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# List of Acronyms

CBO Community Based Organisation

CDCRM Community Disaster & Climate Risk Management Programme

CEO Chief Executive Officer

CSO Civil Society Organisation (inclusive of CBOs and NGOs)

CSSP Civil Society Support Programme

EOPR End of Project Review (CSSP review with Project committee)

EU European Union

GoS Government of Samoa

ICCAI AusAID Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI) funds

MTR Mid Term Review

MWCSD Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development

NGO Non Government Organisation

PMU Programme Management Unit

PWD People with Disabilities

SUNGO Samoa Umbrella Organisation for NGOs

**Further Note:** A Round in CSSP terminology is a financial year within the period of the overall funding agreement. CSSP is currently in its third round (Round 3) which is from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013.

# BACKGROUND

CSSP’s overall purpose is to deliver sustainable social and economic benefits to the people of Samoa through strengthened CSOs. It seeks to achieve measurable social and economic benefits from well managed projects, where CSOs play a more active role in national and community affairs. To facilitate support to CSOs, CSSP provides a single point of contact and a common application and reporting requirement. It also provides for CSO capacity building in project and organizational management and in proposal writing. Most of the capacity building is through a contract to the Samoa Umbrella of Non Government Organizations (SUNGO) which has had a good track record of support to civil society organizations. Other technical assistance is provided grantees to improve the implementation of their projects and to help make their impact more lasting and sustainable. CSSP sponsors forums and meetings throughout the year for information exchange among community organizations on their projects and best practices. CSSP also implements projects to achieve national initiatives through special *ring fenced* funds. An example is the AusAID Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI) funds for water harvesting activities to achieve Samoa’s MDG targets for safe water for vulnerable families and communities.

The four key objectives of CSSP are:

* **Objective 1:** Tangible and sustainable social and economic benefits meeting the needs of vulnerable groups in Samoa.
* **Objective 2:** Well governed CSOs with more capacity to manage developmental programmes and projects on a sustainable basis.
* **Objective 3:** Strengthened voice of civil society organizations to effectively influence national policy
* **Objective 4:** Efficient and effective programme management.

# A SUMMARY OF KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

* Four (4) out of eight Category 3 full applications under consideration were recommended to European Union for final approval. Twenty-five (25) approved Category 2 community projects are in the beginning stages of implementation.
* A Mid-Term Review by EU and AusAID reviewers found CSSP to be doing well in its service delivery (processing applications, monitoring, reporting on contract compliance, and documentation) but weak in the assessment of impact of projects. An implementation plan to progress 39 of 40 approved MTR recommendations is in place.
* A technical assistance (TA) consultancy to address weaknesses in CSSP systems was completed in early February and included a staff retreat. Staff developed new procedures to reduce bottlenecks and streamline processes. The TA also produced a revised Monitoring and Evaluation framework and a new approach to assessing vulnerable applicants more objectively. A follow-up report in May by the consultant indicated good progress by the Programme Management Unit in implementing changes. Recent staff performance assessments have also confirmed positive results in performance factors, motivation and retention.
* The CSSP proposal for AusAID Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI) funds was approved and funds transferred to CSSP. CSSP has contracted Samoa Red Cross Society (SRCS) to provide capacity building assistance for an estimated 500 households and 50 villages over the next 20 months. The project is very challenging and will require close monitoring by all parties. See appendix
* Through its implementation of ICCAI funded projects for clean water, CSSP will be contributing to two national initiatives - (1) Samoa’s MDG Initiative targets for clean water for vulnerable families; and (2) Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan (NAP) 2011-2016 through the Community Disaster & Climate Risk Management Programme (CDCRM).
* The 2nd EU replenishment audit took place in this period and auditors reported few minor findings and significant improvement in support documentation.
* Ten Project Design courses for CBOs were implemented by SUNGO in financial year for 241 participants from approximately 70 organisations. Results of the PDM training evaluations showed improvement in knowledge and skills and the tracer study confirmed sustained results in communities.
* Six more NGOs started the self assessment process in this period bringing the total to 12 for the year. Of these 6 have draft action plans to improve and strengthen governance, management and stakeholder relations. Participating NGOs are very satisfied with the process to date. SUNGO and CSSP will continue to do follow-up monitoring on their action plans.
* Contracts were given to three civil society research groups (NGOs and independent researchers). All are on track for completion by September 2013. Two progress reports have been submitted .
* Only one additional project terminated early in this reporting period bringing the total to 10 or 3% of all projects approved to date.
* Projects designed and managed by women or whose beneficiaries are women and children continue to dominate approvals by CSSP. Over half ()of all CSSP funds benefit vulnerable groups directly (women, youth, people with disabilities, elderly) while the remaining 47% goes to general community projects (benefits to all).

# ACTIVITY OUTPUTS

## OBJECTIVE 1: Tangible and sustainable CSO projects:

1. The table below gives totals for all applications by round and decision. Table 1 last column provides total approved funds for Round 3 applicants (Category 1, Category 2, Category 3) to date.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Decisions on all applications by Round** | | | | | | **Round 3 (2012-2013) separately** | | | | | |
| **Decisions** | **Round 1-3**  **Applications** | | | **Total No. Applications** |  | | **Round 3**  **No. of applications** | | **Round 3 – SAT ($)**  **$ approved, provisionally approved, reserved** | | |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **All rounds** |  | | **1st 6 months** | **2nd 6 months** | **1st 6 months** | **2nd 6 months** | **Total $** |
| Declined | 97 | 303 | 181 | 581 |  | | 90 | 91 | - | - | - |
| Funded | 57 | 111 | 91 | 259 |  | | 22 | 69 | 462,363 | 2,447,346 | 2,909,709 |
| Provisional Approval\* |  |  | 4 | 4 |  | | 60\*\*\* | 4 | - | 1,197,826 | 1,197,826 |
| Reserved \*\* |  | 9 | 84 | 93 |  | | 54 | 30 | - | 4,457,190 | 4,457,190 |
| **Grand Total** | **154** | **423** | **360** | **933** |  | | **226** | **194** | **462,363** | **8,102,362** | **8564725** |

\*Category 3 funding: 4 projects waiting final approval from EU

\*\* reserved 81 water tanks (ICCAI funds) for households and community shelters & 3 spring water projects.

\*\*\*these mostly Category 1 projects were decided in the 2nd 6 months (January to June 2013).

1. Status update on all CSSP Projects approved and implemented as of 30 June 2013.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Status of all CSSP Projects Funded as at 30 June 2013 for Rounds 1 , 2, & 3** | | | |
| **Status of projects** | **Number** | **%** | Comments |
| Completed | 69 | 27% | The majority of completed projects achieved a satisfactory to excellent rating (between 3-4) on their end of project review (EOPR) score sheet. |
| EOPR required | 76 | 29% | EOPRs have tended to lag behind due to the amount of work to secure, assess and select applicants. There was more focus on EOPRs in the later part of this period. |
| In progress | 51 | 20% | Projects are on track as per their project plan and implementation schedule. |
| In progress - delays | 19 | 7% | Most delays are caused by lack of progress reports from approved applicants and delays in the availability of materials |
| Terminated early | 10 | 4% | Reasons include land not secured, governance issues, no 10%, other. |
| **Grand Total** | **260** | 100% |  |

1. **Graphs and Tables as of 30 June 2013 for all approved applications:** See also Annex V.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **VULNERABLE GROUPS BY FUNDING AMOUNTS** | | | |  | **Grand Total** |
| **Children 0 -18** | **Youth** | **Women** | **PWD** | **Community** |
| Climate change |  |  |  |  | 270,000 | 270,000 |
| Crafts |  |  |  |  | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Culture / traditions |  | 10,000 |  |  | 70,000 | 80,000 |
| Disaster Preparedness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education Bldg | 1,495,692 |  |  |  |  | 1,495,692 |
| Education Other | 599,169 |  |  |  |  | 599,169 |
| Education Resource Centre | 203,165 |  |  |  |  | 203,165 |
| Farming |  |  |  |  | 516,736 | 516,736 |
| Fishing |  | 42,000 |  |  | 156,829 | 198,829 |
| Garden |  | 16,580 | 9,648 |  | 98,366 | 124,594 |
| Health services |  |  |  |  | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| Income generation |  | 30,000 | 94,559 |  | 97,600 | 222,159 |
| NGO Support |  |  | 26,250 | 300,000 | 380,000 | 706,250 |
| Other |  | 54,727 | 65,718 |  | 281,834 | 402,279 |
| Pre-school building | 548,070 |  |  |  |  | 548,070 |
| Research |  | 41,200 |  |  |  | 41,200 |
| Sanitation | 51,000 |  |  |  | 250,438 | 301,438 |
| Security fence | 245,002 |  |  |  | 30,000 | 275,002 |
| Social services | 50,000 |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |
| Sports |  | 276,000 |  |  |  | 276,000 |
| Training |  | 65,730 | 38,292 |  |  | 104,022 |
| Water source |  |  |  |  | 167,248 | 167,248 |
| Water tanks |  |  |  |  | 1,520,099 | 1,520,099 |
| Wom Cttee house |  |  | 603,963 |  |  | 603,963 |
| **Grand Total** | **3,192,098** | **536,237** | **838,430** | **300,000** | **4,339,151** | **9,205,916** |
| **%** | **35%** | **6%** | **9%** | **3%** | **47%** | **100%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTOR** | **Sum of CSSP $ Approved** |
| Agr | 799,793 |
| Com Dev | 2,589,452 |
| Edu | 3,374,415 |
| Hlth | 810,133 |
| Justice | 50,000 |
| Water | 1,625,777 |
| **Grand Total** | **9,249,571** |

