to obtain feedback about CSOs performance</p>	

**Activities – the initial planned activities and approaches for achieving project outputs**

- Conduct training workshops on organisational development, advocacy and thematic issues such as peacebuilding, security and development that will result in identifying key policy challenges to address through the project
- Undertake process for forming partnerships with 15 CBOs in the targeted border regions
- Deliver organisational capacity building support and mentoring to partners.
- Conduct participatory policy-oriented research and use for advocacy.
- Facilitate civil society forum discussions on thematic sub-regional issues.
- Produce written and visual material and reports on issues of peace, security and development in the MRU.
- Facilitate meetings between members of target communities with local, national and sub-regional decision-makers on important and urgent thematic issues
- Conduct meetings at the sub-regional level to share experiences and increase understanding of key issues and lessons learned from Africa and globally

Georgian-Abkhaz context			
	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
6. Target communities in the context of Georgian-Abkhaz societies are aware of their rights and possibilities as citizens and empowered to solve their problems by addressing government officials and state institutions.	6.1 At least 5 'success stories' at the end of year 2 (March 2010), where IDPs managed to improve their conditions through addressing state institutions.	6.1 Reports from IDP network members; media screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant state institutions are willing to consider and adopt suggestions from local partners and to respond to grievances.</li> </ul>
	6.2 By the end of project, at least three civic initiative groups are established in the Gal/i region, that involve local youth groups and that meet at least twice a year with youth groups in/from Sukhum/i.	6.2 Statistics from local administration in Gal/i 6.2 Monitoring by local partners in Gal/i; interviews with council members; minutes of meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite fragility the security situation in the Gal/i region does not deteriorate to a level that makes project implementation impossible or highly dangerous.</li> <li>Ability and will for IDP NGOs and Abkhaz NGOs to continue working with nascent CBOs in Gal/i</li> </ul>

	<p>6.3 Increased participation of IDPs as voters by at least 5% from 35% in 2004 in the target communities during local elections in Georgia (scheduled for spring 2010).</p>	<p>6.3 UNDP report <i>IDPs and their behaviour during elections</i>, May 2004; Official statistics from Precinct Election Committees (PEC)/ District Election Committees (DEC); statistics from MRA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability of CR, CDC and IDP advocacy group to maintain constructive links with decision makers and political party representatives.</li> <li>• Elections meet internationally accepted standards in terms of openness and fairness.</li> </ul>
	<p>6.4 Media reports on IDP issues do not decrease by more than 10% in at least three Georgian newspapers and two national TV channels from the current, high baseline level of 16 items in the first quarter of 2009.</p>	<p>6.4 Monthly media digests/monitoring (starting March 2009)</p>	<p>Media outlets are willing and able to feature contributions about IDP issues.</p>

<p>7. Creation of new, and improvement of existing, policies and programmes which address the concerns of conflict-affected communities in the Georgian-Abkhaz context, as a result of more effective formal and informal mechanisms for public participation.</p>	<p>7.1 (Indicator no longer relevant)  <i>Note: Initial plans to shift focus to IDPs in private sector in year 3 were abandoned in the past during year 3 as the National Action Plan on IDPs fell short of completing the settlement of housing and resettlement issues of IDPs in collective centres by 2011. A series of evictions left IDPs in collective centres disorientated and vulnerable, so resettlement processes and housing remained priority areas for Synergy and will stay on the agenda in the foreseeable future. In this light, we consider that this indicator no longer applies.</i></p>	<p>7.1 IDP action plan, minutes of steering committee, privatization law, other legal documents; monitoring of annual state budget;                      National Action Plan (NAP) on IDPs; Updates from MRA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability of CR, CHP, CDC and IDP advocacy group to maintain constructive links with decision makers.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

	<p>7.2 Civil society's initiatives for laws are being approved by decision-makers in Abkhazia: e.g. correction of election code (end of 2009); declaration of income (end of year 2); national programme/law on corruption (end of project)</p>	<p>7.2 Body of legal documents 7.2 interviews with officials and civic activists 7.2 focus groups</p>	
	<p>7.3 Local population in at least 1 community in Abkhazia takes part in budgeting decisions at the end of project (March 2013)</p>	<p>7.3 Protocols of local council meetings 7.3 focus groups with local population and officials</p>	
<p>8. Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations in the target communities to engage in advocacy, policy dialogue and monitoring</p>	<p>8.1 By 2013, at least 20 local and international networks, organisations, and state institutions consider and/or promote the IDP network as a valuable resource for recommendations and assessments of IDP issues in Georgia.</p>	<p>8.1 Media monitoring/digest 8.1 reports of local and int'l NGOs and state institutions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDP network members remain committed to shared goals and to promoting their activities not only as separate organisations but as network members and representatives.</li> </ul>

	<p>8.2 A 25% increase of the number of proposed and implemented projects (from 6 civic initiatives led by 4 CBOs at the outset of the project) each year by CBOs, especially youth groups in Abkhazia (in Sukhum/i and Gal/i districts) promoting good governance and transparency.</p>	<p>8.2 Media monitoring; 8.2 proposals and reports from local NGOs; 8.2 focus groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention in Abkhazia continues to be practicable and legal across the lifetime of the project, despite political tensions.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

**Activities – the initial planned activities and approaches for achieving project outputs**

- 6.**
- Conduct a series of focus group discussions and/or surveys with local populations to identify attitudes towards issues such as governance, civic participation and IDP/refugee rights, and corruption in at least 5 regions/communities in the Georgian-Abkhaz context, in order to identify major concerns and areas to focus on over the lifetime period of the project.
  - Through participatory consultation processes, CDC and the IDP network (especially the IDP advocacy group) will develop a policy agenda and promote it with political parties, state institutions and in the media, to promote political participation of IDP community, including women and young people.
  - CHP will identify partner CBOs in Abkhazia, including Gal/i, and plan civic education campaigns to raise awareness of specific governance and accountability issues. It will seek to engage with students and young professionals in the identified key sectors to make visible and support champions of these principles.
  - Carry out ongoing advocacy work (especially among IDPs in Georgia and Gal/i population) to empower local communities

to address and solve their own concerns at local governance levels. In year 1 and 2 in Georgia this will target 5-10 particular compact settlements in Tbilisi, Kutaisi and Zugdidi.

- ‘Success stories’ of effective civic participation initiatives and grassroots advocacy will be published and promoted in the local and national media, in order to uphold role models and encourage target groups and citizens in general to solve their problems by addressing state institutions.
- Media monitors both in the Georgian-Abkhaz context will be recruited to screen relevant papers and TV channels for contributions relevant to the project, and produce monthly digests.

**7.**

- Regular screening of public policy documents and programmes that are relevant to the focus areas identified as well as monitoring of their implementation, e.g. screen and/or produce relevant shadow reports.
- Conduct workshops on identified key issues with participation of partner CBOs and politicians at local as well as national levels.
- CHP and CDC will work with their partners to identify priorities, organise regular policy dialogue with relevant officials and politicians to address the priorities, and monitor the development and implementation of legislation, policies and programmes to respond to these needs. As necessary, they will mount public advocacy campaigns to push for legislative and policy reform.
- CHP will identify at least 1 community in Abkhazia and conduct joint workshops and meetings with local population and local administration representatives to create and carry out a pilot project for participatory community budgeting.
- CR will organise and facilitate meetings between NGOs in the Georgian-Abkhaz context, including IDPs and returnees, to exchange experiences, analyze how efforts to increase accountability and participation affect the peace process and identify points to feed into official negotiations.

**8.**

- CDC and CHP with support from CR will work with CBO partners to provide substantive training on governance issues, advocacy, public campaigning, and organisational development and support their activities with technical and financial inputs. Special target groups are the IDP network in Georgia, CBOs in Gal/i, as well as youth groups in Abkhazia (including Gal/i).
- Representatives of relevant local and international organisations, networks and officials will be invited to IDP network

meetings and other events; press releases and reports will be distributed widely among local and international communities.

