



**DFID CNTR: 00 0512A**

**SLGP Consultants' Report Number 216**

(Original Number 436)

**FEEDS I Review and Developing a Framework for FEEDS II  
Part A: Outcomes of the FCTA Retreat, Part B: Joint Civil  
Society/FCTA Workshop**

by

**Oga Steve Abah, Jenkeri Zakari Okwori, Salihu Lukman and Ali  
Muhammad Garba, and Dr Nina Bowen**

**July 2007**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>PART A: FCTA RETREAT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Objectives.....	5
2.2	The Process .....	5
2.3	Outcomes .....	6
2.4	Synthesis/Conclusion .....	12
2.5	Recommendations .....	12
2.6	Next Steps.....	12
<b>3.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>THE PROCESS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>OUTCOMES.....</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1	Lessons Learnt and Recommendations made at the FEEDS Retreat: .....	16
7.1.1	General lessons.....	16
7.2	Group Work: Consultation Processes .....	17
7.2.1	Internal consultation processes – presentation .....	17
7.2.2	External consultation processes.....	17
7.2.3	Group Work/Presentation .....	17
7.2.4	Plenary discussion on consultation processes: .....	18
7.2.5	<b>Group II – Theme I .....</b>	<b>19</b>
7.2.6	Plenary Session Group II.....	19
7.2.7	Group III – Theme II .....	20
7.2.8	Plenary Session Group III.....	21
7.2.9	Group IV – Theme II .....	21
7.2.10	Group V – Theme III .....	21
7.2.11	Group VI – Theme III .....	22
7.3	Group Work: Situation Analysis.....	23



7.3.1	Group I – Theme I .....	23
7.3.2	Group II – Theme I .....	23
7.3.3	Group III – Theme II .....	25
7.3.4	Group IV – Theme II .....	25
7.3.5	Group V – Theme III .....	26
7.3.6	Group VI – Theme III .....	26
7.4	Setting Targets and Strategies .....	27
7.4.1	Presentation by Mohammed Ari, Director Education FCTA .....	27
7.4.2	Group I – Theme I .....	27
7.4.3	Group II – Theme I .....	28
7.4.4	Group III – Theme II .....	28
7.4.5	Group IV – Theme II .....	29
7.4.6	Group V – Theme III .....	29
7.4.7	Group VI – Theme III .....	29
7.4.8	Plenary Discussion .....	30
7.5	Group Work: Costing and Budgeting .....	31
7.5.1	Group I – Theme I .....	31
7.5.2	Group II – Theme I .....	31
7.5.3	Group III – Theme II .....	32
7.5.4	Group IV – Theme II .....	33
7.5.5	Group V – Theme III .....	33
7.5.6	Group VI – Theme III .....	34
7.6	Strategy Implementation, Monitoring And Evaluation .....	34
7.6.1	Group I – Theme I .....	34
7.6.2	Group II – Theme II .....	35
7.6.3	Group III – Theme III .....	35
7.7	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	35
7.7.1	Group IV – Theme I .....	35
7.7.2	Group V – Theme II .....	36
7.7.3	Group VI – Theme III .....	36
7.7.4	Group VII – Theme IV .....	37
<b>8.0</b>	<b>SYNTHESIS/CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>10.0</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>PART B: JOINT CIVIL SOCIETY/FCTA WORKSHOP .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>12.0</b>	<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>41</b>
12.1	Outcomes .....	41
12.2	Recommendations .....	42
<b>13.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>42</b>
13.1	Background .....	42
13.2	Consultancy Objectives .....	43
13.3	Outline of Report .....	43
<b>14.0</b>	<b>PROCESS FOLLOWED AND WORK DONE .....</b>	<b>43</b>
14.1	Consultation .....	43
14.2	Civil Society Meeting .....	44
14.3	FCTA Retreat .....	44
14.4	Poster of Community Scorecard Results .....	44
<b>15.0</b>	<b>OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>45</b>
15.1	Civil Society Meeting .....	45
15.1.1	FEEDS Process Suggestions .....	45
15.1.2	Reflections on the Scorecard and SDA surveys .....	45
15.1.3	Suggestions for FEEDS II Priorities .....	46
15.2	Interview Comments .....	46



15.3	Challenges .....	47
<b>16.0</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS AND OUTSTANDING ISSUES.....</b>	<b>47</b>
16.1	Recommendations .....	47
16.2	Outstanding Issues.....	48
<b>17.0</b>	<b>REPORT AGAINST TERMS OF REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>48</b>

### **List of Annexes**

#### **Part A: Outcomes of the FCTA Retreat (18<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> July 2007, Kaduna)**

Annex 1	Terms of Reference
Annex 2	List of Documents
Annex 3	List of Workshop Participants
Annex 4	SDA Presentations
Annex 5	Papers Presented at the Retreat

#### **Part B: Outcomes of joint Civil Society /FCTA workshop (7<sup>th</sup> June 2007, Abuja)**

Annex 6	Terms of Reference
Annex 7	List of People Met
Annex 8	Interview Guide
Annex 9	Civil Society Meeting Discussion Comments
Annex 10	Comments on FEEDS Processes, Successes, Challenges

## Acronyms/Abbreviations

AMMA	Abuja Municipal Management Agency
CBO	Central Budget Office or Community Based Organization
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CPBO	Central Planning and Budget Office
CWIQ	Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire Survey
DFID	(UK) Department for International Development
FCDA	Federal Capital Development Authority
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FCTA	Federal Capital Territory Administration
FEEDS	Federal Capital Territory Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
FFPs	FEEDS Focal Persons
FPs	Focal Persons
LGA	Local Government Area
LEEDS	Local Government Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTSS	Medium Term Sector Strategy
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
NGOs	Non Governmental Organizations
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRS	Planning Research and Statistics
SDA	Secretariat Department Agency
SDAs	Secretariats, Departments and Agencies
SEEDS	State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
SLGP	State and Local Government Programme
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound
SMEs	Small Medium Enterprises
STDA	Satellite Towns Development Agency

## **1.0 PART A: FCTA RETREAT**

### **2.0 SUMMARY**

#### **2.1 Objectives**

The overarching objectives or aim of this assignment are:

- To ensure that the achievements, challenges and lessons from FEEDS I come to inform FEEDS II process, strategies and targets.
- To ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. This will help to set the scene for a FEEDS II strategy that is relevant, realistic, inclusionary, pro-poor, and coherent across departmental strategies.
- The review processes would also provide a space in which to share the aim to start LEEDS policy development with FCTA and civil society. Through this, we would gain initial ideas on how to approach this, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS.

#### **2.2 The Process**

Presentations were made in plenary sessions by key staff of FCTA, which covered the following (See Annex 5 for papers presented at the retreat):

- Overview of FEEDS I
- SDAs' presentation on their progress with FEEDS I
- Outcomes of the Civil Society FEEDS Review workshop
- Presentation on community consultations
- Situation analysis
- Strategy implementation
- Costing and Budgeting

Presentations were also made by an expert on Monitoring and Evaluation.

A presentation on community consultation techniques was made followed by a film show, which demonstrated the issues and challenges of consultation.

Groups were formed to deliberate more closely on key issues and themes. Each group presented its finding at plenary. These were further discussed and the understanding deepened further at the plenary.

## 2.3 Outcomes

### Summary of proposals made at the FEEDS Review workshop

#### FEEDS

- **FEEDS Coordination:** The Planning and Statistics Department, which previously coordinated FEEDS and MDG DRGs, has been dissolved and temporarily housed within the Department of Establishment and Training. Proposed longer term solutions include:
  - Merging planning and the Central Budget Office, to create a Central Planning and Budget Office (CPBO). The CBO is currently coordinated by an SLGP engaged consultant, and needs to be integrated into the main stream civil service. It is proposed that a Director with knowledge of both finance and planning is redeployed, which would enable creation of a Department of Planning and Budget.
  - Re-establishing the Department of Planning and Statistics. The Central Budget Office would be placed under this Department, eventually to create a Department of Planning and Budget.
  - With each of these solutions, the current CBO Coordinator would become a technical consultant to the Director of the Department of Budget/Planning.
  
- **Creation of a FEEDS Coordination Standing Committee.** A Standing Committee of Directors should be constituted to coordinate FEEDS, chaired by Director of the Department with responsibility for coordinating FEEDS (currently Planning and Statistics). This Standing Committee should be constituted as soon as possible, so as to enable immediate progress with FEEDS.
  
- **Establishing the FCTA FEEDS Focal Person Forum as a Standing Committee** (FEEDS Focal Person Standing Committee), and expanding remit as set out below.
  
- **Creation of FEEDS Committees in each SDA**, including:
  - Directors
  - Budget Officer
  - Planning Officer
  - FEEDS Focal Person (Secretary of the Committee and responsible for reporting back issues raised and the outcomes of the FEEDS Focal Person Standing Committee.
  
- **Cross-cutting targets and strategies:** Some SDAs already collaborate on cross-cutting issues, while others do not. There is a need for formalised collaboration on targets and strategies that cross-cut SDAs.
  - Where relevant and possible, cross-cutting issues would be dealt with by the FEEDS Focal Person Standing Committee.
  - In cases where substantial SDA collaboration is required, or where a relevant Unit does not have a FEEDS Focal Person, a special Standing Committee would be constituted for collaboration on cross-cutting targets and strategies.

The Committees would include:

- i. Heads of all the relevant SDAs.
  - ii. The Chair of the Committee would be the Director of the key SDA in relation to the target/strategy at hand.
  - iii. FFPs from the relevant SDAs,
  - iv. Budget officers,
  - v. Planning officers
  - vi. The budget for implementation would be located in the key SDA in relation to that issue.
- **FEEDS Chapters:** The FEEDS chapters would be decided by the FEEDS Standing Committee (of Directors) in collaboration with the Minister's Office.
  - **Situation analysis/Baseline data:** Each SDA must collect and collate data relevant to their sector, and commence collection in August 2007.
    - The FEEDS Committees in the SDAs would be responsible for data collection and collation, in collaboration with SDA statisticians.
    - Sources of data include: relevant sectoral Ministries, Central Bank of Nigeria, National Planning Commission, National Population Commission, Ministry of Finance, NGOs and community groups, bilateral agencies and donors.
    - There is a need to develop a computerised databank in each SDA, and a central collection and collation system and computerised databank in the Department responsible for coordinating FEEDS.
  - **Setting FEEDS targets and strategies:**
    - FEEDS targets and strategies must be coordinated with LEEDS
    - Each SDA will be responsible for setting their own targets and strategies
    - Proposed targets and strategies will be submitted to the Department responsible for coordinating FEEDS, and presented by the SDAs to the FEEDS Standing Committee (of Directors).
    - SDAs should use activity based budgeting to cost their targets and strategies
  - **Process for translating FEEDS into MTSS:**
    - The MTSS must be based on prioritisation.
    - MTSS and FEEDS must be coherent, and developed by the same team
    - FEEDS II targets and strategies must be based on the targets and time-frames in the 2007-2009 MTSS.
  - **FEEDS Chapters:** Decision on FEEDS II chapters to be made by Minister's Office in collaboration with the Standing FEEDS Committee (of Directors).
  - **Monitoring and Evaluation:**
    - There is a need for project verification and budget monitoring
    - Indicators should be SMART compliant
    - There is a need for monitoring within SDAs, managed by the SDA FEEDS Committee, and central M&E coordination undertaken by the department responsible for FEEDS in collaboration with the FEEDS Standing Committee (of Directors). The SDA FEEDS Committees should visit the field to verify project progress.



- Performance should be presented to EXCO on a regular basis (monthly or quarterly), using red, amber and green coding to indicate project completion performance in relation to the work-plan and budget
- There is a need for rewards and sanctions for performance
  
- **Resource envelopes:**
  - These should be developed in accordance with sectoral priorities, and is the responsibility of the Minister's Office
  - SDAs should base their costed targets and strategies on the budget envelopes received in 2007.
  - Resources should also be sought from donors; we should not rely on budget envelopes.

### **LEEDS**

- **LEEDS:** LEEDS development should commence immediately, with support from FCTA. LEEDS and FEEDS II should be developed simultaneously.
  
- **LEEDS coordination:**
  - LEEDS should be coordinated by the Department of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters.
  - A LEEDS Committee should be created with Directors of relevant SDAs, the Chairmen of the Area Councils and the Area Councils Service Board, and relevant NGOs.
  - The LEEDS Committee would be chaired by the Director of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters.
  - The LEEDS Committee would work in collaboration with the FEEDS Standing Committee (of Directors).
  
- **LEEDS Committees within the Area Councils** should be set up.

### **FEEDS and LEEDS**

- **FEEDS and LEEDS coherence for targets, strategies and budgets.** For example, if FEEDS promises a borehole to Abaji, the corresponding Abaji LEEDS may promise distribution pipes. Developing this FEEDS/LEEDS coherence requires a collaborative approach. Using one set of community consultations as the basis and starting point of both FEEDS and LEEDS would enable such coherence
  
- **FEEDS/LEEDS community consultations:** Agreement that this is vital to bottom-up planning and the development of appropriate and effective FEEDS/LEEDS targets and strategies.
  - The consultations should be coordinated by the Department of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters.
  - To ensure that the community consultations influence the FEEDS and LEEDS targets and strategies, the FEEDS committee in each SDA would be responsible for analysing the data relevant to their sector.
  
- **FEEDS and LEEDS PPPs:** To be coordinated by the Standing Committee for PPPs in the Office of the Minister





- **Sensitization on FEEDS and LEEDS** is required within:
  - FCTA
  - Area Councils and traditional leaders
  - Communities
  
- **Appointment of a FEEDS/LEEDS Focal Person in each Ward:** Each Area Council should have 10 FEED/LEEDS Focal Persons, one from each Ward.
  
- **Area Council/civil society FEEDS Focal Persons** should attend the monthly FEEDS Focal Person meetings currently limited to FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons



**Proposed timeline for FEEDS II**

**Proposed timeline for FEEDSII**

Tasks to be managed by CBO PC, with SLGP support and oversight.

Tasks	August	September	October	November	December	January
<b>Setting up Committees and Structures for FEEDS2</b>	■					
FEEDS Standing Committee of Directors						
LEEDS Committees						
<b>Baseline data collection &amp; compilation</b>	■	■	■			
<b>Baseline data and M&amp;E workshop</b> (funded by SLGP)		■				
<b>Cascade training on SEEDS modules</b> (workshops funded by SLGP)		■				
<b>Sensitisation on FEEDS/LEEDS in FCTA &amp; Area Councils</b>	■	■				
<b>Community Consultations</b> (funded by SLGP)		■	■			
<b>Analysis of consultation data in Area Councils - draft LEEDS priorities</b>			■			
<b>FEEDS/ LEEDS coherence workshop (Acs, FCTA, FFPs)</b> - funded by FCTA/SLGP			■			
<b>Development of FEEDS &amp; LEEDS targets and strategies</b>			■	■		
Sectoral workshops funded by FCTA/SLGP			■	■		
<b>Preparing activity plans and costing targets and strategies</b> (costing LEEDS targets and strategies - support from SLGP)				■	■	
Submission of FEEDS draft targets, strategies, costing and workplans					■	
<b>FEEDS/ LEEDS coherence workshop (ACs, FCTA, FFPs)</b> - funded by FCTA/SLGP					■	
<b>Finalisation of FEEDS &amp; LEEDS strategies and targets</b>					■	
<b>Preparation of FEEDS chapters</b>					■	
<b>Preparation of LEEDS</b> (support from SLGP)					■	



## **2.4 Synthesis/Conclusion**

The overall objective of the retreat, which is to review FEEDS I and develop a framework for FEEDS II and LEEDS, has been achieved as per the content of Key Decisions.

## **2.5 Recommendations**

- FEEDS Committees would be set up in each SDA, including a Director, a Budget and a Planning Officer, as well as the FEEDS Focal Persons (as Committee Secretary).
- A Committee should be set up to get the incoming administration to buy-in and implement the key decision of the FEEDS Retreat.
- SLGP may wish to engage a consultant at this early stage to follow up on the formation of these committees, develop the needed training material, assist with the drawing up of the LEEDS framework and timeframe and other activities that will be required in the process

## **2.6 Next Steps**

- The next step is for the retreat to realistically determine whether the above issues and recommendations could be implemented before the new administration settles down. If there is a reasonable chance that these could be done or at least a minimum risk that not much would change then:
- FCTA, the Department of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters to liaise with SLGP to agree on funding formula and support for the FEEDS/LEEDS development project.
- The three partner institutions (FCTA, the Department of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters and SLGP) should also agree and proceed to set up the various committees that will drive the process.

## **3.0 INTRODUCTION**

This report documents the second part of the 'FEEDS I Review and Developing a Framework for FEEDS II' consultancy. The first component of the consultancy, Outcomes of the FEEDS I Review civil society workshop, was documented by Dr Nina Bowen in June 2007 (Part B of this report). The two reports appear separately because of the general labour strike in June, which affected the civil service and caused the retreat/workshop to be postponed to July. This extension of time was outside the original timeframe of the consultancy and the (International) Lead Consultant became unavailable to conclude the assignment. A new set of consultants were hired to work with the National Consultant to conclude the consultancy. The reports should, therefore, be seen/read as 'two chapters' of one report on 'FEEDS I Review and Developing a Framework for FEEDS II'.