## OBJECTIVE 2 (CSO Capacity building)

CSSP provides capacity building support to civil society organizations through SUNGO. In addition to a grant to support SUNGO in achieving its objectives against its Strategic Plan, SUNGO also tendered to conduct 10 Project Design and Management workshops for civil society organisations applying to CSSP. Table 5 below provides a summary report on SUNGO’s activities against their M&E targets.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5: SUNGO capacity building to Samoa Civil Society Organizations  **SUNGO VISION: Samoa has a competent and confident civil society sector that promotes sustainable development and quality of life for the people of Samoa** | | | | |
| **SUNGO activities** | | **Description of Activity** | **Targets against SUNGO M&E framework[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Outputs to date.** |
| 1 | **CSO information & liaison**  *SUNGO fosters a well informed CSO sector through communications & services.* | Communications, promotion and information dissemination, (including website/newsletters/promotional materials), and data collection.  **Achieves SUNGO**  **M&E No. 2** | (1)65% of stakeholder respondents rate SUNGO communication as “good” or “very good” on a five-point scale. Target **nearly achieved (60%)**  (2) 5% increase in financial membership annual subscription ; **Target Achieved.**  (3) 5% Increases in new members ; 65% of members’ details up to date. **Target achieved.** | (1)Survey of 40 respondents show a majority of satisfactory & high satisfactory rating in the following areas: 60% for overall satisfaction with SUNGO; 30% for how well SUNGO communicates with CSOs and 60% feel they get useful information. ***Nearly achieved targets overall. Need to explore ways to improve communications with CSOs.***  (2) 18 new organisations applied for membership in the financial year bringing the final total to 138 organisations (64% are CBOs & the balance are NGOs including two registered trusts). ***Achieved the M&E targets for increase in financial membership subscriptions .***  (3) Member organisation profile: (13% NGOs in social services; 12% community development; 9% agriculture; women, youth & education are the balance. |
| 2 | **CSO Support & Admin**  *SUNGO is recognized as a well managed organisation…* | Includes maintaining office, meeting and training space for CSOs,equipment, staff costs (7staff), vehicle maintenance, insurance, office supplies,volunteers.  **Achieves SUNGO**  **M&E No. 1** | (1)65% of respondents (inc. members and stakeholders) rate SUNGO’s performance as “good” (4) or “very good” (5) on a five-point scale **Nearly achieved (60%)**  (2)Unqualified audited accounts. **Achieved.**  (3) All staff are satisfied with communication and training opportunities. **Insufficent data.**  (4) Contracts sufficient to meet financial target for year Fundraising target met. **Achieved.** | (1)Survey of 40 respondents show a majority of satisfactory & high satisfactory rating in the following areas: 63% rating for how well SUNGO is run  (2) SUNGO has also received an unqualified audit.  Change in management with a new CEO (Mr. Taviuni Fonoti) to replace Roina Vavatau.SUNGO has 9 full time staff & one volunteer.  Challenges: Recruiting CSO information and liaison staff was challenging. To high skill set for low salary. Only 1 newsletter released & 6 press releases & two banners printed.  (3) Target 3 – appears that staff retention has been difficult to achieve due to the pull factor of staff, once up-skilled, are attracted to public and private sector higher paying opportunities.  (4) Contracts provide bulk of SUNGO operating funds. CSSP provided SUNGO with a grant to cover most of its operating expenses and SUNGO additionally received a contract to implement 10 Project Management workshops. |
| 3 | **CSO policy dialogue, advocacy & research**  *SUNGO member organisations’ needs & concerns are addressed at a national level; effective research* | Includes coordination with CSOs, preparation and submission of reports, SUNGO & stakeholder meeting venues resources and supplies, and logistics. Inclusive of all public forums.  **SUNGO M&E No 4 & No 5** | Two advocacy courses offered**. Not achieved**.  High level of engagement of civil society members in consultation with government. **Achieved.**  Effective research. **Good progress.** | (1) No advocacy courses offered.  (2) Engagement of SUNGO EC/CEO in consultation with government:  -SUNGO AGM held 29 May 2013. Constitution reviewed & amended. New EC included 43 financial member organisations voted in by 43 financial member organisations (63 members). EC retreat followed to review the Strategic Annual Plan & workplan.  -211 mtgs (engaging SUNGO reps) held in the financial year mostly with Ministries & SC (49%), donor mtgs & reviews (19%), CSSP (12%)  - SUNGO now a part of all National Sector Cttees & advisory bodies except for Health, sits on 3 donor funding programmes & is the designated chair for one (GEF). Selected by IWRAW to provide a shadow repor to 52nd UN CEDAW Hearing in NY. Comments from public officials present indicate an influence of the report for 52 concluding comments for implementation by the SGov over the next 5 years. SUNGO now on the CEDAW partnership coordinated by the MWCSD.  - 2 CSO forums held in financial period (10% Women in Parliament amendment; views for the upcoming SIDS conference. SUNGO view that minimal timeframe is provided for public integration of ideas and views due to short notices from Government & SUNGO Thematic Group leaders filter information to members too late for consultation.  (3) VITA volunteer funded by AusAID to set up the research unit. UNDP has funded a Social accountability research on the 4 MDG Goals Samoa was weakest on. Need for a fulltime local counter-part was needed and agreed to with CSSP. 1st phase of the Accountability Research is complete (262 questionnaires completed. |
| 4 | **SUNGO contract – CSO Institution strengthening**  *SUNGO CSOs embowered to provide quality services to their communities* | All logistical and follow-up support for CSO training and mentoring workshops. Includes implementing NGO assessments and NGO follow-up by SUNGO trainers and NGO coordinator.  **SUNGO M&E 3** | 60% of top 3 priorities identified CSO training needs met .  At least 90% of registered trainers complete CAT training . **Achieved.**  60% of those identifying in TNA attend courses. **Achieved.**  100% courses submitted and SQA accredited **. Good progress. Nearly achieved.**  85% rate ability to use information as “good” (4) or “very good” **(Need data)**  NGO Assessment tool tested and applied . **Achieved.** | -44% increase in number of training participants due largely to the CSSP support for CBO project management courses for CBOs. SUNGO has recently granted recognition by the Samoa Qualifications Authority under its Non Formal Learning Recognition and Accreditation.  *Main reason for increased registration for SUNGO courses (241) were high demand for project mgt skills, accessibility at district levels & no fees chared; lower participation for ICTP courses (206) due to focus on struggling NGOs lacking staff and distance travelled.UNDP (22 participants) is a gender course.*  -54% of CBOs trained (135/225)  -46% of NGOs trained (90/225)  -3 training providers: SICTP (54% of courses), SUNGO (42% of courses), UNDP (4% of courses).  -By gender, more females (65%) attend all courses then males (35%). There is increasing participation by men however in the SUNGO courses offered for community based organisations.  -97% of all participants met the course objectives for pre & post tests.  NGO Assessment tool has been fully tested and applied successfully. See Section IV (iii) NGO Assessment Target – in this report.[[2]](#footnote-2) |
|  | Project Mgt workshops(Savaii/Upolu) | All preparations, revisions of lesson plans, logistics, training of trainers, implementation, mentoring of 10 approved applicants and a tracer study. | 75% CSOs have improved systems **(Need data)** | CSSP contract to SUNGO for Project Management courses resulted in 100 community organisations (241 people) participating in 10 (one week long) workshops. A tracer study was also completed and showed that applicants have applied their learning. Only remaining work to be done is the completion of SUNGO mentoring |

## OBJECTIVE 3 (CSO advocacy)

***Advocacy Survey:*** A survey was conducted by CSSP in May and June 2013 to gauge from NGOs what advocacy activities of the Government of Samoa or international bodies they were involved in. Survey forms were sent to 10 currently active NGOs. Seven forms were returned. This first survey will provide a baseline for future surveys to assist CSSP and SUNGO to assess whether or not CSOs engage freely in public debate on development and are active in advocating for national and civil society issues. A compilation of the survey is provided in Annex V. While the sample is small, the survey represents an estimated 20% of the national NGOs in the country. CSSP provides some *cautious* assumptions from the results (1-4) below.

1. Decision-making representation of NGOs on Government Committees and Boards is limited and is mostly in the areas of health and education. Decision-making representation in the Pacific Region and International committees and boards is also limited and is mostly participation is as registered international members and in the areas of health and environment.
2. Four of the NGOs participating in the survey had some form of training in advocacy. All seven NGOs have conducted media campaigns and/or published articles (or had articles published).
3. Two NGOs surveyed were active in consultations on gender. And threeattended consultations on climate change.
4. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is an essential tool in the collaborative engagement between a government ministry and sector coordination. It clarifies roles and responsibilities of each party and provides guiding principles for their engagement. NGOs seeking such memorandums have found the process challenging and time consuming. Vvare in place between Government agencies and registered NGOs. The process has taken these NGOs many years.

Two NGO recommendations: (a) Government Ministries to pass on timely opportunities for NGO representation in national and international forums and/or funding opportunities . (b) SUNGO to play a more proactive role with NGOs in networking, raising awareness and progressing issues advocated by CSOs with stakeholders such as government ministries, international bodies and the public at large.

***Civil Society Research Projects*** meet a CSSP objective to strengthen the voice of civil society organisations to effectively influence national policy to help bring about positive changes in the community. Three projects were approved and funded for SAT 25,000 per project. All three involve NGOs progressing research findings with government, international agencies and the public. Two progress reports have been submitted. Deadline for completion is September 2013.

1. Samoa Spinal Network will explore why critical health problems of people with spinal cord injuries develop after they are discharged from medical care and return home, and howthis can be prevented for a better quality of life for these patients. *Team Leader: Epenesa Pouesi Young*
2. PABITRA (Samoa) is an NGO established to promote local research and encourage young Samoans to enrol in postgraduate studies. The research will determine the effectiveness of their training approach in increasing quality research in the country. *Team Leader: Nat Tuivavalagi*
3. *Independent consultants Measina Meredith (Team Leader) and John Sala* will evaluate the Independent Water Schemes Association (IWSA) contribution to two rural independent water schemes. Their project entitled “Participation and water equity in Samoa” is supported by the IWSA to identify what is working and why.

## OBJECTIVE 4: CSSP Programme Operations

**Office:** Due to health, safety, and power interruption concerns with the current office building, CSSP secured another location after reviewing its options. It will be moving to the ground Floor of the National Provident Fund building (NPF) in the month of August. The new location has a number of advantages including its central location forthe public and Government Ministries, improved working environment and safety for staff, and expanded space to allow for additional staff and storage. The building also has a backup generator for power. Public parking will be across the street and adjacent to the Central Bank Building.

**Programme activities:** CSSP engaged Mary Cretney and Alison Gray to help the Programme Management Unit strengthen and streamline its systems for processing applications, contracts and payments and identifying the most vulnerable groups for funding. The consultancy engaged the staff in reviewing the weaknesses in processes and procedures, and putting new procedures in place including weekly staff meetings, further staff orientation on procedures, and increased delegation of responsibilities to line staff. The result has increased motivation and improved coordination particularly between the admin and programme staff. The CSSP database design was further revised as a part of the technical assistance and all staff trained to regularly review the database for analysis and reporting. The result has been that all staff can now monitor and keep track of all projects at any point in time until completion. Issues can be addressed earlier.

