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<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCPR</td>
<td>Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Community Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Conflict Prevention and Recovery Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>District Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaO</td>
<td>Delivering as One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNACSA</td>
<td>Ghana Commission on Small Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMIC</td>
<td>Ghana Multimedia Incubator Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoG</td>
<td>Government of Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRS</td>
<td>Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSGDA</td>
<td>Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPG</td>
<td>Inter-agency Programme Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHSP</td>
<td>Joint Programme for Human Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Joint Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAs</td>
<td>Ministries, departments and agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Microfinance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLGRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government and Rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFED</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTI</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBSSI</td>
<td>National Board for Small Scale Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC</td>
<td>National Democratic Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td>National Development Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORPREP</td>
<td>Northern Regional Poverty Reduction Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Peace Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>New Patriotic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMG</td>
<td>Operations Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>Regional Coordinating Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADA</td>
<td>Savannah Accelerated Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALW</td>
<td>Small Arms and Light Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMA</td>
<td>Tamale Metropolitan Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTFHS</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNU</td>
<td>United Nations University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND
The concept of human security, as originally articulated by UNDP in its 1994 Human Development Report, is based upon individuals’ rights to “freedom from fear,” “freedom from want” and “freedom to live in dignity”; and it is closely linked to the Millennium Development Goals (“MDGs”). It is distinguished from national security by its “people-centred” focus. In its advocacy for the protection and empowerment of the most vulnerable in times of crisis, human security is also relevant to the objectives of conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

While there has been exceptional progress in Ghana towards meeting MDG poverty reduction targets, this improvement is seen primarily in the south of the country. Poverty levels in Ghana’s Northern Regions are virtually unchanged since 1991-92. There is high youth unemployment in and migration from the North, and development in the Northern Regions has been hindered by ongoing disputes over land and chieftaincy issues. The potential for the destabilizing effect of these trends to be increased by conflicts in neighbouring countries; by the social effects of recent oil discovery and production in Ghana, and by the development of large scale, transnational drug trafficking there, is great.

With the aim of addressing threats to human security in Northern Ghana, and with particular reference to conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes, the United Nations Joint Programme, “Enhancing Human Security through Developing Local Capacity for Holistic Community-Based Conflict Prevention in Northern Ghana” (“UNJHSP”), was initiated on 1 June 2009.

The programme is a three year collaboration between the Government of Ghana (“GoG”) and six UN Agencies: the United Nations Development Programme (“UNDP”), which is the Lead Agency for the Programme; the United Nations Children’s Fund (“UNICEF”); the World Food Programme (“WFP”); Food and Agriculture Organization (“FAO”); the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (“UNIDO”) and the United Nations University (“UNU”). It is built upon the strengths of a UN inter-agency collaboration and based on the philosophy of the UN Delivering as One (“DaO”); and it envisages strong interagency partnerships as well as national leadership and ownership.

The Programme is funded by the Japanese Government through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS). The total UNTFHS award is US$ 2,969,575.28. The Programme’s original end date was 31 May 2012. The JHSP has recently received preliminary approval for a one year no-cost extension from the OCHA Human Security Unit.

The goal of the UNJHSP is to create an enabling environment and develop the capacity of local institutions, communities and individuals in the three northern regions of Ghana to enhance conflict prevention through integrated and people-centred approaches for sustainable human security. The Programme includes four sectoral components which focus on various aspects of food security, livelihood resilience, and capacity building in conflict resolution and peacebuilding approaches for communities and local government. A fifth component focuses upon knowledge management and the promotion of mainstreaming the human security concept into the national development context.

Beyond the tangible outputs of these activities, the JHSP aims to reduce conflict between different groups within communities by bringing them together to work towards common outputs and results.
The Programme’s implied, although not explicitly stated, theory of change is thus based upon the transformation of communal and individual behavior and diffusion of conflict. The performance indicators for the Programme are presented in Annex 2.

THE JOINT HUMAN SECURITY PROGRAMME MIDTERM EVALUATION

This review was commissioned by UNDP Ghana on behalf of the JHSP. The objective of this consultancy was to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the JHSP, based on the detailed terms of reference presented below, in Annex 1, “Terms of Reference”. The evaluators considered the programme’s continued relevance, as well as preliminarily assessed its efficiency and effectiveness, including emerging outcomes, and its sustainability. The evaluation has also noted post-design emerging issues which will be critical to address before national elections are held in December 2012. Finally, the evaluators assessed the functionality of the JHSP as a UN Joint Programme. The consultancy schedule, including the field trip to regional offices, is attached herewith as Annex 3, “Table of Site Visits and Persons Met”.

The evaluation consultants are Dr. Annette Ittig and Ms. Patience Agyare-Kwabi. Dr. Ittig is an experienced international monitoring and evaluation expert with extensive, multi-agency experience, including the formulation, implementation and evaluation of human security and joint programmes, in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. Ms. Agyare-Kwabi is a social development and M&E consultant with joint programme formulation experience with UNFPA Liberia and UN Zimbabwe.

The evaluation has been informed by a literature review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as well as visits to each of the four project sites in Tamale, Yendi, Wa and Bawku, and a local stakeholder validation session. Nearly 70 respondents, among them UNDP and other UN agency representatives, donors, government officials and NGO partners were interviewed, as well as male and female beneficiaries.

The consultants also presented their findings and recommendations to stakeholders in Accra upon completion of their fieldwork. The feedback from both the validation and the presentation has been incorporated into this report.

The mission’s restricted timeframe curtailed some of the evaluation’s planned fieldwork outside Accra. The turnover of staff at UNDP, as well as at partner agencies and in GoG offices, also hindered the collection of background information on the design and early implementation phases of the programme.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Programme Relevance. The relevance and timeliness of the JHSP to Ghana’s most under-developed and conflict-affected northern regions cannot be underestimated. Security and development needs in Ghana still remain great, and support to interventions which aim to address behavioural and systemic constraints to physical and economic security, well-being and good governance remains a relevant issue for donors, government and communities towards achieving the MDGs and human security objectives there.

Overall Programme Design. The programme design of the JHSP is ambitious, with five separate components and multiple anticipated outputs and outcomes. The five components include a broad range of activities relevant to the reduction of human security threats which were intended to build upon each other. However, the programme’s theory of change, including how the five JHSP
components would align in support of behavioral change and conflict reduction, has not been explicitly stated. Therefore, while conflict resolution and peacebuilding sensitizations feature in each component, the full synergies anticipated between these activities have as yet not been realized.

**Programme Risks and Assumptions.** Some of the assumptions upon which the Programme was based, such as all UN partners having a thorough understanding and acceptance of Joint Programming, that there would be no staffing gaps, and that the parallel funding modality would be efficient, have been optimistic. It has therefore not been possible for the Programme to achieve all of its midpoint targets.

**Cross-cutting issues** such as gender, youth and environment have not been well integrated into the programme design or strategically mainstreamed into its implementation.

**Post-Design Critical Issues.** Since the formulation of the JHSP, certain issues have been identified as particularly relevant to the programme’s objectives, and they are therefore critical to incorporate into its remaining timeframe. These include: the recognition of the site-specific dimensions of conflict; several youth-related themes, including the link between lack of education, skills and jobs, as well as the manipulation of at-risk youth by conflict entrepreneurs; the upcoming 2012 election as a possible conflict trigger; shifts in local influencers; and demographic changes which should influence beneficiary targeting.

**Programme Management and Coordination.** The governance structure of the JHSP includes a large Joint Steering Committee, a Programme Manager and a Technical Group of UN partner agency focal points. The Steering Committee includes UN, national, sub-national and local partners. The Steering Committee members are based both in Accra and in the North, and there have been logistical challenges in bringing together all of its members.

The Programme Manager has been tasked with Accra-level liaison and coordination, as well as with the management and oversight of field activities and staff, and administrative, communications and reporting functions. The Programme Manager has been over-stretched by these multiple duties and by his accountability to various groups; and he has not had full backstopping. This has negatively affected the expected effectiveness, efficiency and clear guidance, expected from his role.

Furthermore, although the UN agency focal points should play key roles in communication and collaboration between the partners, their accountability mechanisms are not clear. This has hindered the JHSP progress, as well as the realization of the DaO concept. Inadequate communication between the field and Accra, as well as between agency partners, was cited as a major concern by most of the respondents. Furthermore, there is currently no common information-sharing platform used by all the UN partners which would provide real time implementation data.

**Financial and Operational Procedures.** The synchronization of financial and operational procedures between the UN agency partners has been a challenge; and this has negatively impacted on the sequencing of programme activities. The parallel funding modality currently used in the Programme has further exacerbated activity sequencing, and the JHSP does not have a dedicated finance officer tasked with keeping disbursements on track. As of this writing, only 49% of JHSP funds have been disbursed.
**Transaction Costs.** The initial transaction costs of planning and establishing the JHSP have been high for the UN partners. Many UN respondents complained that the JHSP actually increased their workload, rather than reducing duplication of activities.

**Staffing.** Staffing gaps, including the resignation of the JHSP Programme Manager, the Accra and Tamale Programme Assistants, and two UNV field specialists in 2011, have adversely affected the achievement of UNDP’s intended outputs, as well as its coordination role. UNDP is in the process of replacing these staff, and the new programme manager and field specialists are expected to be in place shortly.

**Programme Collaborations and Partnerships.** The JHSP has four Ministry partners, and it has developed alliances with most of the key stakeholders in the four programme sites. The DAs, Chiefs, Community Opinion Leaders, the Peace Council and the Regional Peace Advisory Committees have been engaged; and national and local counterpart expectations of the JHSP, including for direct funding of activities, are quite high. However, the JHSP has not yet identified a single overarching GoG partner that would be willing and capable of championing the human security agenda for post-project sustainability.

Collaborations with local partners such as NBSSI, WANEP, GHANEP, RUMNET have to date been superficial; and their potential has not yet been adequately exploited to support key outputs. Alliances with other potential partners, e.g. with the private sector in relation to livelihoods, or with related programmes funded by other donors, have not yet been well-explored.

**Programme Implementation.** The JHSP aims for policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes. The delivery of planned JHSP outputs and preliminary outcomes has been uneven in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, including cost-effectiveness. This is due in part to the operational and management-related issues noted above. The strongest programme results were achieved in the area of peacebuilding sensitization, where JHSP-supported interventions were successful not only in providing avenues for dialogue but also in increasing dialogue between different ethnic groups at community levels. Partly as a result of this, the JHSP and the UN are seen as trusted and credible partners for the facilitation of dialogue and brokering peace among different groups.

In addition, efforts towards micro and small business development have been initiated; and the Community Action Plans (CAPs) have been developed with integrated conflict resolution approaches. Moreover, the development and mainstreaming of HS dimensions into the CAPs supports and strengthens the local governance system by involving grassroots stakeholders in decision making on key issues. This is the core of Ghana’s decentralization process, and it is often hindered by poor facilitation by local authorities. The JHSP serves as a means to support this process in the four programme sites.

**Summary Analysis and Lessons Learned.** The JHSP programme design has a highly “Accra-centric” perspective: it would have benefited by better knowledge of national and local government processes to maximize complementarities with interventions by other actors, and by more involvement of field actors at the design stage, to inform more realistic outcomes. Moreover, the programme design is very broad, with too numerous strategic results: fewer intended results would have been more achievable.
The “Joint Programme culture” is new to Ghana; and training and orientation on Joint Programmes, and on how they differ from joint programming and other delivery mechanisms, is key for buy-in from UN partner agencies. Teambuilding exercises can transform the “single agency” mindset into a “Delivering as One” team approach. The teambuilding session facilitated by UNIDO at the JHSP AWP Planning Workshop at Prampram, February 7-9, 2012 was an initial positive step towards this.

The inception period for a JP can be lengthy. As the initial transaction costs for UN agency partners - investments of staff time and funding needed to establish joint implementation, monitoring, and administration mechanisms – are high, programme periods of up to five years are generally needed to realize reductions in these costs. This should be a consideration in determining whether or not to create a JP.

The parallel funding modality has hindered procurement and sequencing of JHSP activities, as well as increased transaction costs. It also has encouraged agencies to work separately, rather than to “Deliver as One”. Furthermore, the JHSP does not have a dedicated finance officer tasked with keeping disbursements on track. Pooled or pass-through funding, or a combination of modalities, might have supported a better aligned implementation, and should be considered in the formulation of future JPs.

Large, complex JPs commonly rely on a central Programme Management Unit or Programme Coordination Unit, which may combine coordination, oversight, and monitoring functions, rather than tasking an individual programme manager with all of these duties, as has been done in the JHSP. PCUs typically include the Joint Programme Manager, an administration/finance assistant, and an M&E specialist. Moreover, JPs with PCUs which have national leadership have shown greater sustainability than those managed solely by UN partners.

Coordination with national and sub-national partners is essential, in order that JPs do not create parallel UN systems. The design of the JHSP would have benefited by more involvement of field actors and knowledge of national and subnational government processes: there have been missed opportunities and duplication of other efforts or already achieved actions, for example, in the creation of CICs.

A common information-sharing platform for real time mapping of activities and sharing of documentation is essential for a Joint Programme; and poor intra-programme communication is a challenge which the JHSP is trying to address. Teamworks is one platform currently under consideration by the JHSP team.

Benefit Sharing. The modalities for distributions of gains and the sharing of benefits from the JHSP, such as from the MFP and small ruminants, have not as yet been developed. Discussions with beneficiaries and other local stakeholders revealed some uncertainties about benefit sharing modalities, and the possibility that some discontent and conflict among community members could ensue, if these are not properly moderated.

Beneficiary target groups may need to be redefined over the course of the project, to better align with demographic changes and the emergence of new groups of opinion leaders, e.g. youth leaders and politicians.
RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD.
Operational and management-related bottlenecks which have hindered the JHSP progress have been noted above. Recommendations to address them are offered below.

Recommendations for Activity Prioritization and Implementation:

- Articulate a clear vision statement for the Programme which incorporates its theory of change.
- Consolidate JHSP gains to date, and focus on activities in these areas which will be critical in the time currently remaining for the programme, for example, the conflict prevention and resolution activities identified by local stakeholders (see Annex 12, “Minutes of the Validation Session”).
- Diversify the groups to which peacebuilding and conflict management will be given, to include politicians, businessmen, youth leaders and other new, non-traditional opinion leaders.
- As the upcoming election could be a conflict trigger, outline potential election scenarios; determine what preventative actions – for all UN agencies - would best address the most probable scenarios, and identify “quick wins” which target the most at risk groups, e.g. mass employment activities to engage jobless youth or other livelihood interventions, and which will increase JHSP visibility. Conduct a stakeholder mapping exercise of other development partners (“DP”s) and donor programmes engaged in similar human security related activities in the Northern Regions, in order to identify other DPs with whom activities can be shared or piggy-backed. This exercise should be incorporated into the current UN wide mapping and database of “who’s doing what/where” in the North
- Re-prioritize activities in the RRF accordingly.

