

Alliance 2015

towards the eradication of poverty

**GHANA: AID EFFECTIVENESS AND THE EDUCATION
SECTOR: IMPLICATIONS FOR CIVIL SOCIETY**

An Alliance2015 report

Akwasi Addae-Boahene
Consultant

November 24, 2007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.0 INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Background of Study	8
1.2 Purpose of Study	9
1.3 Methodology of Study	9
1.4 Data Collection Techniques	9
1.5 Report Structure	10
2.0 PARIS DECLARATION AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS IN GHANA	11
2.1 Background of the Paris Declaration	11
2.2 Paris Declaration and Poverty Reduction and Development	11
2.3 Comprehensive Development Framework in Ghana	13
2.4 The Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy	13
2.5 Sector-Wide Approach to Development Assistance	14
2.6 Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy	14
2.7 Multi-Donor Budgetary Support	15
3.0 THE EDUCATION SECTOR AND PARIS AGENDA	17
3.1 Education Sector Policies and Strategies	17
3.2 Education Sector and the Paris Declaration	17
3.2.1 Country Ownership Sector Programming	18
3.2.2 Sector Alignment and Harmonisation	18
3.2.3 Coordinating Sector Results	19
3.2.4 Policy Dialogue between Government and Development Partners	19
3.2.5 Partnership with Civil Society	20
3.3 Education Sector Funding Modalities	21
4.0 IMPLICATION OF THE PARIS DECLARATION FOR CIVIL SOCIETY, DONORS AND GOVERNMENT	23
4.1 Position of Civil Society on Paris Declaration	23
4.2 Sector Challenges for CSOs	23
4.3 Programming and Funding Challenges for CSOs	24
4.4 Ineffective Institutional Arrangements	25
4.5 CSOs Effectiveness	25
4.6 Lack of Trust	26
5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
5.1 Conclusions	27
5.1.1 Ownership	27
5.1.2 Governance within the Education Sector	27

5.1.3	Civil Society Contribution in the Education Sector	28
5.2	Recommendations	29
5.2.1	Democratic Ownership of Sector Programming and Results	29
5.2.2	Making Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector	29
5.2.3	Making CSOs Effective Sector Partners	30
5.2.4	Funding Sustaining CSOs	30
5.2.5	Programme Diversification for CSOs	30
ANNEX 1	TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUDY	32
ANNEX 2	INTERVIEW GUIDE	33
ANNEX 3	LISTS OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	39
ANNEX 4	REFERENCES	40

About this report and the research project

This report is part of a research project carried out by the Alliance2015 on the Aid Effectiveness and the Paris Declaration and the implementation in the education and governance sectors in case countries with a focus on effects for funding and policy spaces for Civil Society. The full study consists of the following reports:

A2015 Mozambique country study: Methven, Sara (INTRAC) (March 2008): The Impact of The Paris Declaration on Civil Society in Mozambique. *An Alliance2015 report*

A2015 Ghana country study: Addae-Boahene, Akwasi (November 2007) Ghana: Aid Effectiveness and the Education Sector: Implications for Civil Society. *An Alliance2015 report*.

A2015 Ghana country study: Akwetey, Emmanuel (IDEG)(December 2007): The Paris Declaration and Aid Effectiveness: Effect of Implementation on Civil Society Funding and Policy Space in Ghana. *An alliance2015 report*.

A2015 Nicaragua country study: Mauricio Gomez Lacayo and Carlos Alberto Benavente Gomez (INGES) (November 2007): Aid Effectiveness and the Paris Declaration: Impact on the Financing and participation of Civil Society Organisations in Nicaragua in the Education and Governance Sectors. *An Alliance2015 Report*.

A2015 Bolivia country study: Gomez, Javier (CEDLA) (January 2008 DRAFT): Situation of the Alignment and Ownership Process in Bolivia. *An Alliance2015 report*.

A2015 Synthesis report: Wright, Katie (INTRAC) (April 2008): Fostering Democratic Ownership – Towards Greater Impact on Poverty. *An Alliance2015 report*.

The research is organised and funded by the Alliance2015: www.alliance2015.org. The research project is coordinated by Lars Koch, IBIS: lk@ibis.dk. All rights reserved by Alliance2015. Reproduction and quoting is encouraged with due reference to the source.

ACRONYMS

ADEOP	Annual District Education Operational Plan
ADMU	Aid &Debt Management Unit
AESOP	Annual Education Sector Operational Plan
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CG/APM	Consultative Group/Annual Partnership Meeting
CGS	Capitation Grants Scheme
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DACF	District Assemblies Common Fund
DAs	District Assemblies
DEFAT	District Education for All Teams
DEOs	District Education Offices
DFID	British Department for International Development
DPs	Development Partners
DSS	Direct Sector Support
EFA	Education for All
ERP	Economic Recovery Programme
ESP	Education Strategic Plan
FBOs	Faith Based Organisations
GES	Ghana Education Service
GETFund	Ghana Education Trust Fund
G-HAP	Ghana Harmonisation and Aid Effectiveness Plan
G-JAS	The Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy
GNAT	Ghana National Association of Teachers
GNECC	Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition
GNP	Gross National Product
GoG	Government of Ghana
GPF	The Growth and Poverty Forum
GPRS	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
GPRS II	The Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy
G-RAP	The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor country
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HLF3	Third High Level Forum
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDBS	Multi-Donor Budget Support
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOESS	Ministry of Education Science and Sport

MoFEP	Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning
NAP	National Action Plan
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NNED	Northern Network for Education Development
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PD	Paris Declaration
PRSC	Poverty Reduction Support Credit
PRGF	Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
PSOs	Private Sector Organisations
PTR	Pupil Teacher Ratio
RAVI	Rights and Voice Initiative
RBAs	Right Based Approaches
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UN	United Nations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

External inflows have been of critical importance in financing development programmes in developing countries. Most of these external inflows come through Official Development Assistance¹ (ODA). The form and mechanisms of ODA has been criticized in the recent past because most experts believe that it has been ineffective. Professor William Easterly of New York University, who is a former associate of the World Bank, has insisted that the better part of ODA provided over the past fifty years has been ineffective. One of the reasons according to him is the lack of control over the persons responsible for managing this aid.² As the world moved towards poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), there was the need to design a new aid architecture that will ensure an efficient management of aid money and the achievement of the MDGs.

The need to make sure that aid responds to poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGs, has spawned impatience and anxiety. Therefore in March 2005 a High Level Forum made up of 35 donors and 57 partner countries signed the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness. The Declaration adopted five partnership commitments as the basis for development cooperation. These partnership commitments include ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability. The Declaration establishes global commitments for donor and recipient countries to support more effective aid in a context of a significant scaling up. The intent is to reform the delivery and management of aid by those who give aid and the recipients of aid money, in order to improve its effectiveness. The Declaration therefore represented a paradigm shift in international development cooperation in that it goes beyond previous agreements of general principles to a more pragmatic approach to improve the quality of aid management by substantially reducing transaction cost for both givers and recipients, and its impact on development.

This new arrangement of aid effectiveness was welcomed by civil society because the principles of ownership and accountability were endorsed by the Paris Declaration. Civil society organisations (CSOs) believe that these principles will set the basis for the balancing of the relationship between donors and recipient countries. Secondly, CSOs agree that linking the Paris Declaration to key development goals like poverty reduction and the MDGs put the interest of poor and marginalized people at the mainstream of the aid effectiveness agenda. However, this new arrangement has significant implications for CSOs.

Firstly, the role of CSOs as development actors has not been acknowledged by the Declaration and so CSO participation does not form part of the indicators of progress. Secondly, the Declaration seeks to indicate that governments are capable of representing the interest of all sections of the society including the poor and marginalized. There is also the critical concern by CSOs that there were no independent accountability

¹ According to the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) ODA includes grants and concessional loans.

² The White Man's Burden, Penguin Press.

mechanisms within the partnership commitments and the indicators of progress, and that donors and governments were only accountable to themselves. Donor/ government collaboration has also been overemphasized through the design of Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs), sector wide approaches (SWAp), Joint Assistance Strategy (JASs) and multi-donor budgetary support (MDBS) to the extent that CSOs might be excluded.

The Government of Ghana (GoG) together with donors has committed to pursue the Paris Declaration Agenda and is making progress. GoG developed a new development framework through the GPRS II and through which the new aid management agenda based on the Paris Declaration is being pursued.

The institution of the Paris Agenda in Ghana took into account the following instruments:

- The comprehensive development framework (CDF): The CDF aims at bringing external partners together to finance the development programmes formulated by the recipient country rather than support numerous individual projects.
- The sector wide approach. (SWAp): The SWAp was first instituted in the health sector, but has been adopted in the education sector.
- The multi-donor budget support (MDBS): The MDBS process as adopted by GoG aims at ensuring continuous flow of development assistance to enable government finance its poverty related expenditure.
- The Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS) as a way of improving the alignment of development assistance with the core business of government and the government political and partnership cycles.

