



IMD

Partner in democracy



REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE IMD/IEA PROGRAMME IN GHANA

2000 - 2003

Drs. Jan Peter Dijkstra
Prof. Kofi Kumado

25 September, 2004

Table of Contents

List of acronyms	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction	6
I. Overview of the IMD/IEA programme in Ghana 2001-2004	8
II. Political parties overview and main developments and trends during the evaluation period	12
III. The evaluation issues	
1. Results	
Effects on process of democratisation and multiparty democracy	15
Effects of projects on the institutional capacity of political parties	16
Results of individual projects	17
Efficiency and consistency in objectives implementation	20
2. Programmatic processes	
Process towards formulation	21
Demand driven approach vis-à-vis intended results	22
Qualitative development of projects during programme period	22
Functioning of monitoring mechanisms in programme implementation	23
3. Implementation modalities	
Functioning of overall programme management	23
Registration and documentation of projects	24
Added value of the chosen cooperation and implementation modalities	24
IV. Lessons learned	
Need for continuation and possible future direction	26
Programme budget and absorption capacity of political parties; need for additional initiatives?	26
The role of the IEA and main functions it should undertake	27
Improvement of quality of projects - demand driven approach	27
Selection of political parties in the future programme	27
Possible indicators to measure impact of programs, to monitor progress and to compare to other similar programmes	29

Annexes

1. Evaluation programme	30
2. Terms of reference for the evaluation of the IMD/IEA programme in Ghana	32
3. Evaluation questionnaire	36
4. Bilateral activities NPP, NDC, PNC and CPP 2003 – 2004 – IEA overviews	39
5. Joint activities 2003-2004 – IEA overview	44
6. Joint activities – IMD preference list	45
7. Files review résumé – bilateral activities NPP, NDC, PNC and CPP 2003 – 2004	46
8. Budgets and disbursements 2003 and 2004 – IMD overview (only hard copy)	49

List of acronyms

CDD	Ghana Centre for Democratic Development
EC	Electoral Commission
FES	Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
FNS	Friedrich Naumann Stiftung
GJA	Ghana Journalists Association
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
IMD	Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy
IPAC	Inter Party Advisory Committee
JAP	Joint Action Plan
NCCE	National Commission on Civic Education
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PAF	Political parties Activity Fund
PMS	Programme Management System
PWC	PriceWaterhouseCoopers
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Chapter II contains the list of acronyms of the Ghanaian political parties.

Executive summary

1. At the request of IMD an external evaluation of the IMD/IEA programme Ghana 2001-2004 took place from 5 to 17 September 2004. The evaluation team consisted of former Netherlands ambassador Jan Peter Dijkstra, consultant Catalic-Netherlands, and Professor Kofi Kumado, Director of the Legon Centre for International Affairs, University of Ghana.

2. The evaluation had the objective of measuring the results achieved and, if possible, the impact of the programme in relation to its initial objectives; to review the programmatic processes, the implementation modalities including the programme management, the role and functions of IEA and the relationship to other organisations active in the field of support to political parties in Ghana. The team was asked to advise on the possible future direction of the programme and the selection of political parties that should be included in the future programme.

3. IMD identified the Ghana programme in 2001 and 2002, entering its phase of implementation in early 2003. The basic documents underpinning the cooperation with political parties in Ghana are the Memorandum of Understanding on the Programme Framework Protocol and the Programme Framework Protocol. The representatives of IMD, the IEA, and the political parties NPP, NDC, PNC and CPP signed this document on 14 January 2003. The cooperation resulted in the realisation in Ghana of a political party Platform that works co-operatively to strengthen democracy in Ghana, to open and maintain channels of communication between them and to strengthen political parties individually. The four active non-parliamentary parties, GCPP, NRP, DPP and EGLE, were gradually involved in the joint activities of the Platform.

4. As follow-up to what was agreed in January 2003, IMD and IEA signed in 2003 and 2004 agreements, covering respectively the bilateral support to the four political parties for operational costs and a one time funding for basic equipment, the funding of bilateral activities of the four parties, the funding of joint activities and the funding of IEA for its facilitation of the platform and the management of the funds and facilitation of the bilateral component of the programme. Programme expenditures in 2003 amounted to Euro 427.951,-. The actual budget expenditures for the first half-year of 2004 were at Euro 399.000,-. The approved programme budget for 2004 is Euro 634.399,-.

5. Main conclusion of the evaluation team is the main objectives of the programme have been achieved and that the programme is contributing to the consolidation of multi-party democracy in Ghana. This conclusion is based inter alia on the following elements: the state of inter-party relations in Ghana at the commencement of the programme; the development since then of a vibrant dialogue between and among the political parties in Ghana; the stimulation of policy-making within the political parties and the evident camaraderie which has developed among the leadership of not only the four political parties involved in the bilateral programmes but the remaining four which participate actively in the joint party activities. In this connection, mention should also be made of the process leading to the revision of the 2000 Code of Conduct and its launch. This process has involved not only the political parties but also the Electoral Commission, the National Commission on Civic Education, and the media and, to some extent, the wider Ghanaian public.

6. During the evaluation, everyone interviewed by the evaluators stressed the uniqueness of the IMD/IEA programme in relation to the interventions of other development partners in Ghana because of the bilateral programme and the cross party activities. The bilateral programmes have contributed to the strengthening of the management capacity of the parties. Each party involved in the programme has credited their improved service delivery to their members and greater ability to reach out to non-members. Indeed, an unexpected benefit to which all the parties drew the evaluators attention is the improvement in internal democracy by the reorganisation of internal decision-making process necessitated by the desire of the parties to ensure that the programmes submitted to IMD/IEA are

really what the parties want and not only what a section of their leadership think would be good for the parties.

7. The groups that benefited most from the bilateral programme differ from party to party. On the whole, one can say that middle level operatives of all four parliamentary parties benefited most. Further, the creation of the function of policy analysts has clearly strengthened policy formulation within each of the four participating parties together with a functional apparatus. Out of this, there is a noticeable improvement in the ability of the parties to package their messages and the substantive contents of the message.

8. As to the cross party component of the programme the evaluators are of the opinion that the joint responsibility of the parties for the joint activities is key to the overall success of the platform as it has been demonstrating so far. The implementation role of IEA is complementing this perfectly as the political parties have all expressed to the evaluators their satisfaction with IEA's performance of these functions and with the general trust that they have in IEA as a neutral facilitator. The role of IEA as an even-handed partner in the cooperation has been key to the current successes.

9. The added value that the programme in Ghana reflects is very much the same as in other countries where IMD works. The IEA/IMD programme is a niche in the support to political parties in terms of direct funding. There are no other sponsors active in Ghana following the same modalities. On the bilateral level the parties benefit most from this modality. That is not to state, as was argued above, that the support to the platform and the implementation of joint activities is of less significance. The platform and the joint activities have been very successful compared to what others have been able to do with political parties. The force of this cooperation is in the first place in the ownership and demand driven character of the programme. Secondly it is in the way it is being facilitated by a Ghanaian Institute.

10. The process for the design and formulation of the programme depends on the type of programme. The Platform of General-Secretaries and policy analysts of the four parliamentary parties deals with the Joint Action Plan. IEA assists with facilitation and technical support, in particular as relates to budgeting. Apart from quality, there are a few weaknesses to the process: ensuring that this programme has been validated by the members of the platform within their individual political parties; absence of a place for the non-parliamentary parties to influence the choice, design and formulation of the individual activities and finally the tacit ceding of budgeting responsibility to IEA by the Platform, evidence of the trust the parties have in IEA and the credibility of the Institute, but unduly separating design from costing. The focus is on the process as it functioned at the time of the evaluation. Technically, IEA has played the budgeting role commendably. Evaluators made recommendations to address these questions.

11. As to the quality and capabilities of the political parties in the bilateral programme and project management the evaluators see room for improvement. Most important are the development of qualitatively improved proposals and compliance with agreed reporting requirements, both in substance and timeliness. The evaluators have taken into account that only just over a year of practical implementation has past and that political parties needed time to gain experience.

12. The evaluators were generally satisfied with programme management arrangements. They saw as minor disadvantage of the present construction that IEA will have to make more efforts than an IMD representative to translate the general experiences of IMD in other countries or on general themes into the Ghana programme. It is recommended that IMD should pay attention to that side of the relationship with the IEA team and the potential inputs it can give. Internally IEA could do some streamlining of the registration of documents under the various contracts and establish a structured programme monitoring system. IMD could share its own good practices here with IEA.

13. As to the future direction of the programme the evaluators see good prospects for deepening the dialogue between the parties. The Platform and particularly the Caucus of Chairmen of political parties are committed to take on the sensitive question of potential inter-party conflict and the development of mechanisms to help resolve these questions. The evaluation team finds that the inter-party dialogue merits remaining the central focus of the cooperation with the prospect of widening the agenda. At the same time the programme developed by the platform underpinning and enhancing dialogue through joint operational activities and including all active political parties, is an indispensable ingredient in promoting the main programme objective. This programme will have to remain tailored to the actual and longer-term needs of the parties as a group. The parties should be soon in a position to move somewhat away from the elections focus and to look at the need for more general institutional development and capacity building. This applies to both the orientation of the joint activities programme and the individual programmes of the parties.

14. The bilateral programme has also contributed a great deal to the success of the first years of cooperation. For the parties it was a crucial and highly appreciated component of the partnership. It was found that most of the parties have clear ideas how they would like to move forward as an institution after the elections. There is also scope for creating more concrete links between the joint activities and the bilateral projects. As to the size of bilateral funding/drawing rights the evaluation team would not advise against a modest increase in the longer run, but would put at this stage quality improvement before increase in funding, for the reasons discussed in its report.

15. One of the most frequently discussed issues was the selection of political parties to the programme. At the time of the IMD identification of the programme there have been numerous consultations, leading to the initiation of the Platform with the four political parties in parliament. Whilst other parties were invited to take part in joint activities of the Platform these parties' awareness grew that there was more going on in the field of IEA support to political parties than initially perceived. The lack of information on the precise form and nature of support has created a number of misperceptions about the IMD/IEA programme that has, for good or bad motives, become part of a public debate as the evaluation team could witness. All in all the evaluation team can conclude is that the process has not derailed the programme, but that in the light of the IMD/IEA general programme objective of promoting multiparty democracy, the complaints must be taken seriously and be discussed on the merits. The evaluators have focussed on the specifics of the Ghana situation and on what in a particular context and particular moment is possible to forge with full support of main stakeholders. There is no doubt the start with the four selected parliamentary parties has allowed the process to develop reasonably efficiently, particularly on the dialogue and consultations side.

16. On the basis of its discussions the evaluators could conclude that the parties are interested in finding appropriate solutions to this question. The main advice the evaluators can give is that the matter should be given to the political parties themselves to debate and to reach agreement on (the principle of ownership). This will eliminate or at least minimise any sense of discrimination or unfair exclusion. A discussion of an expanded platform may be broadened to bring in the Electoral Commission. The year 2005 would be a good starting point for revised participation, taking into account that elections have taken place by then.

17. The general recommendations of the evaluation team on this matter are the following:

- Conclude that programme developments in Ghana warrant a new look at the criteria for inclusion of parties in the various programme components;
- Recognise that the effectiveness of programme implementation will be affected by the number of parties included and that programme effectiveness remains an important consideration in this matter;
- Recognise that the joint projects have been very successful because they were all-inclusive exercises; a weakness is that not all parties were part of design and priority setting in the JAP;
- Indicate that for all parties involved or to be included in the programme, and particularly in the bilateral component, basic capacity and good performance is a criteria for eligibility for funding;

- Ask, on the basis of the relevant part of the report of the evaluation team, the for the present purposes expanded platform of the eight parties, to consider the matter and then to advise how the parties could give their ideas what the precise criteria could be under which bilateral funding for operational costs and operational party activities could be granted, such as a parallel and possible input to the continued public funding debate; this may include a weighing mechanism on the basis of he representativity/electoral strength of parties;
- Ask the Advisory Council to consider the matter on the basis of the report of the evaluation team and the outcome of the discussions of the expanded platform.

18. On the question of developing indicators for measuring the impact of the programme and monitoring performance it was found that the IMD programme is becoming more specific in defining in a structured and logical manner the relation between objectives, activities results and allocated budgets. The IMD Ghana annual plan for 2004 is a good example of this working method. The Joint Action plan follows its own structure but it is possible to link the actions and activities proposed by the Platform to the logical frameworks internally used by IMD. This provides a monitoring framework on the programme level. It would be useful in coming years to focus IEA on this approach and to take is as a basis for both the services that IEA is expected to deliver, as well as a structured monitoring tool for the output of the Platform. The same approach can be applied to the individual activity plans of the parties. Most of them have a rudimentary logical framework, wherein activities and target groups and sometimes methodology is defined. What is still missing is the definition of the expected outcomes/results and the initial costing.

19. Examples of good monitoring practises that are already applied by some political parties are: the invitation of observers to events, the conclusion of meetings and trainings with a documented evaluation by the participants, either collectively, individually or both, the submission of a post-activity report within 14 days after the event; the review by parties of the impact of previous workshops as an input to follow-up; the invitation of the media to events and the monitoring of the press on programme related outputs etc. The comparison to other programmes can only be effective if similar monitoring standard and elements were used and the quality of information would on average be of the same level. As argued, the aforementioned structuring of IMD's own annual country plans is an important step in that direction.

Introduction

An external evaluation of the IMD/IEA programme Ghana 2001-2004 was undertaken from 5 to 17 September 2004. The evaluation team consisted of former Netherlands ambassador Jan Peter Dijkstra, consultant Catalic–Netherlands, and Professor Kofi Kumado, Director of the Legon Centre for International Affairs – University of Ghana. The evaluation programme is detailed in annex 1 of this report.

