

## **REPORT ON THE SELECTION OF THE NINE BEST PERFORMING BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS (BPBOs)**

At the 13<sup>th</sup> Implementation Steering Committee (ISC) meeting held at the conference room of the Public Services Commission on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2014, the CDM Secretariat was tasked to facilitate the process for selecting the Six Best Performing Beneficiary Organizations. The aim is twofold. These are to:

1. Acknowledge hard work and
2. Grant awards to the selected Beneficiary Organizations (BOs).

During further deliberations on the issue at the 14<sup>th</sup> ISC meeting on Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> April, 2015, it was agreed that three different evaluation teams should be formed to independently assess the various Beneficiary Organizations for the purpose of the awards. The evaluation teams were to determine their own evaluation criteria. The principal aim is to eliminate biasedness and promote transparency and credibility in the selection process. The table below provides some details on the evaluation teams and their respective contributions to the overall **100%** score:

#	Evaluation Team	Justification for Team selection	Contribution to total score
1	Members of the ISC whose organizations are not BOs	They also had oversight responsibility for the CDM.	30%
2	CDM Secretariat	Secretariat had the benefit of managing and coordinating the implementation of the CDM	30%
3	Mid Term Evaluation Consultant	Consultant visited all Beneficiary Organizations and interacted with them.	40%

*Table 1: The Evaluation teams, and their scoring percentages*

### **PROMOTION OF FAIRNESS**

To ensure fairness, the classification of BOs into first and second call groups was maintained. This took cognizance of the fact that the first call BOs started the implementation of the CDM earlier than their second call counterparts. Scoring was carried out separately within each group. Also, six BOs were selected from the first Call category, while three were selected from the second call category to reflect the different sizes of the two groups.

### **SUMMARY ON OVERALL PERFORMANCE BY ALL BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS**

Tables 2 and 3 below provide the consolidated scores for all BOs within each group as well as the relative positions of each BO. Whereas table 2 provides the summary for the first call BOs, table 3 does same for the second call BOs.

EVALUATION TEAM(S)	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	AITI - KACE
ISC Members - (30%)	11.80	15.70	16.20	17.30	15.40	17.75	15.50	16.70	14.05	16.05	15.80
CDM Secretariat - (30%) <sup>1</sup>	17.27	18.64	23.18	13.64	25.46	18.18	15.91	10.00	25.46	8.64	13.64
Mid Term Evaluation Consultant - (40%)	26.60	24.00	21.40	30.00	28.00	19.40	21.40	21.40	35.60	19.40	28.00
<b>TOTAL – (100%)</b>	<b>55.67</b>	<b>58.34</b>	<b>60.78</b>	<b>60.94</b>	<b>68.86</b>	<b>55.33</b>	<b>52.81</b>	<b>48.10</b>	<b>75.11</b>	<b>44.09</b>	<b>57.44</b>
<b>POSITIONS</b>	<b>7TH</b>	<b>5TH</b>	<b>4TH</b>	<b>3RD</b>	<b>2ND</b>	<b>8TH</b>	<b>9TH</b>	<b>10TH</b>	<b>1ST</b>	<b>11TH</b>	<b>6<sup>TH</sup></b>

*Table 2: Individual BO performance within the first call classification*

EVALUATION TEAM(S)	FWSC	MOTI	MOELR	FDA	MDPI
ISC Members - (30%)	11.20	11.30	16.80	17.35	12.60
CDM Secretariat - (30%) <sup>2</sup>	28.00	10.00	18.00	19.00	24.00
Mid Term Evaluation Consultant - (40%)	22.60	21.40	24.00	19.40	20.60
<b>TOTAL – (100%)</b>	<b>61.80</b>	<b>42.70</b>	<b>58.80</b>	<b>55.75</b>	<b>57.20</b>
<b>POSITIONS</b>	<b>1ST</b>	<b>5TH</b>	<b>2ND</b>	<b>4TH</b>	<b>3RD</b>

*Table 3: Individual BO performance within the second call classification*

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the last row of table 8

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the last row of table 9

## ANALYSIS ON ASSESSMENTS BY THE THREE EVALUATION TEAMS

### Team One - The ISC Evaluation Team:

#### Overall Scoring-Outcome by the ISC Evaluation Team

The tables below (*i.e. tables 5 and 6*) provide the scoring outcomes of the ISC evaluation team. Whereas table 5 relates to the first call Beneficiary Organizations, table 6 relates to those of the second call.