The implementation of the Paris Agenda in Ghana has several implications for the work of CSOs, donors and the Government of Ghana (GoG). This research arrived at some conclusions and recommendations as follows:

Conclusions:

- CSOs in the education sector should continue to be seen as development actors in the communities in which they operate, to mobilize citizens to claim rights and hold donors and governments to account. They should therefore continue to align their programmes with the poor and marginalized including women groups.
- Development based CSOs should continue to innovate on rights based approaches (RBAs) in their programming and create opportunities for advocacy by continuously highlighting on the needs of the poor and policy failures within the education sector.
- CSOs in the education sector should create alliances and networks with key interest groups and stakeholders in the education sector and work to ensure that government and donors honor their commitments to poverty reduction.

- CSOs in the education sector need to lobby for participation and space in sector dialogue that goes on between donors and government.
- CSOs globally should share ideas, skills and experiences; northern CSOs in particular should take the lead in providing opportunities for capacity building for southern CSOs in the areas of policy analysis and dialogue, advocacy and coalition building.
- Donors should set up a separate funding mechanism that can sustain CSOs in an independent manner and create the conditions for CSOs to continue to speak out for the poor and marginalized.

Recommendations:

- CSO networks in the education sector like GNECC and NNED should be strengthened at the national, regional and district levels to mobilize citizens and citizen-led associations to advocate for the efficient use of aid money and the achievement of the MDGs and the goals of the GPRS II.
- CSO networks in the sector should improve their consultative processes in a way that ensures that they speak on behalf of marginalized and poor people and their membership.
- CSO networks in the sector and particularly GNECC and NNED should strengthen their relationship and collaboration with other institutions and networks like the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education and the Ghana National NGO Coalition on the Rights of the Child.
- GNECC and NNED should advocate for the establishment of a G-RAP type of funding solely for the sector to ensure adequate and independently managed funding for CSOs.
- GNECC and NNED should rethink and may re engineer their existing structure and management so the two coalitions can effectively provide the leadership required within the education sector. The current arrangement and especially the capacity is not allowing the two coalitions to effectively engage with their membership and citizens.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Debates on the management of aid have resulted in a consensus that aid disbursement and reporting should be aligned and harmonised to improve aid delivery and effectiveness. In March 2005, therefore, a high level meeting was held in Paris to establish the foundation of a new order in international development cooperation. The main constraints of previous paradigms were seen to be the situation in which multiple donors created a fragmented pattern with a multitude of directives regarding priorities, reporting requirements, monitoring and conditional aspects of cooperation, that were difficult for the recipient countries to manage. There was therefore a need to move the focus of aid delivery from the magnitude of resources being transferred to the quality of the support provided. These constraints were seen to lead to a lack of ownership in recipient countries. Further, it was believed that existing conditionality led to high transaction costs, thus diverting resources from addressing the needs of poor people. The new paradigm for development cooperation was suggested, and the resolution signed by the 35 donor countries, led by the OECD Development Assistance Committee and 57 recipient countries was built on a desire to scale-up development cooperation through concrete measures.

The Declaration emphasises alignment and harmonisation with national priorities and needs. The commitment made by donors and partner countries as stated in the Declaration reflects the realization that management of development assistance must be reformed to reduce poverty and inequality to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Civil society generally welcomed the Declaration with argument that it was a step in the right direction but pointed out that the Declaration has little to say on three essential questions- *aid effective for what purpose, for whom and as measured by whom?*³ The Declaration states that the purpose for the reform of the aid system is to better meet goals for poverty reduction including MDGs. But civil society has questioned how much aid as currently managed actually reaches the poor and mobilizes them to address their own problems, and propose this, as a true measure of aid effectiveness.⁴

Donors and civil society disagree on the real purpose of the Paris Declaration. Civil society believes that donors are more concerned with the “transaction cost” of aid and not the real impact or poverty reduction. This assertion clearly embolden civil society to act as watch dogs for aid management and ensure that both donors and southern governments meet their commitments towards poverty reduction.

³ Reality check “Paris Declaration: Toward Enhanced Aid Effectiveness”, January,2007,Page 9 cited in http://www.odi.org.uk/ffa/workshop_nov05/comments-scoping%20paper/ATujan.pdf

⁴ Ibis

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

In September, 2008 the Third High Level Forum (HLF3) of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness will be held in Accra to assess the progress of the Declaration in achieving the goals and commitments on aid effectiveness. Representatives of donor institutions, governments, civil society and the media will meet to discuss the place and influence of aid in development.

IBIS, a Danish NGO in Ghana has commissioned this consultant to carry out the research with the following objectives:

- 1 Analyse the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Aid Effectiveness agenda in Ghana and specifically in the education sector and how it is changing funding modalities for government and CSOs, and changing policy negotiations and decisions;
- 2 Provide guidance for CSOs, networks and IBIS thematic programmes in the education sector in Ghana to better understand and engage at the policy level in the sector and navigate in future fundraising; and
- 3 Provide an input into the global debate on the Paris Agenda and CSOs and the changing roles between civil society and the state actors.

The research will provide evidence from the ground on impact and possibilities for civil society working in the basic education sector in the light of the Declaration. The findings would also feed into the Danish debate on the Paris Agenda and the reformulation of the Danida Civil Society Strategy. Furthermore, the study will provide IBIS and partner organizations with recommendations regarding how best to support partners engaging in the new policy space. Above all, the findings will improve understanding of partners on how the implementation of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness affects both developed and developing countries.

1.3 Methodology

Data for the preparation of the research was obtained from two main sources-desk study and primary source. The desk study involves reviewing existing literature on the subject obtained from Ministry of Education Science and Sport, IBIS, the NDPC, GNECC, GNAT, MoFEP and from Google search. The main instrument of primary data was structured interview guide administered to some staff from IBIS, GNECC, NNED, DFID, Ministry of Education and the GES. Interview questions as well as the Terms of Reference document that guided the study are included in the annex.

1.4 Data Collection Techniques

A day was spent at Gomoa District where interviews were held with GES and IBIS staffs. Additionally, two days were spent in the Northern Region-one day each at Tamale and East Gonja District, Salaga where interview guides were administered to IBIS, NNED, DEFAT and GES staffs. While in Tamale, the Consultant had the opportunity to

participate in a workshop organized by the Northern Network on Education and Development (NNED). Participants' comments and contributions during the workshop were invaluable in the writing of this report.

1.5 Report Structure

The study has been organised into five chapters, including this introductory chapter. Chapter two discusses the Paris Declaration and development frameworks in Ghana. Chapter three assesses the education sector policies and strategies. Chapter four discusses the implications of the Declaration on civil society, donors and GoG. Chapter five concludes the study with a set of recommendations on how to make CSOs effective within the new aid and development architecture.

2.0 PARIS DECLARATION AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS IN GHANA

2.1 The Background of the Paris Declaration

The endorsement of the Paris Declaration was a follow up on the Declaration adopted at the High level Forum on Harmonisation in Rome in February 2003, and a core principle put forward at the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Development results in February 2004. The Declaration is to improve the effectiveness of aid for stated purposes of accelerating the achievement of the 2015 Millennium Development Goals of reducing poverty and inequality. The agreement represented a more action-oriented road map to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development.⁵

The partnership commitments of the Declaration cover five broad areas, namely:

- **Ownership:** partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies, and coordinate development actions;
- **Alignment:** donors base their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures;
- **Harmonisation:** donors actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective;
- **Managing for Results:** managing and implementing aid in a way that focuses on the desired results and uses information to improve decision-making; and
- **Mutual Accountability:** donors and partners are accountable for results.

Development actors involved in international cooperation welcomed efforts by the donor community to improve the effectiveness of aid in the wake of commitments to increase levels of aid by 2015. Nevertheless, many CSOs have voiced out concerns that the Declaration is a relationship between donors and governments and have warned that the impact of commitment made in the Paris Declaration on reducing poverty will be limited if reforms ignore the political process of development. CSOs are crucial actors in democratic governance but the Paris Declaration marginalizes them as development actors in their own societies⁶.

2.2 Paris Declaration and Poverty Reduction and Development

If aid is to work effectively for poor people, both rich donor countries and southern governments will need to radically increase their levels of accountability and transparency. The Declaration represents a useful but limited attempt to deal with persistent problems of aid delivery. Unlike many other international agreements, it includes measurable targets, with a 2010 deadline.⁷ However, for some of the issues

⁵ An excellent over view of the Paris Declaration from a donor official point of view can be found in a presentation by Real Laverge from CIDA Policy Branch to CCIC. See civil society and Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness- <http://www.ccic.ca/002/aid.shtml>

⁶ See Reality Check "The Paris Declaration: Toward Enhanced Aid Effectiveness?" January 2007 BOND, CCIC , accessible at : http://www.odi.org.uk/ffa/workshop_nov05

⁷ Actionaid Making Aid Accountable and Effective: The Challenge for the Third High Level Forum and Aid Effectiveness. Accra, Ghana 2008, page 5.

included the in Paris process, such as technical assistance and predictability, the targets do not go far enough, and many other key issues such as conditionality are omitted altogether.

