CAC South Asia – Questionnaire for Independent Project Completion Assessment
Center for Advocacy and Research, Bangaluru, Karnataka

Title of Project	Monitoring Government Food Schemes and Schemes for Vulnerable Women through Community Participation and Action to Create Transparent Governance
Project Location: Six slum settlements in Bangaluru	
Corruption Problem being addressed: *(as described in the project proposal).* Corruption problem in PDS: Black-marketing, malpractices in distribution, malpractices in the issue of BPL cards and issue of ration cards, improper functioning of ration shop and non functioning of vigilance committees. In ICDS: Improper quality and quantity of food served, children not being fed within the premises as stipulated by the Government, non-existence of Anganwadi Centres, development committees, lack of basic amenities at the Centre. Social Welfare Scheme: Lack of awareness, manipulation by middlemen, political biases and influences complicated application procedures.	

	Planned	***Actual***
Implementation period	15th June 2009 -15th June 2010	15th June 2009 -15th July 2010
Total Budget (for one year)	Rs.622700	Rs.470235.80
PTF Contribution		
	Project Objectives	
As described at Project Approval		***Status of Achievement at Completion[1]*** *(in view of the Evaluator)* ***in the First year***
1. To consolidate the on-going efforts being made to strengthen transparency and pro-poor urban governance by Women's Forums and Community Advocates.		2
2. To go beyond the four settlements we are currently working in, we need to systematically network with other civil society organizations including NGO, CBO to ensure that strategies are up-scaled to make the urban bodies sensitive and accountable to the entitlements of the community.		2
3. To strengthen mechanisms that legitimizes community participation and involvement.		2

---

[1] Please use the following ratings scale and provide brief narrative. 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings; 2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-coming; 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced; 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings; 5 = not achieved.

Executive Summary:

Over the past one year CFAR has been working with a multi-pronged strategy. While at one level, through various trainings, workshops on use of instruments such as Right to Information Act, entitlements under the various government schemes, participation in rallies, demonstrations, exposure visits attempts have been made to capacitate the community advocates. At another level continuous interface between the government and the community was being facilitated through local-level public hearings, one-to-one meetings with the officials, to ensure accountability of the systems of governance. The efforts towards advocacy were not limited only to government representatives, at opportune moments attempts were also made to reach out to even the political representatives. Simultaneously, concerted efforts were made to reach out to those community members in responsible positions and make them realize their duties and obligations. For instance trainings were organized for the members of Vigilance Committees on the fair price shops and members in Anganwadi Development Committees.

At the outset it is noteworthy that prior to implementation of the programme of Citizens Against Corruption under PTF, CFAR had been working across four slums in Bangaluru. This additional support from PTF helped them to upscale their work by spreading out to 2 new areas and also narrowing down their focus in terms of fighting corruption. The primary objective of their intervention has been to strengthen community action towards making systems of governance, service delivery more transparent and pro-poor. In doing so, the organization focused on enabling the community representatives to fight an informed battle with the use of legal instruments. Simultaneously, strategies were adopted for strengthening mechanisms that legitimize community participation and involvement thus ensuring community-responsive systems of delivery.

*Top Three Results (**actual**). In view of the Evaluator)*	1. Two model ration shops in function with display boards, electronic weighing machine, sample display, maintaining proper records and operating as per rules. 2. Availability of two published materials on PDS and RTI in local language 3. 28 Trained community advocates were in function
Overall Achievement Rating[2] in Evaluators view. Use numeric rating as well as narrative. See footnote 2.	2

Commentary to support overall assessment:

Guidance. Please provide a narrative to accompany your overall achievement rating taking into account your overall assessment (in a maximum of 20 lines) of taking into account quality or project design, implementation performance and results achieved. Reasons for rating of 4 or more may please be explained here. It is suggested that this be written last

---

[2] The degree to which the project achieved, or seems likely to achieve, all or most of its objectives and produced the outcomes projected in the logframe attached to the Project Proposal. The rating be based on, and consistent with, the detailed ratings in the Completion Assessment section.

after the detailed assessment (Section 2 below) has been done and Overall Achievement Rating determined.