	Total Score By All Members For Each Criterion							Overall Total Score	Three score average	30% of three score average
	Concept	Structure	Content	Outcome/ Mainstream	Evidence	Comfort	Internal Assessment			
OoP	20.0	19.0	19.0	21.0	19.0	20.0	0	118.0	39.33	<b>11.80</b>
PSC	28.0	26.0	27.0	23.0	25.0	28.0	0	157.0	52.33	<b>15.70</b>
NDPC	26.0	26.0	26.5	26.0	26.0	31.5	0	162.0	54.00	<b>16.20</b>
OHCS	29.0	28.0	28.0	29.5	27.5	31.0	0	173.0	57.67	<b>17.30</b>
MOF	22.0	24.0	28.0	26.0	26.0	28.0	0	154.0	51.33	<b>15.40</b>
MOFA	29.0	29.0	31.0	31.0	26.0	31.5	0	177.5	59.17	<b>17.75</b>
MWRWH	26.0	27.0	23.0	28.0	24.0	27.0	0	155.0	51.67	<b>15.50</b>
MOTCCA	28.0	27.0	28.5	28.0	24.5	31.0	0	167.0	55.67	<b>16.70</b>
EPA	22.0	23.0	25.0	23.0	23.0	24.5	0	140.5	46.83	<b>14.05</b>
MGCSP	27.0	29.0	26.0	24.5	23.0	31.0	0	160.5	53.50	<b>16.05</b>
AITI-KACE	24.0	24.0	24.0	28.0	26.0	32.0	0	158.0	52.67	<b>15.80</b>

*Table 4: Scoring outcome by the ISC evaluation team for first call BOs*

	Total Score By All Members For Each Criterion							Overall Total Score	Three score average	30% of three score average
	Concept	Structure	Content	Outcome/ Mainstream	Evidence	Comfort	Internal Assessment			
FWSC	20.0	20.0	17.0	18.0	20.0	17.0	0	112.0	37.33	<b>11.20</b>
MOTI	21.0	20.0	21.0	16.0	19.0	16.0	0	113.0	37.67	<b>11.30</b>
MELR	27.0	27.0	30.0	27.0	27.0	30.0	0	168.0	56.00	<b>16.80</b>
FDA	30.0	30.0	27.5	28.0	24.0	34.0	0	173.5	57.83	<b>17.35</b>
MDPI	22.0	21.0	23.0	19.0	18.0	23.0	0	126.0	42.00	<b>12.60</b>

*Table 5: Scoring outcome by the ISC evaluation team for second call BOs*

#### Composition of the ISC Evaluation Team

This four-member team is made up of ISC members whose organizations are not benefitting from the CDM pilot. Four main organizations are represented on this team.

These are:

- Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA),
- Ghana Audit Service (GAS),
- Public Sector Reform Secretariat (PSRS) and
- Controller and Accountant General's Department (CAGD)

Scores by the ISC evaluation team is to constitute 30% of the total score.

### Justification for Selection of Team

The ISC is made up of individuals with considerable knowledge and experience in the management of Public Service Organizations. Members of the ISC could therefore provide unbiased and credible assessment on the performance of BOs. Besides, the ISC provided policy direction and also had oversight responsibility over the implementation of the CDM-pilot. Furthermore, by their mandate, the institutions represented on this team have crosscutting responsibilities towards all BOs without any special inclination towards any particular BO(s).

### Evaluation Platform Used

The ISC team used mainly presentations made by the Beneficiary Organizations at the two-day Knowledge and Experience sharing workshop held at Koforidua over the period May 03-05, 2015. The presentations were guided by a template designed by a Canadian Monitoring and Evaluation specialist who compiled the Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) . Each BO made a presentation on three key achievements and their associated outputs, results and challenges as well as the lessons learnt. Also, each BO was to indicate the good practices that in its view have contributed to the successful implementation of their CDM activities.

### Evaluation Factors/Criteria Used

Seven main evaluation factors/criteria were used to score the various presentations by the BOs. These are: Concept, Structure, Content, Outcome/Mainstream, Evidence, Comfort and Internal Assessment. The table below provides meanings to the various terms as well as the maximum score that each team member could allocate to each factor/criterion.