The other issue that is significantly missing in the Declaration is about the place of women in poverty reduction. Women's rights are a cross-cutting issue, impacting on all aspects of development. As such, women's empowerment is a pre-requisite for development and poverty cannot be tackled unless the rights of women are put at centre stage. Similarly, aid cannot be deemed effective unless it tackles the central issue of women empowerment. The effectiveness of the Declaration should be measured in terms of the extent to which development interventions are consistent with beneficiary's requirements; country needs, aid's intended purpose and the reduction of poverty and inequality which is a true measure of aid effectiveness in the poorest countries, where aid is a key resource.

The Paris Declaration assumes that reforms in the delivery and management of aid will improve aid's effectiveness in reaching poor people and mobilizing them to address their rights. However, the Declaration establishes no commitment to clear targets or mutually accountable assessments of whether these reforms will result in sustained progress in reducing poverty. For aid to be effective it is widely accepted that recipient countries should take ownership for the development process. Unless countries are able to decide and direct their own development paths, development will fail to be inclusive, sustainable or effective. Country ownership of development programs should be understood as more than simply government ownership. The involvement of civil society stakeholders including women's organizations in the formulation and delivery of policy and programmes should be seen as integral part of ensuring real country ownership and leadership. In this debate, it is expected that governments should ensure regular and purposeful consultations with citizens and civil society just as it does with donors. If this happens, it will genuinely ensure country ownership and leadership.

Ownership is one of the five partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration, which says donors will respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.⁸ However, the Paris indicators relating to ownership focuses on southern countries developing national strategies not on donor actions. Poor donor behaviour in relation to internal sector policy discussions and tied aid seriously undermines country ownership of development strategies, reduces policy space and negatively affects accountability.

One key issue highlighted by the Paris Declaration is particularly the continuing scandal of the effectiveness technical assistance. Southern partners during a baseline survey indicated that donor provided technical assistance was not often aligned to their national priorities. Technical assistance also constitutes a high proportion of aid but has largely been ineffective, over-priced, donor driven and based on an outdated model of

⁸ "Making Aid Accountable and Effective", cited in OECD DAC Baseline. See www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/45/38597363.pdf

development.⁹ While there is international consensus that aid should be about providing necessary resources for poverty eradication, aid flows rarely match need. Also many countries and critical issues receive paltry aid allocations. This is a situation which every body agrees must change, yet Paris Declaration is largely silent on this critical issue.

2.3 Comprehensive Development Framework in Ghana

Efforts to improve the impact of aid delivery in Ghana began in the early part of 1999, when the World Bank launched the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) initiative, and Ghana was selected as one of twelve CDF pilot countries. The CDF consists of a number of fundamental principles aimed at guiding development and poverty reduction, including the provision of external assistance. As such, the CDF is based on the principles of long-term holistic development framework; country ownership; country-led partnership; and results orientation. The CDF aims at bringing external partners together to finance the development programmes formulated by the recipient country, rather than support numerous individual projects, most of which had no country ownership. CDF also aims at supporting government policy and reforms, as opposed to driving government reforms, as had been the case before.

The effects of the CDF were:

- The formation of a 14 government-led thematic “CDF-groups” for coordinating dialogue between government and donors;
- Monthly working lunches between donor representatives; and
- Hosting of full consultative meetings chaired by the Vice President of the Republic of Ghana.

The influence of the CDF notion in the global design of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) is exhibited by the fact that the processes and activities related to PRSP formulation and implementation aimed at representing the four core principles of the CDF. To enhance the synergy between aid effectiveness in poor countries, Ghana has sought to secure HIPC debt relief and continuing access to soft-window credits from the IMF and World Bank.

2.4 The Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy

The design and preparation of the Ghana Growth and Poverty Strategy (GPRS II) (2006-2009) is guided by practical lessons and experiences drawn from the implementation of the GPRS I (2003-2005). The GPRS II is based on the preposition that Ghana has positioned itself to attain the social and economic status of emerging middle income country within the next decade. The role of GPRS II is to accelerate the growth of the economy to attain the middle income level.

While the GPRS I focused on poverty reduction programmes and projects, the emphasis of GPRS II is on the implementation of growth-inducing policies and programmes which have the potential to support wealth creation and sustainable poverty reduction. GPRS II is therefore anchored on pursuing the following priorities:

⁹ Actionaid International: Real Aid 2: Making Technical Assistance Work (Johannesburg, 2006), See http://www.actionaid.org/docs/real_aid2.pdf

- continued macroeconomic stability
- accelerated private sector-led growth
- vigorous human resource development
- good governance and civic responsibility¹⁰

GPRS II essentially integrates the otherwise disparate development agenda and sectoral commitments that competes for inclusion in the annual national budget into one comprehensive development policy framework

The estimated total resources required to finance the GPRS II is US\$ 8.06 billion. GoG will bear the total cost of wages and salaries and administrative expenses associated with the project and programme implementation but which is not included in the estimate. As reflected in macroeconomic framework, the budgeted expenditures for investments and services over the same period only amounts to US\$ 6.27 billion indicating an overall funding gap of US\$ 1.79 billion which is expected to be filled by external inflows (HIPC savings, debt cancellation and the Millennium Challenge Account) and resources from the international capital market through the issue of sovereign bonds.

2.5 Sector-Wide Approach to Development Assistance

The sector-wide approach (SWAp) is a process where donors give significant funding to a government's comprehensive sector policy and expenditure, for example, education, consistent with a sound macroeconomic framework. The main impetus behind SWAp is the general dissatisfaction of most stakeholders with the impact of aid on poverty reduction and quality of life of people in the developing countries. Donor support for SWAp can be in form of budget support, projects, technical cooperation and policy dialogue.

The SWAp was first introduced in Ghana in 1997, in the health sector before being adopted in the education sector. Within the education sector the main instrument for the implementation of the SWAp is the Education Strategic Plan (ESP). The ESP is a collaborative approach to education development in Ghana. The implementation of the policy presupposes the need for all stakeholders in education to marshal resources, both human and financial to see to the realization of EFA goals. Additionally, the SWAp requires the setting up of a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF), a mechanism which provided high level of discussions between DPs and GoG under the leadership of the sector ministry on the disbursement of donor funds within the sector. The intent is to establish and implement a sector programming and financing framework that falls in line with the commitments of the Paris Declaration. It will therefore be important to examine the process and mechanisms of the education sector against the five principles of the Paris Declaration.

2.6 Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy

The Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS) is aimed at improving development assistance with the core business of government and the government's political partnership cycle. It is built on commitments by development (DPs) to work toward the

¹⁰ Republic of Ghana, Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy II (2006-2009), November 2005, page xxi

achievement of goals and priorities of the second Ghana Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II) to accelerate progress against mutually defined harmonisation principles. In addition to defining the relationship between the government of Ghana and development partners in relation to the implementation of the GPRS II, the G-JAS also provides a framework for CSOs to monitor the implementation of the aid partnership framework. The Growth and Poverty Forum (GPF) which comprises CSOs and Private Sector Organisations (PSOs) in Ghana was established to ensure the active participation of civil society and non-state actors in the PRSP formulation, implementation, and monitoring processes. In support of the ESP, the G-JAS focuses on improved educational outcomes and accelerated achievement of the MDGs. It also emphasizes on increasing access, completion and quality in basic education, particularly the six-year cycle of primary schooling, and specific measures, such as incentive schemes, to increase girls' enrolment, retention and completion particularly in secondary education¹¹.

The G-JAS consists of five elements that contribute to a comprehensive approach on the part of the DPs to the aid relationship in Ghana. They are:

- a joint assessment of the current country situation (political, social, economic)
- a joint description of the major challenges facing Ghana in its quest to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and middle income status
- a statement of principles and commitments on how G-JAS partners will work with each other, with government, and with civil society and private stakeholder
- priorities for the joint DP response at the GPRS II pillar and sector level; and
- arrangements for results monitoring and risk mitigation.

The G-JAS is a four-year rolling programme starting from 2007-2010 and adopted to take into account the national cycles in the country. The G-JAS reflects strong DP political will to engage in a more harmonized and efficient dialogue with government in all aspects of development cooperation. However, G-JAS is not legally binding. To the extent that G-JAS is inconsistent with the laws or policies of any signatory, such laws, policies and commitments will prevail.

2.7 Multi-Donor Budgetary Support

Further discussions on how to make aid more effective led to the formulation of aid policy known as the multi-donor budgetary support (MDBS). Svensson¹² defines budget support as programmes aid or funds channelled through local accounting systems directly to beneficiary governments. It is not linked to specific project activity and disbursement is expedited. In Ghana the main objectives of the MDBS are:

- to ensure continuous flow of aid to enable government finance its poverty-related expenditure; and

¹¹ Development Partners of Government of Ghana. G-JAS. Final Document –March 2007

¹² Svensson, J (2000). 'When is Foreign Aid Policy Credible: Aid Dependence and Conditionality?' *Journal of Development Economics* , 61:61-84.

- to harmonise the policies and procedures of the participating development partners (DPs) in order to minimize transaction cost for the beneficiary countries.