Recommendations – Governance, Staffing, Financial Modalities

- As the JHSP will continue for at least another year, it is recommended that a small interagency Programme Coordination Unit be established in Accra to coordinate administrative, financial, reporting, communications and liaison functions. The Unit could include the Programme Manager, an M&E specialist, a finance/administration assistant, and communication assistant. As it is not now possible to change the JHSP parallel funding modality, the role of the finance assistant would focus on keeping the remaining disbursements on track. It is further recommended that a national counterpart be considered for inclusion in the proposed PCU.
- As parallel funding has proved unhelpful in the current phase of the JHSP, it is strongly recommended that pooled or pass-through modalities, or a combination of these financing options, be used in future joint programmes.
- Establish a stronger macro level coordination mechanism in Accra. Options include utilizing the Outcome Group (Governance), with an identified Focal Point; placing the JHSP on the IPG agenda, which would elevate it to the policy level; and increasing support from the RC’s office
- Allocate 50% of the new programme manager’s time to the field office, where s/he can provide guidance to the field coordinator and UNV field specialists, as well as proactively coordinate with key local government and civil society partners; for the other 50% of the time, s/he would be Accra-based.
• The roles and accountability mechanisms of the agency focal points should be clarified, to ensure the smooth and timely flow of information to and from Accra and the field.
• Introduce a common information-sharing platform that will provide real time implementation details: a recommended platform is Teamworks, which is already widely used for this purpose in the UN system

**Recommendations – Training and Teambuilding.**
• Invest in additional teambuilding, training and orientation sessions on Joint Programmes, as this is key for buy-in from UN partner agencies. It is recommended that such sessions be held on a six monthly basis, due to the rate of staff turnover in the agencies.

**Recommendations – Sustainability**
• To ensure post-project sustainability, select an overarching national partner from among the four ministries with whom the JHSP is already allied, to “own” the programme
• establish handover guidelines and systems with local partners as soon as possible
• align with the national peace architecture in establishing partnerships for sustainability at all levels, e.g. CICs, once formed and trained in peacebuilding, can easily evolve into community peace councils, and thus support implementation for the National Peace Council

**Way Forward.** The JHSP is an ambitious, timely and relevant programme. Its efforts to transform communal and individual behavior and to diffuse conflict are already demonstrating some positive emerging results. However, some of the outputs expected from the JHSP at midpoint have not been achieved, due to the programme design, operational and management-related bottlenecks noted above.

Many of the challenges that the JHSP has faced are common to JPs elsewhere. The Programme provides several lessons for the design and management of future JPs, as well as for a possible second phase of the JHSP – an option which is currently under consideration by the UNCT.

The recent approval by the UNTFHS of a one year, no-cost extension for the JHSP provides an opportunity for the Programme to make necessary adjustments to its activities, its governance structure, and financial and operational procedures, towards achieving the objective of alleviating human security threats in Ghana’s most under-developed regions during its remaining timeframe.
INTRODUCTION

The concept of human security, as originally articulated by UNDP in its 1994 Human Development Report, is based upon individuals’ rights to “freedom from fear,” “freedom from want,” and “freedom to live in dignity”; and it is closely linked to the Millennium Development Goals (“MDGs”). It is distinguished from national security by its people-centred focus. In its advocacy for the protection and empowerment of the most vulnerable in times of crisis, human security is also relevant to the objectives of conflict prevention.

Rationale for the Joint Government of Ghana/UN Human Security Programme. While there has been exceptional progress in Ghana towards meeting MDG poverty reduction targets, this improvement is seen primarily in the south of the country. Poverty levels in Ghana’s Northern Regions are virtually unchanged since 1991-92. There is high youth unemployment in and migration from the North, and development in the Northern Regions has been hindered by ongoing conflicts over land and chieftaincy issues.

The potential for the destabilizing effect of these trends to be increased by conflicts in and population movements from neighbouring countries; by the social effects of recent oil discovery and production in Ghana, and by the development of large scale, transnational drug trafficking there, is great.1 These potential human security threats have also created new power brokers and “conflict entrepreneurs” whose influence is overtaking that of more traditional authorities, even in more remote northern areas.

Programme Objectives, Linkages and Components. With the aim of addressing risks to human security in Northern Ghana, and with particular reference to conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes, the United Nations Joint Programme, “Enhancing Human Security through Developing Local Capacity for Holistic Community-Based Conflict Prevention in Northern Ghana” (“UNJHSP”), was initiated on 1 June 2009.

The programme is a three year collaboration between the Government of Ghana (“GoG”) and six UN Agencies: the United Nations Development Programme (“UNDP”), which is the Lead Agency for the Programme; the United Nations Children’s Fund (“UNICEF”); the World Food Programme (“WFP”); Food and Agriculture Organization (“FAO”); the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (“UNIDO”) and the United Nations University (“UNU”). It is built upon the strengths of a UN inter-agency collaboration and based on the philosophy of the UN Delivering as One (“DaO”)2; and it envisages strong interagency partnerships as well as national leadership and ownership.

The Programme is funded by the Japanese Government through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS). The total UNTFHS award is US$ 2,969,575.28. The Programme’s original end date

2“Although Ghana is not a One UN pilot country per se, the UNCT conducts its activities on the basis of a joint annual work plan which has as its main objective the achievement of all the MDGs in Ghana by the target date of 2015. “ Advisory Group to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Committee on United Nations Affairs, Parliamentary Field Mission to Sierra Leone and Ghana - Focus on United Nations Reform, 30 May-3 June 2011, p. 13
was 31 May 2012. The JHSP has recently received preliminary approval for a one year no-cost extension from the OCHA Human Security Unit.\(^3\)

The goal of the UNJHSP is to create an enabling environment and develop the capacity of local institutions, communities and individuals in the three northern regions of Ghana to enhance conflict prevention through integrated and people-centred approaches for sustainable human security. The Programme aims to deliver policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes. It includes four sectoral components which focus on various aspects of food security, livelihood resilience, and capacity building in conflict resolution and peacebuilding approaches for communities and local government. A fifth component is concerned with knowledge management and the promotion of mainstreaming the human security concept into the national development context.

Beyond the tangible outputs of these activities, the JHSP aims to reduce conflict between different groups within communities by bringing them together to work towards common outputs and results. The Programme’s implied, although not explicitly stated, theory of change is thus based upon the transformation of communal and individual behavior and the diffusion of conflict. The performance indicators for the Programme are presented in Annex 2.

The JHSP builds on the country’s current development agenda and priorities. It is linked to several Government of Ghana policy frameworks, including:

- Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013), particularly the key thematic areas of “Transparent and Accountable Governance” and “Human Development, Productivity and Employment”
- The National Peace Council Act (2011)

Its links to UN policy and programming frameworks include:

- The UNDAF Thematic Area “Transparent and Accountable Governance”, particularly Outcome 10.4, “National peace architecture and conflict prevention mechanisms institutionalized and functional”

The main partners for the programme are:

- GoG: the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP); the Ministry of Interior; the Ministry for Local Government and Rural Development (MoLGRD); the National Peace Council; the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA); the Tamale Metropolitan Assembly, the Wa, Yendi and Bawku Municipal Assemblies,
- UN Executing Agencies: UNDP, UNIDO, UNICEF, UNU, WFP, FAO

---

\(^3\) Email from Jennifer Serunjogi, Financial Management Officer, United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, to Christy Ahenkora-Banya, Programme Specialist, UNDP Ghana, 14 March 2012. The HSP team has submitted a formal request for the no cost extension and, as of this writing, a final, positive response is anticipated shortly from the donor.
- CBOs and LNGOS: Ghana Health Service (GHS), West Africa Network for Peace building (WANEP), Ghana Network for Peace building (GHANEPC) University of Ghana, Legon, University for Development Studies, Tamale

**Evaluation Aims and Objectives** This review was commissioned by UNDP Ghana on behalf of the JHSP. The objective of this consultancy was to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the JHSP, based on the detailed terms of reference presented below in Annex 1, “Terms of Reference”. The evaluators considered the Programme’s continued relevance, as well as preliminarily assessed its efficiency and effectiveness, including emerging outcomes, and its post-project sustainability. The evaluation has also noted post-design emerging issues which will be critical for the JHSP to address before national elections are held in December 2012. Finally, the evaluation team also assessed the functionality of the JHSP as a UN Joint Programme.  

In addition to this midterm evaluation, the JHSP has been periodically self-monitored. There was as well a recent midterm evaluation of JHSP outputs undertaken by the UNU/UDS, the findings of which have been integrated into this review.

**Consultancy workplan** The consultancy schedule, including the field trip to regional offices, is attached herewith as Annex 3, “Table of Site Visits and Persons Met”.

**Evaluation Consultants** The evaluation consultants are Dr. Annette Ittig and Ms. Patience Agyare-Kwabi. Dr. Ittig is an experienced international monitoring and evaluation expert with extensive, multi-agency experience, including the formulation, implementation and evaluation of human security and joint programmes, in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. Ms. Agyare-Kwabi is a social development and M&E consultant with joint programme formulation experience with UNFPA Liberia and UN Zimbabwe.

**Evaluation Methodologies – Literature Review, Interviews, Site Visits and Stakeholder Consultations** The evaluation included a literature review (sources are listed in “References”, below), key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as well as field visits to the four project sites in the Northern Region (see Annex 3, “Table of Site Visits and Persons Met”), and a local stakeholder validation session in Tamale (Annex 12, “Minutes from the Local Stakeholder Validation Session, Tamale, 2 March 2012”). Nearly 70 respondents, among them UN agency representatives, government officials, and NGO and CBO partners were interviewed. Male and female beneficiaries were also interviewed (see Annex 4, “List of Respondents”). The evaluators also presented their findings and recommendations to stakeholders in Accra upon completion of their fieldwork. The feedback from the validation and presentation has been incorporated into this report.

**Evaluation Constraints and Assumptions** The mission’s restricted timeframe curtailed some of the evaluation fieldwork outside Accra. The turnover of staff at UNDP, as well as at partner agencies and in GoG offices, also hindered the collection of background information on the design and early implementation phases of the programme.

---

4 The UNDG’s Guidance Note on Joint Programming, dated 19 December 2003, provides a succinct overview of the components required for a Joint Programme:  
[http://www.searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Strategic_Alliance_and_Partnerships_5d UNDG_Guidance.pdf](http://www.searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Strategic_Alliance_and_Partnerships_5d UNDG_Guidance.pdf)
PROGRAMME DESIGN, MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION, COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

PROGRAMME DESIGN

Programme Relevance  The relevance and timeliness of the JHSP to Ghana’s most under-developed and conflict-affected northern regions cannot be underestimated. Security and development needs in Ghana still remain great, and support to interventions which aim to address behavioural and systemic constraints to physical and economic security, well-being and good governance remains a relevant issue for donors, government and communities towards achieving the MDGs and human security objectives there.

Overall Programme Design  The programme design of the JHSP is ambitious, with five separate components and multiple anticipated outputs and outcomes. The five programme components include a broad range of activities relevant to the reduction of human security threats which were intended to build upon each other. However, the programme’s theory of change, including how the five JHSP components would align in support of behaviorial change and conflict reduction, has not been explicitly stated; nor has a detailed conflict analysis upon which to build its broad strategy for reducing human security threats been undertaken. Therefore, while conflict resolution and peacebuilding sensitizations feature in each component, the full synergies anticipated between these activities have as yet not been realized. Additional details are given below in section III, “Programme Implementation”.

The programme design would have also benefited had it been better informed on local government structures, in order to more closely link JHSP activities to existing processes: see below, section III, “Programme Implementation”.

Programme Design Risks and Assumptions  The programme has neither a clearly articulated overall risk management strategy, or context specific strategies, for guidance when things do not go according to plan. Moreover, some of the assumptions upon which the JHPS was based, such as all UN partners having a thorough understand and acceptance of Joint Programming; that there would be strong coordination at the field and Accra levels; that there would be no significant staffing gaps; and that the parallel funding modality would be efficient, have been optimistic. It has therefore been difficult for the programme to effectively achieve all of the results intended, and its progress to date as measured against its midterm targets is uneven.

Cross-cutting issues such as gender and environment have not yet been well integrated into the programme design. There is no clear strategy for gender and youth mainstreaming, though the project document identifies both as critical targets. Although the Programme has identified some women’s groups to support, it has not yet introduced other gender dimensions into programme activities, such as a gender analysis of the impact of threats and enhancing capacity building in gender and conflict resolution modules.

While provision has been made for the collection of gender-disaggregated data for monitoring, activity reports on gender equality are not sufficiently analytical, thereby posing challenges in translating

---

plans into concrete action to close gender gaps. The most significant achievements pertain to expanding women’s access to and control over productive assets and improving women’s well-being, and to easing their workload by facilitating their access to basic services and infrastructure like the milling and fortification machines. Progress in strengthening women’s NGOs and CBOs in decision-making in the community and their representation in peace and conflict dialogue is still low; and the involvement of strategic groups like the Northern Women in Peace Building has been minimal. Integrating mechanisms to address negative gender-specific, conflict-related coping mechanisms, like the migration of the “kayayee” and “boro boys” to southern Ghana, is now a national phenomena which the programme cannot overlook.

**Post-Design Emerging Issues** Since the formulation of the JHSP, certain issues have been identified as particularly relevant to the programme’s objectives, and they are therefore critical to incorporate into its remaining timeframe. These include: the recognition of the site-specific dimensions of conflict; several youth-related themes, including the link between lack of education, skills and jobs, as well as the manipulation of at-risk youth by conflict entrepreneurs; the upcoming 2012 election as a possible conflict trigger; shifts in local influencers; and demographic changes which should influence beneficiary targeting.

**PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION**

**Programme Management and Coordination** The governance structure of the JHSP includes a large Joint Steering Committee, a Programme Manager and a Technical Group of UN partner agency focal points. The “HSP secretariat” is a term that has been loosely used to refer to some or all of these groups. The Steering Committee includes UN, national, sub-national and local partners. Committee members are based both in Accra and in the North, and there have been logistical challenges in bringing together all of its members. The Steering Committee has met once since the commencement of the JHSP.6

The Programme Manager has been tasked with Accra-level liaison and coordination, as well as with the management and oversight of field activities and staff, and with administrative, communications and reporting duties. The Programme Manager has been over-stretched by these multiple functions and by his accountability to various groups. This has negatively affected the expected effectiveness, efficiency and clear guidance expected from his role.

Furthermore, although the UN agency focal points should play key roles in communication and collaboration between the partners, their accountability mechanisms are not clear; and this has hindered JHSP progress, and the realization of the Delivering as One concept. Inadequate communication between the field and Accra, as well as between agency partners, was cited as a major concern by most of the respondents. It has also affected coordination between the UN agency JP

---

6 “…a Joint National Steering Committee has been established for the programme. The composition comprises all participating UN Agencies, the Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning, Local Government and Rural Development and the Interior. It also includes civil society organizations such as the West Africa Network for Peace building (WANEP- Ghana) and the National Peace Architecture the National Peace Council. The 1st National Joint Steering Committee of the programme was held at Tamale in the last quarter of 2011 to review progress on implementation, address strategic policy challenges and make recommendations on the way forward”, UNCT Ghana, *Third Annual Progress Report to the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*, January 2012, p. 20
partners. Furthermore, there is currently no common information-sharing platform used by all the UN partners which would provide real time implementation data.

Financial and Operational Procedures As financial and administrative systems differ among UN organizations, it is not surprising that the synchronization of financial and operational procedures between the UN JHSP partners has been a challenge. Indeed, procedural harmonization has been a challenge common to other Joint Programmes elsewhere.

Unfortunately, the lack of harmonized procedures has greatly disrupted the sequencing of programme activities. Furthermore, implementation delays reduce the programme’s credibility among the beneficiaries. Most UN respondents felt that the JHSP’s parallel funding modality has further exacerbated activity sequencing, and the JHSP does not have a dedicated finance office tasked with keeping disbursements on track. As of this writing, only 49% of JHSP funds have been disbursed.

Transaction costs The initial transaction costs of planning and establishing the JHSP have been high for the UN partners. Many UN respondents complained that the JHSP actually increased their workload, rather than reducing duplication of activities.

Staffing Staffing gaps, including the resignation of the JHSP Programme Manager, the two Programme Associates for Accra and Tamale and two UNV field specialists for Wa and Yendi in 2011, has adversely affected the achievement of UNDP’s intended outputs, as well as its JHSP coordination role. UNDP is in the process of replacing these staff, and the new programme manager and the UNV field specialists are expected to be recruited shortly.

Since the resignation of the two field specialists, the Tamale field specialist has covered both his post as well as Yendi; and the UNDP Recovery field specialist in Wa has provided back up for the JHSP there.

Monitoring and Evaluation The HSP has a joint M&E Plan. However, each agency monitors and reports on its activities to its own office; this information is subsequently forwarded to UNDP. This

---

7 However, some of the UN partners were given an introduction to Teamworks by UNU at the AWP Planning Workshop in Prampram in February 2012
9 “There is some evidence that pooled and pass-through funding arrangements reduce transactions costs for government and donors. However, when UNCTs chose to use parallel funding mechanisms, there has been little reduction in transaction costs to government, as Ministries are still required to interact with UN agencies separately: United Nations Development Group, Delivering as One, December 2006, p. xiii
10 For example, consultants’ interviews with UNICEF and WFP Tamale, 20 February 2012
12 Since the conclusion of the MTR, UNDP has recruited a new HSP Programme Manager and two UNV field officers have been identified and are expected to be in place by mid-May
13 “...on a quarterly basis, the Programme Management Team and each collaborating UN agency will conduct periodic monitoring that is centered on the output levels generated by inputs and activities. The Team and each
indicates that M&E in the JHSP is viewed more as a silo activity, with a set of distinct, individual agency indicators, rather than as a joint plan.

**Participatory Monitoring Systems** The JHSP intends to support the DAs to establish a database and coordination mechanism for third party actors, including NGOs and other development partners who are active in the programme sites, in order to align support for the District/Municipal Development Plans. This task has not yet been undertaken. However, once completed, it could support mechanisms for a more holistic participatory monitoring system with information on who is doing what, where and when for the promotion of human security and conflict prevention. It would also complement the UN-wide mapping of activities in the North which has recently begun (see below, n. 21).

**PROGRAMME COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS**

The JHSP has four national partners (MoI, MoFEP, MLGRD, and MoFA), and it has developed collaborations with most of the key stakeholders in the four programme sites. The DAs, Chiefs, Community Opinion Leaders, the Peace Council and the Regional Peace Advisory Committees have been engaged; and national and local counterpart expectations of the JHSP, including for direct funding of activities, are quite high: see, for example, Annex 12, “Minutes from the Local Stakeholder Validation Session, Tamale, 2 March 2012”, local stakeholder interpretations and expectations, section 2.0). However, the Programme has not yet identified a single overarching GoG partner that would be willing and capable of championing the human security agenda for post-project sustainability.14

Collaborations with local partners such as NBSSI, WANEP, GHANEP and RUMNET have to date been superficial; and their potential has not yet been adequately exploited to support key outputs, e.g. the BDS and other livelihood-related activities envisaged in JHSP Objective 3; additional details are given below, in section III, “Programme Implementation”. While the Programme has had preliminary meetings with the GoG’s Savannah Accelerated Development Authority (SADA) project and the NGO Sustainable Peace Initiatives (SPI), to discuss human security and peacebuilding synergies with them in HSP project sites, these are yet to be followed up.

Furthermore, interactions with the media and security forces have not been deepened, nor has their potential to sustain conflict management beyond the programme well exploited. In addition, alliances with other potential partners, such as with the private sector for livelihood interventions, or with related programmes funded by other donors such as DFID and the World Bank, have not yet been well-explored.

---

14 The HSP secretariat has explored “…a tripartite national level ownership involving the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of the Interior, All three Ministries were invited to the National Joint Programme Steering Committee and agreed to the arrangement. The Programme Secretariat will follow up with the three Ministries to discuss a strategy for coordinating national level interventions and determine an approach for level lead partner and a mechanism for national level engagement. “, *Third Progress Report*, 2012 (op. cit.), p. 29
The JHSP aims for policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes. The delivery of planned JHSP outputs and preliminary outcomes has been uneven in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, including cost-effectiveness, due in part to the operational and management-related issues noted above. Overall, the peacebuilding/conflict resolution components have scored better than the livelihood and food security components: additional details are given below.

**Implementation of Objective 1:** Capacity of local Governance and civic institutions for democratic governance, integrating conflict sensitive approaches, developed by 2011. (UN Partners: UNDP, UNICEF) The enhancement of local government capacity in conflict sensitive approaches remains one of the key expected outcomes of the JHSP. However at the time of this mid-term evaluation, major activities which should contribute to the attainment of this objective at this stage of programme delivery, have not been executed in any of the four programme sites. This was confirmed through the evaluation team’s discussions with DA officials as well as with programme officers and through available reports. It should be noted that the results of these activities must critically inform the development of a more targeted capacity enhancement component for local government and civic institutions. These include the Conflict Analysis and Human Resources skills audit and capacity assessment in Yendi, Bawku, Wa and Tamale, and the training for forty-five government officials and institutions in the four districts on mainstreaming conflict prevention and management skills.

UNDP is the agency responsible for the implementation of these activities; and its inability to do so to date is linked to its lack of field presence. However, the agency’s inability to undertake these activities during the initial phases of the programme is seriously problematic: these activities should have formed the basis for contextualizing capacity enhancement and the mainstreaming of HS and conflict management in the DAs as the main local governance systems and to be able to review structures in a site-specific manner. Secondly, an understanding of the capacity gaps through the HR audit could have provided the baseline capacity information, a pillar upon which the design and development of all trainings and capacity building for such local government officers and also institutions must be built.

Contextualizing capacity gaps in conflicts management approaches should inform as well the engagements of stakeholders and the formulation of a medium to long term plan to address HS gaps within local institutions. Sequencing of activities in the attainment of this component have been compromised and often overlooked; and the building of desired sequencing of activities and required synergies has been disappointedly compromised.

A major and commendable achievement of the objective 1 of the HSP is the preparation of Community Action Plans (CAPs). To date, CAPs including conflict prevention and food security priorities have been developed and validated in all sites except Bawku due to some insecurity situations which delayed implementation activities. Furthermore, the roles of key stakeholders and

---

15 The field activities of the JHSP were the topics of lively discussions with beneficiaries and local stakeholders (see, for example, Annex 12, “Minutes of the Local Stakeholder Validation Session, Tamale”), as well as with Accra stakeholders following the consultants’ presentation there. Implementation modalities and sequencing and field level outputs and bottlenecks have been considered and analyzed in detail by the consultants. I am indebted to Ms. Patience Agyare-Kwabi for her write-up of this section: Annette Iitig

16 JHSP Programme Against Workplan, January 2012
partners, such as the NDPC and the NPC, have not yet been formalized; and their great potential for strategic contributions is still untapped.

The provision of funds for the support of the 4 District/Municipal Assemblies (Yendi, Bawku, Tamale and Wa) for the annual review /update of their Development Plans and strengthening their conflict prevention component, through training, meetings, information sharing and mutual learning was also not achieved in 2011 as proposed by the programme activities. Although the activity is rescheduled for 2012, the MTR considers this as another missed opportunity, since results of the activity could have critically informed stakeholders on progress of the programme in the attainment of its expected outcome and to be able to measure the extent to which HS outcomes are / can be progressively achieved. Secondly this activity has the potential of supporting participatory stakeholder monitoring. For the DAs themselves non-availability of dedicated funds remains one of the challenges to mainstreaming of HS in line with the programme objective.

The current level of engagement of third party actors is unclear, because another major activity which should have been attained in 2011 i.e. support of local governments to establish Data base and coordination mechanism for third party actors (Development Partners, NGOs active in the areas ) so as to align support to District/Municipal Development Plans, has not yet been achieved.

Furthermore, the provision of financial and material support to local governance institutions in the four programme sites for the implementation monitoring and administration of programme activities. (T&T, stationery etc.) is outstanding. Clearly this is a major gap and a constraint to local participation and ownership of programme processes, since without proper monitoring of programme activities, corrective and sustainability measures cannot be built in.

Table 1: Assessment of Expected outcomes against Actual Outputs of Objective 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Remarks on intended versus actual results to date</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1 Increased capacity of local governance institutions to reduce conflict and for the effective management and delivery of public services** | **Not on track with work plan timelines:** Some critical outputs have not yet been undertaken according to proposed timelines e.g. conflict analysis / HR Skills audit / capacity assessment has not been undertaken.  
**Sequencing, building of synergies and timely delivery of outputs have been unnecessarily compromised**  
**Roles of key stakeholders and partners have not been properly formalized and their strategic contributions not yet tapped:** NDPC, National Peace Council, Youth Council | **Discussions with MMDAs, DPCU**  
**HSP Report _ Progress Against Workplan 2011** |
| **1.2 Civic engagement and participation of local stakeholders in public policy making and local governance processes promoted** | | |

**Implementation of Objective 2:** Capacity of security institutions and community members in human rights and rule of law issues enhanced, and mechanisms for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts and armed violence institutionalized at the local level by 2011 (UN partner:

---

17 Ibid.
The promotion of the rule of law remains one of the key elements of HSP and its relevance cannot be underestimated. The key activities outlined for implementation under the second objective of the HSP are therefore very relevant. Effectiveness in the delivery of these activities under objective 2 is low and has not been on track in line with the set timelines which was set for 2011. Reasons for the non timely delivery of these activities are unclear. Whilst the delivery of some of the key outputs by the UNICEF under this objective has been timely, focused and is currently ongoing, those which should have been delivered under UNDP were not achieved.

The provision of financial and material support to local governance institutions in the 4 Programme sites for the implementation monitoring and administration of programme activities scheduled for the 1st quarter of 2012 including direct fund transfers to the 4 Assemblies. These include the creation of awareness (of community leaders, heads of Arabic schools, Peace keepers) on child rights issues and the consequences of involving children in conflicts. The MTR however is concerned about the disjointed manner in which implementation is being executed. The implementation of the disbursement of these funds must necessarily be linked to that to be delivered by UNDP to support the monitoring by DAs.

The request for training according to programme reports, are still being processed, but the training is to focus only in Bawku, not in other districts. Training is planned in Bawku for NGOs, district assembly members, youth groups, heads of Arabic schools etc. Part of the training involves also monitoring of small arms. However the MRT can stress that the delivery of this activity should be considered a matter of urgency as outcome of the debriefing with stakeholders including representatives from all the 4 DAs stressed the urgent need and importance of these trainings to reinforcing peace and security.

Table 2: Assessment of Expected outcomes against Actual Outputs of Objective 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Remarks on intended versus actual results to date</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1. Human rights promoted and rule of law regime established in programme communities and district/municipalities | • Not on Track according to work plan timelines: Limited engagement with security agencies and institutions in the project sites;  
• Current information on circulation of small arms outdated and management and use information unreliable;  
• Some emerging positive outcome reveals critical engagements among different factions as a result of project activities.  
• There is the need for consolidation of cohesion and peace-building activities | • HSP Report _ Progress Against Workplan 2011  
• Interviews and discussions  
• Draft Annual Report 2011  
• Discussions with MMDAs, Chiefs and Opinion Leaders |
| 2.2. Reduction in circulation of small arms and effective management and responsible use of small arms promoted |                                                                                                                      |                                                            |
| 2.3. Improved community security and social cohesion                               |                                                                                                                      |                                                            |

To date, there have been positive accounts of engagement, both during and after training sessions, between different factions at all community levels. However, there has been limited engagement with security agencies and institutions in the project sites; and current information on circulation, management and use of small arms needs to be updated according to information gathered through
discussions from the Small Arms Commission and meetings with some groups of Blacksmiths in project sites.

**Implementation of Objective 3**: At least 10 new business initiatives introduced productivity of entrepreneurs increased by 75% and income of targeted beneficiaries increased by 25% in the programme sites by 2011 (UN partners: UNDP, UNIDO, WFP) The objective is a very critical component to the attainment of security and mitigation of violent conflicts. Its implementation however has been unduly delayed with serious implications for the attainment of the expected outcomes. If measured according to the target of 2011 then, this objective is far from being achieved. The selection and profiling of blacksmiths has been targeted to only one site, Yendi however skills training and business development services (BDS) is yet to be conducted whilst the Blacksmiths remain very expectant not only for Yendi but all the other sites. The credibility of the UN delivering on timely basis is being compromised whilst opportunity to engage these blacksmiths to address the proliferation of small arms especially in the conflict prone areas is being lost.