The report prepared by Dr. Nina Bowen (Part B) documents the outcomes of:

- Consultation with (Federal Capital Territory Authority) FCTA stakeholders involved in FEEDS I, which obtained their views on the FEEDS I process/outcomes and recommendations for FEEDS II, as well as the ideas of the framework of the civil society meeting and the FCTA workshop.
- The outcomes of the meeting with representatives from civil society, Area Councils and FCTA (7<sup>th</sup> June 2007). At this meeting, the results of the Community Scorecard Survey and the Service Delivery Assessment were presented, to obtain input from civil society on FEEDS I outcomes and processes, and suggestions on how to improve the process for FEEDS II.

This report is presented in Part B.

This first part of the report (Part A) documents the proceedings of the 3 Day Retreat held in Kaduna to review FEEDS I and develop a framework for developing FEEDS II. The report also documents what the workshop/retreat explored on ways of developing LEEDS in the FCTA Area Councils and how to make FEEDS II and LEEDS coherent. The workshop was the third of three key primary activities of the consultancy.

## **4.0 BACKGROUND**

In November 2000, the UK's Department for International Development commissioned the State and Local Government Programme (SLGP) to run for six years in four selected locations (initially Benue, Ekiti, Jigawa and Enugu, and presently Jigawa, Enugu, Lagos, Kano and Kaduna). The programme was designed to enhance the capacity of State and Local Governments in Nigeria to manage resources and provide improved delivery of services, in the interest of the poor, in a transparent, accountable and responsive manner.

The purpose of SLGP is to enhance the capacity and effectiveness of federal, state and local government in chosen states, and at federal level, to formulate policy, manage resources and support service delivery in the interest of poor people. The programme also intends to further this process in other states by dissemination of lessons learnt and through influence on other donor initiatives. One of the key components of SLGPs support is to improve the functioning of States and LGAs through policy development, better management of resources, and improving accountability and transparency in governance.

In 2005, the FCTA produced its first Federal Capital Territory Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (FEEDS) document. Like the national level NEEDS, and SEEDS documents produced by states, the aim of the FEEDS document is to identify key poverty problems in the FCT, and to set out sectoral strategies and concrete targets to address them in the short and medium term.

The process of producing the FEEDS document included consultations with ordinary people in the FCT's Area Councils and representatives from the private sector. This collaboration was structured by a three-tier consultative framework:

Consultative Forum: a multi-stakeholder forum of representatives from civil society, the private sector and government.

Consultative Committee: representatives from FCTA departments, agencies and parastatals, Area Councils and the National Assembly. This included six 'external' FEEDS Focal Persons from each of FCT's six Area Councils, and 'internal' FEEDS Focal Persons from FCTA sectoral departments.

Core Technical Team: Technical experts from the Minister's office and wider government, civil society and the private sector.

One year into the implementation of this first FEEDS strategy, a process of monitoring and evaluating FEEDS progress has been undertaken. In January 2007, SLGP facilitated a pilot Community Scorecard Survey, in which ordinary people in Area Councils evaluated the realities of service provision in their communities, and changes in this regard over the past year. SLGP has also undertaken a pilot Service Delivery Assessment (SDA) in FCT. Framed by the initial (2005) SEEDS benchmarking exercise, the SDA provides current data on FCTA service provisioning in six key sectors: infrastructure, SMEs, agriculture, education and health.

## 5.0 OBJECTIVES

The overarching objectives or aim of this assignment are:

- To ensure that the achievements, challenges and lessons from FEEDS I come to inform FEEDS II process, strategies and targets.
- To ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. This will help to set the scene for a FEEDS II strategy that is relevant, realistic, inclusionary, pro-poor, and coherent across departmental strategies.
- The review processes would also provide a space in which to share the aim to start LEEDS policy development with FCTA and civil society. Through this, we would gain initial ideas on how to approach this, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS.

## 6.0 THE PROCESS

A three-day retreat/workshop (18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> July 2007) was conducted in Kaduna to review FEEDS I and develop a framework for FEEDS II. The retreat also explored ways to develop LEEDS and the strategies required to make FEEDS II and LEEDS coherent. Participants in the retreat were FCTA Directors and their Deputies and assistants. Budget and Finance officers as well as FEEDS Focal Persons (FFPs) also attended the retreat/workshop. In all, seventy-five FCTA staff attended and participated in the retreat.

The retreat was divided into three segments as follows:

### **The Presentation Segment**

This session was intended to provide background knowledge and information on FEEDS I and how SDAs participated in the process. Presentations were also made to provide technical knowledge in costing, budgeting and M&E. Presentations made at the retreat are: (see Annex 5 for list of papers presented at the retreat).

Presentations on Progress with FEEDS I in selected SDAs: Representatives of the following SDAs made presentations (see Annex 4)

- Social Development Secretariat
- Education
- Satellite Towns Development Agency (STDA)
- Abuja Municipal Management Agency (AMMA)
- Transport
- Agriculture

Outcomes of the Civil Society FEEDS Review workshop (7<sup>th</sup> June): Presentation made by Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat)

Introduction to situation analysis and consultation processes: Presentation made by Director, Administration and Finance, Education Secretariat, Alhaji Mohammed Ari

Setting targets and strategies: Presentation made by Director, Administration and Finance, Education Secretariat, Alhaji Mohammed Ari

Costing and Budgeting: Presentation made by Acting Director, Finance and Administration, Health Secretariat, John Egwu Obiahu.

Strategy implementation: Presentation made by Director, Administration and Finance, Education Secretariat, Alhaji Mohammed Ari

Monitoring and Evaluation: Presentation made by Professor George Abalu

A presentation on community consultation techniques that focused the following was also made by two experts – Professor Oga Steve Abah and Dr. Jenkeri Zakari Okwori:

- Briefing people on what projects are about, and ask them if they are involved
- Community research (PRA, and other processes including drama).
- Transect work in communities – cross sectional walk across the community.
- Data analysis – we engage in different ways. In the community itself. Your interpretation alone.
- Drama making – to tell the stories from the villages. Drama is about information gathering, and feeding back to the community on the action plans they have discussed, and to make final decisions. The drama shows what the people's priorities are.

The retreat/workshop participants were also treated to a film show, which demonstrated the issues and challenges of consultation, particularly in terms of the differences in perceptions of the people and how they react to issues and events. The film indicated the challenge of 'who should we be talking to?' when consulting the people and the need and urgency to hear the 'correct' and 'relevant' voices.

### **Participatory Review Sessions: break out group discussions**

After each presentation, small groups were formed to review the ideas presented, undertake deeper analysis and prepare proposals for FEEDS II. Each group was provided with a set of targeted questions to guide their discussion. Group themes were assigned randomly to the groups and each group took 30 to 45 minutes to deliberate. Each group presented the outcomes of their discussions and recommendations/suggestions to the plenary. Additional plenary time was given for questions/comments/observations. Details of the presentations are contained in Annex 4.

Consultants with expertise in relevant areas facilitated the break out group discussions.

### **Developing a Framework and time-line for FEEDS II**

A whole day was set aside for the development of a framework and timeline for FEEDS II. The purpose of this session was to make key decisions on the development of a framework for FEEDS II and LEEDS. Key questions and issues were given to the participants a day earlier to deliberate upon and return the next day with answers and suggestions. Participants were to use the knowledge and information gained in the two earlier sessions as well as group presentations during plenary sessions. Some of the key questions to be resolved included:

- How will FEEDS be centrally coordinated?
- What FEEDS committees should be set up?
- What cross-SDA committees should be set up?
- How should the development of coherent FEEDS and LEEDS targets, strategies and budgets be facilitated?
- How should the community and civil society consultations be organised?
- What baseline data should be collected, and how will the data be managed?
- What M&E systems are required, and how will they be managed?

Other documents were reviewed by the participants to facilitate understanding and support their various view points (see Annex 2 for list of documents).

## **7.0 OUTCOMES**

It is evident that participants are enthusiastic and supportive of the FEEDS process and the need to develop FEEDS II.

### **7.1 Lessons Learnt and Recommendations made at the FEEDS Retreat:**

#### **7.1.1 General lessons**

MTSS was developed with participation of FCTA SSAs, Directors and Deputy Directors from across the SDAs. It was developed very quickly, at a 2-day workshop in Abuja in June 2006. The process was guided by young and inexperienced consultants, who were not well enough informed on FEEDS, and to some degree took over the final writing process which lessened FCTA ownership. The consultants also influenced the use of different terminologies to refer to the same thing. Semantics took a life of their own and people wasted much valuable time debating them.



**Recommendation for FEEDS II:** There is a need for the MTSS 2008-2010 to be developed in-house, by the same teams that coordinate FEEDS II development. This will ensure that the MTSS is coherent with FEEDS and FCTA-owned

There was a general misconception that FEEDS I programs will be funded from a separate source, outside of the statutory budget. This influenced the unrealistic nature of some of the targets and strategies, which went beyond budget allocations.

**Recommendation for FEEDS II:** There is now understanding that FEEDS is part of everyday work and the overall planning framework for the SDAs.

Very few officers were involved in the development of FEEDS I. The process was heavily led by the Minister's office, through the SSA Information and Strategy, and few lower level staff, such as budget and planning officers, were involved. This hindered ownership of FEEDS. We have not had all the Directors together, to own FEEDS and move the process forward.

**Recommendation for FEEDS II:** The 2007 FEEDS Review Retreat has been helpful in enhancing ownership of FEEDS across FCA, and including management Staff and Budget and Planning Officers in the FEEDS process.

We need ALL the stakeholders to buy into the process.

FEEDS I targets and strategies were 'mixed up', which created further confusion.

**Recommendation for FEEDS II:** There is a need for further training and sensitization on FEEDS and LEEDS, and the meaning and process of setting targets, strategies, activity based budgeting, M&E, etc. This sensitization and training must include budget and planning officers as well as Directors and Secretaries.

## **7.2 Group Work: Consultation Processes**

### **7.2.1 Internal consultation processes – presentation**

*Do you have constant meetings within your SDAs on FEEDS and the targets?*

As Focal Persons, do we just come to meetings, do we report back to the agency? Do we ensure that the budget officers respond appropriately? We needed the budget officers here, we need to know how to do activity based budgeting – the budget officers need to be with us all the time – how many km of road, etc – so they are able to develop a proper budget. Do the Focal Persons write memos, talk to the executive meetings and so on?

### **7.2.2 External consultation processes**

FCTA consultations went into the area councils. *How did we do it?* We went to the people to find out what they think – and consensus. How do we marry the needs with the FCTA budget? What were the best ways of consultations? FCTA went into the rural areas, which was good – shows that we took it seriously. All the time resources are a constraint. Think about how to prioritise the targets and strategies.

### **7.2.3 Group Work/Presentation**

#### **Group I – Theme I**

FEEDS is about translating a dream

- Each Mandate Secretariat to prepare a plan
- Set our [their] targets

***How do we make a decision?***

Modalities to consider:

NOW	LATER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal Sectoral consultation</li> <li>• Incremental budgeting</li> <li>• Top-down decision making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter-sectoral consultation</li> <li>• Activity-based budgeting</li> <li>• Bottom-up decision making</li> </ul>

*Who should be involved?*

- Desk officers
- Budget officers
- Focal Persons
- SDA Management

***Role of Focal Persons***

Guide the process of budgeting by making information available to the management

***Mechanisms consultation***

NOW	LATER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not defined</li> <li>• No defined format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bottom-up (consultation with stakeholders)</li> </ul>

***Reporting progress***

NOW	LATER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal Persons report to their immediate bosses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutionalize the Focal Persons in each SDA;</li> <li>• Put in place a Central Team to coordinate information from Focal Persons</li> </ul>

**7.2.4 Plenary discussion on consultation processes:**

**Group 1:** How do we make decisions on what is happening currently and what ought to be so that FEEDS and LEEDS will succeed? Internal consultation doesn't go far enough. Parks and recreation should know what social welfare is thinking about. Health must let planning department know what they are thinking about.

We should stop incremental budgeting and make sure that everything we do is linked to activity-based budgeting. There are problems with top-down decision-making – now we are saying that we need bottom-up decision-making, starting from the people that we serve, and up to the Council and FCTA.

Who should be involved in decision-making: desk officers, budget officers and FEEDS FPs? Focal Persons should be the guide to the process (you know what the community wants and articulate this to your boss).



Other mechanisms for consultation: This is not yet defined. We want to have these bottom-up consultations; we should stop thinking that we know what the community wants and start to ask them.

*Reporting at FEEDS FPs meetings?* They report to their immediate bosses. This is ok, if the report goes further and not sits on his/her desk. We need a central Focal Person's office – to coordinate the work of all the FPs across the SDAs, including further scorecards.

### **7.2.5 Group II – Theme I**

*How do we improve consultation processes on FEEDS within our SDAs?*

- Scheduling of a stakeholders meeting
- Creating an understanding of FEEDS, which was not the case at conception
- Mobilizing a group or committee where Focal Persons representing SDAs would report back to comprising membership drawn from units

*How do we make decisions on FEEDS targets and budgets within our SDAs and what processes should be used?*

- SDAs should set up a mechanism where key members of staff comprising the Focal Persons, Budget Officers and Heads of Departments in the various SDAs come together to draw up the prospective targets from their different units and synergize to create a workable target based on their budget

*What mechanisms are used for consultations with budget officers and those responsible for FEEDS implementation?*

- At present, no proper mechanism exists. It was suggested that SDAs could set up committees within them (internally) to formulate a pattern of consultation.

*How do we report progress with FEEDS implementation within SDAs?*

- Setting up of a Monitoring and Evaluation committee within SDAs to assess the progress or performance of their set targets.

### **7.2.6 Plenary Session Group II**

***How do we improve consultation on FEEDS in the SDAs?***

Need a stakeholders meeting to determine targets and the projects we have in mind and iron out any difficulties as a group. At the start of FEEDS I we didn't understand the concept well, FPs were hand picked. For FEEDS II, we need to come together and make progress from where we stopped. We need a FP Committee in each Unit – to tell them what went on in meetings (so that FPs don't keep the information to themselves). Need sensitization of staff in FCTA on FEEDS. If FP leaves the Unit, the new representative won't know where to start from.

How do we make decision on FEEDS targets and budgets within our SDAs? At the start, the FPs were not aware of making budgets – so we decided to include budget officers and Directors in this meeting.

- What is the role of FEEDS FPs in SDAs? Our duty is to go to the FEEDS FP meetings and the info stops there. We need field sampling of the impact of FEEDS on the general public – to tell people of each Focal Person meeting.



- What mechanisms were there to include budget officers and those responsible for FEEDS implementation? There was none. If there is a committee in each SDA – of budget officers, FFPs and Directors – this would be mechanism.
- Need an M&E committee for FEEDS implementation within each SDA? From time to time, the committee would go to the field to monitor the progress of our targets.

### **7.2.7 Group III – Theme II**

#### *Consultation;*

- Town Hall meeting
- Conference/Retreat

#### *Communication*

- Circulars
- Memos
- Newsletters

#### *Who was involved?*

- Executives
- SDAs
- Area Councils
- CBOs/NGOs/CSOs

#### Top-bottom

All stakeholders came together in planning and decision making

- Bottom-top approach i.e., input from grassroots
- Through Focal Persons in the various Departments and Area Councils
- Town Hall meetings contribution from (a) various Area Councils (b) Faith-based Organizations, (3) CBOs/NGOs

#### SDA Focal Persons

- Area Councils Focal Persons
- Monthly/Quarterly Newsletters for end users
- Community Scorecard
- Regular stakeholder meeting
- The use of Internet facilities

Focal Persons Committee, Management Committee of various Secretariats, Agencies

#### Electricity

Education – Number of Schools

Engineering – Infrastructural provision

Treasury – Budgetary provision/fund

Maintenance Department – Maintenance

#### Water

Education Secretariat – Number of schools

Water Board – Infrastructure provision

Treasury – Budgetary provision/fund  
Maintenance Department – Maintenance

### **7.2.8 Plenary Session Group III**

Consultation processes – mechanisms across FCTA.

- Consultations through the FPS to Town hall meetings, conference and retreat. What do we mean by consultation and communication? It is about passing across information – then you will achieve a set target.
- Who was involved in FEEDS I planning? Before the document came to be, the implementation already started (horse before the cart) – this is major problem. Since we have the opportunity to make the correction – we think the bottom-top approach will work – what do people want to do? They tried to budget adequately.
- What mechanisms outside EXCO can be set up to improve consultations across FCTA? Regular stakeholder meetings, scorecards, use of internet, newsletters (monthly/quarterly) .
- There are no current mechanisms for SDA collaboration on targets, but we need them.

### **7.2.9 Group IV – Theme II**

#### ***Who was involved?***

Planning Officers

#### ***How did SDAs collaborate?***

Through:

- Focal Persons in SDAs
- EXCO meetings
- Meetings of Information Committees with Senior Special Assistant on Information and Strategy

#### ***How should FEEDS II be coordinated?***

[It should be coordinated] by [a central] Planning Research and Statistics (PRS) [Department]

#### ***Links between SDAs***

PRS of SDAs [to liaise with and report to] the [central] PRS in FCTA

#### ***Mechanisms of communication outside EXCO***

- Strengthen information committees/units in SDAs and FCTA
- Town Hall meetings with stakeholders
- Advocacies

#### ***Cross-cutting issues***

- SDAs [to] set up desks to liaise with statutory SDAs in budgeting
- Ownership/funding of projects rest with statutory SDAs

### **7.2.10 Group V – Theme III**

#### **EXTERNAL PROCESSES**

- Consultation/Identification of needs
- Identifying relevant NGOs and the communities

3(a) Consulted –

- Area Councils



- A few NGOs and CBOs
- Government structures

Did not consult – the people – communities

Implications – political opportunism, [which] led to misplacement of priorities and locating projects, not according to need, but according to political considerations

Area Councils were seriously consulted

### **7.2.11 Group VI – Theme III**

*What external processes should we use to deepen and sustain civil society and community input?*

Consultations

- Press
- NGOs
- CBOs
- Development Partners
- Faith-based Organizations
- Cooperative Societies
- Community leaders
  - Village Heads
  - Women Group Leaders
  - Youth Group Leaders
  - Religious Leaders

*Stages of Consultation with External Actors*

- Creating awareness
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Funding and other resources
- Reorientation

*How did we consult?*

Most [stakeholders] were consulted. However, step down consultation to grassroots was not effective – SLPG [SLGP?] could have made it more effective.