The objectives of the evaluation were the following:

Firstly, to measure the results achieved and, if possible, the impact of the programme in relation to its initial objectives. This includes an assessment of the possible effect of the project on the process of democratisation of the political system and/or its contribution towards multiparty democracy in Ghana; the effect of the project on the institutional capacity of the party(ies) involved and the evaluation of the individual projects themselves.

Second, to review the programmatic processes in order to have a better understanding of the methodology and the operational modalities applied over the last two years and their impact on the programme. This includes the form of the co-operation, the administrative procedures and the role of IMD's local partner in the implementation, the Institute of Economic Affairs.

Thirdly, to indicate what lessons can be learned, the need for a continuation of the programme and its possible future direction, the ownership of the programme, the selection of the political parties that should be included in the future programme etc.

(Annex 2 contains the full terms of reference of the evaluation).

Methodology

The evaluation was carried out on the basis of the methodological approach recommended in the terms of reference, consisting specifically of:

- Study of documents, including the programme agreements, minutes of meetings, IMD mission reports, memoranda, correspondence, contracts, project documents and narrative and financial reports;
- Briefings and interviews with IMD staff in the Netherlands and the IEA staff and the IMD liaison office in Accra;
- Meetings and interviews with party leadership and functionaries of the political parties forming the Platform of the cooperation programme and some other parties involved in the joint activities;
- A workshop of representatives of registered political parties involved in the IMD/IEA programme to discuss common issues;
- A meeting with the Advisory Council of the programme;
- Other stakeholders in the process of democratisation such as the Electoral Commission (EC), the National Commission on Civic Education (NCCE) and media representatives;
- Heads of donor agencies running programmes in support of political parties;
- The auditors of the programme, PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC);
- A meeting with the Netherlands ambassador in Accra.

The files reviewed of all the parties involved in the bilateral component of the programme were reviewed. These files contained information on the bilateral activities implemented by the NPP, NDC, NPC and CPP under the political parties activity fund (PAF) and the funding of operational costs of the parties in 2003 and 2004. Furthermore the file containing the information on joint activities in 2003 and 2004 was reviewed. Most of the information on the preparation of the joint activities is documented in the reviewed minutes of meetings of the Platform (for an outline of the cooperation programme reference is made to chapter I of this report).

The review of the relevant documents took place as analytical reading according to relevant elements of questionnaire designed by the evaluators, focussing on the documented preparation and results of the activities, the process and the implementation methodology and modalities (see annex 3 for the evaluation questionnaire).

Follow-on assessment took place as a part of the above-mentioned interviews with the four political parties of the Platform and the relevant members of the staff of IEA as the funds manager and the main implementing partner for the joint activities.

Most of the interviews were conducted by the two evaluators jointly, following the above mentioned questionnaire that had been organised such that an easy selection could be made of the questions to the actors that were most suitable to provide the needed information.

In the case of the political parties interviewed, the team met with practically all the chairmen and general-secretaries of the parties, as well as policy analysts and national party officials directly involved in the preparation and implementation of the joint and bilateral activities.

A workshop was organised for the political parties. All eight parties involved in the joint activities were present, not only those that had been visited bilaterally. The session focussed on three main questions:

- Criteria and conditions (i) to become and (ii) to stay partner on the IMD/IEA programme;
- Appraisal of the joint activities programme 2003 – 2004;
- Views on the future direction of the joint activities programme / further development of the dialogue and cooperation between the political parties, both in terms of themes/issues and implementation modalities.

The workshop started later than planned due to the late arrival of participants. The discussion over two hours focussed mainly on the first item, the selection of parties under the current programme. Some remarks were made on the relevance of the executed joint activities and a possible focus in the future. All participating parties got ample time to highlight their views and the discussions were held in an atmosphere of cordiality, generally oriented more to consensus and conciliation on the main issue than to confrontation.

The evaluators used the last days of their mission to draft their report, of which the main findings were used to give a debriefing to the IEA staff and the IMD liaison office in Accra. Final editing of the report took place in the subsequent days.

The evaluators thank the IEA staff and IMD liaison for all the support they received from them in the preparation and during implementation of their mission. They have very much appreciated the hospitality extended to them when using the IEA office as home basis for their evaluation work.

Structure of the evaluation report

The Executive Summary is capturing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. Chapter I, summarising the IMD programme on the basis of factual information derived from the IMD and IEA documentation, follows the introduction of the report.

Chapter II provides an overview of political party life in Ghana and discusses the main developments and trends during the programme period. These first two chapters are meant to provide a general background to the following core chapter of the report, dealing with the evaluation issues.

Chapter III follows as much as possible the structure of the terms of reference and the order of questions posed to the evaluators. The three sub-chapters deal with respectively with programme's results, programmatic processes and implementation modalities. They form the basis for the main lessons learned that are presented in chapter IV.

1. Overview of the IMD/IEA-programme in Ghana 2001 - 2004

Introduction

IMD started talks in Ghana with representatives of the four parties represented in parliament in 2001 as a part of the identification and development of the broader IMD programme in a number of selected countries. The process of identification in Ghana ran parallel to identification of opportunities for cooperation in other countries, like Guatemala, Bolivia, Tanzania and Suriname. Two identification missions took place, one in November 2001 and a follow-up mission in January 2002. Based on positive findings, IMD subsequently organised a start-up conference with IEA in May 2002. The aim was the introduction of IMD to a wide spectrum of political stakeholders in Ghana and to engage in consultations about options to support – in impartial ways – the institutional development of political parties. The outcome of these discussions form the basis for consultations of a follow-up mission with the parliamentary political parties at IEA and deliberations with the Electoral Commission in October 2002, leading to an expression of interest to participate in a platform of political parties to identify a national agenda aiming at consolidating democracy within a spirit of national reconciliation. On that occasion agreement was reached in principle about the outlines for a draft program framework. The set-up for the foundation of a platform in partnership with IEA was endorsed in November 2002 when the president of IEA visited IMD in The Hague (sources: IMD Annual Report 2002 and the text of the Program Framework Protocol dated 14 January 2003).

The identification and preparation of the programme in Ghana was a sensitive process, that was successfully concluded by IMD by bringing on board and reaching agreement with all main stakeholders, including IEA as the programme facilitator.

Main programme objectives, definitions, preferred projects, eligible projects

The terms of reference of the evaluation refer to the following objectives and definitions:

- The main objective of the IMD/IEA-programme for Ghana is: *“the promotion of the process of democratisation by supporting political parties [in Ghana] in the area of capacity building”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).
- The definition of capacity building has been formulated as follows: *“The strengthening of political parties on all levels, from the top to the local cadres, of the party infrastructure, as well as the promotion of a democratic culture and behaving with the leadership and cadres of the party”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).
- A more specific objective for the first year of the programme was: *to assess the opportunities and constraints for the long-term institutional development of political parties in Ghana and to develop an agenda (action program) on how these challenges can be addressed and supported. The assessment will be undertaken with the objective of consolidating the democratic reform process in Ghana* (source: report of an IMD mission 13-14 January 2003).

In view of these Objectives and definition, the kind of projects that would have preference in the programme (according to the IMD criteria) are:

- Political training regarding principles and processes of multiparty democracy;
- Leadership training, specially for cadres on provincial and local level;
- Training in management capacities;
- Joint projects that can promote mutual trust and collaboration between parties;
- Development of better channels of communication between chosen representatives and their voters, including strengthening of political accountability;
- Strengthening of financial management capacities;
- Improving processes of policy definition;
- Strengthening the influence and participation of women in political parties.

General programme developments in 2003

The basic documents underpinning the cooperation is the Memorandum of Understanding on the Programme Framework Protocol, ceremonially signed in Accra on 14 January 2003 by the representatives of IMD, the IEA, and the political parties NPP, NDC, PNC and CPP. A signed Programme Framework Protocol supplemented this MOU. The MOU covered the year 2003.

In the preamble of the MOU the signatories “consider it desirable for the promotion of stability of the democratic process in Ghana that the Registered Political Parties in Ghana should create a forum for constructive interaction between the said political parties”. For the purposes of the MOU the registered political parties is defined in the MOU as NPP, NDC, PNC and CPP.

The MOU defines the functions of Forum, inter alia:

- The institutional development of all the registered political parties, and
- Keeping open the channels of communication between the individual parties.

The Programme Framework Protocol defines the Forum as a Platform of General-Secretaries of the registered political parties, with the mandate to assess the opportunities and constraints for the long-term institutional development of political parties in Ghana and develop an agenda (action programme) on how these challenges can be addressed and supported. The assessment will be undertaken with the objective of consolidating the democratic process in Ghana.

The (expected) outcome of the platform is described in the Programme Framework Protocol as “a common multi-annual action programme that identifies implemental programs that aim at the institutional development of the parties individually and at strengthening the legal and political provisions under which the political parties collectively can strengthen their functions and performance”.

Developments in 2002 and early 2003 allowed IMD to state in its subsidy request 2003-2006 to the Minister for Development Cooperation that the Ghana cooperation had reached its implementation phase and that a cross party programme was under preparation. The requests give an outline description of the programme focus, expected results in the short and longer term and the main partners. In the short term the Ghana programme was expected to lead to institutional development of the parties and increased capacity of the parties on national and regional levels. In the longer term the expected results were dialogue on party programmes and the creation of a linkage of political reform and poverty alleviation (national agenda/PRSP). The IMD year plan adds to this information that there is a good basis for implementation via IEA.

The cooperation in 2003 resulted in the realisation in Ghana of a political party platform that works co-operatively to strengthen democracy in Ghana, to open and maintain channels of communication between them and to strengthen political parties individually. As agreed under the MOU policy analysts of each of the four parties were appointed and contribute to the work of the platform their own parties.

As follow-up to what was agreed in January 2003 IMD and IEA signed in mid-March 2003 three agreements, covering respectively the bilateral support to the four political parties for operational costs and a one time funding for basic equipment, the funding of bilateral activities of the four parties and the funding of IEA for the facilitation of the platform and the management of the funds and facilitation of the bilateral component of the programme.

Political parties on the Platform of General-Secretaries of the parties, facilitated by IEA completed in July 2003 a Joint Action Plan (JAP) for 2003 focussing on four issues:

1. Organising parties political broadcasts;
2. Drafting a code of conduct for political parties;
3. Creation of conflict resolution mechanism;
4. Organising symposia on issues of common interest to all parties.

The four parties attached to the JAP their individual programmes for bilateral activities. The JAP was submitted to IMD and approved.

In autumn of that year three symposia took place on the topics of public funding of political parties, elections and inter-party conciliation. The preparation of a code of conduct was started in 2003 but was not finalised that year. The joint activities on the broadcasts and conflict resolution mechanism developed more slowly. Funding for the joint activities in 2003 was drawn from savings from the bilateral operational cost agreement.

On the bilateral side, the four parties all developed and implemented activities mainly for skills and policy training, strategic planning and organisation of cadres at various party levels (sources: IMD year plan 2003; IMD Annual report 2003; JAP 2003 and bilateral plans; IEA bilateral projects overview; progress reports of IEA and the political parties).

In the same year Advisory Council, consisting of five eminent Ghanaians, was instituted.

The lessons learned – as stated in IMD annual Report 2003 - was that the challenge during the initial phase of the programme was to clarify the various roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved, to set up the communication mechanisms and to clarify the reporting procedures and requirements. These are key aspects in the cooperation that require dedicated time and attention to ensure that mutual confidence is established, while efficient working procedures are drafted. The report continues in saying that the approach has been successful in establishing the relations with all the stakeholders into an operational programme. The forthcoming general elections at the end of 2004 have put the focus on some of the immediate concerns. The challenge will be to move the inter-party dialogue beyond the short-term concerns and to focus on a longer-term agenda for consolidating multiparty democracy in Ghana.

General programme developments in the first eight months of 2004

IMD formulated its framework for the Ghana programme for 2004 on the basis of a sub-division of content objectives and activities, process objectives and activities and programme support. The last component consists of expected objectives, activities, results and (estimated) four representation/monitoring, technical assistance and evaluation. Along the same line the content component has the categories party systems, political parties and democratic culture and practise. The process component deals with dialogue, ownership and partnerships. Proposed budgets for contents and process are respectively Euro 455.000,- and Euro 145.000,-, a total of Euro 600.000,- for programme expenditure and another Euro 25.000,- for programme support and evaluation.

As noted already, it was anticipated by IMD that during the elections year 2004 the programme will focus on supporting political parties in the run up to the elections, not on campaigns but rather on facilitating the dialogue and the outreach of the various parties' perspective on societal issues. The main objective of the programme is to let the parties work on and present a long-term programme on strengthening the role of political parties to consolidate the Ghanaian multiparty democracy. The central part of the programme remains the platform of general-secretaries supported by the policy advisors. The management and support of the platform remained at IEA that is also responsible for organising the entire cross party component. For the bilateral activities, the parties will also have in 2004 access to the party activity fund PAF, managed by IEA.

In January 2004 the platform started to develop its joint action plan for that year, including the individual party plans the four parties. This work was completed in April, leading to the signing between IMD and IEA of a new series of agreements covering the funding of bilateral support to the four political parties for operational costs, the funding of bilateral activities (PAF) of the four parties, the funding IEA services and new contract for the funding of joint activities under the JAP 2004. The total budget amounted to Euro 634.399,-.

The four parties set themselves in the JAP three key principles that would constitute the broad parameters for their activities in 2004, recognising that it is an election year:

1. Creating a level playing field for political parties in Ghana;
2. Building/strengthening our institutional capacity as political parties;
3. Enhancing the public image of political parties in Ghana.