The organisation along with a series of other activities to address the issues of the 6 urban slums in Bangaluru city was also successful in implementing the proposed activities of the project in the first year. We observed that the project team members (all women) are very committed and the field level workers are from the community, which has an added value in their interventions. Even though there is some non-clarity/lack of details in the objectives, results and constructive engagements, the activities initiated were more specific and the results achieved were generally satisfactory. In the case of community empowerment and focus on sustainability the organization is able to create a conducive environment and complete a series of interventions in the first year itself, which is highly satisfactory.

We also observed the need for some corrective action. The organisation team should take special effort to reorganize the presentation of the objectives, context, output/outcome, impact of the proposed project activities. There is a lot of repetition, duplication and non-clarity in the presentation of goals, objectives, activities and results. This will adversely affect the implementation of the activities to achieve the stated objectives. The project proposal should qualify as a reference material for both the team leaders and the field staff who are actually implementing the programme.

Another observation is that the quality of intervention will be reduced in due course because of too much intervention in a variety of programmes. They started focusing three areas – PDS, ICDS and Social Welfare Schemes. Each of these can be addressed year by year with follow up in the succeeding years or can be addressed separately to effectively address the corruption issues in each area thereby creating a momentum in reduction of corruption in the specific areas. So necessary rethinking is required to the team in this regard.

Completion Assessment[3]

1. *Quality of the Project Design*

a. Elaboration of the corruption problems to be addressed. $\boxed{1}$

b. Clarity and relevance of the objectives to the corruption problem being addressed. $\boxed{3}$

c. Proposed Community empowerment activities $\boxed{1}$

d. Coherence of Results Framework (Logframe) $\boxed{3}$

$\boxed{2}$

e. Constructive engagement plan

Comments: *(to support/explain rating and overall assessment).*

---

[3] Ratings Scale: **1 = Highly Satisfactory or Likely; 2 = Satisfactory/Likely ; 3 = Moderately Satisfactory/Likely; 4 = Moderately unsatisfactory/Unlikely; 5 = Unsatisfactory/Unlikely; 6 = Highly Unsatisfactory/Unlikely; NA = Not Applicable**

1. Though the organisation elaborated the corruption problem very clearly, there is lack of clarity and relevance of the objectives. The objectives are too broad and seem difficult to achieve within the stipulated period, as they are not SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound. For example, objective four is "Given that the community advocates and volunteers would be capacitated through various processes, one of the significant objectives would be to engage in processes that lead to institutionalization of the forums into 'Community Based Organizations', thus ensuring its sustainability". This objective is not clear in itself, as it does not state the kind of processes the organization would take to institutionalize the forums into CBOs. It could have been written as "To capacitate the existing women's forums, through 20 (any particular no.) training programmes to strengthen them as CBOs in order to ensure their sustainability".

2. Each of the objectives is supported by a narrative, which describes the objective in detail mentioning the processes and activities that would be adopted to achieve the same. Though this is helpful to understand the objectives clearly, it also creates confusion as activities are already mentioned separately in the proposal.

3. There is lack of clarity in the results framework as well as the constructive engagement plan, whereas the community empowerment activities are spelt out very clearly.

2. ***The Implementation Performance*** *(in the First year)*

a. Extent to which the planned project activities completed. | 2 |

b. Extent to which the planned outputs completed. | 1 |

c. Community empowerment initiatives implemented | 2 |

d. Constructive engagement during implementation | 2 |

e. Focus on sustainability | 2 |

Comments:

1. Almost all of the programme activities proposed for the first year by the organisation have been implemented and completed satisfactorily and the proposed outputs are achieved. However, more interventions are needed to extend its scope and coverage.

2. The organisation is doing a variety of other activities in the same intervention area and it is difficult to identify the specific outcome from the proposed project activities. However, in our observation and discussion with the stakeholder groups we found that the implementation performance was satisfactory and the completion of the planned output was highly satisfactory.