A key outcome of this component is to establish linkages/partnerships with existing institutions for the training of youth and women in skills development, business development and management and product development. The NBSSI confirmed some engagement with the HSP on this but formalization of initial process in the form of an agreed MOU with schedule of activities as at the time of the evaluation. The NBSSI had drafted a concept paper for consideration by the UN but discussions during the MTR revealed no concrete actions have been undertaken on that yet.

Youth unemployment emerged as a major critical issue where the vulnerability and easy manipulation of unemployed youth could have negative repercussions’ on sustaining peace. Stakeholders contacted intensely discussed the low targeting of youth as direct beneficiaries of the programme18. ICT Training in Data processing has been provided for 40 youths in Tamale by GMIC. National Youth Employment programme committed to employ all 40 trained youth for the national e-governance project but this has not yet taken place and during the MTR some of the trainees were expectant of the UN to support their engagement in some form of employment.

<p>| Table 3: Assessment of Expected outcomes against Actual Outputs of Objective 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Remarks on intended versus actual results to date</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1. Blacksmiths and those potentially involved in arms production and distribution engaged in alternative livelihoods</strong></td>
<td>Partially achieved but not on track according to work plan timeline</td>
<td>• HSP Report _ Progress Against Workplan 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2. Reduction in incidence of poverty and vulnerability in programme sites through increased opportunities for employment and income generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews and discussions with beneficiaries – blacksmiths, MMDAs. NBSSI, youth and opinion leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft Annual Report 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Refer to comments from Stakeholders in Annex 12
Implementation of Objective 4: Increased production of food crops by 40% and livestock by 30% in an efficient manner to meet the basic food security and nutritional requirements of the District’s/Municipalities’ by 2011 (UN partners: FAO, WFP, UNICEF) The component is in line with the MDG 1 cutting poverty in half. Part of the goal is to cut malnutrition in half. In 1990/92, malnutrition among general population Ghanaian population was estimated at 37 per cent; by 2001–03, it had fallen dramatically to 12 per cent, thus meeting the malnutrition MDG target for the general population.19 The percentage of underweight children under age 5 declined from 27 per cent before 2000 to its most recently calculated level of 13.9 per cent in 2008 20 although the decline is a recent phenomenon, since the rate was at 25 per cent as late as 2005.

Access to water remains one of the critical needs of communities in the 3 Northern Regions and thus justifies the focus of the component. Although Ghana has made considerable progress on the percentage of the population with access to improved water source (83.8 per cent in 2010, up from 58 per cent in 2000)21, there is still a huge deficit in terms of the population who still need potable water especially in the Northern Region.

The outputs delivered under the component 4 of the HSP programme so far do not in any way indicate the likelihood of achieving programme targets in 2012. According to the Draft Annual Report for 2011, during the year WFP reached out to a total of 4,014 beneficiaries with targeted supplementary feeding in 2 sites, Tamale and Yendi. A total of 21,584 metric tons of food supplements was distributed to 3,239 pregnant and lactating women and 775 children under five years in the two sites. It is also important to note that provision has not been made for regular follow up visits to assess the problems of adaptation and impact of the technology transfer in these communities. Beneficiaries again expressed concern about their inability to fortify wet dough and beans with the MFP due to use of dough in the preparation of foods such as koko, banku and Koose which are widely and frequently consumed in the communities.

The evaluation team’s field visits to selected MFP sites revealed mixed results. Only one out of the three visited was actively and functionally engaged. Though the MFP is meant for fortification of dry flour, the programme is yet to explore ways of its use in dough and make appropriate recommendations. To ensure sustainability of the project certain modules of generating income to procure other products for beneficiary groups has not been exploited and an example of a group not being able to access the full income generation potential of the MFM can be found already in Yendi.

---

19 IFPRI (2010a).
20 UNDP-HDR (2000) provides the first figure; WDI (2010) provides the second.
21 The first figure is from Ghana DHS (2010); the second is from WDI (2011).
where the group is saddled with huge electricity bills with low patronage of facility by community members. The income sharing modalities are still not clear to women in groups as exemplified in discussions with two groups: Tamale and and WA. WFP Field Officers, DNOs and CHN are to assist the groups during their monitoring visits to further deliberate on the modules and settle on one that may best work for a particular group.

Table 4: Assessment of Expected outcomes against Actual Outputs of Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Remarks on intended versus actual results to date</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1. 50% increase in availability and access to water for dry season farming by 2011 | **Not Yet Achieved:**  
- An overly ambitious expected outcomes. Many factors contribute to the achievement of this expected out but then many of the contributory outputs of the HSP yet to be undertaken or scrapped due to funding;  
- Context specific delivery of outputs require strategizing with MOFA to consolidate feasible activities;  
- Leveraging activities with other ongoing regional activities e.g. SADA; demand driven supply of water pumps for dry farming in communities in Bawku, Wa and also Tamale areas may be timely. | • HSP Report _ Progress Against Workplan 2011  
• Interviews and discussions with beneficiaries – blacksmiths, MMDAs. NBSSI, youth and opinion leaders  
• Draft Annual Report 2011 |
| 4.2. 50% reduction in post-harvest crop losses in the 3 target districts by 2011 |  
| 4.3. 30% increase in livestock production in the 3 target districts by 2011 |  
| 4.4. 50% increase in production of food staples for improved food security and by 2011 |  
| 4.5. 40% increase in area under economic tree crop cultivation by 2011 |  
| 4.6. Decreased malnutrition |  |

The outcomes for this component are ambitious; and most activities have yet to be undertaken or have been cancelled due to insufficient funding. Rather than cancelling additional activities, the JHSP will aim to link, or piggyback, planned activities with other ongoing regional initiatives, e.g. the SADA/NRGP demand-driven supply of water pumps for dry season farming.

*Implementation of Objective 5: Mainstreaming and advocating Human security Concept in the context of Ghana enhanced by 2011(UN partners: UNDP, UNU)* Most of the activities outlined under this implementation objective 5 are on track. These include the baseline study and community entries conducted in 2010 which had the full participation of all the participating agencies and DAs. Some Local-level dialogues were also conducted in 2011 which promoted community level participation on human security issues. The importance of these exercises are greatly valued by community members as a means of fostering inter-ethnic dialogues as confirmed during the MTR. Similar ones are planned based on team agreements. The UNU and its partner research institutions have been rather elaborate on researching on human security issues in the 4 programme sites.
Table 5: Assessment of Expected outcomes against Actual Outputs of Objective 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Remarks on intended versus actual results to date</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1.</strong> Enhanced knowledge and understanding of the Human Security Concept in the context of Northern Ghana</td>
<td><strong>Partially achieved and on track according to work plan timeline</strong></td>
<td>- HSP Report <em>Progress Against Workplan 2011</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2.</strong> The concept of Human Security as well as Programme’s impacts / lessons learnt widely disseminated in the sub-region</td>
<td>- Broad articulation of the concept of Human Security with varied expectations from programme community members</td>
<td>- Interviews and discussions with beneficiaries – blacksmiths, MMDAs. NBSSI, youth and opinion leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HS Information briefs being developed by UNU for programme facilitators</td>
<td>- Draft Annual Report 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The achievement of mainstreaming human security approaches into a country context is a long term outcome which is not likely to be fully achieved within duration of the JHSP. Nonetheless, at the macro level, the JHSP has a strong champion in the NPC. While initial outputs, including a baseline survey and midterm outcome assessment, have been realized, and knowledge management tools are in process, the delivery of most of this component’s outputs, including a research report and an end of programme workshop, will not be undertaken until the programme wind up period.
SUMMARY ANALYSIS AND LESSONS LEARNED

The JHSP is an ambitious and complex programme. The programme’s design is broad, with many subcomponents and numerous intended results. As noted above in section III, “Implementation”, at least some of its initially expected outcomes will not be realized within the time remaining in the programme. As other JPs elsewhere have demonstrated, a limited number of outcomes allows for greater programme focus and more achievable results.

Insufficient local participation in the formulation of a JP can also contribute to low rates of implementation and sustainability. Overall, the design of the JHSP was Accra-centric in the setting of programme outputs and outcomes, and it would have benefited from a greater involvement of local actors at the formulation stage to inform more realistic output targets. In future interventions, national and local stakeholder inputs must be increased, not only for greater national ownership and sustainability, but also for a realistic UN exit strategy.

The preparation and inception periods for a JP can be lengthy. As the initial transaction costs for UN agency partners – including the investments of staff time and funding needed to establish joint implementation, monitoring, and administration mechanisms – are high, programme periods of up to five years are generally needed to realize reductions in these costs. This should be a consideration in determining whether or not to create a JP, as well as the length of its lifespan.

The “Joint Programme culture” is new to Ghana; and training and orientation on Joint Programmes, and on how they differ from joint programming and other delivery mechanisms, is key for buy-in from UN partner agencies. Teambuilding exercises can transform the “single agency” mindset into a “Delivering as One” team approach. The teambuilding session facilitated by UNIDO at the JHSP AWP Planning Workshop at Prampram, February 7-9, 2012 was an initial positive step towards this; and the workshop participants recommended that another session be held in Tamale for field staff.

Programme management and staffing The JHSP Programme Manager role was responsible for coordination, reporting, oversight, communication and liaison functions, as well as the supervision of field staff. The JHSP management function could not be effectively realized by UNDP, in part as the Programme Manager was overstretched by the range of these tasks; and he did not have full backstopping. Moreover, he was located outside UNDP premises. In contrast, large, complex JPs commonly rely on a central Programme Management Unit or Programme Coordination Unit, which may combine coordination, oversight, and monitoring functions, rather than tasking an individual programme manager with all of these duties:

22 This has been well-documented elsewhere: see, for example, UNDG, 2006, p. xvi
23 “The twenty-one joint programmes reviews synthesized in this exercise almost unanimously called for increased education on the identification and design of joint programmes through enhanced UNDG guidance and through the RC system at the country level.”, UNDG, Joint Programmes, 2006, p.xv
24 In line with the DoA requirement for “One Building”, which has been demonstrated to improve communication and coordination, the JHSP Programme Manager’s office has since been relocated to the UNDP Accra compound the JHSP line of reporting has also since been transferred from the Livelihoods to the Peace and Governance Unit.
25 For example, the UN JP for Local Governance and Community Development in Nepal: http://www.lgcdp.gov.np/ and the UN JP for Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery in Somalia.
To be effective, the UNV staffing modality used in the JHSP requires strong supervision and guidance. While day to day supervision would be undertaken by the Field Coordinator, overall guidance and direction for work plans, activity monitoring, local stakeholder liaison and other activities is the responsibility of the Joint Programme Manager; and this responsibility requires that some 50% of his/her time be in the field.

**Communication** A common information-sharing platform for real time mapping of activities and sharing of documentation is essential for a Joint Programme; and poor intra-programme communication is a challenge which the JHSP is trying to address. Teamworks is one platform currently under consideration by the team.

**The parallel funding modality** has not proved to be an optimal financing option for the JHSP. It has hindered procurement and sequencing of JHSP activities, as well as increased transaction costs. Moreover, it has encouraged agencies to work separately, rather than DaO. Furthermore, the Programme has not had a dedicated admin/finance assistant tasked with keeping disbursements on track. Unfortunately, it is now not possible to change the JHSP’s funding modality. Pooled or pass-through funding, or a combination of modalities, might have supported a better aligned implementation; and these options should be considered by the UNCT Ghana for future JP formulations.

**Interagency Coordination** Complex programmes like the JHSP generally feature a larger role for RC offices for macro level coordination. However, the human capacity of the Accra RC unit is currently overstretched for programmatic coordination functions. Alternative, or complementary, options for the coordination of interagency processes include IPG involvement, as all agencies are members of the IPG. Furthermore, the IPG leads many UN activities in the North. Moreover, if the JHSP were to have a dedicated slot on the IPG agency, this would elevate the Programme to policy level consideration.

**Coordination with national and sub-national partners** is essential, in order that JPs do not create parallel UN systems. The design of the JHSP would have benefited by more involvement of field actors and knowledge of national and subnational government processes: there have been missed opportunities and duplication of other efforts or already achieved actions, for example, in the creation of CICs.

The development and mainstreaming of HS dimensions into the Community Action Plans (CAPs) supports and strengthens the local governance system by involving grassroots stakeholders in decision-making on key issues. This is the core of Ghana’s decentralization process, and it is often hindered by poor facilitation by local authorities. The JHSP offers an opportunity to ensure this process is realized in the programme sites. In addition, stronger JHSP collaboration with the NDPC may be required to establish clear national guidelines for the inclusion of CAPs into local government sub-structure planning.

26 This has been cited as a concern by UN respondents, as well as noted in various HSP documents, e.g. “There is a need to improve a shared communication strategy for things such as shared documents (MOUs, implementation/annual work plans, BTORs, photos etc).”, *Third Progress Report*, 2012, p. 34

27 At the field level, “...for example, HSP field specialists and coordinators may be playing a role in development coordination that would be better housed at the regional governing authority, or with planning officers at the municipal authorities”, NYU 2011 (op. cit.), p. 26

28 Interviews and discussions with NDPC and DAs
In best practice, a JP is well-integrated into the national budget, and an appropriate national counterpart is dedicated to its coordination, monitoring and evaluation as, for example, in the UN JP for Local Governance and Community Development in Nepal: [http://www.lgcdp.gov.np/](http://www.lgcdp.gov.np/) This goal is key to post-project sustainability, and it has not yet been specifically noted in JHSP documentation.

Joint Monitoring Missions are valuable, but consistent field level backstopping of project communities and stakeholders is essential. Furthermore, participatory monitoring with the involvement of key national stakeholders and communities (“CPM”) is necessary for local ownership.

**Monitoring and Evaluation.** A robust, jointly owned and managed M&E system is key to measuring JP contributions to national development plans. The JHSP has a Joint M&E plan, but monitoring and reporting of the programme by UN partners has been more a single agency rather than a “One Team” activity. A review of the current Joint M&E Plan could identify areas where One Team monitoring activities can be undertaken either jointly by agencies’ field staff, or by individual field officers on behalf of all the agencies.