#	Evaluation Criteria	Definition behind criteria	Maximum possible score per person
1	<b>Concept</b>	Idea behind the determination and design of the CDM work plans and activities	10
2	<b>Structure</b>	Consistency of presentation to the template provided.	10
3	<b>Content</b>	The wealth and depth of information presented	10
4	<b>Outcome/Mainstream</b>	Nature and credibility of the outcomes reported on	10
5	<b>Evidence</b>	Nature and verifiability of available documentation to support claims	10
6	<b>Comfort</b>	Presenter's posture, confidence and delivery	10
7	<b>Internal Assessment</b>	Felt Impact of CDM activities on service delivery	40
	<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>100</b>

*Table 6: Assessment Criteria used by the ISC Evaluation Team*

### Scoring Procedure:

1. Each of the four ISC members was present at the two-day Knowledge and Experience sharing workshop held at Koforidua.
2. Using the assessment criteria above, each team member independently scored presentations by all the 16 Beneficiary Organizations

3. The aggregate scores per criteria was then computed
4. A three<sup>3</sup> score average per criteria was then calculated and
5. 30% of the three score average was then computed. This is to reflect the 30% allocation to the ISC evaluating team as per table 1 above.

Please refer to Appendix 1 for detailed scores by individual ISC evaluating team members

**Team Two - The CDM Secretariat:**

**Overall Scoring-Outcome by the CDM Secretariat**

The tables below (i.e. tables 7 and 8) provide the scoring outcomes of the CDM Secretariat. The tables provide the composite score on the two criteria used by the secretariat for the assessment. Whereas table 7 relates to the first call Beneficiary Organizations, table 8 relates to those of the second call.

	# Of Factors Considered	Maximum Possible Score	ACTUAL SCORE BY FIRST CALL BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS										
			OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSF	AITI - KACE
Total Score For Compliance	5	55	31	40	48	19	46	35	29	18	47	17	22
Total Score For Effectiveness	1	11	7	1	3	11	10	5	6	4	9	2	8
<b>Grand Total Score</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>30% of Grand Total Score<sup>4</sup></b>			<b>17.27</b>	<b>18.64</b>	<b>23.18</b>	<b>13.64</b>	<b>25.46</b>	<b>18.18</b>	<b>15.91</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>25.46</b>	<b>8.64</b>	<b>13.64</b>

Table 7: Scoring outcome by the CDM Secretariat for first call BOs

	# Of Factors Considered	Maximum Possible Score	ACTUAL SCORE BY SECOND CALL BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS				
			FWSC	MOTI	MOELR	FDA	MDPI
Total Score For Compliance	5	25	23	9	15	15	22
Total Score For Effectiveness	1	5	5	1	3	4	2
<b>Grand Total Score</b>			<b>28</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>30% of Grand Total Score</b>			<b>28</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>

Table 8: Scoring outcome by the CDM Secretariat for Second call BOs

**Composition of the CDM Secretariat Evaluation Team**

<sup>3</sup> Three score average = Total Score/3.

Note that all ISC evaluating team members did not score for Internal Assessment. This explains the use of the three score average rather than the normal average.

<sup>4</sup> The denominators for computing the 30% of the grand total score differ between the two call categories. They are **66** and **30** for the **first and second call** categories respectively.

The entire management team of the CDM secretariat participated in the evaluation exercise. The team comprised seven persons as below:

- Director, in charge of coordinating the CDM-pilot
- Director in charge of Monitoring and Evaluation
- Principal Budget Analyst
- Principal Accountant
- Senior Management Analyst
- Economics Officer and
- Administrator

**Justification for Selection of Team**

The CDM secretariat is in charge of the day to day management of the CDM pilot. Over the past three years of implementation, the secretariat has interacted with the various BOs and is in a good position to identify and offer credible factors for assessing performance of the BOs which will be consistent with the intermediate and ultimate outcomes set under the CDM. It was therefore considered prudent for the secretariat to participate in the evaluation. Scores by the CDM secretariat team constitutes 30% of the total score.

**Evaluation Platform Used:**

The evaluation platform used was nature and level of responsiveness of BOs to reporting requirements stated in the operational manual. Specifically, the following are the reporting requirements; submission of monthly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, annual reports, responsiveness to audit implementation recommendations as well as implementation effectiveness.

**Evaluation Factors/Criteria Used:**

The two evaluation criteria used are compliance criteria and effectiveness criteria. An efficiency criterion was considered but later withdrawn due to the difficulty in establishing a common basis for comparison. Each of the criteria had a separate number of factors. The table below provides details on the criteria and the individual factors under each.

