

**Lessons Learnt and the Way
Forward – The Collaboration
between East Africa Legislative
Assembly (EALA) and the
European Parliamentarians
for Africa (AWEPA)
March 2005–April 2008**

Lisa Von Trapp

Lessons Learnt and the Way
Forward – The Collaboration
between East Africa Legislative
Assembly (EALA) and the
European Parliamentarians
for Africa (AWEPA)
March 2005–April 2008

Lisa Von Trapp

Sida Evaluation 2008:52

Sida

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation, an independent department reporting to Sida's Director General.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

Author: Lisa Von Trapp

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 2008:52
Commissioned by Sida, Sida

Copyright: Sida and the author

Date of Final Report: May 2008
Printed by Edita, 2009
Art. no. Sida48042en
ISBN 978-91-586-8133-0
ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	9
About the Partners.....	10
The AWEPA/EALA Programme (2005–2007).....	12
Administration and Implementation	14
Programme Results (Participants’ Perceptions).....	24
Sustainability	27
Donors to the AWEPA/EALA Programme, Donor Coordination, and New Sources of Support for EALA.....	28
Looking Forward – AWEPA’s new Proposal and Questions on Direct Funding to EALA	30
Conclusion	33
Selected References.....	34
Annex 1. List of Interviewees	37
Annex 2. Terms of Reference (TOR).....	39
Annex 3. Paper Submitted by Hon. Dan Wandera Ogalo, MLA	46
Annex 4. AWEPA Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy.....	50
Annex 5. Sample Articles on Programme Activities	54
Annex 6. Copy of the EALA Work Plan (June 2007–June 2008) Under ACBF Grant.....	56
Annex 7. Sample Cost Breakdown for Five Programme Activities.....	61
Annex 8. The EALA Women’s Forum	65

Abbreviations

AWEPA	European Parliamentarians for Africa
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EU	European Union
EAC	East Africa Community
EALA	East Africa Legislative Assembly
MLA	Member of Legislative Assembly
NEPAD	New Partnership for African's Development
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NDI	National Democratic Institute for International Affairs
PGA	Parliamentarian for Global Action
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women

Acknowledgements

The Consultant would like to thank the participating Sida, European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA) and East Africa Legislative Assembly (EALA) staff for their valuable assistance throughout the review process. The Consultant is equally grateful to the EALA Members who were willing to give her time in their busy schedules and to be interviewed at short notice. She would particularly like to thank the Honourable Speaker Abdirahin Haithar Abdi, as well as Hon. Dan Wandera Ogalo, MLA (Uganda) who very kindly provided her with a paper outlining examples of the AWEPA/EALA programme's achievements.

The views and interpretations expressed in this review are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).

Executive Summary

AWEPA has been providing capacity building activities for EALA since 2002 and the two organizations signed a new MOU in June 2007 for the period of 2007–2011. To date AWEPA is the only partner to provide EALA with long-term and predictable support. EALA Members go so far as to say that “little would have happened at the Assembly without AWEPA funding”. While EALA has successfully sought new sources of support, the relationship with AWEPA compares favourably with that of the other partners.

The AWEPA/EALA programme is highly demand-driven and EALA Members and staff express a strong feeling of ownership for the programme. They stress that the work plans, both in terms of design and content, originate within EALA. In addition, EALA staff members are integrally involved in all aspects of the programme’s administration. This is a positive sign for the sustainability of the programme. Several additional factors discussed in more detail later can also be said to contribute to the sustainability, some of which are by-products of how the programme has been designed and implemented, and some of which have emerged over time.

The range of activities in the programme is very broad but by and large the programme appears to be meeting its stated objectives and most of the planned activities have been implemented. Every MLA and EALA staffer interviewed immediately and enthusiastically described specific examples of how the AWEPA/EALA programme has impacted on their own work. For Members the programme has been most important in terms of their legislative and representative roles. However, support for improved parliamentary oversight and legislative fiscal review and analysis appears underweighted.

Despite some improvements, weaknesses persist in the narrative reports which lack detail and remain at the level of short descriptions of activities, with little or no information on follow-up and results. The weaknesses in reporting appear linked to larger weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation. This is regrettable considering the results ascribed to the programme by its beneficiaries, and it is encouraging to see that AWEPA is making efforts to address such weaknesses in future.

AWEPA undertakes several measures to ensure cost efficiency (although more could be done) and the cost breakdown provided for five activities shows that the majority of the costs appear to be in line with what would be expected as compared to other parliamentary strengthening programmes. However, AWEPA’s staff and consultant costs in particular (or what AWEPA describes as “basic project costs” in general) make up a surprising portion of the programme’s budget, and this despite the strong involvement of EALA staff in the programme’s administration.

Transparency around the budgets and financial reports has emerged as an issue of concern. It is difficult for EALA to plan without full information on available funding. In addition, financial reports lack detail (e.g. on the number of participants, rates for accommodation and how many nights, meals and per diems given, average cost for flights etc.) making it difficult for partners or donors to ascertain cost effectiveness and to spot potential problems. Moreover, financial reports do not provide information on the total amount of money spent on “basic project costs” (or what many organizations call administrative costs). Finally, it is worrying that AWEPA has not always sought approval from Sida before making substantial deviations from the presented plan and budget (reallocating funds) as is required in the grant agreement.

With higher funding requests to Sida and Norad, and the addition of a new donor (Irish Aid), funding to the programme stands to increase significantly (not to mention new sources of support for capacity building for EALA such as the African Capacity Building Foundation – ACBF). As such, donor coordination and information sharing is more important than ever. In the past Sida and Norad have attempt-

ed to coordinate and share information but these efforts have broken down to some extent. Coordination should be revived and deepened, with Irish Aid included. More specifically, donors to the programme should clarify together their expectations and requirements for the annual reports and financial statements and AWEPA/EALA should provide donors with a single annual report and financial statement indicating how funding from all three donors was used. While it is not practicable at this stage, in the future donors may also wish to consider receiving one proposal from AWEPA, again deciding together on the proposal format in advance. The same principle should be applied to future reviews.

Finally, the question of whether donors should provide funding to EALA directly arose regularly during the review process. This is a sensitive issue for all involved. EALA appears poised to take on full responsibility for the programme in the near future, previous impediments to direct funding have diminished, and there are some activities where it is difficult to see the value added in channelling funding through AWEPA. However, AWEPA continues to provide added value to the programme, particularly in terms of its long experience and networks in the region, Europe and among donors. While several interviewees did prefer the idea of direct funding there does not seem to be a clear call from EALA for direct funding at this point, provided that AWEPA is much more transparent in the budget process and the financial statements. Another option which may be worth exploring is a more incremental arrangement in which a portion of funding continues through AWEPA but direct funding is given to EALA for a specific set of activities. However this issue evolves in the future, EALA should be in the driver's seat.

Summary of Recommendations

1. In future an MOU should be signed by all three partners (Sida, AWEPA, and EALA) with a copy of the Agreement between Sida and AWEPA attached and provided to EALA. Given the renewed emphasis on donor coordination Sida should also explore whether or not to include other donors in this MOU.
2. AWEPA should estimate its total basic project costs and include this total as a separate item in the indicative budgets and again in the annual financial reports.
3. The donors to the programme should explore whether they would like define the percentage of the total grant that should go to basic project costs.
4. Noting that EALA has an obligation to declare sources and amounts of donor funding, the MOU between AWEPA and EALA should be updated to address expectations on financial transparency.
5. AWEPA should provide EALA with a “budget envelope” or global idea of available funding during the planning process (e.g. prior to EALA developing their annual work plan).
6. AWEPA should brief EALA quarterly basis on the state of the programme's finances and inform EALA when funding tranches are released. This should be included in future MOUs.
7. The partners should explore whether setting up a small AWEPA office (1–2 staff) within EALA would be mutually beneficial, practicable and cost effective. AWEPA should provide EALA with a document including a costing exercise demonstrating the potential benefits of such an office.
8. Any future agreement between Sida and AWEPA should again require that AWEPA seek written approval for major changes in the work plan and reallocation of funds. However, it may be useful to include a “flexibility bracket” or a percentage of funds which can be reallocated between budget lines without prior approval.
9. Sida should endeavour to have more direct contact with EALA; ensuring lines of communication are open with the Speaker and the Clerk.

10. AWEPA/EALA should regularly inform Sida of upcoming activities and, as appropriate, invite Sida representatives to participate in activities. Sida representatives should participate in/observe 1–2 activities per year.
11. The narrative progress reports should be strengthened. Reports should include more detailed information, show that cross-cutting themes have been addressed, and emphasise information on results related to intended outputs, outcomes, and where possible, impact. Supporting documentation should be included as appropriate
12. Monitoring and evaluation of the programme should be strengthened, and a clearer more defined M&E plan for the programme developed, within the framework of the AWEPA Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (and EALA's future strategic plan which will include mechanisms for M&E).
13. Any future agreements between Sida and AWEPA should make particular reference to monitoring and evaluation, as should agreements with other donors to the programme.
14. The indicative budget line "consultation and evaluation" should be disaggregated to ensure that adequate funding goes towards evaluation. In addition, it would be helpful if the total amount spent on evaluation was reflected as a separate line in the financial reports.
15. AWEPA should assess the baseline for M&E upon completion of the current phase of the programme.
16. Measurable indicators should be clarified in the M&E plan. They should be qualitative, quantitative and/or time bound, capable of being monitored and the plan should include guidance regarding the methods for assessing the indicators.
17. AWEPA and EALA should work cooperatively on monitoring and evaluation as they do on other aspects of the programme.
18. The M&E plan should clearly identify and assign responsibility for monitoring and evaluation to specific staff within AWEPA and EALA. The identified staff from both AWEPA and EALA should participate in and take full advantage of Sida's planned annual partner workshop which will focus on results-based management and be followed by on the job training.
19. Donors to the programme should strengthen coordination and information sharing.
20. Donors to the programme should clarify together their expectations and requirements for the narrative and financial reports.
21. AWEPA should submit one annual report and financial statement to all donors. In the future donors may also wish to consider coordinating to receive one proposal from AWEPA.
22. There should be one Annual Review Meeting with AWEPA, EALA and all donors to the programme present rather than several separate meetings.
23. Donors should undertake future reviews of the AWEPA/EALA programme jointly.
24. EALA will be developing a strategic plan as part of its cooperation with the ACBF. AWEPA should be consulted during this process. Future programme activities should be aligned with EALA's strategic plan.
25. The AWEPA/EALA work plans should take into consideration new sources of similar support to EALA, avoid duplication, and where appropriate seek to co-finance activities or otherwise leverage additional support.

26. Programme cooperation with the East African Law Society should be continued and new partnerships with civil society organizations (particularly those in the East Africa Civil Society Forum and other regional CSOs) should be explored and encouraged where appropriate, as should bottom-up approaches in general.
27. Support to EALA to develop and improve its public information capacity should be prioritized.
28. Greater emphasis should be placed in future work plans on EALA's oversight role in general and on the role of EALA in the budget process in particular.
29. The partners should explore providing training on gender-responsive budgeting in advance of the next budget debate.
30. The AWEPA/EALA programme should explore whether to support the EALA Women's Forum in addition to the current planned activities. A mechanism should be created for the Forum to propose activities for future annual work plans.

Introduction

AWEPA has been providing capacity building activities for EALA since 2002, initially with major funding support from Sida, Norad, and Belgium. This review examines AWEPA's second agreement with Sida for support to EALA for a total contribution of SEK 6,000,000 disbursed in 5 tranches over a period of three years (2005–2007). This agreement has been extended by one year, largely due to delays in the inauguration of the second Assembly which slowed down implementation of the planned activities for 2007.

This support is now coming to a close. AWEPA has submitted a new funding proposal to Sida, prepared in consultation with EALA, for the period of 2008–2011. The proposal has been short-listed and Sida has provided comments on the proposal and asked for revisions. It is hoped that the conclusions and recommendations contained in this Review will assist Sida in decisions regarding continued support to AWEPA and EALA.

Purpose and scope

According to the Terms of Reference (TOR, see Annex Two) developed by Sida in consultation with AWEPA and EALA, the purpose of the Review is to assess to what extent programme objectives have been met (and if so, have had an effect on intended outcomes, if not impact), to identify lessons learned and make recommendations for future implementation of activities.

Sida's support to EALA is channelled through AWEPA. As such the review looks at AWEPA and EALA in relation to one another, and more specifically in terms of AWEPA's support to EALA. Ultimately the review is primarily for the benefit of these two partners.

It is important to note that the AWEPA/EALA programme was evaluated in 2005 in a study commissioned by Norad, and AWEPA underwent an organizational review in early 2006, commissioned by Sida. In addition, AWEPA has been regularly evaluated since its inception in 1984.

Methodology and guiding questions

The Review is based mainly on a desk review of relevant documents and interviews with key players, notably Sida staff, AWEPA staff, EALA Members and staff, and staff of the programme's two other donors during the review period, Norad and Irish Aid. Documents and interviewees were identified by the partners in consultation with the Consultant. A list of documents reviewed can be found at the end of the Review and the list of interviewees is attached as Annex One.

A series of guiding questions grouped under the thematic areas of effectiveness, efficiency, results, relevance and sustainability, were developed by the partners prior to the start of the Review (see Annex Two).

The Consultant carried out a first field visit to Nairobi, Arusha and Dar-es-Salaam in March, 2008. During the field visit the Consultant received an initial briefing from Sida and held inception meetings with the partners. The Consultant also observed the 2007 Annual Review meeting between Sida, AWEPA and EALA. The Consultant held as many face-to-face interviews as possible during the field visit. Interviewees who were unavailable during the field visit were interviewed by phone. The Consultant again travelled to Nairobi on May 7–9, 2008 to hold bilateral meetings with Sida, AWEPA and EALA to discuss their comments on the draft Review and to hold a final validation meeting with all three partners. In this final meeting the partners shared and discussed their individual comments, reviewed and agreed to the recommendations, and added one recommendation.

About the Partners

AWEPA

The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA) is an international non-governmental organization with some 25 years of experience that supports parliaments in Africa from a development perspective and works to keep Africa high on the political agenda in Europe. AWEPA's membership is comprised of around 1500 current and former European parliamentarians from almost all EU Member States, the European Parliament, Norway and Switzerland.

AWEPA's headquarters are in the Netherlands and it currently maintains offices (or staff) in Belgium, Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa, Southern Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. More responsibility is being delegated from headquarters to AWEPA's African offices in all phases of the programmes. AWEPA "envisages a more central role for the African offices" in programme development, fundraising, country analysis and strategic evaluation in the near future.¹

AWEPA works with some 25 African parliaments (including regional parliaments and the Pan-African Parliament), as well as regularly organizing activities across Europe. In addition to its programme with EALA, AWEPA maintains national programmes for (or involves in AWEPA activities) members and staff of the national parliaments of the EAC's member states.

Sweden's overarching relationship with AWEPA

Sida has shown a high level of confidence in AWEPA, providing AWEPA with significant core funding and project funding for country programs. Moreover Sida has invested in AWEPA as an organization contributing to a series of management studies and audits of AWEPA from 1998 – 2002. In 2006 Sida also commissioned a full Organizational Review of AWEPA.

Sida's 2005 evaluation of its parliamentary strengthening portfolio notes that support for international parliamentary networks² constitutes the second largest share of Sida's expenditures for parliamentary support. Among these international parliamentary networks, AWEPA receives the highest level of funding. Support for networks is reiterated in a 2002 Sida Working Paper as one of the five primary methods used by Sida for capacity development.³ While this same paper notes that there is a risk that networks "take away strength and resources from essential work in the [member] organization[s], and that, relatively speaking, too much time and money is spent on air tickets and discussions at seminars and conferences", the 2005 evaluation team concluded that these risks were justified in the area of parliamentary support.

AWEPA's 2005 and 2006 Annual Reports show Sweden as its largest donor, with 16.9% 20.3% of its total funding coming from Sweden in 2005 and 2006 respectively. Swedish parliamentarians have been particularly involved in AWEPA. The AWEPA section in the Riksdag is one of AWEPA's largest with around 120 members.⁴ AWEPA's Secretary General and CEO (who also serves as AWEPA's Political Coordinator for NEPAD) is a former Member of the Swedish Parliament.

¹ Strengthening African Parliaments, AWEPA, June 2007

² Other networks receiving Sida support include Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA), E-parliament, and the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE). These networks vary widely in their "substantive focus, geographic reach, management and involvement of members." Approaches to Parliamentary Strengthening, Sida Evaluation 05/27, 2005.

³ Methods for Capacity Development: A Report for Sida's project group "Capacity Development as a Strategic Question", Sida Working Paper No. 10, February 2002.

⁴ *Organizational Review of the Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa-AWEPA*, 2006, p. 45

The East African Legislative Assembly (EALA)

EALA was formally inaugurated on November 30, 2001 and had its first sitting on November 29, 2001. The Second East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) held its first sitting on June 5, 2007. Based in Arusha, Tanzania, EALA is a supranational parliament.

Article 49 of the EAC Treaty establishes EALA as the legislative organ of the Community. Like most legislatures EALA has as its core functions legislating, oversight and representation. Article 49 further states that EALA:

- Shall liaise with the National Assemblies of Partner States on matters relating to the Community;
- Shall debate and approve the budget of the Community;
- Shall consider annual reports on the activities of the Community, annual audit reports of the Audit Commission and any other reports referred to it by the Council;
- Shall discuss all matters pertaining to the Community and make recommendations to the Council as it may deem necessary for the implementation of the Treaty;
- May for purposes of carrying out its functions, establish any committee or committees for such purposes as it deems necessary;
- Shall recommend to the Council the appointment of the Clerk and other officers of the Assembly;
- Shall make its rules of procedure and those of its committees

The Assembly may also perform any other functions as are conferred upon it by the Treaty. As noted above, EALA is empowered to make its own Rules of Procedure and to constitute Committees. EALA maintains seven standing committees: Accounts; Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources; General Purpose; House Business; Legal, Rules and Privileges; Regional Affairs and Conflict Resolution; and Trade Communication and Investment. EALA may also appoint Select Committees as needed. The composition and leadership of each of these Committees is equally shared among the Partner States.⁵

There are 27 Members⁶ of EALA indirectly elected for a five-year (renewable) term by their respective National Assemblies (although not from within the National Assemblies), and five ex-officio Members.⁷ They will soon be joined by nine members from both Rwanda and Burundi, as well as a contingent of staff from these two countries⁸. Article 50 of the Treaty requires that EALA's Members "represent as much as it is feasible, the various political parties represented in the National Assembly, shades of opinion, gender and other special interest groups in that Partner State".⁹ As such, EALA members come from diverse backgrounds such as business, NGOs, retired civil servants and Members of the National Assemblies. Aside from the latter, most have little or no parliamentary (or political) experience.