FIJI			
Outputs	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
9. Increased understanding and use of the concepts of good governance, human rights, citizenship and Fiji's Constitution.	9.1 Significant (est. 4 %) increase, year on year, in the rural population's ability to express and explain these concepts, within the three target provinces (Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra).	9.1 UNDP Survey  9.1 Pre-education workshop survey  9.1 Workshop understanding assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CCF's grassroots education teams continue to move around the country with relative freedom.</li> <li>• No major restrictions imposed on CCF's advocacy activities by the government.</li> <li>• Media censorship is removed</li> <li>• The yearly UNDP survey takes place as planned and CCF gains access to the resultant data.</li> </ul>
	9.2 Modest (est. 2 %) year on year increase in ability to express and explain these concepts in the urban communities in Fiji.	9.2 UNDP Survey	

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	<p>9.3 Specific evidence in 60% of target communities (communities in Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra) of increased civic activity, by 2013).</p>	<p>9.2 Follow-up survey with local coordinator and workshop participants.</p>	
	<p>9.4 NOTE: We have removed this indicator because the media censorship laws in place do not allow us to monitor this indicator.</p>		
<p>10. Fiji has an agreed pathway towards a fair, representative and sustainable democracy based on inclusivity and respect for the rule of law.</p>	<p>10.1 70% of senior security force and senior government officials (PS and Ministerial level) to have participated in dialogue training and/or an inclusive dialogue event by 2013.</p>	<p>10.1 Monitoring of participant lists from the Dialogue Fiji initiative and other dialogue training processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiji returns to parliamentary democracy</li> <li>• The media is not unduly restricted</li> </ul>
	<p>10.2 By 2013 Fiji's military and political leadership are participating in a nationally inclusive and independently facilitated dialogue and constitutional formation process.</p>	<p>10.2 Monitoring the level of seniority of participants (Interim government and political parties) in Dialogue events</p>	

	<p>10.3 A modest year on year increase in informed public debate on the pathway towards sustainable democracy in Fiji's in the 'letters to the editor' pages of Fiji's two major newspapers.</p>	<p>10.3 Tracking the diversity of opinions (i.e. the number of people submitting letters), and rating the level of understanding of these concepts.</p>	
	<p>10.4 By 2013, no greater than 50% of Fiji's ministries have military personnel in senior positions (PS or equivalent, and Ministerial level).</p>	<p>10.4 Commissioned analysis</p>	
	<p>10.5 Decreased year on year incidence of government interference in the judiciary and court cases by 2013.</p>	<p>10.5 Quarterly report on the state of the judiciary and court cases.</p>	

<p>11. Improved political stability, through an increased acceptance of Fiji's cultural diversity.</p>	<p>11.1 Modest (3%) year on year increase in public acceptance of the concept of multicultural citizenship in the 3 target provinces (Tailevu, Naitasiri and Ra).</p>	<p>11.1 UNDP Survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fiji does not experience a serious, widespread and prolonged incidence of communal violence.</li> <li>▪ No major restrictions imposed on CCF's activities by the government.</li> <li>▪ Fiji returns to parliamentary democracy</li> </ul>
	<p>11.1 Pre-education workshop survey</p>	<p>11.2 National and international human rights reports (local NGO's, US state department, FHRC).</p>	
	<p>11.2 A 20% decrease in incidents of racism, hate crimes and discrimination by 2013.</p>	<p>11.3 CCF tracking the diversity of opinions (i.e. the number of people submitting letters), and rating the level of understanding of multiculturalism.</p>	
	<p>11.3 A modest year on year increase in informed public debate and discussion on issues related to multiculturalism and ethnic rights in the 'letters to the editor' pages of Fiji's two major newspapers.</p>	<p>11.4 CCF government policy monitoring report</p>	
<p>11.4 By 2013 at least one national policy decision on indigenous rights and/or resource issues will be clearly influenced by visible public debate.</p>			
<p>Note: Output 12 is removed from the logframe. See sensitive material section of narrative.</p>			

**Activities – the initial planned activities and approaches for achieving project outputs**

- Elicit, formulate and promote a social justice agenda that addresses the underlying causes of ethnic conflict;
- Encourage long-term political stability through civic education, public mobilisation, reporting and monitoring;
- Promote a less race-based electoral system through a legal process of constitutional reform;
- Work with media and civil society to respond to intimidation, potential violence from extreme/radical groups and from state institutions, including its security institutions;
- Amplify the voices of civil society through promoting dialogue and peace building initiatives with the interim government on key national issues, including the return to democracy;
- Promote government responsiveness and accountability by scrutinizing budgets, legislation and policy programmes against the framework of Fiji's constitution and international human rights standards and raising awareness of shortcomings and by conducting community education programmes on democratic governance, human rights and Fiji's constitution.

Uganda			
Outputs	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
13. Increased ability of civil society in Northern Uganda to hold Government and state institutions accountable.	13.1 By 2010 12 workshops in six target areas have informed communities about the content and relevance of the PRDP for northern Uganda.	13.1 Partner reports on the number of workshops held, attendance numbers and informal feedback from participants on what they have learnt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-scale war does not resume and there is sufficient stability to begin reconstruction and other peacebuilding</li> <li>• Continued progress in deepening democracy in Uganda, including toward improved decentralisation and multi-party politics.</li> <li>• Target communities are interested in engaging with government structures on peacebuilding issues.</li> <li>• Government officials and politicians are willing to participate in project sponsored policy dialogue and willing to take civil society contributions seriously.</li> </ul>
	13.2 By 2013, a cohort of young women and men from the five districts of northern Uganda are monitoring the implementation of recovery programmes and have made practical recommendations to Government at the district and national levels on measures to meet the needs of their communities.	13.2 Position paper submitted by the young people to their elected leaders 13.2 Monitoring reports from participating civil society group 13.3 One-to-one interviews with elected leaders	

<p>14. More responsive policy making processes that address key conflict issues and/or needs of conflict-affected communities in Northern Uganda, in particular women, youth and other marginalised social groups.</p>	<p>14.1 By 2013 a 30% increase in the number of CSOs in at least three districts of Northern Uganda who are engaging policymakers at the district and national level on issues affecting their communities.</p>	<p>14. 1 Reports and minutes of meetings between CSOs and policymakers at the district and national level</p> <p>14.1. Document reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submissions by project partners</li> <li>• Number of civil society submissions to parliament and/or Office of the Ugandan Prime Minister</li> </ul>
	<p>14.2 By 2011 project partners produce a joint policy report and set of recommendations on key governance issues in Northern Uganda.</p>	<p>14.2 Joint report</p> <p>14.2 Record of dialogue between policymakers (at the district and national level) with project partners.</p>
	<p>14.3 By 2013 parliamentary committees and Office of Prime Minister are receiving at least two submissions on policy and programme recommendations from civil society in target areas</p>	<p>14. 3 One-to one- interviews with Members of parliament and officials in the office of Prime Minister.</p> <p>14. 3 Joint reports submitted to Office of Prime Minister and Parliament.</p>

	<p>14. 4 By 2013 civil society groups cooperating across the Ugandan-Sudanese border are presenting joint ideas, analysis and views to policymakers on ways to deal with the legacies of conflict on the Uganda-Sudan border</p>	<p>14. 4 Community meetings in Uganda and Southern Sudan to obtain feedback about the issues raised. 14.4 Record of dialogue between policymakers (especially members of parliament) and CSOs on the joint report.</p>
<p>15. Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations to engage effectively with governments and policymaking processes.</p>	<p>15.1 Four partners have attended three workshops on policy development and advocacy skills and received 20 hours of support to improve their policy develop and advocacy skills.</p>	<p>15.1 Workshop reports 15.1 Feedback from partners 15.1 CR assessment</p>
	<p>15.2 By 2013, four partners have attended 4 workshops on conflict analysis and received 10 hours per year of support to improve their skills and knowledge.</p>	<p>15.2 Workshop reports 15.2 Feedback from partners 15.2 CR assessment</p>

	<p>15.3 By 2013, 6 civil society groups cooperating across the Ugandan-Sudanese border have on at least 4 occasions presented joint ideas, analysis and views to policy makers on ways to deal with the legacies of the Uganda-Sudan border.</p>	<p>15. 3 Focus group discussions 15.3 one-on-one interviews with CSO leaders.</p> <p>The joint ideas, analysis and views will be compared against existing, or in some cases (non) existing literature. We would also solicit feedback from policymakers on whether they found those ideas presented &amp; engagements useful in their decision-making.</p>
--	--	---

**Activities – the initial planned activities and approaches for achieving project outputs**

- Conducting training workshops on policy advocacy
- Conduct participatory policy-oriented research and use it for advocacy
- Conduct training/ sensitisation on PRDP
- Training paralegals / community groups focusing on dispute resolution in Northern Uganda
- Produce and disseminate written and visual materials and reports on issues of peace, governance and recovery in Northern Uganda
- Facilitate policy dialogue on cross-border trade (between Uganda and Southern Sudan)
- Facilitate dialogue and debate between elected leaders, the Ugandan Office of Prime Minister, and communities in Northern Uganda on issues of recovery
- Train partners in monitoring and evaluation and work with them to set up monitoring frameworks.

