



DFID CNTR: 00 0215A

SLGP Lesson Learning Report Number 904
(Original Number 341)

**Design of SLGP Lesson Learning and Dissemination
Activities**

by

Simon Milligan

November 2006

Table of Contents

1.0	SUMMARY	3
2.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.1	Structure of the report	4
2.2	The process	4
3.0	WHY SHARE LESSONS?.....	4
4.0	WHAT IS AN EFFECTIVE LESSON-SHARING STRATEGY?	5
5.0	OUTCOMES.....	6
5.1	Lessons Learned Reviews	6
5.1.1	Introduction.....	6
5.1.2	Themes.....	6
5.2	Options for lesson-sharing activities and products	7
5.3	Interpersonal communication	7
5.3.1	LLR Feedback Workshops	7
5.3.2	Conferences	8
5.4	Written materials	9
5.4.1	Synthesised reports: the 'How to'	9
5.5	Electronic media	9
5.5.1	Radio	9
5.5.2	Moderated egrouop or listserv	9
5.5.3	Enhanced web page.....	10
5.5.4	Print media	10
5.6	Other dissemination pathways	11
5.6.1	Linking with specialist communicators.....	11
5.6.2	Target audiences and their information needs	11
5.6.3	Flyers.....	11
6.0	NEXT STEPS	11

List of Annexes

Annex 1	Template for Presentation of the Case Studies
Annex 2	Proposed Time Schedule band Budget for the LLRs and Dissemination Workstream
Annex 3	List of SLGP and Related Documents Consulted during Assignment
Annex 4	List of Persons met during the Assignment

Acronyms/Abbreviations

DFID	Department for International Development
EXCO	Executive Council
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FEEDS	Federal Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
HRM	Human Resource Management
IBP	Issue-Based Project
LEEDS	Local Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
LG	Local Government
LLDO	Lesson Learning & Dissemination Officer
LLRs	Lessons Learned Reviews
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MS	Microsoft
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPC	National Planning Commission
OPR	Output to Purpose Review
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PFM	Public Financial Management
SG	State Government
SEEDS	State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
SLGP	State and Local Government Programme
SRIP	Support to Reforming Institutions Programme
SWM	Solid Waste Management
ToR	Terms of Reference

1.0 Summary

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this input require the consultant to assist with the establishment of the lesson learning and dissemination system for SLGP. The report opens with a discussion of the core reasons why SLGP should and is obliged to share lessons on its approach and outcomes. These include a requirement to widen the programme's impact and to remain accountable to DFID. It explores the characteristics of an effective dissemination strategy, arguing the need for a two-way sharing of lessons and ideas. The purpose of the proposed Lessons Learned Reviews (LLRs) is discussed, and suggestions are provided as to appropriate lesson-sharing products and activities. Core outputs of this consultancy include the ToR for the proposed Lesson Learning and Dissemination Officer, the various LLR teams, and the time schedule and budget¹.

The report outlines the next steps to be taken by SLGP-Abuja and proposes that the Lesson Learning and Dissemination Officer position should be advertised immediately and be filled by mid November 2006, with the first LLR commencing by the first week of December 2006.

2.0 Introduction

The State and Local Government Programme (SLGP) is a UK-DFID financed programme that supports effective pro-poor State and Local government in DFID's four partner-states in Nigeria (Lagos, Jigawa, Kano and Enugu) and the Federal Capital Territory area. The purpose of the programme is to enhance the capacity and effectiveness of state and local government to formulate policy, manage resources and support improved service delivery in the interests of poor people.

Since SLGP was initiated in November 2000 it has worked in a total of six states and at Federal level with a number of Federal Ministries and Agencies. The work has covered a wide range of activities leading to varying degrees of success over the years. There now exists a large body of reports and evidence in the field of these successes and failures. With the programme having just over one year to run before a successor DFID-funded governance programme should commence it is important that the lessons learned by SLGP are teased out, shared and built upon.

Besides the need to share lessons with DFID (and other donors), various state governments and federal agencies have shown an appetite for reforms and it is vital that information on SLGP's reform initiatives can be made available to them in an accessible form. Unlike when SLGP started, there are now numerous donor funded initiatives in governance, and each of these streams of work would benefit from understanding of what SLGP-funded initiatives were successful and why, and equally, what were less successful and why.