⁵ Currently committees are comprised of around 9 members with the exception of the business committee which has 8 members. That means that a workshop for a single, full committee is quite small

⁶ Nine from each member state. Members can be re-elected for a second term.

⁷ The ex-officio Members include one Minister from each partner state responsible for East African Community Affairs (currently there are three but this will increase to five), the Secretary General of the EAC and the Counsel to the Community. They may participate in debates but have no right to vote in the Assembly. The Ex-officio Members report to EALA on the implementation of the Treaty and any other issues of interest to the Partner States.

⁸ Five staff from Rwanda and Burundi have been recruited and approval has been given for an additional five staff members. This will bring the total staff up to 27.

⁹ Article 50 of the Treaty also requires that an MLA (a) is a citizen of that Partner State; (b) is qualified to be elected a member of the National Assembly of that Partner State under its Constitution; (c) is not holding office as a Minister in that Partner State; (d) is not an officer in the service of the Community; and (e) has proven experience or interest in consolidating and furthering the aims and the objectives of the Community.

Among the main recommendations included in Sida's 2005 evaluation of its parliamentary strengthening portfolio is that parliamentary strengthening programmes should be sufficiently "politically contextualized". With this in mind is interesting to note that EALA Members face different political incentives than the MPs in the National Parliaments of the Member States. Beyond being a regional parliament, EALA is unique in that Members are not grouped by political party and there is no majority or opposition. Some describe EALA as "more technical than political". While divisions along party lines appear weak, stronger divisions may be found more along the lines of national interests.

The AWEPA/EALA Programme (2005–2007)

Overview

The proposal for the AWEPA/EALA programme (2005–2007) identifies three target groups for support: EALA Members, EALA Staff and EALA's Committees.¹⁰ It examines a set of challenges for each target group, with some natural overlap. Of particular concern is the need to increase outreach to constituents; review of the Treaty; EALA's role in dispute resolution; the need for both Members and staff to forge stronger links with their counterparts in the National Assemblies of the member and candidate states and to increase exposure to other parliamentary institutions. In addition, a number of specific issues of import to EALA's work and regional integration were raised such as trade; the use of natural resources (e.g. Lake Victoria); conflict prevention and resolution (particularly around resource based conflicts); mediation of disputes; transport and free movement of citizens and labour. More recently, EALA faces challenges around the need to integrate new Members and staff from Rwanda and Burundi with differing parliamentary and bureaucratic cultures (outside the Commonwealth tradition shared by the original Partner States) as well as language barriers. In addition, there was high turnover following the second election with only six members returning (although high turnover is typical of parliaments in the region and in Africa in general, it may have a greater impact on EALA due to its small size).

The proposal identifies a set of objectives (see Box One) for each target group, as well as strategies for meeting these objectives.¹¹ Somewhat surprisingly, the objectives fail to make specific reference to EALA's core functions of legislation, oversight and representation, although in some they are implied. The main mechanisms for delivering support, as specified in the MOU between AWEPA and EALA, are capacity building seminars, trainings, study visits, exchange programmes to similar institutions, and participation in international parliamentary conferences.

¹⁰ AWEPA staff noted that normally about 70% of support goes to the MLAs and Committees, and 30% to staff.

¹¹ Programme proposal Support to the East African Legislative Assembly: Cooperative Programme, EALA & AWEPA, 2004–2007, p. 9-10

Box One: Programme Objectives

EALA Members

1. To improve the interface between MLAs and the constituents they represent;
2. To disseminate relevant information about the process of regionalization, reinforce regional ties and communication on a parliamentary level and to provide a forum in which Members of the EALA may meet national constituents to discuss problems of common interest;
3. To exchange knowledge with other regional parliamentary institutions in Africa and Europe on questions such as conflict prevention and resolution, use of natural resources, regionalization, regional treaty interpretation and separation of powers
4. To enhance the links and opportunities for exchange of knowledge between EALA and the member States National Assemblies (including candidate member states)
5. To develop a more comprehensive outreach programme using electronic, print and radio media using existing infrastructure.

EALA Staff

1. To improve the skills of the staff members to perform their particular functions and to improve their understanding of the roles of the various stakeholders in the administration of a Parliament;
2. To provide relevant examples and disseminate information concerning the operation and methods of other regional parliamentary institutions;
3. To increase sharing of skills and knowledge, especially in a South-South context, between staff of EALA and other African Regional Parliamentary institutions.

EALA Committees

1. To improve the abilities of Committees, members and staff to respond to the newly created regional context in which they must function, and in particular to the process of regionalization and the role of regional parliamentary committees in assisting in mediating an end to conflicts and in preventing new conflicts from erupting;
2. To disseminate knowledge concerning the methods of work and functions of Committee systems in other regional parliamentary institutions in Europe and Africa;
3. To facilitate and encourage Committee-to-Committee forums between EALA and the National Assemblies of the Member (and candidate member) States in which exchanges may take place on problems and regional policy.

Work plans

Programme activities are laid out in an annual work plan developed jointly by EALA and AWEPA. The work plan indicates the target group, reference to the objectives, indicative budget (not itemized) and proposed timing for each activity. The work plan remains a flexible instrument which can be amended to respond strategically to emerging needs and opportunities. For example, AWEPA staff noted that during the period when inauguration of the second Assembly was delayed, they were able to refocus support almost exclusively on staff.

“The Programme is meeting the need of Members and staff because it is planned by them.” EALA staffer

The work plans, both in terms of design and content, originate within EALA. The programme is demand-driven and consistent with EALA's priorities. EALA Members and staff express a strong feeling of ownership for the programme. The planning process is as follows. The Committees each prepare a proposed work plan (these are now on a three-year basis). The Committees' plans are then submitted to the Business Committee which harmonizes and approves them. The decision to approve activities in the Committees' proposed work plans is largely based on how well they fit into the programme of the Assembly and the priorities of the EAC. In future activities (and the programme in general) should also be aligned to EALA's strategic plan which is currently being developed.

At the same time EALA staff prepare individual proposals for training which are submitted to the Clerk. These proposals are then presented to their peers and discussed during a staff meeting before

being approved or rejected. This process is appreciated by EALA staff who describe it as “very democratic”.

The set of approved activities for both Members (Committees) and staff with estimated budgets are then submitted to AWEPA for agreement. It is at this point that EALA is informed whether funding is available for the activities in the proposed work plan and some adjustments may be made accordingly. AWEPA may also recommend regional or other activities which EALA might find useful. For example, AWEPA ensures EALA's participation in its EU Presidency Seminars (organized twice a year) and approximately three regional conferences each year for the Great Lakes countries on themes such as the Great Lakes peace process; ground rules on parliamentary democracy, private sector development, HIV/AIDS, and poverty reduction. These conferences are seen as mechanisms to ensure that cross-cutting themes are addressed even when they are not a focus of the programme's work plan.

One area of concern emerged regarding the planning process. Interviewed EALA Members and staff unanimously cited difficulties in planning without knowing how much funding is actually available. In addition, even when the work plan is accepted activities have sometimes been cancelled due to lack of funds. It would be useful for AWEPA to provide EALA with a “budget envelope” (with some margin for error) prior to developing the work plan. In addition, EALA would appreciate quarterly or bi-annual briefings on the state of the programme's finances and to be informed when tranches are released. Two members also suggested that an AWEPA staff member sit with each Committee as they prepare their proposals in order to keep expectations realistic.

Box Two: AWEPA brings added value to the programme through its networks

AWEPA works with 25 parliaments and has over 25 years of experience in the parliamentary strengthening field. AWEPA's access to the European Parliament and officials within the European Union is particularly valued by EALA. Participation in international activities such as the EU Presidency Seminars are seen as good networking opportunities and an opportunity to share experiences with likeminded parliamentarians on issues such as trade, HIV/AIDS, and governance and corruption. As a relatively young institution EALA has yet to have built up similar networks of its own.

There are networks however that EALA should be able to begin using on their own. For example EALA is an associate member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and has observer status with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA). EALA maintains relations with the parliamentary bodies of the other regional economic communities, SADC Parliamentary Forum and the ECOWAS parliament, as well as the Pan-African Parliament. During the first Assembly EALA members also participated in five of the activities of the AMANI Forum. It should be noted that AWEPA has assisted in facilitating contact with some of these bodies. One MLA also praised how AWEPA has facilitated parliamentary involvement in NEPAD, raising awareness and understanding of the NEPAD process.

Administration and Implementation

Three AWEPA staff are specifically assigned to the programme: Dr. Jan Nico Scholten, President and Political Coordinator who takes the lead on fundraising and coordinating with the Honourable Speaker; Marc Holtkamp, Regional Programme Coordinator who manages the programme; and Linda Baas, Regional Consultant who oversees implementation and accounting.¹² They allot to the programme around 15%, 20%, and 50% respectively of their time. The programme also benefits from cross

¹² As of July 1, 2007, Dr. Scholten no longer charges his time to the programme. He retired as Executive President, but remains with AWEPA as President of the Association and as Political Coordinator for several programmes. Previously a portion of his time was charged. In future, Marc Holtkamp will be devoting his time solely to AWEPA's programme in Sudan and Linda Baas will also be reducing her time. A new contact person has been identified in the Amsterdam office, a new Project Manager with significant M&E experience has been hired in Arusha, and there are plans to hire a full-time administrative/logistical officer in Arusha. The Project Manager is currently part time until funding is fully secured. As such, the staffing for the programme is in a bit of a transition period and should become more decentralized. It is hoped that the new Project Manager will be able to hold a workshop with EALA staff on a bi-annual basis on M&E and provide M&E training.

support from other AWEPA offices, particularly the regional office in Nairobi. The Programme Coordinator noted that cross support from the Nairobi office tends to be highest for activities organized in Kenya and Tanzania. Cross support is also significant when organizing regional or Europe-based activities.

Sida's agreement with AWEPA places the responsibility for programme administration and implementation on AWEPA. In practice, however the programme is run cooperatively and EALA staff are highly involved in almost all aspects of programme administration and implementation. Indeed, the fact that EALA plays such a large role has led many EALA Members and staff to view AWEPA as a "funder" rather than an implementing organization. Nevertheless there are several areas where AWEPA staff continue to take the lead:

- *Fundraising:* The MOU between AWEPA and EALA stipulates that "AWEPA will undertake the securing of financial resources in order to implement the programme to be agreed upon by EALA and AWEPA. Both Parties accept that the programme can only be implemented to the extent that funding is made available." AWEPA brings added value through its long standing relationships with several donors.
- *Approving EALA's draft work plan and budgets:* AWEPA argues that they keep budgets for activities realistic and in line with donors expectations (e.g. avoiding high per diems which are of particular concern to the donors) and ensure that funds are distributed more evenly between the different committees and between the MLAs and the staff.
- *Organizing study trips to Europe:* and organizing the participation of EALA in regional workshops (which may be sponsored or co-sponsored by other AWEPA programmes). Such activities also serve to promote EALA.
- *Accounting:* The programme bank account is based in Arusha with Ms. Baas, as signatory. Funds are transferred to this account from AWEPA Headquarters in Amsterdam as necessary. Payments are made by Ms. Baas alone or working with an EALA staff member. Occasionally an EALA staff member is solely responsible for an activity's expenditure. The staff member then accounts to Ms. Baas and provides receipts and any other necessary information. Ms. Baas noted that she has never experienced problems with the accounting of EALA staff.

In other areas the division of labour differs. AWEPA credits EALA staff as being responsible for about 50% of the work on the programme. EALA staff put this number somewhat higher, at around 80%.¹³ Whatever the percentage, the EALA staff contribution is significant and in kind – e.g. they do not charge any of their time to the programme. For some activities EALA staff note that the only role for AWEPA staff is approving the accounts. They point out that while AWEPA is responsible for fundraising the proposals may be written cooperatively. EALA staff are responsible for writing the concept notes for activities. They help identify resource people and assist on logistics such as booking flights and identifying hotels. EALA staff are more likely to accompany Members during programme activities, while AWEPA staff are mainly present at regional conferences or during study tours. Committee Clerks and/or other staff who participate in activities for EALA Committees draft the activity reports which are tabled before, discussed, and approved by the Committee. The reports are then circulated to all Members for information and/or brought to the floor of the House. In most cases the House will debate and pass a resolution based on these reports with recommendations and plans for implementation. All Staff who undergo training must also provide a report within one week of their return. All reports are submitted to AWEPA.

¹³ The amount of time spent on the programme by EALA staff is not seen as a burden for the Assembly, particularly as AWEPA activities tend to take place while EALA is not in session.

It should be noted that AWEPA does not have an office in Arusha. The Regional Consultant either works from home or goes to EALA's offices to work with the staff. AWEPA has suggested setting up a small office (1–2 people) within EALA. The goal of such an office would be to further decentralize staffing for the programme, increase communication between AWEPA and EALA, and make the monitoring and evaluation process smoother. However these potential benefits would have to be weighed against the potential costs of maintaining such an office. There are several questions to consider in making the case for such an office. How would the office impact on the programme budget? Would this set up be demonstrably more cost efficient than the current set-up? Would it reduce the amount spent on cross support from the Kenya office and/or consultant fees? Would the office have sufficient authority to take decisions?¹⁴ Does EALA actually have the space available to host such an office? And last but not least, how would this impact on the role of EALA staff in the programme? If these questions can be satisfactorily addressed, the final decision should of course rest with EALA.

Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation

The agreement between Sida and AWEPA requires that AWEPA submit an annual progress report, work plan, and financial report no later than 45 days after the end of the financial year. The authors of the 2006 Organizational Review of AWEPA note, “our starting point in assessing AWEPA reporting methods is that narrative reports are more a collection of anecdotal evidence than a systematic account and analysis of results achieved, progress made and challenges surmounted”.¹⁵ In general the AWEPA/EALA programme progress reports have remained at the level of short descriptions of activities, with little or no information on follow-up and results. Moreover, the descriptions of activities lack detail, often omitting to reference the activity's objectives, how cross-cutting themes have been addressed, or even basic information such the number of participants.

Sida has repeatedly raised the need for better reporting, particularly as linked to monitoring and evaluation. The minutes for the 2006 Annual Review note that “the linkage between [activities] and the objectives, results and indicators mentioned in the initial proposal was not visible.” In correspondence Sida also requested that a logical framework be added to the annual narrative reports. The 2006 progress report was revised to include a logical framework as an annex and this practice has continued in the 2007 progress report. The 2007 progress report showed some improvements and included some supporting documentation, for example, an annex which showed progress towards the establishing *Guidelines for Parliamentary Action on Creating a conducive Environment for Business, Entrepreneurship Investment and Trade*.¹⁶ For the most part however, such information remains sketchy in the narrative part of the progress reports. The minutes for the 2007 Annual Review (held in March 2008) again highlight the “need, in reporting, for information on results relating to intended outcomes and impact” and a request that this information be emphasized reports. AWEPA is currently preparing its last progress report for the 2005–2007 programme, an opportunity to take these requests on board.

The weaknesses in reporting appear linked to weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation. The original programme proposal devotes one short paragraph to monitoring and evaluation:

“A system of regular monitoring is in-built in the programme. This regular monitoring, using appropriate indicators, acts as a safe guard to ensure that original objectives are being met. Stakeholder participation in the evaluative process is a pre-condition to check analysis against the indicators specified. At the end of each project year a participatory review seminar will be held with the Hon. Speaker and his Office, the Clerk and his Office, and representatives of all target

¹⁴ There is a perception among some EALA Members and staff that waiting for authorizations from Amsterdam causes delays on the ground.

¹⁵ Organizational Review of the Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa–AWEPA, 2006, p. 40

¹⁶ These guidelines emerged during a first regional seminar for East Africa and the Great Lakes Region in which EALA participated. This activity was linked to several AWEPA programmes which may undertake greater monitoring and evaluation.

*groups. The results from the yearly review will be used to determine the efficacy of inputs made and also identify any changes or adjustments that may need to be made in the programme as a whole.”*¹⁷

Unfortunately there is no detailed description of this “in-built” system or how “regular monitoring” will take place in practice, although as part of the proposal AWEPA also developed a logical framework for the programme with columns for objectives, intervention logic, indicators, critical factors, types of activities, and a tentative plan of finance.¹⁸

During the period under review AWEPA began a new drive towards improving M&E for the organization as a whole, appointing a Director of Research and Evaluation and releasing a new Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy in January, 2006 (see Annex Four). According to the strategy, AWEPA programmes should use a combination of SMART and SPICED methods. Teams are supposed to be required to provide an output inventory (monthly) and an outcome mapping (quarterly). An impact assessment is held annually or as a midterm review. This is described as a focus group panel consisting of parliamentary and civil society representatives and an AWEPA team reviewing progress using a Most Significant Change approach and comparing results with African partners. A fourth measure is a ‘sustainability profile’ in which an AWEPA team participates in a dialogue with project donors on the impact assessment report and partner analysis, and will brainstorm on possible innovations for future programme development. The strategy notes that “each of these M&E practices will yield a document for inclusion in the overall narrative report of the programme implementation.”¹⁹

The 2006 Organizational Review of AWEPA concluded that “AWEPA should monitor how participants in their activities capitalize on their new knowledge and contacts once back in day-to-day work.” It noted the new drive for M&E within AWEPA as a “commendable step towards improving not only implementation performance but also better follow-up and the assurance that project objectives, expected outputs and outcomes are weighted against tangible results”. However at the time of the organizational review AWEPA’s M&E strategy had “yet to be established in practice”.

To a large extent, this still seems to be the case for the AWEPA/EALA programme. A first two draft quarterly outcome reports for the programme were prepared during 2007, although they appear incomplete. The impact assessment measure described above seems to have been scaled down to a more informal consultation meeting between the Political Coordinator and the Speaker in which some evaluative questions may be asked and included in the Political Coordinator’s report back to Headquarters. A member of the Nairobi staff has visited EALA to do M&E twice and has made first attempts at putting together the two quarterly outcome reports for 2007. There is also a very useful annual review meeting between Sida (and sometimes other donors to the programme), AWEPA and EALA which spends some time discussing the narrative report and financial statements, but so far they have not discussed an impact assessment report as described in the Strategy. In addition, AWEPA staff working on the programme noted that so far participants have not been asked to fill out evaluation forms upon completing an activity (except in regional conferences, and as are typically used in AWEPA’s other programmes), nor have there been any type of follow-up questionnaires given to participants (e.g. 6 months or one year later). This is regrettable considering the positive results attributed to the programme by participants in interviews during this review.

The weakness of M&E in the AWEPA/EALA programme, at least in relation to the application of AWEPA’s stated M&E policies, may be partly linked to timing issues. As AWEPA’s Director of Research and Evaluation explained, most AWEPA staff, including those working on the AWEPA/EALA programme, were trained according to the new M&E strategy by the middle or second half of 2007. The first outcome reports were expected from staff in 3rd and 4th quarter of 2007. As such, these outcome

¹⁷ Programme proposal *Support to the East African Legislative Assembly: Cooperative Programme*, EALA & AWEPA, 2004-2007, p. 12

¹⁸ In an interview with the Director of Research and Evaluation he explained that this is a fairly new practice for AWEPA.