3. *The Results:*

a. Accomplishments of the results specified in the logframe | 2 |

b. Responsiveness of authorities to constructive engagement. | 2 |

c. Effectiveness of community empowerment initiatives | 1 |

d. Value added of peer learning activities and events. | 2 |

e. Project contribution to CSO partner capacity to carry out anti-corruption work. | 2 |

f. Prospects for sustainability of project activities | 1 |

Comments: (Please briefly explain the ratings and any noteworthy aspects)

1. Though the results are very vague in the logframe, there is some clarity on the results and outcome proposed in part 7 of the project proposal. We observed that the organisation was able to achieve some results satisfactorily as specified in the project proposal. The discussions with the stakeholder groups also proved that the activities were useful to address the identified corruption issues. For example, one of the results was that 371 new ration cards were issued to residents in the intervened settlements as citizens started demanding and availing their rights. Also in Kaveri Nagar and Hosabalunagar significant improvements could be observed after conducting public hearings. Two new bore wells and water tanks were installed in Kaveri Nagar, whereas Hosabalunagar area was resurveyed by the Slum Board for construction of additional community toilets.

2. The identification and development of 28 community advocates, publication of the learning materials on PDS and RTI and its dissemination, consultations, capacity building, public hearing, promotion of federation of women groups, etc, provided ample scope for community empowerment and sustainability of the project. The formation of the umbrella forum called 'Daksha Samuha' is another example of how sustainability of project activities is being given due importance.

3. In addition to this the team attempted an experiment of nurturing and promoting few Vigilance Committees of the community members under each ration shop. The committee members occasionally interact with the members of the community to understand their grievances and issues to further address them. The committees also meet regularly to review their activities and conduct visits to the ration shops to check the stock, etc. Since the mandatory vigilance committees are non-functional, this was a good experience. As a result of this initiative and the efforts of the vigilance committee members, two ration shops i.e. number 70 and 81 have been declared as model ration shops.

4. *Impact of the project on reduction in corruption:*

Through the consistent efforts of the community advocates with the support of CFAR, the community members have joined hands to fight against corruption in their own specific ways. During the course of the project, the community members have called upon the authorities in a number of instances. As a result of the 3 public hearings on issues of basic amenities and right to housing in Kaveri Nagar, Laxmi Devi Nagar and Hosabalunagar, KFCS (Karnataka Food and Civil Supplies department) officials seized a ration shop and also took back the inedible ration from two ration shops. This reflects that the community has now started raising corruption issues on their own to some extent, which would gradually improve through more capacity building programmes.

The women's forums also play a crucial role in keeping a check on corruption. The forum members at the local level act as a checking authority and put their signature in the 'Pramana Patra', a proof certificate mandated by the Karnataka Food and Civil Supplies Department. The shop owners in turn have to produce this document in the monthly meeting of shop owners with the KFCS.

5. *PAC-PTF Advice* (Please consult CSO Partner)

    a.   Value added of PTF technical advice
    b.   Value added of PAC technical advice

Comments: *(In your comments please include Strong and weakest points of PTF-PAC interventions and suggestions for improvement)*

The organization valued very much the technical advice provided by PAC for the development and preparation of project proposal.

Strong points

Training support, consultation support, feedbacks, peer learning opportunity, organizational visit of PAC official.

Weak points

Confusion and lack of common understanding on a general format for project development and reporting, lack of interaction and response from PTF regarding the continuation of the project. There is also the problem of lack of planning to avoid discontinuity of ongoing project activities and creating uncertainty in continuation of the project.

Suggestions for improvement

1. Development of a common format for project proposal will be very useful for the partners as well as PAC for reviewing and monitoring of all the supported projects, comparative analysis of the outcomes of different projects as well as compiling a synthesis report.

2. Support from PAC should be given for periodic review and regular feedback to implement the project effectively.

3. Necessary steps should be taken to approve the second/third year of a project before the completion of the previous year. If there is any delay in approving the project for the succeeding years some contingency grants should be provided to continue the programme, which can be adjusted with final, approved programme.