For these reasons SLGP intends to initiate a robust programme of lesson learning and dissemination. This programme will have its own funding (separate from the SLGP states funding) and will draw lessons from across states and across the years.

¹ These documents are not provided here, but can be found in the original version of this report.

2.1 Structure of the report

Section Two opens with a discussion of the core reasons why SLGP should and is obliged to share lessons on its approach and outcomes, before Section Three opens up into a discussion of what constitutes an effective lesson-sharing strategy. Section Four discusses the purpose of the proposed Lessons Learned Reviews (LLRs) and provides suggestions as to appropriate lesson-sharing products and activities.

2.2 The process

Face-to-face discussions were held with the Programme Coordinator on arrival and before departure from Abuja. Further face-to-face discussions were held with the SEEDS and NEEDS Advisors and SLGP's Financial Controller, coupled with a telephone conversations with the Kano office. Emails were also exchanged with the Lagos, Enugu, Kano and Jigawa offices, and with SLGP's Consultancy Tracking Officer.

3.0 Why share lessons?

There are at least six reasons why SLGP must share lessons learned during its implementation. They are as follows:

- To *capture the knowledge* accumulated by the programme since 2000, doing so before the programme closes in December 2007 (at which point the various teams will dissolve and staff move on), and making this knowledge accessible to a broad range of stakeholders on a longer term basis. In so doing, future initiatives can avoid earlier mistakes and build on and tap into existing pools of knowledge, thereby improving the probability of success. In turn, this should reduce staff uncertainty about the correct course of action and, as a result, lower costs and improve timeliness of responses
- To *widen the impact* of the programme, in part by making available the lessons to non-focal states and federal actors, donors, and other interested parties.
- To be visibly *accountable* to DFID and partners for what the programme is supposed to have achieved to date.
- To build capacity to *analyse* programme experience
- The programme *Logframe requires it to do so*. Specifically, Output D1 requires SLGP to disseminate experience and lessons learned, with related activities and products being OVIs.
- The Draft OPR document (September 2006) calls for SLGP to “[facilitate] sharing of good practice and reform experience”. In various places the review document makes recommendations as to the forms that this might take, including:
 - Dissemination of Federal reforms at the state level, e.g. the federal Debt Management Office.
 - Dissemination of State reform experience at Federal level, e.g. civil service and pensions reform in Jigawa
 - Sharing of good practice between States
 - Sharing of lessons learned within a state, recognising that some SLGP-funded initiatives focus largely or exclusively on one ministry or agency



4.0 What is an effective lesson-sharing strategy?

Despite the rhetoric surrounding the need for lesson-learning and dissemination in donor-funded programmes, there is surprisingly little guidance from donors about best practice in this field. For example, DFID support to this area has tended to focus on how best to disseminate research findings (although clearly many of the principles can be pulled through to implementation and are not restricted to research projects)².

Drawing on experiences from elsewhere³ effective dissemination systems tend to require the following characteristics:

- They place prominence on the needs of the potential user, incorporating the types and level of information they might require into the forms and language they prefer.
- They use a variety of dissemination methods, including written information, electronic media, and person-to-person contact
- They eschew one-way, agency/project-driven flow of information to a passive audience in favour of an interactive and multi-directional flow of information and ideas
- They draw upon existing resources, relationships, and networks to the maximum extent possible while building new resources as required.
- They include effective quality control mechanisms to assure that information to be included in the system is accurate, relevant, and representative.
- They include sufficient information so that the user can determine the basic principles underlying specific practices and the settings in which these practices may be used most productively.
- They establish linkages to resources that may be needed to implement the information.

In creating a working lesson sharing and dissemination plan, the following considerations have emerged from discussions with the SLGP Programme Coordinator (but which will have to be continually assessed over the forthcoming year):

Goal: The key objective of the dissemination effort is to capture the knowledge that has been gained by SLGP and its partners and to share this with other interested parties, enabling SLGP to widen its impact and be accountable to DFID.

Audience: There are two key audiences, namely DFID and government partners. The information requirements of the two audiences are different, with the former more concerned with the implications for ongoing and future programme design and management; the latter, and particularly the civil servants, more likely to be interested in the detailed specifics of how to pursue variants on the initiatives that SLGP has supported.