There was no proper briefing as to the essence or benefits of the strategy.

*Stages of consultation*

- Planning
- Implementation
- Monitoring and Evaluation

*Possible processes for FCTA coherence*

- Sensitization at local level – town hall meetings, dialogue with the people
- Periodic consultation between FEEDS FP and LEEDS FP to synergize their action
- Identification and involvement of actual key players
- Establishment of Joint Implementation Committee
- Monitoring and Evaluation

### *Working with NGOs*

- Identify/certify active existing NGOs and work with them in line with specialization and areas of focus
- Consultations and motivations

## **7.3 Group Work: Situation Analysis**

### **7.3.1 Group I – Theme I**

#### **MIS – Sectoral MIS**

##### *Institutions*

- National Bureau of Statistics
- Central Bank of Nigeria
- National Planning Commission
- National Population Commission
- Federal Ministry of Finance
- Civil Society Groups
- Multi and Bilateral Institutions,
- Etc.
  
- Electronic process
- Mechanical process
- Oral

##### *Who*

- Relevant Desk Officers
- IT Departments
- PRS
  
- Print and electronic media
- Drama
- Meetings

##### *To improve*

- Capacity building
- Infrastructure

##### *Gaps*

- Inadequate manpower
- Under utilization of manpower
- Paucity of resources
- Inadequate data quality

### **7.3.2 Group II – Theme I**

##### *Existing Data*

- Enrolment
- Facilities existing
- Staff strength
- Buildings/toilets
- Performance
- Budget performance

#### *Not Friendly*

- Crop area yield survey
- Hydro-climatological data
- Fertilizer distribution
- Number of hospitals
- Number of doctors/nurses
- Ambulances/equipment
- House census

#### *Data Institutions*

- Population commission
- National Bureau of Statistics
- National Planning Commission
- NISER
- Education Trust Fund
- United Nations Agencies
- World Bank
- NAA
- CBN
- NGOs

#### *Improvement*

- Management Information System
- Provision of tools
- Financing

#### *How is data captured/stored and by who?*

- Records
- Surveys
- Studies
- Appraisals
- Internet

#### *Captured/Stored*

- Manually
- Electronically

#### *By who*

- PRS
- Logistics

#### *Sharing and communication*

- Published – Journals
- Adverts
- Radio
- Newspapers
- Internet



### 7.3.3 Group III – Theme II

*Processes of consulting with communities, civil society and business during FEEDS I*

- Limited consultations/stakeholder meetings
- Series of meetings between Area Council Focal Persons and the FCTA
- Submission of position papers by NGOs, CBOs and CSOs.
- Community Scorecard (Benchmarking process)

*Improvement of the process*

- Broad based consultation with all segments of the communities

*Ideas on suggested community consultation process*

- Transect walk
- Opinion poll, interviews, surveys etc.
- Community Action Plan

*Organizing consultation in the city*

- Thematic workshops
- Seminars
- Phone-in programs
- Surveys
- Neighborhood associations
- Use of village associations

*Organized communities*

- CBOs, NGOs, CSOs
- Faith-based organizations
- Professional associations

*How Area Councils, communities, can be encouraged*

- By involving them in the project cycle (development planning process)
- Direct labor in execution

### 7.3.4 Group IV – Theme II

*What processes were used to consult communities, civil society and business?*

- Five representatives per Area Council representing interest groups (traditional leaders, youth, NGO, civil society, physically challenged persons, etc.)

*Improvement suggestion*

- Same process to be replicated at wards levels for wider coverage
- Direct contact with communities through village square meetings and interactive session

*Suggested community consultation process*

- Through interviews, questionnaires and discussions

*How can consultation be organized in the City?*

- The City is designed based on neighborhood concept that has evolved into neighborhood associations

*How Area Councils, communities, can be encouraged*

- Through seminars, 'talk shops', use of questionnaire and rallies



### **7.3.5 Group V – Theme III**

*How to ensure that data and community consultations influence FEEDS II targets, strategies and budgets*

- Proper situation and data analysis
- Making sure that budget processes are based on empirical data – budget items or projects should be measurable
- Effective feedback mechanism for the end users

*Processes to analyze data*

- Sorting of raw data and subjecting them to internationally/nationally recognized standard

*How to differential national, FCTA and community priorities*

- Identification of needs against available resources
- Ensure that feedback are respected and considered in planning of FEEDS II.

*How to ensure that consultations influence FEEDS targets...*

- Adequate feedback,
- development of implementation policies
- Effective monitoring and evaluation and
- Budget or expenditure control

*Lessons from Community Scorecards*

- Inter-sectoral appraisal of programs [which facilitates] comparison
- Drive towards [development of better – SMART] targets and strategies

### **7.3.6 Group VI – Theme III**

*How do we ensure that the data and community consultations influence FEEDS II targets, strategies and budgets?*

- Availability of correct information
- Uninterrupted channel of communication
- Involvement of decision and policy makers
- Grassroots participation

*Process of analyzing data*

- Follow up
- Cross checking
- Prioritization
- Use of independent assessors

*How to negotiate potential differences*

- Dialogue
- Prioritization

*Validation processes required*

- Effective monitoring, evaluation and review
- Giving policy makers the right information

*Lessons from Community Scorecard and service delivery survey result*

- Community satisfaction or otherwise
- Avenue for redress and sanction

## **7.4 Setting Targets and Strategies**

### **7.4.1 Presentation by Mohammed Ari, Director Education FCTA**

#### **Background**

The former Minister of FCTA Malam Nasir Ahmed el-Rufa'i started his administration of FCTA by outlining the 11 Mandates given to him by Mr. President, some of which are:

- Restore the Abuja Master Plan
- Reduce corruption
- Review land allocation in FCTA
- Provide education to children
- Keep Abuja clean
- Develop the satellite towns to reduce slums

Stressed the importance of involving politicians who have the people's mandate – el-Rufa'i once stated to the civil servants *"you have 35 years to deliver your service. I have 4 years to deliver my mandate"*

Presentation covered major areas:

#### **Problems**

- Capacity building was poor on MTEF and MTSS – consultants employed for the purpose were themselves inexperienced
- There was little connection between MTEF and FEEDS
- The assumption was that FEEDS will come with its own resources and so will be operated 'outside existing budget'

#### **Questions**

- MTEF, MTSS sounds like 'magical words' – and Focal Persons were not involved in the training. It will be very useful if everyone is carried along.
- How many targets can be set in FCTA considering the recommendation that 'few' should be selected?
- More explanation wanted on MTEF and MTSS

#### **Response:**

- Need for sharper understanding and distinction between targets and strategies
- MTEF has indicative envelop, which indicates the resource requirement over the time of the plan. Previously, the Rolling Plan had no indicative resource envelop.
- MTSS requires the outlining of policies in each priority sector. Related strategies are then costed.

### **7.4.2 Group I – Theme I**

- Identification of mandates (vision and mission)
- Needs identification
  - Research
  - Consultation
  - Set clear guidelines to achieve targets (MTEF, MTSS)
- Minister's office
- SDA, Budget Officers
- Planning officers
- Civil society

## SMART

Prioritization of needs according to resources available

### 7.4.3 Group II – Theme I

*Those involved in setting the FEEDS targets*

- Minister, consultants, stakeholders:
  - Area Council Chairmen
  - Traditional rulers
  - Politicians
  - Youth associations
  - Women groups
  - CSOs
  - Physically challenged
  - CBOs
- SDAs, Donor Basket, etc.

*Criteria to be used in selecting targets*

- Need assessment through various modalities
  - Town and Village Hall meetings
  - Interviews, surveys, rural appraisals, etc.
  - Resource availability – human and material

*Measures needed to ensure that targets and strategies are consistent with resource envelop*

- Budgetary discipline (Time and funds)
- Monitoring and evaluation
- SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound)

### 7.4.4 Group III – Theme II

*What have been the challenges in setting targets and strategies and actually achieving them? How can these challenges be resolved?*

Challenges

- No clear understanding between targets and strategies
- Targets set without regards to resource availability

*How to evaluate achievable targets*

- Apply SMART tool mechanism

*How to balance politicians' aspirations, public expectations and the reality?*

- Interactive forum (consultation)

*How to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities*

- Involving the legislators and all other stakeholders in the development of MTSS and MTEF

#### **7.4.5 Group IV – Theme II**

##### *Challenges in setting targets and strategies*

- Problem of prioritization of targets
- Matching targets with available resources
- Inadequate information on targets
- Capacity to understand and interpret targets

##### *How to resolve challenges*

- Resolution of the above challenges

##### *Why targets were not achieved*

- Targets were not SMART

##### *How to evaluate achievable targets*

- Targets must be within
  - Available resources
  - Mandate of SDAs
  - Set/Agreed priorities
  - Available capacity

##### *Potential mechanisms*

- Consultation, monitoring, evaluation and review.

##### *How to balance politicians' aspirations, public expectations and the reality?*

- Consultation, communication, disclosure of information and the involvement of stakeholders at the planning and execution stages

##### *How to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities*

- Fiscal discipline, transparency, feedback and revalidation.

#### **7.4.6 Group V – Theme III**

##### *Targets that cut across SDAs – costs/budgets/responsibilities*

- Identify common targets
- Coordinate with SDAs
- Mandate SDA to cost and budget, [other involved SDAs to] supervise

##### *How to collaborate targets*

- Mandate SDAs responsible should sensitize others to build in the concept of the cross-cutting issues into the target/strategies

##### *Elimination of duplication of work/function*

- Harmonization of targets and strategies by the central committee

##### *Improving financial management – FEEDS II*

- Building effective monitoring and evaluation process that will start from initial stage of FEEDS II to the end

#### **7.4.7 Group VI – Theme III**

##### *Working together on cross-cutting targets*

- [Have] never worked together (inter SDAs)
- However cross-cutting targets are usually discussed within SDAs (e.g. in various sub-sectors in Education)

*How to collaborate targets*

- All relevant bodies must submit information
- Drive a process of regular review meetings
- Pool the resources available to all the SDAs and allocate responsibilities

*Creating an environment that cut across all the SDAs*

- Consultations to provide and issue guidelines

*Elimination of duplication of work/function*

- Through clear role definition and assignment

*Improving financial management – FEEDS II*

- Effective involvement of the private sector through PPP arrangement
- Effective collaboration across the SDAs and Development Partners

**7.4.8 Plenary Discussion**

**Questions/Comments/Observations**

- Comment on theme 3: yes we need to improve our collaboration in cross cutting issues. But we have been doing this, there are examples. E.g., an AEPB challenge is to eradicate begging – we collaborated with the private sector and donors to build a colony for people with leprosy. Then we handed it over to Social Development, Health Secretariat equipped the clinic. Agency for Mass Literacy was also involved. Though we can still deepen this collaboration.
- Thanks to the former minister for what he achieved, he was very bold. We need the guarantee of the politicians for SMART. The answer will come from the politician. We have not yet put LEEDS on the same level as FEEDS. You set your target, but along the line the politicians may change things. How much are the Area Councils touching the lives of the people? Without STDA and minister – it is the ACs that should really be in charge. I wish politicians are here today – are they here today?
- Who was involved in setting the FEEDS I targets? That group listed actors that were NOT part of the target setting? Was this actually the desire and not reality? What processes did we use to identify the right targets and strategies to meet them?
  - Response – MDGs and national priorities shape the targets. The envelope we are talking about is the resources available.
- How do we decide on broad reform areas? Light was not shed by the presentations. This is about areas to give priorities to in FEEDS II.
  - Response: Financial management was the area we concentrated on. The other man talked of transparency and PPP. Inter-sectoral linkages is also key – a shortfall in FEEDS I that we need to address in FEEDS II.
- What comes first – resource allocation and targets? We can set targets and then the resources don't come. Which comes first? So targets are not everything. What worked on FEEDS I is that it has given us an eye opener on how to go forward on FEEDS II.

Various agencies come together to work on cross-cutting issues

- Collaborated with private sector and donor agencies to build a 'colony' for leprosy infected people
- How can we ensure the realization of targets? Question directed to politicians. If money is not provided, who do we hold responsible? Are the Area Councils participating in satellite towns' development?
- Group II, Theme I was requested to elaborate on the broad group theme – *what processes do we use to identify feasible targets and the strategies to meet them?*
- When targets are set by leaders and sent down to civil servants, what should the civil servant do?
- How to decide on broad reform issues? – Areas to give priorities to but the groups did not address these.

#### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

- How many months in a Budget year?
- Which is to be prepared first – MTEF or MTSS?
- Cost analysis? Participant was asked to see presenter 'one on one'.
- Requested the presenter of paper to make paper available in 'hard-copy'
- If ceilings are set by leaders, how do the needs of grassroots be accommodated?
- How do we reconcile fixed resource envelop and FEEDS targets especially when the approved resource envelop are 'cut' again after a budget is prepared?

## **7.5 Group Work: Costing and Budgeting**

### **7.5.1 Group I – Theme I**

#### *Costing difficulties*

- There are no costing difficulties

#### *Improvements*

- Improved capacity building
- Improved communications

#### *Project/Activity based budgeting*

- Identifying which option relates to a particular case
- Budgeting for projects are firm, while budget for activities are flexible

#### *Difficulties in identification? Yes*

#### *Cost variation*

- Effective price monitoring
- Effective projections

### **7.5.2 Group II – Theme I**

A.

- Absence of experts (officer) in planning [such as] Quantity Surveyors, Accountants, Economists
- Inadequate market survey
- Limitations set by the resource envelop as against target set in FEEDS



*B.*

- Project identification
- Project prioritization
- Resource availability and re-prioritization
- Project costing

*C.*

- Project based budgeting
- Activity based budgeting
- Lack of addressing needed target
- Consultation with stakeholder

*D.*

- Lack of understanding of what is recurrent/capital [expenditure]
- Office equipment
- Whether it is cost based or item based (amount involved)

*E.*

- Review of cost
- Periodic market survey
- Allow for inflation
- Monitoring and evaluation

### **7.5.3 Group III – Theme II**

#### *Consultation across board – Activity based budgeting*

- Political viewpoint
- Community viewpoint

#### *Potential challenges*

- Lack of adequate knowledge (education)
- Conflicting interest between State and Local Government Area needs
- Low level capacity
- Low level of democratic culture
- Flexing of political muscles by FG/State against LGA

#### *Challenges of bottom up budgeting*

- Fear of losing authority
- Identification of right Focal Persons from the communities
- Requires broad and intensive consultations

#### *How were sectoral resource envelopes determined*

- Top bottom approach
- A trade-off between bottom-top and top-down is ideal

#### *Challenges of budget compliance*

- Late fund releases
- Inadequate release of funds
- Inflation
- (Act of God)
- Sudden change in government policies
- Undue political interference





#### **7.5.4 Group IV – Theme II**

- Community consultations,
- Town hall meetings,
- Dialogue,
- Making politicians know what the...

Politicians want to implement party manifestoes while technocrats are thinking of actual needs of the people.