The operational framework of the MDDBS comprised two phases. First, the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS I) which outlined the poverty reduction strategy of the government of Ghana and, second the Medium Term Expenditure Framework(MTEF) budget process, which provides the mechanism for allocating resources according to the GPRS priorities and the available resources. The assessment of progress of the MDDBS would be based on the goals set by government in the GPRS. A common review process would be held for all development partners including scheduled meetings to jointly review MDDBS activity implementation and the attainment of MDDBS objectives. According to the Framework Memorandum¹³ governing the MDDBS Ghana government subject to availability of funds would ensure among other things, the implementation of the GPRS and that total expenditures and sector allocations effectively reflect the government's commitment to poverty reduction, and that the budget is comprehensive.

Following the signing of the Framework Memorandum in March 2003, the World Bank made available US\$125 million for disbursement as part of its MDDBS contribution to Ghana. The funds were programmed to support the implementation of agreed poverty reduction programmes grouped into the following broad areas or pillars:

- promoting growth , income and employment
- improving service delivery for human development
- improving governance and public sector specified in the GPRS I and the 2003 budget

A significant feature of the MDDBS is the establishment of a two tranche system of payment. This is based upon a 'base payment' linked to the achievement of defined policy triggers. In 2006, however, GoG was judged by the MDDBS partners to have breached two trigger conditions and withheld a proportion of the budget.¹⁴ Donor decision to withhold a proportion of budget support on grounds of non-compliance with trigger conditions can have serious implications for aid effectiveness.

¹³The Framework Memorandum (FM) was signed in March 2003 between Government of Ghana and participating Development Partners

¹⁴ There was 7.5 percent fluctuation in 2006 as a result of breach in two trigger conditions. Actual shortfall in aid disbursement as a result of the breach amounted to US\$14 million

3.0 THE EDUCATION SECTOR AND THE PARIS AGENDA

3.1 Education Sector Policies and Strategies

The main education sector programme for Ghana has been the Education Strategic Plan (ESP) 2003-2015, launched in May 2003 by the Ministry of Education. The ESP has been a consolidation of several education sector review reports including the President's Committee on the review of Education and the GPRS II, the Education for All (EFA) goals and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Under the ESP, a number of new areas of focus and key targets aimed at driving the GPRS were outlined. In the sector, a holistic package of interventions has been identified as priorities for attaining a middle income status with a minimum per capita income of US\$1000 by 2015. Accordingly, the ESP captures the following education sector prioritized policy objectives under the GPRS II:

- 1 Increase access to and participation in education and training;
- 2 Bridge gender gap in access to education;
- 3 Improve quality of teaching and learning;
- 4 Improve quality and efficiency in delivery of education service;
- 5 Promote and extend the provision of science, mathematics, technology and ICT education and training; and
- 6 Mainstream issues of population, gender, health, HIV/AIDS/STI, fire safety, road safety and environment in the curricula of schools and institutions of higher learning.

These policy objectives have also been grouped into thematic areas reflected in the Education Strategic Plan, namely – Access and Participation, Quality, Education Management and Science and Technology & TVET.

The rearrangement of the education sector planning programming is based on the requirements of the new paradigm in development cooperation under the principles of the Paris Declaration. The intent and purpose is to design a single national development framework (GPRS) which will constitute the basis for a sector agenda (SWAp). The development of the ESP was therefore patterned along the framework of the Paris Declaration and was intended to give it a national ownership status and allow a national influence and responsibility to render development cooperation in the sector more efficient. It also allows a sector performance accountability based on the policy objectives and goals outlined in the ESP. At the same time it was intended to provide a single platform for sector funding under the new framework of the Paris Declaration through the G-JAS and the MDBS.

3.2 Education Sector and the Paris Declaration

The design of the entire GPRS II and the Education Strategic Plan are anchored in the Paris Declaration. It is therefore expected that both the design and implementation of the ESP will follow partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration that has influenced the GPRS II. The programme implementation and financing within the education sector is

based on commitments and agreements within the frameworks of the Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy (G-JAS), the Multi Donor Budgetary Support (MDBS) and Direct Sector Support (DSS) between the government of Ghana and Development Partners under the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).

3.2.1 Country Ownership Sector Programming

Under the country ownership principle, partner countries are expected to exercise effective leadership over their development policies, strategies and coordinate development actions within the sector. The ESP is based on a thorough review of the education sector and builds on previous strategic plans. The outcome of intensive analysis conducted by the Education Sector Review Team and the President's Committee on education reforms created a platform for stakeholders to make input, including civil society and parliament. The reality according to many civil society leaders is that the government white paper which eventually constituted the basis for the Education Reforms, however failed to capture the concerns and input of civil society. Additionally the white paper did not create the opportunity for further engagement of the social partners of the education sector and the general public. What is now a matter of concern for education sector stakeholders is how to harmonize the principles of the education reform and the ESP.

The Education Strategic Plan (ESP) has the active support of development partners who needed to institutionalize the SWAp into the education sector to feed into the national level funding mechanisms established under the auspices of the Paris Declaration. The design of the ESP operational plans raises some interesting concerns in terms of the construction of the platform for participation from civil society and other stakeholders. The quality of country dialogue and citizen participation and ownership in the design of sector strategies is still a matter of concern for many CSOs.

3.2.2 Sector Alignment and Harmonization

Education has been one of the sectors within the overall GPRS II development framework that has received commitments from DPs on alignment and harmonization of sector strategies and procedures. In this respect the education sector DPs base their overall support sector strategies, institutions and procedures, with the Ministry of Education providing the leadership. In the process, the Ministry of Education and its development partners have established a well coordinated platform for collaboration for the implementation of sector programmes. There is a monthly review of sector performance by the Ministry and its DPs on policy initiatives and direction and these regular and productive consultations are aimed at ensuring programme effectiveness and coherence. During these meetings, government officials and DPs get the opportunity to exchange ideas on sector policy direction and procedures. At the same time, it has been a platform for the negotiation of policy conditions, including benchmarks, triggers and performance based allocations at the sector level. Within these arrangements, there continue to exist institutional constraints, policy gaps and more seriously the unequal relationship between the 'partners' around the table.

3.2.3 Coordinating Sector Results

This accountability process has resulted in the institution of the Annual Education Sector Operational Plan (AESOP) which is supposed to be replicated at the district level into Annual District Education Operational Plan (ADEOP). These operational plans are reviewed annually at the Education Sector Annual Review at the regional and national levels. These annual reviews are supposed to provide opportunities for the education stakeholders including civil society to contribute to the analysis of the sector performance and propose implementation strategies to deal with challenges. Whether these analysis and proposals submitted by civil society and other education stakeholders makes a real difference in the programming content of the sector is another point for debate. Civil society leaders have expressed real concern about the quality of their engagement in these processes¹⁵. Their worry is that a few days at a review meeting which brings together large numbers of people will not be productive. There is also a perception that the actual decisions on policy initiatives and direction are taken “closed doors” between ministry officials and DPs¹⁶. Within the year and before each annual review, Ministry of Education, Science and Sports and development partners have different planning, implementation and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the education sector goals are being achieved.

3.2.4 Policy Dialogue between Government and Development Partners

Policy dialogue on national development plans and SWAps are very central to the Paris Declaration. This is the one single thing that has caused a lot of concern within CSOs. The continuous concern is that this policy dialogue mostly takes place between donor and government officials behind closed doors or with very little discussed in the open with organizations representing citizens as well as effective parliamentary scrutiny. This posture within the aid management process in the education sector clearly weakens the key principles of country ownership because they undermine policy options for development and poverty reduction in poor countries. The education sector is diverse and complicated with a lot of social and interest groups and stakeholders. It is therefore perceived that the Ministry of Education is not consulting enough and mostly overlooks the interests and perspectives of other social partners in its dealings with DPs¹⁷. It is perceived that the policy prescriptions are mostly imposed because of the unequal power relations between the ministry and DPs. This point of view tends to support the assertion that “Governments can never be truly accountable to their citizens, and their parliaments, when policy prescriptions continue to be imposed, by donors, as conditions for both debt cancellation and aid. Both donor policy dialogue with government and harmonization of aid practices in program-based approaches have tended to accentuate the impact of donor conditions with numerous additional ‘benchmarks’ that must be achieved for the release of aid monies. Within highly unequal aid relationships, the governments of the poorest countries are very vulnerable to such conditions”¹⁸.

¹⁵ Staff of Ibis and NNED strongly made this point during interviews.

¹⁶ ibis

¹⁷ The most recent and classical example is confrontation between the GES and religious groups on the teaching of Religious and Moral Education in Basic Schools.

¹⁸ Reality Check: “The Paris Declaration: Towards Enhanced Aid Effectiveness?” January 2007. page 5

Recent activities of the Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition (GNECC) and the Northern Network for Education Development (NNED) have resulted in greater collaboration and consultation with the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports and the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education.¹⁹

In the education sector, policy dialogue is done through the monthly meeting between education sector DPs and the Ministry of Education and GES officials. These meetings are also used by the two parties to conduct a continuous sector policy dialogue, exchange views, report on the performance of the sector and improve the harmonization and alignment to ensure the efficiency of implementation of Government's sector strategy²⁰.