² See, for example, <http://www.cimrc.info>

³ See, for example, <http://www.researchutilization.org/matrix/resources/dedp/#dissem> and <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/BPG01.pdf#search=%22%22dissemination%20pathways%22%20dfid%22>



In light of this, technical annexes will be presented in the various Lessons Learned Review (LLR) documents. These will not be detailed step-by-step guides of how, for example, to computerise budget preparation systems or establish a Human Resource Management database. Rather, they will be used to flag up key steps, possible sub-steps, critical considerations (e.g. open or closed source codes, biometric data or not), and references to further information (including SLGP reports, post-holders in various government bodies, and websites). This will enable interested parties to consult reliable sources of information for further, more detailed guidance. In addition, SLGP offices will have the option of undertaking more detailed evaluations of specific initiatives or work-streams, and they will be encouraged to do so.

5.0 Outcomes

In accordance with the ToR for this assignment, the lesson-learning and dissemination workstream will be underpinned by a series of LLRs. These should be commissioned from November 2006.

5.1 Lessons Learned Reviews

5.1.1 Introduction

Lessons Learned Reviews (LLRs) are intended to help understanding of why particular activities have been more or less successful in order to improve performance of ongoing and future initiatives. The reviews will enable SLGP staff, DFID, government partners and other stakeholders to understand what has happened in various work-streams, why it happened, what was successful, what approaches require amendment in the future, and what lessons can be learned from the experience. The lessons learned will be explicitly documented and shared with a wider audience.

A lesson – for example, “If one does ‘x’ then ‘y’ will or should happen” – range from the general to the specific, with the latter being of more applicability and interest to practitioners but often difficult to determine and raising difficult questions regarding attribution. Moreover, the more specific the lesson, the smaller the number of people that might be interested. Consequently, SLGP will need to identify and share lessons that occupy the middle ground between generalised rules on the one hand, and bodies of best practice about very specific fields of interest on the other. In sum, the reviews should create an understanding of bundles of rules about practice in particular areas that, if followed, are likely to shape successful results.

5.1.2 Themes

Following discussion with SLGP staff, it is proposed that the following reviews be undertaken:

- Policy and Strategy development (to include LEEDS, SEEDS, FEEDS, and the SEEDS Manual)
- Civil Service Reform and Service Delivery
- Communication and Transparency
- Issues Based Projects (to include the solid waste management and water)
- Expenditure management, accounting and reporting. To include:
 - Budget preparation processes, budget execution and control
 - Revenue generation and management
 - Records management
 - Treasury operations
 - Accounting systems and procedures

- Auditing, public accountability, fiscal transparency and revenue. To include:
 - Internal audit and control
 - External audit
 - Parliamentary oversight
 - Fiscal transparency

5.2 Options for lesson-sharing activities and products

Communication activities should include the dissemination of information products but be extended to the creation of fora to stimulate a two-way exchange of ideas and experiences with a wide range of stakeholder groups. The following activities and products are proposed with that, and SLGP's budget of 130,000 GBP, in mind. As the ToR for the specific LLRs note, the specific activities and products that stem from each LLR should be finalised with the assistance of SLGP staff and government partners, and will form an output of the review work.

5.3 Interpersonal communication

5.3.1 LLR Feedback Workshops

One-day workshops should be held in Dutse, Kano, Lagos, Enugu and Abuja following the finalisation of each thematic review⁴. As workshops usually differ from conferences in that they are targeted at smaller groups of participants and involve a much higher and more active level of engagement, participants should be carefully selected on the basis that they have the potential to influence others in their own and other ministries and agencies. This might include, for example, several Permanent Secretaries, Honorable Commissioners, Directors, members of a State Reform Team, and any 'Champions of Change' known to SLGP, DFID or government partners. The purpose of the workshops would be to provide key partners an opportunity to hear the findings of the LLRs, to debate them with colleagues in their own and neighboring states, and to identify practical measures that could be undertaken by the incoming administrations. (Advance copies of the LLR documents, including the synthesized reports, should be made available to the participants in the days leading up to the event).