- Conflicting interest between community leaders and party leaders
- Time consuming
- Difficulty in disseminating information
- Difficulty in participation due to lack of education/information
- Possibility of exaggerated budget
- Availability of funds
- Priority within the Mandate
  - Education
  - Health
  - Agriculture, etc

*To ensure equity and balancing in planning*

- Lack of political will
- Untimely release of funds
- Paucity of funds
- Lack of budgetary control
- Absence of effective M&E
- Lack of [budgeting] tracking
- Funds [diversion] by SDAs

#### **7.5.5 Group V – Theme III**

*Challenges of budget implementation*

*External*

- Late approval of budget
- Late release of funds
- Non-release of funds
- Political interference

*Internal*

- Late implementation of proposals
- Non-implementation of proposals
- Due process delay
- Conflicts of interest

*Place of PPP in budget and FEEDS Planning*

- Collaborative support

*Challenges of translating FEEDS into MTSS/MTEF*

- Problem of understanding concept (need to marry the semantics of both programs)

*Who was involved/Who should be involved?*

- Budget officers



- Consultants
- Directors
- SDAs, NGOs, Focal Persons
- Stakeholders

*Challenges of tracking, monitoring and evaluation*

- Lack of co-ordination and networking
- Lack of monitoring and evaluation team/unit

**7.5.6 Group VI – Theme III**

*Challenges of budget implementation*

- Lack of funds release
- [Diversion of funds] – virement
- Political/Chief Executive interference
- Delays from Due Process Certification

*Place of PPP in budget and FEEDS Planning*

- PPP should be involved at planning stages
- They should be involved in funding identified gaps
- They should be involved in supervision, monitoring and evaluation of projects

*Challenges of translating FEEDS to MTSS/MTEF*

- Difficulties in harmonizing the targets
- Lack of understanding the concepts of FEEDS, MTSS and MTEF
- Limited resources for competing demands

*Challenges of tracking monitoring and evaluation*

- Inadequate information on specific project
- Absence of a clear-cut monitoring and evaluation schedule or plan
- Inadequate logistics

**7.6 Strategy Implementation, Monitoring And Evaluation**

Presentation by Mohammed Ari, Director and Professor George

**7.6.1 Group I – Theme I**

*How can the quality of activity plans and costing information be improved and integrated?*

- Improvement on the quality of market survey
- Improvement on the availability of expertise/capacity build up
- Identification and provision of incentives

Lack of understanding of FEEDS

- Will of acceptance of FEEDS
- Inadequate funding
- Lack of institutionalization of FEEDS

Do a critical analysis of the strategy to identify the activity components

Prioritize the activities and responsibilities

M&E based on set out guidelines and sanctions



It is a near impossible task but review of team work to cover foreseen lapses may help

### **7.6.2 Group II – Theme II**

*Using M&E report as a bases for further release of fund*

- Cash releases should be able to fund parts of the project for which it was meant for

Yes

- Time line is known
- Project is defined

Yes

- Because projects are broken down in modules/work breakdown structure activities

By making provision for in

By making adequate planning

### **7.6.3 Group III – Theme III**

*Internal accountability improvement for FEEDS II*

- M&E must be established and strengthened in all SDAs
- Adequate logistics provided for monitoring team
- Sanctions meted on poor implementation i.e. supervision staff and service providers

Accurate/timely data on services provided based on life-cycle of the projects

Capacity building for due-process officers to enhance efficiency. Internal due-process mechanisms to be domiciled

Single line control only recommended

## **7.7 Monitoring and Evaluation**

### **7.7.1 Group IV – Theme I**

*What monitoring systems do we have in FCTA?*

- In the Minister's office: Project monitoring and implementation
- SDAs, FCDA, Treasury: Project monitoring and evaluation
- Central Budget Office (CBO): Budget monitoring and evaluation
- Development Control, Parks and Recreation, AEPB, Water Board: Monitoring and evaluation

*What should be monitored – and How?*

- Projects and budgets

*How?*

- Physical inspection of projects
- Analysis of budget performance

*By whom*

- Project and Budget Monitoring Division of SDAs and the CBO

*What are the key monitoring problems? How can these be overcome?*

- Logistics
- Enforcement
- Lack of coordination
- Inadequate manpower for monitoring
- Inadequate knowledge of monitoring
- Absence of budget provision

*Coordination of budget should be*

- Strengthened at the CBO
- Having a national/state policy on M&E
- Making adequate budget provision
- Manpower training and development

### **7.7.2 Group V – Theme II**

*What should be evaluated?*

- Planning process
- Budget procedures
- Implementation process (compliance, budgetary approval and estimated timeframe)

*How do we evaluate?*

- Comparing plans with achievements (i.e. TOR)
- Identifying constraints
- Internal and external stakeholders

*What are [the] key constraints?*

- Lack of technical know-how
- Lack of budgetary provision
- Lack of access to adequate information

*How to overcome the constraint*

- Capacity building
- Adequate funding
- Access to information
- Adequate record keeping
- Instituting a reward [and sanction] regime - motivation

### **7.7.3 Group VI – Theme III**

*M&E reporting system*

- Logical/systematic report frame

*Audience*

- Management
- Stakeholders
- Policy makers

*Info*

- Progress report
- Compliance level



*For what?*

- Controls

*Kinds of report*

- Periodic reports
- Monthly/quarterly

*Critical constraints*

- Funds
- Capacity
- Interventions [Interference]
  - Political
  - Natural
  - Etc.

**7.7.4 Group VII – Theme IV**

*Building an effective M&E culture*

- Lack of reliable data
- Non-use of M&E feedback for future plans
- Absence of needed political will to support M&E
- Misconception about M&E

*Sensitization about the advantages of M&E*

- Politicians, policy makers, etc
- Simplification of the process of M&E
- Capacity building of the M&E implementers
- Continuous dialogue and consultations
  
- Provide convincing evidence on the importance of M&E
- Organize workshops and seminars for policy makers
- Continuous reporting and documentation of M&E activities to top management

## 8.0 SYNTHESIS/CONCLUSION

The objectives of the assignment, as indicated on Terms of Reference for this assignment, have been achieved as can be seen on the table below:

Objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that the achievements, challenges and lessons from FEEDS I come to inform FEEDS II process, strategies and targets.</li> </ul>	<p>This is evident in the group presentations reported in Annex 4 and the workshop reported in Section 6I</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. This will help to set the scene for a FEEDS II strategy that is relevant, realistic, inclusionary, pro-poor, and coherent across departmental strategies.</li> </ul>	<p>See report on the civil society workshop in Part B and Annex 9.</p> <p>Further to this, a map of civil society and community actors in the next phase was debated and considered at the retreat.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The review processes would also provide a space in which to share the aim to start LEEDS policy development with FCTA and civil society. Through this, we would gain initial ideas on how to approach this, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS.</li> </ul>	<p>One of the key decisions reached is how to make FEEDS and LEEDS coherent</p>

## 9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### General recommendations (from the consultants)

- There is urgent need to sustain the enthusiasm and commitment of FCTA to FEEDS and LEEDS as demonstrated at the retreat by quickly developing systems and relationships to move the process 'from decisions to actions'.
- FCTA must form a FEEDS Steering Committee and liaise with SLGP to work out further details on how to implement the key decisions of the retreat/workshop. This would include the decision to transform the Central Budget Office into the Central Planning and Budget Office, and to locate FEEDS II therein. The Steering Committee, when formed, should be charged with the responsibility of getting the new administration to buy-in and implement the key decisions of the retreat.
- The Committee should work out a detailed budget of the FEEDS II development process and suggest ways of funding the process.
- The Department for Area Council and Chieftaincy Matters should similarly set up a LEEDS Steering Committee to begin the process of LEEDS development with the Area Councils. Membership of such a committee may be drawn from the Central (Planning and) Budget Office, the Department and Chairmen of the Area Councils. It may be reasonable to appoint a 'LEEDS Desk Officer' to coordinate the work of the committee and be the contact person between Area Councils and the Department.



- The committee should liaise with SLGP to develop a LEEDS Guide, determine the modalities for getting the Area Councils involved in the process and set a timeframe for developing the respective Area Councils LEEDS Documents.
- The Department for Area Council and Chieftaincy Matters should similarly work out a detailed budget of what the LEEDS development process will cost and its contribution
- It may be desirable for members of the LEEDS Steering Committee to have another retreat to develop the LEEDS framework or adopt existing ones and agree on the formation of LEEDS Technical Committees, funding of the process, training for stakeholders and committee members as well as a timeframe for LEEDS.
- There should be an internal process of 'selling' FEEDS (through training, participatory planning workshop, etc). Beyond consultations in the communities, the different actors at the community and area council levels should have regular review meetings. Further, both process and end of project reviews/monitoring should be made integral to the implementation process.
- SLGP may wish to engage a consultant at this early stage to follow up on the formation of these committees, develop the needed training material, assist with the drawing up of the LEEDS framework and timeframe and other activities that will be required in the process. All consultants involved in the process should ensure consistency in the use of terminologies to avoid confusion and each time the terminologies are used, they should be operationalised.

### **Consultant's Recommendations**

#### *Lessons form FEEDS I*

- At the start of FEEDS I, FPs were hand-picked. For FEEDS II, a FP Committee in each Unit should be set up and should report all meetings deliberations so that they do not keep the information to themselves. Staff of FCTA should be sensitized more about the roles of FPs in the implementation FEEDS.
- To ensure competent decisions on FEEDS targets and budgets within the SDAs, meetings of FPs should include Budget Officers and Directors. Also, to avoid the misconception that FEEDS programs will be funded from a separate in the future, there is need to involve all the Directors in driving the process of FEEDS II implementation through regular review meetings.

#### *Strategy for FEEDS II*

- SDAs to update their existing data on a continuous basis, undertake baseline to ascertain who and what corporation to link with, map skills and capacity/interest of PPP
- Building effective monitoring and evaluation process that will start from initial stage of FEEDS II to the end need an M&E committee for FEEDS II implementation within each SDA. Each SDA should have a FEEDS Committee as a way of internalising it. FPs to serve as secretaries.



- SDAs to set up committees with membership from FPs, Finance, Head of Agencies drawn from the affected SDAs to deliberate on cross-cutting issues Chairperson of each committee to be chosen on the basis of issue/problem at hand.

*To create databank to facilitate data sharing*

- One set of community consultations should form the basis for both FEEDS and LEEDS. This would help to ensure that both focus on local needs SLGP can facilitate the FCTA and Area Council Community Workers and Agricultural Extension workers to develop a drama using participatory methods (like matrix ranking) to agree on local needs and where priority projects would be located and its use in villages to increase understanding on FEEDS and LEEDS.

## **10.0 NEXT STEPS**

- The next step is for retreat to realistically determine whether the above issues and recommendations could be implemented before the new administration settles down. If there is a reasonable chance that these could be done or at least a minimum risk that not much would change then:
- FCTA, the Department of Area Councils and Chieftaincy Matters to liaise with SLGP to agree on funding formula and support for the FEEDS/LEEDS development project.
- The three (FCTA, the Department and SLGP) should also agree and proceed to set up the various committees that will drive the process – including the restructuring of the Central Budget Office (CBO) and changing it to Central Planning and Budget Office (CPBO).



## **11.0 PART B: JOINT CIVIL SOCIETY/FCTA WORKSHOP**

### **12.0 SUMMARY**

The objective of the consultancy was to support a 2-step FEEDS (Federal Capital Territory Authority Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy) review process to ensure that FEEDS I experiences inform FEEDS II. The aim of developing a framework for FEEDS II development is to ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. The review processes would also provide a space in which to discuss the aim to start LEEDS policy development.

The consultancy focused on three primary activities:

- Consultation with FCTA (Federal Capital Territory Authority) stakeholders involved in FEEDS I to obtain their input on the outcomes and structure of the civil society meeting and the FCTA workshop, as well as solicit initial input on FEEDS I processes and recommendations for FEEDS II.
- Organization of a meeting with representatives from civil society in order to present the results of the Community Scorecard Survey and the Service Delivery Assessment, to obtain input from civil society on FEEDS I outcomes and processes, and how to improve FEEDS II.
- Organization of an internal FCTA workshop, intended to provide a reflective space in which experiences of FEEDS I are discussed, and a process framework for FEEDS II is developed which reflects timely and quality planning, with broad civil society participation.

#### **12.1 Outcomes**

The civil society meeting served the purpose of allowing FCTA and SLGP to present the summary results of the Community Scorecard and Service Delivery Assessment (SDA) surveys, communicate a message about FCTA's desire to create a collaborative working relationship, and provide an opportunity for public comments on FEEDS I and reflections for FEEDS II. The input provided ideas on general areas of collaboration and suggestions for improvement, but further work will be required in order to finalize a framework for sustained civil society engagement.

The focus of individual and group meetings was how to approach FEEDS II planning linked to the FCTA FEEDS Retreat. Comments were made during the course of the interviews on FEEDS I experiences and thoughts for FEEDS II. The key themes emerging from those comments were:

- FEEDS I has contributed to improved systemic thinking about long term planning processes;
- Internal coordination, accountability, and reporting remain significant challenges
- There needs to be more involvement by a broader set of FCTA civil servants, as well as deeper and more consistent civil society participation;
- The quality of targets, strategies, and work plans require improvement, and need to be linked to properly costed budget allocations
- Understanding of monitoring and evaluation is weak;

- External communication about FCTA work has been comparatively strong.

The FCTA FEEDS retreat did not take place during the time frame of this consultancy as originally planned. A retreat structure and discussion guides were developed for future use. Outcomes (the agreed process framework and timeline) will be provided in a separate report by another consultant.

A poster summarizing the Community Scorecard results was completed, with the input of Stella Amadi, a member of the consultancy team.

## **12.2 Recommendations**

- Present a brief presentation of the 'menu' of external participation mechanisms available to FCTA at the upcoming retreat. FCTA retreat participants can then discuss and modify for what is most appropriate and feasible in the FCT context.
- Consider supporting FCTA review of available qualitative and quantitative data to help inform the identification of target groups and monitoring and consultation mechanisms.
- Consider holding more thematic, smaller meetings with external stakeholders to facilitate deeper input and joint problem solving.
- Allow time for consultation with key civil society participants to solicit input on expectations and priorities for consultation events, in addition to FCTA staff.
- Identify 1 or 2 facilitators to hold the floor during the entire event.

## **13.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **13.1 Background**

In 2005, the Federal Capital Territory Administration produced its first Federal Capital Territory Authority Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (FEEDS) document. The FEEDS document identifies key poverty challenges in the FCT, sectoral strategies, performance targets, and planned institutional reforms.

With SLGP support, two monitoring exercises were carried out after the first year: A Community Scorecard Survey of FCTA Service Delivery and a pilot Service Delivery Assessment. FEEDS is intended to be a rolling strategic plan (a 'living document'), developed through consultative processes, and continuously monitored and updated. The FCTA intends to develop a FEEDS II strategy by the end of 2007.

## **13.2 Consultancy Objectives**

The objective of the consultancy was to facilitate a review of processes and lessons learned from FEEDS I, and to work with FCTA and civil society to develop a process framework for FEEDS II. The review process included consultation with key FCTA FEEDS stakeholders, a workshop with civil society actors, and preparation for a two day FCTA FEEDS retreat. The consultancy was originally intended to facilitate the FCTA retreat. Due to the postponement of the Retreat until 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> June 2007, and the unavailability of the consultant on those dates, the outcomes of that exercise will be summarized in a separate report.

A supportive objective was to enable FCTA to gain initial ideas on how to support the Area Councils in developing LEEDS, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS. Upon guidance from the FCT Advisor, this was not prioritized although comments are noted where made.

## **13.3 Outline of Report**

The report outlines activities and outcomes of the consultancy. Section 12 addresses activities undertaken. Section 13 provides a synthesis of outcomes. Section 14 highlights a few key recommendations and next steps. Section 15 reports against the ToR deliverables.

## **14.0 PROCESS FOLLOWED AND WORK DONE**

### **14.1 Consultation**

Individual and group meetings were held with SLGP staff and consultants, key FCTA stakeholders, representatives of the Area Council FEEDS Focal Persons (FFPs) and external informants to obtain input on how the two meetings should be structured. The ToR specified meeting with the Core Technical Team. The membership of the Core Technical Team was apparently informal and therefore it was not possible to systemically interview its members. Recommendations of individuals to interview were obtained from the Chair of the FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons, and from the former Senior Special Assistant to the Minister for Information and Strategy, who coordinated the development of the original FEEDS I document. All individuals suggested were interviewed with the exception of three: one was out of the country, and two were unavailable for scheduled meetings, attempted twice. Annex 7 presents a list of individuals interviewed. The informal discussion guide used is presented in Annex 8. The discussion guide was not a questionnaire. It was used as an organizing tool for the Two consultants (Nina Bowen and Ali Garba) conducting the interviews. Not all individuals were queried on all aspects of the discussion guide, contingent on the time available and the different roles of the informants in the FEEDS process.

During this period, it was decided that to the extent possible SLGP consultants and staff would not serve as facilitators, but that FCTA staff themselves would be asked to take on these roles. After consultation with the Director of Planning and Statistics (Establishment and Training), a small planning committee was nominated to coordinate and facilitate the two events.

## **14.2 Civil Society Meeting**

A draft meeting outline for the one day civil society event was prepared and discussed with the FCT Advisor, and the FCTA planning committee, comprised of the Director (Establishment and Training) of Planning and Statistics, the Chair of the FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons, and the Secretary of Social Development. The civil society meeting was held in Abuja on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2007. A summary of the discussions at the civil society meeting is provided in Annex 9.

A revised power point presentation of the Scorecard Survey was prepared based on the presentation made to the FCTA EXCO but removing the policy implications and shortening the presentation. The presentation was reviewed and edited by the SLGP FCT Advisor. A draft power point of key findings from the SDA survey was prepared, edited by the presenter. Two of the consultants who were involved in the implementation of the survey, Stella Amadi (Community Scorecard Survey) and Sunny Kulutuye (Service Delivery Assessment), presented the results at the meeting.

Stella Amadi and the SLGP FCT Advisor assisted two external Area Council FEEDS Focal Persons in preparing their presentations on local contexts and priorities.

## **14.3 FCTA Retreat**

The FCTA Retreat was postponed until 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> June 2007, outside the availability time frame of the lead consultant. A draft outline and discussion guides for the retreat were prepared and discussed with the FCT Advisor, and the FCTA planning committee. Copies were provided to the SLGP FCT Advisor and the FCTA planning committee for future reference and refinement.

Upon request of the FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons Chair, a simple template for preparing presentations at the FCTA Retreat was provided. The presentations are intended to open the retreat, and provide short overviews of successes and challenges related to FEEDS I processes.

For both events, the planning for logistical arrangements was supported through the development of a task list and discussion with SLGP. Final arrangements for the set up of the Civil Society venue were made by the consultant with SLGP support.

## **14.4 Poster of Community Scorecard Results**

Stella Amadi participated in a meeting with external Area Council FEEDS Focal Persons to draft the text of the poster summarizing the results of the Community Scorecard Survey.