It is therefore the forum to set up education sector benchmarks or triggers, review progress of the ESP and to offer technical assistance options for the achievement of the benchmarks. The concern here is that because CSOs are acknowledged to be making effective contributions to the education sector programmes and work in partnership with the deprived, marginalized and poorer constituencies, the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports and the Ghana Education Service have an obligation to create maximum opportunities for these CSOs to participate in the development of the appropriate sector strategies and policies aimed at poverty reduction, especially when they happen in these meetings. Both donors and MOESS are all in agreement that there is the need to continue to engage CSOs in a more productive way beyond the ESAR²¹. The platform for CSO participation and the mechanism to coordinate the different collaborations between the MOESS and its partners is what has remained a challenge. Making aid effective in many respects will require efficiency for the institutions that manage aid resources at all levels. Within the education sector, there seem to be a difficulty of institutional collaboration and coordination.

3.2.5 Partnership with Civil Society

The Ministry of Education's view is that, the NGO group is a larger, more diverse body of stakeholders contributing to education sector development.²² The methods of contributing to education sector development are also generally more diverse, with many NGOs providing capacity in the form of personnel (e.g. volunteer teachers), while others provide direct financial support, especially at the district and community levels. In the ESP, it was recognized that extensive 'off-budget' support, through uncoordinated projects and inputs, whether from donors, lenders, non-public sector NGOs, CBOs, FBOs or the private sector could make it difficult to plan properly and to use resources effectively²³. However, it is this "uncoordinated" support to most districts and communities that makes a real difference in terms of results. The multiplicity of work plans in the districts in most cases lead to duplication and waste in the system. The

¹⁹ Following a range of evidence-based campaigns, the two networks have been offered seats on the different committees of the Education Sector Annual Review (ESAR).

²⁰ 2006-Guidebook on Sector Groups-FINAL DRAFT (3), page 5.

²¹ Donor and MOESS representatives made this assertion at separate interviews.

²² This view is disputed by CSO activist who assert that GNECC and NNED have built their networks in such a way that the two coalitions can legitimately represent education sector CSOs.

²³ Ministry of Education, Science and Sports, Preliminary Education Sector Performance Report, June 2007

problem however is that most district level education annual work plans do not receive the required levels of funding from central government. Th view is however not shared by a number of CSO activists, who assert that GNECC and NNED have over the years worked hard to provide the needed leadership for education sector CSOs w

To ensure that the various policies and work plans achieve the set targets in the districts and benefit the children in the classroom, it is important that work plans of the key stakeholders implementing educational programmes/activities in the districts are harmonized so that each district will have unified and coherent work plan devoid of duplication. This will cut down on waste and ensure the judicious use of scarce resources in the education sector. To this end, education plans at the district level needs to be fully integrated into District Work Plan. Harmonization and coordination are inevitable not only with NGOs but within a district as well.

3.3 Education Sector Funding Modalities

The funding of the ESP falls under the general funding framework of the G-JAS (2007-10), which flows from the Ghana Partnership Strategy (GPS) which was endorsed in November 2005 during the Consultative Group/Annual Partnership Meeting (CG/APM) and this was updated in the same forum in June 2006. The GPS comprises results matrix which maps DP funded activities to GPRS II policy priorities; an annual harmonization action plan; and an overview of external assistance, detailed by GPRS II pillar and sectors.²⁴ The GPS provides a framework for monitoring the effectiveness of development assistance in supporting GPRS II. The GPS also provides for a rolling Harmonization and Aid Effectiveness Plan (G-HAP) based on the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. G-JAS partners have fully committed themselves to taking forward the G-HAP in partnership with government and civil society. The G-JAS ensures that DPs work together and coordinate their activities. Consequently G-JAS partners have identified a set of strategic principles and commitments drawn from the G-HAP, to drive their harmonization and aid effectiveness efforts forward during G-JAS implementation.

The G-JAS enables partners to make financial commitment projections over the four year period. Over the 2007-10 period DPs project US\$ 5.3 billion, of which two thirds would be provided on grant basis and one third on a concessional credit basis. A total of US\$ 1.4 billion is expected in the form of budget support through the MDBS and US\$ 3.9 billion to be provided for sectoral programmes. The education sector will receive a total of US\$ 411.9 million over the period.²⁵ Supporting poverty reduction was a core motivation for the establishment of MDBS. The DFID is providing £105 million over the next ten years to help Ghana provide free and quality basic education for all Ghanaian children²⁶.

²⁴ Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy: Commitments by partners to work towards GPRS II goals and harmonization principles. Page 1

²⁵ Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy: Commitments by partners to work towards GPRS II goals and harmonization principles. Page 28

²⁶ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>

In May 2006, the ESP was estimated to cost an average of ¢13.8 trillion annually (\$1.5 billion) with the Basic Education component to be 56.6% of the total estimates for the sector. The MOESS receives a substantial amount of funding from sources other than GoG – Donor, GETFund, HIPC and DACF. In 2005, it was estimated that 35% of funding for the sector will be sourced from outside the GoG²⁷.

At present, approximately 34% of the total resource envelope for the education sector is provided by non statutory and external sources (Development Partners, GETfund, HIPC, DACF). In addition, the monetary contribution made by NGOs, CBOs, etc to the education sector (e.g. the building of schools) is not accounted for in the total resource envelope at all²⁸. Knowing how much has been committed to the sector is good, but these commitments are tied to progress to be made on sector triggers and benchmarks reviewed annually through the PAF. The Ministry of Education will need to coordinate the release and disbursement of the funds that come from all the different sources including DDS. The coordination of the implementation of sector activities and funds disbursement can be overwhelming for the ministry.

²⁷ Report on the Education Sector Annual Review 2006

²⁸ However the MOESS estimated NGO contribution to the 2008 education budget to be nine million Ghana cedis or 0.41% of the total expected resources for the education sector.

4.0 IMPLCATIONS OF THE PARIS DECLARATION FOR CIVIL SOCIETY, DONORS AND GOVERNMENT

4.1 Position of Civil Society on Paris Declaration

The principles of ownership and accountability in the PD are welcomed by CSOs as constituting the right basis for the relationship between donors and recipient countries. In addition, CSO have consistently expressed the view that the principles of the Paris Declaration have been in many ways contributed to a more reformed aid management system especially at the southern country level and has especially resulted in a drastic reduction in transaction cost in favour of the southern countries. It is argued by the framers of the Paris Declaration that, it is about making aid effective. This has been consistently challenged by civil society. Civil society has laid out its concerns in three key questions: Aid effectiveness for what purpose? Aid effectiveness for whom? Aid effectiveness as measured by whom?

The ultimate and intended purpose of the Declaration is to strengthen country capacity to meet the goals for poverty reduction, including the Millennium Development Goals through a systematic reform of the aid management process. However, the *Declaration's* aid effectiveness agenda is manifested in the indicators, timetables and targets for actions by donor and partner countries with very little input from civil society. CSOs have in this respect argued that the PD's objectives, commitments and assessment indicators which constituted the fundamentals of the Declaration are not in any way conditions for effective poverty reduction, but on institutional reforms in government for a more effective and efficient *aid system*. The argument is further advanced that with the current status the PD is only a political agreement and does not at all address a number of key issues which are controversial in aid reform such as conditionality and tied aid.

4.2 Sector Challenges for CSOs in Ghana

CSOs in the education sector have generally not participated in discussions on bench marks, triggers and policy directions of the sector, because these discussions have been held exclusively between the Ministry of Education and its development partners. This clearly poses serious challenges to civil society organizations that are involved in the implementation of programmes in the field. These consultative sector meetings normally happen in Accra between mostly high level Ministry of Education and GES officials and development partners. The question is how are these benchmarks, triggers and policy goals translated into the activities of the implementing agencies like the District Assemblies (DAs), District Education Offices (DEOs) and NGOs? Are these triggers and benchmarks reflective of the institutional capacity of the agencies under the ministry who will be expected to accomplish them? How can civil society participate in these discussions? How should civil society within the education sector be organized so it gains legitimacy? These are important questions for both MOESS and CSOs to answer, so that the issue of country ownership and leadership will be adequately addressed.

Secondly, the extent to which the results of these discussions and negotiations are disseminated to agencies and institutions within the sector is not clear. CSOs particularly are completely absent from this equation and are particularly disadvantaged in terms of

policy directions within the sector. Consequently the discussions are also not without the innovations lessons and achievements of civil society in the field. Additionally, due to the fact that these policy initiatives are held at the highest level of the decision making machinery of the ministry, regional and district level operators within the GES bureaucracy receive very little information. The combined result is that, programmes and initiatives mostly undertaken at the regional and district levels remain completely isolated from the indicative policy goals. While most civil society organizations operate at the grassroots and are on a daily basis responding to real issues and challenges of the deprived and marginalised and providing support.