The identified joint activities in the JAP are:

1. Hold regular bi-monthly meetings (of the platform);
2. Organise skills training workshops for political parties;
3. Organise party political broadcasts;
4. Complete the formulation of a code of conduct;
5. Organise joint political party symposia;
6. Create a conflict resolution mechanism

The JAP budget for joint activities took another joint activity into account: Meetings of the Caucus of Chairmen of the four political parties as a new structural element of the programme.

Implementation until September 2004 included the regular platform meetings, the organisation of four joint symposia, the completion, launching and distribution of a new Code of Conduct, the preparation of party political broadcasts, the launch and first meetings of the Chairmen Caucus, the installation and various meetings of the Advisory Council to IMD/IEA, as well as numerous bilateral activities by the four political parties on the basis of their party plans. Some steps were taken to bring the process of preparation of a skills training course and the creation of a conflict resolution mechanism forward (sources: minutes platform; progress reports IEA and political parties; IEA activities overviews).

In its semi-annual report January-June 2004 IMD notes that a number of results on the contents and process objectives and activities have been made. IEA overviews of the bilateral projects in 2003 and 2004 (until date) and the joint activities in 2003-2004 are respectively in annexes 4 and 5.

During the two years of implementation there were regular visits of IMD staff to Ghana, both on the operational level of the IMD policy and programme officers and on the level of the IMD director Mr. Von Meijenfildt. The last visit in July this year was by Professor van Kemenade, President of the Board of IMD and minister of State. He was present at the official launch of the new Code of Conduct (sources: IMD reports on visits to Ghana).

On the institutional level IMD contracted in 2002 and subsequent years, in addition to the IEA services, the support of a local liaison, Mr. T.Y. Wiarda, keeps regular contacts with IEA on the general progress of the programme, provides IMD contextual reports on general developments in Ghana of relevance to the cooperation and organises and provides logistical support to visiting IMD missions.

Budgets and expenditures 2002 - 2004

Programme expenditures in 2002 were Euro 6.698,- for the start-up conference in May that year.

Programme expenditures in 2003 amounted to Euro 427.951,- against an original year budget of Euro 600.000,-. The actual budget expenditures for the first half-year of 2004 were at Euro 399.000,-. The approved programme budget for 2004 is Euro 634.399,-.

2. Political parties overview and main developments and trends during the evaluation period

The modern Constitution of Ghana dates to the early 1800s, when Britain started laying down the foundations for the emergence of a modern central government. The first political parties emerged in the 1940s, principal among them being the United Gold Coast Convention and the Convention Peoples Party. By the time of independence in 1957, some four or five parties had come into existence. They had varying degrees of presence in different parts of the country. Ghana thus entered her independence life as a multi-party democracy.

This post-independence life has been punctuated with one-party rule and military dictatorships. Nevertheless, the Ghanaians' love and interest in multi-party democracy did not appear to have been seriously dented. In this regard, it may be noted that when, under the military government of the PNDC in the late 1980s, the regime sought, through its National Commission on Democracy, the opinion of Ghanaians on the future political direction of the country, an overwhelming majority opted for a return to multi-party democracy.

The multi-party democracy was entrenched in the current Constitution, the 1992 Constitution. A careful reading of the document reveals the fact that its framers consider political parties as important tools for constitutionalising government in contemporary Ghana.

At the time of the Evaluation, there are nine (9) registered political parties in Ghana. These are:

1. The New Patriotic Party (NPP), the ruling party
2. The National Democratic Congress (NDC), the ruling party until the 2000 Elections and now the opposition party with the largest number of seats in Parliament
3. The Peoples National Convention (PNC)
4. The Convention Peoples Party (CPP)
5. The Great Consolidated Popular Party (GCPP)
6. The National Reform Party (NRP, a splinter group from the NDC)
7. The Democratic Peoples Party (DPP)
8. Every Accountable Ghanaian Living Everywhere (EGLE)
9. The United Ghana Movement (UGM)

Numbers 2, 7 and 8 are generally considered to be together, at least in the recent past. Numbers 3 and 4 follow what is referred to in Ghana as the Nkrumaist tradition, after the First President of Ghana, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, who founded the CPP.

The role that the political parties are expected to play in the political system may be gleaned from Article 55(3) which provides that "Subject to the provisions of this Article, a political party is free to participate in shaping the political will of the people, to disseminate information on political ideas, social and economic programmes of a national character and sponsor candidates to any public office other than to District Assemblies or lower local government units". In addition, the Constitution underlines the importance attached to multi-partyism by prohibiting the establishment of a one-party state.

However, it is one thing to decree multi-party democracy on paper; it is quite another to realise it in actual practice, to nurture and enable it to grow roots and become a part of the culture of a people.

In the Ghanaian context, some of the enabling factors were succinctly summarised by Mr. B. J. da Rocha, a former Chairman and Secretary-General of a Ghanaian political party and currently a Senior Fellow of IEA as follows:

- 1) Every political party, whether in power or out of power, must recognise the rights of other parties to exist and operate within the framework of the Constitution. Diversity of opinions, programmes and objectives need not necessarily breed hostility and mutual exclusion.
- 2) Where elections are free and fair, a party voted into power must be constantly conscious of the fact that it can also be voted out of power. In the latter event it must gracefully accept the verdict of the people. By the same token, a party beaten must accept defeat with dignity and brace itself for the next round. Acceptance of election results is of the essence to multi-party democracy. It is therefore essential that the Electoral system should be so organised and managed, and elections so conducted, that the results commend universal acceptance and credibility. Political leaders must recognize and accept the duty to ensure free and fair elections.
- 3) In a multi-party system the ruling party, or parties, and the parties in opposition must know that they could easily change places at the next election. In the conduct of their relations with one another therefore, the ruling party should not forget that it is a potential opposition, nor must the opposition forget that it is a potential government in the waiting.
A tradition whereby the ruling party tries to crush the opposition, or the opposition tries to make it impossible for the ruling party to govern, undermines the multi-party system and will eventually discredit and destroy it. Opposition may be strong, even uncompromising, on serious matters of principle, but it must be understood always that this must be done within the Constitutional framework. The government party must also realise that it is no sign of weakness to listen to what opposition has to say, neither is it prudent to dismiss out of hand opinions expressed by its opponent. Neither the government nor the opposition has a monopoly of wisdom or good ideas.
- 4) Leaders of political parties must recognize their responsibility to build bridges across party lines and to treat one another with courtesy and decorum. All citizens are equal in the eyes of the law. The election or appointment of a person to a high office of state does not overnight turn him into some Superior being. Political leaders must realize that in a free, democratic, Republic, the respect which goes with public office must be earned. Respect may be, and has often been, commanded and exacted by force and fear, but such respect is really a kind of hypocrisy, not genuine respect.
- 5) If political leader treat one another with mutual respect and frankness, their followers and supporters cannot fail to take notice and be influenced.
- 6) Political leaders must be able to identify matter of national importance on which consensus among them is possible. It is a good thing for the public to know that on some particular issue of national importance all political parties are of one mind. Even in areas where there are irreconcilable differences the art of reasoned discussion and debate must be cultivated, instead of the exchange of invectives and abuse.

(Source: B.J. da Rocha, 'The Survival of Multiparty Democracy in Ghana and The Politics of Accommodation in the Fourth Republic', IEA publication – Accra, March 1996)

In terms of these factors, the country has come a long way since 7 January 1993, when the 1992 Constitution became operative. A lot of progress has been made. The political temperature in the country as a whole and among the political parties in particular has come down considerably. Elections were held in 1992, 1996 and 2000 with the active participation of political parties and a few individuals as independent candidates.

At the 2000 Elections, the NPP won both the Presidential Elections and a majority of the Parliamentary seats (104). The NDC won 89 seats. The PNC took 3 three seat. The CPP won only one seat. The other five parties, which took part in the elections, won no seats.

Some of the parties were inactive for a while (EGLE, NRP, DPP) and almost non-existent; they have picked up steam as the 2004 Elections draw nearer. One party (UGM) has almost disappeared from the political party radar. The people jocularly say that it is on sabbatical. Many of the parties make more noise than the number of seats they have in Parliament or the proportion of votes they obtained in the 2000 Elections would suggest.

Political parties in Ghana have benefited from a number of direct and indirect interventions by the development partners of Ghana. The indirect interventions have generally been routed through the Electoral Commission or the National Governance Programme managed by the United Nations Development Programme. Some programmes have been channelled through think tanks such as IEA or CDD; others through the German Foundations of which Friedrich Ebert and Friedrich Nauman are the most active.

All these initiatives and interventions are beginning to produce positive outcomes politically in Ghana. The parties now engage in more joint activities. Two of the most recent pieces of evidence to support this opening up to each other and greater willingness to engage each other are:

- a) The revised Code of Conduct for political parties with an enforcement and monitoring mechanism and,
- b) The recent appearance of the leader (Chairmen) of the four parties with representation in Parliament in the media in a convivial posture. The message of these momentous events is gradually seeping down to the ordinary supporters of the parties throughout the country that having differences of opinion does not make people enemies of each other. Further, that while each of us belongs or may belong to different political parties, this is only a friendly game. Ultimately, we are all stakeholders and beneficiaries of the national interest, stability and prosperity.

Most of the credit for the development of this positive rapprochement and productive engagement among the political parties is generally given by the political pundits and the political party leadership in Ghana to the IMD/IEA Programme of assistance to the political parties.

A noticeable outcome is the evident trend of less strident but no less intense politicking as we approach the 2004 elections.

3. The evaluation issues

3.1. Results

Effects on democratisation and multiparty democracy

As far as the Evaluators can tell from (a) the interviews, (b) the available documentation and (c) their own observation of the stakeholders and competing programmes, the main objectives of the programme have been achieved. This conclusion is based inter alia on the following elements: the state of inter-party relations in Ghana at the commencement of the programme; the development since then of a vibrant dialogue between and among the political parties in Ghana; the stimulation of policy-making within the political parties and the evident camaraderie which has developed among the leadership of not only the four political parties involved in the bilateral programmes but the remaining four which participate actively in the joint party activities. In this connection, mention should also be made of the process leading to the revision of the 2000 Code of Conduct and its launch. This process has involved not only the political parties but also the Electoral Commission, the National Commission on Civic Education, and the media and, to some extent, the wider Ghanaian public. This shows clearly that the programme is contributing to the consolidation of multi-party democracy in Ghana.

During the evaluation, everyone interviewed by the evaluators stressed the uniqueness of the IMD/IEA programme in relation to the interventions of other development partners in Ghana because of the bilateral programme and the cross party activities. The bilateral programmes have contributed to the strengthening of the management capacity of the parties. Internal democracy in the operations of the parties is a major aspiration of the Ghanaian Constitution as can be seen from a reading of its Article 55.

The main objective of the IMD/IEA intervention, as we understand it is to deepen multiparty democracy and to assist the political parties to make effective and positive contributions to the consolidation of multiparty democracy in Ghana. In addition to the general comments made above the cross and one party activities have in this respect achieved the following:

1. Ensuring that Ghana would have multi parties.
2. Acceptance by the parties of the right of others to exist and operate in Ghana.
3. Particularly, because of the outcome of the 2000 Elections each party understands that it can be voted in or out of power by the electorate within the cycle instituted by the Constitution. The programme is helping them to understand therefore the need to be each other's keeper.
4. The leadership of the parties increasingly are recognizing their responsibility to build bridges across party lines and to co-operate and work assiduously towards achieving this end. The Platform and the Chairmen's Caucus are emerging evidence of this realisation.
5. The evolving inter-party dialogue and consultation are creating in the rank and file of the parties an awareness of the need to treat each other with mutual respect, while also respecting diversity of opinions, ideologies and altitudes.
6. The evolving change in the ethos of the parties is making the wider public less and less sceptical about the role and value of political parties in a constitutional democracy.

One drawback attributable to the time of the effective start of the programme (2003) may be noted. Because of the timing, there is a wrong perception that the IMD/IEA initiative is intended to assist the parties to win elections. This election focus misconception has been unfortunate as it undermines the long-term perspectives of the programme. This is also the reason why the non-parliamentary parties

have been most strident and vocal in their objections to the exclusion from Platform and especially the bilateral activities.

As noted in Chapter 2 of this report, although there were nine registered political parties in the period before 2003 only five were really active. One, the UGM, has been and remains dormant. In the circumstances, the focus on the parliamentary parties for the programme was justified.

However, two considerations are rendering this approach problematic, especially in 2004, which is an election year. The first is the IPAC operations. The second is state practice with regards to ad hoc state assistance to the parties. Both processes use legal registration and therefore the all-inclusive approach. Especially, the direct assistance to the parliamentary parties through the policy analysts and budgetary support for operational expenses and allowances seem to be breeding suspicion which may be undercutting the most important achievement of the programme to date, namely inter-party dialogue and consultation.

Of course, part of this suspicion is attributable to the absence of a generalized information flow system, which would provide credible information about the actual direct support, which the four parties are receiving from the IMD/IEA programme. In this sense, it might be said that, though at the moment any damage to the democratisation process in Ghana is attributable to this criterion might be minimal or insignificant, the focus solely on the 4 parties might become more problematic in the future especially, if one or more of the present four fail to win any seats in the 2004 elections.

Effects of projects on institutional capacity of political parties

There is a noticeable improvement in the ability of the parties to achieve their objectives. This has been produced especially by three elements of the bilateral programmes namely the on-off equipment grant, the establishment of the function of policy analysts and the capacity-building activities. Each party involved in the programme has credited their improved service delivery to their members and greater ability to reach out to non-members to these elements. Indeed, an unexpected benefit to which all the parties drew the evaluators attention is the improvement in internal democracy by the reorganisation of internal decision-making process necessitated by the desire of the parties to ensure that the programmes submitted to IMD/IEA are really what the parties want and not only what a section of their leadership (SGs) think would be good for the parties.