¹⁹ AWEPA Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy, 2006, p. 3

reports would not have been expected under AWEPA's own policies before the second half of 2007. Moreover, as AWEPA has become more decentralized, some time has to be allowed for full compliance by AWEPA's many programmes. And as with any change in policy there has naturally been some resistance among already overburdened staff.

Organizations often lack sufficient resources for M&E. This does not seem to be the case for AWEPA which has budgeted \$20,000 in the indicative budget line for "consultation and evaluation", a sum which should be more than adequate. However AWEPA staff explained that in practice it is difficult to tell how much of this budget line has gone to consultation (mainly expenses related to meetings between the Political Coordinator and his counterparts) and how much has gone to time spent on M&E. While recognizing that the Political Coordinator may ask some evaluative questions during consultations, it is recommended that this line be disaggregated and that there be a separate line for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding. In addition, it would be helpful if M&E was reflected as a separate line in the financial reports.

AWEPA staff working on the programme recognize that M&E, and follow-up more generally, continue to be a weakness in the programme and blame lack of capacity and time. In addition they noted that it is difficult for them to do the logical frameworks. They are aware that AWEPA has an overall M&E Strategy which they described as "a good system" and they recognize the need for the programme to be more aligned to the strategy, as well as the need to increase M&E overall. They indicated that they would appreciate more feedback from Sida in this regard.

Monitoring and evaluation seems to be the one area of the programme where EALA staff play little role. This is no doubt a missed opportunity as EALA staff have proven a valuable resource in other aspects of the programme. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation should be managed as joint exercises with development partners. Interviewed EALA staff were of the opinion that little is happening in terms of M&E and that there is no "structure", "mechanism", or "instrument" in the programme to do this. They noted that beyond the submission of activity reports to AWEPA there is little or no follow-up. As one staff member put it, "we see results over time but they are not reported". While the majority of EALA staff do not have specific skills in monitoring and evaluation, several have received some relevant training and those interviewed were keen to acquire such skills and to assist in any way possible in the future. In addition, the strategic plan being developed by EALA will include mechanisms for M&E and there is an M&E officer within the EAC who may be able to provide some initial guidance and assistance.

EALA Members were similarly unaware of M&E efforts related to the programme – in their view M&E "is not happening". Again there are missed opportunities. For example, the Honourable Speaker noted a significant opportunity for follow-up which could potentially contribute to EALA's oversight capacity. As noted earlier, after the majority of activities a report is brought to the floor of the House. Normally a resolution is passed with recommendations and a plan for implementation. It would be useful to monitor whether these recommendations have been implemented. There is some evidence that this is already being done within EALA, for example a 2005 report on the Nanyuki Seminars includes a table on the status of implementation (with challenges, desired result areas, tasks, who is responsible, timeframe, available resources, and progress as of June 2005).²⁰ Another MLA noted that they were accompanied by journalists during a study tour and got good media coverage but examples are not included in the progress report. Media coverage is important in terms of increasing EALA's visibility. Two sample articles related to different activities are attached as examples in Annex Five.

Workshop evaluations and focus groups are simple methods for obtaining low cost regular data. Other data sources typically used in parliamentary strengthening programmes may include (but are not

²⁰ *Functional relationships between the EALA and the National Assemblies of the Partner States of the EAC: Implementation of Recommendations of Nanyuki 1 and Nanyuki 2*, East African Legislative Assembly, Arusha, June 2005

limited to) the Clerk or secretariat, interviews with MPs and staff, examination of legislative records, interviews with CSOs, news accounts, score cards, indexes and surveys. To give a specific example, the Parliamentary Centre in Ghana monitors member contributions on the floor of the house (through review of the Hansards), as well as tracking committee reports, Members inputs during budget debates, and media reports. At the committee level they may also monitor issue focused deliberations, leadership in terms of private members bills, or whether recommendations from field visits have been implemented. While such practices can be time consuming, the fact that EALA is such a small institution simplifies matters and presents unique opportunities.

Any future agreement between Sida and AWEPA should make particular reference to monitoring and evaluation. Sida, ideally in coordination with other donors to the programme, should work with AWEPA and EALA to develop a clearer, more defined monitoring and evaluation plan for the programme, with measurable indicators. This plan should clearly identify and assign responsibility for M&E to specific staff from both AWEPA and EALA.²¹ Donors should agree together on their expectations in terms of M&E so as to avoid the risk of varying requirements complicating reporting, and creating additional work for AWEPA and EALA. In addition, M&E should be devised within the framework of AWEPA's 2006 Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy, rather than reinventing the wheel.

It should be noted that Sida is planning a partner workshop focusing on results-based management for organizations that it will be funding. This workshop will be an annual event and will include follow-up on the job training. As such Sida should be able to provide the feedback that AWEPA/EALA needs. Both AWEPA and EALA staff should participate in this workshop – and both have expressed interest and willingness to participate in interviews with the Consultant, and the Honourable Speaker indicated that he approved this measure.

Financial Reports and Related Issues

Along with the narrative progress report, AWEPA is required to submit an annual financial report to Sida. The agreement between Sida and AWEPA calls for the annual financial report to “be based on the statement of accounts and cover revenue and expenditure as compared to the budget for the entire operation including all sources of financing”.²² The financial reports have for the most part met these requirements. Columns in the financial report indicate funding from Norad and others. It is expected that a column will be added indicating the contribution of the programme's newest donor, Irish Aid. At one point a column indicating the original budget work plan was omitted but this was swiftly remedied when Sida brought it to AWEPA's attention.

AWEPA's financial reports, when compared to the indicative budgets, show savings for some activities and considerable overspending for others, with funds consequently reallocated from one activity to another. While some flexibility is necessary, it is worrying that AWEPA did not seek approval from Sida before making substantial deviations from the presented plan and budget as required in the grant agreement. Future agreements should again require that AWEPA seek written approval for major changes in the work plan and reallocation of funds. However, as discussed in the 2007 Annual Review Meeting, any future agreement should include a “flexibility bracket” or a percentage (generally around 10 - 15%) of funds which can be reallocated between budget lines without prior approval.²³ Above such an amount AWEPA would still need approval from Sida.

²¹ It is somewhat unclear who is specifically assigned to carry out M&E for the programme on behalf of AWEPA. The Director for Research and Evaluation indicated that the responsibility lies with the Project Coordinator. As the current Project Coordinator is based in Amsterdam and devotes roughly around 20% of his time to the AWEPA/EALA programme this may not be the most logical arrangement.

²² The agreement also stipulates that the final financial report shall provide information on interest income and that interest income shall be refunded to Sida by AWEPA within seven months of the end of the project/programme, unless otherwise agreed, p.5.

²³ AWEPA cited their contract with Belgium as an example of an agreement where such a flexibility bracket exists.

Both Sida and Norad have identified the lack of detail in the financial reports as problematic. This, combined with a similar lack of detail in the narrative reports, makes it difficult to ascertain cost effectiveness and to spot potential problems. Interviewed EALA Members and staff unanimously identified the lack of financial transparency as a key issue for the programme. More specifically, they find the financial reports opaque and difficult to understand. EALA has raised this issue with Sida. During a 2005 meeting between representatives and Sida, the Clerk explained that the lack of clarity in the financial reports made it difficult for EALA to fulfil their obligation to declare sources and amounts of donor money.²⁴ At the time Sida recommended that this issue be incorporated into the MOU between AWEPA and EALA. The latest MOU (June, 2007), however, shows no mention of this issue.

EALA has sought clarification from AWEPA without success, particularly in terms of understanding the proportion of the grant spent on AWEPA and the proportion spent on EALA. AWEPA's inability or refusal to provide information in this regard is a continued source of frustration. In the past AWEPA has responded to such requests by noting that Sida has agreed to the financial reports and that AWEPA's financial management system is in accordance with international accounting standards. While these two statements are factually correct there is no reason why either should impede increased transparency and information sharing around the programme's budgets and financial reports. Unfortunately this has introduced an element of mistrust into a relationship which is otherwise described extremely positively by Members and staff alike. The minutes of the 2006 Annual Review show that the donors also asked AWEPA about the repartition of resources between AWEPA and EALA. AWEPA's response was that "there is no fixed amount for repartition, and it all depended on direct costs and whether the activity was implemented with active support from EALA or not."

It is important to understand that AWEPA does not use a fixed percentage for administrative costs.²⁵ Rather, AWEPA's project accounting model allocates "specific project costs" and "basic project costs" to projects.²⁶ This system is discussed in a 2002 review commissioned by Sida and carried out by KPMG²⁷. Specific project costs are directly related to one project/activity (e.g. travel costs, venue costs, printing costs, expert fees, etc.). Basic project costs are expenses that "could not be identified specifically to one project", mainly staff costs and other general costs (communications costs, rent, computer costs, insurance, etc.).²⁸ Basic project costs are calculated using a fixed rate according to the hours spent on the project. There are different rates for different categories of personnel and a percentage of the rate covers what are normally considered overhead costs.

AWEPA staff stress that the basic project costs in the AWEPA/EALA programme vary greatly from activity to activity. For example, a large conference requires a significant level of AWEPA staff time, and may mean mobilising staff from other AWEPA offices in the region.²⁹ This means higher basic

²⁴ Minutes of meeting between Justin Bundi, David Wiking and Mary Gachochi, March 14, 2005.

²⁵ It should be noted that organizations often differ in their definitions of what constitutes administrative costs, sometimes referred to as overhead or indirect costs.

²⁶ *Review of AWEPA's Financial Management System*, KPMG, Sida/DESO, November 19, 2002, p. 15

²⁷ *Ibid.*, KPMG's overall conclusion was that "AWEPA has improved the Financial Management System during the last years and now has an adequate system in place, p. 1

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 15. In the bilateral validation meeting AWEPA disputed the KPMG report quote noting that "the basic project costs component is time spent by staff on a specific activity".

²⁹ It should be noted that increased transparency would be useful in terms of the regional conferences which are partially financed by funding from the AWEPA/EALA programme and partially financed by funding to other AWEPA programmes. In the financial reports on these activities it is impossible to tell how Sida's money has been used. Take the regional seminar held in Arusha in 2006 for a total of 110,787€ with 40,787€ charged to Sida. With no details on exactly how Sida's funding was allocated, Sida may question if their funding was spent in line with their expectations. The fact that 17 AWEPA staff from offices in Europe and the region participated in this fairly small seminar raises red flags but in fact AWEPA explained that there was a separate staff meeting held following the seminar and many were funded by the Netherlands (although this was not communicated to Sida at the time). One can see how lack of transparency could easily lead to negative misperceptions.

project costs. On the other hand a training activity for an individual EALA staff member requires very little AWEPA staff time and thus should incur little basic project costs.

Unfortunately the annual financial statements do not differentiate between specific and basic project costs. As such the donors to the programme and EALA cannot determine how much of the programme budget has gone to basic project costs. Moreover, determining a global overview of the total amount of the grant that goes towards AWEPA's total costs as requested by EALA is complicated because some of AWEPA's expenses fall into the category of specific costs; for example the fees for the main consultant working on the project and travel costs for AWEPA staff (as is standard practice for comparable organizations when using project funding).

AWEPA's finance department provided a detailed breakdown of costs for four activities in 2007 chosen by the Programme Coordinator as representative of the different types of activities. The Consultant requested that they add one activity from 2006. This information is summarized below in Table 1. The full information can be found in Annex Seven.

In addition, the finance department provided information on the total travel costs for AWEPA staff charged to the programme in 2007. 62,701€ or 16.6% of the total programme budget was spent on travel. Within this figure of 62,701€, 12% went to AWEPA staff travel costs (about 2% of the total project costs). Despite some perceptions that AWEPA staff travel a lot, the cost of AWEPA's travel in 2007 remains low, perhaps due to the fact that AWEPA staff seek to combine travel for more than one programme so as to reduce the overall travel costs per programme.³⁰ However it should also be noted that 2007 was an unusual year in the programme as activities were begun in June and there were fewer activities than in other years.³¹ Regarding the AWEPA/EALA programme AWEPA noted that they take advantage of special discount hotel and flight rates available to EALA Members, and book flights well in advance and always in economy class. Per diems (or out of pocket) are set at \$25 per overnight which is reasonable and within Sida's own per diem guidelines (although it should be clarified how this sum incorporates the cost of meals as Sida expects the total for meals and out of pocket to be within Sida's per diem guidelines). These measures are positive and indicate cost efficiency. In general most costs appear to be in line with what would be expected when compared to other parliamentary strengthening programmes.

Table 1: Breakdown between Basic and Specific Project Costs for Five Activities

Activity Name/Year	Basic Project Costs/ Percentage	Specific Project Costs/ percentage	Total/ percentage
The Hansard and activity reports/ 2006	6560/ 31%	14,312/ 69%	20,871/ 100%
Staff Training Advanced Computer Courses/ 2007	5236/ 35%	9553/ 65%	14,789/ 100%
Committee on Legal Rules and Privileges/ 2007	5992/ 48%	6422/ 52%	12,414/ 100%
Visit to Rwanda and Burundi/ 2007	17,465/ 47%	19,455/ 53%	36,919/ 100%
Observation Mission, Kenya General Elections/ 2007	3380/ 15%	18,880/ 85%	22,259/ 100%

Table 1 shows that as predicted by AWEPA there is some variation in basic project costs among the activities examined. At the same time the table shows that basic project costs make up a significant portion of the total costs for the activities and by extension for the programme. It is interesting to note that the majority of the staff time charged to the activities is for staff in AWEPA's Kenya office –

³⁰ For example, a trip from headquarters to the region will likely be linked to more than one programme and only a percentage of the total costs for that trip will be charged to the AWEPA EALA budget.

³¹ Bilateral validation meeting with the Honourable Speaker and the Clerk of EALA.

therefore mainly going to AWEPA's operations in the region and not to AWEPA headquarters (see Annex Seven). Unfortunately AWEPA was not able to provide the total amount for basic project costs for the fiscal years being examined in the short time period allotted for the review. It is therefore impossible to determine the percentage of funding that has gone to basic project costs per annum. If the activities above are an indicator, however, it would appear that basic project costs regularly reach and exceed 30%.

AWEPA has indicated that such programmes are labour intensive, yet one would expect that labour costs for AWEPA would be reduced considering the high amount of in kind cross-support from EALA staff. Furthermore while one expects a higher amount of staff time to be charged for workshops or larger conferences, it is difficult to understand the high charges for activities such as the printing of the Hansard and Committee Reports. The Hansard and Committee Reports are recorded, transcribed and/or written by EALA staff. They are official documents with no editorial input from AWEPA. According to EALA staff they were fully responsible for the procurement process for the printing which consisted of requesting three quotations from three different printers and then submitting the best quotation to AWEPA for approval. They then had the documents printed and submitted the bill to AWEPA. The documents themselves are simple, printed in black and white with blue covers. The approved quote from the printers for 250 copies³² each of the Hansard (volume IV) and eight committee reports came to a total of \$14, 918. The total cost of the activity was billed as 20,872€³³, with AWEPA billing 1 day of the Consultant's time and 17 days of staff time (including two days of the President's time). If the cost of such a straightforward activity rises by around a third when overseen by AWEPA, it cannot be deemed cost efficient.³⁴

Before AWEPA provided the cost breakdown for this activity donors and EALA only saw the financial statement. It is reproduced here for comparison and as an example of how activities are presented in the financial statements (and how they may be difficult for partners to understand).

The printing of EALA Publications – the Hansard and activity reports for the first quarter of 2006 (expenses in Euros)³⁴

Coordination costs	2926
Research/Experts/Fees	1240
Facilities/Direct other cost	8309
Public/Document/Materials	6522
Administration and Accounting	720
Total	20,872

It useful to compare practices from other organizations in terms of charging for the items contained in the category of basic project costs, including labour. UNDP's Global Programme for Parliamentary Strengthening charges a general management support fee of 7%. A further 10% is typically added for administrative costs bringing the total to 17%, although there is some upwards flexibility (but not

³² A small discrepancy exists between the quotation shared by EALA and AWEPA's 2006 progress report. The quotation is for 250 copies of each document while the progress report indicates that only 200 copies of each document were printed.

³³ AWEPA converts all costs into Euros.

³⁴ In the main categories in the financial statements, AWEPA's costs are most likely to fall into design costs, coordination costs, research and expert fees and administration and accounting. Design costs are defined as "costs of staff involved in the programme development (and as needed, revision) of the project, including consultations with donors beneficiaries and partners". Coordination costs are defined as "costs of staff involved in the coordination of the project from the first until the last phase, thus from the original idea of the project to the publication of the results". Research and expert fees are defined as "costs incurred during execution of the project, which relate to the input of expertise from external consultants and project staff during the implementation of project activities". Explanatory Note on the Indicative Budget for the EALA programme 2004–2007, AWEPA

exceeding a total of 22%). UNDP however, also has a reasonable amount of core funding.³⁵ NDI is slightly higher at around 24%. Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA) is more similar to AWEPA, both in its composition as a member-driven parliamentary network of around 1500 parliamentarians, and in that it has little core funding. Working with their auditor PGA has set a fixed rate of 16% for administrative costs. As with AWEPA, PGA defines these costs as a combination of staff time and overhead costs; although like AWEPA they may sometimes charge a consultant's time separately. Different donors have occasionally set different caps on the amounts PGA is allowed to use for administrative costs. For example a contract with the UN set the amount at 12% of the total, a contract with the EC at 7%, and a contract with the Netherlands at 3%.³⁶ In these cases there is normally an agreement that a certain amount of time of support staff can be charged separately on the grant, thus allowing for staff costs.

To date a large amount of discretion has been given to AWEPA in the use of program funds. Ultimately it is up to Sida (and other donors to the programme) to decide whether to define a percentage of the total grant that goes to basic project costs. This is standard practice for many donors but certainly not obligatory. It would be prudent however to have stronger oversight over this area. At the same time, it is important to understand that AWEPA, like many parliamentary networks, struggles to find core funding. As such, the money used for basic project costs that comes from project funding can be seen as filling this gap. Sida should remain sensitive to this constraint which affects AWEPA's very ability to function as an organization. In the past Sida has not questioned AWEPA's need for core funding – on the contrary Sida has provided multi-annual core funding grants to AWEPA.