<b>Comparative learning – programme wide</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Important Assumptions</b>
<p>16. Analysis of CR and partners' strategies and methodologies for more effective governance that are particular to conflict contexts is shared and results in informing government, donor and NGO policies and programmes.</p>	<p>16.1 By 2013 at least 60% of feedback from participants in joint analysis workshops confirms an increased understanding of their shared challenges to and opportunities for making governance more accountable and responsive in their local context, policies or programmes.</p> <p>16.2 By 2013 at least 30% of interviewed readers of analytic reports and workshop participants confirm they have identified new strategies and methodologies from CR-led analysis and will apply these to future activities.</p>	<p>Questionnaires to a sample number of workshop participants</p> <p>Feedback requests via website.</p> <p>Interviews with 20 donor/government actors, in particular DFID governance advisers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is possible to convene joint analysis workshops in which partners from all project areas are able to participate.</li> <li>• Despite contextual differences between programme regions the analysis and interpretation of governance and the ability of civil society actors to influence these proves feasible</li> </ul>

**Activities – the initial planned activities and approaches for achieving project outputs**

- Partners and CR conduct two joint analysis workshops – 1<sup>st</sup> workshop in the first half of second year, 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop at end of fourth year – provisionally hosted by CCF in Fiji and the Justice and Peace Committee in Kampala, along with a series of public events targeting key audiences in the host country and wider region
- Following each workshop, produce a report analysing challenges of promoting governance in conflict contexts, identifying methodologies and lessons learned, and documenting mini-case studies from the projects. Report will be published in print and electronically
- Disseminate the report through partners’ and CR’s networks in-country and globally. CR will make it directly available electronically to a minimum of 17,000 people on its database and send the print version to the approximately 750 who are on CR’s strategic network of conflict transformation and governance practitioners. It will also be available on partner’s and CR’s website.
- Based on their experiences through the project, promote lessons learning through participation in national and international networks. CR will offer to conduct a meeting(s) for interested UK government personnel to brief them on the findings and likely implications for future policy and practice.

**Annex A3 Financial report**

**A3.5 – Expenditure to Date (31 March 2012) since start of Programme**

<b>Agreed Budget Lines</b>	<b>Total Agreed Programme Budget to date</b>	<b>Total Expenditure to date</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Variance %</b>
Budget line				
100 - Staff	£636,206	£448,245	£187,961	30%
Budget line				

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

200 – Prof Services				
Budget line				
300 - Premises	£104,999	£75,715	£29,284	28%
Budget line				
400 - Travel	£311,999	£215,365	£96,634	31%
Budget line				
500 - Events	£840,861	£678,243	£162,618	19%
Budget line				
600 – Furniture & Equip	£97,334	£83,977	£13,357	14%
Budget line				
700 – Office Supplies	£62,478	£36,835	£25,643	41%
Budget line				
800 - Communications	£100,537	£58,509	£42,028	42%
Budget line				
Evaluation	£59,381	£22,854	£36,527	62%
Budget line				
Indirect Costs	£450,000	£322,500	£127,500	28%
<b>Total for Period</b>	<b>£3,000,000</b>	<b>£2,189,958</b>	<b>£810,043</b>	<b>27%</b>

Note 2

Note 3\*

Annex 09 includes £15,116 funds received for Overspend in year 2010/  
2011

Note1

Note2	Individual lines within the total agreed budget will be updated to include Re-profiled Yr5&Yr6 budget changes once approved by KPMG
Note3	Total Expenditure figure differs to Annex figures submitted to KPMG for March Quarter end, an adjusted Annex is submitted to include Consultant fee and expenses for services incurred but omitted.

### **Annex A3.6 Value for Money (VfM) requirement**

Conciliation Resources introduced a Value for Money (Procurement) Policy in May 2011 to ensure goods, services and work are purchased in line with good practice and / or meet donor requirements. The process of commissioning services from Consultants is currently being reviewed and output/outcome focused contracts will be introduced.

We continue to use appropriate methods to achieve economies and build on existing and successful services to benefit from the most advantageous combination of price and quality of services, charity rates and discounts available.

Through our reporting we track savings against budget for services such as utilities and travel, where we can achieve benefit through consolidation of the activities or finding alternative providers and balancing cost savings against efficiency; for example, direct flights to destinations increasing time on the ground.

In our work with partners we provide training where needed in organisational and project management and require full reporting of costs and expenditure: monitoring the cost of services they provide, such as workshops, meetings and travel costs to ensure they are maintained at levels in line with local standards.

**Annex A4 Materials produced**

**West Africa**

Item	Date	Title of material	Description of	Web link
1.	August 2011	Findings of the Local Government Barometer in two border districts in Liberia: Tewor and Kolahun.	Results from use of monitoring using the barometer assessment tool for local government service provision.	<a href="http://www.iredd.org">http://www.iredd.org</a>

**Georgian-Abkhaz Context**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Title of material</b>	<b>Description of material</b>	<b>Web link</b>
1.	06/05/11	Public campaigns	Coverage of public campaigns 'My town – My home' carried out in 3 Abkhaz regions within the framework of GTF in year 3 (spring 2011) (in Russian, "12:01)	<a href="http://asarkia.info/asarkia/index7.php?ELEMENT_ID=52">http://asarkia.info/asarkia/index7.php?ELEMENT_ID=52</a>
2.	16/05/11	Synergy supplement in 'Rezonansi' national newspaper, No 7	Supplement financed through GTF, highlighting IDP perspectives on resettlement processes and work of IDP network Synergy undertaken with GTF support (in Georgian)	<a href="http://www.c-r.org/node/1471">http://www.c-r.org/node/1471</a>
3.	18/07/11; 03/10/11; 21/11/11; 26/12/11; 27/02/12	Synergy supplement in 'Rezonansi' national newspaper, No 8-12	Supplements not published with GTF financial support, but highlighting work of IDP network Synergy undertaken with GTF support (in Georgian)	<a href="http://www.c-r.org/resources?search_api_views_fulltext=synergy">http://www.c-r.org/resources?search_api_views_fulltext=synergy</a>
4.	17/11/11	Gal/i region: unresolved problems (reportage)	Short reportage ("02:47) on round table organised in Gal/i with GTF support (in Russian)	<a href="http://asarkia.info/asarkia/index7.php?ELEMENT_ID=223">http://asarkia.info/asarkia/index7.php?ELEMENT_ID=223</a>

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

5.	01/02/12	East Africa meets the Caucasus	Coverage of ECAP visit to Caucasus in UK Embassy's newsletter	<a href="http://ukingorgia.fco.gov.uk/en/about-us/working-with-georgia/british-embassy-projects/cp-projects/cr-uganda">http://ukingorgia.fco.gov.uk/en/about-us/working-with-georgia/british-embassy-projects/cp-projects/cr-uganda</a>
----	----------	--------------------------------	---	---

**Fiji**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title of Material</b>	<b>Type of Material</b>	<b>Number/date</b>	<b>Web link</b>
1	Tutaka	Quarterly Newsletter	3	<a href="http://www.ccf.org.fj/article/news/publications4/newsletters2">http://www.ccf.org.fj/article/news/publications4/newsletters2</a>
2	One nation diverse people – UDHR Article 1	Radio Advertisement	1	
3	The Bottom Line (guiding principles for constitution making)	Newspaper Supplement	2: 17/2/12 Fiji Times; 18/2/12 Fiji Sun	

***GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources***

4	International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination	Newspaper Supplement	1	
5	Non-derogable Human Rights	Radio Advert	1	
6	Media Freedom with Responsibility	Newspaper Supplement	1	<a href="http://www.ccf.org.fj/about_us/annual_report/may%20supplement.pdf">http://www.ccf.org.fj/about_us/annual_report/may%20supplement.pdf</a>
7	Right to Nationality	Radio Advertisement	1	

8	Stereotypes: Labels of Persecution	Newspaper Supplement	1	
9	Talkback Radio	Media	3	
10	Press Releases	Media	37	<a href="http://www.ccf.org.fj/article/news/media1/press-release">http://www.ccf.org.fj/article/news/media1/press-release</a>

**ECAP**

Item	Date	Title of material	Description of material	Web link
1.	January 2012	Draft Programme Document. ECAP Consolidation in South Sudan	Describes the various options that ECAP can adopt for South Sudan	Not on website.

**Annex A5 Web Update**

**Increasing government accountability in conflict zones through public participation in policymaking**

Conciliation Resources' GTF funded programme is operational in four regions: East and Central Africa; Fiji; the Georgian–Abkhaz context; and West Africa. Poor governance is often both a root cause of conflict and a major barrier to building lasting peace. The programme's purpose is to encourage increased public participation in policymaking, leading to greater government responsiveness and accountability.

Thanks to this funding, we support over a dozen diverse civil society organisations, building their capacities to transform conflicts.

Conciliation Resources is using innovative methods to inform and influence policymaking. In Fiji the Citizens' Constitutional Forum (CCF) has worked to strengthen the ability of communities to advocate for human rights, good governance and greater racial tolerance. By including rural areas CCF has made it possible for marginalised communities to participate in local politics and feed ideas into the countrywide constitutional reform process.