	# of factors	LIST OF FACTORS	Maximum <sup>5</sup> Possible score for		Total expected <sup>6</sup> number of entries	
			First call BOs	Second Call BOs	First call BOs	Second Call BOs
Compliance criteria	5	Submission of monthly financial reports	11	5	36	24
		Submission of semi-annual progress reports	11	5	5	3
		Submission of annual reports	11	5	3	2
		Number of Audit issues raised	11	5	-	-
		Audit recommendation implementation	11	5	-	-
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Effectiveness criteria	1	Early completion of CDM activities	11	5	-	-

*Table 9: CDM Secretariat’s Evaluation Criteria, Number of factors considered, detailed list of factors, maximum possible scores for both first and second call categories, as well as total number of expected entries for each factor.*

**Scoring Procedure: Compliance criteria**

<sup>5</sup>The maximum possible score reflects the total number of BOs in each call category. Hence maximum possible scores for the first and second call BOs are respectively 11 and 5.

<sup>6</sup>The number of **entries** refers to the different number of times a particular kind of report is to have been submitted. This differs significantly between the two call categories since they both had different implementation periods being 3 and 2 years for first call and second call BOs respectively.

Each of the factors under the compliance criteria was scored independently. However, similar scoring procedures were adopted for the submission of monthly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports as well as the annual reports. The scoring was done as a team. Tables 10 and 11 below provide aggregate scores on the compliance criteria for first and second call BOs respectively.

COMPLIANCE (55)	ACTUAL SCORE BY FIRST CALL BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS										
	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	AITI – KACE
Score on submission of monthly financial reports	6	4	11	2	9	7	1	8	10	3	5
Score on submission of semi-annual progress reports	3	11	8	6	9	6	10	1	7	2	4
Score on submission of annual reports	11	11	11	3	11	3	11	5	11	3	5
Score on number of Audit Queries attracted	11	4	8	8	11	11	2	4	8	2	8
Score on Audit recommendation implementation	0	10	10	0	6	8	5	0	11	7	0
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>22</b>

*Table 10: Actual Scores On the Compliance Criteria by First Call BOs*

COMPLIANCE (25)	ACTUAL SCORE BY SECOND CALL BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATIONS				
	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Score on submission of monthly financial reports	5	2	3	1	4
Score on submission of semi-annual progress reports	5	1	4	4	4
Score on submission of annual reports	5	5	5	5	5
Score on number of Audit Queries attracted	3	1	3	5	5
Score on Audit recommendation implementation	5	0	0	0	4
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>

*Table 11: Actual Scores On the Compliance Criteria by Second Call BOs*

**Scoring for submission of monthly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports and annual reports:**

- i. Enter in an excel spreadsheet the appropriate score for each report submitted taken due cognizance of the time it was actually submitted as against when it was due.
- ii. Sum up all the scores for each BO to determine the total score per BO

- iii. Compute an average of the total score being: Total Actual Score / total expected number of entries
- iv. Allocate positions of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>..... 5<sup>th</sup> e.t.c to the average scores from highest to lowest
- v. For the first call BOs, allocate an actual score of **11** for the first position, **10** for the second position, **9** for the third position ..... up to 1 for the last position.  
Similarly, for the second call BOs, allocate actual score of **5** for first position, **4** for the second position.....up to 1 for the last position. In all cases, where there is a tie, the average associated actual score is allocated for all BOs involved.

*Please refer to Appendices 2, 3 and 4 for the detailed scoring on submission of monthly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports and the annual reports.*

#### **Scoring for number of audit issues attracted:**

- i. From the composite audit report, identify and count all audit issues raised against each BO for both years 2012 and 2013. Since the second call BOs commenced implementation in 2013, 2012 audit issues are not applicable to the second call BOs.
- ii. Note the total number of issues against each BO
- iii. Rank the BOs according to total number of audit queries attracted from smallest to highest.
- iv. Allocate positions of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> etc starting with BOs with the minimum number of queries.
- v. For the first call BOs, allocate an actual score of 11 for the first position, 10 for the second position, 9 for the third position ..... up to 1 for the last position.

Similarly, for the second call BOs, allocate actual score of 5 for first position, 4 for the second position.....up to 1 for the last position. In all cases, where there is a tie, the average associated actual score is allocated for all BOs involved. For non-submission, a nil score is awarded.

*Please refer to Appendix 5 for detailed scoring for number of audit queries raised*

#### **Scoring for audit recommendation implementation:**

- i. Assemble all audit recommendation implementation letters received
- ii. Take note of the dates on which the letters were received
- iii. Rank the BOs according to the dates on which the letters were received (ie. from earliest to latest)



- iv. Allocate positions of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> etc according to the rankings above
- v. For the first call BOs, allocate an actual score of 11 for the first position, 10 for the second position, 9 for the third position ..... up to 1 for the last position.