## **15.0 OUTCOMES**

### **15.1 Civil Society Meeting**

The discussion was conducted in a productive spirit. The meeting served the purpose of allowing FCTA and SLGP to present the summary results of the Scorecard and SDA surveys, communicate a message about FCTA's desire to create a collaborative working relationship, and provide an opportunity for public comments on FEEDS I and reflections for FEEDS II. The input was overall too general to constitute a frame for putting a process framework into place, in part due to the large number of individuals, the need to hold the meeting entirely in plenary due to the constraints of the venue, and the limited time available. Recommendations for how to capitalize on the meeting and move forward are provided in Section 14.

Highlights from the Civil Society meeting are below. A fuller account of comments and FCTA responses can be found in Annex 9.

#### **15.1.1 FEEDS Process Suggestions**

- Involvement of civil society throughout the entire process to ensure ownership
- Participation in setting targets and in institutionalizing a process of getting data from Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)
- Participation in joint monitoring teams, and independent monitoring and evaluation
- Project Committees at local levels (to monitor capital investments), and funds tracking
- More targeted identification of NGOs and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) in specific sectors to work together on sectoral issues
- Broader participation, and the need to push consultation to community levels, beyond the level of Area Councils
- Inclusion of Councilors and Traditional Authorities in consultation
- Regular review meetings with the FCTA, and the development and dissemination of mid-term reviews
- More clarity regarding how civil society can access FCTA (points of entry)
- Better feedback mechanisms, i.e. suggestion boxes and wider dissemination of complaint call in numbers
- Clarity of Area Council FFPs' roles vis a vis the Area Council Chairmen and the FCTA
- Awareness and sensitization to promote community participation

#### **15.1.2 Reflections on the Scorecard and SDA surveys**

- Overall positive feedback on the studies
- Concerns about the extent to which the results are statistically representative
- The need for using international, Nigerian, or local standards of performance to compare progress
- Disaggregation between primary and secondary education in the future
- The need to monitor impact on children as well as women

### **15.1.3 Suggestions for FEEDS II Priorities**

- Specific attention to gender
- More attention to needs of the physically challenged
- More attention to rural areas, and to the community level
- Environmental sanitation
- Improving planned settlements, in place of demolitions
- Employment, skills training, and microfinance
- Water
- Greater outreach for agricultural services

### **15.2 Interview Comments**

The focus on individual and group meetings was how to approach FEEDS II planning efforts linked to the Civil Society Meeting and the FCTA FEEDS Retreat. Comments made during the course of these conversations which relate to the processes, successes, and challenges of FEEDS I, and recommendations for FEEDS II, are provided in Annex 10. Common themes are listed below:

- There are a long list of challenges, but overall FEEDS I has influenced more internal systemic thinking and improved understanding about long term planning processes and management needs;
- Internal communication and coordination is a significant challenge, and clearer accountability and reporting structures are needed;
- There needs to be deeper involvement and understanding of FEEDS among a broader cadre of FCTA civil servants, a transparent system for rotating focal persons, and agreed ways for FEEDS related information to be communicated through the Secretariats beyond the FFPs themselves;
- Targets need to be fewer and more realistic, in turn linked to clear strategies and supportive activity plans;
- Linking budget allocation to sector priorities, strategies, and workplans is a central challenge;
- More systemic, continuous, approaches need to be identified for accessing and channeling external input and monitoring
- Understanding of monitoring and evaluation overall is weak; and
- Communication outwards about FEEDS related work has been relatively good although there also need to be improvements in broadening the reach of those efforts.

The FCTA retreat did not take place during the time frame of this consultancy as originally planned. Outcomes of FCTA retreat (the agreed process framework and timeline) will be provided in separate report by another consultant.

### 15.3 Challenges

- The venue for the Civil Society Workshop (Merit House, Abuja) did not allow for break out groups. The event was therefore less of a workshop, with structured working sessions, and more a broader consultation meeting. There were approximately 115 participants, and the day was held in plenary session. Events of this type can be useful in establishing a common understanding, and can be important at the beginning of multi-stakeholder processes. It was an important first step in revitalizing FCTA relationships with external stakeholders in preparation for FEEDS II. This type of event is not, however, conducive to problem solving or detailed agreement on next steps.
- The original timing of the FCTA Retreat, immediately after the installation of the new government, was not conducive to FCTA participation requirements, necessitating a late minute change in the dates.
- A change in FCTA staff responsibilities for the overall coordination of FEEDS meant that time available for joint planning was reduced.

## 16.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND OUTSTANDING ISSUES

### 16.1 Recommendations

**Present a brief presentation of the ‘menu’ of external participation mechanisms available to FCTA at the upcoming retreat.** FCTA retreat participants can then discuss and modify for what is most appropriate and feasible in the FCT context. The input from the Civil Society Meeting was general in nature. There is limited time at the retreat to discuss detailed mechanisms and processes to be used with external stakeholders, particularly given the significant internal issues which need to be covered. Realistically, it may be difficult to design a concrete plan at that forum, although some progress can be made. The ‘menu’ can include examples from Nigeria and from other PRSP processes, such as project monitoring of localized capital investment plans, sectoral working groups for important sectors which include a limited number of NGOs, CBOs, and opinion leaders; ‘standing committees’ at the Area Council level or below which are topically focused and track an agreed set of performance improvement issues; budget monitoring groups, public hearings, etc. The desired outcome would be the outlines of agreed priorities, and delegation to a small group of named individuals to develop and present a more detailed proposal, with a deadline attached for completion.

**Consider supporting FCTA review of available qualitative and quantitative data to help inform the identification of target groups and mechanisms for consultation and monitoring.** The objective is to assess if trends can be identified regarding what groups and categories of people make up the poor. There may be particularly important ‘excluded’ groups that are hard to reach out to, and unlikely to participate in general meetings due to time constraints, lack of access to information, etc. Targeted efforts might be necessary. Outreach efforts need to be driven by the understanding of key economic and social drivers of poverty within FCTA, and FCTA’s own priorities and resources, but simple examples might be People Living with HIV/AIDS groups (clinic based, or sometimes membership NGOs), disabled groups (including but not limited to formal NGOs) or rural poor women farmers.



Responsiveness and coverage of overall service delivery are the over-riding issues at the moment, but supporting a perspective which increasingly takes account of differentiation and drivers of inclusion/exclusion will be important for the future.

**Consider holding more thematic, smaller meetings with external stakeholders to facilitate deeper input and joint problem solving**, and select venues conducive to smaller group work.

**Allow time for consultation with key civil society participants** (beyond external Area Council FFPs) to solicit input on expectations and priorities for consultation events, in addition to FCTA staff.

**Identify 1 or 2 facilitators to hold the floor during the entire event.** This will smooth transition periods and ensure roles and responsibilities are clear. It also helps to ensure attendees can fully participate and respond to others' comments, without having to focus on moderation, running times for sessions, etc. Participants may be best placed to facilitate certain sessions, particularly when driving towards a clear output that requires intimate knowledge of the institution, but in general the use of facilitators is intended to allow participants reflective space, and to create a more 'neutral' environment for comment.

## 16.2 Outstanding Issues

For the FCTA Retreat, the following steps are outstanding:

- Finalization of workshop structure based on attendees and facilitation team input;
- Allocation of facilitator roles for all plenary sessions and small group discussions; and
- Ensuring quality breakout space is available in venue to ensure the most productive working group sessions possible.

## 17.0 REPORT AGAINST TERMS OF REFERENCE

The contracted deliverables are:

- A workshop for civil society is facilitated, which presents the FEEDS I monitoring results to civil society/Area Council FFPs, and offers a space for reflection and discussion of next steps.
- A FEEDs Review retreat is facilitated, in which FCTA stakeholders analyse FEEDS I processes, outcomes and challenges, and collaboratively develop a process framework for FEEDS II.
- A report (in SLGP quality control format) that sets out:
  - FEEDS I processes, strategies, targets and achievements;
  - Broad recommendations for FEEDS II processes, strategies and targets;
  - The agreed strategy, framework and time-line for FEEDS II development.
- A poster on the scorecard, which can be disseminated in FCT villages.





**Civil Society Workshop:** The event was held as planned. Input provided at the civil society workshop is included in Annex 9 of this work, and summarized in Section 13.

**FEEDS Review Retreat:** A FEEDS Review Retreat was planned, based in input from FCTA stakeholders. Due to FCTA's postponement of the retreat dates, and the unavailability of the consultant during those dates, it was agreed that the consultancy would cover only the planning phase for the event.

**Reporting Requirements:** The revised contents of this report, agreed with the FCT Advisor, are as follows:

A report (in SLGP quality control format) that sets out:

- (a) The processes and outcomes of the FEEDS review work to the end of the consultancy (interviews that reflect on FEEDS I processes and outcomes etc., consultative meetings on the workshop, documentation of the civil society workshop), and recommendations.

**Scorecard Poster:** Stella Amadi, a member of the consultancy team, attended a meeting with the Area Council FEEDS Focal Persons and contributed to the drafting of the Scorecard design and text. SLGP subsequently arranged for the design, layout, and printing of the Scorecard poster.

## Annex 1

### Terms of Reference

#### FEEDS I Review and Developing a Framework for FEEDS II

##### Introduction

The State and Local Government Programme (SLGP) is funded by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). DFID's strategy for assistance to Nigeria focuses on the need to improve governance, state capacity, resource management and pro-poor service delivery. Specifically, SLGP provides support to governance processes in five States (Lagos, Enugu, Kaduna, Jigawa and Kano) and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

##### Background to this assignment

In 2005, the FCTA produced its first Federal Capital Territory Authority Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (FEEDS) document. Like the national level NEEDS, and SEEDS documents produced by states, the aim of the FEEDS document is to identify key poverty problems in the FCT, and to set out sectoral strategies and concrete targets to address them in the short and medium term.

The process of producing the FEEDS document included consultations with ordinary people in the FCT's Area Councils and representatives from the private sector. This collaboration was structured by a three-tier consultative framework:

Consultative Forum: a multi-stakeholder forum of representatives from civil society, the private sector and government.

Consultative Committee: representatives from FCTA departments, agencies and parastatals, Area Councils and the National Assembly. This included 6 "external" FEEDS Focal Persons from each of FCT's 6 Area Councils, and "internal" FEEDS Focal Persons from FCTA sectoral departments.

Core Technical Team: Technical experts from the Minister's office and wider government, civil society and the private sector

The FEEDS document outlines strategies for:

- Key sectoral areas: *education, health, water provision, environmental protection, access to justice, housing, sports and welfare, employment generation, agriculture and food security and rural transport.*
- FTCA institutional reforms: *revenue generation, restructuring the civil service for better service delivery, right-sizing, accountability and transparency, land administration and the Abuja Master Plan.*
- The development and monitoring of FEEDS strategies and targets: *consultations and ownership, benchmarking, implementation and funding, monitoring and evaluation, and risk mitigation.*

One-year into the implementation of this first FEEDS strategy, a process of monitoring and evaluating FEEDS progress has been undertaken. In January 2007, SLGP facilitated a pilot Community Scorecard Survey, in which ordinary people in Area Councils evaluated the realities of service provision in their communities, and changes in this regard over the past year. SLGP has also undertaken a pilot Service Delivery Assessment (SDA) in FCT. Framed by the initial (2005) SEEDS benchmarking exercise, the SDA provides current data on FCTA service provisioning in key sectors: infrastructure, SMEs, agriculture, education and health.

The FEEDS is intended to be a 'living document' – a strategy that is developed through consultative processes, implemented, then monitored and updated. The FCTA intends to develop a FEEDS II document by 2008. FCTA also hopes to move forward on Area Council (LGA) LEEDS policy development in 2007-2008.

### **Objective of this Assignment**

The first step towards FEEDS II will be a review of the processes, successes, challenges and lessons of FEEDS I. SLGP intends to engage consultants to facilitate this review, and to work with FCTA entities and civil society actors to develop a process framework for FEEDS II.

The review process will include the facilitation of two analysis sessions:

- A half day workshop with civil society actors in Mid-May. This will be framed by presentation of the Scorecard/SDA results to NGOs and the civil society FEEDS Focal Persons from the Area Councils. The aim is to share the monitoring results, and to gain critical analysis from civil society on the process and outcomes of FEEDS I.
- A 2 day FEEDS I Review retreat for FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons, and a limited number of additional staff (budget/finance, more senior officers from key departments etc). The aim is to create a reflective space in which FCTA can unpack the processes, successes and challenges of FEEDS I. This is particularly with regard to setting targets, costing, budgeting, and the processes of consultation and monitoring. The retreat will end with the preparation of an agreed FEEDS II process framework.

The overarching objective or aim of the 2-step review process is to ensure that the achievements, challenges and lessons from FEEDS I come to inform FEEDS II process, strategies and targets. The aim of developing a framework for FEEDS II development is to ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. This will help to set the scene for a FEEDS II strategy that is relevant, realistic, inclusionary, pro-poor, and coherent across departmental strategies. The review processes would also provide a space in which to share the aim to start LEEDS policy development with FCTA and civil society. Through this, we would gain initial ideas on how to approach this, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS.

**Activities:**

Specifically, the assignment will involve:

**Civil Society workshop:**

- Facilitating a meeting with a small number of the 'external' FEEDS Focal Persons, with a view to developing an outline for the workshop. The workshop is intended as a space for open discussion, and thus the outline would be fairly loose, and largely comprise points for discussion.
- One possibility is that the workshop includes short presentations from some of the 'external' FEEDS Focal Persons, on their own experiences of the FEEDS I process and outcomes in their communities. If this possibility is pursued, the consultants would need to work with these people to develop their presentations.
- Adaptation of the presentation of the SLGP Scorecard results presentation (presented to FCTA in April), to suit civil society needs.
- Making the presentation and facilitating discussion at the workshop. With the assistance of SLGP staff at the workshop itself, documenting the discussion. The workshop would end with an open invitation to civil society to be involved in FEEDS II development; and for NGOs, an invitation to join hands with FCTA on FEEDS II implementation.  
A level of oversight on the FCTA Planning and Statistics Department (which coordinates FEEDS) work to identify and invite NGOs and civil society to the workshop.

**FCTA FEEDS I Review:**

- Facilitating a meeting with the FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons, to gain initial understanding of the FEEDS I process, challenges and outcomes. Development of a workshop outline, in line with their perceived needs. The outline should include a review of the consultative process, target setting, costing, budgeting, planning processes, implementation, monitoring, and so on.
- Working with the FCTA Planning and Statistics Department (which coordinates FEEDS) to identify the kind of people who should be invited to the retreat (in addition to the FEEDS Focal Persons).
- Preparation of a FEEDS I Review outline, and associated materials.
- Identification of the need for any additional facilitators.
  - Facilitation of a lively, reflective two day Review Retreat, and making presentations at the Retreat as required. The Retreat will end with the development of a process framework for FEEDS II.

**Reporting:**

- Based on the lessons learnt during the processes above, preparation of a report that (a) reviews FEEDS I processes, strategies, targets and achievements; (b) sets out broad recommendations for FEEDS II processes, strategies and targets; (c) presents the agreed broad strategy, framework and time-line for FEEDS II development.

### Deliverables

- A workshop for civil society is facilitated, which presents the FEEDS I monitoring results to civil society and the 'external' FEEDS Focal Persons, and offers a space for reflection and discussion of next steps.
- A FEEDS Review retreat is facilitated, in which FCTA stakeholders analyse FEEDS I processes, outcomes and challenges, and collaboratively develop a process framework for FEEDS II.
- A report (in SLGP quality control format) that sets out the findings of the FEEDS I review process, broad recommendations for FEEDS II processes, strategies and targets; and the agreed framework for FEEDS II development.

### Inputs and Timing

The civil society workshop will take place on 7<sup>th</sup> June, and the FCTA Review Retreat will take place on 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> June. The consultancy input would commence on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2007. Exact timings will be developed in agreement with the engaged consultants

Consultant	Travel	Working remotely	Working in Abuja	Reporting	Total
International Consultant (lead)			19	1	20
Consultant 2 (national) – FCTA Retreat	2		10		12
Consultant 3 (national) – civil society workshop			5		5

It should be noted that a specific number of days have been allowed for this assignment, and it is expected that the outputs will be fully delivered within this timeframe.

**Lead Consultant** will be responsible for:

- Coordinating the work of the consultancy team
- Strategising, making presentations at and facilitating the review retreat.
- Writing the FEEDS II framework summary and the final report.

#### National Consultant 1:

- Provide critical knowledge of the FEEDS I process and FCTA
- Coordinating the communications with FCTA and external Focal Persons
- Be engaged in all aspects of the assignment
- Coordination and facilitation at the workshop

#### National Consultant 2:

- Assistance in developing the civil society workshop (framework for workshop, who to invite, oversight on hall booking and invitations etc)
- Coordinating communications with the external Focal Persons, and (if relevant) help them to think through their presentations.
- Facilitation and documentation at the workshop

### Logistics

SLGP will provide access to office support and space. The consultant should provide his/her own computer.



**Slgp**

---

### **Reporting**

The Consultant will report to the SLGP FCT Advisor (Emma Jones), and the FCTA Director Planning and Statistics, Hadiza Abdulliahi (who is responsible for the FEEDS unit). SLGP require a Consultants Report on the process of the work, which should be submitted to the SLGP FCT Advisor in both hard and soft (electronic) copies.