We are supporting border communities in marginalised areas of Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea to enable citizens to demand accountability from government. They are seeking to change the attitudes of officials towards peoples' needs and priorities. Working with community groups we have helped in the creation of district platforms for dialogue to enable communities to monitor and track how development funds are spent. We've encouraged policymakers across the region to understand the stresses experienced by border communities and improve the behaviour of officials towards them. Building public awareness and skills to understand how government works and their rights to services is new to these communities who have endured years of conflict.

In the Georgian–Abkhaz context, members of the Synergy network of internally displaced people influenced local authorities in the planning and spending of budgets for services to benefit local displaced communities directly. Displaced people have gained increased recognition of their needs and have learnt to hold local government institutions to account on issues that affect them. Through developing cooperative relationships with local authorities they have experienced improvements in their standard of living and positive changes in the way they are perceived. Practical results are being achieved, such as the allocation of public money to improve living conditions for displaced people, alongside moves towards recognition of their citizenship rights.

In South Sudan connections are being built between civil society and regional government in the areas in which the Lords Resistance Army (LRA) is operating. Women have organised into community groups recognised by government so they can access and monitor community development funds. In northern Uganda a post-conflict concern is the denial of land rights to women and others displaced by the long-running LRA conflict, who do not know the boundaries of their land. These people are stronger and more confident through inclusion as monitors and paralegals in their communities.

The overall impact of these programmes is that those with little power – women, widows, ethnic minorities, youth, and the displaced – can voice their concerns and participate in political processes. They are learning to engage effectively with policymakers in decision-making on issues that impact their everyday lives.

**Annex 6 Annual Work plan for 2012/13**

**West Africa**

Output No.	Description of Activities	Start Date	Finish Date	Verifiable Output for Activity	Responsible
	3. Partners demonstrate increased capacity to contribute to policymaking and research in the region.				
	Activity 1.1 Facilitate workshop to enable partners share experiences, lessons learnt and plan future action	13/06/2012	15/06/2012	Joint Plan for Year 5	CR
	Activity 1.2 Facilitate workshop to enable partners share experiences, lessons learnt and plan future action	12/12/2012	14/12/2012	Workshop report	CR
	Activity 1.3 Facilitate meetings to enable partner organisations develop guidelines for policy meetings based on information from scorecards	08/08/2012	10/08/2012	Policy guides from 2 partner organisations	CENCAD & LDI

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	4. Up to fifteen civil society organisations (CSOs) have a better understanding of how to hold their local and/or national governments to account and influence policy debate on the issues that affect border communities.				
	Activity 2.1 Facilitate workshop to train District Platforms for Dialogue in Sierra Leone and Guinea on how to use scorecards and governance barometer	10/07/2012	13/07/2012	Workshop reports	CENCAD & LDI
	Activity 2.2 Facilitate meetings to enable each District Platforms for Dialogue to identify priority areas of work in relation to specific governance processes pertaining to their context (Sierra Leone elections, Liberia decentralisation, Guinea post election non-violence).	07/2012	08/2012	Reports	CENCAD & LDI
	Activity 2.3 Organise workshop on experience sharing and lessons learnt among District Platforms for Dialogue from the 3 target countries.	11/09/2012	13/09/2012	Lessons learnt reports	CENCAD & LDI

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	5. An increase in the level of analysis and policy recommendations produced by targeted CSOs on the needs of conflict affected border communities made available to policymakers.				
	Activity N.1 Facilitate policy dialogue between District Platforms for Dialogue and the national policy actors based on data from governance assessments and scorecards	09/2012	02/2013	Report from Policy dialogue meetings	CENCAD & LDI
	Activity N.2 Ministerial Exchange Sierra Leone and Liberia on decentralisation lessons learnt from Sierra Leone experiences.	07/072012	09/07/2012	Report on Exchange, Monitoring report	LDI & CR
	Activity N.n Facilitate CSO partners in Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia to conduct a self-assessment on the overall project output and outcomes during the life of the project in West Africa and feed lessons to the documentation process.	11/2012	12/2012	Self-assessment reports	CENCAD & LDI

	Activity N.n Facilitate local partners to document and share lessons learnt on how to approach governance from peacebuilding/ conflict transformation perspective from five years GTF experience in West Africa. (Partner organisations document at their level plus a CR-led documentation process)	11/2012	31/03/2013	Lessons Learnt Report: GTF West Africa	CR & Partners
--	--	---------	------------	--	---------------

**Georgian-Abkhaz Context**

Output No.	Description of Activities	Start Date	Finish Date	Verifiable Output for Activity	Responsible
6.	Target communities in societies the Georgian-Abkhaz context are aware of their rights and possibilities as citizens and empowered to solve their problems by addressing government officials and state institutions				
	Operate resource centre for IDPs in Potskho-Etseri and conduct training and discussions on civic activism	01/04/12	31/03/13	Most vulnerable IDP community (at least 150), mainly youth have access to computer with internet, and a library, and are able to solve bureaucratic and legal problems in relation to unemployment, schooling, living conditions, etc.	Saunje, ISNC

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Students' competition, debates at university and short film on issues relating to anti-corruption programmes	01/05/12	30/11/12	Articles and short film produced that reflect young people's views and suggestions regarding anti-corruption programmes	CHP
	Small-scale opinion survey (focus groups and interviews) regarding administrative reforms and provision of municipal services.	July 2012	September 2012	Survey findings that illustrate public opinion on reform issues, to feed into recommendations and follow-up meetings with authorities	CHP
7. Creation of new, and improvement of existing, policies and programmes which address the concerns of conflict-affected communities in the Georgian-Abkhaz context, as a result of more effective formal and informal mechanisms for public participation.					
	Print and distribute papers on LSG and European standards of governance	01/04/12	30/04/12	150 hardcopies (in Russian) with recommendations on LSG and European standards of governance.	CHP

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Round Table and production of short film on LSG and modernisation processes with civil society and authorities	May 2012	May 2012	Recommendations drawn up in papers (see above) presented to and discussed with wider audience, and covered in local media, in order to pave way for improvements in policies.	CHP
8. Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations in the target communities to engage in advocacy, policy dialogue and monitoring					
	Quarterly network meetings/ joint workshops for info-sharing and planning across the regions, including the following thematic issues: electoral processes; political party platforms and how to influence them; budget monitoring;	01/04/12	31/03/13	Improved skills of Synergy members in regard to political processes and public participation: draft of priorities and recommendations in regard to IDP policies from IDP perspective; analysis of political party platforms in regard to IDP issues; exchange with political parties and Central Election Committee (CEC)	ISNC, Synergy

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	10 Synergy supplements in nation-wide newspaper Rezonansi, featuring issues such as political party platforms, IDP participation in electoral processes, resettlement processes	01/04/12	31/03/13	IDP perspectives in regard to political processes/elections promoted among mainstream Georgian readership	Postfactum, ISNC
	Mini-grant competition for Gal/i youth initiatives, 2-day seminar on organisational development and strategic planning, and final round table with NGOs and other civic actors in Gal/i	01/07/12	31/03/13	Gal/i youth have increased knowledge and skills to implement their own civic initiatives	CHP
	Production of short film on GTF-related activities and their results	01/12/12	31/03/13	Lessons learned captured and shared with wider audience on Abkhaz TV and online	CHP

**Fiji**

Output No.	Description of Activities	Start Date	Finish Date	Verifiable Output for Activity	Responsible
9. Increased understanding and use of, the concepts of good governance, human rights, citizenship.					
	Media Advocacy PRESS RELEASES Response to Government policies on CCF Policies advocating as per the organisation position on these issues (Refer CCF Policies) and issues of Current National concerns including the Constitution, Electoral Reform, Political Dialogue and National Reforms addressing the Human Rights, Good Governance and Citizenship from the perspective of content and process.	April 2012	March 2013		

	Community Workshops	April 2012	March 2013		
	Follow Up Workshops	Aug 2012	March 2013		
	Community leader Workshops	April 2012	March 2013	4 x Community Leader workshops conducted with (a) improved knowledge of HR, governance and citizenship, and (b) action plans developed.	CCF
	Community Based Organisation Workshops	April 2012	March 2013		
	Universal Periodic Review Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013		
	Peace and Governance Barometer Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013	6 monthly Peace and Governance Barometer reports developed and distributed.	CCF
	Rural Youth Community Workshops	April 2012	March 2013	5 workshops conducted in covering Ra, Naitasiri, Tailevu, and Ba, with (a) improved knowledge of HR, governance and citizenship, and (b) 75% of trained youth leaders have developed an advocacy project plan.	CCF