Similarly, for the second call BOs, allocate actual score of 5 for first position, 4 for the second position.....up to 1 for the last position. In all cases, where there is a tie, the average associated actual score is allocated for all BOs involved.

*Please refer to Appendix 6 for detailed scoring on audit recommendation implementation*

## 2. Scoring Procedure – Effectiveness Criteria

BO	NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - EARLY COMPLETION OF WORK PLANS															
	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Early Completion	5	11	9	1	2	7	6	8	3	10	4	1	5	3	2	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	5	11	9	1	2	7	6	8	3	10	4	1	5	3	2	4
<b>Marks/11</b>	7	1	3	11	10	5	6	4	9	2	8	5	1	3	4	2

*Table 12: Actual Scores for the effectiveness criterion by First and second call BOs*

The effectiveness criterion was defined in terms of how early a Beneficiary Organization completes all of its work plans. An effective organization would complete its work plans much earlier than less effective ones. The scoring procedure adopted for the effectiveness criteria is below:

List out all BOs under each of the two categories (i.e. first and second call)

- i. Identify all BOs that have completed implementation of their CDM activities in each category
- ii. Rank the BOs according to how early they completed their activities
- iii. Allocate positions of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> etc according to the rankings above
- iv. For the first call BOs, allocate an actual score of 11 for the first position, 10 for the second position, 9 for the third position ..... up to 1 for the last position.

Similarly, for the second call BOs, allocate actual score of 5 for first position, 4 for the second position.....up to 1 for the last position. In all cases,

where there is a tie, the average associated actual score is allocated for all BOs involved

**Team Three - Mid Term Evaluation Consultant**

**Overall Scoring-Outcome by the Mid Term Evaluation Consultant**

Table 14 below provides the overall scoring outcome reported by the Mid Term Evaluation team.

Beneficiary Organization	Supportiveness of internal stakeholders (ownership)			Observable improvement in service delivery			Improvements in work environment			Viability (i.e. BO has built on outputs from own resources)			Total Score per BO			Average score	Total Score used <sup>8</sup>	Ranking
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C			
EPA	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4.5	4	4	4	4	19	17.5	17	17.8	<b>35.60</b>	1
OHCS	4	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	3.5	4	3	3	4	15	14	16	15.0	<b>30.00</b>	2
MOF	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	13	15	14	14.0	<b>28.00</b>	3
AITI-KACE	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	15	13	14	14.0	<b>28.00</b>	3
OoP	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	1	3	13	13	14	13.3	<b>26.60</b>	4
PSC	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	1	2	12	13	11	12.0	<b>24.00</b>	5
MELR	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	14	11	11	12.0	<b>24.00</b>	6
FWSC	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	12	10	12	11.3	<b>22.60</b>	7
NDPC	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	3	10	10	12	10.7	<b>21.40</b>	8
MDPI	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	12	9	10	10.3	<b>20.60</b>	9
MOTCCA	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	3	11	10	11	10.7	<b>21.40</b>	10
MWRWH	4	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	4	2	2	14	8	10	10.7	<b>21.40</b>	10
MoTI	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	3	2	1	3	12	8	12	10.7	<b>21.40</b>	10
FDA	4	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	4	9	8	12	9.7	<b>19.40</b>	11
MOFA	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	10	9	10	9.7	<b>19.40</b>	11
MoGCSP	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	12	8	9	9.7	<b>19.40</b>	11

*Table 13: Scoring Outcome from the Mid-Term Evaluation Team*

The team of consultants selected to carry out the Mid Term Evaluation of the CDM-pilot was given an additional task to submit a list of six best performing beneficiary organizations. The consultants were to determine their own evaluation criteria independent of what the other teams had used. Four individual consultants from Cicada conducted the evaluations independently, with each one focusing on particular evaluation criteria. Scores from the consultant was to constitute 40% of the total score.

**Justification for Selection of the Consulting Team**

By virtue of the fact that the consultants had just completed a Mid-Term Evaluation of the CDM-pilot, the consultant would have visited and interacted with all the BOs. These

<sup>7</sup> The average score is over 20 since each of the three evaluators in the team (named A, B, and C here) scored on 5 for each criteria.

<sup>8</sup> The scores in this column account for the 40% allocation to the consulting team. Essentially, the figures are twice those of the average scores.

interactions would have given the consultant greater insights about the impressions of the BOs on the CDM. These can potentially influence the level of effort to be applied to promote sustainability of CDM activities by the various BOs.

**Evaluation Platform Used:**

Visits and interactions with the various BOs during the Mid Term Evaluation exercise.