**Visibility:** CSSP visibility has increased with more coverage in the media and in the signage placed on completed projects. All CSSP supported organisations have been encouraged to invite media to their project openings. In addition, CSSP held a development partner visibility workshop in May 2013 for twelve NGOs receiving funding from CSSP led by the AusAID media officer. The workshop increased awareness of donor requirements for visibility as well as a general sharing of experiences among NGOs of their best promotional practices. Visibility of CSSP support increased after the workshop. CSSP also organized a development partner site visit for 10 projects to coincide with European Union Day (May 9) in Samoa. One of the CSSP youth groups funded for musical instruments was invited to perform at the EU Day evening celebration and raise awareness of CSSP support.

*Lotofaga, Safata Tilapia Project visibility visit*

# PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST M&E INDICATORS AND TARGETS

1. **Target: 75% of funded projects score satisfactory (3 points) or excellent (4 points) in end of project review (EOPR)**

Achievement: Of 67 completed CSSP projects to date, 97% scored 3+ (satisfactory to excellent) on their End of Project Review forms. ***Target achieved and exceeded.***

1. **Target: 75% of projects are on track to achieve expected results**

Achievement:Of 156 ongoing projects, 127 (81%) are on track to achieve expected results; 19 (12%) projects have some delay (mostly with progress reports or materials and supplies) and 10 (4%) have been terminated early. ***Target achieved and exceeded****.*

1. **Target: 40% of projects target villages ranked as highly vulnerable by assessors.**

Achievement**: Target nearly achieved for Round 3 Category 2 (32%)**

*CSSP village vulnerability ranking is based upon census data for education levels achieved and employment levels achieved for adults 18 years or older. It also based upon distance from urban areas. However, as there are pockets of poverty communities in and around the urban areas which may not be picked upon the CSSP ranking for vulnerable villages, CSSP assesses these projects through site visits.*

1. **Target: 75% of completed projects sustain benefits at one year follow-up.**

Achievement: In progress. *CSSP is in the process of putting out an Expression of Interest consultancy for all its completed projects up to July 2013 (100 plus).* ***Target on track to be achieved.***

1. **Target: 85% of applicants undertaking Project Management training (from SUNGo) rate ability to use information as “good” or “very good”. 60% of organisations in 15% sample tracer study show improvement.**

Achievement: Tracer study was completed but no results yet from SUNGO. *CSSP will follow-up with SUNGO.* ***Target partially achieved***.

1. **Target :** Up to **15 NGO self-assessments** to be undertaken by June 2014. At least 12 NGOs receive training support.

Achievement: 12 self-assessments (80% of the target) are in various stages of implementation as of June 2013. ***Target on track to be achieved and perhaps exceeded by 2014.***

*Note: 13 organisations were engaged in the NGO assessment process throughout the year (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013). Only one of the 13 has not responded at the time of this report. Seven of the 14 completed the full assessment process and have draft action plans in place. The implementation of the action plans will be monitored by CSSP and SUNGO. The remaining six are still going through the self assessment with SUNGO. The delay in the NGO assessment process leaves an under-spent budget allocation from this financial period which needs to be carried forward to the next Financial period.*

**Target : At least 80% of funded NGOs (Category 1 and Category 2) meet criteria in funding contract**

Achievement: 89% (16 of 18 NGO projects) are either completed or are on track to complete projects as planned. Two (2) have terminated due to governance issues. Five projects are processing contracts. ***Target achieved and exceeded****.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sector** | **NGOs Funded** | **Projects Funded** | **% of Proj** | **$ funded** |
| Agr | 1 | 1 | 4% | 65,000 |
| Com Dev | 2 | 3 | 13% | 370,000 |
| Edu | 3 | 5 | 22% | 183,918 |
| Health | 6 | 10 | 43% | 838,250 |
| Justice | 2 | 4 | 17% | 400,000 |
| **Total** | **14** | **23** | **100%** | **1,857,168** |

*14 NGOs (23 projects) were funded for a total of $1,857,168, ranging from*

*$26,250 to 300,000 per project (average $78,743)*

1. **Target: 75% of funded NGOs meet all conditions of their Category 3 grant.**

Achievement: Only two NGOs were funded in October and November 2012. Still have another year to go to submit a final report. ***Target on track to be achieved.***

**Target : SUNGO training meets 60% of the needs identified in Training Needs Analysis.**

Achievement: Insufficent data from SUNGO. *CSSP will follow-up with SUNGO.* ***Target not achieved****.*

**Target : Number and range of CSSP funded NGOs represented on Government committees and in international organisations. Baseline survey 2012/2013.**

Achievement : The baseline NGO Advocacy Survey is completed and compiled in Annex V. ***Target on track to be achieved.*** SUNGO to be engaged to assist in the next 6-month period.

**Target : 20% increase in number of Government Committees and international organisations with SUNGO representation.**

Achievement : Partly achieved by SUNGO. SUNGO is now on all Government Sector committees except Health. However, CSSP will need more specific SUNGO data. CSSP will follow-up with SUNGO.

***Target on track to be achieved.***

**Target: 85% of stakeholders satisfied with PMU performance overall.**

Achievement : Insufficient data. CSSP will need a mechanism to capture overall stakeholder satisfaction with its performance and services. Will revise current monitoring forms to capture this better.

***Target not achieved.***

**Target : 80% of applicants are satisfied with the application process.**

Achievement: CSSP conducted a public satisfaction survey 23-24 August 2012 and received an overall satisfaction rating of 79.5%. Another public satisfaction survey was conducted in January 2013 but only a handful of surveys were turned in. The suggestion box at the office all produced less than 10 responses over this 6 monthly period – nearly all complimentary with a few suggestions. From all responses, CSSP is well regarded but will need to improve in the notification of decisions and explanations provided particularly to the declined applicants. ***Target partly achieved.***

# PROGRAMME ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

1. Governance
   1. Approval for the extension of the current financial year to 31 August enabled CSSP to incorporate the approved recommendations of the Mid Term Review (MTR) into the next Programme Estimate work plan and budget. The PE 3 budget and work plan for 1 September 2013 through 30 June 2013 have been submitted and are awaiting a final decision from European Union.
   2. PMU Reporting – The CSSP 6 monthly progress report was submitted to the Steering Committee meeting in March 2013 but required reformatting to be in line with funding partner specifications. This caused delays. PMU now has an acceptable template which will result in more timely reports.
   3. The vulnerability scoring is much improved and will undergo further adjustment when the government poverty studies are released in November 2013. CSSP’s vulnerability scoring by village will be reviewed again at that time and adjusted accordingly.
   4. Water tank Projects: Over the past 18 months, 94 organisations (54 villages) applied to CSSP for water harvesting assistance. In addition, the Community Disaster and Climate Risk Management (CDCRM) Programme of the Samoa Red Cross Society (SRCS) requested CSSP support for community water tanks for disaster shelters for 50 villages. To address these concerns, CSSP developed and submitted a design for AUD 2 million (ICCAI) to implement water harvesting activities for households and community water tanks. The project was designed to add another 500+households to the MDG 1,000 to achieve the targets meeting the MDG criteria for most vulnerable families. The project was also designed to purchase and install 10,000 litre water tanks at 50 village “disaster preparedness shelters”. The CDCRM project is part of Samoa Disaster Risk Management National Action Plan 2011-2016. The project design was approved by the CSSP Steering Committee in March 2013 and funds transferred to CSSP in April 2013.

*CDCRM Community Water Tanks for 50 village Shelters (ICCAI funded)*

CSSP has made good progress towards collaboration with key stakeholders in the Water and Sanitation sector towards achieving the MDG Initiative targets for clean water using ICCAI funds. A common survey form to be used by CSSP and other stakeholders providing water harvesting support has been agreed. A contract with Samoa Red Cross Society for technical assistance has been approved along with a schedule of activities. CSSP and Samoa Red Cross will be challenged on a number of fronts to implement the project in the time period allocated so all funds are expended and all water tanks (500 water tanks for families/100 community water tanks for shelters) provided by the March 2015 deadline. The key challenge will be to maintain a high level of coordination and cooperation among all parties involved to ensure that all tasks are implemented in a timely manner.

1. Finance and Donor Funding Agreements:
   1. CSSP received good commendation from the EU auditors in March 2013. Support documentation has improved greatly and no ineligible costs were identified. CSSP was advised to prepare for the audit well in advance due the high level of photo copying involved.
   2. A key issue for CSSP will be to ensure 70% of AusAID funds will be expended before the next trance. The matter is complicated because all ICCAI funds which are ring fenced for a single project (water tanks) were transferred at one time to be expended over a 20 month period. This may leave a large balance in the AusAID account and may affect CSSP’s other projects that are also funded by AusAID (general fund) if there are shortfalls. The matter is being addressed by the Steering Committee.
   3. CSSP has notified its key stakeholders and its grantees (approved applicants) of the need to ensure all projects are completed before the March 2015 deadline of the current funding agreements. Ceilings have been reached for certain EU budget components and have resulted in a request for the use of contingency funding.
2. Mid Term Review : The CSSP Mid Term Report was reviewed and the recommendations adopted in June 2013. Of the 40 recommendations of the EU and AusAID Reviewers, all but one were adopted for implementation. The approved recommendations have been consolidated into 4 key focus areas in the implementation plan presented in Annex V. These recommendations will be actioned over the next twelve months.
3. Sustainability

**Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E**) – CSSP received assistance through a Technical Advisor to put into place a methodology to reliably and systematically capture information on vulnerability. It has been tried with Category 2 applicants and appears to be a reliable measure. The NGO vulnerability measure has had to be further revised.

**NGO sustainability** – NGOs with income generating potential and/or strong fundraising skills are able to sustain their operations at a low level. Social service NGOs (health, education, environment) will need to rely on external sources including government funding. CSSP will encourage them to to strengthen fundraising skills (Samoa Cancer Society is a good example) and/or diversify their donor funding base.

**Gender Equality-** In Round 3, 30% (30) of CSSP approved projects were requested by specific women organizations or where women were the decision-makers. Preliminary effort to obtain data on the breakdown of beneficiaries show that most direct beneficiaries are women .