**Crosscutting issues – gender** The programme is off track in its gender mainstreaming and involvement of women. There is no clear strategy for gender and youth mainstreaming, although the project document identifies both as critical targets. The programme approach is more focused on support to a few women’s groups for already existing activities such as milling.

A better strategy would be to include a gender mainstreaming approach which analyzes women’s roles and which builds their capacities to support peacebuilding and conflict management. Mainstreaming gender equality in the JHSP will require the introduction of concrete gender action plans into programme activities. While provision has been made for the collection of gender-disaggregated data for monitoring purposes, project/programme reports on gender equality are not sufficiently analytical, thereby posing challenges to translating plans into concrete action to close gender gaps.

**Land and Natural Resource Management** Land and the management of natural resources remain issues which can trigger violence. Discussion of land and natural resource management, e.g. on tree tenure, has to date been minimal in the programme. In addition, the evaluators’ interviews with traditional chiefs and inter-ethnic peace committee members in Wa, Yendi and Bawku reveal that elements of protracted and potential land conflict, such as the invasion of Fulani headsmen and basic access to farmlands in the programme sites, could fuel resource-related conflicts. The programme could support the development of local strategies to address these issues.

**Benefit Sharing.** Within the various JHSP outputs are elements of benefit sharing. The modalities for the distribution of gains and the sharing of benefits from the programme, such as from the MFP and small ruminants, have not as yet been developed. Discussions with beneficiaries and other local stakeholders revealed some uncertainties about benefit sharing modalities, and the possibility that some discontent and conflict among community members could ensue, if these are not properly moderated.

**Beneficiary Target Groups.** It may be necessary to redefine beneficiary target groups over the course of a project, to better align with demographic changes and the emergence of new groups of opinion leaders. In the case of the JHSP, the latter would include youth leaders and politicians. The relevance of current JHSP beneficiary targeting of community groups is not too clear, especially with regard to at risk youth, who do not currently feature prominently as beneficiaries.
RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD

Some significant and positive emerging outcomes have already been achieved by, or in part through, the JHSP. However, its actual versus intended outputs by midpoint in the programme are uneven, particularly with regard to its livelihood-related outputs. Operational and management-related bottlenecks which have hindered the JHSP progress have been noted above. Recommendations to address them are offered below.

Recommendations – Activity Prioritization and Implementation

- Articulate a clear vision statement for the programme, including its theory of change.
- Consolidate JHSP gains to date and focus on activities which will be critical in the time remaining for the programme, and for which local stakeholders have expressed an ongoing need, e.g. conflict management and resolution, negotiation and mediation, and peacebuilding sensitization.
- Widen and diversify the groups who receive these trainings to include the most at-risk groups, such as jobless youth, as well as CBOs and other key influential local actors, including the security forces and politicians. Engagement and involvement of CBOs and subnational partners is essential for the integration of HS and peacebuilding approaches into local government planning and development processes, such as the CICs.
- There is an urgent need to introduce conflict sensitive approaches in trainings for security forces, with a “do no harm” approach, particularly as the security context may change rapidly during the upcoming election period.
- Certain outputs are high profile and strategic, particularly those linked to livelihoods, and will therefore require quick implementation. Such outputs include, for example, the establishment of the Tamale craft center, skill training sessions, and ICT job placements for trainees.
- As the upcoming election can be a conflict trigger, outline potential election scenarios; determine what preventative actions – for all UN agencies - would best address the most probable scenarios, and identify “quick wins” which target the most at risk groups, e.g. mass employment activities to engage jobless youth, and which also will increase JHSP visibility.
- Map similar conflict prevention, peacebuilding and livelihood activities by other development partners in the northern regions, in order to identify other projects with which JHSP activities can be shared or piggy-backed. This exercise should be integrated into the recently initiated UN wide mapping and database of “who’s doing what/where”.
- Develop community participatory monitoring systems measuring site-specific progress in programme implementation and sustainability measures.
- Increase joint monitoring missions by the agency field teams to maximize information sharing and reduce duplications.
- Re-prioritize activities in the RRF accordingly.

Recommendations – Governance, Staffing and Financial Modalities

---

29 This was initiated after the completion of the MTR.
• Programme Coordination Unit: As the JHSP will continue for another year, it is recommended that a small interagency Programme Coordination Unit be established in Accra to coordinate administrative, financial, communication, M&E and liaison functions. The Unit would include the Joint Programme Manager, an M&E specialist, a finance/administration assistant and, depending on resources, a communication assistant. As it is not now possible to change the JHSP parallel funding modality, the role of the finance assistant would focus on keeping the remaining disbursements on track. It is further recommended that a national counterpart be considered by the JHSP for inclusion in the proposed PCU.

• As parallel funding has proved unhelpful in the current phase of the JHSP, it is strongly recommended that pooled or pass-through modalities, or a combination of these financing options, be used in future joint programmes.

• Coordination: Establish a stronger macro level coordination mechanism in Accra. Options include utilizing the Outcome Group (Governance), with an identified Focal Point; placing the programme on the IPG agenda, which would elevate it to the policy level; and increasing support from the RC’s office. The last option is the least likely, as the capacity of the RC office is currently overstretched for programme coordination functions.

• Staffing: allocate 50% of the new programme manager’s time to the field office, where s/he can provide supervision and guidance to the field coordinator and UNV field specialists, as well as proactively coordinate with key local government and civil society partners; for the other 50% of the time, s/he would be Accra-based.

• Communication and information sharing: Clarify the roles and accountability mechanisms of the agency focal points to ensure the smooth and timely flow of information to and from Accra and the field.

• Communication and information sharing: Introduce a common information-sharing platform that will provide real time implementation details: a recommended platform is Teamworks, which is already widely used for this purpose in the UN system

Teambuilding and JP orientation. Invest in additional teambuilding, training and orientation sessions on Joint Programmes, and how they differ from joint programming and other delivery mechanisms, as this is key for buy-in from UN partner agencies. It is recommended that such sessions be held on a six monthly basis, as there is a high rate of staff turnover both in Accra and in the field.

Sustainability. To ensure post-project sustainability,

• Select one overarching national partner from among the four ministries with whom the JHSP is already allied, to “own” the programme
• establish handover guidelines and systems with local partners as soon as possible
• align with the national peace architecture in establishing partnerships for sustainability at all levels, e.g. CICs, once formed and trained in peacebuilding, can easily evolve into community peace councils, and thus support implementation for the National Peace Council

Way Forward. The JHSP is an ambitious, timely and relevant programme. Its efforts to transform communal and individual behavior and to diffuse conflict are already demonstrating positive emerging
results. However, as noted above, there have been operational and management-related bottlenecks which have hindered programme progress; and the outputs at its midpoint have been mixed.

Many of the challenges that the JHSP has faced are common to JPs elsewhere. The Programme provides several lessons for the design and management of future JPs, as well as for a possible second phase of the JHSP – an option which is currently under consideration by the UNCT.

The recent approval by the UNTFHS of a one year, no-cost extension for the JHSP provides an opportunity for the Programme to make necessary adjustments to its activities, its governance structure, and financial and operational procedures, towards achieving the objective of alleviating human security threats in Ghana’s most under-developed regions during its remaining timeframe.
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## ANNEX 2:
**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

### Objective 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.1.</strong> Capacity of 3 local government institutions (45 government officials in total) strengthened for accountable leadership and development management</td>
<td>Number of government staff trained</td>
<td>45 government officials (or about 80% of gov. officials) to be trained in the sites</td>
<td>About 5% of government officials trained in the sites</td>
<td>- Training records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative improvement in services by public institutions</td>
<td>Improved service delivery by local public institutions</td>
<td>Low quality of service delivery; reactive without interrogating the structural issues</td>
<td>- Regular perception surveys and opinion polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.2.</strong> Conflict prevention mainstreamed in development planning at the local level</td>
<td>Number of district/municipal development plans mainstreaming conflict prevention</td>
<td>All 3 (Yendi District, Bawku Municipality, Wa Municipality)</td>
<td>No District/Municipal Plan ‘mainstreamed’ conflict prevention while there are some references to a certain level</td>
<td>- Evaluation of District/Municipal Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.1.</strong> Capacity of 60 community volunteers, 15 CBOs and community members in public engagement, programme management, technical skills, teamwork/institutional function, leadership, resource mobilization, and negotiation increased</td>
<td>Number of community volunteers and CBOs trained</td>
<td>60 community volunteers trained</td>
<td>Very few community volunteers are trained in conflict management</td>
<td>- Training records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of CSOs active in conflict management in the sites</td>
<td>Support about 80% of CSOs to become active in conflict management</td>
<td>Only a few CSOs are active in conflict management</td>
<td>- Monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of local development initiatives influenced by civic involvement/action in the sites</td>
<td>Increased civic participation/initiatives in development processes by 50%</td>
<td>Low civic involvement</td>
<td>- Published reports of the development programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.2.</strong> Capacity of women and youths participating in official</td>
<td>Number of women and youths participating in official</td>
<td>Increased number of women and</td>
<td>Very limited participation of women and</td>
<td>- Attendance lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participate in local governance increased consultations/meetings youths who are engaged in local governance processes youth groups in development discourses at the local level minutes - Observation during monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation/ contributions during local meetings</th>
<th>Increased level of participation and quality of engagement involving women and youths</th>
<th>Low level of participation/ contributions</th>
<th>- Meeting minutes - Observation during monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.2.3. Capacity of 35 chiefs and traditional leaders in local governance increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of chiefs and traditional leaders participate in sensitisation sessions</th>
<th>35 chiefs and traditional leaders</th>
<th>Few chiefs and traditional leaders trained and/or level of training is not sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of chiefs and traditional leaders in local governance increased</td>
<td>Increased capacity in conflict prevention and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- Observation during monitoring and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4. Role of media in peace and development reporting enhanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of media representatives trained</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>Few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of local and mass media reports/ activities contributing to peace and development</td>
<td>Increased number of local and mass media reports/ activities</td>
<td>Limited number of media contributing to peace and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of media focus/ quality contributing to peace and development</td>
<td>Increased media focus/ reporting on peace building issues and development</td>
<td>Some media reports turn to exacerbate conflicts due to lack of professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tracking of media reports on conflicts, peace and developmental issue</td>
<td>- Tracking of media reports on conflicts, peace and developmental issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1. 15 institutions and 3 community councillors and facilitators in each site, trained</td>
<td>Number of institutions and community councillors trained in human rights awareness</td>
<td>15 institutions and 3 community councillors in each site</td>
<td>Few trained</td>
<td>- Training reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1.2. Training in conflict management, negotiation and mediation for district and municipal security personnel and committees conducted

| Number of stakeholders trained in conflict, management, negotiation and mediation | 30 officials | Few | - Reports by civil society organisations and incident reports by district police stations - Hospital records |

### 2.2.1. Capacity of law enforcement agencies and traditional authorities enhanced in small arms management

| Updated records on legitimate local possession of small arms | Improved tracking and control of usage of small arms in target communities | Unregulated use and proliferation of small arms in the communities | - Regular inspection of records |

### 2.2.2. Public education programmes on the dangers of small arms use and possession organised

| Number of chiefs, traditional warriors, local blacksmiths sensitized through public education programmes organised | All chiefs and 20 traditional warriors from each community; 40 local blacksmiths, 8 armourers and 3 licensees; general public | Few | - Training records |

### 2.3.1. Community members trained in early warning systems and processes (15 members in community policing; 10 community volunteers in early warning; 1 District/ Municipal and Community Peace Council in

| Number of community members mobilized, trained and supported for community policing | 15 in each site | 0 or few | - Training records - Monitoring visits and reports |
| Number of community volunteers trained in early warning | 10 in each site | Few | - Training records |
| Establishment of community-police security committees | Increased physical and personal security | No community police security committee | - Early warning reports - |
| Number of District/ Municipal and | 1 District/ Municipal and | 0 | - Monitoring reports - Official reports |
each site) and early warning systems and processed established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Peace Council established</th>
<th>Community Peace Council established in each site</th>
<th>the district peace councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of conflicts mediated by district/municipal peace councils</td>
<td>3 Peace councils established (one each in Yendi, Bawku and Wa) and contribute to conflict mediation</td>
<td>No peace council in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3.2. Trust and confidence building among community members enhanced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of social cohesion and trust building activities (cultural and sporting activities) organised</th>
<th>At least 2 joint activities organized in each site</th>
<th>Not known joint activities at programme site areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of trust and confidence among community members enhanced</strong></td>
<td>Increased trust and confidence among community members</td>
<td>Low level of trust and confidence among community members as a result of conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Objective 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.1.</strong> 10 blacksmiths in each Programme site supported to establish alternative livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.2.</strong> 10 arms distributors introduced to alternative livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2.1.</strong> Baseline vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Pilot Districts Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.2.2. Improved Small-scale Technology for Agro-processing**

- Number of groups which adopt and get trained in improved small-scale technology for agro-processing: 6 groups
- Status of programme districts not available: 0 or very few in each Programme site

**3.2.3. Improved Market Access for Value-added Agro-products**

- Percentage of produce marketed: 100% sales of value-added agro-products
- Percentage of produce unsold/post harvest loss: Increase in income of producers
- Status of programme districts not available: High incidence of loss of produce from inability to market

**3.2.4. 6 Groups Supported to Undertake Non-agro-based Small-scale Industries**

- Number of groups trained: 6 groups
- Status of programme districts not available: 0 or very few in each Programme site

**3.2.5. Milling and Fortification Activities by 3 Community-based Women’s Groups Established and in Function**

- No. of functional community milling and fortification machines: 3 milling machines at project site
- Status of programme districts not available: 0

**3.2.6. Capacity of 3 Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs) to Deliver Sustainable Financial Services Strengthened**

- Loan Portfolio No of loan clients (indicating % female): 3 microfinance institutions (Rural Banks or Financial NGOs)
- Portfolio at Risk (PAR) Operational Self Sustainability Financial Self Sustainability: Limited capacity of MFIs to outreach the poor, especially women
- Status of programme districts not available: Baselines for loans/savings will be established at the beginning of the programme and targets set accordingly