The groups that benefited most from the parties differ from party to party. One would say that the NPP appears to have achieved the most. The party developed an activity, tested it on one group or level within the party and then repeated it down the party levels when found to be helpful. We attach as an annex, the lists of party activities, which tell the story better than words can tell. On the whole, one can say that middle level operatives of all four parliamentary parties benefited most. Further, the creation of the function of policy analysts has clearly strengthened policy formulation within each of the four participating parties together with a functional apparatus. Out of this, there is a noticeable improvement in the ability of the parties to package their messages and the substantive contents of the message. At least the parties say so themselves.

The evaluators say the sense of ownership that the parties feel towards the projects and their realisation of the usefulness to them of functions like those played by their policy analysts make these interventions sustainable in the long term. But there is a need for the parties to be made aware of the possible terminal point of the IMD/IEA support. Indeed each of the parties was at pains to let the evaluators know (1) that the IMD/IEA support accounts for only 50% of their programme expenses and constituents only a small part of the over-all costs of running and maintaining the party (2) they only submit to IMD/IEA activities which they have carried out anyway. Nevertheless, they show genuine appreciation of the IMD/IEA support.

Results of individual projects

Joint activities

The agenda for the development of joint activities is fully the responsibility of the platform of General-Secretaries of the four parties, supported by their policy analyst and facilitated by the IEA programme staff. Once agreed upon the JAP's are the main guidelines for implementation. Different from the way bilateral projects under the PAF are developed and implemented, the joint activities are discussed frequently by the platform in order to move the design forward on a consensual basis. The advantage of this practice, which is professionally facilitated by the IEA project director and his assistants, is that progress can, to a certain extent, be stimulated by IEA. On the other hand, there is the safeguard that no activities are designed such that it would disturb the mutual relationships and the trust that have gradually been established between the parties at the platform. The disadvantage is that consultations can be time consuming and the minutes show that IEA has to encourage the parties occasionally to deliver contributions that were promised in a timely fashion.

The evaluators are of the opinion that the joint responsibility of the parties for the joint activities is key to the overall success of the platform as it has been demonstrating so far. The implementation role of IEA is complementing this perfectly as the political parties have all expressed to the evaluators their satisfaction with IEA's performance of these functions and with the general trust that they have in IEA as a neutral facilitator.

The evaluators see however a growing scope for expanding the joint activities programme during the coming years by capitalising on the routine and confidence that are now developing in the implementation of the joint activities and by concentrating the leadership in the platform on the main lines of action and the engagement of the necessary commitment and inputs on the party level, leaving it more to the policy analysts and IEA more to hammer out, if need be, details of implementation.

There is in the joint activities programme, as a result of the described working methods and other good practises applied, sufficient evidence that the implemented projects have delivered the direct results. The total of projects developed in 2003 and 2004 until date were 11, including the establishment of the Caucus of the Chairmen of the Platform parties. Three projects are still under preparation. In 2003 three symposia on various relevant themes were held in the capitals of the Greater Accra, Volta and Ashanti regions. In 2004 the programmed four conferences have been held in the capitals of the Northern, Western, Eastern and Upper Eastern regions. The symposia included not only representatives of the four parliamentary parties but also other political parties who were invited as a matter of policy to promote the inclusiveness of the programme. The inclusion of other parties in joint activities has become more significant in the year 2004 than in the start-up period.

The development and launching of the new Code of Conduct has been completed. Two activities that were already on the agenda of 2003 and reappeared in the JAP of 2004 are the skills training programme and the development of a conflict resolution mechanism. Another activity that was already on the 2003 agenda, the party political televised broadcasts, is in an advanced stage of implementation.

The new structural venture of the platform, the Chairmen Caucus, was installed in 2004 and is functioning beautifully. The bringing onboard, in a structured manner, of the chairmen of the parliamentary parties is expected to afford a broader basis of support and commitment to the programme, both in terms of engaging the parties but also in the perspective of broadening the agenda and for the resolution of inter-party conflict.

The platform of general-Secretaries cannot be defined as a project per se, but has been at the centre of the success of the programme and will more and more be in a position to be pivotal in the development and actualisation of the cooperation's objectives also in steering the platforms joint operational agenda.

Overall, the result in numbers of the joint activities programme has been impressive for a first year of operational implementation. The choice has been correct in promoting the objectives as defined for the cooperation in general and in the annual programmes in particular. They focussed on the one hand on the debate of main issues of common interest to the parties, whilst creating a new meeting place for all

the political parties. Interaction between the parties was far better than it had been before. On the other hand the parties promoted at the same time a better image of themselves in the public perception, as the media coverage was important. As one journalist commented: “it became attractive to attend and report on these events as we knew that all parties would be there”. The pro-active public relations policy and practices of IEA have stimulated the excellent coverage of the joint activities by the media. There is general recognition that they are doing here a good job, as it is activating one of the main channels to reach the broader public in support of one of the programme’s main objectives. One of the parties commented that the number of symposia on scale of 2003 and 2004 could be reduced to the advantage of more numerous inter-party meetings at the lower levels of officials and stakeholders for example in the constituencies.

The tables 5 and 6 provide respectively an IEA overview of the joint activities 2003-2004 and the joint activities categorised according to the IMD preference list.

Bilateral projects

The funding for individual party projects is based on the PAF agreement between IMD and IEA. The four parties on the platform decided in 2003 to divide the available US\$ 100,000, - in equal shares for each party. The same principle was followed in 2004. The total amount was also the same as for the previous year. This is different from the practice with drawing rights in other IMD countries where the relative weight of a party, mostly on the basis of the number of seats is taken into account in allocating so called drawing rights. Also is different the fact that in Ghana this was an agreement amongst the four parties themselves, endorsed by IMD. The approach demonstrated a spirit of cooperation and recognition of partnership, notwithstanding the fact that two in terms of general election results heavily outweigh the two small parties on the platform. The practical consequence of this distribution has been that the parties had equal opportunity to benefit from the funding, leaving outside this discussion possible different levels of financial inputs into programmatic activities coming from their own or other sources.

Looking at the total number of bilateral activities per party per year of implementation (2003 was in fact less than half a year for actual implementation, whilst the horizon of this evaluation is September 2004) the overall quantitative result is very encouraging. A total of 68 activities have been implemented, varying from 12 to 23 per party. Three parties have followed in 2003 and in 2004 the system of “repeater” projects, implementing the same type of project for a similar target group in different regions. This means on the one hand that the variety in projects of these three parties has not been that great but effectiveness was enhanced, as was the need to develop good project designs of a different nature very much limited, allowing for rapid implementation from this perspective. One party showed a relatively large variety of activities. The nature of the activities show that chosen activities were to a certain extent congruent with the established programmatic practices of the party.

In general it is safe to state that almost all of the implemented activities addressed the target groups they were intended for. Evaluators found documentary proof, mostly in (post activity) reports and press clippings that programmed activities have been implemented. In the cases where narrative reports were available we conclude that the proposed methodology was followed. The qualification here is that the proposals were generally very limited, closer to an outline than an elaborated proposal and that the methodologies applied in the bilateral projects – in so far highlighted in the proposal – were traditional, particularly in the case of meetings, workshops and trainings. Again in the case of one party there was some more variety but no evidence could be found of innovative approaches on the methodological side. Starting with project design and proposal writing as well as substantive reporting on events, there is still a lot to improve. This would also allow for a better documentation of the bilateral projects.

Overall the immediate results of the bilateral projects are evident. The target groups were addressed. They varied from party cadres at different executive levels, both national, regional, constituency and ward levels depending on the party focus in the programme. The outreach to party leadership on different levels has therefore made a good start. In some cases the opportunity has been seized also to

reach out to communities or to involve sympathisers, attending workshops as observers. It was difficult to judge what the immediate results for these groups have been. The numbers of participants involved was in most cases where it was explicitly reported significant. A lot could therefore be done with relatively modest budgets.

The activities have been within the categories of preferred activities. They are mostly in the categories of political training, leadership training for party cadres, development of better channels of communication and, more occasionally, strengthening the influence and participation of woman and youth in the parties. One has to consider that the parties started each programming period with an individual plan that has helped to focus the actions. The perspective of forthcoming elections has frequently been there in the choice of activities, without however embarking on direct campaigning activities. The vision of the parties as it could be perceived by evaluators was that they wanted to reinforce institutionally and to prepare on contents, party organisation and skills of cadres to be able to perform better in actual outreach and campaigning and taking on functions for fulfilling roles in the conduct of the elections.

One of the strongest features of the IMD/IEA Ghana programme is the level of ownership. This is true for the joint activities but even more so for the bilateral activities that are proposed and implemented under the individual party plans 2003 and 2004. Without exception the political parties felt 100% owners of these activities, in originating them and in implementing them. This feeling has also generated commitment on their part and sustainable interest in the IMD/IEA intervention.

These positive findings on the rapid development of the bilateral programme, its immediate results and the level of ownership merit to be qualified by a number of weaknesses that were in part already expected at the start of the programme or surfaced during implementation. Evaluators distinguish three areas of concern that have been recognised by the immediate stakeholders and the manager of the bilateral funding, the IEA.

1. As already mentioned the design of activities generally needs improvement;
2. The same accounts for the quality of reporting and the timeliness. IEA has been reminding the parties regularly that there is a need to comply with the agreed requirements and timeframe of reporting. There has been some improvement but not sufficient to say that an acceptable level has been reached; IEA has – with approval of IMD – at the start of the programme not been too hard on the parties if it came to compliance, mainly to further ownership and to allow parties to learn and gain experience with facilitation of IEA on the front of the process.
3. Invitations to IEA to attend bilateral activities came very late in time (as some proposals did) and did not allow IEA sufficient time to follow up on them.

The evaluators consider that the pilot phase of the programme is rapidly coming to an end, a year after the start of actual implementation of operational activities, and that the parties will have to make greater efforts to improve on the abovementioned aspects. Evaluators recognise that the programme and its modalities are relatively new to the political parties in Ghana and that there is no strong culture to document and to report in writing on past events. To a certain extent the programme forced the political parties to make internal adjustments as to the handling of the programme within the accepted rules, regulations and practices in the parties. This has taken time to settle down. The parties and IEA had anticipated the need to do capacity building on financial management, proposal writing, reporting and other skills development in the party not directly relevant for sound project management. The recommendation is to give this high priority, starting with the needs assessment, module development and implementation of those skills that are essential for good programme and project management. It is also indicated that the parties take the possible turnover of the staff and cadres involved into account and design such skills training in such a way that it could be repeated periodically when the need arises.

The table in annex 7 contains evaluators files review résumé on the bilateral activities.

Funds for political parties (operational costs)

As a separate funding the parties received in 2003 a one-time subsidy to buy the equipment necessary to support their work under the programme. On a more permanent basis there is funding up to an amount of US\$ 3000,- monthly per party for the operational cost. About two thirds of this amount is for payment of salaries or financial compensation for time spent on the programme to the General-Secretaries, the full-time project analyst, coordinators and administrative support staff. The remainder is for other operational expenses. The purchase of equipment has been completed. All parties are fully operational for the programme. The funding by IEA to the parties for operational costs has become regular. There is financial accounting for the expenditures. In one case the party is using its own discretion in how time of party cadres devoted to the programme implementation is being compensated from the available funding.

The funding has been and is effective in support of the programme. It has laid an operational basis that has facilitated implementation on both the level of the platform, including the policy analysts, and the bilateral programme significantly. A question that the evaluators raise is the sustainability of this component of the IMD/IEA programme in the longer run. They are of the view that the embedding of the structural elements in the functions now sponsored under the programme is likely to succeed, but that absence of alternative funding at a time the IEA assistance would stop, is a potential threat to sustainability. An answer may lay in possible public funding of political parties in the future. This debate is already ongoing and IEA could from its own experience with the IMD programme in Ghana assist in further developing ideas on how to design public funding and what functions of a party it may support.

Budgetary performance

Expenditures in the programme cannot entirely be reviewed on the basis of the periodic transfers of instalments by IMD to IEA. In chapter I of the report the actual expenditures in 2002, 2003 and 2004 are given. Expenditures for IEA services and the operational costs follow a regular pattern. The expenditures funding for joint activities and the PAF are behind the estimates. One major joint activity, in budgetary terms, the skills training has not been making much progress. On the bilateral side many activities have already been implemented and it is expected that the parties will make full use of the allocated funding.

Efficiency and consistency of the implementation of the programme objectives

The IEA/IMD programme is in design and implementation a Ghanaian programme owned by the political parties that are part of the cooperation. On the Platform the development of objectives, issues, the setting of priorities and the overall design of joint activities as well as the organisation of the work of the platform, is steered and decided by the platform itself. IEA provides service, facilitation and expert input. The bilateral plans and activities are also fully owned by the parties in question. IEA facilitates on a programme design level and appraises the concrete proposals once presented by the parties for funding.

On the joint activities level some qualifications need to be made. Although the other four parties not represented on the platform have been brought in to participate in joint activities, they are not part of the overall programming and priority setting. This limits the real ownership and sense of commitment of those outside the platform. A second element to bear in mind is the fact that the bilateral assistance is limited to the four parties on the platform. There are obviously all kind of arguments that would plead for maintaining the efficiency in terms of operations and impact of bilateral funding in the programme. The broader question of the selection of parties for the IMD/IEA programme is discussed elsewhere in this report. The question of ownership will be put there in this wider perspective.