# Revised Workplan (next six months – July to December 2013)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Activity Description  [x -workshop; CfP-Call for Proposals; DL- deadline; Dec- decision; R-Reports] | 1  Jul | 2  Aug | 3  Sept | 4  Oct | 5  Nov | 6  Dec | Comment |
| 1 | Programme Management Reporting (Special 6 monthly meeting) |  | Rpt |  |  |  |  | SC meeting planned for 5 August 2013 to approve 6 monthly report. |
| 2 | Implementation of MTR recommendations | on-going & reviewed at SC meetings |  |  |  |  |  | An implementation plan is under review by SC. Key recommendations have been incorporated as activities in the PE 3 workplan and budget (pilots, case study) |
| 3 | On-going processing of Cat 1, Cat 2, Cat 3 projects | Ongoing as per CSSP contracts |  |  |  |  |  | CSP Project Committees will need to be reminded to implement all projects within the contract deadlines. CSSP last payment under current donor agreements – prior to March 2015. |
| 4 | ICCAI Project Implementation for water tanks |  | On – going as per agreed schedule |  |  |  |  | Starts 1 August when SRCS contract is signed. CSSP/SRCS engaged in implementation as per schedule. Regularly meet to review progress & make changes. 54 villages served (94 CSSP applicants) will require weekly engagement of CSSP & SRCS staff. |
| 5 | Tracer study |  | On going for completed projects |  |  |  |  | Tracer study TOR are agreed in principle by SC. PM to finalize EIS/TOR & approve by SC. Announcements in the media in August 2013. |
| 6 | CSSP Office move to the NPF Building & Launch |  | Launch |  |  |  |  | Planned move and launch in August, engage media and, current applicants to inform them of the new location. |
| 7 | SUNGO Contract :   * Information & Liaison and Public Forums targeting CSOs – SUNGO contract. * Mentoring & Support to NGOs –SUNGO contract | SUNGO contract activities - ongoing |  |  |  |  |  | SUNGO contract to be finalized and signed after SC review.  SUNGO implements objectives of their strategic plan, gathers data, compiles results and provides information and liaison services to CSOs. |
| SUNGO NGO Coordinator position coordinating with CSSP on advisory, training, mentoring to NGOs, implement NGO Assessment. |
| 8 | Design, pilot test PDM modified (Climate Change) |  |  | TA |  |  |  | TA provides training modules that can be incorporated into SUNGO PDM training. |
| 9 | Design & pilot 5 NGO training modules. |  |  | TA |  |  |  | TA provides training modules that can be incorporated into NGO Assessment follow-up action plans. |
| 10 | Pilot Education Projects |  |  |  | TA |  |  | TA to work with 20 – 25 community organisations interested in applying for non-infrastructure, value added projects in education. Prepare to submit applications (non infrastructure) in the next CfP (November 2013). |
| 11 | Pilot Community Dev Projects |  |  |  | TA |  |  | TA to work with youth aged 20 – 25 and women’s community organisations interested in applying for non-infrastructure, value added projects in community development (income generation). |
| 12 | Pilot NGO advocacy |  |  |  | TA |  |  | TA to work with 5-6 NGOs on an advocacy pilot in unique and creative ways to raise awareness. |
| 13 | Case Study on ICCAI |  |  |  |  |  |  | Next reporting period (June 2014) – the case study will build on the tracer study data gathering. |
| 14 | Stakeholder Review – preparations and event. |  |  |  |  | **X** |  | Review planned for November 2013 |
| 15 | Call for Research Proposals |  |  |  |  | **CfP** | **DL** |  |
| 16 | Cat 1 & Cat 2 Call for Proposals |  |  |  |  | **CfP** | **DL** | May need to reduce contract period to 10 months to encourage approved applicants to complete projects earlier. |
| 17 | Cat 2 Applications workshops (Upolu/Savaii Islands) – Secure & Select applicants |  |  |  |  | **xx** |  | Project Officers conduct 2 public awareness and respond to « walk-in » individuals or groups or by e-mail (100 people) |
| 18 | Tendered governance workshops |  |  |  | xxxxx | xxx | xx | Managing Organisations; Project Design and Management training. |
| 19 | Technical advice for applicants & on applications. | Technical support to applicants |  |  |  |  |  | Technical advice prior to and after approval of applicants on as needed basis. |
| 20 | Network with sectors to identify & assist on promising projects for funding, CBOs, and NGOs. | Stakeholder mtgs/consultations on-going  ON-GOING |  |  |  |  |  | CSSP engages with SUNGO, Sector partners, Development partners, Steering Committee members and other stakeholders. |
| 21 | Programme Visibility | On-going – as a part of project monitoring |  |  |  |  |  | Production and installation of signage. Production and distribution (or airing) of other media promotional materials. SC/donor site visit |
| 22 | Government Audit |  | Audit - Gov |  |  |  |  | Preparation for Samoa Government audit –CSSP placed on the audit schedule planned for August 2013 |
| 23 | CSSP PE 2 Closure – EU Audit |  |  | Audit  -EU |  | Rpl |  | PE 4 will be done in the next reporting period. |

**Submitted by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Gladys Alailima,

**Programme Manager**

**Civil Society Support Programme**

**Approved by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Noumea Simi,

**CSSP Chair and Imprest Administrator**

**Ministry of Finance**

Date: 6th August 2013

# Annexes

1. Financial Report/Acquittal – An acquittal report has been submitted to AusAID (up to 30 June 2013) and is ***attached as a separate file*** in this report.
2. Financial Summary of Income and Expenditures ***See Annex below***
3. Cash flow forecast – General programme activities ***See Annex below***
4. Cash flow forecast – International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI) ***See Annex below***
5. Charts and Graphs ***See Annex below***
6. A Revised Risk and Fraud Framework (revisions highlighted in yellow) ***See Annex below***
7. MTR Implementation Plan ***See Annex below***
8. Compilation of views from NGOs on Advocacy and Furthering Dialogue with Government ***See Annex below***
9. Views of CSSP Services from an Non Government Organisation and Community Based Organisation ***See Annex below***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | | | | | **ANNEX II: FINANCIAL SUMMARY OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES** | | | | | | **Activities and other costs** | **PE Act** | **Actual** | | | | **No** | **AusAID** |  | **European Union** | | **RECEIPTS** |  |  |  |  | | General programme activities |  | 2,194,490 |  | 2,696,694 | | International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI) |  | 4,457,190 |  |  | | Interest received |  | 93,401 |  |  | | VAGST reimbursement from Government of Samoa |  |  |  | 89,652 | | Payable Education Sector (TVET and SSFGS) \* |  | 1,737,100 |  |  | | **Sub total** |  | **8,482,181** |  | **2,786,346** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **DEDUCT PAYMENTS** |  |  |  |  | | **Result 1** |  |  |  |  | | Category 1, 2 & 3 \*\* | 1.1-1.3 | 1,640,127 |  | 1,229,571 | | **Sub total** |  | **1,640,127** |  | **1,229,571** | | **Result 2** |  |  |  |  | | CSO networking & capacity building support. (SUNGO Contract) | 2.1 | 413,395 |  |  | | PDM Workshops | 2.2 | 132,000 |  | 30,000 | | **Sub total** |  | **545,395** |  | **30,000** | | **Result 3** |  |  |  |  | | CSO advocacy & research support *(requires a tendering process to select service providers.* | 3.1 | 12,500 |  | 25,000 | | **Subtotal** |  | **12,500** |  | **25,000** | | **Result 4** |  |  |  |  | | **Programme Operations** |  |  |  |  | | Staff costs | 4.1 | 148,400 |  | 172,124 | | Operating PMU office | 4.2 | 392 |  | 114,931 | | Secure (CFP), select, & monitor applicant projects | 4.3 |  |  | 58,643 | | Technical / Advisory Support to PMU | 4.4 | 80,186 |  | 10,534 | | **Subtotal** |  | **228,978** |  | **356,232** | | **Result 5** |  |  |  |  | | Programme Visibility | 5.1 | 17,103 |  | 12,223 | | **Subtotal** |  | **17,103** |  | **12,223** | | **Result 6** |  |  |  |  | | Audit /Evaluation | 6.1 | 10,000 |  | 6,365 | | **Subtotal** |  | **10,000** |  | **6,365** | | **Result 7** |  |  |  |  | | Capital Investments | 7.1 | 40,896 |  | - | | **Subtotal** |  | **40,896** |  | **-** | | **TOTAL** |  | **2,494,999** |  | **1,659,391** | | **Contingencies** |  |  |  |  | | **TOTAL** |  | **2,494,999** |  | **1,659,391** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Increase / (Decrease) in cash** |  | **5,987,182** |  | **1,126,955** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Cash at 01 July 2012** |  | **3,387,703** |  | **551,522** | | **Cash at 30 June 2013** |  | **9,374,885** |  | **1,678,477** | |

\* Represents the AusAID funds for the Education Sector (TVET & SSFGS) that have since been reversed on 19th July 2013