**Evaluation Factors/Criteria Used:**

Four main factors were used to assess the performance of the BOs. These are:

#	Criteria	Measure and Qualifiers
1	Supportiveness of internal stakeholders (ownership)	How well have staff bought in to the change (i.e. knowledge of the intervention, involvement with the intervention, as well as active promotion of the intervention)
2	Observable improvement in service delivery	Positive changes in the way of doing business (improved internal/external communication, work ethics, service delivery, time saving, cost saving etc). Maximum use of output-physical facilities, equipment, software etc.
3	Improvements in work environment	Improved effectiveness at work, convenience in work delivery, improved access to equipment and tools, behavioral change of staff, and customer feedback
4	Viability (i.e. BO has built on outputs from own resources)	Is it self-sustaining in terms of resource needs, skills retention and knowledge transfer?

*Table 14: Evaluation criteria/factors used by the Mid Term Evaluation Consultant*

Kindly refer to the complete write-up by the consultants as appendix 7 attached.

**APPENDIX 1: DETAILED SCORES BY THE INDIVIDUAL ISC EVALUATING TEAM MEMBERS**

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP																			
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT																			
NO	PART	CEILING	AIT-KACE	MOF	NDPC	MOFA	MELR	MOTCCA	EPA	OOP	MOTI	OHCS	FDA	PSC	MWRWH	MOGCSP	FWSC	MDPI	
<b>CAGD</b>																			
1	CONCEPT	10	6	4	6	8	7	7	5	6	6	8	7	6	7	7	6	7	
2	STRUCTURE	10	6	5	6	9	7	7	6	5	7	8	7	7	7	8	7	7	
3	CONTENT	10	6	7	5	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	
4	OUTCOME/EVIDENCE	10	7	6	6	7	6	6	5	8	5	7	7	6	8	6	6	6	
5	OWNERSHIP	10	7	4	7	6	7	6	7	7	7	8	5	6	7	6	7	6	
6	COMFORT	10	8	7	8	8	6	9	6	7	5	7	8	7	8	6	7	7	
7	INTERNAL ASSESSMENT	40																	
	<b>TOTAL (CAGD)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>40</b>	
<b>GIMPA</b>																			
1	CONCEPT	10	5	5	6	6	6	8	5	7	8	7	8	7	5	6	8	7	
2	STRUCTURE	10	4	6	6	6	7	7	6	7	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	
3	CONTENT	10	6	7	8	8	8	7	7	6	7	7	7	8	6	7	5	7	
4	OUTCOME/MAINSTREAMING	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	7	6	9	8	4	9	7	7	8	
5	EVIDENCE	10	7	8	8	8	8	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	8	6	
6	COMFORT	10	9	8	8	9	9	7	7	7	5	9	9	8	8	9	5	9	
7	INTERNAL ASSESSMENT	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>TOTAL (GIMPA)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>43</b>	
<b>AUDIT SERVICE</b>																			
1	CONCEPT	10	6	6	7	8	7	6	5	7	7	7	8	8	7	7	6	8	
2	STRUCTURE	10	7	7	7	8	7	6	5	7	7	7	8	6	6	7	6	8	
3	CONTENT	10	6	7	7	8	7	6	5	6	7	8	7	5	7	6	8	8	
4	OUTCOME/MAINSTREAMING	10	7	5	5	7	5	5	5	6	5	7	7	6	6	5	6	6	
5	EVIDENCE	10	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	7	7	7	5	6	5	6	
6	COMFORT	10	7	5	8	7	7	7	4	6	6	7	9	5	3	8	5	7	
7	INTERNAL ASSESSMENT	40																	
8	<b>TOTAL (AUDIT SERVICE)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>43</b>	
<b>PSRS</b>																			
1	CONCEPT	10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7			7	7	7	7	7	7		
2	STRUCTURE	10	7	6	7	6	6	7	6			6	7	6	7	7	7		
3	CONTENT	10	6	7	6.5	7	7	7.5	6			7	6.5	6	6	6	6		
4	OUTCOME/MAINSTREAMING	10	5	6	6	8	7	8	5			6.5	6	7	5	5.5			
5	EVIDENCE	10	6	8	5	6	6	6.5	5			6.5	6	6	6	6			
6	COMFORT	10	8	8	7.5	7.5	8	8	7.5			8	8	8	8	8			
7	INTERNAL ASSESSMENT	40																	
8	<b>TOTAL (PSRS)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>177.5</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>140.5</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>173.5</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>160.5</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>126</b>	
	<b>AVERAGE (BASED ON THREE SCORES)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52.67</b>	<b>51.33</b>	<b>54.00</b>	<b>59.17</b>	<b>56.00</b>	<b>55.67</b>	<b>46.83</b>	<b>39.33</b>	<b>37.67</b>	<b>57.67</b>	<b>57.83</b>	<b>52.33</b>	<b>51.67</b>	<b>53.50</b>	<b>37.33</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>-</b>
		<b>30%</b>	<b>15.80</b>	<b>15.40</b>	<b>16.20</b>	<b>17.75</b>	<b>16.80</b>	<b>16.70</b>	<b>14.05</b>	<b>11.80</b>	<b>11.30</b>	<b>17.30</b>	<b>17.35</b>	<b>15.70</b>	<b>15.50</b>	<b>16.05</b>	<b>11.20</b>	<b>12.60</b>	