Moreover, while EALA staff take on a large share of the programme work in practice, the current Agreement between Sida and AWEPA ultimately places the administrative burden squarely on AWEPA's shoulders. It states that AWEPA is responsible for the following:

1. To plan, implement and monitor the project/programme.
2. To provide the necessary professional and administrative support, personnel services and any other resources required for a successful implementation of the project/programme.
3. To ensure that administration and internal control of project resources are adequately carried out. (p. 2)

These arguments notwithstanding, AWEPA now has over five years of experience running this programme (which includes several activities that happen annually). AWEPA should therefore be able to predict to a large extent the types of (and the total) costs they are likely to incur. Moreover the KPMG Review notes that “the debited basic costs for projects (covered by the calculated fixed rate) are subject to continuous internal evaluation to ensure that the actual basic costs are covered.” As such it is not unreasonable to expect that AWEPA at least estimate its basic project costs during the planning process and include this as a separate item in the indicative budgets and again in the annual financial reports.³⁷ Should Sida agree in the future to allow AWEPA to reallocate funds if the amounts involved are within an agreed fixed amount then this caveat should also apply to AWEPA's estimated basic project costs, providing a certain amount of necessary flexibility.

³⁵ The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) is an example of a parliamentary organization with full core funding. As such none of the project funding it receives goes to staff and other overhead costs. This is highly unusual for parliamentary organizations/networks.

³⁶ Norad normally allows no more than 5% of a total budget to be spent on programme administration although this rule has not been applied to the AWEPA/EALA programme per se.

³⁷ This has been done to some extent in one specified indicative budget in which design, coordination, and research and expert, and administrative and accounting costs are estimated, however these categories can include both basic and specific costs so the total for basic costs is still unclear.

Increasing transparency on AWEPA's costs (particularly basic project costs) in running the AWEPA/EALA programme should not be seen as a way to reduce Sida funding going to AWEPA (except in cases of unambiguous inefficiencies). Rather it should be seen as a way to ensure that AWEPA's costs in running the programme are fully met, while dramatically increasing transparency in the budget and financial reporting process.

Programme Results (Participants' Perceptions)

Before looking more specifically at the programme results it is useful to have an overview of some of the major achievements of EALA.³⁸ In its short existence EALA has shown that it is not a "rubber stamp" parliament. In the first assembly EALA enacted eleven laws, regularly proposing important amendments. EALA also took the legislative initiative, publishing and introducing four Private Members Bills despite meeting with strong resistance from the Council. When the Council attempted to force the Assembly to withdraw the Private Members Bills, Members of the Assembly successfully brought a case against the EAC in the East African Court of Justice.³⁹ The first Assembly adopted four resolutions for implementation by the Council⁴⁰ and the standing committees produced 25 reports in addition to four reports on the EAC Audited Reports, four reports on the Budgets of the EAC, and one report on Supplementary Estimates.

In the past eight months, the second Assembly has already passed a high number of laws. They include the Lake Victoria Transport Act, the Customs Amendment Act, the Summit's Delegation of Funds, the Appropriation Bill, the Supply Appropriation Bill and the Trade Joint Negotiations Bill.⁴¹

By and large the programme appears to be meeting its stated objectives and most of the planned activities have been implemented, although plans to increase information to the public (e.g. through purchasing broadcasting equipment) have been delayed and weaknesses remain in terms of addressing cross-cutting themes such as gender and HIV/AIDS. Support for improved parliamentary oversight and legislative fiscal review and analysis also appears underweighted.

Every MLA and EALA staffer interviewed immediately and enthusiastically described specific examples of how the AWEPA/EALA programme has impacted on their work. For Members the programme has been most important in terms of their legislative and representative roles (with little focus on oversight so far). More specifically, Members appear particularly proud of their work related to the East African Customs Management Act (see Box Three) and the Lake Victoria Basin Commission Bill.

The study tour of Lake Victoria sponsored by the AWEPA/EALA programme is described by Members as particularly important in terms of understanding what is happening on the ground and interacting with and getting the views of constituents. As one Member explained, "had we not gotten the views of people on the ground, we would probably have passed the Lake Victoria Basin Bill as is". Instead, informed by the study tour, the committee proposed significant amendments. Amendments were so drastic that the Council decided to withdraw the Bill for revisions. It is expected that the revised Bill will be much richer.

New Members with little or no parliamentary experience credit the induction seminars and workshops on the Rules of Procedure as significantly impacting on their ability to function in a parliamentary setting. They "feel more confident", "understand the rules better" and "know how to generate a Private

³⁸ For a detailed description of the first Assembly's achievements see *Five Years Of EALA: 2001–2006*, East African Legislative Assembly, Arusha, 2007

³⁹ The judgment of the Court is available at: <http://www.saflii.org/ea/cases/EACJ/2006/1.pdf>

⁴⁰ The Assembly has been very active in the area of trade. In addition to the Private Members Bill – The East African Trade Negotiations Bill – a resolution was passed "seeking to enforce the directive of the Summit to the effect that in matters pertaining to participation in WTO and ACP/EU, the EAC Partner States should negotiate as a bloc". *Five Years of EALA*, p. 7

⁴¹ Minutes, 2007 Annual Review (held March 2008), p. 1-2

Members Bill”. They also appreciate the opportunity to interact with and learn from former Members who serve as resource people. Old Members confirm that following the induction seminars they see a change in the behaviour of new Members and improvements in the discussions and debates. Members in general credit the programme with helping them “speak from a point of knowledge”.

Staff also credit the induction seminars, as well as other capacity building activities with improving Members performance, noting that initially members were more timid and stuck to general comments but now they are more prepared, discuss issues with confidence and give opinions. It is their view that the quality of debate has improved and that Members are more at ease when interviewing witnesses called before committees.

Staff who have received training through the programme consistently point out that they feel more confident. As one staff Member explained that he feels “more confident tackling a broader range of issues and presenting them to the legal and other committees” Before he would have been “afraid to give my view in the committee” now he is “confident about speaking during committee meetings”. Another went so far as to say “I am another person now”. Staff credit the programme with giving them the tools to improve documentation, process work faster, and be more imaginative. As the Clerk noted, when he arrived only one member of the staff could write a concept paper, now all can. Several staff also noted that concept notes or “how they write projects has improved”. Others noted that their “research methodology has improved” and that they are able to “approach issues differently” and “interpret policies”. One staff member with management responsibilities explained that training in new management techniques has meant that he is “able to manage staff in a more focused manner and to communicate better” as well as “do different types of budgets and costing exercises.” These self perceptions are reinforced by Members who note marked improvements in staff performance. Members appreciate staff more and are more likely to go to them for help in asking questions or drafting bills.

Box Three: Examples of Results submitted by a Member of EALA

Hon. Dan Wandera Ogalo, MLA (Uganda) and a parliamentary strengthening expert in his own right, submitted a paper to the Consultant outlining examples of the AWEPA/EALA programme’s achievements. He highlights results around the East African Management Act, resource-based border conflicts, Treaty amendments, the Nanyuki Series (relations with the National Assemblies), other various capacity building trainings, relations with Rwanda and Burundi, Induction courses, and election monitoring. That Hon. Ogalo was willing to take the time to provide such detailed information in addition to being interviewed underscores the value of the programme. The following are several examples pulled from the paper that demonstrate ways in which the programme has achieved its goals and objectives (see Box One). They highlight results related to EALA’s core functions as laid out under in the Treaty. The full paper is attached as Annex Four.

Example One: The East African Customs Management Act

Reference to objectives:

- To improve the interface between MLAs and the constituents they represent.
- To disseminate relevant information about the process of regionalization, reinforce regional ties and communication on a parliamentary level and to provide a forum in which Members of the EALA may meet national constituents to discuss problems of common interest.

Contribution from Hon. Ogalo:

“The Customs Union Protocol was to be concluded by 2004. It became clear to the East African Legislative Assembly in 2003 that insufficient time would be available to the Assembly in the enactment of the law establishing the Customs Union. Rather than await the bill, the relevant committee with funding from AWEPA held workshops and seminars for civil society, business people and government officials in all the partner states. The committee was in effect holding public hearings under the guise of the seminars and workshops.

As expected when the Bill was introduced in the Assembly in 2004. The community budget allowed only three days of committee meeting and two days of plenary to enact the bill the law.

Fortunately the committee was already seized of issues of Customs Union and used the knowledge gathered in seminars and workshops to review the bill and advise the Assembly to enact to a bill of over 200 clauses in only two days.

There is no doubt in my mind that without that knowledge the major amendments made to the bill would not have been possible. There were so many gaps in the bill that the Speaker ordered the Executive, the Committee on Trade and the Legal Committee to agree on amendments so as to finalise the Bill in plenary in the two days allocated.”

Example Two: Resource-based border conflicts

Reference to objectives:

- To improve the abilities of Committees, members and staff to respond to the newly created regional context in which they must function, and in particular to the process of regionalization and the role of regional parliamentary committees in assisting in mediating an end to conflicts and in preventing new conflicts from erupting.
- To improve the interface between MLAs and the constituents they represent.

Contribution from Hon. Ogalo:

“Lake Victoria is shared by Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. Fishermen from each of the countries were frequently arrested as trespassers in waters of another country and locked up in jail. They alleged human rights abuses and ill treatment because they were foreigners. Secondly, along the Karamoja (Uganda)/ Turukana (Kenya) border and Kagera (Tanzania)/Mutukula (Uganda) boarder there are conflicts over grazing rights as well as cattle rustling (theft) from one country to another.

Under AWEPA funding on conflict resolution the two committees on National Resources and Conflict Resolution met the different communities and organized meetings bringing together leaders and elders from the different communities where cross border conflicts exist and thereby created a cross border dispute settlement mechanism.

Kenyan fisherman held in Tanzanian and Ugandan jails were released on intervention of the Assembly and the Council of Ministers come up with a memorandum of understanding on how to handle cross border fishing”

Example Three: The Nanyuki Series

Reference to objectives:

- To enhance the links and opportunities for exchange of knowledge between EALA and the member States National Assemblies (including candidate member states).
- To facilitate and encourage Committee-to-Committee forums between EALA and the National Assemblies of the Member (and candidate member) States in which exchanges may take place on problems and regional policy.

Contribution from Hon. Ogalo:

“These are annual workshops bringing together Members of Parliaments of the Partner States and the Assembly because the Treaty requires liaison between the parliaments. This requirement of the Treaty is to ensure linkages. As was noted earlier the Assembly has the same functions as those of National Assemblies and if there are no linkages and planning for the future, it is easy to have duplication.

At the end of the meeting resolutions and recommendations are reached and the members of National Assemblies brief their respective parliaments.

The Partner States have never funded this Treaty function. We have been able to do so by reason of donor funding via AWEPA.”

Other examples of results noted by Members and staff include:

- Members and staff credit the Nanyuki (inter-parliamentary relations) seminars with strengthening relations between EALA and the National Assemblies, although one Member called for them to be more committee focused. Similarly, staff exchanges have led to “better contact with national parliaments”. As one staff member explained “I now understand how I should relate with national parliaments and how I can get information from them and transmit information to them.” (See also Box Three).
- An EALA recommendation arising out of a workshop that Member States appoint a specific Minister for EAC Affairs has been implemented.
- EALA has reviewed and proposed amendments to the Treaty, some of which have been accepted. This is an ongoing process.

- Workshops in Kampala and Dar-es-Salaam to review the rules led to rules being amended.
- Following a study tour to the European Parliament the report debated in the House recommended that EALA hold meetings throughout the region for greater visibility and to make its presence felt in the partner states. This is now a regular practice.
- Members credit the programme with increasing EALA's visibility in regional networks, and generating important networking opportunities.
- Staff note that since the Hansards and committee reports were published EALA has seen increased interest in its publications and what it does more generally.
- After studying the restructuring in the UK House of Commons, the Deputy Clerk made a set of proposals for restructuring to the Speaker. For example, on information systems, he proposed that EALA should recruit its own network manager. This is planned for next year. Additional pressure brought to bear on the EAC Secretariat following a staff computer training has led to EALA being allowed to upload some documents (improving availability of committee reports) but in general EALA cannot access or publish on its own as EALA website is actually a set of pages on the EAC website under control of the EAC Webmaster. Normally EALA must ask EAC webmaster to make any changes to its pages, often experiencing frustrating delays before information is posted.
- Following trainings the Serjeant-at-Arms wrote and distributed a manual on safety in the workplace and instituted fire drills.
- Several staff positions changed to include a requirement for a Masters degree for renewal of conditions. One staff member noted that the Masters degree he undertook as part of the AWEPA/EALA programme not only built his capacity but was necessary for the renewal of his contract.

Sustainability

The programme proposal for the period being reviewed contains one paragraph on “factors for sustainability”.⁴² It notes that EALA's support for the programme “is high as evidenced by the executed Memorandum of Understanding and the signed forward”.⁴³ The proposal also explains that “written and possibly audio-visual records will be maintained...which will form part of the archives of EALA, and so will constitute a ready and accessible resource on which to draw”, and that there will be broad dissemination of information. Finally it cites development of facilities and staff trained who “will continue to deliver services beyond the termination of the programme.”

EALA's staff are involved in all aspects of the programme's administration, taking on a large share of the work. While not planned for by AWEPA in a detailed way, an important by-product of the programme has been skills transfer in terms of programme management to EALA staff. As such, EALA has indeed been developing the institutional capacity to maintain intervention benefits after donor support, and/or support from AWEPA, has come to an end.

Moreover, the programme has a significant staff training component. While the Second Assembly has had high turnover among Members, there has been little staff turnover. This is likely to remain the case as staff positions within EALA are highly sought after and EALA tends to offer better terms and conditions than the National Parliaments. The institutional memory rests largely with the staff and new

⁴² Programme proposal Support to the East African Legislative Assembly: Cooperative Programme, EALA & AWEPA, 2004–2007, p. 12

⁴³ In his foreword, former Speaker Hon. Abdulrahman Omar Kinana concludes by saying, “it is with a real sense of pride and achievement that we commend the co-operative programme between EALA and AWEPA and hope that it will be enhanced for the benefit of the two institutions and the people of East Africa.”, p. 2

and old Members alike depend on staff to assist them in understanding the issues, answering questions etc. Ensuring the participation of the Clerks (and/or other staff such as the Research Officer) during capacity building workshops for EALA Committees – and the fact that the Clerks are then responsible for writing the workshop reports – means that staff learn alongside Members about specific issues. This is an example of good, sustainable practice.

Sida's 2005 evaluation (and 2006 Position Paper on Parliamentary Strengthening) recommends that Sida better diversify and target the use of (current and former) parliamentarians in programming. This is a fairly typical practice for parliamentary networks such as AWEPA who regularly draw on their own members in the different European parliaments as resource people during workshops, seminars and conferences. Over time, AWEPA and EALA have also begun to use MLAs from the first Assembly as resource people, particularly the induction seminars. While EALA's parliamentary system is somewhat unique, MLAs with previous experience in the National Assemblies or MPs from the national assemblies themselves may also serve a role as resource persons.

Finally, AWEPA has sought to diversify funding for the programme, while EALA has successfully sought other sources of support for capacity building (e.g. ACBF) that can be used on their own or in combination with the resources channelled through AWEPA. A withdrawal of Sida funding would certainly be a blow to the programme, particularly as new members and staff from Rwanda and Burundi join the Assembly. However, EALA appears less dependent on Sida funding today than when the programme was initiated.

It should be noted that even with the addition of new members and staff, EALA remains a small institution, notably when compared with most National Parliaments. As one interviewee explained there is actually a risk of over assistance. Nevertheless, EALA's own budget remains insufficient. EALA committees in particular are dependent on outside funding to carry out their work in full, although EALA is pushing for more funding within their own budget for committee work. This overarching sustainability problem will only be resolved when the member states contribute sufficiently to EALA through the EAC budget, and when EALA is given more control over its own budget. Until then it is doubtful that the activities contained in the programme could be undertaken without donor funding. Ideally the next round of capacity building should seek to build EALA Member's skills and confidence to further address this fundamental issue.

Donors to the AWEPA/EALA Programme, Donor Coordination, and New Sources of Support for EALA

While this review focuses on Sida's support, the AWEPA/EALA programme has received support from other donors, mainly Norad. Currently both Sida and Norad⁴⁴ are considering new proposals from AWEPA for approximately 1,086,000€ over three years. AWEPA has also secured new funding from Irish Aid in the form of a grant of around 825,000€ disbursed in three tranches over three years.⁴⁵ The first tranche was disbursed in December 2007 and disbursement of each additional tranche is dependent on acceptance of a yearly progress report and financial statement.

⁴⁴ At the time of this review, Norad had yet to decide whether to continue to channel its support to EALA through AWEPA or to provide funding to EALA directly. Norad is putting EALA in the driver's seat, allowing EALA to make the final decision as to what it prefers.

⁴⁵ The donors should be commended for providing longer term support to EALA, in line with recognized best practice in parliamentary strengthening programming. A recent donor consultation on parliamentary development and financial accountability noted that "long term programmes on the ground mean that donors can identify new opportunities more quickly.... Donor coordination also makes it easier to respond to opportunities. If a donor is unable to fund a new opportunity they can approach donor partners who have additional funding or are looking for a similar project. Unfortunately donor bureaucracies, often require detailed plans in advance, which may limit the ability to respond to emerging issues and opportunities." Regarding the latter, the AWEPA/EALA work plans do remain somewhat flexible.

With higher funding requests to Sida and Norad, and the addition of a new donor, funding to the programme stands to increase significantly (not to mention new sources of support for capacity building for EALA discussed subsequently). As such, donor coordination and information sharing is more important than ever. In the past Sida and Norad have attempted to coordinate and share information regarding their support to the AWEPA/EALA programme, for example holding joint review meetings and sharing the results of Norad's 2005 Mid-Term Review Report.

This coordination has broken down to some extent, partly because of the different location of Sida and Norad's offices in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam respectively. However this is not considered a major impediment provided a minimum of communication and planning takes place. Coordination should be revived and deepened, with Irish Aid included. While the Irish Aid counterpart for the programme is based in Dublin he has indicated his willingness to link travel to the region for the programme's annual review meetings. In fact, donor coordination is so important to Irish Aid that they have gone so far as to build it into their agreement with AWEPA. Paragraph 2(xiii) of the AWEPA/Irish Aid agreement states that "AWEPA shall put in place appropriate arrangements for liaison between donors providing financial assistance towards the costs incurred by AWEPA in relation to the Project".

AWEPA/EALA should provide donors with a single annual report and financial statement indicating how funding from all three donors was used. Donors to the programme should clarify together their expectations and requirements for the annual reports and financial statements, particularly as both Sida and NORAD have identified lack of detail in the annual reports and financial statements as problematic in the past. A single report should: increase donor coordination and information sharing; diminish the risk of duplication; and reduce the reporting burden on AWEPA. While it may be not practicable at this stage, in the future donors may also wish to consider receiving one proposal from AWEPA, again deciding together on the proposal format in advance.⁴⁶

The same principle should be applied to exercises like this review. Irish Aid will undertake a mid-term review and would welcome coordination with other donors on this. This is in line with the Paris Principles for aid effectiveness and emerging best practice. The recent donor consultation on parliamentary development and financial accountability⁴⁷ recommended among its key messages that "donors should ensure greater dialogue, sharing of information and coordination around parliamentary strengthening work." and "undertake further evaluations of parliamentary strengthening work and, when possible, carry out joint evaluations so as to conserve resources and increase coordination."