4.3 Programming and Funding Challenges for CSOs

CSOs are recognized to contribute significantly to development. Their role however is based on the fact that they intend to promote active citizenship to enhance governance. This role by civil society takes several forms, but essentially it provides development alternatives to citizens through the usually non bureaucratic and flexible programming. Direct support for civil society is projected at \$57.7 million over the G-JAS period (2007-2010) but a critical evaluation of the table indicates that the projected support for CSOs will be on a downward trend, and will be expected to reduce by 29 % (US\$ 16.8 to US\$ 11.9) in three years.

Table 1: Projected Financial Flow to Ghana (US \$ Millions)

Aid Instrument/GPRSII Pillar and Sector	2007	2008	2009	2010	2007-2010
Total Projected Disbursement of which:	1292.7	1382.9	1434.7	1255.0	5365.3
Budget Support (MDBS)	293.6	354.6	378.1	361.2	1387.5
Direct support to CSOs	16.8	16.1	12.9	11.9	57.7
Sector and investment support	982.3	1012.2	1043.7	881.9	3920.1
Pillar 1: Private Sector Competitiveness	596.6	583.1	626.5	519.4	2325.6
Agriculture	200.6	244.5	235.2	190.2	870.5
Private & Financial Sector Devt	91.5	78.4	56.0	36.6	262.5
Energy	76.6	48.5	53.7	57.7	236.5
Transport	227.9	211.7	281.6	234.9	956.1
Pillar 2: Development & Basic Services	315	330.6	307.7	273.3	1226.6
Health(incl.HIV/AIDS)	115.3	116.4	92.2	89.4	413.3
Education	99.2	110.2	103.5	98.0	411.9
Water and Sanitation	100.5	104.0	112.0	85.9	402.4
Pillar 3: Good Governance & Civic responsibility	70.7	98.5	109.5	89.2	367.9
Public Financial management	5.4	7.4	6.0	5.5	24.3
Public Sector Reform	7.9	8.6	6.7	4.7	27.9
Decentralisation	29.5	45.8	63.2	60.7	199.2
Other governance (incl.M&E)	27.9	36.7	33.6	18.3	116.5

Source: Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy

An emerging programme area for civil society participation in the Paris Declaration is the accountability by donors and government on resources and results. There is very little confidence in the definition and measurement of many of the Paris Declaration indicators and monitoring system.

The question then is do CSOs have the capacity to undertake these comprehensive assessments? Will the donors including the World Bank agree to an assessment in which they do not take the lead? Will the donors be willing to provide funding for civil society to critically assess their performance under the aid effectiveness framework? How can funding for civil society activities and programming be independent of donors, even when the funds come from them? How can civil society guarantee that there will be adequate funds to undertake this critical role of monitoring commitments and performance under the Paris Declaration framework?

4.4 Ineffective Institutional Arrangements by MOESS/GES

There is real concern on the institutional set up both at the national and district levels. Fact is governments and public sector agencies are not effective in the implementation of social sector programmes because they just are not cut for that. The bureaucratic nature does not allow them to be efficient to deliver these programmes. The education sector is particularly complex and institutions and organs of government are not particularly oiled to respond to the complexities of the sector. Institutional governance within the education sector is therefore a critical area to be addressed if aid will be effective in that sector. The hugeness of the Ghana Education Service as a public institution and its inability to respond effectively and sufficiently to challenges in the sector is the clearest example. Based on the decentralized education system, districts will be able design comprehensive strategic plans for education, patterned along the lines of the ESP and which also responds to specific sector needs of the district and which also fits into the GPRS II. A completely decentralized²⁹ GES, will be more efficient in its operations, which will also reflect the real needs of people in a way that will address poverty. Decentralization will also enhance harmonization and alignment at the district level and this will benefit the poor and deprived.

4.5 CSOs Effectiveness

Civil society organizations are also not adequately mobilized, coordinated or networked in the education sector, except through the Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition (GNECC) and the Northern Network for Education and Development (NNED). These two coalitions of education sector NGOs and civil society groups have contributed in a significant way to social mobilization towards Education for All within the sector, but they are not engaging themselves or strengthening their networks to appropriately participate and take advantage of emerging policy dialogue spaces. In this era of SWAPs and the implementation of the PD frameworks, it makes more sense for CSOs to have a

²⁹ A completely decentralized system involves the transfer of competence, authority and means (finances) to a lower unit or entity. Fiscal decentralization is not practiced in Ghana. The GES still relies on the MOESS/Government for funding.

real need to work on their own internal systems of collaboration and draw on their strengths in such a way that they could take advantage of any available policy space.

GNECC and NNED will have to strengthen their coalitions through adequate mobilizations of new members and improve upon the consultative processes within their membership. Additionally the two coalitions will need to draw on the capacities and strengths of their members to galvanize their own positions as legitimate leaders for education sector CSOs. These efforts will require resources, which at the moment are not adequately available. In many ways some useful collaboration can take place between southern CSOs and northern CSOs to achieve these goals.

4.6 Lack of Trust

Lack of trust among public sector institutions is a limiting factor in achieving development results at the district level. There is a lot of mistrust between the district assembly and other sector agencies including civil society organizations who believe that district assemblies are too politicized to implement programmes in a consistent manner. First, there is the concern that the assembly procurement and funds disbursement processes are not transparent and are not generally targeted at addressing the poverty needs of the poor, vulnerable and the marginalized. Another interesting discovery in this direction is that GoG staffs are often suspicious to include CSOs during negotiations with DPs. Their suspicion comes from two main reasons:

- 1 MOESS delegates would not like to be criticized for their actions or decisions some policy issue;
- 2 CSOs are a large diverse body of stakeholders contributing to education sector development, but who do not speak with one voice³⁰.

³⁰ DEFAT members were very articulate in putting across these views.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Ownership

There seem to be great anxiety among CSOs as to the ultimate implications of the PD framework on what different CSOs do at various levels. The anxiety is based on two separate issues:

- The implementation of the ESP through SWAp places a lot of capacity challenges on GES, which is already an over burdened institution and definitely not in a position to regenerate itself. The Ministry of Education and its key agency, the GES have an enormous task of coordination and providing the technical and programme leadership in the implementation of the ESP. It is very clear that within itself, the GES especially is over burdened and is not adequately resourced in terms of personnel and funds to achieve the policy goals of the ESP.
- Debates, consultations and negotiations within the education sector in respect of policy goals are held behind close doors between development partners and the Ministry of Education and its agencies with no participation from civil society. This has led to a situation where civil society perceives of a lot of the sector initiatives as “donor driven”. This calls for fundamental changes in the decision making structure and processes within the sector.

5.1.2 Governance within the Education Sector

- Civil society is not formally represented in the governance structures of the education sector where important sector policy decisions are made to strengthen country leadership of the education programmes and to give meaning to making aid effective in the sector. Governance in all respects is seen as a real concern in the education sector as decision making is over centralized in headquarters buildings. The general implementation of education sector programmes including funds should take into account the public sector decentralization programme.
- There is also a real concern on the institutional set up at both the national and district levels and the ability or willingness of public institutions to engage with stakeholders or create policy spaces for citizens and civil society. Setting national and local development priorities in a country like Ghana is a very complicated exercise, and therefore needs to involve many stakeholders to ensure democratic ownership of those priorities. The art of engaging all the essential stakeholders in the education sector has been particularly difficult. Many civil society organizations feel left out in the actual negotiation of policy conditionality between the Ministry of Education and development partners.
- Limiting CSOs participation to the annual performance review of the education sector alone is not enough. The argument here is that democratic ownership and country leadership means that civil society, citizens and citizen-led associations, including women’s organizations should indeed be part of the formulation sector policy benchmarks. The situation is particularly critical at the district where there is very little collaboration between the different public institutions that are

supposed to harmonize their activities in the education sector. This is especially manifest in the relationship between district assemblies, district education oversight committees and district education offices. The Paris agenda supports the harmonization of even district level programmes to the extent that sector programmes are coordinated and linked to the MDGs and the GPRS II.

5.1.3 Civil Society Contribution to the Education Sector

- It is widely acknowledged that civil society and in this case NGOs both national and international continue to play a critical role in the delivery of education. The innovative and flexible nature of their interventions makes their work particularly attractive and admirable by even people in the public sector. At the district level and even at the community level, NGOs are widely praised for the work they continue to do. In many cases, they provide complementary expertise, funds and methodologies to their clients. In addition, NGOs work outside the bureaucracy and political agenda of governments and so are able to target the poor, vulnerable and marginalized. Public sector agencies including the district assemblies and district education offices are not able to do the same. District education offices particularly acknowledge that partnering with civil society organizations and NGOs has enhanced the impact and reach of their programmes. Examples were cited in the Gomoa and East Gonja districts where IBIS has partnered with the DEOs to implement innovative results-oriented programmes. CSOs also working separately and independent of public sector institutions have delivered excellent programmes with far reaching results. Additionally NGOs are now partnering and supporting other civil society groups in an increasing way to monitor social development and create awareness on citizen's rights. A good example is the partnership between IBIS and GNECC and NNED through DEFATs at the district level.
- CSOs represent a large constituency of poor and marginalized citizens whose voices and needs have to be factored into the development assistance. CSOs can only become legitimate agents for the poor, if they are themselves democratically responsible. When individual CSOs become democratically responsive then they can aggregate their strength into networks and coalitions at the different levels of their operations to contribute to the sector reforms and programmes. At the moment GNECC and NNED have not shown how civil society networking and coalitions can influence the debate on development accountability and results. The two organizations will have to work to the next level by appropriately strengthening their regional and district structures like the District Education for All Teams (DEFATs) to engage institutions, citizens and citizens-led associations at their levels.
- It is widely acknowledged that CSOs have accumulated experience in programme design, implementation and monitoring. National governments and development partners understand that CSOs are critical social partners and indeed have a large constituency of members. They represent and work on behalf of the poor, marginalize and indeed on behalf of citizens, even if they are not elected, and therefore are relevant in poverty reduction and development.