The methodology of implementation of the programme is consistent with the objectives of the programme. On the question of inclusiveness there was, early in the programme the realisation that all registered political parties should be involved as was stimulated on the joint activity level. For example the key principles that the platform adopted in their JAP, creating a level playing field for political parties in Ghana; building/strengthening our institutional capacity as political parties and

enhancing the public image of political parties in Ghana are translated in activities that further these objectives. The extent to which this is the case is not so much criticised by the non-parliamentary parties from the joint activities perspective but from the exclusion from the Platform, the Chairmen Caucus and the bilateral funding. So within the present choice of partners the methodology is fully consistent with the general and more year specific objectives. Again in the wider context of participation there is room for enhancement.

The added value that the programme in Ghana reflects is very much the same as in other countries where IMD works. The IEA/IMD programme is a niche in the support to political parties in terms of direct funding. There are no other sponsors active in Ghana following the same modalities. On the bilateral level the parties benefit most from this modality. That is not to state that the support to the platform of joint activities is of less significance. The distinction there with what others can do is only not that great as in the bilateral field. The platform and the joint activities have been very successful compared to what others have been able to do with political parties. It is noticeable that the parties have given preference to the IMD/IEA programme because of its uniqueness. As was argued several times before, the force of this cooperation is in the first place in the ownership and demand driven character of the programme. Secondly it is in the way it is being facilitated by a Ghanaian institute. There is competition between the most relevant institutions in this sector.

Some of the sponsors called it a healthy competition. The evaluators see also occasional signs of strong competition leading to duplication of efforts. The “copy right” question is of less relevance than the opportunities for efficiency if there were a more open environment for cooperation. This limits the possibilities of partnerships on an equal level of main implementing agencies. The evaluators noted the interest in cooperation on the side of other international NGO’s. This would be within the bounds of their methodological approaches, like the organisation of workshops, conferences and trainings. IEA has developed over the years relations with other economic and political governance sponsors and is in some cases also implementer for others. What could be done to stimulate cooperation is to start with a periodic exchange of information with interested sponsors. Besides the larger general (annual) governance forum and coordination on governance among some donors, there are no forms of structured information exchange or coordination focussed on support for political parties. The political parties themselves, under leadership of the Platform, linking up to the existing forum of IPAC, could also take the initiative for coordination.

The role and value of the IEA in assuring support for the implementation of the programme has been described to a large extent under the appraisal of the results of the programme and the overall programme management. Evaluators have suggested some improvements. The overall picture is one of hard work and commitment of IEA in providing facilitation and its own inputs in support of the political parties.

The allocation and utilization of the programme funds have been in support of the general objectives of the programme. As discussed earlier this will require also a more pro-active attitude from the political parties in complying with the basic requirements for proposals and narrative and financial reporting under the agreements. The resources to develop their capacities in this regard further are available.

3.2. Programme processes

Process towards formulation

As outlined to the Evaluators, the process for the design and formulation of the programme depends on the type of programme. The Platform of General-Secretaries and policy analysts of the four parliamentary parties deal with the Joint Action Plan. IEA assists with facilitation and technical support, in particular as relates to budgeting. Apart from quality, there are three weaknesses to the process.

First, no effort is made to ensure that the members of the platform within their individual political parties have validated this programme. No statement or evidence of this validation is required of them. They provide none.

Second, since the programme is intended to be implemented as a cross party activity, it is a weakness that no place is created for the non-parliamentary parties to influence the choice, design and formulation of the individual activities. In this regard, the fact of the initiation of the programme by the parliamentary parties is not necessarily the issue. It is the fact that involving the non-parliamentary parties in the conceptualisation and design of the activities will give them a greater sense of belonging and ownership. This will, in turn, ensure that these joint activities strengthen inter-party dialogue and consultation.

Third, the ceding of budgeting responsibility to IEA by the Platform evidence the trust the parties have in IEA and the credibility of the Institute. But this unduly separates design from costing. The continuation of this process would mean that the parties would not acquire the full complement of project development and management skills. In a way, this will impact unfavourably on the capacity-building element of the IMD/IEA Programme. Besides, IEA is like a fund manager to IMD. It is unclear that taking on the budgeting responsibility of the parties is an appropriate role for the Institute to play in the circumstances.

It must be emphasized that the weaknesses highlighted above are not intended to be a criticism of IEA or IMD. The focus is on the process as it functioned at the time of the evaluation. Technically, IEA has played the budgeting role commendably.

Some of the observations noted above apply to the bilateral programme process as well. Here the parties individually develop and present their programmes separately to the IEA. IEA endeavours to assist them improve the programme technically. IEA also does the budgeting for them. But, over time, there has evolved within each party a rigorous intra-party validation process. Correspondence with IEA, which were made available to the evaluators as well as interviews with the parties, attest to this development.

There are three weaknesses however. First, it is not easy to tell whether the programme submitted to IEA is part of the total package of activities the party intends to carry out over the programme period. Second, but unavoidable is the circumstance that the parties do not know what programmes have been submitted by each other. Third, there is no noticeable effort at reconciling, relating or linking the individual party programmes with the Joint Action Programme so as to make them mutually reinforcing.

Demand driven approach

Basically, the programme originates from the parties themselves. Neither IMD nor IEA influences this development. Of course, the parties have information on the broad objectives of the IMD/IEA Programme and are probably influenced by these objectives in the conceptualisation phase of the programmes. We assume they would do this to assure funding under the IMD/IEA Programme. Nevertheless, the fact the parties conceptualise the programme themselves makes it demand-driven. This approach has been instrumental in generating interest and commitment. The approach also gives the parties a sense of ownership of the programme. Each party interviewed by the Evaluators was at pains to point out this fact of ownership. There was a genuine sense of control.

Qualitative developments of projects

Two parties (NPP & PNC) clearly produced qualitative programmes. The other two parties (NDC & CPP) presented programmes of indifferent quality. This may have something to do with internal party dynamics as well as the programme development infrastructure and instruments available to each party

at the commencement of the IMD/IEA intervention. There is a noticeable improvement with the passage of time.

Functioning of monitoring mechanisms

Monitoring was done by IEA. The main instrument for monitoring was the reporting – activity and financial. Here IEA has correctly in our opinion, adeptly the gradual approach, using diplomacy rather than hard rules to encourage the parties to meet their obligations. The reports are of indifferent quality and some are in arrears. We did not have access to all because of the audit, which was on-going at the time of the evaluation. One weakness was that some of the parties did not do self evaluation or participants' evaluation at the time of implementation. So, in the absence of a generalised impact assessment, it is difficult to make any meaningful judgement about whether the activities were considered useful, beyond the fact that they took place. We also feel that IEA should develop and implement a more effective tracking system as part of the monitoring process to enable it better check over-due or undelivered reports. We think that in the early years of the programme, that is the period covered by the evaluation, there is a lot to commend the diplomatic approach of IEA

3.3. Implementation modalities

Functioning of overall programme management

The main feature of the cooperation modality between IMD and IEA is the mandate given to IEA under the MOU of January 2003 and the subsequent agreements for the different programme and funding lines for the full programme and fund management. This includes the facilitation of the work of the beneficiaries in preparing programmes and budgets, to ensure quality of the implementation of programmes and activities (in particular the work of the platform and the joint activities), to ensure that proper records and accounts are kept of all funds received from IMD and to oversee the utilisation of these funds and to report periodically to IMD of such utilisation.

IMD is funder and IEA is implementer in accordance with the arrangements per agreement laid down in specific terms of reference or MOU. The relations between IEA and the four individual political parties and respective responsibilities for the purpose of the implementation of the IMD-IEA agreements (in as far they concern the political parties), have been laid down in a separate (framework) agreements between them and IEA. The operational funding and the activities developed under PAF are governed by this agreement. In managing the programme on behalf of IMD, IEA is internally following its own established organisational rules and procedures. The documentation in the files indicates that these rules are followed and that there is a functional separation of powers. The staffing for the project is such that the various individual roles and functions can effectively be exercised. Reference is made in particular to the Administrator who is mandated to approve projects, the project director who is central in the programme management, the accountant and the administrative staff.

As to the joint activities the involvement of the platform in assessing the financial consequences of their yearly programming should be reinforced. This could also have an effect on priority setting. As said elsewhere in this report the Platform leaves most of the financial side of the programme to IEA, which is correct once a joint activity is being implemented by IEA.

Given the functional separation of functions in the IEA organisation there is also a tendency to treat budget aspect separate from contents. Internally the project director is certainly commenting on some of the project budgets. This practise could be made more systematic. One way of stimulating a documented appraisal of a bilateral project is to include in the process of approval of the projects and appraisal form to the IEA Administrator, complemented with the input of the accounts department and other assistance under the responsibility of the project director. After approval of the project the confirmation letter to the political party should make specific reference to the applicability of the framework agreement, remind of the agreed reporting requirements and to name and date of the (revised) proposal of the party.

The evaluators already commented on the deficiencies in reporting by the parties. This has an effect on what IEA can report to IMD. The monthly reports of IEA to IMD are informative on the work of the platform and the preparation and implementation of joint activities. In the 2003 narrative reports 2003 there was a standard paragraph on bilateral performance. This was not prominent in the first period of 2004. Main reason was that not much happened on that front early 2004. Evaluators recommend reintroducing this practise and highlighting to IMD in a summary form the bilateral work of the parties under the PAF and the fund for political parties. An periodical overview per party of all the implemented projects in a particular year or in the pipeline, would help IMD to appraise better the scope and impact of these two funding lines. This can be generated easily, as the evaluators have found, because the necessary information is available in-house in IEA.

Registration and documentation of projects

As said in the introduction of this report the evaluation of the projects has essentially been based on the review of existing documents in the IEA files of each political party, some references in platform minutes, the individual plans under the JAP, complemented by interviews with the four parties. Evaluators had difficulty to get a complete overview of the bilateral projects on the basis of the present IEA registration. The work was restrained by the fact that at the same time the PWC auditors had a number of documents under review, that were only returned late in the day. However, the organisation of files on the PAF could be improved by separating per party file the documents and (post-activity) reports and correspondence from project to project, including the closure. A separate file or chapter in the file could contain the relevant financial documentation. The same advice applies to the file on joint activities. This would improve the accessibility of documentation.

There are already separate files on operational funding. They contain some documents that relate to the PAF and they therefore only need some streamlining.

As the monthly narrative reporting by the political parties on occasion at the same time deal with the operational funding and the PAF it is advisable to have the relevant parts copied to both files.

A more general improvement of programme and project documentation would be to keep an electronic overview on the (dates of receipt or sending) of main project documents, like proposals, budgets, approval letters, revisions, reports, closure etc. This would support readily available management information on the one hand and the monitoring function on the other.

Documentation and the keeping of a Ghana register at IMD in The Hague is well organised, both in hard copy of the essential documents and more extensively in IMD's PMS system. A minor point was that the final parts 4 of the project files 2003, related to the closure of the implementation of the agreements between IMD and IEA, were still empty. Evaluators understand that final closure of 2003 will take place once the results of the PWC audit over the year 2003 have been presented.

Added value of the chosen cooperation and implementation modalities

Evaluators understand that the chosen form of cooperation was partly motivated by legal requirements, as under the Political Parties law direct funding by foreign institutions is prohibited. The advantage of working with IEA is that all political parties see IEA as a reliable, neutral and professional partner, knowing the ins and outs of political party life in Ghana and with a credible reputation and expertise in governance matters. As the ownership in the entire programme is firmly in the hands of the political parties, IEA is more in the role of facilitator than a classic funder, who may need considerable time to build a relationship of trust and may not or never reach the same level of effectiveness as a local institution can. The choice has in that respect been correct. It also saves IMD in The Hague or a local IMD representative lot of detailed work on programme and (joint) project management.

A minor disadvantage of the present construction is that IEA will have to make more efforts than an IMD representative to translate the general experiences of IMD in other countries or on general themes

into the Ghana programme. It is recommended that IMD should pay attention to that side of the relationship with the IEA team and the potential inputs it can give. The frequent missions of IMD to Ghana only partially serve that purpose. Perhaps, IMD should facilitate visits of at least the IEA project co-ordinator to The Hague and selected countries, for example in Africa, in which IMD is active. In one case, Kenya, IEA has presented the Ghana programme to stakeholders there.

IEA has also the role of sole main implementer of the joint programme. In case of need for additional expertise (for example for the party political broadcasts) IEA subcontracts. In case of a more expanded programme IEA could consider to contract out more of the services needed and concentrate itself on its main facilitation functions. This also relates to cooperation with other institutions or sponsors that could provide implementation capacity.

The IEA relationship with the parties is good. There is the permanent pushing for reporting, reaching now the point of not approving new activities if the previous one(s) have not been properly accounted for. The causes and possible solutions for this problem have been highlighted elsewhere in this report. IEA has a challenging task to keep the parties committed to the needs of early programming for the coming year(s). This will for 2005 not be an easy task as the forthcoming elections are increasingly absorbing the officials in question. On the programme level there was also the ambition to develop a multi-annual agenda. This has not been possible yet. IEA could encourage and facilitate the parties to make for the next two programme years the first step in multi year planning by developing for 2005 and 2006 a bi-annual plan that is taking a post elections perspective. Evaluators were informed that for 2004 the idea of multi-annual planning was not regarded useful because of the forthcoming elections.

The relations of IEA with IMD-The Hague are excellent. There are, as said, frequent operational and higher level missions and IEA representatives occasionally visit IMD.

The role of the IMD liaison officer in Accra is useful as he can be relied upon for practical and logistical support to visiting IMD delegations and provides IMD with a "second" perspective on relevant general developments in the country. The liaison also maintains periodical contacts with IEA to discuss programme progress and other business. The originally foreseen role for the liaison officer in an IMD Ghana NGO has not materialised for reasons discussed above.

The evaluators understand the added value of regular inputs on general events in the political governance domain. IMD could consider to acquire more regular inputs from local Ghanaian professional channels (outside IEA).