CAGD	Controller and Accountant General Department
GIMPA	Ghana Institute of Management and Productivity Institute
GAS	Ghana Audit Service
PSRS	Public Sector Reform Secretariat

**Legend 1: Institutions whose representatives formed the ISC evaluating team**

**APPENDIX 2: DETAILED SCORING ON SUBMISSION OF MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS BY CDM SECRETARIAT**

BO	NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS															
	FIRST CALL Bos											SECOND CALL Bos				
	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Jun-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jul-12	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aug-12	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sep-12	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oct-12	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nov-12	10	0	0	0	7	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dec-12	10	0	0	3	5	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jan-13	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	10	3	5	0	0	0	0	0
Feb-13	3	3	3	3	7	3	0	5	10	3	5	0	0	0	0	0
Mar-13	5	3	3	3	7	3	0	3	10	3	7	0	0	0	0	0
Apr-13	7	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	10	3	5	0	0	0	0	0
May-13	7	3	3	3	3	10	0	3	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0
Jun-13	10	3	3	5	7	5	0	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Jul-13	5	3	5	7	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Aug-13	5	3	7	7	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Sep-13	5	3	7	3	0	5	3	3	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Oct-13	5	3	7	3	0	5	3	3	7	3	3	3	0	5	0	0
Nov-13	5	3	10	3	3	7	3	3	7	3	5	3	0	5	0	5
Dec-13	5	5	10	3	3	10	3	10	10	3	5	3	0	7	0	7
Jan-14	3	3	7	3	3	5	7	3	10	3	0	5	0	3	3	10
Feb-14	3	3	7	3	3	7	10	3	7	3	3	5	0	3	3	7
Mar-14	3	3	10	3	5	10	5	3	10	3	3	7	0	3	3	7
Apr-14	3	3	10	3	5	3	3	3	10	3	3	10	3	7	3	5
May-14	3	3	10	3	7	3	3	3	10	3	5	10	3	5	3	5
Jun-14	3	5	10	3	7	3	3	3	10	3	5	7	3	7	5	7
Jul-14	3	7	7	0	7	5	3	3	7	5	7	7	3	7	3	7
Aug-14	3	10	7	0	5	5	3	5	5	5	7	10	3	5	3	7
Sep-14	5	5	7	0	5	5	3	5	0	5	5	10	3	7	3	5
Oct-14	7	7	7	0	5	5	3	7	0	5	7	10	3	10	3	7
Nov-14	0	7	10	0	7	7	3	10	0	5	3	10	5	7	3	10
Dec-14	0	7	7	0	0	5	5	10	0	5	5	7	7	10	7	7
Jan-15	0	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	7
Feb-15	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	10
Mar-15	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	7
Apr-15	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	7
May-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>127</b>
# of Mths	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	24	24	24	24	24
Average	3.36	2.81	4.81	2.31	3.97	3.53	1.92	3.64	4.39	2.33	2.97	5.46	2.83	4.92	1.75	5.29
Rounded	3	3	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	3	5	3	5	2	5
<b>Position</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BO</b>	<b>OOP</b>	<b>PSC</b>	<b>NDPC</b>	<b>OHCS</b>	<b>MOF</b>	<b>MOFA</b>	<b>MWRWH</b>	<b>MOTCCA</b>	<b>EPA</b>	<b>MOGCSP</b>	<b>KACE</b>	<b>FWSC</b>	<b>MOTI</b>	<b>MELR</b>	<b>FDA</b>	<b>MDPI</b>
<b>Marks/11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>

	Marks allocated for submitting each financial report					
	<15 days after each month ending	within one month after it is due	Within three months after due	Submitted within six months of due	Submitted in bulk or within one year of due	Submitted after one year and Non submission
Monthly financial reports	10	7	5	3	1	0