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Engaging Pacific	April 2012	August 2012		
	Dialogue Fiji	April 2012	March 2013	4 Divisional Dialogues and 6 sector based dialogues conducted Dialogue Fiji registered as a company.	DF
10. Fiji has an agreed pathway towards a fair representative and sustainable democracy based on inclusivity and respect for the rule of law.					
	Media Advocacy Talkback Radio	April 2012	March 2013		
	Tutaka Newsletter Quarterly	April 2012	March 2013	4 quarterly newsletters produced and distributed	
	Social Media Advocacy (Facebook, Website Hits, Issues, Twitter)	April 2012	March 2013	Number of hits and comments	
	Peace Day celebrations Advocacy 21st September 2012	Sept 21 2012	Event		
	Human Rights Day Advocacy 10th Dec	Dec 10 2012	Event		
	Short Film/Documentary	April 2012	August 2012		
	National Budget Training Workshops	May 2012	June 2012		

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Public Lecture Constitutional Issues series	July 2012	October 2012	2 lectures conducted and number of attendees.	CCF
	Rule of Law and Justice Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013	Monthly reports	CCF
	Constitutional Dialogues x 3 in 2012	April 2012	Dec 2012	3 constitutional dialogues conducted	
	Media Monitoring and Report (Weekly Report for immediate week ending	April 2012	March 2013	Monthly Media Monitoring Reports	
	Militarisation Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013	2 x 6 monthly reports	
	Government Action Against the Charter Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013		
	Youth Forum and Leadership Mentoring	April 2012	March 2013		
	Youth Street Theatre and Advocacy Project	April 2012	March 2013		
	Creative Arts Sponsorships on CCF Thematic areas	April 2012	March 2013		
	Youth Advocacy Training	April 2012	March 2013		
	Monitoring and Evaluation Youth Programme	April 2012	March 2013		
	Regional Advocacy (organisations PIFS)	August 2012	August 2012		

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

11. Improved political stability, through an increased acceptance of Fiji's cultural diversity.					
	International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Event and Advocacy. 21 <sup>st</sup> March	March 21 2012	Event		
	Fiji Day Advocacy (October)	October 10 2012	Event		
	Annual Report	April 2012	July 2012		
	Perception Index Survey Media Advocacy	July 2012	Sept 2012		
	Media Advocacy Stakeholder Workshop	Sept 2012	Sept 2012		
	ICERD monitoring and Report	April 2012	Sept 2012	Report completed and presented to UN in Geneva	
	Indigenous Institute Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013		
	Racism/ Hate Crime and Sacrilege Monitoring and Report	April 2012	March 2013		

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Mining Research – Economic Justice	Jan 2013	March 2013		
	Minority Rights Group Joint Research	April 2012	March 2013		
	Survey (M & E) Workshops results	April 2012	March 2013		
	Urban Youth Workshops	April 2012	March 2013	3 workshops covering Ba, Nausori and Lautoka	
	School outreach	April 2012	March 2013		

**ECAP**

Output No.	Description of Activities	Start Date	Finish Date	Verifiable Output for Activity	Responsible
13	Increased ability of civil society in Northern Uganda and South Sudan to hold Government and state institutions accountable.				
	Activity 1: Peace recovery and Development Plan monitoring	April 2012	March 2013	Periodic monitoring reports discussed with communities and local Government leaders	CR/JPC
	Activity 1.1 Review of lessons learnt- to feed in the design of PRDP II	June 2012	February 2013	Regular dialogue with Governments and other agencies monitoring PRDP	JPC

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Activity 1.2. Developing a policy paper on Amnesty law and the need for reconciliation	June 2012	October 2012	Discussion paper	CR (Totto Chan, JPC, ARLPI)
	Activity 1.3: Community reconciliation- perspectives of communities	November 2012	April 2013	Issues paper on reconciliation Discussions with local leaders and Governments representatives on the practical need for reconciliation	ARLPI
	Activity 1.4: Advocacy at the local, district and national level on various issues (amnesty, reconciliation, land conflicts, cross-border issues)	April 2012	March 2013	Reports of various meetings	Totto Chan, JPC, ARLPI with support of CR
	Activity 2: Cross-border Dialogue				
	Activity 2.1 Developing Action and implementing action plan for cross-border dialogue	April 2012	March 2013	Action plan Developed Action Plan implemented 3 Issues paper presented in Kampala and Juba	CR

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

	Activity 2.2 Partners trained on alternative to violence	August 2012	February 2014	Workshop/ training reports	JPC
	Activity 2.3: Facilitate the cross-border committee to develop and implement action plan	April 2012	March 2013	Report of meetings	CR/ JPC/ ARLPI/ Totto Chan

15	Increased institutional capacities and skills of civil society organisations to engage effectively with governments and policymaking processes.				
	Activity 2.1 Follow up training on advocacy/ policy development in the region	November 2012	November 2012	Training report	CR
	Activity 2.2 Support partners to develop their skills in conflict analysis, governance and project implementation and reporting	April 2012	March 2013	Increased skills among partners	CR/ JPC/ Totto Chan/ ARLPI
	Activity 2.3 Mediation of land conflicts in northern Uganda	April 2012	March 2013	Activity reports	ARLPI/ JPC
	Activity 2.4 Training of community leaders on alternatives to violence	April 2012	April 2013	Training reports	JPC/ ARLPI/ Totto Chan with support of CR

Activity 2.4 Working with partners in South Sudan to define the parameters of governance in conflict. This is necessary given the changing political situation in South Sudan after 9 <sup>th</sup> July (a new country will be formed and new governance structures and systems are being set up)	October 2012	April 2013	Report on Governance challenges in South Sudan	Totto Chan
Activity 2.5: Documentation of best practices in land mediation in northern Uganda	October 2012	April 2013	Report on best practices	ARLPI/ JPC

### **Annex 7 Local partner list**

**The updated partner list is attached as an Excel file.**

The CSO AGENDA in **Liberia** reported as an additional partner in AR 3, is no longer working on the West Africa project.

**ECAP** Partners are changing in roles as the broader CR ECAP programme extends across borders into South Sudan, CAR and DCR, with GTF supported work focused on South Sudan but with lesson sharing and support from the experience of the Uganda partners:

Totto Chan, a child trauma centre based in Juba, South Sudan: Totto Chan has a track record of collaboration with UNICEF, and has supported former child abductees returning from the LRA in Southern Sudan to civilian life. Jim Long John, the Director of the Totto Chan has been instrumental in the last three years in coordinating cross-border peacebuilding between Uganda and Southern Sudan, and among communities/tribes within Sudan. He works with men and women, religious and traditional leaders and elders in cross-border peacebuilding work. As lead contact, Jim has long-standing links with our key Ugandan partners. Totto Chan currently has a peacebuilding officer who is responsible for day-to-day management of peacebuilding activities. The challenge, however, is that Totto Chan is institutionally weak and is yet to fully develop the governance structures.

Acholi Religious Leaders' Peace Initiative (ARLPI): Established in 1998, ARLPI is an interfaith initiative for peace in northern Uganda that has developed a network of community-based peace-committees in the IDP camps, and has a record of inter-community mediation, contacts with LRA and a strong advocacy voice at the local, national and international levels. Since 2000,

CR has collaborated with ARLPI on a number of projects such as: strengthening ARLPI's organisational capacity, international and national advocacy, work with communities to resolve emerging disputes, research, cross-border peacebuilding work and developing a strategic plan.

The Justice and Peace Commission of Gulu Archdiocese has been active in northern Uganda since 2001, particularly in inter-community peacebuilding, and in establishing a network of paralegals/ community based volunteers in the IDP camps across the LRA affected areas of northern Uganda, promoting community based mediation/ dispute resolution. They are instrumental in our community engagement initiatives.

**Annex 8 Main contacts list**

The third contact, Fundraiser , has changed. See also Excel copy.

**Contact Details**

<b>Organisation Name:</b>	Conciliation Resources		
<b>GTF Reference Number:</b>	GTF 003		
	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Email:</b>
<b>Chief Executive Officer for your Organisation</b>	Andy Carl (Executive Director)	Mr	<a href="mailto:acarl@c-r.org">acarl@c-r.org</a>
<b>Lead Contact for GTF Programme (if different from above)</b>	Jonathan Cohen (Director of Programmes)	Mr	<a href="mailto:jcohen@c-r.org">jcohen@c-r.org</a>
<b>Authorised Signatories for Funding Requests (if different from above)</b>	Juliet Williams (Finance Manager)	Ms	<a href="mailto:jwilliams@c-r.org">jwilliams@c-r.org</a>
<b>M&amp;E Expert (if exists)</b>			
<b>Any other relevant persons</b>	Giulia Girardi (Funding Officer)	Ms	<a href="mailto:ggirardi@c-r.org">ggirardi@c-r.org</a>

**Annex 9 Short articles**

**Short Article 1 – Georgian-Abkhaz Context**

### **Resilience in the face of displacement**

“One of our goals is to ensure that displaced people have decent living conditions,” says Lali Grigolava, a campaigner from Tskhaltubo in western Georgia. And over the past year, with the help of a support network funded through GTF, she has been able to do just that.