4. Lessons Learned

Need for continuation and possible future direction

In the short period that the IMD/IEA Ghana programme has been operational the political parties have been remarkably successful in creating a constructive and effective forum for inter-party dialogue in the promotion of the democratic process in Ghana. Looking at the history of the political parties, their confrontational practises and the impact of frequent interruptions of the democratic process in Ghana, it is a laudable achievement that the political parties are now involved in the development and implementation of joint activities that enhance communication and good conduct between the parties, and at the same time reinforce the political parties collectively and individually as the institutional pillars of society. The results and recent initiatives to widen the scope of inter-party cooperation have been such that there is a good prospect of deepening the dialogue. The Platform and particularly the Caucus of Chairmen of political parties are committed to take on the sensitive question of potential inter-party conflict and the development of mechanisms to help resolve these questions.

The evaluation team finds that the inter-party dialogue merits remaining the central focus of the cooperation with the prospect of widening the agenda. At the same time the programme developed by the Platform underpinning and enhancing dialogue through joint operational activities and including all active political parties, is an indispensable ingredient in promoting the main programme objective. This programme will have to remain tailored to the actual and longer-term needs of the parties as a group. As new programming will start soon to develop priorities and activities for the year after the forthcoming elections, the evaluation team recommends to embark on a longer term agenda, for example for the next two programme years. The parties should be in a position to move somewhat away from the elections focus and to look at the need for more general institutional development and capacity building. This applies to both the orientation of the joint activities programme and the individual programmes of the parties. There is also scope for creating – where applicable – more concrete links between the joint activities and the bilateral projects and to boost the output now that the platform is settling in its function of programme developer.

On a practical level, certain activities of a technical and less party-specific strategic nature could be done jointly, a more efficient and cost saving approach. The other way of moving to a different stage for the joint programme is the inclusion of smaller inter-party meetings and conferences for the lower echelons of parties in the regions and constituencies. The burden of organising and leading this type of joint events could be shared by the individual parties and not necessarily be facilitated by IEA.

The bilateral programme has also contributed a great deal to the success of the first years of cooperation. For the parties it was a crucial and highly appreciated component of the partnership. They will have to focus even more now on further institutional development and capacity building. The first year of operational support and implementation of bilateral activities on the basis of an (semi) annual plan, have laid a good foundation. The planning could now become more forward-looking. It was found that most of the parties have clear ideas how they would like to move forward as an institution after the elections. The future IMD/IEA cooperation can help them to structure these efforts further and to engage the necessary expertise.

Programme budget in relation to absorption capacity of political parties; need for additional initiatives

Most political parties claim that there is need for more bilateral funding and that in different measure the parties pay part of the costs of programmes out of their own modest funds. This in itself is a good thing. From the operational perspective it is true that the needs are much larger than what the IEA/IMD programme could possibly cater for. The evaluation team would not advise against a modest increase in the longer run, but would put at this stage quality improvement before increase in funding,

for the reasons discussed in this report. For the same reason the call from some parties for greater flexibility in the release of bilateral funding is coming too early.

The role of the IEA and main functions it should undertake

The role of IEA as a neutral and even-handed partner in the cooperation has been key to the current successes. It has performed well in its facilitating role, leaving the ownership precisely where it belongs: in the hands of the political parties. IEA is a trusted and respected partner. The evaluation team recommends that this role be sustained. There are some functions that IEA could reinforce in support of the general programme management. They relate to the management of information and documentation. IEA will need to continue to coach the political parties as some weaknesses that impact on the bilateral programme performance has not been sufficiently addressed yet. This influences also the extent to which IEA can fulfil its narrative reporting function on this programme component vis-à-vis IMD. The monitoring role of IEA of bilateral activities could be complemented and made more systematic by giving a task to that effect to the IMD liaison officer in Accra, in division of labour between him and IEA that is generally invited to these events.

The periodical distribution to the interested public by IEA of general programme information would foresee in a need.

Improvement of quality of projects while keeping ownership with political parties – the demand-driven approach

The political parties have gone during the past period through a learning process in designing and implementing bilateral activities. They need to fulfil the requirements under the IEA/IMD funding arrangements. There is still a lot of room for improvement on the level of the political parties both in proposal development particularly in timeliness and completeness of reporting. The evaluation team urges the partners in this cooperation to enhance the needed basic skills of those involved in the programme and project management, as was already foreseen early in the cooperation's partnership is continued. This should not only be targeted at accountants and finance officers, but also at leadership and programme managers.

Selection of political parties in the future programme

One of the most frequently discussed issues was the selection of political parties to the programme. At the time of the IMD identification of the programme there have been numerous consultations, leading to the initiation of the platform with the four political parties in parliament. There was soon thereafter among the political parties on the Platform recognition that “ Most of the activities proposed by the Platform under the Joint Action Plan will involve and benefit all registered political parties. In order to minimize the sense of exclusion among non-qualified parties and to enlist their co-operation, The IEA should be assigned most of the implementation responsibilities. In this way the activities will be seen as part of The IEA's general services to the Ghanaian public and the sense of exclusion and marginalisation among other parties will be either reduced or eliminated altogether.”(Source: JAP 2003 point 5.0).

Real developments proved differently. Whilst IEA started to invite the other parties to participate in joint activities of the platform these parties awareness grew that there was more going on in the field of IEA support to political parties than initially perceived. The lack of information on the precise form and nature of support has created a number of misperceptions about the IMD/IEA programme that has, for good or bad motives, become part of a public debate as the evaluation team could witness. All the immediate or associated stakeholders knew and spoke about the question. The main complaint from the parties outside the platform was that they were discriminated and that there was no level playing field as proclaimed objective of the platform in the election year 2004. There had been the occasional threats to take the case to court, written and oral complaints were made, the last also publicly. All in all the evaluation team can conclude that the process has not derailed the programme but that in the

light of the IMD/IEA general programme objective of promoting multiparty democracy, the complaints must be taken seriously and be discussed on their merits.

The evaluation team has heard many, if not most of the arguments in favour or against the enlargement of the group of four selected for the programme in Ghana. It has also considered the question in the perspective of cooperation in Ghana, knowing that the IMD approaches in the modalities of its cooperation the countries in a tailor-made fashion, not blueprinting models worldwide. The evaluators find that this is one of the strengths of the IMD approach. Limiting its appraisal to Ghana this report explains why in this case this has worked so far, focussing on the specifics of the Ghana situation and on what in a particular context and particular moment is possible to forge with full support of main stakeholders. There is no doubt the start with the four selected parliamentary parties has allowed the process to develop reasonably efficiently, particularly on the dialogue and consultations side.

The arguments heard pro and contra will to a certain extent sound familiar to IMD as it has gone elsewhere repeatedly through similar debates. The difference this time around could be that the ownership of the programme is so firmly in Ghanaian hands that deciding this issue from outside (read: by IMD) would not an advisable route to take. One actor should in the view of the evaluation team remain outside this discussion, that is IEA in order to preserve its integrity and neutrality for future facilitation.

Besides what the evaluation team can contribute there is a role for the Advisory Council of IMD/IEA that has not had this item on its agenda (yet). Members of the Council gave their first reaction to the evaluation team. The political parties on the platform carry a special responsibility. From the bilateral talks that the team had with the parties, from the exchanges with the Chairmen Caucus and the Workshop of all political parties with the team, it could be concluded that the parties are interested in finding appropriate solutions to this question. The bottom-line is that the inclusion of non-parliamentary parties in the joint activities is a sine qua non for that programme component and that a balance should be struck between what is right and fair and what is effective in terms of implementation. There are general lessons learned that it would not serve the programme objective to financially support a registered political party bilaterally that does not have the minimal capacity to implement any programme. Reference here is made to assess the capacities of parties before starting operational activities. There is also recognition that for the purposes of the present support for parties from the government side, for example for the elections the smallest parties would not get an equal level of support as the largest represented in parliament. So there is in principle always scope for differentiation as IMD applies in other countries, with basic amounts and the weighing of the relative political weight of parties on the basis of elections results.

The recommendation of the evaluation team is as follows:

- Conclude that programme developments in Ghana warrant a new look at the criteria for inclusion of parties in the various programme components;
- Recognise that the effectiveness of programme implementation will be affected by the number of parties included and that programme effectiveness remains an important consideration in this matter;
- Recognise that the joint project have been very successful because they were an all-inclusive exercises; a weakness is that not all parties were part of design and priority setting in the JAP;
- Indicate that for all parties involved or to be included in the programme, and particularly in the bilateral component, basic capacity and good performance is a criteria for eligibility for funding;
- Ask, on the basis of the relevant part of the report of the evaluation team, the for the present purposes expanded platform of the eight parties, to consider the matter and then to advise how the parties could give their ideas what the precise criteria could be under which bilateral funding for operational costs and operational party activities could be granted, such as a parallel and possible input to the continued public funding debate; this may include a weighing mechanism on the basis of he representativity / electoral strength of parties;
- Ask the Advisory Council to consider the matter on the basis of the report of the evaluation team and the outcome of the discussions of the expanded platform.

Options for inclusion of non-parliamentary parties that were offered in the discussions with the evaluators and that can be offered as input are:

- Include all registered political parties and treat them equally;
- Use a percentage of the national vote and determine this for example at 1 %;
- Continue the present system;
- A combination of all three above with appropriate weights.

The main advice the evaluators can give is that the matter should be given to the political parties themselves to debate and to reach agreement on (the principle of ownership). This will eliminate or at least minimise any sense of discrimination or unfair exclusion. For that discussion – expanded – platform may be broadened to bring in the Electoral Commission.

The year 2005 would be a good starting point for revised participation, taking into account that elections have taken place by then.

Possible indicators to measure impact of programs, to monitor progress and to compare to other similar programmes

The IMD/IEA programme is becoming more specific in defining in a structured and logical manner the relation between objectives, activities results and allocated budgets. The IMD Ghana annual plan for 2004 is a good example of this working method. The Joint Action Plan follows its own structure but it is possible to link the actions and activities proposed by the platform to the logical frameworks internally used by IMD. This provides for a monitoring framework on the programme level. It would be useful in coming years to defocus IEA on this approach and to take it as a basis for both the services that IEA is expected to deliver, as well as a structured monitoring tool for the output of the platform.

Most of the individual activity plans of the parties have a rudimentary logical framework, wherein activities and target groups and sometimes methodology is defined. What is missing is the definition of the expected outcomes/results and the initial costing. One extra complication is that most of the parties treat their party operational programmes with some secrecy and present IEA only those activities that are eligible for IMD/IEA funding. There is no transparency as to the total ambitions and needs and that does not further the original objective to develop programmes such that the interest of more sponsors could be raised. The requirement to perform satisfactorily under the general conditions of the programme will be a good driving tool to focus the political parties more on documented results. They are all interested in effective programmes for their parties. The improvement of design and the full compliance with the reporting requirements, as well as a standard inclusion of monitoring elements in the cycle will facilitate the overall monitoring.

Examples of good practises already applied by some are: the invitation of observers to events, the conclusion of meetings and trainings with a documented evaluation by the participants, either collectively, individually or both, the submission of a post-activity report within 14 days after the event; the review by parties of the impact of previous workshops as an input to follow-up; the invitation of the media to event and the monitoring of the press on programme related outputs etc.

The comparison to other programmes can only be effective if similar monitoring standard and elements were used and the quality of information would on average be of the same level. As argued, the aforementioned structuring of IMD's own annual country plans is an important step in that direction.

On the more general level of developments it could be interesting for IMD and IEA to bring in some outside monitoring of the general political environment in Ghana. The monitoring of specific elements of that environment, like the functioning of the Code of Conduct, could give interesting perspectives on programme impact.

Annex 1

Programme Evaluation IMD/IEA Ghana programme – as executed

Date	Activity	Time
Wednesday 1 st – Friday 3 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews staff IMD The Hague; documents and Ghana files research (Dijkstra) 	
Saturday 4 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrival Mr. Dijkstra 	7:30 p.m.
Sunday 5 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to the IEA office - doc. Review Briefing by IMD liaison Mr. Wiarda 	9.00 a.m. 4:00 p.m.
Monday 6 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to Peoples' National Convention Headquarters. Meeting with IEA staff (Project Director/Finance and Administrative staff) Visit to National Democratic Congress Headquarters. 	9:00 – 1:00 a.m. 11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. 2:00 p.m.
Tuesday 7 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to Convention Peoples' Party Headquarters. Meeting with Mr. Kwesi Jonah Visit to UNDP 	9:00 – 11:00am 2:00 – 3.30 p.m. 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Wednesday 8 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to the Electoral Commission Visit to National Commission On Civic Education. Meeting with Dutch Ambassador Meeting with Mr. Kuijper, Secretary of Embassy Meeting with Political Party Chairmen Meeting with IEA/Admin. 	9:00 – 10:00 a.m. 10:15 – 11:15a.m. 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. 12:30 – 13:30 p.m. 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. 4:00 – 6.00 p.m.
Thursday 9 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop for Political Parties (includes lunch). Visit to Graphic Communications Group Meeting with GCPP 	9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. 3:00 – 4:00pm 4:15 – 5:00 p.m.
Friday 10 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to FES. Visit to FNF Follow-on-discussions with IEA - Mrs. Mensa 	9:30 – 10:30 a.m. 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. 2.00 - 5.00 p.m.