**Legend 2: Scoring-legend for submission of monthly financial returns**

**APPENDIX 3: DETAILED SCORING ON SUBMISSION OF SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS BY CDM SECRETARIAT**

NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS																
DATE DUE	FIRST CALL Bos											SECOND CALL Bos				
	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Dec-12	0	7	7	0	5	5	7	7	7	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Jun-13	7	7	7	7	3	7	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
Dec-13	3	7	0	5	5	0	5	0	3	3	3	5	5	5	0	5
Jun-14	7	5	7	7	7	7	5	0	5	3	5	5	0	5	5	0
Dec-14	0	3	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	5
Jun-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
# of Bi-annuals	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	4	4	4
Average	2.83	4.83	3.50	3.17	3.83	3.17	4.50	1.17	3.33	1.83	3.00	5.00	1.25	2.50	2.50	2.50
Rounded	3	5	4	3	4	3	5	1	3	2	3	5	1	3	3	3
Position	9	1	4	6	3	6	2	11	5	10	8	1	5	2	2	2
BO	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Marks/11	3	11	8	6	9	6	10	1	7	2	4	5	1	4	4	4

	Marks allocated for submitting semi-annual progress report				
	Within three months after due	within six months of due	within one year of due	after one year of due	Non submission
Semi-annual progress reports	7	5	3	1	0

**Legend 3: Scoring-legend for submission of semi-annual progress reports**

**APPENDIX 4: DETAILED SCORING ON SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL REPORTS BY CDM SECRETARIAT**

NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - ANNUAL REPORTS																
FIRST CALL BOs												SECOND CALL BOs				
DATE	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Dec-12	5	5	3	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Dec-13	5	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3
Dec-14	3	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	5
	13	13	13	9	13	9	13	11	13	9	11	8	8	8	8	8
# of Annuals	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
Average	4.33	4.33	4.33	3.00	4.33	3.00	4.33	3.67	4.33	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Rounde	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Position	1	1	1	9	1	9	1	7	1	9	7	1	1	1	1	1
BO	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Marks/11	11	11	11	3	11	3	11	5	11	3	5	5	5	5	5	5

Marks allocated for submitting annual report				
	Within three months after due	within six months of due	within one year of due	after one year of due and non-submission
Annual reports	5	3	1	0

**Legend 4: Scoring-legend for submission of annual reports**

**APPENDIX 5: DETAILED SCORING ON NUMBER OF AUDIT QUERIES ATTRACTED BY BOS**

	NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - NUMBER OF AUDIT QUERIES ATTRACTED															
	FIRST CALL Bos											SECOND CALL Bos				
	O O P	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE	FWSC	MOTI	MOELR	FDA	MDPI
# of Audit Queries - 2012	3	5	4	3	3	3	7	5	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0
# of Audit Queries - 2013	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Rank																
<b>Marks/11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

	Total Number of audit queries attracted by BO			
Number of Audit Queries raised in 2012	X	X	X	X
Number of Audit Queries raised in 2013	X	X	X	X
Total number of audit queries raised	XX	XX	XX	XX

**Legend 5: Scoring-legend for total number of audit queries attracted by BO.**



**APPENDIX 6: DETAILED SCORING ON AUDIT RECOMMENDATION IMPLEMENTATION**

BO	NAME OF BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION - AUDIT RECOMMENDATION IMPLEMENTATION																
	OOP	PSC	NDPC	OHCS	MOF	MOFA	MWRWH	MOTCCA	EPA	MOGCSP	KACE		FWSC	MOTI	MELR	FDA	MDPI
Date Submitted	N/S <sup>9</sup>	Jan 26, 2015	Jan 26, 2015	N/S	Mar. 27, 2015	Feb 13, 2015	April 2, 2015	N/S	Jan 2, 2015	Mar. 16, 2015	N/S		Feb 04, 2015	N/S	N/S	N/S	Mar. 19, 2015
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	2nd	2nd	0	5th	3rd	6th	0	1st	4th	0		1st	0	0	0	2nd
<b>Marks/11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>

	Marks allocated for submitting audit recommendation implementation notice			
	Within three months after due	within six months of due	within one year of due	after one year of due and non-submission
Audit recommendation implementation	5	3	1	0

*Legend 6: Scoring-legend for audit recommendation implementation*

<sup>9</sup> N/S means not submitted as at June 29, 2015 (i.e. 15<sup>th</sup> ISC meeting)