Finally, EALA noted that more direct contact with donors would be appreciated, or as one Member put it "when you give your friend your cows to look after you should occasionally check on them." EALA encourages donors to set up meetings or stop by if they are in Arusha and to occasionally observe programme activities. A first opportunity for Sida may be the Nanyuki meeting to be held in Nairobi (date TBC). AWEPA should regularly inform Sida and other donors about upcoming activities and, as appropriate, invite them to participate in these activities.

Outside support to EALA is increasing

In the past the AWEPA programme, funded by Sida and Norad, comprised the main continuous outside support to EALA. Other support was mainly ad hoc, for example workshops supported by the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung – FES (particularly on trade), UNIFEM (on gender mainstreaming), or the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs – NDI (on extractive industries)⁴⁸.

⁴⁶ As noted, Irish Aid has already accepted the AWEPA proposal.

⁴⁷ Consultation Report, Donor Consultation on Parliamentary Strengthening and Financial Accountability, organized by DFID, UNDP and WBI and hosted by the Government of Belgium, Brussels, Belgium, May 21–22, 2007, p. 6

⁴⁸ Most recently, on Feb. 27–29, 2008, NDI and the Revenue Watch Institute (RWI) organized a workshop with EALA and members of the national parliaments of Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda on "Promoting Transparency and Accountability of Revenue from the Extractive Industries".

Today however, EALA is diversifying support. A new agreement has been signed between EALA and the African Capacity Building Foundation in February 2006 for a total of USD 1.5 million over four years.⁴⁹ ACBF's planned contribution for EALA's June 2007–June 2008 work plan is USD 818,060 (a copy of the ACBF work plan is attached as Annex Six). It should be noted that while the ACBF/EALA work plan appears similar to the AWEPA/EALA programme's work plan, EALA staff have been conscious of trying to avoid duplication and have indicated activities that may be co-financed by both ACBF and AWEPA. However the work plan was not shared with AWEPA prior to this Review. Finally Kenya has given USD 250,000 to EALA for country tours, although for now this funding can only be used for tours to Kenya.

EALA's relationship with AWEPA compares favourably to that of other partners

So far AWEPA is the only partner to provide EALA with long-term and predictable support. EALA Members and staff express a high level of appreciation for the programme and they place a high value on their relationship with AWEPA.⁵⁰ The AWEPA programme is described as “quick” “responsive”, “wonderfully flexible” and “not bureaucratic”. In general AWEPA “follows the work plan well”, there are “few delays” and “activities go smoothly.”

By contrast, interviewed EALA Members and staff describe cooperation with the ACBF to date as proving difficult in practice. The planning processes under the ACBF grant are viewed as “highly bureaucratic” and “repetitive”. Disbursement of funds has been delayed leading to activities being postponed or cancelled. Little has been accomplished so far beyond hiring the coordinator and buying some office equipment. For example, due to disbursement delays, the Induction Seminar, which should have been co-financed by ACBF and AWEPA, was only supported by AWEPA.

Another partner, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, is described as “listening to us but doing everything [administration] on their own”, while the AWEPA/EALA programme is described as a real “partnership” which is “empowering” to both members and staff.

Looking Forward – AWEPA's new Proposal and Questions on Direct Funding to EALA

The progress of the East African Customs Union is encouraging and must now be complemented with similar progress in the ongoing negotiations of the East African Common Market, as well as the consultations on fast tracking the process towards East African Federation. As with the Customs Union, EALA will have a critical role to play.

AWEPA and EALA signed a new MOU in June 2007 for the period of 2007–2011. As per the terms of the MOU AWEPA is now seeking new funding from Sida and Norad for the period of 2008–2011. Funding has already been secured from Irish Aid. While this review is not designed to specifically review the new proposal for 2008–2011 a few general comments are included here.

AWEPA's new proposal to Sida sets as its overall objective “to support and promote continued democratisation in East Africa, in order to reduce poverty and uphold the Human Rights of the citizens of the EAC”. The proposal attempts to anchor the programme to the *Swedish Strategy for Support to Regional and Sub-regional Development Cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa* and the EAC Development Strategy 2006–2010. However, it should be noted that there is no specific information as to how the programme is related to the role of EALA in the budget process and in financial oversight to contribute to the overall goal of poverty reduction.

⁴⁹ See article online: <http://www.acbf-pact.org/whatsnew/eala.asp>

⁵⁰ Several staff specifically complemented AWEPA's Regional Consultant Linda Baas on her responsiveness, even going so far as to recommend that she have more “decision-making authority” devolved to her by AWEPA's Headquarters.

The proposal reiterates the more recent challenges of integrating Members and staff from Rwanda and Burundi and the high Member turnover following the second election. Other challenges include developing tools such as “communications and coordination mechanisms in order to review development decisions in the EAC and disseminate this information” and the need to continue to “monitor the application of the clauses of the EAC Treaty by the Partner States.”

Target groups have been expanded to include citizens of the Partner States, CSOs and other local groups and colleagues in National Assemblies and other regional parliamentary institutions, although there is no information on how this will be done in practice or which CSOs they are planning to involve.⁵¹ The proposal also makes mention of the media, noting that it will “commission articles”. While communication with the media is important and many parliamentary strengthening programmes include members of the media on field trips (on a voluntary basis) or even provide journalists with training to better understand parliament and thus improve coverage, it is highly unusual to pay journalists to cover parliament. This may need to be revisited.

Overall, activities and indicative budgets lack detail.⁵² A logical framework is included and the section on M&E is somewhat expanded compared to the previous proposal but remains vague. The proposal notes that the EAC Development Strategy’s objectives demonstrate agreement with the cross-cutting themes identified by Sida, but again there is no specific information on how these will be addressed/ included, although the most likely mechanisms appear to be the inter-committee workshops between EALA and Partner Country Committees and the regional and international conferences.

One emerging opportunity related to gender which is not included in the proposal but which came up during the review is the newly established (October 2007) EALA Women’s Forum (see Annex Eight for full details and planned activities). Among the Forum’s objectives are “to initiate and support development initiatives to serve the interests of East Africa women”; “to provide an advocacy role on the women’s agenda on all phases of the EAC integration process”; and “to increase women’s participation in leadership/politics”. The Forum is currently seeking funding support, and women Members advocated for it enthusiastically during interviews. While activities related to the Forum are not included in the proposal, the Clerk indicated that there may be an opportunity for the Forum to make proposals for the AWEPA/EALA work plan during the May sitting. This Forum, which is particularly concerned with connecting to other Forums in the National Assemblies of the Partner States, will likely get a boost from the new Members from Rwanda as the Forum for Rwanda Women Parliamentarians (FFRP) has already shown impressive leadership, hosting a major international conference in early 2007.

Should support to EALA continue to be channelled through AWEPA?

The question of whether donors should provide funding to EALA directly arose regularly during the review process. This is a sensitive issue for all involved. Originally, as a new institution, EALA was seen as too weak to receive direct funding. Furthermore, as all funding to EALA must go through the EAC Secretariat, there were fears that it could be diverted, or that disbursements to EALA could be delayed due to heavy bureaucracy. These risks seem to be diminishing. While direct funding must still go through the EAC Secretariat, donors can earmark contributions for EALA. Furthermore EALA has recently become self accounting, allowing EALA full control over any funds earmarked for it. A concrete example of this exists in EALA’s agreement with ACBF which has as a term and condition that a special account be opened under the authority of the Clerk and EALA’s Accountant. Norad is currently considering providing funding directly to EALA, although the final decision rests with EALA as to

⁵¹ It is likely that these will include the East Africa Civil Society Forum. Other regional CSOs such as the Kituo Cha Katiba, East African Sub-Regional Initiative on the Advancement of Women (EASSI), Education Center Women Direct (ECWD), Society for International Development (SID), African Youth Trust may also be relevant and all happen to be current or future partners for Sida.

⁵² Some elements that were not achieved in the last phase of the programme have been rolled over into the new proposal, such as purchasing broadcasting equipment.

whether to receive Norad funding directly or continue to channel Norad's support through AWEPA.⁵³ Interestingly, EALA Members and staff point out that Norad is the only donor to the programme that has maintained fairly regular direct contact with EALA. Finally, donors have in essence shown that they are willing to accept the EAC's financial management system (and by extension EALA's financial management system) by contributing directly to the EAC.

Hon. Ogalo's paper⁵⁴ brings to light a painful truth. EALA does not merely face a lack of funding for capacity building, EALA lacks funding period – and to a large degree EALA has had to take what they can get. As Hon. Ogalo puts it donors originally “declined to fund the mainstream activities of the Assembly and its committees. They could only fund capacity building activities in the form of workshops, seminars etc. The Assembly accepted this position but found a way of carrying out its core functions in the process.” or as another member put it, AWEPA “fills a void that enables committees to do their work”. Fortunately for EALA the AWEPA/EALA programme planning process is highly participatory and driven by EALA. However a pervasive lack of funding means that EALA remains at risk of having activities imposed upon them by outside organizations looking to assist them. Arguably, direct funding could contribute to building EALA's financial and administrative autonomy and thus to its overall independence.

Perhaps ironically, the AWEPA/EALA programme will be seen as most successful (and sustainable) when EALA is able to take on full responsibility for the programme. EALA is a young institution but it is maturing very quickly. This is partly credited to AWEPA's support and the results obtained through the AWEPA/EALA programme.

EALA staff is credited with doing much of the work on the programme. As described earlier, EALA is involved in all aspects of programme administration from proposal writing, to activity planning and budgeting, to reporting. The only area where they have yet to play a major role is in monitoring and evaluation; largely because little has been done in this area to date. AWEPA staff noted that a side effect of the joint work on budgets is that EALA staff have gained experience on how to administer funds, improving overall accountability. Although AWEPA did not have a clear strategy in this regard, their work with EALA staff has meant that EALA staff are developing the necessary skills to eventually take over the running of the programme. This is extremely positive in terms of sustainability. The question remains whether EALA staff are ready to take on full management of the programme now, particularly as a new contingent of staff with no experience with the programme will be joining this year.

AWEPA argues that their oversight and accounting function provides an extra check which helps to keep the budgets for activities realistic. Similarly AWEPA seeks to ensure that funds are distributed more evenly between the different committees and between the MLAs and the staff. These are important functions; however, it is probable that these types of risks could be mitigated in the terms of a direct funding agreement. In addition, AWEPA clearly provides added value through their networks, and the inclusion of EALA in other AWEPA activities which give EALA higher visibility in the region and beyond (see Box Two). This should not be underestimated. Interviewed EALA Members and staff agreed that EALA has yet to develop these types of networks, particularly in Europe. Should AWEPA no longer receive funding related to their work with EALA, it is unlikely that AWEPA would be able to provide the same level of access to their networks and broader activities that they do today. The AWEPA/EALA programme should of course seek to help EALA build up its own networks, but the partners recognize that this will take time. With this in mind, should donors decide to move towards funding EALA directly, they may still wish to provide some support to EALA through AWEPA.

⁵³ If they choose the latter Norad would undertake an additional appraisal of EALA's capacity to receive and manage such funding. It should be noted that unlike the Sida Agreement which is signed by Sida and AWEPA only, the Norad agreement was a three-party agreement signed by Norad, AWEPA and EALA, thus giving EALA a clear picture of the funding available.

⁵⁴ See Annex Three.

On the other hand there are some activities where it is difficult to see the value added in channelling funding through AWEPA (e.g. printing EALA reports, buying equipment, on-line courses for individuals etc.). Nevertheless these activities are well worth supporting. Initially, donors may want to consider direct funding for a first set of identified activities where there is little advantage to having third party management.

Finally, it is important to note that interviewed EALA Members and staff show a high level of satisfaction with the programme and that AWEPA is extremely valued as a partner. While several interviewees did prefer the idea of direct funding, the majority were content to continue with the current arrangement provided that AWEPA is much more transparent about the budget process and the financial statements. However this issue evolves in the future, EALA should be in the driver's seat.

Conclusion

The comments of the different actors interviewed were remarkably consistent and there was a real willingness to discuss areas of the programme that could be improved. Along with documentary evidence, comments showed that overall the programme is demand driven, owned by EALA, and achieving results. However weak points remain in the narrative reports and monitoring and evaluation. In addition, both the donors and EALA are seeking greater transparency in the financial reports and financial information in general.

The full set of recommendations emerging from this review can be found on pages 5-7 of this document. They contain messages for Sida and the other donors, particularly in terms of improving coordination and clarifying together their expectations and requirements on narrative and financial reports, future proposals, and monitoring and evaluation. At the same time AWEPA is called upon to improve narrative reports and monitoring and evaluation (with EALA), and to increase transparency in financial reports and on financial information in general. EALA must take the lead on ensuring that new sources of support do not lead to duplication but are complementary and that all sources of support are aligned to EALA's strategic plan once it is in place. Ultimately it will also be up to EALA to decide whether a small AWEPA office within EALA would be mutually beneficial, practicable and cost effective, and whether or how they would like to approach possibilities for direct funding.

Finally in terms of programming the review recommends that further steps be taken to address cross-cutting themes (taking advantage of new initiatives such as the EALA Women's Forum), to strengthen cooperation with CSOs, and to explore bottom-up approaches in general. Priority areas include improving EALA's public information capacity and strengthening EALA's ability to play their oversight role and their role in the budget process.

Selected References

General (alphabetical)

- ACBF grants USD 1.5 million to build the capacity of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA)*, African Capacity Building Foundation, February 2006 (see: <http://www.acbf-pact.org/whatsnew/eala.asp>)
- Agreement between Sida and AWEPA on Support of East African Legislative Assembly during 2005–2007*, Sida (Contribution No: 21000371), 2005
- AWEPA Annual Report 2005*, AWEPA, November, 2005
- AWEPA Annual Report 2006: Parliament and Progress*, AWEPA, June 2007
- AWEPA Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy*, AWEPA, 2006
- Conference Report: Private Sector Development and Poverty Reduction*, AWEPA, September 2006
- Consultation Report, Donor Consultation on Parliamentary Strengthening and Financial Accountability*, DFID, UNDP and WBI, Brussels, Belgium, June 2007
- Decision on Support to AWEPA for its Activities with the East African Legislative Assembly*, Sida, Nairobi, February 2, 2005
- EALA – AWEPA Programme Proposal: Strengthening the Capacity of the East African Legislative Assembly 2008–2010*, EALA and AWEPA, November 2007
- East African Community Treaty*, 1999
- East African Legislative Assembly Fact Sheet*, East African Community,
- East African Court of Justice, Application No 1 of 2005, Calist Andrew Mwatela, Lydia Wanyoto Mutende, Issac Abraham Sepetu versus the East African Community, Judgment, October 2006 (see: <http://www.saflii.org/ea/cases/EACJ/2006/1.pdf>)
- Five Years Of EALA: 2001–2006*, East African Legislative Assembly, Arusha, 2007
- Functional relationships between the EALA and the National Assemblies of the Partner States of the EAC: Implementation of Recommendations of Nanyuki 1 and Nanyuki 2*, East African Legislative Assembly, Arusha, June 2005
- Hubli, K. Scott and Schmidt, Martin, *Approaches to Parliamentary Strengthening: A Review of Sida's support to Parliaments*, Sida Evaluation 05/27, Department for Democracy and Social Development, November 2005
- Hudson, Alan and Wren, Claire, *Parliamentary Strengthening in Developing Countries*, Report produced for DFID by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), United Kingdom, February 2007
- Kyomuhangi, Charlotte (Library Assistant, EALA) Back to Office Report, Report on Website Design held at Uganda Management Institute, Kampala Uganda, March 16–17, 2006
- Methods for Capacity Development: A Report for Sida's project group "Capacity Development as a Strategic Question"*, Sida Working Paper No. 10, February 2002
- Maliyamkono, T.L., *Mid-Term Review Report to the EALA/AWEPA/NORAD Project for the Royal Norwegian Embassy*, 2005 (please note: copies of AWEPA and EALA's written comments on the Mid-Term Review were also provided to the Consultant)

Memorandum of Understanding between the East African Legislative Assembly and AWEPA, June, 2007

Ng'inja, Sarah, *Travel Report: Strategy Meeting with the East African Law Society, Annual Review Meeting with AWEPA and EALA, and courtesy visit to the East African Court of Justice*, Sida, December, 2005

Ojiambo, Elphas, *Travel Report: AWEPA/EALA Regional Seminar on Parliamentary and Private Sector Cooperation for Sustainable Development*, Sida, September, 2006

Outcome Report Form Pan-African Parliament, AWEPA, 2007

Overview of Activities 2002–2006: EALA – AWEPA Cooperative Programme, AWEPA

Parliamentary Strengthening Position Paper – Revision 060529, Sida, Division for Democratic Governance, June 2006

Review of AWEPA's Financial Management System, KPMG, Sida/DESO, November 19, 2002

Sample Evaluation Form for the Regional Parliamentary Seminar for the Great Lakes Region: Towards Universal Access to HIV/AIDS Prevention, Treatment, Care and Support, Nairobi, April 18-19, 2007

Strengthening African Parliaments, AWEPA, June 2007

Strengthening Parliaments in Africa: Improving Support, Africa All-Party Parliamentary Group, United Kingdom, March 2008

Support to the East African Legislative Assembly: Cooperative Programme, EALA & AWEPA, 2004-2007

Svensson, Arne; Salih, Mohamed; Häggroth, Sören; and Westman, Henrik, *Organizational Review of the Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa–AWEPA*, April, 2006

Financial Reports and related documents (by submission date)

Explanatory Note on the Indicative Budget for the EALA Programme 2004–2007, AWEPA, 2005

Van Raak, H., *Interim Financial Report: Agreement between Sida and AWEPA on support of EAST African Legislative Assembly during 2005–2007*, AWEPA, February 27, 2006

Scholten, Dr. Jan Nico, *Interim Financial Report: Agreement between Sida and AWEPA on support of East African Legislative Assembly during 2005–2007 (period January 2006- June 2006)*, AWEPA, December 6, 2006

Scholten, Dr. Jan Nico, *Interim Financial Report: Agreement between Sida and AWEPA on support of East African Legislative Assembly during 2005–2008 (period January – December 2006)*, AWEPA, March 7, 2007

Andersson, Lennart, *Interim Financial Report: Agreement between Sida and AWEPA on support of East African Legislative Assembly during 2005–2008 ((period January – December 2007)*, AWEPA, February 15, 2008

Meeting Minutes

Minutes, EALA/AWEPA 2005 Annual Review Meeting, December 2, 2005

Minutes, Meeting between Justin Bundi, David Wiking and Mary Gachochi, March 14, 2005

Minutes, EALA/AWEPA 2006 Annual Review Meeting, January 31, 2007

Minutes, EALA/AWEPA 2007 Annual Review Meeting, March 20, 2008

Progress Reports and related documents (by submission date)

Project Progress Report #2, November 2006

Project Progress Report 2006 (and Annex), EALA – AWEPA, February 2007

Project Progress Report 2007, EALA – AWEPA, February 2008

Sida Assessment Memos (by submission date)

Muema, Grace, *Assessment Memo – AWEPA/EALA, Parliamentary Cooperation Programme in East Africa, September 2004 – December 2007*, Sida, Nairobi, November 8, 2004

Wiking, David, *Assessment Memo – AWEPA/EALA, Parliamentary Cooperation Programme in East Africa, February 2005–December 2007*, Sida, Nairobi, January 31, 2005

Bjuremalm, Helena, *In depth Assessment Memo: AWEPA 2006–2009*, DESO/DESA, Sida, June 19, 2006

Work Plans and related documents (by submission date)

AWEPA – EALA Contract: Proposed Activities for the Year 2006, East African Legislative Assembly, 2005

Work Plan 2005, EALA – AWEPA

Draft Work Plan 2006, EALA – AWEPA

Proposed Activities for the Year 2007, EALA – AWEPA, 2006

Draft Work Plan 2007, EALA – AWEPA (Revised July, 2007)

Draft Work Plan 2008, EALA – AWEPA, February 2008

Other sources

AWEPA website: <http://www.awepa.org>

EALA website: www.eac.int/EALA

Copies of correspondence between Sida and AWEPA provided by Sida.