Lali is a member of Synergy, a nationwide network of internally displaced persons (IDP) set up over ten years ago with support from Conciliation Resources to help Georgians displaced by the war in Abkhazia articulate their views and improve their lives.

Around 20 grassroots organisations across the country now belong to Synergy. Members say that by working together they have been able to achieve much more than they could have done alone.

More than 200,000 people lost their homes during the Abkhaz war in the early 90s and most still occupy the emergency accommodation provided for them back then. Traumatized by the conflict, and marginalised within wider Georgian society, the IDPs have struggled to find a voice.

In 2010 Lali decided it was time to become more active. Encouraged by Synergy, she started a local women's group in Tskhaltubo and joined the network.

Lali's biggest success so far has been to get the local council to sort out the chronic, power supply problems which have affected the area for years. This has made a huge improvement to everyday life, lifting spirits and making it easier for small-scale local initiatives to function properly.

Lali also intervenes on many day-to-day welfare issues, from ensuring people get the right state benefits, to helping local IDPs who are being moved to new accommodation.

Resettlement has become a key issue for Georgia's displaced. As the government tries to revive tourism, it is seeking to reclaim and renovate many of the hotel complexes which provided emergency housing after the war. All over the country IDPs are once again being uprooted. It's a painful process.

“This is [our children's] home, and if they have to leave they will go through the same pain our generation went through when leaving Abkhazia.”

Thanks to advice from lawyers working with Synergy Lali is able to keep a close eye on the resettlement process, making sure that in Tskhaltubo everyone knows their rights, and things are done according to the law.

Local residents in Tskhaltubo see Lali as someone they can really rely on for help. She works tirelessly to ensure everyone is kept abreast of the latest government thinking on IDP issues and the conflict in general. She holds meetings in IDP centres and appears regularly on local television – which has helped raise the profile of IDP issues among the wider community too.

With parliamentary elections approaching in October 2012, Lali and other Synergy members have decided it's time to start speaking out on peace-building issues. They are working on a plan to engage with political parties and ensure that this election campaign sees a proper and honest debate about the peace process and the prospects for return.

## **Short article 2 – Fiji**

### **Ratu Peceli Bolavucu youth leader**

Ratu Peceli Bolavucu is the Youth President of Namulomulo village. Peceli was a participant in the CCF Community Education Workshop held in Namulomulo village in the Tailevu province of Fiji. The CCF Community Education Workshops are one-day interactive workshops aimed at building people's understanding of Human Rights, Good Governance, Citizenship and Multiculturalism. Each workshop aims to provide people at the grassroots level in Fiji with the knowledge to improve good governance practice, advocate for their rights as citizens, and promote cross-cultural understanding and acceptance.

Before the CCF Community Education Workshop, Peceli felt that he did not have adequate skills as a leader and therefore the village youth organisation was not effective and did not have effective activity planning in place. During the workshop in April 2011, Peceli learnt about good governance principles and how a good leader can use them to help plan and bring about activity outputs. As a result of the workshop, he applied good governance practices to his work and within the village youth organisation he led, bringing about a positive attitudinal change amongst the organisation's members. For example, Peceli explained that "We created a one year plan for the organisation with new, clear objectives and we have already [7 months later] met most of those objectives. In the usage of money we now produce receipts on monies used and other things being used, and every meeting minutes are noted down and recorded".

Between April 2011 and March 2012, CCF conducted a total of 47 Community Education Workshops across Tailevu, Naitasiri, Ba and Ra provinces in Fiji, involving 1648 local community members (about 1% of the population of these provinces). Of these participants, 60% were male and 90% were i-Taukai (indigenous Fijian) and 10% were Indo-Fijian. As well as increasing knowledge and understanding of Human Rights, Good Governance, Citizenship and Multiculturalism, the workshops create a safe space for people to share their thoughts and feelings about the country under military rule. .

Through building a practical understanding of Human Rights, Good Governance, Citizenship and Multiculturalism, and providing safe spaces for dialogue on these issues at the local level, CCF believes that their Community Education Workshops serve in helping to enable the diverse people of Fiji to play a part in societal and national governance. Through the workshops the

participants will have an increased capacity to demand from their leaders accountability and transparency in their behaviour and actions, and also recognise that as community / national leaders they have a responsibility to deliver good governance practices to their constituencies.

CCF also believes that through building these understandings and demands for human rights, good governance and multicultural citizenry at the local level will provide the foundation for creating meaningful and sustainable mechanisms throughout all levels of society, and ultimately create an sustainable democracy in Fiji.

**High resolution photos for the stories are in a separate file.**

**Annex B1 Programme budget all years**

**Annex B1 Detailed Budget for all project years  
Conciliation Resources GTF003**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Agreed Budget Lines</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure 2008/09</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure 2009/10</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure 2010/11</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure 2011/12</b>	<b>Budget 2012/13</b>	<b>Budget 2013/14</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Detailed budget line 100 - Staff	£69,398	£118,990	£132,891	£126,966	£136,128	£33,662	£618,035
Detailed budget line 200 – Prof Services	£62,451	£65,318	£65,895	£54,051	£72,205	£17,370	£337,290
Detailed budget line	£15,318	£19,043	£19,684	£21,670	£20,958	£7,809	£104,482

**GTF Annual Report 2011-12. Conciliation Resources**

300 - Premises							
Detailed budget line							
400 - Travel	£43,174	£51,221	£55,921	£65,049	£37,889	£21,059	£274,313
Detailed budget line							
500 - Events	£77,127	£219,857	£205,477	£175,781	£180,656	£71,376	£930,274
Detailed budget line							
600 – Furniture & Equip	£46,576	£18,613	£8,005	£10,784	£15,110	£-	£99,088
Detailed budget line							
700 – Office Supplies	£5,403	£16,012	£9,326	£6,094	£6,897	£5,562	£49,294
Detailed budget line							
800 - Communications	£11,268	£23,360	£12,881	£11,000	£8,666	£10,668	£77,843
Detailed budget line							
Evaluation	£-	£5,894	£13,948	£3,012	£15,050	£21,477	£59,381
Detailed budget line							
	£52,500	£90,000	£90,000	£90,000	£90,000	£37,500	£450,000

Indirect Costs							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>£383,215</b>	<b>£628,308</b>	<b>£614,028</b>	<b>£564,407</b>	<b>£583,559</b>	<b>£226,483</b>	<b>£3,000,000</b>

Re-profiled Budgets for remaining years is available as an Excel file.

**Annex B2 Politically sensitive information**

Language used to identify regional contexts where there is political sensitivity has been chosen to avoid difficulties for implementation of the programme and stakeholders. Politically sensitive information has been saved in a separate file. This relates to the governance and rights situation in one region.

**Annex C1 Outstanding issues**

Any outstanding issues are addressed in the report and/ or included as separate annexes. E.g. Annex C2 Risk assessment tables, Annex D1 Report of ECAP Georgia exchange of learning.

**Annex C2 Risk Assessment tables**

**West Africa:**

Risk	Potential impact	Probability	Mitigation measures
	High/medium/low	High/medium/low	Show how you are tackling the risk in question
<b>External:</b> Legislative clerks in Liberia might not be assertive in providing information which could slow information gathering process at the national level	Low	Low	Organised meetings with legislators & legislative clerks to develop better understanding of the project and build trust and support
<b>External:</b> Lessons from other district platforms might not be applicable given socio-cultural, political & religious context	Medium	Low	Developed deeper understanding of the power relations and dynamics, interest and influence of stakeholders and how to engage at different governmental levels irrespective of context
<b>External:</b> Upcoming Election in Sierra Leone, 17 November 2012. The risk of election violence.	High	Medium	DPDs organise non-violence campaigns in the target districts and monitoring early-warning signals and reporting to district Security Councils. DPDs continue to campaign for people in communities to opt for non-violence.

<p><b>External:</b> There is a current debate on the type of decentralisation Liberia should opt for and whether there is a capacity to implement it. This might delay the passage of the decentralisation Act.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Developed comprehensive buy-in strategy including: high level meetings; policy papers; public hearings; and lobbying</p>
<p><b>External:</b> Government officials especially during an election year in Sierra Leone might feel threatened by social audits.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Engender clear understanding of social audit objectives among local government officials and how it improves service delivery</p>
<p><b>External:</b> Narrow space for civil society to operate especially at the national level to demand accountability in Guinea. (De-concentration model)</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Lobby individual ministries and institutions on specific issues for change.</p>

<b>Internal:</b> CENCAD's Executive Director's aspiration to go into active politics as a political party candidate of the incumbent government which may or may not be an advantage through leverage in policy making	High	Medium	New leadership to work with the DPD and provide space and leverage for them to engage and demand the changes required.
<b>Internal:</b> Reorganisation of partnerships weakens delivery of activities.	Medium	Medium	Reallocation of funds used for central costs of partner deployed to support CBO networks locally.