5.2 Recommendations

In making recommendations on the role of CSOs in making aid effective within the education sector, it will be important to consider that any contributions by CSOs can only be effective if they are in a position of strength in terms of capacity, systems and strategy. This will ensure that the existing PD frameworks that give very little space for CSOs will begin to create an enabling environment and space for civil society in such a manner that will strengthen national leadership in sector programming.

5.2.1 Democratic Ownership of Sector Programming and Results

- The PD is effectively about country ownership, leadership and context. This is because the achievement development results is very complicated and will always require collective national efforts from the design, implementation and monitoring of sector programmes. CSOs therefore have a responsibility to ensure that they play the lead role to ensure a national mobilization of citizens and all segments of society towards their participation in sector programmes to ensure that policies reflect the needs of people.
- The government must take the initiative in fostering a partnership between the public sector and education sector CSOs and also between government, donors and civil society, through facilitation of discussion, providing communication links and lead in policy development at both national and district levels. Through this process district assemblies, district education offices and civil society can harmonize their programmes, approaches and procedures at the district level. CSOs need to be proactive in demanding a country partnership that includes all key stakeholders and should not leave this at the discretion of government and its representatives.
- Education sector based development CSOs should be encouraged to use Rights Based Approaches (RBAs) and Advocacy based tools in their engagement with community and district level education stakeholders. This is to ensure that the commitments of education sector institutions are linked to the needs of the poor and marginalized.

5.2.2 Making Aid Effective in the Education Sector

- Aid effectiveness is about results, impact, people and poverty. The focus of the current paradigm of the PD should change radically to reflect poverty reduction. The present discourse of aid effectiveness over emphasizes the efficiency of the management of aid resources by governments and donors, and less on the impact of actual disbursement of aid resources on the lives of poor people. The long bureaucratic procedures required for the release of resources from the Ministry of Finance in Accra to the Ministry of Education and to GES and its subsequent disbursement to districts where action is required take a long time and sometimes is unpredictable. Processes and procedures don't reduce poverty it is action in

places where poverty is an issue that makes a difference. CSOs can play a key role in ensuring accountability and transparency in the use of aid money.

- CSOs should be considered as partners in the fight against poverty, so that government, public sector institutions at all levels and indeed DPs create a favourable environment for their operations as CSOs contribute to the achievement of results in the sector. This space will include funding and access to important policy dialogues that happen between donors and the government. CSOs will create the opportunities for the voices of the poor to be heard.

5.2.3 Making CSO Effective Sector Partners

- GPRS by their very essence and content are principally aimed at targeting the poor and marginalized to create resource opportunities. CSOs led by GNECC and NNED and in collaboration with international NGOs need to form and support alliances, networks and coalitions within the education sector and create a platform that can appropriately dialogue with the Ministry of Education and donors from a position of strength. The internal capacities of these coalitions need to be strengthened.
- CSOs should create a system that documents their financial and in-kind contribution to the education sector, so that the total contribution of CSO will be accounted for in the total resource envelope of the education sector. This will be a basis for demanding recognition at the table currently managed by government and development partners.

5.2.4 Funding Sustaining CSOs

- The effectiveness of aid is about ensuring that aid really contributes to the achievement of the GPRS and MD Goals. Part of the development assistance to governments should also be channeled through CSOs for the same purpose of poverty reduction. The Ghana Research and Advocacy (G-RAP), Rights and Voice Initiative (RAVI) types of funding should be made available for civil society. There is the need to develop clear criteria for disbursing such funds to civil society in a way that does not tie their operations. There are already indications that the DPs have projected about US\$ 58 million as direct support to civil society within the G-JAS period.³¹ The disbursement of these funds should be independent of both government and donors.

5.2.5 Programme Diversification for CSOs

- CSOs, especially those within the education sector should begin to diversify their programmes in such a way as first to create direct collaboration between northern NGOs and Southern NGOs. It is only when this kind of collaboration is pursued, that the debate on aid effectiveness will go in favour of civil society. The strength

³¹ Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy: Commitments by partners to work towards GPRS II goals and harmonization principles. February 2007, Page 28.

of civil society in this regard will be enormous because they represent a large constituency of marginalized and deprived poor people who normally are voiceless. Together this collaboration can be used to pursue the following:

- Northern CSOs can contribute to and lead in the building of global coalitions, networks and alliances at the international and country levels
- Northern CSOs can also contribute to the training and sharing of key skills in policy analysis and dialogue, advocacy, coalition and networking so that collectively global civil society can continue pursue the debate on making aid effective.
- Global civil society should continue to advocate for policy space, donor and government accountability in aid management, human rights and poverty reduction at the international and national levels.
- CSO should continue to be engaged in programme innovation, knowledge and skill transfer and partnership with public sector agencies and citizen led associations, especially women groups.
- Sector based development CSOs should be encouraged to use Rights Based Approaches (RBAs) and advocacy based tools in their programmes.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE STUDY

Please contact Lars Koch, IBIS, for the Terms of reference: lk@ibis.dk

ANNEX 2 INTERVIEW GUIDE

Implementation of the PD

- What is the current state of implementing the PD as opposed to other countries?
- How are the core areas put forth by the PD improving aid efficiency in international development?
- How effective if at all, has donor assistance benefited the development plans of recipients?
- b. what has been the significant difference?
 - Is the relationship between donors and recipients effective to alleviate poverty?
- b. how can you evaluate this?
 - To what extent can you reconcile national or citizen based ownership from exclusive govt. ownership to promote accountability?
 - How successful has CSOs and other networks been in tracking the core principles of the PD?
 - Are national development plans in tandem with national priorities?
 - How closely, if at all has CSOs been engaged in the implementation of national development plans as embodied in policy documents?

Mapping of Main Actors

- What are the consequences of aid harmonization on development actors?
- How different are the PRSP from the economic recovery plans in the 1990s?
- What is the role of CSOs in a recipient and donor countries in promoting aid effectiveness?
- Will the PD really lead to government transparency, or improved upon good governance?
- How can a unified aid program between donors and recipients promote citizens participation?
- In what way can CSOs monitor aid effectiveness in fragile or repressive states where dissent is not tolerated?
- How can partners decrease the duplication of aid delivery to promote effectiveness?
- b. Who coordinates the effectiveness of aid in the midst of duplication by development actors?
 - What role can CSOs play in monitoring without becoming an instrument of the state with the same aim as government?

Changes in Funding Modalities

- In what way will the centralization of aid delivery by donors affect the budget of CSOs?
- How will the pursuance of pro-poor policies by govt. make CSOs effective?
- Will aid delivery be effective to beneficiaries and donors as a result of the PD?
- How independent have CSOs been in implementing donor funded projects?

- In reality, can the PD lead to better outcomes and impact for donors and recipients?
- With the increase in budgetary support for SWAPs and the exclusion of other development actors, can CSOs effectively monitor the use of development assistance?
- Is the current system of reporting under the PD likely to make development aid effective?
- How has conditions tied to aid reduce as result of the PD?
- To what extent have CSOs been successful if at all, in promoting aid effectiveness?

Ownership and Conditions

- Can real ownership be possible in the midst of donor conditions?
- Are the operational plans of recipients in tandem with their expenditure or annual budgets?
- To what extent will the objective of the PD contribute to aid effectiveness?
- Will budget centralization prioritize or de-prioritize CSOs concerns in development plans?
- How can CSOs be detached form politics if aid delivery is centralized under a recipient government's authority?
- Are the targets per indicator under the PD different from the PRSP or even the ERPs of the 1990s?
- Are development plans of recipients' independent from donor influence?
- Is success/intervention measured only when development plans meet the needs of donors or beneficiaries?

Sector Policies and Strategies

In what way are agreed development plans citizen oriented?

What is the role of CSOs in the implementation of the PRSPs or even annual consultative group meetings?

How can you measure the link between commitments and outcomes?

Is good governance an attestation of aid effectiveness in recipient countries?

How can you evaluate the criteria for success?

Is accountability possible in the midst of aid conditions?

How do national legislatures or stakeholders realize progress in the delivery of aid?

Who is accountable for the results realize under the PD?

How can development actors measure transformative change?

Experience of CSOs Participation

How useful will experience of CSOs in other countries promote aid effectiveness?