Annex 1. List of Interviewees

AWEPA

1. Dr. J. Nico Scholten, President (and Political Coordinator)
2. Marc Holtkamp, Regional Programme Coordinator
3. Linda Baas, Regional Consultant
4. Dr. Jeff Balch, Director, Research and Evaluation
5. Lennart Andersson, Administrative Director

EALA

Members

1. Hon. Abdirahin Haithar Abdi (Kenya, current Speaker, 1st and 2nd Assembly; Chair of the current Business Committee)
2. Hon. (Ms.) Safina Kwekwe Tsungu (Kenya, 2nd Assembly)
3. Hon. Gervase Akhaabi (Kenya, 2nd Assembly)
4. Hon. Clarkson Otieno Karan (Kenya, 2nd Assembly; Member of the current Business Committee)
5. Hon. (Ms.) Beatrice Matumbo Shellukindo (Tanzania, 1st Assembly)
6. Hon. (Ms.) Kate Kamba (Tanzania, 1st and 2nd Assembly; Member of the Business Committee in the 1st Assembly)
7. Hon. George Francis Nangale (Tanzania, 1st and 2nd Assembly; Chair, 2nd Assembly Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources Committee)
8. Hon. Dan Wandera Ogalo (Uganda, 1st and 2nd Assembly; Member of the current Business Committee)
9. Hon. (Ms.) Lydia Wanyoto Mutende (Uganda, 1st and 2nd Assembly)
10. Hon. Sozi Kiwanuka Med Kaggwa (Uganda, 1st Assembly)

Staff

1. Justin Bundi, Clerk
2. Kenneth Madete, Deputy Clerk
3. Alex Obatre Lumumba, Senior Clerk Assistant
4. Paul Masami, Clerk Assistant
5. Gloria Nakebu-Esiku, Editor of Hansard
6. Charles Ngeleja Kadonya, Senior Research Officer
7. Algresia Akwi Ogojo, Project Coordinator
8. Alphaxard Lugola, Serjeant-at-Arms

Irish Aid

1. John O'Grady

Norad

1. Kjersti Tromsdal, Political Officer
2. Inger Tveit (formerly oversaw Norad's support to AWEPA/EALA and Norad's 2005 review)

Sida

Helena Bjuremalm, Regional Advisor, Democracy & Human Rights

Sara Ng'inja, Programme Officer, Regional Democracy and Human Rights

Annex 2. Terms of Reference (TOR)

2.1 Background

2.1.1 Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Sida is the Swedish government agency for bilateral international development cooperation and most of Sweden's cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe. The Parliament and Government decide on the development cooperation budget, the countries which Sweden shall have programmes of development cooperation with, and the focus of the cooperation.

Sida supports activities in almost 120 countries, including the partner countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Most of the resources are allocated to the twenty or so countries with which Sida has extensive, long-term programmes of cooperation⁵⁵. The framework of cooperation is specified in special country strategies and regulated in agreements between Sida and the government of each partner country. Sida channels its funds through various types of programmes: general budget support, sector wide approaches, trust funds, project support etc.

Sida's contributions are based on the changes the partner countries wish to implement and are prepared to allocate funds to. Sida's task is to assess the type of contributions that can give results, and then to provide the know-how and capital required. Each contribution is carefully studied and evaluated. Sida's support to any project ceases as soon as the project is able to operate independently of Sida funding. Less successful projects should be concluded rapidly rather than revised. Sida operates through some 1,500 partners in cooperation, mostly Swedish. These are companies, popular movements, organisations, universities and government agencies that possess the expertise to make Swedish development cooperation successful.

In the long run Swedish development cooperation should lead to wider economic and social cooperation with the cooperation countries, to the benefit of all parties concerned.

For more information, please see Sida's homepage: www.Sida.se.

2.1.2 Programme for Regional Democracy and Human Rights

The programme for Regional Democracy and Human Rights has thus far been based on the "Swedish Strategy for Support to Regional and Subregional Development Cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa 2002–2006", which has now been extended until June 2008. It is anticipated that this strategy will be extended until end 2008. However, existing priorities as regards regional integration including a strong focus on EAC, will most likely remain.

The underlying thought for the Regional Democracy and Human Rights programme is essentially that certain challenges to development in the Greater East African countries (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi, Rwanda, Ethiopia and to a lesser extent Zambia, Sudan, Somalia and Congo) must or can benefit from a regional approach. Although some challenges are perhaps better addressed at a local/national level, it is evident that a regional approach is sometimes necessary and that it often adds value.

Democratisation in Greater East Africa is characterised by slow and difficult processes with a high degree of vulnerability to armed conflicts. The political institutions and the norms underpinning democratic development are still being shaped, while conflict management mechanisms are still weak. Governments are responsible for promoting, respecting, protecting and fulfilling Human Rights.

⁵⁵ This number will be decreased to twelve, over the coming years. In addition to these twelve partners, Sida cooperates with countries in different categories, including i.a. countries in conflict or post-conflict situations, and countries with democracy deficits.

Likewise, democracy, as a system of ensuring the will of the people through political processes, will have different attributes in different countries. However, countries (especially neighbouring ones) will heavily influence each other's processes of democratisation in general. Armed conflicts and disrespect for rule of law, human rights and democratic procedures hence seem to be contagious and vice versa.

The current "Swedish Strategy for Support for Regional and Subregional Development Cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa" claims that while conflict management often needs to be addressed regionally, a regional approach to Democracy and Human Rights often adds value, and is not necessarily less relevant. It is believed that there is need and room for increased collaboration between civil society actors in the region, as well as between respective governments.

The overall objective of the programme is to "promote democratic governance, and thereby management of conflicts, in the East African countries" with a view to Sida's goal of contributing to "an environment supportive of poor people's own efforts to improve their quality of life". To this end, the programme focuses on activities related to:

- i) developing and/or working with agents of change
- ii) engendering politics through the empowerment of women
- iii) developing and/or working with conflict management mechanisms
- iv) creating synergies between attempts to promote democratic governance in Greater East Africa

Nevertheless, the question of when and whether a regional approach is preferable over a national approach, is always valid. Some advantages to a regional approach were identified in initial discussions:

1. As a result of the sensitivity of certain Democracy and Human Rights related issues, a regional approach may open up for dialogue between concerned parties.
2. When national Human Rights organisations are unable to report on Human Rights abuses, organisations in other countries, may do so.
3. A regional approach may provide opportunities to expose national actors (governments as well as civil society) to experiences from other countries.
4. At times it may be more cost effective to conduct studies and/or engage in training and the like in a regional forum as opposed to conducting identical/similar activities in several countries.

2.2 Purpose of the Review

The purpose of the review is to assess to what extent programme objectives have been met (and if so, have had an effect on intended outcomes, if not impact), to identify lessons learned and make recommendation for future implementation of activities. Although conclusions and recommendations will guide Sida in decisions regarding continued support to AWEPA and EALA, the review is primarily for the benefit of both of these.

The report will be shared with Sida Headquarters, who have an overarching agreement with AWEPA Headquarters.

2.3 Intervention Background

The review shall look at both AWEPA and EALA, in relation to one another, specifically in terms of AWEPA's support to EALA.

It is important to note that the AWEPA/EALA programme was evaluated in 2005 in a study commissioned by NORAD, and AWEPA's whole organisation was reviewed in early 2006 – both studies may be provided to the consultant. In addition, it should be mentioned that AWEPA has been thoroughly evaluated regularly since its inception in 1984.

2.3.1 Brief of AWEPA, EALA and the Programme

The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA) is an international non-governmental organization that supports parliaments in Africa and works to keep Africa high on the political agenda in Europe. It has some 1500 current and former parliamentarians as members from the European Parliament and almost all EU member states, as well as Norway and Switzerland.

AWEPA works in Africa from a development perspective to strengthen the core functions of parliaments: oversight, representation and legislation. It believes that strong parliaments are essential prerequisites for Africa's development. They contribute to peace, stability and prosperity on the continent. In Europe, AWEPA members improve the understanding and commitment among parliamentarians and other political leaders towards important issues in Africa.

AWEPA strives to assist EALA in becoming a modern, critical and well functioning regional parliamentary body, through a fully participatory process. Special attention is given to:

- EALA's role in promoting regional integration in the East African Community, as well as regional peace building activities in the wider Great Lakes Region
- Strengthening the role of parliament in urgent issues affecting the Great Lakes Region.

When EALA was inaugurated in 2001, most of its members had very little political experience and found the parliamentary system adopted by EALA unique. The members of the Assembly are twenty-seven elected members and five ex-officio members that include the Minister responsible for Regional Cooperation from each partner country, the Secretary General and the Counsel to the Community. The Assembly is the legislating organ of the community and its functions should include, inter alia, liaising with the national assemblies of the partner countries on matters relating to the community, debating and approving the budget of the community and establishing committees that are deemed necessary.

With the support of AWEPA (from the Arusha office, and at times the Nairobi office), members and staff of the Assembly are being empowered to carry out their specific mandates through capacity building seminars, study visits and exchange programmes to similar institutions. Objectives are categorised in terms of support to all members of EALA, support to staff of EALA and support to committees of EALA. High turnover of members of EALA is a major challenge. The regional AWEPA office is based in Nairobi. EALA is based in Arusha. For more information, see www.awepa.org and www.eac.int.

Sida's support to the programme commenced in March 2005, and is currently running until September 2009 (due to a request for extension). The support totals SEK 6,000,000.

2.4 Stakeholder Involvement

2.4.1 AWEPA and EALA

Both have been consulted and given the opportunity to contribute to the Terms of Reference (ToR). In as far as is possible, their contributions have been incorporated.

2.4.2 Beneficiaries

Individuals, groups, institutions, communities etc. which are deemed by AWEPA and EALA, Sida or, indeed, the consultant, to be beneficiaries of the programme should be consulted and interacted with to the extent that benefits the review. It is asked of the consultant to take cognizance of the fact that the turnover of MPs within EALA has been considerably high, and hence the focus should be on those MPs who have actually participated in the programme.

2.5 Review Questions

2.5.1 Effectiveness

- To what extent has the programme so far achieved its goal(s), objectives and planned outputs?
- What are the reasons for achievement or non-achievement of the above?
- How can the programme be made more effective?
- Is the programme making use of methodologies such as Results Based Management (RBM) and/or Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) to make it more effective?

2.5.2 Efficiency

- Could the programme have been implemented with less resources and still maintain the desired level of results?
- Are internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms satisfactory?
- How are lessons learned and knowledge gained institutionalised?
- How can the programme be made more cost-efficient?

2.5.3 Results

- What are the intended or unintended results (positive or negative) of the programme on beneficiaries?
- How has the programme affected different groups, beneficiaries and stakeholders?

What do those affected by the interventions perceive to be the results of the interventions on themselves?

- To what extent can changes that have occurred during the programme period be identified and measured?
- To what extent does EALA's and AWEPA's joint reporting live up to agreed standards as regards results based management and reporting (input, outputs, outcomes, impact – including indicators and sources of verification)?
- To what extent do the two partners make use of their respective organisational learning regarding results achieved and impact, i.e. to what extent are lessons learned institutionalized?
- Is data collected, and progress made, by EALA as an institution, monitored (whether by AWEPA or EALA, or both)?

2.5.4 Relevance

- Is the programme providing an adequate solution to the development issues at hand?
- Is the programme consistent and complementary with activities supported by other donors?
- Would AWEPA and EALA have the capacity to expand the programme to include other countries, i.e. Rwanda and Burundi?
- To what extent is the programme in line with Sida's Position Paper on Parliamentary Strengthening (www.Sida.se/publications)?
- To what extent does the programme integrate gender and HIV/AIDS sensitivity and awareness?

2.5.5 Sustainability

- Is the programme consistent with EALA's priorities and effective demand?
- Is the programme supported by relevant institutions, stakeholders etc? Is it 'owned' by EALA and are EALA members able to influence to programme design?
- How committed are the leadership, Committee Chairs, members and staff of EALA to the programme?
- Is EALA characterised by good governance including effective management (also financial) and organisation?
- How have roles and division of labour evolved throughout the cooperation, and how can these be further improved?
- Does EALA have the financial and institutional capacity to maintain intervention benefits after donor support, and/or support from AWEPA, has come to an end?
- Does AWEPA/EALA have a broad and diverse enough group of donors in order not to risk over-dependency on Sida?

2.6 Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Based on the above questions, the review should aim to offer recommendations on ways in which the programme can be improved, from an implementation perspective as well as a support perspective, and shall also aim to make recommendations on Sida's continued support to AWEPA/EALA.

2.7 Methodology

Based on the ToR, the consultant should be able to develop his/her own participatory methodology, to be presented to Sida as part of the tender.

The consultant will be granted access to all relevant documents and records, from Sida, AWEPA and EALA. However, no documents should be released to a third party. The consultant should study any relevant background material and make a record of all relevant data, which shall upon request be submitted to Sida at the end of the assignment.

All practical arrangements such as interviews, travel etc. shall be made by the consultant, however, interviewees should be determined in consultation with all parties concerned.

The review will be carried out by means of a study of the programme proposal, progress reports and other relevant documentation, discussions with AWEPA and EALA, interviews with organisations' staff, meeting beneficiaries through field visits (preferable) but if not possible through phone calls/e-mail

(especially as regards former MPs), meeting with donors, analysis of the design and implementation of planned activities, performance analysis etc.

2.8 Work Plan and Timeframe

It is expected that the consultant will, as part of his/her tender, design and present a detailed work plan including validation visits to AWEPA and EALA during which findings will be discussed. It is estimated that the review can be completed within a 4-5 week period, and will commence at the soonest time possible, but not sooner than January 2008.

Inception meetings with Sida, AWEPA and EALA will be held on award of the contract, at suitable and mutually established times. An initial briefing meeting will take place between Sida and the consultants on commencement of the assignment.

2.9 Reporting

A draft report shall be submitted to the Embassy, no later than one week after the completion of the review. The consultant shall receive comments from the Embassy, AWEPA and EALA, no later than two weeks after receiving the draft report. Once the comments have been incorporated to the extent possible, the consultant will send the final report, in one electronic copy and four hard copies, to the Embassy no later than a week after receiving comments.

The report will contain an executive summary of no more than two pages. The executive summary shall have a particular emphasis on main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

Dates and other details for the commencement, reporting and completion of the review will be specified in the contract between Sida and the consultant, being understood that the dates and details shall take into account the convenience and availability of the parties hereto.

The report will be written in English and should not exceed twenty pages, excluding annexes.

Format and outline of the reports shall follow the guidelines in Sida Evaluation Report – a standardised Format (see annex 1).

A meeting shall be arranged at the Embassy of Sweden for a presentation of, and discussion on, the findings before the report is finalised.

2.10 Budget

Tenders shall include a budget outline based on consultancy (hourly) fees and reimbursables.

All costs shall be given excluding VAT. Contracts entered into will be in Swedish Kronor (SEK). The consultancy company shall submit an invoice to the Embassy once the final report has been approved.

2.11 Consultant

The review will be carried out by a consultant with international experience in programme evaluation/review.

2.11.1 Compulsory

- Ten years of documented theoretical and practical experience in project/programme implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation.

- At least seven years of documented experience of development cooperation in the field of Democracy and Human Rights in the international arena, and more importantly, in relation to the EAC.
- At least five years of documented knowledge of the particular challenges of parliamentary strengthening
- Sound knowledge of development policies and administrative systems of relevant country governments and institutions.
- Fair knowledge of structure, mandate and policies of the East African Community.
- Proficiency in English and Kiswahili.
- Evidence of the consultants' adoption of a Quality Assurance System as well as a description on how quality control will be implemented in the course of the assignment.
- Evidence of
 - registration by a national Registrars of Companies and a Trade Association
 - registration and payment of value added tax or a similar sales tax in accordance with national legislation
 - declaration of preliminary taxes for staff and employee contributions
 - absence of debts and/or liabilities regarding taxes and social security contributions

2.11.2 Advantageous

- Knowledge of Sida policies and priorities, including Sida's ultimate objective of poverty reduction, and Sida's position paper on Parliamentary Strengthening.
- Proficiency in French.

It is imperative that the consultant, and any company or institution with which s/he is affiliated is independent of the activities and AWEPA/EALA have no stake in the outcome of the evaluations.

Annex 3. Paper Submitted by Hon. Dan Wandera Ogalo, MLA

The East African Legislative is funded by contributions from the Partner States. Since its inception in 2001, inadequate resources have been provided and yet its mandate is large in that it carries out oversight, legislative and representative functions. A total of 32 sitting days per year is all the Assembly has.

As a result, the Assembly was forced to approach donors for financial assistance. However all donors approached declined to fund the mainstream activities of the Assembly and its committees. They could only fund capacity building activities in the form of workshops, seminars etc.

The Assembly accepted this position but found a way of carrying out its core functions in the process. Below are some of the examples.

3.1 The East African Management Act

The Customs Union Protocol was to be concluded by 2004. It became clear to the East African Legislative Assembly in 2003 that insufficient time would be available to the Assembly in the enactment of the law establishing the Customs Union. Rather than await the bill, the relevant committee with funding from AWEPA held workshops and seminars for civil society, business people and government officials in all the partner states. The committee was in effect holding public hearings under the guise of the seminars and workshops.

As expected when the Bill was introduced in the Assembly in 2004. The community budget allowed only three days of committee meeting and two days of plenary to enact the bill the law.