**3.2.7. 36 Groups**

- Number of groups: 36 groups
- Status of programme districts not available: Limited access of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. 50% increase in availability and access to water for dry season farming by 2011</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers with access to wells and other small water systems</td>
<td>45% of farmers with access to water in dry season</td>
<td>30% of farmers with access to water in dry season</td>
<td>Number of dams rehabilitated, Number of wells and boreholes constructed, Number of farmers engaged in dry season farming, Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. 50% reduction in post-harvest crop-losses in the 3 target districts by 2011</td>
<td>Percentage post harvest losses</td>
<td>15% post harvest losses</td>
<td>33% post harvest losses</td>
<td>Number of improved storage cribs, District/Municipal data on post harvest losses, Monitoring report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. 30% increase in livestock production in the 3 target districts by 2011</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers rearing small ruminants</td>
<td>80% of farmers</td>
<td>55% of farmers</td>
<td>Number of improved breeds of sheep and goats, Monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. 50% increase in production of food</td>
<td>Percentage of Households</td>
<td>35% of households</td>
<td>70% of households</td>
<td>Number of farmers adopting improved services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>Expected Outputs</td>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Capacity of 13 national</td>
<td>- Number of people trained in field</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Report of baseline/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborators in human security assessment survey will be enhanced by end 2008</td>
<td>Data collection and processing</td>
<td>Assessment survey that includes methodology, tools, lessons learnt and the way forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2.</strong> By end of 2009, 50% of the leadership of government agencies, community-based and civil society organizations in the three target regions will be sensitized to embrace the human security concept</td>
<td>Number and level of participation of three regional sensitization meetings / training workshops organized</td>
<td>50 participants for each of 3 regional workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3.</strong> By end of 2011, 40% of local government agencies, community based and civil society organizations in the three target regions will mainstream human security in their core field development and advocacy programs</td>
<td>Number of Government and Non-Governmental Organizations that have mainstreamed the human security concept in their core business within the target areas.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4.</strong> By 2011, the human security concept and practice, as well as project impacts will be shared with over 100 national stakeholders at the highest level (advocacy groups, policy-makers, academics, etc)</td>
<td>Calibre and number of persons in attendance at the national dissemination workshop.</td>
<td>100 participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Progress reports
- Mid-program evaluation report.
- Reports of collaborating NGOs, Civil Society Organizations, etc.
- Detailed report on the dissemination workshop, including list of participants and copies of papers presented.
### ANNEX 3:
### EVALUATION SCHEDULE

#### Monday 13\(^{th}\) February - 30\(^{th}\) March, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name/Group/Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday February 13</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Meeting with *Core UNDP Team</td>
<td>UNDP Conf. Room, Accra</td>
<td>Lead: Christy Ahenkora Banya (Programme Manager, UNDP): 0244148748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 14</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Security Briefing</td>
<td>UNDP Office</td>
<td>Mr. Antonius Lucassen Security Officer, UNDSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>RC focal point</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Wolfgang Haas (UN Coordination Specialist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UNICEF Conf. Room, Accra</td>
<td>Iwanna Swart (Education Officer, UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idris Abdullah, (Social Protection Officer, UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP Conf. Room, Accra</td>
<td>Lead: Francis Sarpong Kumakuma (Programme Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>GMIC</td>
<td>GMIC</td>
<td>Solomon Darrey (Director), Emmanuel Fiagbenen (Training Coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>GNACSA</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Lead: Roselyn Adezewaa Otoo (HSP, Programme Assistant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>National Peace Council</td>
<td>National Peace Council Office</td>
<td>Francis Azumah (Coordinator, National Peace Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Telephone Meeting with HSP Tamale Office</td>
<td>Alisa Hotel</td>
<td>Annette and Ernest Sigiri, HSP Field Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday,</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>UNDP Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christy Ahenkora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banya (Programme Manager, UNDP): 0244148748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 16</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Edward Adimozoya (former HSP Programme Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Gov’t</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Samuel Kpassah, Sr. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Preparation of Inception Report</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Presentation of Draft Inception Report</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Consultants, Christy, Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-4:00</td>
<td>Finalization of Inception Report and Tools</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 17</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>UNIDO Conf. Room, FAO Accra</td>
<td>Mr. Kwame Asante (National Programme Coordinator, UNIDO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning</td>
<td>MoFEP Offices, Accra</td>
<td>Mrs. Stella Dede Williams (Chief Economic Officer, Head AfDB/UN Systems Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, February 19</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>F light from Accra to Tamale</td>
<td>Accra – Tamale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Arrive Tamale</td>
<td>Tamale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Meeting with Programme Field Coordinator</td>
<td>NR Peace Council Tamale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gariba Lodge Tamale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diced, Chairman, NRPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 20</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>HSP Tamale</td>
<td>Field Program Office, Tamale</td>
<td>Ernest and Moro Bukari, HSP Field Specialist, Tamale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>HSP Office</td>
<td>Clara Dube, UNICEF HSO Tamale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>UNICEF Security Briefing</td>
<td>UNICEF office</td>
<td>Prosper, Programme Officer Gynila, Programme Assistant Aboubacar Koisha, HSO Tamale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 21</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>Suglo Kombo Women’s Nyohini</td>
<td>Madam Hawawu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Group (Milling and Fortification) Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>Blacksmiths Chagni Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Youth Chiefs Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamale Metropolitan Assembly Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuhu 0244978518 Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Abdullahi, Chief Yusef Mahmud Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ibrahim, Planning Officer Chagni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, February 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Regional Coordinating Council, NR TMA Conf. Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>GHANEP San Nasamu Asabyi, Deputy Regional Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>RUMNET A Diallo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>UDS Aballah Kassim, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gariba Lodge Al Hassan Imoro , Media Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Sam Donkeh, UDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Abdullahi Dr. Abdullahi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, February 23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00 am</td>
<td>Travel from Tamale to Yendi YMA Conf. Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Yendi Municipal Assembly Jimah Yakubu, Deputy Municipal Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Yendi Blacksmiths Association Alhaji M. Shaibu, Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>Milling and Fortification Group B. A. Samadu, Department of Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 pm – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Traditional Chiefs Ambrose Ansaayiri, MOFA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Dept. rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aisha, Beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kognaa Abdulai Andani, Chief Kingmaker of Yendi Traditional Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheikh Abduliah Elias, Chief Imam of Lameshege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Gariba – Registrar, Dagbon Traditional Council, Yendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Feb 24</td>
<td>9.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, Feb 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, Feb 26</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 pm – 6.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Feb 27</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, Feb 28</strong></td>
<td>7.30am - 6.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, Feb 29</strong></td>
<td>9.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:15am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, March 1</strong></td>
<td>8.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 pm – 7.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, March 2</strong></td>
<td>9:00am - 12:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 pm</td>
<td>framework for report; initial validation minutes review; emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>4.30 am Depart Maryam Hotel for airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.45 am Flight from Tamale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00 am Arrival in Accra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 pm – 6.00 Preparation of debrief notes, revision of validation minutes, review of Pampam report, Ernest and Edward draft reports, emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9:00am UNDP Ghana – prelim debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00pm UNDP: Verbal in house presentation of key findings and preliminary recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00pm National Peace Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>10.30am FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.30am NBSSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00pm UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>9.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.30 - 12.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12</td>
<td>9:30 – 1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2 – April 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4
LIST OF RESPONDENTS

UN Agencies

UNDP Ghana

Ms. Ruby Sandhu-Rojon, Resident Coordinator
Ms. Christy Banya, Programme Manager
Mr. Lawrence Lakhmansingh, Peace and Governance Adviser
Mr. Ernest Sigiri, Human Security Field Coordinator
Mr. Moro Bukari, Human Security Field Officer, Tamale
Mr. George Akundikya, Human Security Field Specialist, Bawku
Mr. Louis Kuukpen, Monitoring Evaluation Analyst
Mr. Wolfgang Haas, UN Coordination Specialist
Mr. Edward Adimozoya (Former Programme Manager, Human Security Programme)
Ms. Roselyn Adezewa Otoo, Focal Point
Mr. Daniel Afriyie-Nyarko, Field Specialist, Wa

UNICEF Ghana

Mr. Rene Van Dongen, Deputy Country Representative
Mr. Charles Dzradosi, Social Policy Specialist
Ms. Iwanna Swart, Education Officer
Mr. Idriss Abdullah
Ms. Clara Dube, HFO, Tamale
Mr. Kabuka Banda, UNICEF Security Focal Point

UNIDO

Mr. Kwame Asante, National Programme Coordinator

WFP Ghana

Mr. Nguyen Duc Hoang, Head of Programme
Mr. Francis Sarpong-Kumankuma, Programme Officer
Ms. Gyamila Abdul Razak, Programme Officer, Tamale
Mr. Prosper Dakurah, Programme Assistant, Tamale

FAO Ghana

Mr. Benjamin M. Adjei, National Programme Assistant
Ms. Sophie Tadria, APO Food Security, Nutrition and Food Safety
Ms. Henrietta Appiah, National Programme Assistant
Ishmeal Yeboah, National Programme Assistant
UNU
Dr. Elias T. Ayub, Director
Ms. Yasuko Kusakari, Socio-Economist

Government of Ghana

Ministry of Finance
Ms. Stella Dede Williams, Chief Economic Officer

Ministry of Local Government
Mr. Samuel Passa, Programmes Director

National Peace Council
Maulvi Dr. A. Wahab Adam, Chairperson of NPC and Ameer (Head)
Mr. Francis Azumah, Executive Director
Father Tadeus, Chairperson, Northern Regional Peace Council

National Board for Small Scale Industries (NBSSI) Headquarters, Accra
Mr. Lukman Rahim, National Director
Mrs. Anna Armoh Himbson, Deputy Director

National Development Planning Commission
Mr. Jonathan K. Azasoo, Senior Planning Analyst

Regional Coordinating Council (RCC) Northern Region
Mr. San Nasamu Asabigi, Deputy Northern Regional Minister
Mr. Joseph Dasana, Coordinating Director

Tamale Metropolitan Assembly
Mr. Ibrahim Alhassan, Planning Officer
Ms. Rafiatu Mohammed, Budget Assistant
Mr. Kwabena Arkorful, MOFA Director

Yendi Municipal Assembly
Mr. Jimah Yakubu, Deputy Municipal Coordinator
Alhaji M. Shaibu, Planning Officer
Mr. B. A. Samadu, Department of Community Development
Mr. Ambrose Ansaayiri, MOFA Director
NBSSI, Tamale

Mr. David Amos Andoh-Kesson, Regional Director

Regional Peace Advisory Council, Upper East, Bolgatanga

Mr. Daud James Abangos-Gos, Chairperson

Bawku Municipal District Assembly

Mr. P. K. Kuupoe, Municipal Co-ordinating Director
Mr. Joseph A. Abugre, Municipal Planning Officer
Mr. Apumbor Francis Xavier, MOFA Director

Ghana Health Service, Bawku

Mr. Douglas Nyaba, Municipal Nutrition Officer

Upper West Regional Co-ordinating Council

David Yakubu, Regional Co-ordinating Director
Abdul Salm Kadir, Director Planning
Madam Fati Koay, Administrative Officer
David Anaafo, Officer

Upper West Regional House of Chiefs

Naa Seidu Braimah, Chief of Guli

Wa Municipal Assembly

Honourable Alhaju Duogu Yakubu, Municipal Chief Executive (MCE)
Mr. Mohammed Rufeu, Municipal Coordinating Director
Mr. Kenneth D. G. Diesuo, Principal Planning Officer

Upper West Regional Peace Advisory Council

Alhaji Daud R. Yahaya, Chairperson

Assemblymen

Honourable Nuredeen Abdul Rahman, Assemblyman Nyohini South
Honourable Yussif Yahaya, Assemblyman, Choggu
Honourable Salifu Lazurus, Assemblyman, Tamale
Honourable Issah Pahaya Duogo, Assembly Member, Charai in Wa
Donor

Embassy of Japan

Mr. Shin-ichi Honda, First Secretary

National Non-governmental Organizations

Northern Region Women in Peace Building Movement

Hajia Zaratu, Chairperson

Rural Media Network (RUMNET)

Mr. Kassim Abdallah, Executive Director
Mr. Alhassan Imoro, Media Director
Mr. Joseph Zeini, Journalist / Reporter

Bawku Inter-Ethnic Peace Committee (BIEPC)

Mr. Thomas Abilla, Representative of the Kusasi Group
Mr. Patrick Adakudugu, Representative of the Kusasi Group
Alhaji Alhassab Mbalba, Representative of the Dagombal Group
Malam Mohammed Adeedde, Representative of the Hausa Group
Mr. Stephen Seidu, Representative of the Bisa Group

BEWDA

Mr. Shaibu, Executive Director

Beneficiary Groups

Traditional Authority (Yendi)

Kognaa Abdulai Andani, Chief Kingmaker of Yendi Traditional Area
Kpatya Regent of Dagbon
Sheikh Abdullah Elias, Chief Imam of Lameshegu, Tamale
Adam Gariba – Registrar, Dagbon Traditional Council, Yendi

Nyohini Women’s Group – Milling and Fortification (Tamale)

Madam Mumuni Abdul Rahama
Madam Fatima
Madam Zeinab Muhami
Madam Aseitu Suleima
Madam Awawu Mumuni (Magajia)
Madam Habiba
Madam Abiba Idrissu
Madam Adisa Adam

Changni Blacksmiths (Tamale)

Mr. Sailusu, Chairman
Mr. Idrissu, Deputy Chairperson
Mr. Sualisu, Council of elders
Mr. Alhasan Adam, Council of elders
Mr. Numanu Sayuti, Elder

Choggu Small Ruminants Group (Tamale)

Fuseini Mahama
Abdul Isshaku
Alhassan Lansah
Alhassan Yahaya
Dakuniga Fuseini
Adisah Alhassan
Yakubu Alhassan
Zurera Imoro
Adam Alhassan
Adisah Zakuba
Issaka Baako
Mahama Yakuba
Alhassan Abdulai
Mumuni Abubakari
Iddi Shaibu
Adam Abdulai
Adam Ibrahim
Yakuba Haruna
Sulemana Abubakari
M. A. Saaka Dua, Secretary

Nyohini Small Ruminants Beneficiary

Abubakari Yaro

Women’s Group – Milling and Fortification, Kunfong in Yendi

Zuwera Mahama
Madam Ayeshetu

ICT Training Beneficiaries
Asampana Lilian (Choggu)
Mohammadu Yaro (Choggu)
ANNEX 6: GUIDES FOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

A. FOR UN AGENCIES

1. Were you involved in the JP design phase?
2. What were/are your overall expectations of the joint programme?
3. What do you feel has gone well with the programme and specifically with your component?
4. How well do you feel the JP is DoA in terms of:
   a. Programme management/governance structures, e.g. Steering Committee, Technical Committee, “Programme Management Team”, etc?
   b. Planning – coordination with other JT partners
   c. Staffing
   d. Implementation - coordination, e.g. within your component(s) – sectoral outputs, delivering on schedule – how far are you towards meeting your targets?
   e. M&E
5. How do you see this programme fitting in with the UN programme for Ghana for development outcomes?
6. What would you say are the key programmes from other donors/government in Northern Ghana relevant to this programme? What are your linkages with those programmes?