**Georgian-Abkhaz context:**

Risk	Potential impact	Probability	Mitigation measures
G/A - Risk 1 <b>(External)</b> Recurring political unrest in Georgia poses a danger of full-scale political crisis. Further developments in this direction where government and opposition are not able to engage in	Low to medium impact on the ability of CR, ISNC and the IDP advocacy group to maintain constructive links with decision makers and political party representatives. And the new law on political parties adopted in December 2011 could potentially deem Synergy's engagement with	Low	Support to the IDP network continues in order to promote their engagement in democratic processes at local and national levels. In the event of political disruption some activities would have to be postponed until the situation calms down again to enable lobbying for changes in policies

<p>dialogue and compromise to find a solution to the crisis, can potentially lead to violence and a diminution of the democratic space.</p>	<p>political parties in the run-up to elections in 2012 and 2013 illegal.</p>		<p>and strategic policy meetings with various political parties. However, grassroots advocacy work would continue.</p>
<p>G/A – Risk 2 <b>(External)</b> Local branches of Georgian Interior Ministry put pressure on local communities, including network members, local authorities and beneficiaries</p>	<p>Medium impact on beneficiaries, civil servants and IDP network members that would limit their space to manoeuvre and willingness to engage in programme activities</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Network members would need increased support on the ground and intensified engagement with authorities as well as grassroots communities. <i>Synergy</i> members already invest significant time and energy to make their programme work as transparent as possible and demonstrate that it is not harmful to interests of the Interior Ministry. This effort will be intensified with first signs of interference on the part of the ministry at any level, e.g. by</p>

			arranging bilateral meetings with officials in the ministry.
<p>G/A – Risk 3 <b>(External)</b></p> <p>Internal political tensions in Abkhazia and increased pressure from the Russian Federation in regard to involvement of ‘Western’ organisations and the role of civil society could potentially rise higher in light of recent friction with EU officials and Abkhaz authorities.</p>	<p>Medium Increased political tensions would make involvement in Abkhazia more difficult, in particular in the Gal/I region, and potentially paralyse partners’ activities for a number of months.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>CHP would potentially have to rethink and identify issues relating to effective governance and transparency that are less sensitive.</p> <p>Advocacy work in the Gal/I region would again have to be postponed.</p>

<p><b>External:</b> New leadership could potentially be less appreciative of the nature of CR's and partners' work.</p>	<p>Medium to high: The space for civil society activism and 'Western' engagement in general may narrow.</p>	<p>Low to medium</p>	<p>CR and partners make sure to foster relationships with various political actors, including the political opposition in Abkhazia, and to clarify purpose and scope of the programme, in order to counter potential scepticism and critique.</p>
---	---	----------------------	---

**Fiji**

Risk	Potential impact	Probability	Mitigation measures
	<p>High/ medium/ low</p>	<p>High/ medium/ low</p>	<p>Show how you are tackling the risk in question</p>
<p>Fiji Risk 1 (Internal) The Fiji programme manager is unable to visit Fiji due to the Fiji government stopping entry.</p>	<p><b>Medium:</b> If prolonged this will have adverse effects on the outputs of all activities.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>CR now has a programme support position based in Fiji, enabling a level of continuity of activities.</p>

<p>Fiji Risk 2 (External) Increased personal security risk due to changed political climate, leading to partner office closures and activity cancellation / delays.</p>	<p><b>High:</b> If prolonged this will have adverse effects on the outputs of all activities.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Partners have a level of flexibility within activity timeline to enable a 'catch-up' phase, e.g. in community education workshops</p> <p>Partners maintain a level of dialogue and engagement with the Fiji government on intended activities.</p>
<p>Fiji Risk 3 (External) Broad censorship is re-imposed on the media - banning CCF's radio education and advocacy.</p>	<p><b>Medium:</b> Will stop/halt the ability to undertake certain activities.</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>The Fiji government has removed censorship laws, but a level of government 'media harassment' still exists.</p>	<p>CR would help partners in divert resources to other activities with same/similar outputs – such as local theatre, education workshops.</p>

<p>Fiji Risk 4 (External) The Fiji government damages the legitimacy of the constitutional development process through stopping / overly interfering with the process.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>CR would help partners in diverting resources to advocate for dialogue / democratic processes.</p>
--	-------------	---------------	---

**ECAP**

Risk	High/ medium/ low	High/ medium/ low	Show how you are tackling the risk in question
<p><b>External:</b> The Governments of Uganda and South Sudan put pressure on partners thus limiting their activities.</p>	<p><b>Medium:</b> impact on partners, beneficiaries, and civil servants in the districts (Uganda) and State (South Sudan) that would limit their space to manoeuvre and willingness to engage in programme activities</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Partners will need increased support on the ground and intensified engagement with authorities as well as grassroots communities. CR and partners already investing significant time and energy to make their programme work as transparently as possible. Local Government leaders in both countries appreciate the added value of the programme and are also convinced that the programme is complimentary</p>

			<p>to governments' efforts.</p> <p>In both countries, local Government officials do participate in most of the programme activities.</p>
<p><b>External: South Sudan.</b> Increased levels of violence within South Sudan and open hostilities (with possibilities of full scale war) between South Sudan and Sudan likely to affect programme implementation.</p>	<p><b>High:</b> Increased instability in South Sudan increases the prospects for LRA activity in South Sudan and their (LRA) possible return to northern Uganda.</p> <p>Increased political instability in South Sudan will adversely effect the achievement of the programme objectives, especially the cross border strand of our work.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Carry out regular risk analysis and design means to protect the space for engagement of partners across the border;</p> <p>Divert resources to support advocacy aimed at promoting return from the LRA ranks</p>

<p><b>Internal:</b> Totto Chan becomes unable to establish itself as a respected NGO and CR is unable to provide necessary support for partner's professional and organisational development.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>CR continues to support the development of the capacity of Totto Chan and it's networks (women, religious and traditional leaders – for instance in conflict and governance analysis, financial management and reporting, project design, participating in field monitoring missions to the communities).</p> <p>Furthermore, CR organised joint events and meetings of all partners to encourage learning between them and identifying synergies in approaches, tools and targets.</p> <p>In addition, CR supports partners in programme implementation. For example, in March 2012, CR supported Totto Chan and it's network members to organise a cross-border event involving political leader, CSOs and communities.</p>
---	-------------	---------------	--

<p><b>External:</b> Increased donor funding to northern Uganda and South Sudan that has no component of capacity building of local organisations results in existing partners getting over-stretched (and pulled in different programme directions). The available funding also makes an 'artificial' distinction between Governance and peace building projects</p>	<p>High: If it happens, it will delay achievement of impact.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Regular briefing of the donor agencies in Kampala and Juba in one-to-one meetings, and through the donor technical groups.</p> <p>Support the partners to develop their action plans that are realistic and in line with their mandate</p>
--	--	-------------	---

## **Annex D1 Learning exchange**

### **East Africa meets the Caucasus**

#### **Study tour organised by Conciliation Resources**

**2-12 October 2011**

#### **SOME REFLECTIONS**

*Mira Sovakar, Caucasus Projects Manager and Kennedy Tumutegyereize, East and Central Africa Programme Director. Conciliation Resources*

Conciliation Resources (CR) organised a visit by civic actors from East Africa to the South Caucasus. During a 10-day visit, CR's partners from northern Uganda and South Sudan shared perspectives on issues of public participation and effective governance in conflict-affected regions with a range of Georgian-Abkhaz context civil society interlocutors, as well as international actors based in the region.

In a series of informal work meetings and public events, the group examined experiences of displacement, managing diversity, the challenges of building democracies, and women's roles in peacebuilding in the Caucasus, and shared experience from the long-running conflicts affecting Uganda and South Sudan.

#### **Background**

The experience of violent conflict has a devastating impact on a society's ability to govern itself and on the potential to promote sustainable development and public wellbeing. Ineffective governance is often both a root cause of conflict and a major obstacle to building lasting peace. At the same time the legacies of conflict – such as polarised societies with high levels of distrust and damaged institutions – create specific barriers to improving governance.

In 2008 Conciliation Resources began a five-year programme with partners in four geographical areas - West Africa, northern Uganda (with southern Sudan), the Caucasus and Fiji. Funded through UKAid's Governance and Transparency Fund and building on CR's long-term engagement in these regions, the initiative's aim is to enhance prospects for sustainable peace in regions affected by conflict by promoting public participation in holding governments to account. Central to this is a shared belief that in societies where diverse local communities have a voice and feel confident that their concerns are being taken seriously and addressed adequately by those in authority, there is less space for violent conflict to erupt.