## **Annex 2**

### **List of Documents Reviewed**

- The FEEDS document
- The Community Scorecard Survey
- Documentation of the 'Civil Society – FCTA' FEEDS Review workshop

### Annex 3

#### Participants in the FCTA FEEDS I Review Retreat

**Gombe Jewel Hotel, Kaduna**  
18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> July 2007

NAME	SDA	DESIGNATION
A. D Abdullahi	D (STDA)	Director
A. O Eze	FCT UBEB	Project monitoring
A. O. Leramoh	AEPB	HOD (A&S)
Abubakar Shehu Sadiq	Urban Affaire-AMMA	LTPO
Abubakar Yusuf	CBO	Budget Officer
Adamu A. Edah	STDA	Chief Planning Officer
Adamu Jatau Noma	FCT Educ Sec.	„
Ahmad Liz	FCT SEB	Asst. Director
Ahmed Ismaila	FCT Legal	Chief State Counsel
Ajibola O. Kayode	RTS AMMA	SEO
Alao M. A	FCT Educ. Sec.	Accountant
Ali M. Garba	BUK / SLGP	Facilitator
Ann I. Ijeoma	AGIS	CAAO
Ari Isa Mohammed	Educ. Sec	Director AF
Atole Saturday	FCDA Rest. & Comp	Focal Person
Awuruo Okere C. I	Treasury	Asst. Director
Ayodeji Olorunyomi	Transport Sec	FEP
Baba K. Umar	AGIS	Deputy Director
Belema West	FCTA Est. & Training	Focal Person
Bello Elayo	Facility Maintenance	Senior Architect
Bunmi Olowuokere	FCT INB	FEEDS Focal Person
Chibueze Emesoh	CBO	Economist
D. S. Audu	Estab. & Training	CAAO
Dambo M. A	AEPB	HOD (F&A)
Dr. Baba-gana Ada	DPR (AMMA)	H/LPRS
Dr. S. A. Kafaro		Facilitator
E Ope Ojo	AEPB	FEEDS Focal Person
E. G. HAMman	FCT AME	Director
E. O Awoniyi	„	Chief ENSR.
Emma Jones	FCT Adviser	SLGP
Emma Obi Okonkwo	Estab. & Training	Economist
Engr. P. B. Umoh	„	CE
Fracis Ohuche	Agric.	Asst. Chief Accountant
Gambo Gadzama	Facility Maintenance	Deputy Director
George S. Koce	FCTA (ACCM)	Participant
H. N. Obiechina	FCDA Dep. of Regist.	D.D Plan & Rest
Halima Umaru Bagudu	Minister's Office	Prog. Monitoring Officer
HassanAbubakar	AMMA	Budget Officer
Hauwa Nuhu	Rest & Comp.	CAO
Hussaini H. Pai	FCT – UBEB	Chairman
I. A. Garba	AC & CM	Focal Person
Ibrahim A Idris	FCT - AME	Accountant



<b>NAME</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>DESIGNATION</b>
Idris Moh'd Auwal	Social Dev.	Budget Officer
Imokhai Fidelis	Treasury	Planning Officer I
Jimiko D. H	FCTAME	FEEDS Focal Person
John E. Obiahu	Health Sec.	Director
K. B. Anibilowo	AEPB	Director
Kehinde Niyi	STDA	Asst. Director
Kevin O. Ike	FCTA SOS	Focal Person
Kumaiin Ikyia	AGIS	PED
M T Bawa	AMMA FM & M	Project Logistics
M. A. Ayegba		Facilitator
M. M. YAkubu	FCT SEB	Project Monitoring
Maromike Lasisi	"	Participant
Matilukuro M. O.	Estab. & Training	Statistician I
Matthew Abu O	AEPB	Budget Officer
Mbonu T .O	FCT UBEB	FEEDS Focal Person
Michael Dapip	FCT SEB	Manpower Budget Officer
Mohammed M. Moh'd	HHSS	Head, Planning Prog. & Proj.
Mukhtar Galadi ma	Dev. Control AMMA	Asst. Chief Town Planner
Mustapha Hussain	„	Planning Officer I
N. F Tsokos	SOS Env. Sec.	DWASS
Nathen S. N	FCTAME	Asst. FEEDS Focal Person
Nuhu Ahmed	AMMA	Director
O. G. Folarin	Dep.. of Logistics	H/Logistics
Odey Charles	Estab. & Training	Focal Person
Ogundipe Niyi	RST AMMA	PPL.O
Oloye E. S	Engineering FCDA	AD for RES
Olufemi Folarin	ARD	Focal Person
S. H. Ashara	Transport Sec.	NAF
Samson Ohiweremen	FCT WB	Accountant I
Sani D Hiali	FCT UBEB	Planning Officer
Sanusi Malumfashi	AEPB	Participant
Simoa N. Isato	AMMA	Asst. Director
Sola Oke F	Transport FCTA	Planning Officer I
Uwazie M. N	ARD	C/ADP
YAhaya Abdullahi	AEPB	Scientific Officer
Zainab Ibrahim	SLGP	FCT Tech. Officer
Zanna Hamza	AGIS	Chief Accountant

## Annex 4

### SDA Presentations

#### **Submission from Social Development Secretariat**

So many departments have to come together under social development secretariat due to the reforms. FEEDS document captured social development in two areas – sports and social welfare. This was because of the SEEDS benchmarking.

#### *Questions/Comments:*

- How the department relates with similar agencies e.g. AEA?
- Targets poorly stated – not SMART.
- Girl child education – is this in conjunction with the Education Secretariat?
- User friendly facilities – in buildings and busses?
- Networking with professional bodies and NGOs?

#### **Response**

Social Development is a stakeholder in all the SDAs. Planning to hold ‘stakeholders’ meetings with other SDAs.

- Work with other agencies as a ‘trigger’ or provider of information.
- A request has been put to Management to make bus operators and builders to ensure that they install user friendly facilities for physically challenged people.
- Targets were set by someone else either than Social Development.
- AEA is an independent body nurtured by Social Development.

#### **Submission from Education Secretariat**

Early child care, which was included but dropped from FEEDS I should be added in FEEDS II

#### *Questions/Comments/Observations:*

- How to reconcile assumption on population 6.0million and 1.9mm there is need for this to be reflected in FEEDS II.
- How far has Education gone on Adult Education?
- Regulatory measures on childcare centers,
- Problem of dilapidation also need to be addressed
- Need to work with other agencies – Social Development and AMMA to ‘domesticate principle’ – for example; what is the meaning of ‘recreation’ in a Nigerian concept and culture? Reforms have happened without considering our ‘context’.
- The budgetary implication on the ‘wide’ difference between the two population figures given 6.5mm and 1.5mm.

#### *Responses*

- Change is reflected in targets 39% to 76% (check)
- Early childcare is part of UBE. Also to facilitate the target on girl child education
- Government is the regulatory agency that monitors and seek to standardize early childcare
- A child will get to school within 30mins – improved access.
- Budget allocation cannot be equated to budget release.



- General improvements on provision of facilities on adult education, including women and nomadic education and youth that did not have opportunities to go into formal education.

### **Submission from Satellite Towns Development Agency (STDA)**

Task force hastened implementation of strategies. – not clear whether the targets sets in FEEDS were achieved or not. – 30% decongestion of city – not achievable due to paucity of funds.

### **Submission from Abuja Municipal Management Agency (AMMA)**

#### *Water Supply*

Water supply below expectation in rural areas FEEDS I learning process. Many things did not work in FEEDS I. Gurara water project not completed as scheduled but expected to be completed in 2008.

#### *Environment*

Problems of roads, due to budgetary constraints Okada riders have been banned. Parks and recreation – target achieved 'Abuja now a beautiful green city', sewage collection 70-80% achieved in the city – services outsourced. Maintenance agreement has been reached with service companies. Much still needs to be done in the rural areas. (To prepare an e-copy.)

#### *Questions/Comments/Observations*

Need to deploy CCTV cameras at recreation parks

### **Submission from Agriculture**

First strategy was to work with women's groups in the Area Councils. We were to provide 100 metric tones of fertilizer. Some of the strategies were fixed arbitrarily – to achieve this in three years was an over ambition. Also 23,000 tonnes fertilizer at subsidized rate was ambitious. To date, FCTA has provided 25% to 50% subsidy to farmers. Secretariat also aimed to provide workspaces. Has achieved the Fish Market and Grain Market. The idea of these specialized workspaces was to ensure qualitative progress.

When the strategy for tractor hire was put in place – at that time we had 25 tractors for hire. We wanted to increase to 50 tractors. 30 were procured and distributed at subsidy for farmers groups. We were also meant to identify 40 cooperatives to receive a subsidized tractor. N500,000 deposit and 5-year payment plans. Nine have so far been distributed, 25% subsidy. The Secretariat has also encouraged farmers to adopt and improve farming technologies. We also aimed to support donor assisted programmes with counterpart funding – e.g. FADAMA II. Community Scorecard – we see it as an eye-opener, and it is already guiding us in the distribution of fertilizer in 2007.

### **Additional Details From Plenary discussion:**

How have SDAs been linked up with related departments in FCTA? Parks and recreation wants to reduce crime rate – have social development contacted us about working together on this? Also, the social development presentation didn't mention AEA.



Social Development performance was there, but there were other problems. The setting of targets, they weren't clear – poorly set. If you have a very wrong target, there is no way that you can have a measurable achievement. E.g., some of the targets are more of a statement than a target – and doesn't comply with SMART. Need to look at the types of business they want to provide for, precisely what they'll provide and so on

Education Secretariat: Some of the policy targets like girl-child education – was this done in relation to education secretariat. Have you actually developed a programme on girl-child education?

- **Social development responses:** Social development mandate is to enhance activities to happen in several secretariats. Girl child education – we arouse the idea and put it to the mandate secretariat responsible. Disabled people – user-friendly buildings and buses – we are on it. Target setting – targets were wrongly done by the wrong people – they were set but independent departments. Targets were set by people who were not professionals. Now we have consolidated targets, and will use for FEEDS II. Our work is to bring issues out that may not be brought out in the SDAs unless we did so.
- **Director women affairs:** with regard to crime issue in gardens, this is quite understood. We are stakeholders in most of the ministries – mainstreaming and so on. The secretariat is now getting gender Focal Persons in all the departments, (MDG funds) for gender mainstreaming, including gender budgeting and so on. All these things are in the pipeline.

#### **Comments on education presentation:**

- Statistics/population. The assumption was that the population was 6-million, now we hear that it is 1.5 – so how can we present statistics?
- We should avoid copying other countries, and think of how to provide necessary facilities against armed robbery etc, in ways that fit in with Nigerian culture and society.
- Statistics – 13-25% is quite high. But why have they not achieved the targets they have set, and can they relate them to the MDGs?
- What regulatory measures are being taken for looking after child day care?

Response from Theresa:

- At the time of setting targets, yes 6.5 million population was estimated. We could only meet 45% of that access. Now, if the population is 1.5 million – this is new baseline data. Now we have 79% access. (Our target was 45%) – this is due to the change in population. Why have the targets not been achieved? – we have achieved 79%. Before 2006, management of early child care was in the private sector but now we are starting to deal with it (age 3-5) under UBE. We are now looking at monitoring and the standardization.
- The true population percentages need to be reflected in FEEDS II.
- Now a child will get to school in 30 minutes. The Community Scorecard also showed that access was OK. Review of targets is required.
- We have failed on FEEDS, what we need to do is make sure that we pass next time. The departments should all work together. The bottom line of FEEDS is reducing poverty. We need to avoid policies we have seen elsewhere, like right-sizing, that are actually increasing poverty. The departments do not know what the others are doing – this is the problem.
- With regard to Adult Literacy, we have training centres and girl-child centres.

## Annex 5

### List of Papers Presented at the Retreat

1. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *FCTA FEEDS REVIEW RETREAT*
2. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *OUTCOMES OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY FEEDS REVIEW WORKSHOP*
3. Professor Oga Steve Abah Dr. Jenkeri Zakari Okwori *COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS FOR FEEDS AND LEEDS*
4. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *INTRODUCTION TO SITUATION ANALYSIS AND CONSULTATION PROCESSES*
5. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *SETTING TARGETS AND STRATEGIES*
6. John Egwu Obiahu MBA, CNA, ACTI, (Acting Director, Finance and Administration, Health Secretariat) *COSTING AND BUDGETING PROCESSES*
7. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY*
8. George I. Abalu, Managing Consultant, Agrosearch International Abuja, *MONITORING AND EVALUATION*
9. Alhaji Mohammed Ari, (Director, Finance and Administration, Education Secretariat) *KEY DECISION TO MAKE TOMORROW*

## Annex 6

### Terms of Reference

#### FEEDS I Review Workshops

##### Introduction

The State and Local Government Programme (SLGP) is funded by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). DFID's strategy for assistance to Nigeria focuses on the need to improve governance, state capacity, resource management and pro-poor service delivery. Specifically, SLGP provides support to governance processes in 5 States (Lagos, Enugu, Kaduna, Jigawa and Kano) and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

##### Background to this assignment

In 2005, the FCTA produced its first Federal Capital Territory Authority Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (FEEDS) document. Like the national level NEEDS, and SEEDS documents produced by states, the aim of the FEEDS document is to identify key poverty problems in the FCT, and to set out sectoral strategies and concrete targets to address them in the short and medium term.

The process of producing the FEEDS document included consultations with ordinary people in the FCT's Area Councils and representatives from the private sector. This collaboration was structured by a three-tier consultative framework:

Consultative Forum: a multi-stakeholder forum of representatives from civil society, the private sector and government.

Consultative Committee: representatives from FCTA departments, agencies and parastatals, Area Councils and the National Assembly. This included six 'external' FEEDS Focal Persons from each of FCT's six Area Councils, and 'internal' FEEDS Focal Persons from FCTA sectoral departments.

Core Technical Team: Technical experts from the Minister's office and wider government, civil society and the private sector

The FEEDS document outlines strategies for:

- Key sectoral areas: *education, health, water provision, environmental protection, access to justice, housing, sports and welfare, employment generation, agriculture and food security and rural transport.*
- FTCA institutional reforms: *revenue generation, restructuring the civil service for better service delivery, right-sizing, accountability and transparency, land administration and reviving the Abuja Master Plan.*
- The development and monitoring of FEEDS strategies and targets: *consultations and ownership, benchmarking, implementation and funding, monitoring and evaluation, and risk mitigation.*

One-year into the implementation of this first FEEDS strategy, a process of monitoring and evaluating FEEDS progress has been undertaken. In January 2007, SLGP facilitated a pilot *Community Scorecard Survey*, in which ordinary people in Area Councils evaluated the realities of service provision in their communities, and changes in this regard over the past year. SLGP has also undertaken a pilot *Service Delivery Assessment* (SDA) in FCT. Framed by the initial (2005) SEEDS benchmarking exercise, the SDA provides current data on FCTA service provisioning in key sectors: infrastructure, SMEs, agriculture, education and health.

FEEDS is intended to be a 'living document' – a strategy that is developed through consultative processes, implemented, then monitored and updated. The FCTA intends to develop a FEEDS II document by the end of 2007. FCTA also hopes to move forward on Area Council (LGA) LEEDS policy development in 2007-2008.

### **Objective of this Assignment**

The first step towards FEEDS II will be a review of the processes, successes, challenges and lessons of FEEDS I. SLGP intends to engage consultants to facilitate this review, and to work with FCTA entities and civil society actors to develop a process framework for FEEDS II.

The review process will include two workshops:

- A workshop with civil society actors on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2007, including NGOs and civil society FEEDS focal persons (from the Area Councils) and potentially donors. The workshop will start with a presentation of the Scorecard/SDA results. It will move onto analysis of the FEEDS I process, and discussion of how to improve this process for FEEDS II. The aim is to share the monitoring results, to gain critical analysis from civil society on the process and outcomes of FEEDS I, and to gain their ideas and buy-in for FEEDSII. The workshop will be held in Abuja.
- A two day FEEDS I Review retreat for FCTA FEEDS Focal persons, and a limited number of additional staff (budget/finance, more senior officers from key departments etc). The aim is to create a reflective space in which FCTA officers can unpack the processes, successes and challenges of FEEDS I. This is particularly with regard to setting targets, costing, budgeting, and the processes of consultation and monitoring. The retreat will end with the preparation of an agreed FEEDS II process framework.

The overarching objective of the 2–step review process is to ensure that the achievements, challenges and lessons from FEEDS I come to inform the FEEDS II process, strategies and targets. The aim of developing a framework for FEEDS II development is to ensure coherent, well-timed and high quality planning, with broad civil society participation. This will help to set the scene for a FEEDS II strategy that is relevant, realistic, inclusionary, pro-poor, and coherent across departmental strategies. The review processes would also provide a space in which to discuss the aim to start LEEDS policy development. Through this, FCTA would gain initial ideas on how to support the Area Councils in developing LEEDS, and how to promote coherence between LEEDS and FEEDS.

## **Activities:**

### **Civil Society workshop:**

- Facilitating a meeting with a small number of Area Council FEEDS focal persons, NGOs and businesses that were closely involved in FEEDS I, to collaboratively develop an outline for the workshop. The workshop is intended as a space for open discussion. Thus the outline would be fairly loose, mainly comprising a series of points for debate. An initial meeting has been held with Area Council FFPs, and a second meeting is booked for 23<sup>rd</sup> May (11am), SLGP Usuma Street office.
  - The FEEDS FFPs have agreed to make short presentations at the workshop, to share their experiences of the FEEDS I process and outcomes in their own communities. The consultants will support them in preparing their presentations.
- Working with the Area Council Focal Persons to identify the highlights of the Scorecard results, and drafting simple sentences for a wall poster. This poster will be printed and disseminated in FCT – particularly the villages.
- Adaptation of the presentation of the SLGP Scorecard results presentation (presented to FCTA in April), to make a presentation suitable for civil society.
- Organisation and facilitation of the workshop, including making the presentation and facilitating the debate. With the assistance of SLGP staff at the workshop itself, documenting the discussion. The workshop would end with an open invitation to civil society to be involved in FEEDS II development and to join hands with FCTA on FEEDS II implementation.
- A level of oversight on the work of the FCTA in organizing workshop invitations and logistics etc. The FEEDS I document and the Community Scorecard will be distributed with the workshop invitations.