Implementation Efficiency and Effectiveness:

7. What were the particular challenges with regards to e.g. procurement, financial arrangements, stakeholder expectations?
8. How do you collaborate with other development actors for e.g. IFAD Programme in the North?
9. Would you expect targets to be met if programme progresses as it is? If not, what kinds of revisions should be made for, e.g. coordination, linkages with national stakeholders, financial arrangements, etc.

Local Stakeholders:

10. As you know human security is a complex concept. How well do you think local stakeholders understand the concept of human security and its relevance to their situation? Is there local buy in by MMDAs?
11. How would you describe the level of collaboration with local government counterparts?
12. Out of your relationship with local government what has gone well and what could be improved?
13. To what extent are local government stakeholders involved generally and in your specific component in the programme?
14. How often do you visit project communities / stakeholders?
15. How do you validate the representation of community implementation teams (CICs)
Risk Management
16. What are the external risk factors outside of the UNs fear of influence? What are the risk strategies for the programme?

Sustainability
17. How will programme activities be maintained and sustained after the programme funding stops? E.g., local government funds; community funds?

B. FOR LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS
1. Was your MMDA involved with the programme design?
2. As you know human security is a complex concept. How well do you think local stakeholders understand the concept of human security and its relevance to their situation? Is there local buy in by MMDAs?
3. How would you describe the level of collaboration with local government counterparts?
4. Out of your relationship with local government what has gone well and what could be improved?
5. To what extent are local government stakeholders involved generally and in your specific component in the programme?
6. How often do you visit project communities / stakeholders?
7. To what extent has the CAPs developed under the project integrated into your MMDA?
8. In your view how is the involvement of local community groups in the project activities?
9. Which project strategies are likely to be adopted / adapted by your MMDA in HSP programming?
10. How do you validate the representation of community implementation teams (CICs)

C FOR PROJECT BENEFICIARIES
1. In your view how are community members consulted on the programme?
2. How are community members participating? (traditional authority, community leaders, women, men, youth and children’s, different community level groups) participate in programme activities?
3. What are/ are your expectations regarding the programmes activities?
4. How are community members (men, women and youth, different ethnic groups) likely to benefit from these programme activities?
5. What are the economic and social changes that are likely to be produced by the project?
6. In your opinion are the strategies and targets being used successful in addressing peace and conflict issues in the communities?
7. How are different community groups as well as the disadvantaged/vulnerable women, men, youth and children being targetted?
8. Are the strategies employed on the programme useful in addressing the critical economic, social and security needs and issues of the communities?

9. Were targets for men and women realistic?

10. How will the contributions being made by the programme affect roles and relationships of community members? (women, men and children)?

11. What changes has occurred so far (can occur) in the lives of men and women in terms of the following:
   - Inter district and community, regional and national levels?
   - How has/can the project ensure an increase in livelihood opportunities for community members? (women, men and the youth)?
   - How has / can the project support access to productive resources?
   - How has / can the project improve the health and nutritional status of women and children?
   - How has / can the project impact on the educational status of children and the youth

12. How has the project brought members of the community together?

13. What will happen when the project support comes to an end?

14. Which other similar projects are being undertaken in the community and by who?
ANNEX 7

COMPONENT 1 – SUMMARY REMARKS

Component 1 – Local Capacity for Democratic Governance, Conflict Sensitive Approaches, Developed – Summary Remarks

Objective 1: Capacity of local Governance and civic institutions for democratic governance, integrating conflict sensitive approaches, developed by 2011. [UNDP, UNICEF]

UNDP and UNICEF under the HSP are to support the Development of Community Action Plans (CAPs) and Mainstreaming of Conflict and Human Security Concept into MTDPs by the Municipal, and Metropolitan Assemblies of the programme area. CAPs have been developed for all 19 communities in Bawku, Tamale, Yendi and Wa. Following the Development of the CAPs, Conflict Prevention and Human Security Concept mainstreamed into Medium Term Development Plans (MTDP) of Tamale, Yendi and Wa completed for 2010 – 2013 have incorporated themes on Human Security.

Findings – Development of CAPs: Community participation in the CAPs was considered excellent however although the focus was on the prioritization of peace and conflict resolution the process resulted in high expectations from the communities especially regarding the implementation of their action plans and communities are expecting that the HSP to support the priorities identified and outlined in the CAPs. Discussions with the Planning Officers of Tamale and Yendi confirmed this.

Findings – Mainstreaming CAPs into the MTDP: The Development of the MTDP for the four programme districts have taken into consideration the CAPs for the various project communities. However the implementation of the HSP thematic area in the MTDP may not be achieved as a priority since the Metropolitan and District Assemblies are already saddled with a number of priorities especially infrastructural and social especially education.

Finding – Funding for sustainability of HSP: The District Assembly Common Fund (DACF) continue to be inadequate and so Donor support remains the only option for critical issues such as peace and conflict resolution to be addressed.

Peacebuilding trainings for Chiefs was facilitated by UNDP has led to the training of 50 Chiefs. These are made up of 15 Chiefs in Tamale, 20 Chiefs in Yendi and 15 Chiefs in Wa.

Findings – Training for Chiefs: The trainings led to the bringing together of traditional leaders and chiefs from most of the conflicting divisions and gates. Some engagements have commenced between and among different groups and interactions have been good.

Findings – Regularity of engagement with Chiefs and Traditional Leaders: There has not been consistent follow-ups to trainings and this can slow down the pace of engagements. The Chiefs value the peace brokerage of UNDP.

Findings – Linkages between politicians and chieftaicy conflicts: The roles of political leadership and policy makers at the local level in festering some of the current conflicts is real and is a major concern for the traditional leadership. This emerged from discussions with the two traditional leaders in Yendi.
**Findings: External influences on peaceful settlement of the Northern conflicts.** There are some major negative external influences offering festering conflicts. These includes individuals who dwell outside of the three Northern Regions who wield enormous control and power over opinion leaders and chiefs, and these have not yet been brought into the engagements and peace sensitizations by the HSP

RUMNET training for the media undoubtedly has supported the establishment of the role of Media in peace and development reporting enhanced through the training facilitated by RUMNET. Capacity Building Training for Media in three regions was facilitated by UNDP/RUMNET. 10 Media practitioners each from Tamale, Bolgatanga and Wa (30) trained on conflict sensitive reporting.

**Findings – Sustaining Outcome of Media Trainings:** Regular backstopping of Media trainees will enhance the quality of reporting on peace and diffusion of conflict-mongering on the air waves.

**Findings – The role of RUMNET in the HSP has not been exploited beyond training facilitation.** The potential of RUMNET as a partner who can support a more holistic communication strategy for the HSP has not been exploited. The project has not taken advantage of the potential of RUMNET to support civil engagement through the media.
ANNEX 8

COMPONENT 2 – SUMMARY REMARKS

Objective 2: Capacity of security institutions and community members in human rights and rule of law issues enhanced, and mechanisms for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts and armed violence institutionalized at the local level by 2011 [UNDP]

Findings – engagement with the security institutions: There has been limited engagement with security institutions and community members on rule of law (ROL). Although some contacts were made with the security agents in the districts there has been no sensitization or trainings for them.

Findings – Training for security agencies and human rights institutions: There has been limited engagement with and peace-building training for security agencies and human rights institutions in the project sites;

Findings - Armed violence and the circulation of Small Arms: Current information on circulation of small arms in the country is outdated and management and use information unreliable; Some emerging positive outcome with some engagements among different factions as a result of project activities. Need for consolidation of cohesion and peace-building activities
Objective 3: At least 10 new business initiatives introduced productivity of entrepreneurs increased by 75% and income of targeted beneficiaries increased by 25% in the programme sites by 2011. [UNIDO, UNDP, WFP]

Poverty and vulnerability reduction more of a medium to long term objective likely to go beyond the programme duration. Support for Blacksmiths training in Alternative Products Blacksmiths from Tamale, Yendi, Wa have been mobilized and sensitized on peace and small arms issues. About 30 Blacksmiths from Yendi selected for training expected to start in March 2012.

**Findings:** Poverty and vulnerability reduction are more medium to longer term objectives extending beyond the programme duration and so targets set for.

**Findings - Huge expectations from the blacksmiths:** The Blacksmiths like all other target beneficiaries have huge expectations of the support that may accrue to them under the HSP. Although various groups of blacksmiths have been selected based on consensus and profiling completed for skills training and business development services (BDS) yet to be conducted;

**Findings - Youth unemployment:** Although youth unemployment is critical they are particularly at risk of manipulation by conflict entrepreneurs – they are not well targetted as beneficiaries. Not much targeting of youth as direct beneficiaries. Only 40 youths trained in ICT but not yet placed.

**Findings – Involvement of NBSSI:** Although there has been some ongoing discussions with the NBSSI by UNDP/UNIDO according to NBSSI they are still awaiting official has not been formalized and made more official.

**Findings - Milling and Fortification machines:** The programme have been set up in Nyohini in Tamale, Kunfong in Yendi, Guntingli in Yendi, Possum in Bawku and Charia in Wa, Mill is being used for grinding of other cereals and beans
Objective 4: Increased production of food crops by 40% and livestock by 30% in an efficient manner to meet the basic food security and nutritional requirements of the District’s/Municipalities’ by 2011 [FAO, WFP, UNICEF]

Findings - Small Ruminants Project (FAO/MOFA) About 400 beneficiaries in all 19 HSP Communities in were selected for distribution of ruminants (Sheep). So far all beneficiaries in Bawku, Tamale, have received five sheep each and those in Wa and Yendi are yet to be delivered. All the 2000 sheep have been procured. However the unnecessarily long delay in the procurement of sheep for beneficiaries almost puts the credibility and timeliness of project output delivery into disrepute. According to discussions from the beneficiaries and some Assembly members the delay brought out a lot of questions.

Findings – Beneficiaries Expectations: Some components of project outputs not able to deliver as a result of limited funding. Also beneficiaries expected to have received at least one ram but all turned out to be females.

Findings – Cost of veterinary and other support services: Farmers are weary of the cost maintaining the sheep and provide feeding and medicine costs. Also there are concerns on the ability of the MOFA AEAs to effectively monitor farmers in view of their own challenges regarding monitoring of farmers without the programme having made any provisions to support these activities within the MOFA.

Findings – Backstopping from MOFA / AES: This remains a challenge since there are limited number of AES and also some are challenged with mobility in their supervisory role especially in Bawku with the ban on riding of motor bikes by males.

Findings – economic importance of trees: Whereas the planting of Economic Trees are critical in Northern Ghana for the redress of growing destruction of vegetative cover. The distribution of Mango seedlings to farmers in Bawku and Wa is seen as important in supporting diversification of farming and also to increase tree cover. It is however not too clear how the tree are to be managed by the farmers in view of the increasing bush fires in the areas and inability of farmers to monitor their farmers. The MOFA acknowledges that without an effective backstopping of farmers it is unlikely that trees are going to maintained and the sustainability of the component of
Objective 5: Mainstreaming and advocating Human security Concept in the context of Ghana enhanced by 2011 [UNU, UNDP]

Baseline Survey, Mid-Term Outcome Monitoring, Translation of HS Key Terms into 4 local languages (UNU-GHANEP/UDS/LEGON)

Findings - Baseline survey and Outcome Assessment: These activities have been timely executed and reports are available. The final baseline report is available and an outcome report has been developed by the UNU in collaboration with its partners.
ANNEX 12
STAKEHOLDER VALIDATION SESSION
HELD AT BABA YARA STADIUM CONFERENCE ROOM, TAMALE
FRIDAY, 2ND MARCH, 2012

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this meeting was to validate the UNJHSP mid-term evaluation team’s key findings from their field consultations, including:

- Stakeholders’ interpretations and expectations of human security
- Emerging outcomes identified by the consultants
- Emerging issues
- Critical issues identified by local stakeholders
- Stakeholders’ recommendations for the way forward

The validation was attended by twenty six (26) key local stakeholders from the four HSP regions, as well as the HSP Field Coordinator and one HSP Field Officer (the participants list is attached herewith as Annex A).

The session commenced with a prayer by the Chief Imam of Lamashegu, Tamale. Mr. Daud Abang-Gos, Chairperson for Regional Peace Council, Upper East Region, moderated the validation. An interpreter, Alhassan Salifu Kalala of Justice Radio, Tamale, provided translation services.

Mr. Ernest Asigri, the HSP Field Coordinator, gave the opening remarks. He commended the stakeholders for the importance they attached to the mid-term evaluation and to the validation session. The aim of the validation was to ensure that stakeholders would be presented with the consultants’ preliminary findings for their consideration, discussion and agreement. Mr. Asigri encouraged the participants to continue to engage with the HSP, as it is crucial for strengthening peace in all of the project areas. The sharing of information by the validation participants will support better programme delivery.

The meeting was officially opened by the Moderator, who also expressed his gratitude to the participants. He encouraged them to fully engage with the consultants to ensure that their evaluation findings accurately reflect the local context. The Lead Consultant, Dr. Annette Ittiq, led the facilitation, with contributions from the other team member, Ms. Patience Agyare-Kwabi. Ms. Agyare-Kwabi also recorded the discussion.

2.0 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FOR VALIDATION

1 Local Stakeholders’ interpretations and expectations of Human Security

- Programme expectations - resolutions of ongoing conflicts, CAPs mainstreaming HS/conflict resolution into them; improvement in livelihood options and poverty reduction; improved access to education, skills training, and job placement; increased food security.

Additional Stakeholder Comments\(^{30}\):

\(^{30}\)Comments included additional details on local stakeholders’ interpretations of human security, as well as their perceptions of human security threats.
The HSP should consider the issue of conflict-related migration from the Northern Regions to the south, especially by youth, e.g. Kayaye, boro boys.

Political conflicts do contribute to insecurity and conflict in the Northern Regions. Political partisanship is widespread, and it influences some of the current chieftaincy and ethnic conflicts. Some politicians engage in “divide and rule” tactics, and this has serious security implications;

- Access to good drinking water and to good healthcare are also human security issues;
- Addressing food security and the accessibility of wholesome food, and peoples’ vulnerability to diseases, are critical human security-related issues;
- Human security includes access to good governance, e.g. rule of law, justice and equality, and public participation; and good governance makes for good peace;\(^{31}\)
- Land issues, including insufficiency of land for agriculture, are conflict triggers
- Respect for Cultural diversity. The celebration of different cultural activities sometimes leads to conflicts, so a good understanding of and respect for the diverse local cultures also forms part of human security.