Fortunately the committee was already seized of issues of Customs Union and used the knowledge gathered in seminars and workshops to review the bill and advise the Assembly to enact to a bill of over 200 clauses in only two days.

There is no doubt in my mind that without that knowledge the major amendments made to the bill would not have been possible. There were so many gaps in the bill that the Speaker ordered the Executive, the Committee on Trade and the Legal Committee to agree on amendments so as to finalise the Bill in plenary in the two days allocated.

This was the same scenario with the East African Community Competition Act and the East African Meteorological Act.

3.2 Resource-based Border Conflicts

Lake Victoria is shared by Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. Fishermen from each of the countries were frequently arrested as trespassers in waters of another country and locked up in jail. They alleged human rights abuses and ill treatment because they were foreigners. Secondly, along the Karamoja (Uganda)/Turukana(Kenya) border and Kagera(Tanzania)/Mutukula (Uganda) boarder there are conflicts over grazing rights as well as cattle rustling (theft) from one country to another.

Under AWEPA funding on conflict resolution the two committees on National Resources and Conflict Resolution met the different communities and organized meetings bringing together leaders and elders from the different communities where cross border conflicts exist and thereby created a cross border dispute settlement mechanism.

Kenyan fisherman held in Tanzanian and Ugandan jails were released on intervention of the Assembly and the Council of Ministers came up with a memorandum of understanding on how to handle cross border fishing.

3.3 Treaty Amendments

The committee on Legal Affairs identified many defects in the Treaty. These defects have slowed down the integration process and made it more difficult for the Community to achieve its objectives as stipulated in the Treaty.

The committee on Legal Affairs using workshops and seminars collected views on the Treaty from various stakeholders. These included the Chief Justices, members of parliament, the academia at Universities (Law and political science, human rights commissions, ombudsman and civil society of the three Partner States. A comprehensive report was compiled and tabled in plenary for debate. The recommendations are now with the council of ministers (Executive) for consideration. The Council of Ministers has welcomed the initiative of the Assembly.

Most important however is the statement made by President Museveni in his capacity as Chairman of the Summit when he addressed the Assembly on 26th February 2008. He stated “... *last but not least, the process has already begun of the review of the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African community of 30th November 1999 to accommodate present and future demands of the expanding programme and membership of the community*”

What President Museveni did not say is that the process was begun by the Assembly with funding from AWEPA.

3.4 Nanyuki Series

These are annual workshops bringing together members of parliaments of the Partner States and the Assembly because the Treaty requires liaison between the parliaments. This requirement of the Treaty is to ensure linkages. As was noted earlier the Assembly has the same functions as those of National Assemblies and if there are no linkages and planning for the future, it is easy to have duplication.

At the end of the meeting resolutions and recommendations are reached and the members of National Assemblies brief their respective parliaments.

The Partner States have never funded this Treaty function. We have been able to do so by reason of donor funding via AWEPA

3.5 Capacity Building Proper

1. *Committee Chairs*

The committee chairs have benefited from donor funding. They have traveled and observed the working of the European parliament to be able to appreciate how regional parliaments function. In fact they recently took advantage of the tour to put the case of the Assembly for membership in the EU/ACP Joint Parliamentary Assembly to the Co-Chair of that body. As a result the Assembly has now been admitted with observer status in EU/ACP JPA.

2. *Accounts Committee*

A course for members of the Accounts committee in the first Assembly led better auditing of the Community funds

3. *Training*

Staff have benefited from short and long term courses to better equip them support the work of the Assembly. Without an efficient knowledgeable and hardworking staff a parliament cannot perform.

4. *Swahili*

The majority of ordinary East Africans speak Swahili. Ugandans however are an exception. Accordingly, we found out that at public rallies in Kenya and Tanzania, Ugandans were unable to communicate. Donor funds were used in the first Assembly for Ugandans to undergo a course in Swahili.

3.6 Rwanda and Burundi

The two countries were admitted into the community last year but there was no official community presence in the two countries until the Speaker led a delegation to the two countries. The reception accorded to the delegation by the Heads of State, Speakers of the National Assemblies, Government Ministers, members of parliament etc was a clear indication that the Community has definitely missed something. If the community is to be people centred, the community must go to the people. Signing accession treaties in Kampala has no meaning to the people in Kigali and Bujumbura until they see those signatures translated into action. That action is when they saw the Assembly. The delegation did also enhance institutional relationship between the summit Council of Ministers and the Assembly.

Further guidance was given by the delegation on elections by the National Assemblies of Rwanda and Burundi to the Assembly. As a result, the two Assemblies made rules of procedure to elect their members and have since elected their members to be sworn into office in April. This activity was AWEPA funded.

3.7. Induction Courses for Members

The first Assembly comprised of 27 elected members. Of that number only 10 had ever served in a legislature. The rest had no knowledge about the procedures of a parliament. In the second Assembly 80% of the members are new. These figures emphasise the need for induction courses for members.

Using donor funds the Assembly held an induction course in Zanzibar in 2002 and in Mombasa in 2007 for the second Assembly. The purpose was to get members to understand the workings of a parliament, the rules of procedure, practice etc.

Experts in parliamentary practice including Speakers were invited to make presentations which were then discussed.

For both courses donor funding through AWEPA was used.

3.8 Election Monitoring

The Assembly using funds provided through AWEPA sent a mission to observe general elections in Tanzania (2005), Uganda (2006) Kenya (2007) and reports were prepared by the Missions and submitted to plenary.

The recent Kenyan elections showed that leadership of the Community lay with the Assembly. The Assembly mission issued a report in which it stated the elections were flawed and did not meet the standard of a free and fair election. The Assembly sent a goodwill mission and each member of the Assembly contributes USD 500. A total of USD 13,500 from all the 27 members of the Assembly was handed to the Red cross of Kenya for the benefit of the victims. The goodwill mission also visited the internally displaced people all over Kenya. However the goodwill mission was not funded by the donors.

The Assembly was the only visible organ during the difficult times in Kenya. The Summit was quiet, (much later, President Museveni traveled to Nairobi and President Kikwete attended the signing of the

agreement), the Council of Ministers were absent and the Secretariat at first disowned our report only to be reprimanded by the Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers thanked the Assembly for the work it had done.

Only one hitch – even the Assembly would not have been there if it was not for funding from donors.

3.9 Conclusion

There is no doubt in my mind that donor funding has been responsible for the outputs of the Assembly. Parliaments in Africa are often viewed with suspicion by the Executive especially where the Executive has no control on the deliberations of Parliament. In such situation the Executive resorts to ensuring parliament does not have sufficient resources to hold government accountable. And this case with the Assembly. A strong independent regional parliament with extensive powers makes an overbearing Executive uncomfortable.

I have been a resource person/consultant for many parliaments including Nigeria, Liberia, Botswana, Lesotho, Zambia, Malawi, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia and regional parliaments (EALA and SADC) as well as the Pan African Parliament. I have observed that under funding is the trend all over. In the circumstances, an institution which is meant to ensure good governance, democracy and rule of law is unable to do so.

The donor community has failed to appreciate this and will not directly fund core activities of a parliament but is content to put money directly into national budget hoping that parliament shall receive a reasonable portion of the money from the Executive. Wrong.

In my view, it is time that the Donor Community appreciated the problems and moved away from the policy of funding only workshops and seminars of parliaments. Donors must deal directly with parliaments and not through the Executive – UNLESS of course the donors are not interested in a system of checks and balances and prefer one centre of power. If this is so, donors should stop complaining about failed states. They are partly responsible.

Have I been too harsh?

Good Day.

Annex 4. AWEPA Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Parliamentary capacity building, as an arm of development cooperation, is still a relatively new phenomenon. Strategies for monitoring parliamentary work and evaluating parliamentary support programmes are still evolving. AWEPA has developed a hybrid evaluation strategy for its programmes because experience has shown that the application of ‘off the shelf’ models to highly complex political contexts has proven problematic.

Parliamentary support programmes operate in a fluid and intricate political environment. Parliamentary partners, donors and project implementers all have their own interests to protect and concerns to promote, and this can have an influence on monitoring and evaluation processes and their objectivity. There are also some considerations that impact on monitoring and evaluation processes in the parliamentary context, such as:

- objective, linear evaluation methodologies are ill-suited for non-linear and highly volatile political transition and post-conflict stabilization processes;
- subjective, participatory evaluation methods are gaining acceptance by project donors;
- changing political priorities in a given national context may mean measuring project quality advances against outdated goals or success indicators;
- the plethora and diversity of contributing political and socio-economic factors complicate the possibility of attribution of ultimate impact to project activities.

Another complicating factor in the evaluation of parliamentary development assistance has been the scarcity of qualified professional evaluation consultants in this field. The checkered history of evaluation of parliamentary support in Africa has revealed examples of consultants with little or no political or parliamentary knowledge and experience, who have on occasion succumbed to political influences and personal agendas. AWEPA has developed its monitoring and evaluation processes with a view toward maximizing its ability to learn from project experiences and improve its operations.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Goals

The objective of M&E processes is to make visible an array of project results at different levels. Ideally, a transparent methodology will be agreed among project partners from the outset. The AWEPA strategy involves assessment of results in four areas: output, outcome, impact and sustainability.

- *Output*: the number of capacity building activities implemented, the level of participation, and the quality of their content.
- *Outcome*: Improvement in skills in dealing with the legislative process, budgets, hearings, debates, media and constituency work, illustrated by concrete examples of how the beneficiaries applied their skill.
- *Impact*: the noticeable change coming from parliamentary action, in terms of e.g. peace, development, human rights and MDGs.
- *Sustainability*: the progress on parliamentary (institutional capacity) strengthening, linkage with local expertise, and donor attitude.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Practices

A combination of available M&E strategies is recommended for parliamentary support programmes, using a mix of SMART* and SPICED** methods. The following practices are recommended for each of the measurement areas.

- *Output Inventory*: project staff keep a tally of events and participation, and participant responses:
 - Head of Projects: coordination
 - Head of Offices in Africa: supervision
 - Project Officers: implementation
 - Reporting Frequency: monthly
- *Outcome Mapping*: a monitoring team consisting of project staff, parliamentary staff and local NGO representatives jointly keep a tally of post-event actions, results, process trends and parliamentary functioning (effect), according to agreed indicators, and beneficiary self-evaluation interviews will be conducted selectively to assess participant improvement areas:
 - Director R&E, Deputy Director PD: advice, coaching
 - Head of Projects: coordination
 - Head of Offices in Africa: supervision
 - Project Officers: implementation
 - Reporting Frequency: quarterly
- *Impact Assessment*: a focus group panel consisting of parliamentary and civil society representatives and an AWEPA team (PC, PO, HP/DDPD/DRE) will review progress using a modified Most Significant Change (MSC) approach, and comparing results with African partners (e.g. AISA, ACCORD):
 - Political Coordinator: chair of focus group panel
 - Director R&E, Deputy Director PD: advice, coaching
 - Head of Projects: coordination
 - Head of Offices in Africa: implementation
 - Project Officers: implementation assistance
 - Reporting Frequency: annually (or as mid-term review)
- *Sustainability Profile*: an AWEPA team (PC, PO, HP/DDPD/DRE) will participate in dialogue with project donors on the impact assessment report and partner analysis, and will brainstorm on possible innovations for future programme development:
 - President/Political Coordinator: lead contact in donor dialogue
 - Director R&E, Deputy Director PD: advice, coaching
 - Head of Projects: coordination
 - Head of Offices in Africa: implementation

- Project Officers: implementation assistance
- Reporting Frequency: annually

Each of the above M&E practices will yield a document for inclusion in the overall narrative report of programme implementation. Guidelines for their structure and length will be produced after consultation and agreement within the Project Department.

- * SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound
- ** SPICED: subjective, participatory, interpreted, cross-checked, empowering, diverse/ disaggregated

Indicator Inventory

The following indicators are proposed as an outline for usage in monitoring processes. For specific programmes only a selection of these may be applicable, and others may be agreed upon depending on the nature and content of programme activities.

- Output Indicators:
 - Number of activities implemented
 - Number of participants attending activities
 - Gender balance in participation
 - Political party and/or staff participation
 - Presence of experts, civil society, media, etc
- Outcome Indicators:
 - Improvement in skills or confidence in tabling resolutions/motions/questions using examples of resolutions tabled or questions raised where available
 - Improvement in skill or confidence in dealing with budgetary issues using examples of actions taken on budgetary items where available
 - Improvement in Legislative skills using examples of actions taken (i.e. amendments proposed/private members bills etc) in legislative process
 - Improvement in ability to deal with the public and media using examples of public outreach or media interactions held.
 - Improvement in constituency relations skills using examples of constituency activities held where available
 - Improvement in ability of Parliamentary staff to service Parliament and Parliamentarians.

Note: Beneficiary self evaluation/experience (i.e. interviews or rapid assessment seminars) can be used to get data on the SPICED indicators (improvement in skills) and SMART data, in other words harder data from activities undertaken can be used to give examples of how improved skills were employed by the beneficiaries concerned.

- Impact Indicators:
 - Perceived performance of Parliament and Parliamentarians in all areas
 - Perceived/statistical improvement in sector-specific areas
 - Governance trends: e.g. TI Corruption Perception Index
 - Perceived democratization/political transition/peacebuilding stability

Note: This category can combine both SPICED (perception) indicators as well as harder “external” monitoring data (i.e. the data produced by other domestic organizations) to make the eventual case (if warranted by the data) that it is plausible that the project had a positive effect on the political development in the country concerned. While direct attribution is not possible to make in these circumstances, plausibility can be used to make an indirect link with any positive developments, assuming that is the case. Negative developments however will also have to be explained although these are usually attributable to factors outside of the control of the support programme.

- Sustainability Indicators:
 - Parliamentary institutional capacity and financial independence
 - Domestic/regional parliamentary capacity building alternatives
 - Donor commitment to continuation of capacity building programmes

Annex 5. Sample Articles on Programme Activities

EALA calls for one poll law

WAY FORWARD: The suggestion comes in the wake of violence and protests that have marked the presidential results tallying in Kenya

By **SUKHDEV CHHATBAR**
Special Correspondent

The East Africa Legislative Assembly's observer team to the December 27, 2007 Kenyan general election has called for the enactment of a uniform regional electoral law and establishment of a regional Electoral Commission to oversee future polls in the Community member states.

The recommendation is contained in a 10-page report expected to be tabled at next month's East African Legislative Assembly session.

A copy of the report has been submitted to the beleaguered Electoral Commission of Kenya (ECK), which has found itself in a deep electoral crisis after its chair, Samuel Kivuitu, disowned the results he used to declare incumbent President Mwai Kibaki the victor.

The report comes in the wake of violence and protests that have marked the presidential results tallying. The opposition Orange Democrat-

ic Movement has categorically refused to accept Kibaki's victory," and instead maintains that its leader, Raila Odinga, is the rightful presidential winner.

The report notes that the fundamental principle in the EAC Treaty requires adherence to good governance, which can only be effectively achieved if there is a regional law and commission in place.

Article 3 of the Treaty requires: "...adherence to universally acceptable principles of good governance, democracy, rule of law, observance of human-rights and social justice..."

The EA legislators took a swipe at the ECK over the poor handling of the post voting period, saying, "It was characterised by unco-ordinated and suspect actions, which among others included statements by the chairman of the ECK to the effect that he could not trace some of the returning officers who had the results and had switched off their phones."

In addition, the legislators noted that the ECK chairman has stated that he would declare the results with or without the returns, which he didn't do.

"The delay in the announcement of the results plus the shortcomings mentioned above resulted in gross mismanagement of the tally-

ing process and declaration of the presidential results."

It further said: "The ECK chairman displayed incompetence and weakness in the final management of the electoral process."

Those ECK officials found to have abused their office the report says "should be investigated and be held accountable."

The report also observes that during the pre-voting day, there was a "pervasive atmosphere of suspicion of possible vote rigging."

During the voting day, the mission noted that small and crowded classrooms were used as voting stations compromising voter secrecy, adding that lack of a time frame within which election results were to be announced caused anxiety, tension and speculation.

Meanwhile, the EA secretary-general Juma Volta Mwapachu has distanced himself from the report, which was earlier announced as an EAC observer report.

He told *The EastAfrican* that the EAC Secretariat seconded two staffers, Flora Musonda and Owora Othieno, as administrative supporting staff to the EALA delegation.

"The EAC is not a signatory to the report... We are only public servants and are not supposed to take political positions," he said.

According to EALA speaker Abdirahin Haithar Abdi, the work of the assembly is set to begin now that the full House has been constituted

EALA members tipped on House practice, role

By GITONGA MARETE
Special Correspondent

After months of uncertainty, the East African Legislative Assembly is now set to start functioning again.

EALA Speaker Abdirahin Haithar Abdi said the full House has been constituted, with all standing committees having been given their respective mandates. He was speaking at a seminar for new members of the Assembly in Mombasa.

Mr Abdi told the legislators that the functional relationship between the organs of the EAC should be clearly defined and understood by each organ.

The seminar focused on the roles and functions of parliament; the status, role and functions of members of regional parliaments; points of order; adjournments; decorum and etiquette among other issues. The five-day seminar that ended last Friday was sponsored by European Parliamentarians for Africa.

"As members representing the people of East Africa, you have a duty to acquaint yourselves with the rules of procedure of this legislature, if you are to accomplish your responsibility," chief guest Paudu Ametir Kisebe, Speaker of the Zanzibar House of Representatives, said in his opening remarks.

He stressed that the interest of the public in the member states was to attain sustainable growth and development, as well as widen and

deepen co-operation among partner states for the benefit of the people.

The second induction programme will be tailored for the committee chairpersons so as to equip them with the skills to steer committees towards producing tangible results.

Mr Abdi said after the induction programmes, EALA members would be taken on familiarisation tours of partner states that will be conducted annually.

"The tours are expected to acquaint members of the assembly with the knowledge and understanding of the conditions and needs of the people of East Africa to be able to adequately represent them," he added.

One of the stumbling blocks for the economic partnership among the three countries has been the fear by Tanzania and Uganda that Kenya, with a more vibrant economy, will strangle them economically.

However, according to John Kosch, Kenya's Minister for the East African Community, this suspicion could be allayed if appropriate laws are put in place. He said political integration within the bloc can be achieved easily if laws governing different aspects of integration are put in place.

"The building blocks of the East African integration process are the Customs Union, the Common Market, the Monetary Union and ultimately Political Federation," he said.



Margaret Zziwa (left) from Uganda chats with Lydia Wanyoto (centre) also from Uganda and Janet Minari from Tanzania at the workshop. Picture: Gideon Maundu

Mr Kosch appealed to EALA members to come up with laws that will dispel these fears among members of the community thus creating confidence in the integration, especially with the amendment of the treaty to accommodate Rwanda and Burundi.

"We should not be tied down by fear but rather have the courage to forge ahead in strengthening the integration of East Africa," he said.