Saturday 11 th and Sunday 12 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators individual work – writing interview reports / study additional files and other documents 	
Monday 13 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Advisory Council. • Visit to New Patriotic Party Headquarters. 	9:00 – 10:00 a.m. 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. 2.00 – 3.00 p.m.
Tuesday 14 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit to GJA. • Visit to the German Embassy • Meeting with the External Auditors (PWC) • Visit to DFID (cancelled) • IEA – final interview 	9:00 – 10:00 a.m. 1:00 – 1.30 p.m. 3:30 – 4:30 p.m. 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday 15 th and Thursday 16 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First drafting evaluation report • Meeting evaluation team 	
Friday 17 th September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting • Meeting evaluation team • Sharing of Main Findings with IEA/IMD Staff • Debriefing Mr. Wiarda – IMD liaison • Departure Mr. Dijkstra 	a.m. 11:00 am 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. 5:00 p.m. 9:00 p.m.
Weekend 18 th - 19 th and 22 nd - 23 rd September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final drafting and editing (Dijkstra) 	

Annex 2

Terms of Reference for the programme evaluation of the IMD/IEA-programme in Ghana

Introduction

In 2001 the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty democracy was founded. After an exploring phase, a launching conference and a selection process 11 countries were decided on to be the IMD priority countries. One of them was Ghana. The programme as it stands now only started in January 2003. The main purpose of the programme was to support the political parties in Ghana in the field of capacity-building and institutional strengthening and to enhance role political parties play in the process of democratisation in Ghana.

In order to execute the programme the IMD has received funding for a period of four years from the Minister for Development Co-operation of the Netherlands, ending in the end of 2006.

The multi-annual programme proposal submitted by IMD to the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs mentions a number of programme evaluations. In 2004 evaluations are planned in Bolivia and Ghana.

1. Objectives of the programme evaluation

The programme evaluation is expected to serve various purposes:

Firstly, it will have to measure the results achieved and, if possible, the impact of the programme in relation to its initial objectives. This could lead to recommendations regarding the programme as a whole and regarding its different elements. The conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation will be relevant for the continued development of IMD's Ghana programme.

Secondly, the programmatic processes will be reviewed in order to have a better understanding of the methodology and the operational modalities applied over the last two years and their impact on the programme. This includes the form of the co-operation, the administrative procedures and the role of IMD's local partner in the implementation, the Institute of Economic Affairs.

Thirdly, the evaluation will have to indicate what lessons can be learned.

In the year 2003 the budget of the Ghana programme was € 400.000 and in this year IMD has allocated € 634.000. Attached to this TOR you'll find a short overview of the programme until now and the objectives of the programme for 2004.

2. Evaluation issues

2.1. The programme objective

The main objective of the IMD/IEA-programme for Ghana was: *“the promotion of the process of democratisation by supporting political parties [in Ghana] in the area of capacity building”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).

The definition of capacity building has been formulated as follows: *“The strengthening of political parties on all levels, from the top to the local cadres, of the party infrastructure, as well as the promotion of a democratic culture and behaving with the leadership and cadres of the party”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).

A more specific objective for the first year of the programme was: *to assess the opportunities and constraints for the long-term institutional development of political parties in Ghana and to develop an agenda (action program) on how these challenges can be addressed and supported. The assessment will be undertaken with the objective of consolidating the democratic reform process in Ghana.* (report of an IMD mission 13-14 January 2003)

In view of these Objectives and definition, the kind of projects that would have preference in the programme are:

- political training regarding principles and processes of multiparty democracy;
- leadership training, specially for cadres on provincial and local level;
- training in management capacities;
- joint projects that can promote mutual trust and collaboration between parties;
- development of better channels of communication between chosen representatives and their voters, including strengthening of political accountability;
- strengthening of financial management capacities;
- improving processes of policy definition;
- Strengthening the influence and participation of women in political parties.

2.2. The focus of the evaluation:

2.2.1. Results:

The results can be evaluated on three levels, whereby the perception of the beneficiaries will be of distinct value:

*A. The **first level** is an assessment of the possible effect of the project on the process of democratisation of the political system and/or its contribution towards multiparty democracy in Ghana.*

- Have the main objectives of the programme, as formulated above, been achieved?
- What was the contribution of these activities (cross- and one party) projects to the realization of the main objective?
- The chosen programme approach was based on establishing trust and confidence with the parliamentary parties in Ghana. In other countries IMD works also with non-parliamentary parties. In Ghana nine parties are legally recognized by the Electoral Commission. Is this selective approach by IMD harming the process of democratisation in Ghana?

*B. The **second level** focuses is the effect of the project on the institutional capacity of the party(ies) involved.*

- What has been the effect of the various projects on the institutional development of the parties?
- Who/what groups within the parties benefited most from the projects?
- What is the sustainability of the effect on the party?

*C. The **third level** is the evaluation of the individual projects themselves. The evaluation is focussed on the quantitative and qualitative features of the project and the direct objectives in the project.*

- Is the target group addressed? Did the meetings actually take place? Was the training or educational method appropriate? Was the preparation properly done?, etc.
- Did the projects that have been implemented by the political parties cover the preferences mentioned above?
- Did the political parties use their drawing rights for the purposes as agreed?
- Where the projects demand-driven?

*D. The **fourth** level is a focus on the efficiency and consistency of the implementation of the programme objectives.*

- What is the level of ownership of the activities?
- Is the methodology of implementation consistent with the objectives of the programme?
- What is the added value of the programme in relation to other international support activities to strengthen the development of democracy in Ghana?
- Are partnerships effectively pursued with Ghanaian organizations and/or international organizations operational in Ghana for the implementation of the programme objectives?
- What is the role and value of the Institute for Economic Affairs in Ghana in assuring an efficient support for the implementation of the programme?
- What is the assessment of the allocation and utilization of the programme funds in relation to objectives of the programme?
- What is the appreciation of the arrangements to keep beneficiaries of the programme resources accountable for its utilization?

2.2.2. Process

Has the process towards formulating the programme as it stands now with the close partnership with IEA been accurate?

Has the demand driven approach worked well to achieve the intended results?

Can a development (positive or negative) be witnessed in the quality of the projects realized since the start of the programme?

How does the monitoring of the implementation function and what parameters for monitoring can be distinguished?

2.2.3. Implementation modalities

How does the overall programme management, including the relations between the Institute for Economic Affairs, the parties, the liaison officer and the IMD staff in the Netherlands, function?

Has the registration and documentation of the projects been adequately organized?

What is the added value of the chosen co-operation and implementation modalities (platform, IEA, etc.) in comparison with an IMD representative in Mozambique or the distant approach in Malawi?

2.2.4. Lessons learned

The evaluation should, amongst others, result in recommendations regarding the following issues:

1. The need for a continuation of the programme and its possible future direction?
2. The budget of the programme in relation to the absorption capacity of the political parties and the ongoing process of democratisation, cq the need for additional initiatives to further the objective of the programme?
3. The role of the Institute for Economic Affairs and the main functions it should undertake?
4. The improvement of the quality of the projects while keeping the ownership of the programme with the political parties themselves (principle of demand driven approach)?
5. The selection of the political parties that should be included in the future programme?

6. Possible indicators to measure the impact of programmes, to monitor their progress and to make a comparison to other programmes of a similar nature?

3. Methodology

- Study the relevant documentation regarding the programme (original programme proposal, mission reports, annual plans and programme reports);
- Study the IMD four year programme and specific IMD methodology;
- Select some files, available at both The Hague office and the IEA office in Accra, for case studies regarding the process of project-proposals, decision-making and implementation;
- Workshop with leaders of some political parties to discuss the impact the IMD project has (had) on the development of their party;
- Interviews with representatives of some political parties and political stakeholders in Ghana;
- (Group) discussion with representatives of international NGOs and/or intergovernmental organizations pursuing similar objectives, some external experts and the Royal Netherlands Embassy on the process of democratisation in Ghana and the role of IMD in this process;
- Meetings with the project director, administrator and auditor at the Institute for Economic Affairs to check the procedures and working methods;
- Meetings with the lead party in the Netherlands and with IMD office;
- Formulate the final report and present it to the IMD Director;

4. Time-schedule

The mission is expected to start its work in the second week of august 2004.

Briefing and study of documents: 3 days

Workshop, interviews: 8 days

Meetings with NGOs and experts: 2 days

Finalisation of the report: 2 days

Presentation of the report: 1 day

Final editing of the report for mission leader: 1 day

Total: 17 working days (13 days for Ghanaian evaluator)

5. Evaluation team

The ideal team should consist of:

1 (Ghanaian) neutral insider in the Ghanaian political situation.

1 (Dutch) specialist in programme-evaluation and project-assessment

At least one member of the team should be affiliated to The Netherlands political situation.

6. Reporting

The report should be in English. It will be presented to the Director of IMD within two weeks after the conclusion of the mission. It will contain an executive summary and cover the issues that are mentioned in this Terms of Reference.

7. Miscellaneous

The IMD Director may decide, depending on the needs, to extend the period of the assignment for purposes of discussions about the outcome of the evaluation. Specific new terms of reference shall be agreed for such a follow-through exercise.

Annex 3 Questionnaire Evaluation IMD Programme Ghana

Stakeholders

- 1 Political parties
- 2 Donors-partners
- 3 Donors-non partners
- 4 Implementers (IEA and sub-implementers)
- 5 Advisory Council
- 6 IMD / IEA staff
- 7 Auditor
- 8 Key resource persons
- 9 Netherlands Embassy
- 10 Inference

Personal Identification

Name

Organisation

Function

Date interview

2.2.1. Results

The results of the projects are evaluated on three levels: the possible effects on the process of democratisation, the effect on the institutional capacity of the party and the direct results of the projects.

2.2.1.A. *The first level is an assessment of the possible effect of the project on the process of democratisation of the political system and/or its contribution towards multiparty democracy in Ghana.*

1. Have the main objectives* of the programme, as formulated above, been achieved? 1+5+6
2. What was the contribution of these activities (cross- and one party) projects to the realization of the main objective? 1+5+6
3. The chosen programme approach was based on establishing trust and confidence with the parliamentary parties in Ghana. In other countries IMD works also with non-parliamentary parties. In Ghana nine parties are legally recognized by the Electoral Commission. Is this selective approach by IMD harming the process of democratisation in Ghana? 1+5+6

* The main objective of the IMD/IEA-programme for Ghana was: *“the promotion of the process of democratisation by supporting political parties [in Ghana] in the area of capacity building”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).

The definition of capacity building has been formulated as follows: *“The strengthening of political parties on all levels, from the top to the local cadres, of the party infrastructure, as well as the promotion of a democratic culture and behaving with the leadership and cadres of the party”* (original objective of the institute in their policy document).

A more specific objective for the first year of the programme was: *to assess the opportunities and constraints for the long-term institutional development of political parties in Ghana and to develop an agenda (action program) on how these challenges can be addressed and supported. The assessment will be undertaken with the objective of consolidating the democratic reform process in Ghana.* (report of an IMD mission 13-14 January 2003)

2.2.1.B. *The second level focuses is the effect of the project on the institutional capacity of the party(ies) involved.*

1. What has been the effect of the various projects on the institutional development of the parties? 1
2. Who/what groups within the parties benefited most from the projects? 1
3. What is the sustainability of the effect on the party? 1

2.2.1.C. *The **third** level is the evaluation of the individual projects themselves. The evaluation is focussed on the quantitative and qualitative features of the project and the direct objectives in the project.*

1. Is the target group addressed? 1+4+6
2. Did the meetings actually take place? 1+4+6
3. Was the training or educational method appropriate? 1+4+6
4. Was the preparation properly done?, etc. 1+4+6
5. Did the projects that have been implemented by the political parties cover the preferences** mentioned above? 1+4+6
6. Did the political parties use their drawing rights for the purposes as agreed? 1+4+6
7. Where the projects demand-driven? 1+4+6

** the kind of projects that would have preference in the programme are:

- political training regarding principles and processes of multiparty democracy;
- leadership training, specially for cadres on provincial and local level;
- training in management capacities;
- joint projects that can promote mutual trust and collaboration between parties;
- development of better channels of communication between chosen representatives and their voters, including strengthening of political accountability;
- strengthening of financial management capacities;
- improving processes of policy definition;
- Strengthening the influence and participation of women in political parties.