### **FCTA FEEDS I Review:**

- Facilitating meetings with the FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons, to gain initial understanding of the FEEDS I process, successes, challenges and outcomes. First FCTA FFP meeting booked for 21<sup>st</sup> May (12 noon).
- Interviews with key FCTA Officers (members of the FEEDS Core Technical Group), to gain understanding of the high level processes and their views on the FEEDS I process, successes, challenges and outcomes.
- Development of a workshop outline, which fits with what the Focal Persons feel they want from the review and their perceived needs. The outline should include a review of the consultative process, target setting, costing, budgeting, planning processes, implementation, monitoring, and so on. Preparation of workshop materials and review tools.
- Identification of the need for any additional facilitators (giving SLGP plenty of time to find and engage any required facilitators)
- Working with the SLGP and the FCTA Planning and Statistics Department in coordinating the logistics for the retreat
- Facilitation of a lively, reflective 2-day Review Retreat, and making presentations at the Retreat as required. The Retreat will end with the development of a process framework for FEEDS II.

### **Deliverables**

- A workshop for civil society is facilitated, which presents the FEEDS I monitoring results to civil society/Area Council FFPs, and offers a space for reflection and discussion of next steps.





- A FEEDs Review retreat is facilitated, in which FCTA stakeholders analyse FEEDS I processes, outcomes and challenges, and collaboratively develop a process framework for FEEDS II.
- A report (in SLGP quality control format) that sets out:
  - (a) FEEDS I processes, strategies, targets and achievements;
  - (b) Broad recommendations for FEEDS II processes, strategies and targets;
  - (c) The agreed strategy, framework and time-line for FEEDS II development.
- A poster on the scorecard, which can be disseminated in FCT villages.

**Inputs And Timing**

The civil society workshop will take place on 7<sup>th</sup> June, and the FCTA Review Retreat will take place on 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> June. The consultancy input would commence on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2007 and finish on 15<sup>th</sup> June. Exact timings will be developed in agreement with the engaged consultants. It should be noted that a specific number of days have been allowed for this assignment, and it is expected that the outputs will be fully delivered within this timeframe.

Consultant	dates	Travel	Working remotely	Working in Abuja	Consultant's report preparation	Total
Consultant 1 (lead) – Nina Bowen	21-25 May 31 May -1 June 6-8 June			9	1	10

**Consultant 1 (lead)** will be responsible for:

- Coordinating the work of the consultancy team
- Undertaking initial interviews in FCTA and strategising the two workshops
- Writing the consultant's report up to the activities undertaken to the end of the contract period.
- Be involved in all aspects of the assignment

**Logistics**

SLGP will provide access to office space. The consultant should provide his/her own computer.

**Reporting**

The Consultant will report to the SLGP FCT Advisor (Emma Jones), and the FCTA Director Planning and Statistics, Hadiza Abdullahi (who is responsible for the FEEDS unit). SLGP require a Consultants Report on the process of the work, which should be submitted to the SLGP FCT Advisor in both hard and soft (electronic) copies.

## Annex 7

### List of People Met

Individuals	Title
Emma Jones	FCT Advisor, SLGP
Zainab Nto	SLGP staff (also interviewed in context of previous role as an Assistant to Amina Salu)
FCTA FEEDS Focal Persons (Group Meeting – approximately 15 people)	
Hadiza Abdullhai	Director, Planning and Statistics, FCTA
Ari Isa Mohammed	Director, Administration and Finance, Education, FCTA
Amina Salihu	Senior Special Assistant to the Minister on Information and Strategy, FCTA
Amina Zakari	Secretary, Social Development and previous Secretary, Health and Human Services
Kelvin Ike	FEEDS Focal Person, Social Development, FCTA
Olufemi Folarin	FEEDS Focal Person, Agriculture and Rural Development, FCTA
Ali Garba	SLGP consultant (also interviewed in context of previous role as FEEDS1 consultant)
Area Council External Feeds Focal Persons (3 Group Meetings – 5-6 people each)	Helen Zamni, Idris Musa Ozoko, Fatima Yusuf, Usman Abubakar, Mary Ishaya, Amina Solomon
Joe Abah	Former FCT Advisor, SLGP

## Annex 8

### Interview Guide

**Objectives of Interview:**

**Input into Processes of FEEDS I – Lessons Learned**

- What worked well and why?
- What challenges were there and why?
- Strengths from FEEDS I that need to be continued?
- Most important challenges that need to be addressed and how?

**Input for FEEDS1 retreat structure**

- Content: WHAT is to be accomplished
- Retreat process: HOW it should be accomplished

Theme	Questions	Prompts
<b>Consultation Process for Design</b>	1. What were the strengths and challenges of the FEEDS I consultation framework (open question)? 2. What lessons learned for FEEDS II can you identify from your experience?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTT, CC, CF</li> <li>• What important voices may have been excluded?</li> </ul>
<b>Target Setting and Strategies</b>	3. How were priorities established? 4. How might target setting and strategy development be improved? 5. How was activity planning done and how can it be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was there a common understanding of problems in your sector?</li> <li>• Problem diagnosis and baseline: what to do for FEEDS II</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	6. How is FEEDS used as a management tool? 7. Strengths and challenges in FFP system? 8. Strengths and challenges in coordination across SDAs? 9. Strengths and challenges in internal and external communication (information sharing, openness of decision-making, debate about alternative choices in implementation?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient authority/ leadership engagement</li> <li>• Internal accountability – how to achieve clarity on responsibility?</li> <li>• Budget availability</li> </ul>



Theme	Questions	Prompts
<b>Monitoring</b>	10. Strengths and challenges of the M&E system (open question)? 11. How has/can the Scorecard and SDA be used within the department to inform FEEDS II? Other baseline data? (priorities, targets, activity plans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal progress reviews (departmental, intra-departmental)</li> <li>• External monitoring – e.g. Town Hall meetings, regular feedback processes</li> <li>• Budget tracking</li> </ul>
<b>Retreat Expectations</b>	12. What outcomes would you like the retreat to produce that will help <i>you do your job better</i> ? 13. Do you have suggestions on <i>how</i> this should be accomplished to make the best use of participants' time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify expectations about progress towards <i>plan achievements</i>, versus lessons learned on <i>process</i>.</li> </ul>

## Annex 9

### Civil Society Meeting Discussion Comments<sup>1</sup>

#### Community Scorecard and Service Delivery Assessment Comments

##### *FEEDS Content*

- This is a true reflection of what is happening in the FCT. The FEEDS I document had nothing specific on gender. There should be something specific. (**Women's Development Programme**)
- The information reflects a very good job, but very little has been achieved for physically challenged people. What will happen in FEEDSII? There needs to be more attention to what was actually done in FEEDS I before moving on to plan FEEDS II. (**NGO for the physically challenged**)
- Disability has been considered in the Scorecard and that is good, but FEEDS said FCTA would provide over 1000 jobs for the disabled. There needs to be more effort in implementation on employment. (**AMAC FFP**).
- The FEEDS is very city focused. What about the rural areas?
- There are micro credit organizations working in FCT that are well known and registered and that have done excellent work. Such people must be contacted. This will help ensure more people will benefit from FEEDS micro credit. The NGOs on the ground must be contacted, and they can do a lot of the work for government

##### *Reflections on Validity of Results and Methodology*

- The scorecard should have been differentiated by ethnicity, and where people are coming from the differences between them (others contested the comment). The data captured is too general.
- There are general observations about peoples' perceptions, but there isn't enough information from FCT agencies about what was actually done. There is a different between the education results and what we see on the ground.
- As a person in the field, I feel that the results on agricultural extension do not reflect the reality. If the number of farmers receiving extension services is very low, then the high extension to farmer ratio does not seem right. (**Gwagwalada FFP**)
- The information on mosquito net distribution tells us what was done at the government level, but not how many actually received nets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Content is based on the notes of discussions taken by the consultant and Emma Jones, FCT Advisor. Where possible, the organization and role of the individual making the comment is provided in parentheses. One written submission was received, and this is provided as a direct quote at the end of the Annex.



- The sample size was not large enough. For the future, it needs to be expanded and subject to statistical analysis, to allow us to do further research. **(AEPB)**.
- This was a good effort by FCTA to get a sense of what is being done and what is happening on the ground. There were a number of limitations with the methodology and the data, and we all understand the problems with sample frames. The methodology needs to be more rigorous, using sampling frames and subjecting the results to statistical validity tests. The results are not statistically significant, so therefore they provide an *indication*. This indication might not be a true reflection of what is happening on the ground. The use of international reference points, or an idea of what the FCT's reference points are, would help in interpreting the ratios such as 1:37 extension agent: farmer. What is the standard? For water points, perhaps it could be in relation to what the Water Board intended to do? Regarding the mosquito nets, how many households were reached? What is the effect of mosquito nets on health? The indicators are process indicators. But, we need to ask the 'so what' question? What now? The information gives the impression that people are very busy, but what are they busy about? **(MacArthur Foundation)**.
- Overall this was a beautiful result and congratulations. The Education and Health Secretariats are the largest, and sampling for these areas should be further disaggregated into primary and secondary. **(AEPB)**.
- There should have been more involvement by NGOs working in Area Councils.

#### *FCT Comments and Response - Activities*

- FCTA has developed a gender mainstreaming policy, supported by SLGP. Social Development is a new secretariat, and we have a lot to do in setting it up. The gender mainstreaming policy will be implemented in this next quarter, and it will also be in FEEDS II.
- FCT has done some work for physically challenged persons, such as the Bwari Vocational Training Center. This is also related to the target of jobs created. Forty eight people were trained and microcredit was provided. We are now looking for an NGO manager for the place. We have also worked with the Deaf Society to come up with enterprise schemes. Regarding access to buildings, this is beyond the FCTA, and is also a national problem, but FCTA has produced a development control manual for buildings that includes disabled access to public buildings and will change the existing requirements. FCTA also resettled people with leprosy into a better community so we have done something.
- On job creation, the objective is not just white collar jobs but *access* to jobs through enabling factors of skills training and micro-credit. Are there up to 1000 disabled people in the FCT? We don't have the figures, and we need to start with the figures. But yes, we have not reached targets, but targets were too ambitious. We also need proper targets and we need your help to do this.



- Microcredit programmes do exist, but there have also been teething problems. FCTA has a pilot programme launched last year through NAPEP, and N2million has been provided through microfinance institutions in 2006 (same as in 2007).

*FCT Comments and Response - Monitoring Methodology and Results*

- Some things have been done since the Scorecard was undertaken, so they aren't reflected in the results.
- Regarding the grouping of people in the FCTA, this is not about ethnicity, but about the citizens of the FCTA. Services are for all, not for an ethnic group.
- There was no baseline so it is difficult to get a comparison now or a baseline on which to rank achievement. We need to see this as the beginning of efforts.
- For extension services, it is important to remember that the enumerators also could not reach all target groups for the survey. The Agricultural Secretariat has also re-organized and there is a plan to relocate 60 more people to the field and off the desk. We have also re-organized the ADP [Agricultural Development Programme], and there are now four zonal offices.
- We plan to analyze and re-strategize if things are not right. Overall we need to improve on benchmarking and the Scorecard.
- FCTA needs to aspire to international standards and ratios, but we also need to have Nigerian standards. Then we will have reference points. I agree that this is required and we will keep in mind for FEEDS II.
- We are desperate to use the Scorecard for improved delivery. Did we deliver? No. Referring to an audience comment, there is a difference between being busy, and being productive. We know, for example in extension, that we have procured, but we didn't deliver. Did the extension agents really go to communities?
- Targets can be based on global standards and this is important, but we also need to be realistic and take things one step at a time.
- The Scorecard looks at outputs. If you build a borehole and it is not working, have you given the communities water?
- We need greater clarity in the targets. If we say 1000 jobs, we need to say 300 will be white collar jobs, and know that there are this many people among the disabled that are qualified for these jobs. We can't provide jobs without first building skills.
- In education FCT is conducting a survey on education and special needs, using communities through ward heads and local chiefs. We need to find out how many people there are and what the needs of this group are.



- We need baseline data for future monitoring. We had to use the number of schools as a proxy for the number of villages. The data is not there, and we all need to work on this – NGOs, Area Council FFPs, and the FCTA.
- The Scorecard was designed with civil society consultation. It was not done by externals. There was participation of NGOs. There is not just one authentic group. Who is civil society? There are a multiplicity of groups and interests. Just because one group wasn't involved, does not mean others were not. Civil Society has a tendency to be skeptical or critical. Usually what we get when we communicate with the government is a lot of defensiveness. But the spirit in FCTA at the EXCO was different; it was reflective. It was "*did we really promise this*"? The Directors were asking what the problems were if fertilizer was procured and released and yet the communities were saying they didn't receive it. FCTA is listening, and more than would be possible in other states. In other states we just get defensiveness and closed doors. (**SLGP Community Scorecard consultant**).

#### **Area Council Presentation Comments**

- Regarding the presenter who talked about pay toilets, it would be a good idea to have pay toilets built in the communities but will we be able to pay or will we just continue to use the bush? We need to look at ourselves, enlightenment, to know and reflect on the way we live and our situations. In FEEDS II, we need to be asking what the state of where we live is. We need space, and a situation that does not give rise to demolitions. FCTA should encourage us to re-plan our communities. (**Bwari FFP**)
- Our roads are terrible. What can civil society do to help FCTA? We support the idea of refuse dumps. We can help FCTA in terms of awareness-raising. Perhaps youth can be used to collect waste and pay them for what they collect. In respect to planning, there should be no more demolitions. We need planned areas. (**Bwari**)
- We need resources in the Area Councils, for transformers, water and health (**Gwagwalada FFP**).
- Children have not been mentioned in the monitoring. Children are the future. There is the problem of child abuse, health, sanitation, education. (**Child Abuse Society**).
- We shouldn't be using youth to pick up trash, but civil society and youth can form environmental vigilante groups.
- We need to look at microfinance, the provision of work space for artisans, and capacity building in entrepreneurship. SMEs need more access to the Abuja Enterprise Agency. It should help open up more offices outside of the City, through establishing business information centers. (**SMEDAN**).
- We ask civil society to help rural areas, we need help and government can't do it all. We are ready to work with you. Water is a huge problem. Children won't go to school because there is no water to bath. Some villages have no boreholes at all, and people are suffering. (**Kuje FFP**)





- Land is a big problem. What not slum upgrading instead of demolitions?
- There are four ways in which civil society and FCTA can work together: Participation in setting targets and in institutionalizing process of getting data from NGOs; Awareness and sensitization to promote community participation; Independent monitoring and evaluation, which will enrich the information FCTA has; advocacy and helping with institutionalizing process of getting data from NGOs, and statistics based on results from the field. We need examples to shape what goes into FEEDS II (**CISCOPE**).
- There needs to be a maintenance culture. Community Development Officers should mobilize communities to protect infrastructure provided by FCTA.

#### *FCTA Comments and Response*

- We need to have planned settlements in the cities as well as rural areas. It is not cost effective to deliver water, boreholes, and roads to disjointed communities with very few houses. How do you most effectively harness resources? How do you have healthy communities if there are disorganized communities? They are hard to reach, and we need to include access issues in planning locations. Unless we organize, with laid out streets where cars and roads can reach, we will never reach the MDGs.
- We also need more representation and more accurate data form the Area Councils. There is a disconnect. We need to harmonize budgets and processes. We need to develop FEEDS with Area Councils and communities.
- The presentations were general, sentimental, and not specific. Policy makers need to details about what is needed where; not just the need for electricity, but for what, the watts required, what it will serve etc. Something very concrete. That is what the Area Council Feeds Focal Persons should tell us when we meet. You need to shock policy makers with figures, and we will go and do something about that place. If you can't convince them, shock them.
- The idea of cash for waste collection is an excellent one. We have done it before and it worked well. People know what they would do with the money they would receive, and worked hard.
- Planned villages are a great idea but not demolitions. We need virgin areas. But what do we do in the meantime? Why can't we use Area Council legislative process to have every house have a toilet and then the Area Councils should also get FCT to look at their proposal to be planned villages. If you have something on the ground, there is a possibility of moving forward.
- I have forgotten what it means to be poor, and when I was poor things were different for the poor. As focal persons, it is important not to forget what it means to be poor. You need to try and be in their place. That is why we need to have consultations.