"Issues such as land may be thorny, but this can be handled effectively by enacting laws to protect the interests of those concerned."

He pointed out that, according to a recent report by the National Consultative Committee of member states, over 70 per cent of citizens of the three member states had supported a political federation.

"As members of EALA drawn from all parts of the region, you

have a cardinal role in promoting integration of East Africa for the benefit of the people," he added.

He pointed out that the seminar would prepare legislators to effectively and efficiently participate in parliamentary business, especially in regard to Bills expected to be tabled, including the Lake Victoria Transport Bill and the Bill seeking the amendment of the EAC Customs Management.

Annex 6. Copy of the EALA Work Plan (June 2007–June 2008) Under ACBF Grant

Activity	Objective	Expected outputs in 4 year period	Contribution by ACBF (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (Euro)	Name of co-financier/ donor	Timing
1. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT TO EALA							
Joint meeting, EALA & ACBF	To learn and understand the ACBF operational guidelines	Clear understanding of ACBF procedures and reporting requirements.	6,760				Apr-07
Purchase materials and equipment for EALA & the Project	To provide Institutional support for EALA	Efficient and effective support to delivery of EALA mandate	62,600				June – August 2007
Reference: books, journals and newspapers purchased	To improve the abilities of EALA Members and Staff to perform their functions	Efficient and effective support to delivery of EALA mandate	14,950				Ongoing
Establishment of EAPI	An Institution to train both MPs and Staffers in the region on Technical Parliamentary skills	Contribution for start up costs of EAPI in first year	100,000				October – December 2007
Recruitment Program Coordinator	To coordinate project operations	EALA Project management capacity strengthened	40,000	20,000		EAC	Mar-07
Recruitment Program Assistant	To assist in project management	EALA Project management capacity strengthened	15,000	7,500		EAC	August – October 2007
Recruitment 2 short term Research Assistants	Improved capacity of support staff to service the EALA and its Members	Research capacity of EALA improved	24,000				August – October 2007
EALA Strategic Plan review & systems improvement (consultancy)	Efficient and effective support to delivery of EALA mandate	EALA program monitored better.	20,000				
External Audit		EALA Accountability strengthened.	5,000				30 th June 2008
Quarterly reports		EALA Accountability strengthened					July – September 2007.
							October –

Activity	Objective	Expected outputs in 4 year period	Contribution by ACBF (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (Euro)	Name of co-financier/ donor	Timing
							December 2007
							January – March 2008
							April – June 2008
Annual Report		EALA Accountability strengthened	4,000	500			Jun-08
Sub Total			292,310	28,000	0		
2. STAFF DEVELOPMENT							
Professional Staff training & Development	Technical parliamentary skills of EALA Staffers improved.		96,000				2 Members of staff trained in plan period
Professional staff networking	Specialized supportive skills of staff to serve the EALA developed		48,000				Ongoing within plan period
Sub Total			144,000	0	0		
3. RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION							
Research repackaging and production	Data and information made available to EALA members	A well functioning Research Unit established	10,000				Ongoing in plan period
Policy briefs, and Information sheets produced	Timely information dissemination improved	Lake Victoria Commission Management Bill passed. Lake Victoria Transport Bill passed.	8,000				Ongoing in plan period
		The Inter University of East Africa bill passed					
Sub Total			18,000	0	0		
4. EALA MEMBERS TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT							

Activity	Objective	Expected outputs in 4 year period	Contribution by ACBF (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (Euro)	Name of co-financier/ donor	Timing
Orientation or induction workshop for EALA members on their roles	Improve the EALA Members Knowledge of EALA rules and Procedure Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	To improve technical parliamentary skills in order to better fulfill their roles as Members of EALA	40,250		60,000	AWEPA	Aug-07
Seminar for Committee Chairpersons, Chairpersons of Liaison Committees	Improve capacity of Chairpersons to manage meetings/ business of the Assembly	6 Committees strengthened	40,250		20,000	AWEPA	Sep-07
Knowledge based thematic workshops (6 EALA committees)	To improve the technical parliamentary skills of members so as to better fulfill their legislative and oversight functions.	32 MPs trained in 4 basic workshops and in 4 applied topic workshops during the 4 year period.	40,250		285,000	AWEPA	One workshop per quarter.
		8 training modules developed and produced for MPs					April – June 2008
Sub Total			120,750	0	365,000		
5. EALA MEMBERS NETWORKING WITH NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND CONTINENTAL PARLIAMENTS							
One Inter-Parliamentary Consultative forum (Nanyuki series)	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	4 Inter-parliamentary fora/seminars held between EALA MPs and MPs of National Assemblies with at least 100 participants	60,000		100,000	AWEPA	October – December 2007.
Knowledge base fora for EALA Members			40,000	-			January – June 2008

Activity	Objective	Expected outputs in 4 year period	Contribution by ACBF (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (Euro)	Name of co-financier/ donor	Timing
Networking visits to other regional and Parliamentary Institutions (EU, IPU, ACP/EU, ECOWAS, SADC-PF, PAP)	To Strengthen mutual learning, information exchange and interface with other regional parliaments	Reinforce regional ties and communication on parliamentary level	40,000		70,000	AWEPA	January – June 2008
Sub Total			140,000		170,000		
6. COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH							
TV broadcasts, coverage and publicity	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	12 TV broadcasts on EALA Proceedings	30,000				January – June 2008
Live broadband equipment					65,000	AWEPA	
Radio broadcasts, coverage and publicity.	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	12 Radio debates and broadcasts on EALA Proceedings, roles and functions.	15,000				June – August 2007
							September – December 2007
							January – June 2008
Electronic information communication channels and publications	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	Enhanced utilization & maintenance of EALA electronic Network information & communication channels like internet, & interactive discussion fora.	10,000	7,500		EAC	January – June 2008
Production and dissemination of EALA Newsletter.	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	16 newsletters	12,000	-			January – June 2008
Legislative Briefs and reports to National	To increase the interface between	28 publications (4 annual reports, 16 newsletters and	17,000				Dec-07

Activity	Objective	Expected outputs in 4 year period	Contribution by ACBF (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (USD)	Contribution by other co-financiers/ donors (Euro)	Name of co-financier/ donor	Timing
Assemblies of Partner States	EALA members and the National Parliaments	8 legislative reports)					Mar-08 Jun-08
EALA networking with national civil society organizations (national Public forum series)	Strengthen interface of EALA and Partner States	12 National Public Fora held in the three Partner States with at least 50 participants.	19,000				Jul-07 Sep-07 January – June 2008
Sub Total			103,000	7,500	65,000		
Annual Total			818,060	35,500	600,000		June 2007- June 2008

Annex 7. Sample Cost Breakdown for Five Programme Activities

SIDA EALA 2007, VARIOUS SPECIFICATIONS

Travel costs 2007 activities

62701 of total project costs 376000 = 16.6% (total travel costs in 2007 for EALA activities)
Approximately 12% of 62701 is AWEPA staff travel costs (or 2% of the total project costs)

TZEA1003TZ	Staff Training Advanced Computer Courses, April	Basic costs	Name	Hours	Rate/hour	Amount	Specific costs	Name	Unit	No	Rate/day	Amount	Total
	Coordination Costs	1505	Thiongo	16	55	880	0						1,505
			Ruth	4	35	140							
			Marion	1	65	65							
			J-N Scholten	4	105	420							
	Research / Experts / Fees	0						L Baas	Days	4	296.5	1186	4,183
								Course fee	Persons	4	749	2996	
	Facilities / Direct other Cost	560	Ruth	16	35	560	0						560
	Accommodation / Food Costs	0						Per diem 4 persons	Days	20	60	4794	4,794
	Travel Costs	0						577 4 persons	Tickets	4	144.25	577	577
	Public / Document / Materials	1120	Marianne	16	70	1120	0						1,120
	Administration and Accounting	2051	Peninah	24	35	840	0						2,051
			Marianne	12	70	840							
			Amsterdam	5.3	70	371							
Total		5236 35%					9553 65%						14,789 100%

TZE/1302/UG	Committee on Legal, Rules & Privileges			Basic costs			Specific costs			Unit			No			Rate/ day			Amount			Total		
	Design Costs			1760			Thiongo			32			55			1760			1,760					
	Coordination Costs			880			Thiongo			16			55			880						880		
	Research / Experts / Fees																							
	Facilities / Direct other Cost/ Accomodation / Food Costs/ Travel			801			Ruth Peninah			8 15			35 35			280 525								
	Administration and Accounting			2551			Ruth Peninah Amsterdam			32 32 4.5			35 35 70			1120 1120 315								
Total				5992 48%												6422 52%						12,414 100%		
TZEA/0201/RW	Visit to Rwanda and Burundi			Basic costs																				
	Design Costs			3800			Thiongo Marianne Jocelyne Angelina Nicolas			36 16 6 8 2			55 70 45 35 75			1980 1120 270 280 150								
	Coordination Costs			3280			Thiongo Marianne Angelina			24 24 8			55 70 35			1320 1680 280								

Research / Experts / Fees	Facilities / Direct other Cost	1120	Soferi Beata	16	25	400	296	L Baas	Days	1	296	296	
				16	45	720		7 Telephone				7 1,127	
	Accomodation / Food Costs	2200	Peninah Beata	32	35	1120	10894	15 Food/acc	Days	5	122.5	9190 13,094	
				24	45	1080		13 Per diem	Days	5	26.2	1704	
	Travel costs	280	Ruth	8	35	280	8123	Transport	People	13	625	8123 8,403	
	Public / Document / Materials	2850	Thiongo Marianne Angelina	20	55	1100	135	Copies				135 2,985	
				24	70	1680							
				2	35	70							
	Administration and Accounting	3935	Ruth Peninah Angelina	56	35	1960							3,935
				28	35	980							
				2	35	70							
Total		17465 47%	Amsterdam	13	70	910	19455 53%					36,919 100%	
TZEA1401KE	Observation mission of the Kenya General Elections	Basic costs	Name	Hours	Rate/hour	Amount	Specific costs	Name	Unit	No	Rate/ day	Amount	Total
	Design Costs	980	Zoe Marianne	6	70	420							980
				8	70	560							
	Research / Experts / Fees							900 L Baas	Days	3	300		900
	Accomodation / Food Costs							11195 10 per diem	Days	10	112	11195	11,195
	Travel Costs							6785 10 people	Days	10		6785	6,785

Public / Document / Materials	1000	Thiongo	8	55	440	1,000				
		Marianne	8	70	560					
Administration and Accounting	1400	Ruth	24	35	840	1,400				
		Peninah	16	35	560					
Total	3380 15%				18880 85%	22,259 100%				
TZPB1810	Basic costs		Specific costs		Unit	No	Rate/ day	Amount	Total	
Coordinations costs	4080	Name	Hours	Rate/hour	Amount				4080	
		Ruth	16	30	480					
		Peninah	32	30	960					
		Marianne	16	65	1040					
		J-N Scholten	16	100	1600					
Research / Experts / Fees	1240	Thiongo	4	50	200	Days	1	253	253	1240
		Marianne	16	65	1040					
Facilities / Direct other Cost/ Public / Document / Materials	520	Ruth	8	30	240					8309
		Tatjana	4	70	280	14059	Printing	14059	14059	6522
Administration and Accounting	720	Peninah	24	30	720					720
	6560 31%					14312 69%			20871 100%	

Annex 8. The EALA Women's Forum

Introduction:

The East African Legislative Assembly was established in 2001 as mandated by Articles 9 and 48 of the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community (EAC Treaty). The first Assembly constituted 32 members (elected and ex officio) 9 of whom were women. It's worth noting that none of the 5 ex officio members were women and this trend continues to date. The Second Assembly started with 10 women and the number is expected to rise when Members of Parliament from Rwanda and Burundi come on board.

The EAC Treaty, under Article 121 underscores the EAC's commitment to enhancing the role of women in socio economic development by;

- promoting empowerment of women through increased participation in decision making,
- abolition of legislation and customs that discriminate against women,
- promote effective education awareness programmes aimed at changing negative attitudes towards women,
- creation and adoption of technologies which ensure stability of employment and professional progress for women workers and
- Take such other measures that shall eliminate prejudices against women and promote gender equality.

Likewise The EAC Treaty recognizes the importance of women as a vital economic link between agriculture, industry and trade as articulated in 122. Under this, the Partner States undertake to;

- increase the participation of women in policy formulation and implementation,
- promote special entrepreneurial programmes for women,
- eliminate all laws, regulations and practices that hinder women's access to financial assistance,
- initiate changes in educational and training strategies including vocational and on-the-job training schemes and
- Support national and regional associations of women in business.

The idea of a Women's parliamentary forum in EALA was mooted during the First Assembly. The Second Assembly actualized this through the establishment of the EALA Women's Forum (EALA-WF). This Forum has been in existence since October 2007.

Objectives of EALA-WF:

1. To facilitate networking of all women parliamentary forums in the region, and provide linkages with similar fora in the continent and international levels.
2. To coordinate and support the national women parliamentary forums via the East African Women Parliamentary Forum (EAWPF) in line with Article 65 of the EAC Treaty and provide space where issues that pertain to women are deliberated and acted upon.
3. To provide an advocacy role on the women's agenda on all the phases of the EAC integration process through informed research.
4. To mainstream women's rights issues in all legislative processes.
5. To groom, empower, nurture and provide mentoring services to increase women's participation in leadership/politics.
6. To build the capacity of women members of parliament in EALA in various fields.
7. Initiate and support development initiatives to serve the interests of East African Women in Region
8. Bring unity amongst EALA women parliamentarians and lobby for support from other parliamentarians in progressing the women's agenda.

Activities:

- Establish an office for the forum- Administrator/ researcher/lobbyist, office space, equipment.
- Work towards achievement of the MDGs through initiation and support to programmes and activities that promote the welfare of women such as health, education, entrepreneurship, leadership, peace building & conflict resolution, women's rights, good governance and mitigation of the impact of HIV/AIDS on women amongst others.
- Establish a mechanism for interface with women members of staff of the EAC
- Exchange visits and study tours within the region.
- Regional conferences and meetings for women parliamentarians in the region.
- Initiate/create an interactive website for exchange of information.
- Identify and interface with stakeholders – CSOs, donors, role models.
- Retreat to map strategies for mapping way forward.
- Establishment of hallmarks and models in form of innovative initiatives such as; trade centers for poverty alleviation.

	Activity	Budget	Period
1.	Office establishment office space	6, 000	By end of March 2008
	Equipment- computer, color printer/scanner, copier, fax machine, LCD projector & screen, telephone.	12, 000	
	stationery- toners, paper, letterheads	5, 000	
	furniture- 20 chairs, 3 tables, 2 shelves/cabinets, safe	10, 000	
	administrator/lobbyist	18, 000	
	Establish interactive website	1, 500	
	internet connection	3, 600	
	Sub total office establishment	56, 100	
2.	Meetings: Briefing for EALA members- launch of EALA WF Meeting with EAC female staff members- 60 pax (tea, publicity, space hire and administration) Meetings for EALA WF • Executives- travel economy class (10 pax* 12 months*600USD) • All members (during parliamentary sessions)	72, 000 - 76, 500	By end Feb 2008 By end May • Monthly • Every session
3.	Sub total meetings Retreat for EALA –WF Travel -25 pax*USD 600 Full board hotel accommodation- 25 pax*165 USD*2days Out of pocket- 25 pax*25 USD*2days Stationery Facilitator- USD 300* 4days (inclusive of preps &report production)	15, 000 8, 250 1, 250 500 1, 200 26, 200	
4.	Sub total Retreat Interface with existing networks (CSOS & Women leaders) within the region • ACCESS (Contact persons-Happiness, Harriet) • CEEWA-	Through forum's office	By Nov 2008
5.	Interface with all executives of women parliamentary forums in the region Travel- 35pax*600 USD	21, 000	By June 2008

6.	Full board hotel accommodation- 35 pax* 165 USD* 2 days	11, 500	
	Out of pocket- 35 pax*25USD* 2 days (inclusive of traveling day)	1, 750	
	Sub total Linkages	34,250	
	Advocacy Production of IEC/advocacy materials	5, 000	Continuous
7.	Media advocacy	10, 000	Continuous
	Sub total advocacy	15, 000	
	Regional meeting for 120 (20 from each forum)Women MPS (launch EAWPF forum) Travel-120pax*600 USD	72, 000	By October 2008
	Full board hotel accommodation 120 pax*165USD	19, 800	
	Out of pocket 120 pax * 25 USD	3,000	
	Facilitation-2 pax *250* 4days	2, 000	
	Rapporteur- 1pax*300USD* 2 days	600	
	Media- 5000USD* 1 day	5, 000	
	Stationery (toner paper, flip charts)	1, 000	
	Administration costs- space, identification, communications, local transport	5, 000	
	Contingencies	5, 000	
	Sub total Regional conference	113, 400	
TOTAL		321, 450	

Recent Sida Evaluations

2008:40 Study of the International Organization for Migration and its Humanitarian Assistance

Anders Olin, Lars Florin, Björn Bengtsson
Sida

2008:41 Uri Hydro-Electric Project, India: Evaluation of the Swedish Support

Mike J. McWilliams, L.V. Kumar, A.S. Wain, C. Bhat
Sida

2008:42 What is SwedBio and what does Sida want to do with it? An external evaluation of the Sida-supported Swedish International Biodiversity Programme 2003–2007

Thorsten Celander, Anders Fahlén
Sida

2008:43 The TASO Experiential Attachment to Combat HIV/AIDS Project (TEACH). Final Evaluation Report

Denis Okello Atwaru
Sida

2008:44 Kampala City Council – A Project for Promoting Ecological Sanitation in Kampala, Uganda. Final Evaluation Report

John Carlsen, Jens Vad, Simon Peter Otoi
Sida

2008:45 The Strengthening Environmental Management and Land Administration Programme in Vietnam

Henny Andersen, Bach Tan Sinh, Dao Ngoc Nga, Mike Daplyn, Paul Schuttenbelt, Tommy Österberg
Sida

2008:46 Asistencia Técnica al Régimen Electoral Guatemalteco

Francesca Jessup, Elisabeth Hayek, Roger Hällhag
Sida

2008:47 Programa Acceso a Justicia Guatemala

Kimberly Inksater, Carlos Hugo Laruta, Jorge Enrique Torres
Sida

2008:48 Lessons Learnt from the Integrated Rural Development Programme (ALKA) and the Albanian Macedonia People's Empowerment Programme (AMPEP)

Cvetko Smilevski, Lars-Erik Birgergård
Sida

2008:49 Sida's Support to UNDP in Sierra Leone

Laurence Sewell, Ceinwen Giles
Sida

2008:50 Assessment of Sida Support through UNDP to Liberia Recovery and Rehabilitation

Hans Eriksson
Sida

2008:51 The Civic Education Network Trust (CIVNET) in Zimbabwe

Dren Nupen
Sida

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 43
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>