Each of the contexts in which we are working has experienced conflict in a different way. The degrees, causes, legacies and the ongoing risks of violence have their own dynamics. Similarly, in each region the interplay between conflict and the search for sustainable peace has assumed a different character. However, while the conflicts and peace processes have been different, the aspiration on the part of active citizens to engage in the transformation of their societies and give a voice to people most affected by conflict has been apparent in each region.

In this context, the current visit, which followed a visit by Caucasus partners to Uganda in 2010, was designed to promote better understanding of the complex challenges partners are facing in their respective contexts, and to create opportunities for joint reflection and learning.

### **Democratisation**

Our colleagues from East and Central Africa gave a public talk in Tbilisi and a seminar at the university in Sukhum/i where they outlined progress and challenges in regard to democratisation processes. They identified the inherent lack of common vision within the affected communities as a key obstacle, as well as contested narratives on issues of governance, history, conflicts and how to resolve them. Each group (ethnic, cultural, linguistic, geographical, religious) formulates worst-case scenarios of each other's intentions, while demagogic leaders dominate the political space by selectively using the historical record to validate their analysis. Thus the failure to manage diverse politicised polities is at the heart of Africa's conflicts. While colonialism and neo-colonialism is often blamed for Africa's woes, the bottom line is that post-colonial African leaders have done little to reverse the situation. Rather than facing the challenges squarely, most governments defer their responsibilities to 'their patron states' in the west to resolve their conflicts, and help build key institutions that are pillars of democratisation - such as independent electoral bodies. Political leaders in Africa often seem not to support the idea of strong institutions that might be critical of their actions. A lot of the reflections from the African context resonated strongly with audiences in the Caucasus. A civil society representative in Tbilisi concluded: We could simply exchange a few terms, figures, names and place names from your presentation, and would have an accurate account of our realities in the Caucasus.

Civil society plays a crucial role in democratisation processes in East Africa and the South Caucasus, for instance by providing a watchdog role and monitoring elections. In Uganda, in a number of cases, civic actors have initiated bills that have subsequently been taken up by parliament such as the Amnesty Act and Access to Public Information Act. In Some cases, non-governmental organisations (NGO) have taken the Government to courts to challenge certain laws and practices that are considered to be undemocratic or unconstitutional. The challenge, however, is that the authorities rarely take civil society seriously and view them as opposition. The international support to NGOs is ad hoc and unstructured; and governments manage to muzzle the influence of civil society through restrictive laws and intimidation of activists.

When discussing progress and challenges in regard to gender democracy at a public seminar in Tbilisi, experts from the Caucasus agreed that good legal frameworks are not enough. Due to lack of political will at various ends and traditional gender roles and stereotypes ingrained in the societies, both countries fall short in implementing equality laws and putting them into practice effectively. The Georgian audience applauded progressiveness in terms of parliamentary quota that were put into place in Uganda and were very impressed that their African 'sisters' hold 131 out of 375 parliamentary seats, as well as 28% of the Ministerial positions - including Finance and Economic Planning, Trade and Industry, which are traditionally reserved for men in most governments. At the same time, there was a strong sense that this high level of female representation in decision-making did by far not guarantee that women's concerns are being adequately addressed in state policies and practice. For instance, women in Uganda still face serious challenges in regard to inheriting property including land inheritance, which illustrates that quantitative representation alone does not solve problems of inequality. All agreed how important it was for a society as a whole to recognise the importance of gender equality as an integral part of democratic development that affects both women and men equally. During the visit the civic activists from East Africa got the impression that both men and women in the South Caucasus still had a way to go in breaching taboo topics such as domestic violence and gender-based violence. Despite a number of NGOs working to address these issues, they felt there was still a lack of space for more open and honest debate among the broader public.

### **Displacement and participation**

Issues of displacement are highly politicised in the contexts we work in. Often statistical data are disputed and figures are being downplayed or inflated by respective stakeholders, while displaced communities are among those that are most affected by ongoing conflict and violence. Comparing the circumstances of Georgians displaced from Abkhazia as a result of the 1992-93 war, whose return has not been possible due to protraction at the political level, with those in Uganda and Sudan who were forced to flee their homes from the LRA but have since started returning in large scales, seems futile at first site given the very different nature of displacement in both regions. However, discussing very practical obstacles that prevent return from happening in the East African context, illustrates that a political solution alone does not necessarily mean an end to displacement. Partners from South Sudan and Uganda, countries where 7 out of 10 citizens and 3 out of 10 citizens respectively have experienced displacement at least once over the past thirty years, stressed how important it was for many to maintain the right to return. In their opinion it was equally important to grant individuals the freedom to choose NOT to return in cases where potential returnees are facing unresolved land disputes and safety issues, or where they and their children have put down roots in a new place. Here they pointed out the dilemma of defining 'at which point one ceases to be an IDP'. All these are concrete issues that need to be addressed in the Georgian-Abkhaz context also, but are often overlooked because the political issues dominate public discourse. Entry points need to be created in all the societies affected to allow constructive debate to happen that can eventually lead to practicable and durable solutions.

Interlocutors involved in the study trip found that in each context IDPs and refugees are grappling with similar challenges on the ground whilst in displacement. Housing, access to education and healthcare as well as resettlement, eviction and lack of political participation were among the issues that were discussed in more detail.

Colleagues from Uganda and South Sudan felt that they had a lot to learn from the IDP network Synergy that unites over 15 organisations across different regions of Georgia and has existed for around a decade. In the East African context, civil society networks are rather short-lived and often donor-driven. Together with Synergy network members the visitors discussed benefits and challenges of working together in a loose coalition. They were impressed by the network's close engagement with local authorities at some levels and its progress in promoting issues of IDPs in the public and policy domains.

Displaced communities are among those most affected by ongoing conflict and should be involved in offering and finding solutions. While the Synergy network seems to be successful at mobilising displaced communities and raising issues with local political and municipal leaders, the activists from eastern Africa suggested there could be more emphasis on placing the views, perspectives and concerns of IDPs in regard to the conflict in the wider political discourse in Georgia and internationally.

### **Engagement**

Ugandan and Sudanese partners observed a degree of dynamism and commitment to finding peaceful solutions to the conflict in the Georgian-Abkhaz context communities. However, they got the sense that there was very limited interaction among civic actors across the divide. While opportunities have been created where people meet on 'neutral' ground, such opportunities seem to be rather narrow, and focusing on relatively few individuals.

The group was struck by the extent to which the respective narratives and analyses diverged in societies in the Georgian-Abkhaz context when talking about the conflict and what it was about. This was particularly apparent when discussing the role of Russia in the past and present. On one hand, the Abkhaz society generally appeared to see Russia as a 'protector', and at the same time struggled to define her long-term political, economic and diplomatic influence. Georgians on the other hand regard Russia as one of the key players that makes resolution of the conflict extremely difficult.

The example of the Ingur/i hydro power station, where people in the Georgian-Abkhaz context are 'forced' to co-operate for the benefit of all communities, reminded the visitors that it was possible for Sudan and South Sudan to work out arrangements around sharing oil resources and refineries. In both contexts shared needs can be an impetus to co-operate despite political differences.

Our colleagues from East Africa were particularly interested to hear how young people in the Georgian-Abkhaz context are viewing the protracted conflict and what role they see for themselves to help find possible solutions by engaging with one another and with different groups within their own societies. There was a strong sense that the conflict over Abkhazia will not be resolved in the near future and that therefore the younger generation needs to be engaged and start working on long-term strategies for improving

relations and creating societies that are ready to transform conflict peacefully. In this regard the group felt encouraged by their interaction with youth groups and students on both sides of the Ingur/i river. However, they also recognised the challenge of finding greater buy-in for dialogue processes within the societies as a whole and were concerned by the apparent pressure and distrust toward dialogue participants within parts of the respective societies.

In general, the visitors observed the lack of sound policies for reconciliation and insufficient channels for communication between civil society and authorities. They felt that while there is a systematic engagement with policy makers in some regions at local levels, both by the IDP network and youth initiatives, this is evidently not replicated at the higher levels of central government.

### **Learning Lessons**

Observations and experiences made by partners and Conciliation Resources staff during this trip will be further processed in May 2012, when we bring together partners from across all regional programmes around the world at a joint analysis workshop in London. The three-day event presents a unique opportunity to share experience of working on this project and to subject to scrutiny the assumptions and analysis that have informed our shared endeavours. In doing so we will examine cross-cutting issues, compare methods for promoting effective governance in conflict situations and look at what has worked and what has not. Conciliation Resources prides itself in being an organisation that supports and learns from the way in which local actors link analysis and practice. This initiative is designed to generate concrete ideas and best practice to improve the ways in which governance is undertaken in zones of conflict and fragility.

### **Acknowledgement of support**

This trip was made possible through generous support from UKAid, the UK government's Conflict Pool, the Netherlands' Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.

END