- When we are designing targets, we were not realistic, not specific, and in some cases they were not even based on a needs assessment. We need to think coherently and realistically, and not make unrealistic suggestions that run ahead of the time. Let's not dissipate our energies on what is not possible. We need to distinguish between what is feasible now, versus five years from now. Yes, public toilets are needed, but we can't even manage to do it in the city – so let's not call for them in the villages at this point.
- The provision of electricity to villages; yes, it is needed. But it is the duty of the FFPs to talk to your engineers and technicians. You need to quantify exactly what is needed, and how much it will cost. You are there and you can work it out and tell us: even compare the cost of solar and other options, etc.
- We can't be mentally easy on detail; otherwise civil society will be on our backs. Although sometimes civil society is also mentally easy.
- Independent monitoring and evaluation has been done, but now we need to institutionalize it.
- We have looked at what we planned to do. Planning is not just about NPC and the FCTA – it is also about civil society. Civil society should be part of the planning process for development of NEEDS, FEEDS to LEEDS. The problem is that our planning process is faulty. Communities can come up to identify their own needs and this can move towards LEEDS. We need to start with LEEDS and build up to FEEDS and NEEDS – this is the right direction. We start from the grassroots communities, not from NEEDS. **(NPC Representative, Coordinating Director of Economic Strategy)**

## **Recommendations for FEEDS II**

### *Introduction from FCTA*

- FEEDS I1 was an experience gathering process. There was no database but today we have something to show. Civil Society can work with government to produce a better result. We also need to improve our targets. If the targets are unrealistic, we need to look again at the framework and the process structure: planning, implementation, strategic monitoring and evaluation. We also need results orientated participatory M&E – so that we can measure. In the benchmarking, data is still left off. We need to know the new areas that we need to emphasize in FEEDS II. We need to focus in on the issue of poverty reduction through small and micro-financing and working with groups like SMEDAN. How can we work together with civil society on FEEDS II? People look at FEEDS as a government thing – it is not – it is a collaboration with civil society. Civil society has been looking at what government can do for us, but what can we do together? It needs to be a cooperative document. How can civil society be part of core implementation? How can government support civil society to help implement FEEDS II?

### *FEEDS2 Suggestions*

- The work is commendable, and in other states the resistance can be very strong. However, involvement of civil society in planning, and then nothing more, results in civil society disowning the process. There need to be project committees at local levels, and funds tracking. Involvement at all stages will help civil society own the process and also take responsibility for implementation. (**Oxfam GB**)
- There need to be more consultative meetings in the area councils; not just in AMAC. We also need quality stakeholders. There should be consultation with NGOs working on health for example. The suggestions have been good, but maybe too general.
- To improve FEEDS, we need more and wider participation and communication at the community level, not just at the Area Council level, so they can prioritize their own needs. This would also contribute to awareness.
- Civil society should be involved in monitoring teams, and CSOs should be selected as well that have the capacity to do independent monitoring in parallel.
- FCTA can develop and distribute mid-term reviews, and disseminate the information through radio, TV, and newspapers. There should also be review meetings with the FCTA.
- One of the greatest challenges civil society faces is that the government is bureaucratic; there are suspicions between civil society and government, and it is difficult for civil society organizations to identify how to access the government. Policy makers need to tell us what the entry points are. Civil society can have review meetings to help communicate their knowledge and ideas to the FCTA.
- FCTA has not gotten the correct forum for feedback. Phone numbers for FCTA are provided but people do not know them. Some places have no government services. We need to know the number of villages in each Area Council and have baseline data. We need good feedback mechanisms. One suggestion is an office in each Area Council which can channel feedback up.
- We hardly look back to what we've done before. We need to do this to move forward easier. There was a UNDP survey in the villages but what happened to the data?
- The link between the area council and FCT needs to be created and improved. Area Councils and FCTA are sometimes in conflict. Can FCTA compliment Area Councils on LEEDS and FEEDS?
- We should have suggestion boxes in Area Councils. This is simple and anyone can do this. The Area Council FFPs will be responsible for forwarding the information.



- FEEDS talked of value reorientation; are we driving towards this? In the process of meeting targets, there was more attention to financial management and less to the beneficiaries. How do we rank services? Poor work is often related to the relationship between citizens and government.
- Town Halls are very critical, but they can be more effective if they are strengthened into productive feedback on FEEDS.
- FEEDS could identify CBOs as contact points – they are a source of information on local needs and situations. They know their base. They are the base. We can work with FCTA on this, and then FCTA will meet their targets.
- Civil society can also communicate by email. Give us your emails and tell us what information you are looking for.
- We need to broaden the scope of consultation. Why not incorporate traditional authorities, and councilors, with the focal persons?
- Civil society can monitor the quality of work from contractors, and there should be a three month delay before they are paid to make sure the project is quality (i.e. to see if the borehole is working).
- We are willing and ready to open an office (skills training and workspaces) in your area. All we need is that your chairman writes to us and explains the need (**SMEDAN**)
- Area Council FFPs can compile all the information and send to FCTA.
- We should demand for accountability and CSOs should also be accountable.
- FCTA is saying that FEEDS II targets should be more realistic. We hear this, but everything we did we did on the advice of the government. What can't they be done? Didn't FCTA identify the targets to begin with? They can be done.
- Information can be shared in the rural areas through the use of information bands and theatre.
- The FPs should decide on the suggestions and then consult with the chairman. Last time it was like we were doing their jobs and there was difficulty. Please visit the chairmen soon, and this will be better for us. There needs to be a direct relationship with the chairman. (**AMAC FP**)

*FCTA/National Planning Commission Comments and Response*

- We all agree that CSOs are important. How do we improve this relationship? The interactions have been positive, and FCTA has an open door. Feedback mechanisms are very important, and feedback via email, Area Council suggestion boxes, and village consultations will improve planning processes. CSOs and communities need greater access to the FEEDS document, for awareness and to hold government accountable. The duty of civil society organizations is also to try to identify means to give FCTA feedback. Civil Society says that government is bureaucratic, but we are together now, so it is not so hard to reach us. Feedback and communication is a two way thing. It is important that we begin to talk. We can shout publicly, but we need to get our facts right and speak the truth. The idea of civil society monitoring of projects, and FCTA not paying for three months won't work because private sector also has obligations, loan repayments, etc. We already have product guarantees. But participation is very important. Projects need to be seen as your own. Whether they are functional or non-functional depends on this. **(NPC Representative)**
- All stakeholders need to be clearer on what the roles of Area Councils and What FCTA is. These are clear in the education sector, but not everyone understands this which makes implementation difficult.
- We also need to remember that sometimes other issues stop us from reaching the targets, i.e. late budget approvals, due processes etc. Some things are bigger than individuals, than a secretariat, and even the FCTA.
- Value orientation needs some work and we need to work with civil society. We need to have a real strategy for this for FEEDS II.
- Regarding feedback, we have taken the Town Hall meetings outside AMAC. These will continue. The responsibility for Town Hall Meetings is now vested in the Social Development Secretariat. We've done very well, but we could do better.

*Written comments on Recommendations for FEEDS II (The Carpenters' Foundation International, Kubwa)*

- The FCTA should identify the existing CSOs (e.g. NGOs, CBOs) working in the FCT in accordance with their thematic areas of focus; within specific Area Councils/Satellite towns/communities in such a way that these CSOs become local institutional development partners who would co-work with the respective Area Councils right from the stage of planning through implementation via monitoring and evaluation.
- The FCTA should continue the town hall meetings but should make it a policy matter such that the Area Councils also hold such forums in order that there be better participation [...] people focused administration in the FCT.



- Our observation within the FCT for the past four years expresses the fact that when community people are mentioned or are to be involved in virtually all development issues/sector; the term community people has always referred to the local Gbagi people with disregard to other ethnic/tribal groupings in the FCT; which does not speak well for FCT as a Federal Capital City. For example, a situation where non-Gbagi residents of FCT are asked to go back to their state of origin in order to make application for employment under the Federal Ministry particularly for level 7 cadre and below. This, in the spirit of Abuja as Federal Capital City and not a state capital as opposed to Lagos in the past is not a healthy development.
- Hence, communities in any setting within the FCTA should be specific, defined, and should be holistic in all ramifications.

## Annex 10

### Comments on FEEDS Processes, Successes, Challenges

#### General

- FEEDS I was not really used as a management tool (seen as ‘that document’), although there is now better understanding of what it is, and that FEEDS *is* the work of the FCT. At the beginning, there was not really an understanding that one would come back to it in a year’s time and ask ‘how did you do’?
- An important achievement is that there is now a greater sense of ownership, and a realization that FCTA is ultimately accountable for it. There will be better input for FEEDS II, and it will be a more effective management tool. The current review effort is an example of this change.
- We had processes wrong from the beginning. There was no real work plan, and no link with budget amounts and processes.
- We need to do a better job at responding to issues that affect people’s day to day lives, especially the indigene population. Economic gains are important and we should be sure we focus on these; ultimately these issues will bring them closer.

#### External Consultation and Communication

- Overall the external consultation and communication aspects have been strong (Town Hall meetings, Servicom, press briefings following EXCO meetings, etc.). There are more CBOs involved in each community, and improved quality of participation in government.
- External communication has been working well. The radio programme, town hall meetings, and Abuja Journal are all good initiatives.
- The Consultative Forum represented a broad range of stakeholders, and was a useful way to solicit input on prioritization.
- We need to ‘stratify’ consultation; to find a way to have topical discussions with different stakeholders (i.e. child welfare, agriculture). The general meetings are okay, but they don’t allow us to discuss important issues in any depth.
- The Consultative Forum was more about disseminating information, and less about true consultation and seeking input. It was also done only at the beginning. There are outstanding questions about how many ‘informed’ people really attended. Political party representatives were notably absent; perhaps if there were more NGOs and donors present this would provide a more neutral space and it would be easier to engage different political parties in consultation.
- The Consultative Committee may be redundant. It appeared in the methodology, but it needs to be looked at again in terms of how it works, what its role is, and whether or not this is the best structure.
- There were more FCTA than external people at the Consultative Forum. It’s possible some people were intimidated by this. There could also have been better use of technical specialists, making sure the right people were present to respond to specific questions that people had.



- The Consultative Forums should establish 'standing committees' of small groups of people that agree to monitor and track specific sectoral issues, and report back to the Forum. This will help reach depth and genuine, ongoing participation.
- FCTA should approach the Consultative Forums with more of an 'open book'.
- I don't know how the NGOs were chosen. Maybe selection criteria need to be clearer, to make sure important groups are not excluded.
- There should be thought to submitting a proposal to donors for supporting the participatory planning and consultation process. If FCT pays, the problem will always be who pays the piper. Would it be possible for Area Councils to pay in the future through LEEDS?
- Perhaps there should be a FEEDS Desk in the Area Councils that have a resource envelope to support consultative processes, deducted at source.

### **Internal Processes: Communication and Coordination**

- The Core Technical Team was a good idea, but in practice it existed more on paper. It really came down to one person driving the process. If the CTT idea is used in the future, there needs to be identification of exactly which individuals form part of the CTT; and how to make those individuals accountable for fulfilling their responsibilities.
- Internal communication and consultation was a challenge. FEEDS I could have made better use of technical knowledge within FCTA.
- Internal communications sometimes have disconnects. Communication is usually through EXCO via memos. Working together is sometimes difficult, and we need to design a system that takes account of those difficulties.
- Review meetings should be included as a regular part of the agenda at EXCO. There needs to be an established mechanism for FEEDS reviews at EXCO level.
- Executives need to mandate the directors. The FEEDS Focal Person system needs leadership and support from senior management.
- FEEDS and MTEF need to be the same. We need a new planning process that links FEEDS with the MTEF.
- SDAs need to develop their policy thrust, objectives, targets and activities internally. When reviewed externally to the SDA, it still needs to come back to the SDA for finalization. In FEEDS, sometimes the final version lost its connection with the original. When this happened, FEEDS was just ignored.
- Priorities come from the Minister and leadership, and all SDAs need a unified template to respond to those priorities. Planning also needs to take account of realities – SDAs also have to respond to ad hoc Federal priorities that sometimes requires compromises with FEEDS.
- FEEDS needs to be driven by the head of PNS, and that individual is the main Focal Person. S/he can have a desk officer, but the ultimate responsibility needs to be placed at that level. We need to have a PRS at the centre, otherwise this will not work. We also need to draw better on the civil service to build depth. Someone must have a central coordinating role because of the dearth of capacity. Budget and planning functions need to be integrated.

### **Target Setting and Strategy Identification**

- There is a feeling that targets were arrived at in the Consultative Forums, but in practice they were driven by bureaucrats. The Consultative Forums were more an opportunity to explain targets that had already been chosen.





- Many targets were unachievable, and because they were unachievable, they couldn't be measured. There needs to be a more 'hardnosed approach' to targets, based on an understanding of where we are now. Part of the targets problem was that there are different perspectives between technocrats and politicians: what we could be doing versus what we should be doing. Targets were sometimes 'aspirations', and there was also a lack of clear figures on historical expenditures.
- There was more theme level prioritization in the external consultations, but when it came to policy trade-offs that the strategies demanded, more prioritization was necessary – as well as a filter for what was realistically doable.
- There is a skills gap for target setting. The lack of a baseline has been a problem, and basic data analysis. Targets need a plan to achieve them.
- All internal stakeholders believe their own department's function is important. Therefore, there was a tendency for too many priorities to be selected. There needed to be more rigour in the selection of targets and strategies.
- There needs to be more in-depth situation analysis for FEEDS II – both content and context.
- There are issues related to the quality of input from the Forums, and the input was then used by politicians. Politicians tend to be naïve about what is possible, and it needs to be better contextualized. This stresses the need for a stronger role by the Core Technical Team.
- Most of the strategies are general statements. They tend to be 'wish lists' without sufficient thought for implementation. It proved difficult to attach activity plans to such vague strategies because the strategies themselves were not always clear. Each department also needs to do an activity plan.
- There needs to be a half day session on how to set targets, strategies, and activity plans. There should be fewer and better selected targets. This requires the input of the Core Technical Team, the directors of core departments, and quality data from Planning and Statistics.
- FEEDS needs to link to the MTSS. MTSS needs to be institutionalized so that sectors have a degree of consistency, and so that MTSS can actually be carried out. There needs to be both a respect of institutional sectoral mandates and of political mandates.

### **FEEDS Focal Persons (FFPs)**

#### *FCTA FPPs*

- There have been some selection challenges. There is a problem of fluidity. Some people were selected based on their job titles and not their availability, and they send representatives in their place. SDAs were asked to nominate people at a certain level and with a certain skill set to be the FEEDS desk officer. Some ignored the memo and sent people with different qualifications. There is now more understanding, but the selection criteria need to be re-issued.
- There needs to be a way of building staff understanding beyond the FEEDS representative. Perhaps each department should have a small team so that more than one person is 'in the know.'
- Staff roles as FEEDS Focal Persons need to be an integral part of the job description. Since something has been added, other responsibilities need to be taken away. Options for incentive structures should also be considered.
- We need to think about using mentoring for new FFPs, and to encourage work in small teams.



- The FFPs need to be empowered, and there needs to be greater understanding of FEEDS overall within departments. Working with budget staff as part of smaller teams is particularly important.
- The head of departments need to be the FFPs. They can delegate, but responsibility needs to rest with them.

### **External FFPs**

- The internal FFP systems may have worked better than the external FFPs. How realistic is it for people to volunteer much of their time for no remuneration? Should the Area Councils contribute? There also needs to be attention to the importance of legitimacy in the eyes of the community, and capacity building for the FFPs themselves.
- There needs to be a way of rotating external FFPs and ensuring there is new input. It is also voluntary, and this becomes difficult over time. Perhaps there is a role for the Area Councils to provide small incentives.
- The people that were nominated come from different backgrounds, and they have various capacities. Levels of understanding vary, and when they are in group a number of them are lost part of the time. There needs to be a better way of using people from different backgrounds and different perspectives.
- There needs to be a revision of criteria for selection based on experience. We could also use FEEDS I FFPs to mentor new FFPs, and encourage more working in groups.
- The FFPs would benefit from skills building in participatory processes and consultation methods. It isn't clear that they are always talking to the people they need to talk to. There are both capacity issues about ability to mobilize the broader community and resource issues. We need to look closely at the quality of representation, what are the ultimate reasons for weaknesses, and how we can help address those.

### **Implementation**

- Faulty budgeting is really at the center. An advocacy workshop that seeks to develop a collective understanding is needed.
- There needs to be a structure in place for budget monitoring as it relates to FEEDS implementation. The budget allocations tended to work the way the departments always did. There were no changes to take into account the need to implement FEEDS.
- There also needs to be political accountability, but it is difficult to be held accountable if there is no data. Consideration should be given to civil servant 'advice forums' so that civil servants are clearly communicating to political decision makers and it becomes clear where accountability resides.
- There needs to be training in costing of activities and outputs.
- Civil servants need to be more involved – a deepening of their understanding and involvement so that it is owned.

### **Monitoring and Reporting**

- There needs to be more focus on outcomes and impact evaluation, not simply outputs (e.g. roads built). Reporting on implementation is less important than understanding what impact it is having. The data needs to be collected from service delivery points.
- We need to make better use of the baseline data that we have. We need to improve the baseline, but this also requires a long term investment and we need to move ahead in the meantime.



## **Slgp**

---

- The right targets need to be chosen, and we need to make monitoring a routine process. Tracking outputs under contracts is necessary, but we need to move further than this.
- There needs to be a proper reporting structure to EXCO.

### **Next Steps**

- There needs to be a stock taking of what has been progress so far, and the retreat should be the start of that process.
- What can be done in the near future is starting with the Directors, looking at various inputs and validating them, doing progress reports for the sectors, and identifying key issues that need to be discussed with the new Secretaries.
- We need to move away from 'FEEDS' to talking about FCT core business. How do we raise the performance bar, and where is the money coming from? Ultimate decision making is vested EXCO, and FEEDS is the core business of the EXCO.