2.2.1.D. *The **fourth** level is a focus on the efficiency and consistency of the implementation of the programme objectives.*

1. What is the level of ownership of the activities? 1+4+6
2. Is the methodology of implementation consistent with the objectives of the programme? 1+4+6
3. What is the added value of the programme in relation to other international support activities to strengthen the development of democracy in Ghana? 1+2+3+4+5+6+8+9
4. Are partnerships effectively pursued with Ghanaian organizations and/or international organizations operational in Ghana for the implementation of the programme objectives? 2+3+5+6+9
5. What is the role and value of the Institute for economic Affairs in Ghana in assuring an efficient support for the implementation of the programme? 1+2+4+5+6
6. What is the assessment of the allocation and utilization of the programme funds in relation to objectives of the programme? 1+4+5+6
7. What is the appreciation of the arrangements to keep beneficiaries of the programme resources accountable for its utilization? 1+4+6+7

2.2.2. Process

1. Has the process towards formulating the programme as it stands now with the close partnership with IEA been accurate? 1+5+6
2. Has the demand driven approach worked well to achieve the intended results? 6+10
3. Can a development (positive or negative) be witnessed in the quality of the projects realized since the start of the programme? 1+10

4. How does the monitoring of the implementation function and what parameters for monitoring can be distinguished? 5+6+10

2.2.3. Implementation Modalities

1. How does the overall programme management, including the relations between the Institute for Economic Affairs, the parties, the liaison officer and the IMD staff in the Netherlands, function? 6+10
2. Has the registration and documentation of the projects been adequately organized? 10
3. What is the added value of the chosen co-operation and implementation modalities (platform, IEA, etc.) in comparison with an IMD representative in Mozambique or the distant approach in Malawi? 1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10

2.2.4. Lessons learned

The evaluation should, amongst others, result in recommendations regarding the following issues:

7. The need for a continuation of the programme and its possible future direction? 1+5+6+10
8. The budget of the programme in relation to the absorption capacity of the political parties and the ongoing process of democratisation, cq the need for additional initiatives to further the objective of the programme? 5+6+10
9. The role of the Institute for Economic Affairs and the main functions it should undertake? 1+5+10
10. The improvement of the quality of the projects while keeping the ownership of the programme with the political parties themselves (principle of demand driven approach)? 1+10
11. The selection of the political parties that should be included in the future programme? 1+5+6+10
12. Possible indicators to measure the impact of programmes, to monitor their progress and to make a comparison to other programmes of a similar nature? 5+6+10

Annex 4 IEA OVERVIEWS POLITICAL PARTIES BILATERAL ACTIVITIES

NPP BILATERAL PROGRAMME (2003 - 2004)

2003	Activity	Phase
June	Capacity Building Workshop For Constituency Executives in Brong Ahafo Region.	Completed
August	Capacity Building Workshop For 50 Regional Executives Of The Ten Regions.	Completed
October	Training Workshop for 60 Regional And Constituencies Of The Volta Region.	Completed
November	3-Day Capacity Building Workshop For Constituency Executives Of The Central Region.	Completed
November	Capacity Building Workshop For Constituency Executives of The Upper East Region.	Completed
November	Capacity Building Workshop For Constituency Executives Of The Eastern Region.	Completed
2004		
July	Strategic Review Seminar For Volta Region	Completed
July	Strategic Review Seminar For Brong Ahafo Region	Completed
August	Strategic Review Seminar For Ashanti Region	Completed
August	Strategic Review Seminar For Central Region	Completed
September	Strategic Review Seminar For Upper East Region	Completed
September	Strategic Review Seminar For Upper West Region	Completed

NDC BILATERAL PROGRAMME (2003 - 2004)

2003	Activity	Phase
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting up of Organisational teams at National, Regional & Constituency levels. • Grassroot programme and training forum with a specific constituency. • Regional launchings of party membership cards. 	Not Started
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party leadership interact with people in regions and constituencies. • Capacity Building Workshops for lower party officials. 	Not Started
August	Continuation of July and July Programmes.	Not Started
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational and Administrative Workshop for Party Executives and Functionaries. • Strategic Workshop for Regional Field Organisers from Western, Central, Eastern and Volta Regions. 	Completed
October	Mini rallies at Accra Central Market and Sakumotsoshishi for party activists and sympathizers.	Completed
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop on gender and development for party officials from the ten regions. • Community Interaction at Chorkor and Kokrobite on Tolerance and Political Participation. 	Completed
December	Rallies/Durbars at Pokuase and Afiaman to interact with communities	Completed

2004	Activity	Phase
January	Rallies/Durbars at Shiashie and Katamanso on promoting development needs through democracy	Completed
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Building Workshop for party officials and sympathizers at Zeenu. • Mini durbar at Lanteman • Workshop for training of Regional Executives on Voter Registration. 	Completed
March	Survey on factors motivating voters in the country conducted at Kpone and Mamprobi/Korle Bu	Completed
April	Mini Activity at Sabon-Zongo	On-going
June	Strategic Workshops at Takoradi and Bolgatanga	Completed
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inauguration of National Youth Working Committee in Brong Ahafo Region. • Training of Regional Constituency Executives on Political Campaigning. 	Completed

PNC BILATERAL PROGRAMME (2003 - 2004)

2003	Activity	Phase
August	Seminar on Local Level Political Leadership and Strengthening Democracy.	Completed
2004		
February	Training exercise for regional representatives	Completed
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward Executives Training Programme - Wa • Ward Executives Training Programme - Nabdam • Ward Executives Training Programme - Navrongo • Ward Executives Training Programme - Walewale • Ward Executives Training Programme - Nanlengu • Ward Executives Training Programme - Tumu • Ward Executives Training Programme - Sandem • Ward Executives Training Programme - Bunduri • Ward Executives Training Programme - Bunkpungu • Ward Executives Training Programme – Bolga 	Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed
July	Workshop - Bolgatanga	Completed

CPP BILATERAL PROGRAMME (2003 - 2004)

2003	Activity	Phase
June	Seminar – Ho	Completed
October	Workshop – Koforidua	Completed
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop – Accra • Workshop – Cape Coast • Workshop – Ho • Workshop – Koforidua 	Completed Completed Completed Completed
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop – Tamale • Workshop – Accra 	Completed Completed
2004		
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Programme For Constituency Executives – Brong Ahafo Region • Training Programme For Constituency Executives – Western Region • Training Programme For Constituency Executives – Ashanti Region • Training Programme For Constituency Executives – Upper East Region. 	Completed Completed Completed Completed

Annex 5 IEA OVERVIEW JOINT POLITICAL PARTIES ACTIVITIES (2003 - 2004)

Venue	Date	Theme	Phase
Accra International Conference Centre – Accra	6 th November 2003	Party Perspectives On Public Financing Of Political Parties.	Completed
Freedom Hotel – Volta Region (Ho)	27 th November 2003	Towards Free, Fair and Peaceful Elections 2004	Completed
Georgia Hotel – Ashanti Region (Kumasi)	13 th December 2003	Building A Healthy Relationship Among Ghanaian Political Parties	Completed
Catholic Social Centre – Northern Region (Tamale)	13 th March 2004	Voter Registration Exercise: The Role Of The Political Parties	Completed
Akroma Plaza – Western Region (Takoradi)	24 th April 2004	Campaign Decorum for Election 2004	Completed
Little Acre Hotel – Eastern Region (Aburi)	7 th – 8 th May 2004	Preparation of the New Political Parties Code of Conduct.	Completed
Catholic Social Centre – Upper East Region. (Bolgatanga)	21 st August 2004	Sustaining Ghana’s Democracy: The Need For Peaceful Co-existence.	Completed
Ghana Broadcasting Corporation – Accra (Television Broadcasts)	September – December	1. Peaceful Coexistence 2. Manifestos of parties	Almost Completed
Formation of A Conflict Resolution Agency - Accra	September – Mid October		In progress
Skills Training Programme - Accra	September - October	1. Training on financial management and record keeping. 2. Training on proposal and report writing. 3. Training on fundraising, policy advocacy and presentation.	Planning Underway

Annex 6 JOINT ACTIVITIES ACCORDING TO IMD PREFERENCE LIST

N	PROJECT TYPE	JOINT ACTIVITIES
1	Political Training regarding principles and process of multiparty democracy	
2	Leadership training, specially for cadres on provincial and local level	
3	Training in management capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills Training Programme
4	Join projects that can promote mutual trust and collaboration between parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party Perspectives On Public Financing Of Political Parties • Towards Free, Fair and Peaceful Elections 2004 • Building A Healthy Relationship Among Ghanaian Political Parties • Voter Registration Exercise: The Role Of The Political Parties • Campaign Decorum for Election 2004 • Preparation of the New Political Parties Code of Conduct • Sustaining Ghana's Democracy: The Need For Peaceful Co-existence • Broadcasts for political parties • Formation of A Conflict Resolution Agency • Caucus of the Chairmen
5	Development of better channels of communication between chosen representatives and their voters, including strengthening of political accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party Perspectives On Public Financing Of Political Parties • Towards Free, Fair and Peaceful Elections 2004 • Building A Healthy Relationship Among Ghanaian Political Parties • Voter Registration Exercise: The Role Of The Political Parties • Campaign Decorum for Election 2004 • Preparation of the New Political Parties Code of Conduct • Sustaining Ghana's Democracy: The Need For Peaceful Co-existence • Broadcasts for political parties • Caucus of the Chairmen
6	Strengthening of financial management capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills Training Programme
7	Improve process of policy definition	
8	Strengthening the influence and participation of women in political parties	

Annex 7 FILES REVIEW RESUME (Bilateral Activities) - sheet 1

N		NPP1	NPP2	NPP3	NPP4	NPP5	NPP6	NPP7	NPP8	NPP9	NPP10
	RESULTS SECOND LEVEL										
2	Who/ what groups benefited most?	Region 100 reg+const. Execut.	Region 61 reg. Execut	Region 56 reg.off;const.chairm; secr;organisers	Region ? chairm;secr; organisers	Region ? chairm;secr; organisers	Region ? chairm;secr; organisers	Nat. 85 reg+const. officers	Region 75 const.chairm;secr; organis.	Region 84 const.chairm;secr; organis	Region 126 const.chairm;secr; organis.
	RESULTS THIRD LEVEL										
1.a	Is the target group addressed?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
1.b	The meeting took place?	yes 19-22/6/03	yes 15- 17/8/03	yes 21-24/10/03	Yes 11/03	Yes 11/03	Yes 25-28/11/03	Yes 5-8/3/04	Yes 19-21/7/04	Yes 20-22/7/04	Yes 19-21/8/04
1.c	Was the method appropriate?	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical	classical
1.d	Was the preparation properly done?	dj	dj	dj	dj	dj	dj	dj	dj	yes First in the series of 6 strat. semin.	dj
2	Within preferences mentioned above	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
3	Drawing rights for purpose as agreed?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Demand driven principle?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES										
2	Registration and documentation of projects adequ?	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-

DJ- Difficult to judge; ?- No information in the files review

FILES REVIEW RESUME (Bilateral Activities) - sheet 2

N		NPP11	NPP12	NPP13	NDC 1-5	NDC6	NDC7	NDC8 2 act.	NDC9	NDC10 2 act.	NDC11 2 act.	NDC12 2 act.	NDC13
	RESULTS SECOND LEVEL												
2	Who/ what groups benefited most?	Region 85 const.chairm;secr; organis(+woman org)	Region 61 const.chairm;secr; organis.	Region 49 const.chairm;secr; organis.	Not imple- mented	Nat. ? party exex.+ funct	Reg. ? Field org.+ support.	Local ? activists + sympat.	Reg. ? party off.	Local ? commun.	Local ? comm..	Local ? comm..	Local ? party office.+ organ
	RESULTS THIRD LEVEL												
1.a	Is the target group addressed?	yes	yes	yes		?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
1.b	The meeting took place?	Yes 15-17/8/04	Yes 4-6/9/04	Yes 5-7/9/04	Planned 6-8/03	?	17/9/04	10/03	11/03	11/03	12/03	1/04	2/04
1.c	Was the method appropriate?	classical	classical	classical	-	?	?	?	classical	?	?	?	?
1.d	Was the preparation properly done?	dj	dj	dj		dj	dj	dj	yes	dj	dj	dj	dj
2	Within preferences mentioned above	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	?	yes	yes	?	?	yes
3	Drawing rights for purpose as agreed?	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	?	yes	yes	?	?	yes
4	Demand driven principle?	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	?	yes
	IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES												
2	Registration and documentation of projects adequ?	+/-	+/-	+/-		+	dj	-	+	-	-	-	dj

DJ- Difficult to judge; ?- No information in the files review

FILES REVIEW RESUME (Bilateral activities) - sheet 3

N		NDC14	NDC14	NDC15	NDC16	NDC17 2 act.	NDC18	NDC19	PNC1 2 act.	PNC2 9 act.	PNC3	PNC4 10 act	PNC5
	RESULT SECOND LEVEL												
2	Who/ what groups benefited most?	Local ? comm..	Reg. ?	Party ?	Local ?	Party Cadres 2x250	Youth wings; (const + Univers)	Const. Exec.	Local Party leadersh. ? + 150	Const. execut	Reg. ?	const/loc.	?
	RESULTS THIRD LEVEL												
1.a	Is the target group addressed?	yes	yes	yes	?	yes	yes	yes	yes		?	yes	?
1.b	The meeting took place?	2/04	Yes 5/3/04	n.a.	4/04	Yes 25-26/04	yes 24/7/04	Yes 25/7/04	Yes 10/10/03 11/10/03	14/11;15/11;21/11; 22/11;28/11;29/11; 5/12;7/12;20/12/03	?	15/3;17/3;16/3; 17/3;18/3;15/3; 16/3;17/3;18/3; 17/3/04	7/04
1.c	Was the method appropriate?	?	classical	?	?	classical	classical	?	classical	classical	?	classical	?
1.d	Was the preparation properly done?	dj	dj	?	?	yes	?	dj	dj	dj	?	dj	?
2	Within preferences mentioned above	?	yes	+/-	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	dj	yes	?
3	Drawing rights for purpose as agreed?	?	yes	yes	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	dj	yes	?
4	Demand driven principle?	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	?
	IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES												
2	Registration and documentation of projects adequ?	-	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+/-	-

DJ- Difficult to judge; ?- No information in the files review

FILES REVIEW RESUME (Bilateral Activities) - sheet 4

N	RESULT SECOND LEVEL	CPP1	CPP2 7 act.	CPP3 4 act.	TOTAL RESUME: 68 activities implemented							
					YES +	+/-	-	DJ	? lack of info	classical	total	
2	Who/ what groups benefited most?	?	Party cadres (off;org; reg; secr) + activists	Const. Exec.	66 total no. participants often unknown					2		68
	RESULTS THIRD LEVEL											
1.a	Is the target group addressed?	yes	yes	yes	64					4		68
1.b	The meeting took place?	Yes 6/03	10/10;22/11;15/11; 1/11;12/11;6/12+?/03	7/04	66					2		68
1.c	Was the method appropriate?	?	classical	classical						18	50	68
1.d	Was the preparation properly done?	?	dj	yes	8			54	6			68
2	Within preferences mentioned above	?	yes	yes	56	1		1	10			68
3	Drawing rights for purpose as agreed?	?	yes	yes	57			1	10			68
4	Demand driven principle?	yes	yes	yes	64				4			68
	IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES											
2	Registration and documentation of projects adequ?	-	+/-	+/-	13	39	14	2				68

DJ- Difficult to judge; ?- No information in the files review