\*\* No payments for ICCAI and Round 3 Category 2 projects disbursed as of 30 June 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANNEX III: AusAID CASHFLOW FORECAST - GENERAL PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES** | | | | | | | |
| **1ST JULY 2013 - 31 DECEMBER 2013** | | | | | | | |
|  | **July** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **November** | **December** | ***Total*** |
| **RECEIPTS** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Receipt | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | ***90,000*** |
| **Total Receipts** | **15,000** | **15,000** | **15,000** | **15,000** | **15,000** | **15,000** | ***90,000*** |
| **EXPENSES** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CSO PROJECTS** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous Rounds (Round 1 & 2) | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | *216,000* |
| Round 3 Category 2 |  | 596,000 | 596,000 | 99,333 | 99,333 | 99,333 | *1,490,000* |
| **TOTAL CSO PROJECTS** | **36,000** | **632,000** | **632,000** | **135,333** | **135,333** | **135,333** | ***1,706,000*** |
| **CSO Capacity Building** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSO Capacity Building |  |  | 41,600 | 221,400 |  |  | *263,000* |
| CSO PDM Workshop |  |  |  | 180,000 |  |  | *180,000* |
| **Total CSO Capacity Building** | **-** | **-** | **41,600** | **401,400** | **-** | **-** | **443,000** |
| **CSO Advocacy** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSO Advocacy & research support |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 2,500 | *12,500* |
| **Total CSO Advocacy** | **-** | **10,000** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **2,500** | ***12,500*** |
| **Programme Operations** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Employment Expenses** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries & Wages | 10,770 | 10,770 | 22,682 | 34,023 | 22,682 | 22,682 | *123,609* |
| A.C.C. 1% Contribution | 1,077 | 1,077 | 2,268 | 3,402 | 2,268 | 2,268 | *12,361* |
| N.P.F. 5% Contribution | 5,385 | 5,385 | 11,341 | 17,012 | 11,341 | 11,341 | *61,805* |
| **Total Employment Expenses** | **17,232** | **17,232** | **36,291** | **54,437** | **36,291** | **36,291** | ***197,774*** |
| **Office Operations Cots** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rental - Office lease | 5,272 | 5,272 | 5,272 | 5,272 | 5,272 | 5,272 | *31,632* |
| Electricity | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | *9,000* |
| Bank charges | 20 | 140 | 70 | 140 | 20 | 140 | *530* |
| **Total Office Operations Cost** | **6,792** | **6,912** | **6,842** | **6,912** | **6,792** | **6,912** | **41,162** |
| **Technical/Advisory Support** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical/Advisory- Applicant |  |  |  |  | 5,000 |  | *5,000* |
| **Total Technical/Advisory Support** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **5,000** | **-** | ***5,000*** |
| **Total Programme Operations** | **24,024** | **24,144** | **43,133** | **61,349** | **48,083** | **43,203** | ***243,936*** |
| **Programme Visibility** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Signage & Visibily |  | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |  | 4,000 | *10,000* |
| **Total Programme Visibility** | **-** | **3,000** | **-** | **3,000** | **-** | **4,000** | ***10,000*** |
| **Audit / Evaluation on (Services Contract)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audit / Evaluation on (Services Contract) |  |  |  |  |  |  | *-* |
| **Total Audit / Evaluation on (Services Contract)** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | ***-*** |
| **Capital Investmens** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Investments | 5,000 | 20,000 | 10,000 | 2,000 |  | 3,000 | *40,000* |
| **Total Capital Investments** | **5,000** | **20,000** | **10,000** | **2,000** | **-** | **3,000** | ***40,000*** |
| **Total Expenses** | **65,024** | **689,144** | **726,733** | **603,082** | **183,417** | **188,037** | ***2,455,436*** |
| Reversal fund to Education Sector (TVET & SSFGS) | 1,737,100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Net Cash flow for month** | **(1,787,124)** | **(674,144)** | **(711,733)** | **(588,082)** | **(168,417)** | **(173,037)** |  |
| **Cash Balance B/F** | 4,917,695 | 3,130,571 | 2,456,427 | 1,744,694 | 1,156,612 | 988,195 |  |
| **Cash Balance (C/F)** | **3,130,571** | **2,456,427** | **1,744,694** | **1,156,612** | **988,195** | **815,159** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Annex IV: AusAID CASHFLOW FORECAST - INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION INITIATIVE (ICCAI)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1ST JULY 2013 - 31 DECEMBER 2014** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | | | | | | **2014** | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | **July** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **November** | **December** | **January** | **February** | **March** | **April** | **May** | **June** | **July** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **November** | **December** | ***Total*** |
| **RECEIPTS** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ***-*** |
| **Total Receipts** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ***-*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EXPENSES** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CSO PROJECTS** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICCAI - Water tanks |  |  | 202,750 | 202,750 | 405,500 | 608,250 | 202,750 | 243,300 | 405,500 | 240,000 | 243,300 | 202,750 | 202,750 | 243,300 | 405,500 | 243,290 | 202,750 | 202,750 | *4,457,190* |
| **TOTAL CSO PROJECTS** | **-** | **-** | **202,750** | **202,750** | **405,500** | **608,250** | **202,750** | **243,300** | **405,500** | **240,000** | **243,300** | **202,750** | **202,750** | **243,300** | **405,500** | **243,290** | **202,750** | **202,750** | ***4,457,190*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Expenses** | **-** | **-** | **202,750** | **202,750** | **405,500** | **608,250** | **202,750** | **243,300** | **405,500** | **240,000** | **243,300** | **202,750** | **202,750** | **243,300** | **405,500** | **243,290** | **202,750** | **202,750** | ***1,419,250*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Net Cash flow for month** | **-** | **-** | **(202,750)** | **(202,750)** | **(405,500)** | **(608,250)** | **(202,750)** | **(243,300)** | **(405,500)** | **(240,000)** | **(243,300)** | **(202,750)** | **(202,750)** | **(243,300)** | **(405,500)** | **(243,290)** | **(202,750)** | **(202,750)** |  |
| **Cash Balance B/F** | 4,457,190 | 4,457,190 | 4,457,190 | 4,254,440 | 4,051,690 | 3,646,190 | 3,037,940 | 2,835,190 | 2,591,890 | 2,186,390 | 1,946,390 | 1,703,090 | 1,500,340 | 1,297,590 | 1,054,290 | 648,790 | 405,500 | 202,750 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cash Balance (C/F)** | **4,457,190** | **4,457,190** | **4,254,440** | **4,051,690** | **3,646,190** | **3,037,940** | **2,835,190** | **2,591,890** | **2,186,390** | **1,946,390** | **1,703,090** | **1,500,340** | **1,297,590** | **1,054,290** | **648,790** | **405,500** | **202,750** | **-** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX V Charts and Graphs of Approved Projects**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Aus Water Security & Climate Change Adaptation (**WSCCA – ICCAI funded water tanks only**) | $1,165,137 |  |
| AusAid | $4,811,955 |  |
| EU | $3,272,479 |  |
| **Grand Total** | **$9,249,571** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Round 3 Category 2 funds approved by the Vulnerability\* of the applicant village** | |
| High | $ 476,687 |
| Low | $458,417 |
| Medium | $554,956 |
| Total $ approved | 1,490,060 |

\*Based upon census data on education & employment levels of the adult population 18+ yrs in villages. Also based on the location of village relative to main centres & infrastructure.