In what way(s) can real RBAs be duplicated in other areas to made development assistance very effective?

Perspectives for and Capacity of the CSOs

Will CSOs continue to champion the cause of the vulnerable while being excluded by other actors?

Are CSOs funded in the South independent from donor influence?

How can CSOs collaborate effectively to influence the development process?

Are CSO activities achieving envisaged outcomes?

What is the way forward for CSOs?

How are current activities promoting the ideals of aid effectiveness?

What need to change and in what time frame?

In what way is the PD affecting the work of CSOs?

What role can CSOs play to ensure that national priorities are not subordinated to donor interests?

Recommendations

What is the role of development actors?

How are implementation plans being drawn to promote aid efficiency?

Donor imposition and constraints of recipients-any solution?

The role of PD and sustainable development-any linkage?

How the PD is feasible in meeting the MDGs as embodied in policy documents?

International NGOs and NGOs

Implementation of PD

How has the implementation of PD led to aid effectiveness?

In what way(s) has the core principles in the PD promoted development?

Is budgetary support from donors making the required impacts?

How can you evaluate aid effectiveness in the provision of basic services?

Are NGOs monitoring appropriations meant for development to ensure aid effectiveness?

Mapping of Main Actors

- What role can NGOs play to ensure aid effectiveness?
- Do NGOs contribute to the preparation of development plans of recipients?
- How can NGOs make development actors accountable?
- Has defects and other modifications identified in relation to the PD been mainstreamed into NGO advocacy plans?
- In what way can INGOs and NGOs assist other actors to make aid delivery effective?
- Has changes in donor funds affected the activities of NGOs?

How can you monitor the accountability of recipients in relation to donor funds?

Are donors and governments accessible and transparent ensuring aid effectiveness?

How has the changes in funding modalities affected the monitoring of aid effectiveness?

Will NGOs align their plans to partner countries because of changes in funding?

Ownership and Conditions

- Are recipients really in charge of development projects?

- In what way have the conditions of donors' subordinated recipients in the development plans for example, the PRSPs?
- Is ownership exclusive to donors and recipient governments alone?
- Who measures performance and in fact, aid effectiveness?

Sector Policies and Strategies

- Are development actors committed to the values of the PD?
- To what extent have reforms and other strategies been effective and efficient to ensure aid effectiveness?
- Can citizens hold governments accountable for policy failure under the PD?
- Has decentralization been effective in addressing the deficiencies in the PD?
- Do other stakeholders value the contributions of NGOs in planning to ensure aid effectiveness?

Experience of Civil Society Participation

- What has been the role of NGOs in relation to the PD?
- From experience, is the PD the development tool to ensure aid effectiveness?
- Have NGOs been successful in monitoring the effectiveness of aid delivery?
- How can NGOs evaluate sector policies/plans to promote sustainable development?

Perspectives for and Capacity of INGOs and NGOs

- Can INGOs and NGOs build the capacity of the citizens to demand their rights from duty bearers and donors?
- Are the conditions of donors to INGOs and NGOs in the South different from donors under the PD?
- How can effective collaboration ensure aid effectiveness?
- What can change to make development assistance very effective?
- To what extent are recipients ready listen to the concerns of other development actors as they negotiate for donor support?

Recommendations

- Real changes needed
- PD as embodied need a revision
- Is the PD citizen friendly or donor centred?
- What else need to be done?
- Are donors using the PD to influence recipients politically?

Government Entities & Donors

Implementation of the Paris Declaration

- How is the PD's implementation different as opposed to other nations?
- Are donor supports likely to promote aid effectiveness?
- How independent are national development plans from donor influence?
- Has parliamentary appropriations and responsibility led to aid effectiveness?

- Is the PD the solution to the development challenges of recipient nations?
- Compared to previous economic packages of donors, how different is the PD?

Mapping of Main Actors

- Are development actors achieving the principles of the PD?
- How independent are national development plans?
- Is the PD likely to achieve aid effectiveness in the short, medium or long term?
- What has changed in relation to development plans/projects as a result of the PD?
- How effective can aid delivery be without proper institutional reform?
- Has donor conditions decreased or increased in relation to the PD?
- In what ways can excluded development actors monitor the effective use of donor funds?
- Does the centralization aid delivery make governments accountable the citizenry or even enhance the capacity of civil society?

Ownership and Conditions

- Are the PRS nationally owned or donor dictated?
- While are donors stringent or conditions while still trumpeting the ideals of the PD?
- Is there a link between aid effectiveness and human rights?
- Is the relationship between donors and recipients win-win?
- Who measures performance and effectiveness at every level and with what criteria?
- Can recipients exercise control over their development plans without external influence?
- Is the PD a solution to sustainable development on recipient countries?

Sector Policies and Strategies

- What RBAs are needed in international development to ensure aid effectiveness?
- How can the decentralization of development plans promote aid effectiveness?
- What reforms are needed to make aid effectiveness a reality?
- Are all actors showing commitments to the PD?
- What informs the development of PRSPs and their subsequent approval by donors?
- Is the implementation of the PD the priority of all actors?
- How can disempowered citizens be responsible for development plans?

Experience of Civil Society Participation

- Has capacity building contributed to aid effectiveness?
- How can aid delivery factor the concerns of other interests groups?
- Any lessons for the present and future?
- Who is responsible for progress assessment?
- What are the commitments of donors to aid effectiveness and sustainable development?

Recommendations

- How will development partners overcome challenges?
- Who listens and does what to ensure aid effectiveness?
- What is the level of success so far?
- What are the ideal ways to succeed in a global partnership?
- In the midst of controversy on aid effectiveness

ANNEX 3: LISTS OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

ORGANISATION	POSITION/TITLE	NAME
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	District Director	E.N. Guyuoni
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Training Officer	Mohammed Jakpa
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Department Chairperson	Rose Alidu
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Human Resource Management Department	E.K. Sunkwah
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	IBIS Officer	J.A. Zakaria
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Finance & Administration	Ayishetu W. Seidu
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Basic Schools Coordinator	Atta Braimah
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Girl Child Coordinator	Fati Basigi
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	SHEP	Cecilia Mensah
DEO, East Gonja, Salaga	Planning & Statistics	Rubin Atimbeok
DEFAT	LCC	Parku Elogo
DEFAT	NCCE	T.I. Sandow
DEFAT		Hallaris Kamal-Deen
IBIS, Gomoa	Programme Facilitator	Diana Juhu-Appiah, (Mrs)
DEFAT	PRO	Ibrahim Tahiru Abaranyo
PBME		Kwame Agyapong
DFID	Education Advisor	Dr Don Taylor
IBIS, East Gonja District, Salaga	Programme Facilitator	Eric Kavaarpuo
IBIS, Tamale	Programme Facilitator	Ibrahim Nambiema
IBIS	Programme Manager, ACE Project.	Zakaria Sulemena
GNECC	Director	Michael A. Ansa
East Gonja District Assembly	Planning Officer	Prosper Ahalivon
DEO, Gomoa District Apam	District Director	Beatrice Lokko (Mrs)
DEO, Gomoa District Apam	Training Officer	James Krampah
DEO, Gomoa District Apam	A.D. Finance & Administration	Augustina Appiah (Mrs)
NNED, Tamale	Programme Facilitator	Gaskin Dassah
NNED, Tamale	Advocacy Officer	Charles Songaa
NNED, Tamale	Finance and Admin Officer	Abukari Mohamed

ANNEX 4: REFERENCES

- Actionaid Making Aid Accountable and Effective: The Challenge for the Third High Level Forum and Aid Effectiveness. Accra, Ghana 2008.
- ADF., (2006) The Sector Group with the development Cooperation process: Towards efficiency and Rationalization. Role of key principles. Draft V 6.
- AFRODAD A Critical Assessment of Aid Management and Donor Harmonisation in Ghana- A Case Study
Annual Education Sector Report, 2006
- Annual Education Sector Report, 2007
- Annual Progress Report of the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2006) MDBS Meeting September, 2007
- Development Partners of Government of Ghana. G-JAS. Final Document –March 2007
- Joint Progress Toward Enhanced Aid Effective High level Forum. Paris, February 28-March 2005
- Lawson, A. et al (2007). Joint Evaluation of Multi-Donor Budget Support to Ghana. Volume I: Evaluation Results and Recommendations on Future Design And Management of Ghana Multi-Donor Budget Support. CDD: Accra
- National Development Planning Commission: Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy II Volume I (Policy Framework)
- Reality Check “The Paris Declaration: Toward Enhanced Aid Effectiveness?” January 2007 BOND, CCIC , accessible at :
http://www.odi.org.uk/ffa/workshop_nov05
- Svensson, J. (2000) ‘When is Foreign Aid Policy Credible: Aid Dependence and Conditionality?’ Journal of Development Economics 61:61-84
- The Paris Agenda and its Consequences for Civil Society in Kenya May 2007
- World Bank (2005). Evaluation of the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF)- Ghana Case Study

<http://www.ccic.cale/002/aid.shtml>

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/45/38597363.pdf>

<http://www.eurodad.org/debt>

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk>