Implementation Status & Results
Cambodia
Demand for Good Governance Project (P101156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation Name: Demand for Good Governance Project (P101156)</th>
<th>Project Stage: Implementation</th>
<th>Seq.No: 7</th>
<th>Status: ARCHIVED</th>
<th>Archive Date: 31-May-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: Cambodia</td>
<td>Approval FY: 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Line: IBRD/IDA</td>
<td>Region: EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency(ies):</td>
<td>Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Dates

- **Board Approval Date**: 02-Dec-2008
- **Original Closing Date**: 31-Mar-2013
- **Planned Mid Term Review Date**: 01-Jun-2011
- **Last Archived ISR Date**: 13-Feb-2013
- **Effectiveness Date**: 24-Jun-2009
- **Revised Closing Date**: 31-Mar-2014
- **Actual Mid Term Review Date**: 06-Jun-2011

Project Development Objectives

The development objective of the proposed project is to enhance the demand for good governance (DFGG) in priority reform areas by strengthening institutions, supporting partnerships, and sharing lessons.

Has the Project Development Objective been changed since Board Approval of the Project?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Component(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Component Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to State Institutions</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Non State Institutions</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and Learning</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Ratings

- **Progress towards achievement of PDO**: Satisfactory
- **Overall Implementation Progress (IP)**: Moderately Satisfactory
- **Overall Risk Rating**: Substantial

Implementation Status Overview

This ISR is submitted to record the results of the February 2013 implementation support mission.

Progress toward the development objective – to enhance the demand for good governance in priority reform areas by strengthening institutions, supporting partnerships and sharing lessons – is now rated moderately satisfactory on average, to reflect the varied performance across the project sub-components. In Component 1, the Arbitration Council has achieved highly significant outcomes with a continued growth in the number of cases (an accumulative total of 771 cases compared with a target of 514), with high levels of...
confidence (93%) by employers and union officials toward the institutions role in the arbitration of labor disputes, and sustained policy change when the Memorandum of Understanding with employers and unions was re-signed with a strengthened monitoring role for the Arbitration Council. The One Window Service Office sub-component has continued to progress. 24 offices are now operating and have adopted accountable and transparent practices in the delivery of functions delegated by 10 ministries. An independent report confirmed that the payment of unofficial fees is still low (1.9%). Awareness has improved, but citizen understanding of the benefits of accountable service delivery has still not reached the target of 40%, and issues concerning functional delegation are now posing constraints on effectiveness and efficiency. In Component 2, a review of Non-State actor's activity has highlighted the productive nature of social accountability activity at the local level with the evaluation of the first round of grants providing new evidence of encouraging outcomes, including enhanced service delivery and impacts on policies in communes. Targets for monitoring of state institutions have exceeded targets and resulted in improved government responsiveness. Qualitative indicators note some improvement in the capacity of civil society, and increased trust, especially between citizens and commune councils. Learning events were delayed in Component 3 during 2012 however, and the extension period will enable capacity building and sharing of lessons to take place.

### Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First Administrative Division</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Pouthisat</td>
<td>Khett Pouthisat</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Krong Phnum Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Batdambang</td>
<td>Khett Batdambang</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Takev</td>
<td>Khett Takev</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Sway Rieng</td>
<td>Khett Sway Rieng</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Stoeng Treng</td>
<td>Khett Stoeng Treng</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Siemreab-Otar Meanchey</td>
<td>Otar Meanchey</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Siem Reab</td>
<td>Khett Siem Reab</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Rotanah Kiri</td>
<td>Khett Rotanokiri</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Prey Veng</td>
<td>Khett Prey Veng</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Khett Preah Vihear</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Pailin</td>
<td>Khett Pailin</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Mondol Kiri</td>
<td>Khett Mondol Kiri</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kracheh</td>
<td>Khett Kracheh</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Keb</td>
<td>Khett Keb</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kaoh Kong</td>
<td>Khett Kaoh Kong</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kandal</td>
<td>Khett Kandal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kampot</td>
<td>Khett Kampot</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>First Administrative Division</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Thum</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Thum</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Spoe</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Spoe</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Chhnang</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Chhnang</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Khett Kampong Cham</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khett Banteay Mean Cheay</td>
<td>Khett Banteay Mean Choay</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results

#### Project Development Objective Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits addressed (%)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01-Jul-2010</td>
<td>30-Sep-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Baseline (mid 2010)</td>
<td>Midline result by CDRI</td>
<td>For Endline Study, ACF targeted increase 5% from the midline results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances related to delivery of project benefits that are addressed-(number)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Number Sub Type Supplemental</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 (a): % of AC clients who report paying unofficial fees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>30-Mar-2009</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>No baseline information available.</td>
<td>No reports of unofficial payments to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3: % of OWSO clients who report paying unofficial fees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Baseline % of clients reporting paying unofficial fees based on payments made to Line Ministries prior to establishment of OWSO approach.</td>
<td>Midline result</td>
<td>Endline survey will be conducted in Mar 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2: % of SIs monitored under the project for which monitoring is determined to have a positive impact on SI performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest impact was noticeable with OWSOs, schools, and commune councils. Less impact was noted on grants related to basic health services and NRM.

4.1: Number of SIs / local authorities and service delivery agencies whose performance is monitored through social accountability activities under the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By agencies:
- commune level = 149
- district = 24
- health clinic = 64
- schools = 100

End target value dependent on the quantity and value of grants.

Refined targets:
- commune level = 100
- district = 20
- health clinic = 80
- schools = 175
- OWSO = 6

3.3 Project activities trigger changes in policy or practice that enhance transparency, accountability and civil society partnerships in participating SIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Mar-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OWSO issued 7 prakas re delegation of competencies.

40% of sub-projects have improved disclosure policies by local administrations.

Learning Program triggered 18 additional local trainings.

3.2: % of clients/local elected officials satisfied with quality of services provided at OWSOs across targeted districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised with greater targeting of NSAC activity.

Target = baseline + 5%

3.1: Number of citizen service delivery transactions completed in OWSOs across targeted districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38434.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112806.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of transactions varies significantly across OWSOs; cumulative data is

The target of 250,000 transactions is dependent on
2.4: % of DO clients who report a high confidence in the independence, credibility and effectiveness of the district complaints handling system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>Independence = 95% Confidence = 95% Effectiveness = 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Target = baseline + 10% [Independence = 74% Confidence = 83% Effectiveness = 86%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3: Number of local disputes or complaints received and mediated by DOs (citizens offices) across all target districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2008</td>
<td>This indicator provides information on the use of the DO as a complaints handling system. This indicator is problematic because it is not possible to attribute an increase in complaints to be an increase in problems. It can be either an increase in problems or an increase in the confidence in the complaints handling system. Hence only actual values are tracked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>29-Feb-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of which percentage resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2: % of union and employer group representatives and other stakeholders that report a high confidence in the independence, credibility and effectiveness of the AC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>01-Jul-2010</td>
<td>Midline result by CDRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>ACF targeted increase 5% from the midline results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1: Number of labor dispute cases handled by Arbitration Council (cumulative).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2009</td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>771.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Original target was 514 cases. Revised target = Actual value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of which percentage resolved (cumulative).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 % of citizens (in target areas) aware of and understanding non-state actors facilitation of social accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
31-Mar-2009
31-Dec-2012
31-Mar-2014

**Comments**
new indicator
Estimate from TAF monitor; 70% at village level and 50% at commune level
Endline evaluation TAF.
Refined targets:
Awareness:
Village level = 70%
Commune level = 50%
Understanding:
70% of awareness
Impact on governance
70% of understanding

1.2: % of citizens aware of and understanding services provided by OWSO, and DO (once established) in targeted districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
31-Dec-2012
31-Mar-2014

**Comments**
Midline result by CDRI
Data from mid-line survey. 
69% aware of OWSO; 32% understanding of OWSO; 55% aware of DO; 67% understanding of DO
Target = baseline + 10%
Refined target account for the time taken to build citizen awareness after a new OWSO is established. 
% awareness after year established
year 1 = 30%
year 2 = 50%
year 3 = 60%

1.1: % of union and employer organization leaders and representatives aware of the Arbitration Council and labor arbitration process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>01-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
01-Jul-2010
31-Dec-2012
31-Mar-2014

**Comments**
Midline result by CDRI
Endline study: ACF targeted increase 5% from the midline results.

**Intermediate Results Indicators**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>End Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IO3.6: Positive evaluation of the contribution of partnerships to the project development objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Revised indicator. Improved interactions and growing mutual respect have helped in overcoming hesitations particularly on part of the government representatives to attend events and interface meetings organized by the CSOs, sometimes as learners and at other times as resource persons. The practice of joint planning and implementation of various social accountability tools have also improved the relationship to a great extent. As a result, feedback sessions were more fruitful in planning for corrective actions. Endline evaluations by TAF and PCO. It has been agreed that the Partnership indicator will not be quantified due to the distortions created by counting partnerships in the first half of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3.5: Increased trust and constructive engagement between NSAs and government agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>Mid-line evaluation: concludes that trust and mutual respect between CSOs and state institutions has grown during implementation of sub-projects (observed and reported increases in the number of interactions, collaborative activities, and mutual support between the two actors). The depth of relationship between the commune councils and CSOs most prominent gain, with lesser evidence of interactions and mutual support between the national level state institutions and CSOs. Endline evaluations by TAF and PCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3.4: % of participants in Learning (3B) events given rating as meeting participant needs</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td>98% (Training on Gender and SA) 78% (Disclosure workshop) 100%1 (Conciliation Training) 72% (Theme4) 80% (Theme 5&amp;9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3.3: Lessons (cases, reports, studies) and experiences from within the project are documented, and used in training and capacity building programs</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five learning notes have been submitted in reports during 2012</td>
<td>Target: 3-4 lessons will be developed each quarter until the end of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3.2: Local social accountability community of practice including a cadre of trainers, networks, who are able to undertake ongoing training and capacity-building in the area of SAc.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised indicator.</td>
<td>Midline TAF evaluation - Number of people trained/in-depth training through learning program: 1,520 participants (427 women) in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3.1: MOI, through PCO, plans and establishes a resource centre for good governance and provides learning services in collaboration with technical support from TAF/ACF/OWSO.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator.</td>
<td>Learning Program launched and building capacity of potential state and non-state partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO2.3: % of NSAC sub-grantees whose sub-projects reflect good practice in social accountability design and implementation.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>New indicator.</td>
<td>TAF monitor estimate. 90% design best practice. Capacity for implementation evaluated as average in 4 sub-projects; 4 above average and 3 strong. Await data from midline evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO2.1: Increase in social accountability related knowledge, skills, and capacity to implement in participating NSAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>Revised indicator. self assessment of SAc skills no longer measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>targeted citizens have increased their understanding of and capacity to participate and exert accountability from their elected representatives and appointed decision-makers as evidenced through increased inclusivity of monthly commune council meetings; activation of sub-committees of the commune councils; and improved disclosure of information of sub-national level authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative targets to be agreed in midline NSAC evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO2.2: % of citizens reporting that engagement in decision making processes of communes / local service delivery agents (clinics, schools, communes / districts) has been enhanced through subprojects.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>New indicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Targeted government institutions at sub-national level have become more responsive to citizen demands and more inclusive of citizens in their decision-making. Local government service providers, such as schools and local health facilities, have improved their services as a direct result of the monitoring activities of NSAC sub-projects (improved performance of primary schools e.g. higher attendance rates of teachers, improved hygiene and cleanliness in school premises and reduction of corporal punishments of students; more attentive health staff, reduced staff absenteeism, 24 hour service).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td>Citizen survey not taken up as NGO grant. Direct procurement pending.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IO1.6: Steps taken to integrate district complaints mechanism (DO) in IP3 sub-national accountability system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAF monitor indicates 70% improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed sub-national CHM in place by project end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>new indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IO1.5: Average cost recovery ratio (in %) of OWSOs (i.e., service fee revenue as proportion of operating costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2009</td>
<td>Method of calculation has been changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>After establishment of offices: current year=20% year 1=50% year 2=70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td>sustainability strategy will refine the data being provided for this calculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IO1.4: Reduced cost and time taken for processing OWSO transactions (cf. line agency service standards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Target = 50% &lt; baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IO1.3: Number of line agencies/service delivery functions assigned to OWSOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>30-Jun-2008</td>
<td>9 line ministries delegating 144 functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>10 line ministries delegating 125 functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IO1.2: Revenue generated through tri-partite contributions by AC as % of operating costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount(USD)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2008</td>
<td>$89,900 Current revenue exceeds target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Original PIM target was $81,200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
| | | | |
IO1.1: % of Arbitration Council awards considered to be of satisfactory quality or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>01-Jun-2011</td>
<td>Midline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>31-Dec-2012</td>
<td>Target agreed for endline increased 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>31-Mar-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on Financial Performance (as of 12-Apr-2013)

Financial Agreement(s) Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Ln/Cr/Tf</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Signing Date</th>
<th>Effectiveness Date</th>
<th>Original Closing Date</th>
<th>Revised Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Disbursements (in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Ln/Cr/Tf</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Cancelled</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
<th>Undisbursed</th>
<th>% Disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P101156</td>
<td>IDA-H4410</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>XDR</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>82.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursement Graph

Key Decisions Regarding Implementation
none

Restructuring History
Related Projects

There are no related projects.