Note: NGOs serve all of Samoa

**TE $ -** terminated early – funds spent.

**TE No $** - TE no funds spent

**EOPR** – end of project review after all $ spent & project implemented.

**Status of all CSSP Projects by Rounds 1-3 as of 30 June 2013**

**ANNEX VI: Updated Risk Management Matrix for 2013-2014 – Highlighted yellow indicates a revision**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Area of Risk** | **Level** | **Possible Reason for risk** | **Risk Management Strategy** | **Comment** |
| **1** | **Project timelines** |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Failure to meet timeline proposed | Moderate  for Category 1&2 funding & research.  High for ICCAI  Staffing needs | Delays to key decisions  Last payment ends March 2015 under current Donor agreements.  Difficulties in appointing staff  ICCAI 1: Coordination between two agencies increases risk of delays (Samoa Red Cross/CSSP)  ICCAI 2: changed criteria for selection risks not being well understood by applicants.  ICCAI 3: effort to link with 2 national initiatives and their targets risks falling short of the mark. | One Call for Proposals: Combine Category 1 and Category 2 (mid year). Change guidelines to request proposals that are completed within a 10 month and not a 12 month period to reduce risk. No category 3 proposals.  ICCAI: Regular meetings between SRCS – CDCRM team and CSSP to review and revise approach as needed to meet deadlines and plan approaches. Mtgs planned with applicants to orient them to the new criteria. Signed agreements with village, project committees and households. Good documentation planned through surveys, database and tracer study to provide evidence that targets have been achieved. | Call for Proposals have kept to deadlines. However, measures are being put into place to cut down the assessment time by at least half or more: (1) future Call for Proposals will increase the number of assessors, (2) dbase input training has been provided staff to reduce processing time. |
| **2** | **Governance** |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Ineffective Committee | Moderate | Chairing of Committee  Quality of membership  Quality of Secretariat support  Need to address the high number of meetings in a year for decisions. | 1. Chairing by MOF 2. SC operating guidelines in place 3. Prompt circulation of agendas and minutes 4. Performance of SC as part of audit process 5. Put into place a working group for decisions on selection of applicants and any planning discussions. Keep the Development Partners/Chair at the higher level decisions. | More timely and more accurate minutes helped by the fact that both managers are engaged in compiling notes and reviewing minutes for accuracy and brevity. The decisions on applicants are within the content of the minutes and not as a separate attachment. SC members are stable (little turn over) and are very committed and engaged with CSSP. PMU to Draft a TOR for a working group. |
|  | **Area of Risk** | **Level** | **Possible Reason for risk** | **Risk Management Strategy** | **Comment** |
| **3** | **Communications** |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | Poor communications between Steering Committee and PMU | Low | Breakdown between SC Chair and PMU manager | 1. Regular meetings between SC Chair and manager 2. SC Chair promptly advised of problems 3. Regular PMU reporting to SC | Chair and Programme Manager regularly use e-mail to keep updated and occasional face to face discussions when needed. |
| 3.2 | Poor communications between PMU and stakeholders | Moderate  Initially high for relocation of the CSSP office to NPF | PMU failing to keep CSOs informed about applications process and applicants about progress with applications.  Office relocation: The office relocation will be in August 2013. Expect people going to the Ah Mau office location. | Develop set of communications standards covering   * Provision of information to CSOs * Advising applicants (progress/responses to queries) * Management of email systems to ensure reliability   Office Relocation: Office opening with media invited 1 September. Signs posting of the new relocation at the Ah Mau Office. Regular announcements in media on the new location. Contact all current grantees to let them know of the change. | CSSP Admin process on applications has been recently updated to reflect changes and will be reviewed with staff. It includes a set of standards and procedures for communications to applicants. Applicants are advised through letters of their status. However, most want to know their status immediately and often do not pick up their letters even though they have been contacted several times. The procedure is after several calls their letter is filed with contact notes. |
| **4** | **Transparent decision processes** |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | Risk of bias by SC or PMU under single major source of donor funding | Moderate | Personal contacts of SC/ PMU members, pressure exerted on SC or PMU members | 1. Fair & transparent selection processes 2. Clear COI guidelines & Declaration of interest 3. External systems performance audit 4. Selection of assessors reflects high level of skills, expertise in different sectors, and impartiality. 5. Assessors are thoroughly oriented to the process and to maintain high professional standards and ethics throughout the process. | Prior to every Call for Proposals, all forms and guidelines are reviewed by PMU and SUNGO trainers, recommendations put to the SC for review and approval. Revisions are based upon prior experience. Assessors sign COI forms and declare their interests. Sector stakeholders are contacted to review and input on recommended applicants to the SC. SC approvals are very thorough. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.** | **Appropriate resource allocation** |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 | Risk resources are not allocated in line with priorities and policies approved by Steering Committee | Moderate | Lack of clear priorities for allocating funds  Lack of clear linked criteria | 1. Clear priorities for allocating funds agreed by Committee 2. Criteria used to approve request link to agree priorities | The MTR Implementation Plan is now in place. The SC will need to put into place a guiding document to help the PMU to understand how well CSSP outcomes have been achieved and how to better link activities with outcomes within the larger context. In addition the SC will review the CSSP M&E framework to better collect information and to report on vulnerability, CSO advocacy, and gender equality. |
| **6** | **Performance of the PMU** |  |  |  |  |
| 6.1 | Lack of satisfactory performance by PMU | Moderate | Poor PMU management  Poor staff performance  Lack of staff training  Lack of appropriate systems  Factors beyond PMU control | 1. Development and monitoring of PMU workplan 2. Initial training for new staff 3. Systems in place before grant cycle commences 4. Refer issues beyond PMU control to SC 5. Regular monitoring of managers performance | A CSSP completed a staff review of the PMU performance (staff retreat - January 2013) and will put into place measures to reduce bottlenecks and increase staff performance in their respective roles. Areas have been identified for further HR development.  Monitoring of managers performance has been through SC feedback at SC meetings. Programme Manager and Financial manager are engaged in feedback to low performing staff. |
| 6.2 | Ability to attract appropriately skilled staff | Moderate to High | Specific skills and experience required for key positions | Ensure attractive salary levels offered | Staff retention was 100% in 2012-2013. However, CSSP still needs to review salary packages in light of the low retention rate. CSSP is conducting a preliminary scoping on HR concerns. |
| 6.3 | Staff fail to perform to standards required | Low to Moderate | Staff failing to meet expectation or performance management of staff not in place. | 1. HR management system in place 2. Performance monitored by manager on regular basis | Staff performance assessment has taken place for most staff and is continuing. |
| 6.4 | Lack of adequate support and accommodation to site staff | Low | Accommodation of adequate standard expected to be available | 1. Manager to be responsible for staff welfare 2. Provision of suitable quality accommodation | Financial policies have been reviewed and revised to ensure staff in the field have adequate accommodation and support. Staff have been informed. |
| 6.5 | Conflict of Interest Issues for staff | Moderate | Staff will have contact with applicants with risk of obligation especially in a village setting | 1. COI policy for staff 2. Protocols for dealing with applicants 3. Support and assistance role to SUNGO | CSSP has policies in place for gifts (giving and receiving). Applicants are discouraged from excessive gift giving at orientation sessions and prior to site visits. Normally they are requested to provide nothing or just a beverage. All gift funds ($) are politely returned to their donors. |
| 6.6 | Risk of excessive payments to contractors or for services, misappropriation of funds etc | Moderate to high | Staff will be dealing with procurement of goods for projects with some office cash handling | 1. Establish acceptable practices for project management 2. Cover through staff disciplinary policies 3. Separation of duties in handling financial matters | Procurement procedures are continually reviewed and revised as necessary. The Financial manager has met with suppliers to review procedures and expectations. At orientation sessions for approved applicants, the procurement procedures are reviewed. There is separation of duties for the management of funds. All emerging issues are discussed with staff and addressed. Feedback from auditors show good progress. |
|  | **Area of Risk** | **Level** | **Possible Reason for risk** | **Risk Management Strategy** | **Comment** |
| **7** | **Funds allocation and grants** |  |  |  |  |
| 7.1 | Lack of sufficient quality applications from most vulnerable communities in Samoa | Moderate | Applicants may lack skills required to develop applications | 1. Early and effective promotion of the Fund in underserved vulnerable communities. This is aided by the fact that CSSP has now in place a vulnerability measure based upon census data for vulnerable villages. This measure will be updated with the Government poverty studies due in November 2013. 2. Provision of awareness and training for applicants 3. Opportunity for applicants to revise their applications 4. Unsuccessful applicants to be referred to later rounds | SUNGO recently completed a tracer study and recommendations for their Project Design and Management Training. CSSP and SUNGO will need to continue to jointly review progress on the recommendations. CSSP to more specifically target underserved vulnerable communities in their next CFP. |
| 7.2 | Pooled fund reduces options open to applicants | Low | Two current funding sources now under one pool | 1. New fund able to accept wide range of requests  Increased overall funding likely  2. Information at PMU about other funding sources | The pooled funds do not necessarily reduce options open to applicants since what can be funded is fairly diverse. However, what applicants are applying for is a fairly narrow range of projects. This list could be expanded with more promotional ideas. A planned stakeholder review is being planned for November 2013 and will engage CSOs in sharing project experiences and best practices including new innovative projects implemented in communities. |
| 7.3 | Risk of domination of CSSP fund by larger organizations | Low | Larger organizations have stronger skills and better access to resources | 1. Priority Category One funds to smaller organizations 2. Assistance to emerging organizations when applying | Not a problem. The approved projects are dominated by the smaller civil society organizations in villages. Much less so by NGOs or the larger organizations. |
| 7.4 | Reduced access due to higher level of applications | Moderate | Fewer alternate options to seek support | Overall fund likely to increase over current levels | CSSP is past the mid year of its funding agreements there will need to be a review and a high level decision with donors on CSSP’s future directions. |
| 7.5 | Confidentiality of applications | Low to Moderate | Other applicants provided with details to applicant disadvantage | 1. Applicant information confidential to applicant, PMU and SC unless applicant agrees otherwise 2. Cover in Code of Conduct for PMU | SC and PMU do not discuss results of applications unless a final decision has been made. However, some applicants are sharing information among themselves separate from the PMU. |
|  | **Area of Risk** | **Level** | **Possible Reason for risk** | **Risk Management Strategy** | **Comment** |
| **8** | **Project financial mismanagement** |  |  |  |  |
| 8.1 | Goods obtained by procurement are diverted from project | Moderate | Pressure on project managers | 1. Project Management Committee to monitor project assets 2. Site visits by PMU staff to view assets | Timely monitoring by Project Officers is critical to ensure that the goods purchased are being used appropriately. Any incidences are discussed with the project committee and documented. Applicants are informed that they will need to recover any goods at their own cost. |
| 8.2 | Misappropriation of funds provide through acquittal | Moderate | Lack of financial control by project managers | 1. Project Management Committee in place with responsibility for managing finances 2. Committee to have completed financial training 3. Withholding of grant payments | All but two NGOs have complied with proper acquittal reportsto date. One NGO was discontinued due to lack of a response to addressig issues, the other NGO did not have robust systems in place. CSSP direct funded their suppliers. CSSP is now requiring all NGOs funded for Categories 2 and 3 to undergo NGO assessment of their systems using a newly developed tool piloted by SUNGO for NGOs. |
| **9** | **Donor visibility** |  |  |  |  |
| 9.1 | Donors less visible under new fund | Low | Fund is promoted by CSSP not individual donors | Promotional opportunities that publicly link donors to fund and promote harmonization. CSSP to draft and finalize a visibility strategy that is reviewed and approved by the steering committee. Reports on the visibility strategy 6 monthly to donors. | CSSP logo incorporates the donor logos. CSSP contracts include the applicant’s responsibility to post CSSP signs so they are visible to the public. The project officers ensure this has taken place. |
| **10** | **Sustainability (Beneficiaries)** |  |  |  |  |
| 10.1 | Undue reliance by CSOs on donor funds | High | NGOs highly reliant on core funding provisions which may decrease | 1. Sustainability strategy by NGO to cover  * seeking alternative donor sources/other revenues * cost reduction – use of volunteers etc   2. Approach to government re civil society support | Under a CSSP/SUNGO contract, SUNGO conducts NGO assessments of organizations applying for Categories 2 and 3. In addition, an NGO action plan will be developed for each NGO assessed. These will be monitored by both SUNGO/CSSP Project staff. |
|  | **Area of Risk** | **Level** | **Possible Reason for risk** | **Risk Management Strategy** | **Comment** |
| 10.2 | High NGO Board & Staff Turnover | High | Board retention – lack skilled board members, skilled Board members on a number of Boards (overcommitted)  Staff retention – unsure NGO future, very low pay, NGO trained staff are hired by Gov. and Private Sector. | CSO training be centred around Governance and Management. NGO develops skills in diversifying funding base to generate resources to build programme and retain staff. Builds skills in networking and strengthening volunteer base. | The Samoa ICTP programme has been the training vehicle for NGOs. The recent change to seriously scale down the programme is providing an opportunity for SUNGO/CSSP to explore training options that can be more localized (local trainers) and more customized to NGO realities (i.e. mini training sessions that can be incorporated into board/staff meetings, and retreats). |
| **11** | **Sustainability (donors)** |  |  |  |  |
| 11.1 | Withdrawal of donor funds | Low | Donor dissatisfaction with fund | Donor presence on Steering Committee  Agreed notice period for withdrawal | Current donors such as AusAID have increased support. Another donor may contribute to the fund.  Donors have played an active advisory role in CSSP since its inception. |
| 11.2 | Funds reduction after agreed period (4 years) | Moderate | Policy change or desire to reduce aid dependency | Short term (3 year) contracts for PMU staff  Sustainability plans by CSO organizations | High level of commitment by government and current donors to keep CSSP progressingand supported. AusAID has increased its funding to the region. |
| **12** | **Contracted Services** |  |  |  |  |
| 12.1 | Failure by SUNGO to deliver services under agreed contract | Moderate | Lack of management of contract or poor staff performance | 1. Contract performance monitored by PMU/SC 2. Regular reporting to SC against targets | Risk can be reduced by ongoing close coordination/collaboration between CSSP & SUNGO.  SUNGO has an M&E framework in place and will need to report on these supported by compiled survey’s and other data for 2012-2013.  Key SUNGO and CSSP staff have jointly reviewed areas of overlap in the M&E framework and bottlenecks in the timely exchange of information. |
| **13** | **Other factors** |  |  |  |  |
| 13.1 | GoS seeks control of Fund | Low | Lack of GoS satisfaction with direction of CSSP Fund | Government represented and initial chair  Non government majority on Steering Committee | GoS chairs through MoF but ample representation by civil society representations. |
| NOTE : DELETED 13.2 Major catastrophe- Funds diverted to other priorities | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |
| **ANNEX VII: CSSP Mid Term Review (MTR) Recommendations IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2013 – 2015** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MTR recommendations linked to approved activities in 4 thematic areas (I-IV)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **July 2013 – June 2014**  **(MONTHS)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **July 2014 – June 2015**  **(MONTHS)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **I** | **Theme I: Implementation activities to ‘enhance’ the CSSP programme beyond ‘service delivery’** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Parties engaged** | | | | | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
| **Rec. No. 1-Aus**  **& EU Rec. 10** | | Establishes the Steering Committee to be the working group to progress the implementation of the MTR recommendations. Finalize the SC TOR for this task & include guiding principles for the PMU | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC & PMU | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec. No. 2,7 & 14- Aus** | | Provides approaches to community development through pilot studies in the three programmatic areas (linked to CSSP objectives).[[3]](#footnote-3) Pilot studies have been approved in the CSSP PE3 work plan/budget. Programme mgr to draft a concept paper & EIS for pilots. Tender in October 2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC & PMU | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EU Rec No. 8** | | A programme to link CBO to CBO mentoring support with the network of Civil Society Organisations within Samoa/New Zealand and Australia to tap into networks of potential Samoa contributors overseas.[[4]](#footnote-4) Develop a strategy with the assistance of SUNGO (PM & SUNGO CEO) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU, NGOs & SUNGO | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ***Revisions to the CSSP M&E framework & vulnerability*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec. Nos. 3, 10 & 11-Aus** | | Provides further revisions resulting from MTR implementation to the M&E framework to track progress towards outcomes.[[5]](#footnote-5) Review & approva l of M&E revisions at the 6 monthly meeting with development partners (January/July each year) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC, PM, TA’s | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 5 -Aus** | | Incorporates M& E **specific targets for gender** and to engage MWCSD to assist CSSP to identify gaps and targets. Review & approve at 6 monthly meeting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | MWCSD, PM, SC | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | ***Revisions to the vulnerability assessment of CSOs*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 6 - Aus** | | Provides for the incorporation of GIS data, HIES data to establish vulnerable regions/villages and a fixed allocation of grants to those areas.[[6]](#footnote-6) Note: The Bureau of Statistics will have a poverty mapping in place by November 2013. CSSP will incorporate these at that time & review allocations of grants at the time of the next CFP assessment. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC, PM, key stakeholders (SBS) | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **EU Rec No. 4 & 5** | | As a part of its work plan in implementing the approved ICCAI design for water harvesting support to families and communities, CSSP will access Red Cross GIS maps of households connected or not- connected to SWA scheme. [[7]](#footnote-7)  CSSP will implement the approved ICCAI design for Water harvesting in partnership with Samoa Red Cross collaboration with the W&SS technical sub-committee. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU, Samoa Red Cross Society, W&SS stakeholders | | | | | Implementation of the CSSP/Samoa Red Cross ICCAI projects from 1 July 2013 – 31 March 2015 (50 villages, 500 beneficiary households) | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **II** | **CSSP Final Development Partner Review and Reporting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Parties engaged** | | | | | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
|  | **Rec No. 4, 26 , 27 -Aus** | | A local consultant to be engaged as a part of the CSSP final review (next review of CSSP under current funding arrangements up to 2015). [[8]](#footnote-8) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Donor Partners / SC | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Rec No. 16 -Aus** | | AusAID and EU need to explore a common six-monthly narrative report format, which is linked in structure and focus to the revised log frame and PMEF. *Note: A revised format is in place. M&E reviewed at SC mtgs* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Donor Partners, PM, SC | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **EU Rec 3** | | PMU and donor partners to identify ‘check-ponts’ to chart the progress of the re-organisation work begun at the PMU by Cretney & Grey. *Possible assistance by a consultant to compare with other similar CSO programme organisation actions done in the Pacific Region*. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU, SC, Donor partners | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **EU Rec 11** | | PMU and Steering Cttee to consider the benefits, prior to launching the 2014 Evaluation, of requesting an EU Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) – *Possible for November 2014 in preparation for Final Evaluation in 2015* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PM, SC, Donor partners | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **III** | **Capacity building and enhancement of CSSP Programme Management Unit staff and activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Parties engaged** | | | | | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
|  | **Rec Nos. 8 & 13-Aus** | | **P**rioritises training for project officers in development principles & data collection methods (such as participatory appraisals). Applies the training to the work. This recommendation was agreed in principle where feasible and where the task is not already being done by other stakeholders such as MWCSD & SBS. *Possible with ICTP (SUNGO) & others agencies providing trainings.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU | | | | |  | | Project Officer training where there are opportunities (ITCP, mentoring, TA support) | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 12 & 15-Aus** | | **P**rovides for assistance to PMU to prepare narrative accounts & case studies on good practice models for CSO through an Australian Volunteer.[[9]](#footnote-9) *PM f/up with AusAID*. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU/AusAID | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Rec No. 22 -Aus** | | **R**eview the PMU structure and responsibilities, and identify M&E roles within PMU.[[10]](#footnote-10) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU/SC | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Rec No. 23 -Aus** | | **A** review of the spread of administrative responsibilities among PMU staff with a view to clearing staff time for focussed work on NGO consultations and strengthening of advocacy related components in Category 3 projects. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **EU – Rec 2** | | **P**MU to provide SC update on results of the re-engineering activities undertaken by Cretney & Grey. This is inclusive of the modifications made to the CSSP dbase & M&E[[11]](#footnote-11).[[12]](#footnote-12) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PM/SC | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **IV** | **CSSP engagement with Key Stakeholders & CSOs** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
|  | **Rec No. 9 -Aus** | **S**UNGO to include a community development framework in their training and for SUNGO to encourage CBOs and NGOs to consult broadly in their constituencies around key development priorities. MWCSD assisting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PM/SUNGO/MWCSD | | | | | SUNGO, MWCSD & CSSP to encourage CBOs to consult broadly with their constituents | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 17 & 18 -Aus** | **C**ommunication Strategy for CSSP, including communication to potential applicants, to highlight best practice in terms of reaching vulnerable groups and/or activities which broaden the socio-economic impact of the Program.[[13]](#footnote-13) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU/SC & donors | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EU Rec No. 9** | **C**ommunications Strategy for strengthening CSO capacities using EU reference manual (2010) as a guide to convey messages to a variety of audiencies. Note: Similar to AusAID Rec’s 17 & 18. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU/SC & donors | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 19 -Aus** | **I**ntroducing processes to improve the flow of information on other civil society interventions in Samoa to PMU – such as through quarterly updates at Steering Committee meetings by SUNGO & MWCSD Reps. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC SUNGO & MWCSD Reps. | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 20 -Aus** | **F**inance for a national level consultation on civil society in Samoa towards the end of Year Four. This will serve as a means to shine the spotlight on some of CSSP’s case studies of good practice as well as engage other development partners, public servants and international and local NGOs in positive discussion on civil society support. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | CSSP & stakeholders | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec No. 21 & 24-Aus** | **R**eview CSSP’s engagement with MWCSD at strategic & operational level. MWCSD to support community-level analysis (pre approval), monitoring & evaluation of priority projects, & changes to number of MWCSD staff on SC. Engage with MWCSD on exploring the concept of a Project Officer “travel week” – accompanying MWCSD staff, for peer learning exposure to community development M&E practice.[[14]](#footnote-14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMU & MWCSD | | | | | CSSP PMU (Programme Mgr & Project Officers in particular engage with the Ministry facilitated by the MWCSD Rep on the SC. | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EU Rec. No. 3 & No. 7** | **C**EO for MCWSD to assume the lead role in CSSP to provide policy-centred managerial guidance to link PMU with STNs (and their MWCSD monitors?) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC, MWCSD | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rec 28 & 29-Aus** | **R**eview at the 6 monthly meetings and in the 6 monthly report: CSSP’s relationship with SUNGO & emergent links with other national & international NGOs towards the end of the Programme cycle. NGOs to identify sustainability strategies as a part of project follow-up activities & roles for project beneficiaries, CSSP & stakeholders in promoting sustainability. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SC, SUNGO, NGOS | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EU – Rec 1** | **S**trengthen links with GoS Ministries, invite to address public at future awareness workshops, work with MWCSD – STNs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | On-going & reported at SC mtgs & 6 monthly donor mtg | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Rec No. 25 -Aus** | SC Declined (not accept recommendation) for an exposure visit for PMU Manager and one or two Steering Committee members to observe the functioning of similar civil society programs in other Pacific countries. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX VIII: COMPILED NGO ADVOCACY SURVEY 2013**