### 2 Emerging Outcomes

- **HSP Programme and the UN** are seen as trusted and credible partners to facilitate dialogue and broker peace among the different groups.

**Stakeholder Comments:**
- Participants agreed with the consultants on this point, and they confirmed that it is indeed a true reflection of the discussions held.

**Stakeholder Comments:**
- The process of community selection, as well as the various validation and community entry missions, have encouraged stakeholder co-ordination at the regional, metro/municipal, and community levels.

**Stakeholder Comments:**
- There were no additional comments on this point, and participants generally agreed to this finding and confirmed its validity.

- **Relevant government stakeholders at Regional and District levels** have been introduced to conflict sensitive, conflict prevention, and peace-building approaches to development and planning, though the results to date vary between programme sites.

**Stakeholders’ Additional Comments:**
- That there are indeed positive signs of engagement among the stakeholders is agreed by communities to be true. To what extent has this been achieved by the District Planning? To what extent the HSP been able to support these processes?
- UNICEF support for the CAPs for participation and data validation: this has been dovetailed into the MTDP and they were also informed that what can be done is for communities to pick up their CAPs and look for some funding and support. For BAWKU this has been done. For Tamale the project has built the capacity of communities to identify their needs in human security. This

\(^{31}\) Good governance and rule of law, as features of the Human Security “freedom from fear” pillar, featured prominently in the interviews with RPC representatives, but were not noted by other respondents.
has been documented in CAPs for reference by other donor partners, should they wish to support the communities.

- Positive signs of Traditional Chiefs and Opinion Leaders beginning to engage one another during the formal sensitization and training workshops.

- The Northern Region House of Chiefs confirmed how the Abudus and Andanis came together during the sensitization and training for the traditional authorities under the HSP;
- In the case of Bawku the spiritual cleansing had been done as a result of the sensitization of the HSP;
- In the Upper West, things are getting better as a result of the sensitization and the introduction of the PB concepts. Other disputes, including issues in the catchment area which are not part of the HSP sites, are now being brought to the RPAC for resolution. These outcomes are positive;
- At the community level, there used to be separate chieftaincy and political meetings; and now mixed groups have common meetings, e.g. for the small ruminant beneficiaries, you see persons of diverse factions coming together to discuss issues relating to their programme component in a unified manner;
- During trainings groups sat together, and the contributions made translate to the people benefiting as a representative of the community and not as factions: this has been very positive.

3 Emerging Issues

- Site-specific dimensions of conflict:
  - The issues of Chieftaincy, land and politics vary from place to place in their importance as conflict triggers (in all places – youth-related issues and the lack of jobs were mentioned; these are considered below)
- The upcoming elections are a potential trigger for pre- and post-election conflict
- Peace building and engagement with community groups must be ongoing activities
- Integration of the Human Security approach, including peace building and conflict resolution, has begun into local planning processes, e.g. CAPS, MTDPs (others?)
- Peace building sensitization / training for chiefs, opinion leaders including youth and women leaders, as well as for “external influencers”, security agencies and the media: this needs to be an on-going process.

Stakeholder Comments:
- There are similarities in human security threats in all project sites, but there are different dimensions in each. There is a need to contextualize approaches and not use cookie cutter approaches for the North to cover all the regions and programme communities;
- Fulani issue and its implications on conflicts: Gushegu had an issue with that and its implication on the project sites. They do have links with the HSP beneficiaries but cannot come out clearly; but it could be an emerging issue which requires some further investigations;
- HSP is in the metropolitan and municipal areas, which may not necessarily cover issues relating to rural and more agrarian communities;
- The Chieftaincy in e.g. Dagbon persons can be demanding what they cannot have and sometimes their demands have nothing to do with Chieftaincy;
- Economic insecurity - Petty trading in Wa and other capital cities and the hawking among Zambrama boys (petty traders from the Sahelian regions) and the native traders are now potential HS threats.

4 Critical Issues

- Youth related issues – their vulnerability:
  1. lack of education, lack of skills, joblessness and lack of jobs, resulting poverty
  2. Vulnerability to conflict and to conflict entrepreneurs
  3. Need to engage youth/youth leaders
  4. Youth component in HSP (ICT training, etc.)

Stakeholder Comments:
- Engaging the youth, through youth leaders and the groups they control is key. The HSP have identified some youth chiefs (Zaachi’s). Normally, with the bias / partisan nature of the Zaachies sometimes it is difficult for them to cut across groups and disseminate information they receive, and to establish by-laws. There is the need to identify the specific youth leaders for thematic areas – politics, chieftaincy, etc. - as well as other youth group leaders to ensure that information provided through them gets to all constituencies.
- Inclusiveness in the selection and involvement of the youth remains critical to the project
- The involvement of the National Youth Authority as key implementers in the HSP e.g. the facilitation of the youth leaders to properly engage in the communities and to form themselves into recognizable groups;
- There are youth leaders who are very radical; and some are not willing to use peaceful approaches to conflict. There is need to identify the youth leaders at the communities especially where some of them self-impose themselves due to their radicalism. The traditional leaders have a role in ensuring that radical youth leaders are brought to call.
- The issue of inclusiveness is important, as is legalization of groups through registering as associations, and the role of the National Youth Authority key can be in supporting the process
- The youth leaders who are currently in the system are the only ones that some youths in the communities trust so there is the need to involve the radicals and change their mindset. Need to identify, befriend and court them to change their radicalism. The programme can support their representation.
- Engaging them should also mean sensitzation and some trainings to sharpen their skills in peace building.
- The GMICS Tamale ICT training was very good in bringing some of the radicals and coming together to identify the issues. 40 youth beneficiaries were given ICT training, including data entry, business and entrepreneurial planning. However, the beneficiaries expected to be placed in ICT jobs by the NYEP. This has not yet happened, but now they are the AMBASSADORS of change and still expecting the HSP to link them to the jobs. Why provide training if the trainees are not to be employable?
- Engage the National Youth Authority as a partner and also engage youth more inclusively, including the radical youth leaders
- The National Youth Authority has an official definition of youth as between 15 – 35 years, but in the communities, village youth groups also include membership of responsible elders who support youth development activities. Hence, older people may officially be members of youth groups.
Beneficiary groups: small ruminants, milling and fortification, blacksmiths, ICT: what has gone well, and what hasn’t (slow implementation, etc.)

**Stakeholder Comments:**
- There is the need for the HSP to support the women, to expand uses for the mills and ensure there are further business developments opportunities with the mill to meet other milling demands;
- Delays in the delivery of the sheep has been a challenge and also the limited numbers (5) instead of 10 but the beneficiaries are very understanding of the situation and do generally accept the fact that the they will be obliged to pass on some the sheep to other members of the communities.
- The involvement of the blacksmiths and the training in alternative livelihood.
- The programme must review its objective of training. Though it is good to train, what about post-training job placements and job creation?
- Training was critical but so is the need for job placement and job creation
- The milling and fortification group in Nyohini (Tamale) have not yet been able to secure someone to attend to the mill since they are fully engaged in their Rice processing. They will need someone to operate the machine.

**Local buy-in and outcomes – “mainstreaming” HS?**

**Stakeholder Comments:**
- The HSP has been working well with local partners; but there is the need to strengthen partnerships and cooperation to ensure better local buy in. Some of the critical partners/opinion leaders who have to be brought include:
  - SADA, as a critical partner for sustainability of programmes;
  - The politicians, since like it or not they also “divide and rule”, i.e. manipulate the youth towards their political agenda. The HSP needs to engage more with MPs, especially those from the programme areas;
  - Religious leaders, since their role in moderating against conflicts and supporting peace among their constituents is critical;
  - National Authorities;
  - Gender Desk Officers / Department of women under the MOWAC
  - External Opinion leaders/ Non-Resident Opinion Leaders of the conflict prone areas; and
  - Youth who can act as Peer Educators.

- The role of the Peace Council needs to be reviewed since they seem to have been relegated, and their important liaison role in the implementation of the HSP outputs seems to have dwindled. Though they were part of the earlier sensitizations and the selection of communities, the HSP has not engaged with much since then. As local stakeholders, the National and Regional Peace Advisory Councils are critical in sustaining the gains of the HSP;
- Most areas have some Emergency Task Force for Peace (e.g. Bilchinsi Taskforce in Tamale). These were previously established for conflict resolution at the community level and have been brought into the HSP. However, the HSP needs to further orientate and sensitize them on the concept of human security and also in peace building trainings;
- The active engagement of the Media can be positive in diffusing conflicts e.g. the RUMNET who are the publishers of the Advocate, but the media can also be a negative influence in sparking conflicts through inflammatory propaganda on the airwaves.

5 **Way Forward**

- Consolidating gains to date
- Contextualizing HS interventions
- NB: the programme is scheduled to wind up at end 2012, and request to donor is pending; links to other programmes?

**Stakeholder Comments:**

**Critical Activities may include:**

- Peace-building targeting all the stakeholders which is deepened;
- More youth engagements as a quick wins – job placements and engagements;
- Skills training for the beneficiaries especially in the business management, SMEs and linkages to MFIs;
- There is a need to be very careful in the sharing of the programme benefits. E.g. if some clearly defined structures/systems are not put into place to ensure the successful passing on of animals these can create some conflicts in years to come. There is the urgent need to establish clear modalities in expanding project benefits for target communities for proper ending of the programme;
- The beneficiaries (small ruminants, milling and fortification equipments) should be made to sign MoUs with under the various interventions to ensure proper management and passing on of benefits to other community members;
- The HSP need to learn from some of the good lessons and practices from the MOFA in the implementation of similar programmes which required benefits to be shared among community members;
- The MOFA has to be given proper support to monitor project beneficiaries even after the end of the programme.

6 **Recommendations**

**Stakeholder Comments:**

- Diversify the peace activities as well as the recipients; build the capacity of community groups, including the youth;
- Establish modalities for punishing defaulters among the programme beneficiaries to ensure that gains are passed on to other community members;
- Create a forum for beneficiaries to share experiences among the programme sites;

---

32 The consultants asked the HSP Field Coordinator to comment on the stakeholders’ concerns about “doing no harm” and sustainability, particularly as these would arise after the close of the programme. He advised that these concerned would be addressed. The HSP has not yet put in place any structures for national ownership and post-project sustainability; but the MOFA will be contacted to ensure that there is a system for this. It is expected this would involve social management contracts with beneficiary communities.
- Issues relating to Chieftaincy need to pass through the proper channel. There has been amendment of the 1972 Chieftaincy Act which has been amended into Act 759 2008. These spell out all procedures for solving Chieftaincy conflicts. There is the need for Chiefs and community members to be sensitized on it for them to understand and know how to seek for civil redress in Chieftaincy disputes. The Dagbon issue, for instance, has not been addressed because it has a criminal dimension to it due to the murder of the Dagbon Chief;
- Livelihood options for the youth need to be further explored to reduce their susceptibility to manipulation from conflict entrepreneurs;
- The concept of human security has been well articulated by HSP, but there is the need for ongoing sensitization on peace building; activities must be diversified especially during the upcoming election period;
- There is the need to establish clearly and quickly a system for sharing of the animals. MOFA should be supported to establish systems and structures to ensure post-project sustainability.

3.0 CONCLUDING REMARKS
The Moderator at 12.15pm urged participants to move for a motion to accept and own the findings as a real reflection of issues discussed during the midterm evaluation. The Metro Director of Agriculture for Tamale, Mr. Kwamina Ato Akorful, passed the motion and this was seconded by Alhaji Daud Yahaya of the Regional Peace Advisory Committee, Wa. The moderator highlighted that the “freedom from fear” aspect of human security needs to be continually emphasized; for the communities this is critical. The greatest contribution that the programme can make to the communities is to support the deepening of peace in them.

The HSP Field Coordinator then thanked all the participants and concluded the meeting.
Annex A to Minutes of the Validation Session

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Upper West Regional Coordinating Council (1)
   David Anaafo, Wa

2. Tamale Metropolitan Assembly (1)
   Ahlassan Ibrahim

3. Yendi Municipal Assembly (1)
   Alhaji Mohammed Shaibu

4. Wa Municipal Assembly (1)
   Osman M. Zakaria

5. Bawku Municipal Assembly (1)
   Alhaji J.A . Abugre

6. Dagbon Traditional Council (1)
   Adam Gariba – Registrar, Yendi

7. Northern Region Peace Advisory Council (NORPAC) (1)
   Rev Father Thaddeus Kuusah, Chairperson

8. Upper West Regional Peace Advisory Council (1)
   Ahlaji Daud R. Yahaya, Chairperson

9. Metro MoFA Tamale (1)
   Kwamina Arkorful,

10. RUMNET-Tamale (1)
    Joseph Zeini

11. Blacksmiths Association-Yendi (1)
    Bawa Basheiru

12. Blacksmiths Association Tamale (2)
    Numanu Sayuti

13. Milling and Fortification Group (2)
    Mamuni Rahaman Abdul (Nyohini)
Awawu Mumuni

14. Small Ruminants beneficiaries, Tamale (3)
   Adam Abubakari (Chagni)
   Salifu Lazurus (Changni)
   Abubakari Yaro (Nyohini)

15. ICT Training Beneficiaries (2)
   Asampana Lilian (Choggu)
   Mohammadu Yaro (Choggu)

16. Assembly Members, Tamale (2)
   Nurideen Abdul Rahaman
   Salifu Lazurus

17. Assembly Member, Wa (1)
   Issah Pahaya Duogo, Charai

   Chiefs, Tamale (1)
   Sheikh Abduliah Elias, Chief Imam of Lameshegu

18. Human Security Programme (3)
   Ernest Asigiri, Field Coordinator
   Moro Bukari, Officer Tamale / Yendi
   Lawrence N. Gyamfi (Driver)

19. Interpreter (1)
   Alhassan Salifu Kalala
# Programme Coordination Unit Organogram

**JP Steering Committee Management Group**
Comprised of Head or Deputy Head from UN Agencies
- who have direct oversight and implementation roles in JP
- With TWG present as observers

## JPLG Organogram
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### JP Coordination Unit (PCU)

#### Inter Ministerial Committee

#### Regional Teams

- **SL**
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#### Agency Field Initiatives