Introduction: A survey was conducted by CSSP in May and June 2013 to gauge from NGOs what advocacy activities of the Government of Samoa or international bodies they were involved in. Survey Forms were sent to 10 currently active NGOs. Seven forms were returned (70%).

Q. 1 : Has anyone represented your organization on any Government Committees in the last 6 months?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME OF NGO | SQA | MBS & CCT | MESC | MWCSD/CEDAW | MWCSD/CRC | PPCR | SOE | UNPFII | UNCCD | UNFCCC | UREC | KBA | Rio+20 | IUCN MANGROVE PROJECT | DISABILITY TASKFORCE | NHS BOARD | SAMOA LEADERSHIP | FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON TOBACCO CONTROL | UIC |
| Goshen Trust Mental Health Services | √ |  |  | √ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | √ | √ |  |  |
| Manumalo Baptist School |  | √ | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Nuanua ole Alofa |  |  | √ | √ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | √ |  |  |  |  |
| Ole Siosiomaga Society |  |  |  |  |  | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal Protection Society | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| PABITRA | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Samoa Cancer Society |  |  |  |  | √ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | √ |  | √ | √ |

Assumption: A very limited representation of NGOs on Government Committees and Boards.

Q. 2 : What other advocacy activities have you done in the last 6 months?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME OF NGO** | Attend meetings/ consultations on Climate Change | Attend meetings/ consultations on Gender Issues | Meetings/ consultations with Donors/ International Groups | Other meetings | Media appearance/ articles | Advocacy Training |
| Goshen Trust Mental Health Services | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  |
| Manumalo Baptist School | √ |  | √ | √ | √ |  |
| Nuanua O le Alofa |  | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Ole Siosiomaga Society | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Animal Protection Society |  |  |  | √ | √ | √ |
| PABITRA |  |  |  |  | √ |  |
| Samoa Cancer Society |  |  | √ | √ | √ | √ |

Assumption: Attendance at meetings other than those relevant to the NGO is high. There is good media coverage of NGO activities but this can be explored further.

Q. 3 : Describe an advocacy activity that your NGO implemented in the last 6 months that you are especially proud of. What was the result? How was it promoted?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME OF NGO** | **ACTIVITY** | **HOW MANY?** | **DESCRIBE THE RESULT** |
| Goshen Trust Mental Health Services | * Consultation with National Health Board in regards to the MOU between Goshen and NHS. * NGO Assessment | Ongoing  Several times | * The MOU when it is signed by all concerned will be a major milestone for the organization. An excellent example of advocacy. * Very promising results that will further improve the systems of the organization. |
| Manumalo Baptist School | * The old school serving as an emergency evacuation centre during the flooding caused by cyclone Evan in December and again in February 2013. | Twice | MOH condemned the buildings then CEO MESC agreed to relocate the school to Malifa. A letter of support from MESC approving the climate smart architectural design.  PUMA also agreed in principle with the architectural design, and offered support for the preliminary Environmental Assessment. |
| Nuanua o le Alofa | * Consultation with Board, staff and potential leaders within the organisation to re-think priorities in regards to the AusAid disability inclusive programme. | One | NOLA now recognized as the advocacy body for disability in the country to provide training on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. |
| Ole Siosiomaga Society | * OLSSI current adaptation to climate change project through engagement of coastal communities in Moataa, Saleufi, Fugalei, Savalalo, Sogi, Mulinuu, Vaimoso, Vaitoloa, Pesega and Lepea. | Ongoing | There is now a solid and long-term sustainable partnership with the village communities. These communities have a strong sense of ownership now that they know who the donors are, why they want to help, how the activities address village concerns and understand where and how help can be obtained when needed. |
| Animal Protection Society |  |  |  |
| PABITRA | * Wrote to 20 different organisations to request collaborative activities. Letters promoted vision and mission of PABITRA (Samoa) * Submitted article to INIINI upon request from them. |  | Not clear of the results. |
| Samoa Cancer Society | * Cancer prevention promotion held 27 – 31 May 2013. The USO Bike Ride for Cancer and Healthy Living. Involved a 7-man bike ride through Upolu and Savaii stopping at 12 villages to raise cancer awareness. MOH supported with funds for accommodation. MWCSD organized the villages. Awareness raising was provided on cancer risk factors by MOH. SCS provided awareness on cancer management etc. The Uso Bike Ride was published in WHO | 5 days | Great advocacy and awareness- raising about Cancer Risk Factors and Cancer management.  Strong partnership development among SCS and MOH and MWCSD. |

**Annex IX CIVIL SOCIETY VIEWS OF CSSP SUPPORT**

Samoa Spinal Network, approved for a CSSP Research Grant in March 2013 (deadline 2013), is exploring why critical health problems of people with spinal cord injuries develop after they are discharged from medical care and return home, what is the cause, and how can this be prevented for a better quality of life for these patients.

Team leader Epenesa Pouesi Young for the Samoa Spinal Network said:

“As an Association deeply concerned for the future of spinal cord injuries in our country, Samoa Spinal Network wants to find an answer and, hopefully, a solution for these health problems. We hereby would like to express our sincere appreciation for this great opportunity that Civil Society Support Program has given us through the sponsorship of AusAid and European Union. Their generous support will enable Samoa Spinal Network to conduct the research.”

The overall objective of the Samoa Cancer Society (SCS( is to reduce the number of people in Samoa who develop cancer and to ensure the best quality of life for people living with cancer. Through its media campaign, film events, publications, forums for health professionals and outreach programme, the SCS has broken the silence about cancer.

With CSSP support, SCS has been able to establish a Resource Centre at the National Hospital, conduct outreach services in communities to raise awareness about the prevention and early detection and treatment of cancer, establish counselling services, hire an Executive Officer and a Senior Community Nurse.

The support to SCS meets all three CSSP objectives of providing sustainable social benefits meeting the needs of vulnerable groups, well governed CSOs to manage development programmes and projects and strengthened voice of civil society organisations to effectively influence national policy.

**A quote from the Mid Term Review of the Health Sector Plan 2008- 2018 (April 2013) regarding the effectiveness of SCS and the need to work with NGOs effectively. pg 38**

“Samoa does not currently have a pap smear screening program and prevalence data is not available for cervical cancer.  Admissions to the two main hospitals, is used as a proxy indicator.  The number of admissions was relatively low from 2007 to 2011 but increased in 2012.  The increase coincided with the opening of the Cancer Society’s National Cancer Resource Centre and more widespread outreach programs on the importance of early detection”(Mid Term Review of the Health Sector Plan 2008 - 2018, Ministry of Health, April 2013)

“There are a number of NGOs working on NCDs and their work could be better coordinated and aligned with health sector outcomes through a consensus on role delineation and regular communication and performance monitoring.  This includes diabetes and all types of cancers where NGOs conduct awareness raising and prevention programmes.  Partnerships between NGOs and MOH Health Education nd Promotion Services (HEAPS) could strengthen these activities”

**CSSP Advocacy Survey: Describe an advocacy activity that your NGO implemented in the last six months that you are especially proud of? What was the result? How was it promoted?**

*“SCS is very proud of its cancer prevention promotion that was held 27 May to 31st May. Called the Uso Bike Ride for Cancer and Healthy living, it involved a 7 man bike ride through all of Upolu and Savaii stopping at 12 villages to raise cancer awareness. The Ministry of Health was approached to support the concept with funds for accommodations. Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development organized the villages. Awareness raising was provided on cancer risk factors by MoH and SCS provided awareness on cancer management etc. The Uso Bike Ride was published in WHO.”*

**MULIVAI PRIMARY SCHOOL LIBRARY**

**& COMPUTER ROOM**

**CSSP Project No. 171**

**Applicant**

** *Mulivai Primary School*

**Category 1**

(SAT 23,093.30)

**Project Description**

The Mulivai Primary School PTA together with the Mulivai Village council and two US Peace Corps Volunteers requested support for a Library and a Computer Center. The school had been donated computers and library books from the Government of Germany but had limited space for storage. The school building itself was much deteriorated and badly needed renovations. A request was made to CSSP to build a separate library and computer centre for students.

The newly opened Mulivai Safata Primary School Library and Computer Centre.

**Accomplishments**

The school was completed in August 2012 for a very reasonable cost and greatly improved the student’s learning environment.



The new library shelves with new books to support with the primary students learning and to enjoy reading.

It was the only building standing after Cyclone Evan in December 2012 with very little damage and is still being used for the students resource centre while plans are being put into place to rebuild the adjacent school building

**TILAPIA EARTH PONDS**

**CSSP Project No. 737**

**Applicant**

*Lotofagā Safata Tilapia Club*

**Category 1 Funded**

(SAT 9,000)



A view of one of the two new tilapia earth ponds dug by the excavator. The ponds are gravity fed and drained so there is no need for electrical water pumps.

**Project Description**

 The ‘Papapapa Club” from Lotofagā , Safata Tilapia Club was established to provide an alternative to marine fish which is often in low supply and high priced. The club of seven households also produce vegetables for the Sinalei Hotel. They started with two hand dug tilapia ponds several years ago with the assistance of the Fisheries Division.

The Ministry provided the fingerlings (young tilapia fish) and technical assistance in farm operation and management. With some experience with tilapia rearing and a letter of support from the Fisheries Division , the Club applied to CSSP for funds for expanding and enlarging the size of the ponds. The earth works expansion for the two large ponds was started in March 2013 and completed the following month.

**Accomplishments**

Constructing bigger tilapia earth ponds meant a total of 3,400 tilapia fingerlings are now being raised. The plan is to harvest this stock by September or October 2013.

With their tilapia venture well established as a semi commercial venture, they now have an agreement in place with the Sinalei Hotel to sell all of their tilapia fish when harvested. The club looks forward to the next six months to have a better understanding of how much income can be generated with the larger sized ponds.



The small scale hand-made earth ponds that the club had been using to raise tilapia in earlier times. They are still raising tilapia in these ponds and also have another little pond raising fresh water shrimps.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The purpose of the NGO assessment is to develop a process to assess the health of Non-Governmental Organizations against a set of agreed standards. By assessing an organisation’s activities against these standards, support or training can be made available to address the problems identified and improve the performance of the organization. Assessments are carried out by a small team from SUNGO consisting of SUNGO Technical Advisor, 2 Trainers and the CSO coordinator. The tool has been tested in 2012 and further reviewed in 2013 using feedback from stakeholders [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. PMU to concentrate on building an evidence base of case studies or narrative insights that clarify the purpose of providing support to vulnerable groups and the kind strategies that work to promote empowerment (not just access) of women, youth, and PWD. Pilot studies using M&E methodologies to address each one of the CSSP objectives. Each provides technical assistance to engage 24 -30 projects in the following areas:

   1. Community development – targeting vulnerable households and impacting socio-economic wellbeing.
   2. Capacity building pilot-includes women’s committees and youth groups in priority areas that have received a grant from CSSP previously and demonstrated an interest in further community development work such as an income generation project and not an infrastructure project.
   3. An ‘advocacy pilot’ involving funding to NGOs which may have received previous operational support and have the capacity to engage in information sharing, media sharing and national level work.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. SUNGO, NGOs & CBOs to be consulted for their views and ideas for such a programme at the November stakeholder consultation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Revise M&E plan to include all project as well as 2ndary data and community based analysis by PMU/MWCSD such as *data in files, dbase, tracer studies and the pilot case studies completed before final review.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Call for Proposals planned for November and assessments to begin in February/March 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. CSSP will explore the use of the up-dated HEIS data to identify “hot-spots” for households below Basic Poverty Needs Threshold. CSSP will target “hot-spot” districts and include outreach efforts by CSSP & partners. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Final Review planned for around March to June 2015. Review to have more in-country preparatory time with definite monitoring and evaluation inputs (impact assessments, thematic working papers, etc.) that feed into the process. Review to compare approach adopted during Phase 1 (2010 – 13) and Phase 2 (2013 – 15) to establish the future orientation of civil society support and role of development partner engagement in this area.

   Future programming options that were evident from the MTR include:

   1. Separation of NGO and CBO projects with CSSP retaining a focus on CBO work (and Objectives 1 and 2) provided closer synergies between CSSP and line ministries. The NGO work (and Objective 3) might be supported through an intermediary like SUNGO or other larger national NGOs and international NGO
   2. Further sectoral alignment with prioritisation around community development, gender and youth issues, or other sectors where an expanded role for civil society organisations delivers maximum impact.
   3. Altered harmonised relationships either involving pooled funding or delegated cooperation. Harmonised arrangements with NZAID and UN agencies should also be explored.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Explore technical assistance (senior expert/AusAID Program Officer) to support development of PMY, which draws on best practice M&E and civil society experience in the Pacific. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This may involve additional staff inputs (local consultant housed in CSSP; additional part-time staff member) or other strategies such as sub-contracting impact assessments. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. *Note: Cretney & Gray have already presented the final report on consultancy to SC members in February 2013. Crentey has provided a f/up report on PMU implementation results since the consultancy in Feb 2013.* [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Note: Communication strategy being reviewed by SC & AusAID for final approval at the 6 monthly meeting August 2013. Should include a review of the communication process & letters to project applicants [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Note: MWCSD did not agree to an MOU but would work closely with CSSP to strengthen partnership. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)