Media groups could be asked to attend the initial presentation (of the key findings of the LLR), with short, bulleted briefing documents being provided by SLGP. Non-state actors, including key NGOs, could also be invited to attend (part) of the workshop⁵.

Geographical representation:

Given budgetary limitations within SLGP no more than three states would attend each workshop⁶. Other states could be invited but on the understanding that only food and refreshments would be provided – transport costs and accommodation would have to be met by the participants or their governments. SRIP and other donor-funded initiatives could be requested to finance the participation of their focal states if they are not selected by SLGP.

⁴ Kaduna State partners would be invited to the Kano sessions. Sessions should be held in both Dutse and Kano given the sensitivities regarding Jigawa State Government officials travelling out of state to organised events.

⁵ SLGP might consider the merits of having one or two closed sessions in which only government partners and neighbouring states are present – only 'sanitised versions' of feedback and debate might be forthcoming in truly public events.

⁶ i.e. SLGP's focal state plus two others. Two representatives from each external state would be invited.



Whilst there are merits in a government partner or SLGP facilitating the workshop, it is proposed that the national consultant involved in the preparation of the LLR document lead the session. Whilst this increases the cost to SLGP, it should ensure that the breadth and depth of knowledge gleaned from the various case studies are properly understood, presented and debated in the workshops.

Costs:

See Annex 2

5.3.2 Conferences

A two-day 'end of programme conference' should be held Abuja in September 2007⁷. The conference programme should be developed in June 2007 by the Lesson Learning and Dissemination Officer but should draw on the LLR materials, a reflection on how SLGP has engaged with government partners, and input into future programme design. Participants would include all key partners during SLGP's lifetime, the National Planning Commission, and the MDG Unit in the Presidency⁸. Other participants should include:

- Key advisors in the DFID office and staff from the following projects:
 - Security, Justice and Growth
 - Public Service Reform
 - Coalitions for Change
 - Service Delivery Initiative
 - VOICES
 - Strengthening the National Assembly
 - Policy and Knowledge Facility
 - Debt Management
 - Partnership for Transforming Health Systems
 - Capacity Building for Universal Basic Education
 -
- Key staff in the EC Delegation and experts in the following projects:
 - Support to the National Authorising Officer
 - Economic Management Capacity Building Project,
 - Support to Reforming Institutions Programme
- Staff in the World Bank office and the following projects:
 - Lagos Metropolitan Development and Governance Project
 - State Governance and Capacity Building Project

Costs:

See Annex 2. Note that the costs shown assume that the various donors and their respective projects finance their own attendance.

⁷ This could be followed by an end-of-programme 'party' for all programme partners and SLGP staff.

⁸ So as to influence the criteria and selection of Conditions Grants recipients.

5.4 Written materials

5.4.1 Synthesised reports: the 'How to'.

The new Lesson Learning and Dissemination Officer should be given responsibility to produce concise, 'punchy' documents that stem from the LLR reports. These should be completed within two weeks of the LLR document being approved by the Programme Coordinator, and be presented at SLGP's offices in Abuja at informal, afternoon meetings and be pitched as a pre-publication launches as a way of generating interest and a sense of 'exclusivity' for those attending.

For a suitable example see:

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/how-to-cooperatives.pdf>

This should serve as a guide. Likewise, it is called 'How to' not necessarily because it is a step-by-step guide but rather because it captures attention.

Costs:

See Annex 2. Note that the cost of the 'publication' could be limited to colour ink and glossy paper, with other costs being restricted to the launch event.

5.5 Electronic media

5.5.1 Radio

Coinciding with the pre-publication launch of the respective LLR reports and just preceding the regional feedback workshops, the Programme Coordinator should look to discuss the contents with key broadcasters, including Ray Power. An interview slot could also be requested on Dateline Abuja, which has scope for dialogue with listeners and providing support to an SLGP-supported initiative.

This might require consultation with DFID-Nigeria.

5.5.2 Moderated egroup or listserv

Each LLR feedback workshop should be followed by an electronic discussion, facilitated by an SLGP staff member and/or a 'Champion of Change' known to SLGP. The discussion, which could last for up to two weeks, could be structured around up to half a dozen key subject areas that stem from the LLR documents. The electronic discussion would enable those that did not attend the workshop, including various non-state actors, to participate in the debate, allow donor agencies to develop a more nuanced view of perceptions and realities in government bodies, and assist SLGP to maintain the 'space' for debate about governance reform and institutional change. This activity area could be easily monitored by the number of emails posted to the forum.

The forum could be structured around an automatic mailing list server or egroup. For the former, SLGP would have to decide if the listserv should send several messages daily, or one message in the form of a digest⁹. For an example of the latter, see:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MostSignificantChanges>

⁹ The latter might be more suitable so as to avoid clogging up inboxes and in recognition of the slow dial-up speeds in some areas.



For further information of both options, see:

<http://www.lsoft.com/download/listservlite.asp>

<http://www.listserve.com/>

<http://www.librarysupportstaff.com/4creategroup.html>

<http://groups.yahoo.com/>

5.5.3 Enhanced web page

The SLGP website should be enhanced in four key ways:

- Search engine:
The site should allow for a free and structured search of SLGP documents. A more structured search could include:
 - Location, i.e. Jigawa, Enugu, Ekiti, Benue, Kaduna, Lagos, Kano, FCT or national
 - Publication type, e.g. progress report, OPR, consultant's report
 - Theme, using the titles and the sub-sections of the thematic reviews

For a suitable example, see:

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

- Executive summaries
These should be available through the aforementioned search engine, with a link to download the full document.
- Email to receive updates.
With new reports being posted to the SLGP site on a weekly or monthly basis, potential users should be invited to register for automated emails when something new appears on the site. See, for example:

<http://www.eldis.org/newsscript/select.htm>

<http://www.gsdr.org/go/email-bulletin>

- The SLGP site should register the number of hits recorded every month and in so doing enabling improved monitoring of the lesson-sharing and dissemination workstream.

5.5.4 Print media

As with radio broadcasters, the Programme Coordinator should look to discuss the contents of the LLR reports with key national papers, including:

- Daily Trust (for its wide readership in the north)
- This Day
- The Guardian

This might require consultation with DFID-Nigeria.

5.6 Other dissemination pathways

5.6.1 Linking with specialist communicators

- 'Deposit' key reports, such as the synthesized documents, on key research portals (e.g. ID21, ELDIS) and forward to other key outlets (e.g. the HTSPE-managed PASS initiative)¹⁰.
- Exploit the advisory positions of Higher Education professionals, both to engage with a key non-state actor constituency and to raise issues that they might wish to engage with in a future research capacity, but also to feed SLGP outputs into the high-level forum debates in which senior academics are often involved. Such professionals could be invited to the respective LLR workshops.

5.6.2 Target audiences and their information needs

- Request periodic (quarterly, biannually) 'guest slots' at EXCO meetings, thereby ensuring that SLGP remains well-understood and visible, and heightening the chances of evidence-based policy and action.

5.6.3 Flyers

- The LLDO should prepare A5 flyers for the release of each LLR and associated synthesised document. These should be circulated to the SLGP offices and, in turn, distributed to the offices of key government bodies and non-state actors (e.g. media outlets, key NGOs). The flyers should attract attention to the SLGP website, from where the documents could be viewed and downloaded.

6.0 Next Steps

- The Programme Coordinator to circulate this draft report and invite comments. Particular attention should be paid to the budget figures to ensure their accuracy.
- The Lesson Learning and Dissemination Officer position should be advertised immediately and be filled by 21 November 2006¹¹
- The Programme Coordinator should arrange for Juliet Pierce to return just after the LLDO commences his/her post. It is proposed that Juliet provide the international input to the first LLR, and that her input be scheduled for late November or beginning of December. She should also be asked to provide some orientation to the new LLDO.
- The Programme Coordinator should amend/approve the ToR for the first LLR, namely the review of policy and strategy support. He should identify a suitable national consultant for the second position and ensure that the review commences by the end of the first week of December.

¹⁰ See <http://www.eldis.org/>, <http://www.id21.org> and <http://www.passlivelihoods.org.uk>

¹¹ In addition to exploiting SLGP's personal networks, an advertisement could be posted on: <http://rickjd.proboards104.com/index.cgi> and <http://www.comminit.com/vacancies.html>. I also understand that a Prof. Ikpendu C. Ononogbu is the country representative of the African Evaluation Association. His contact details are: Focal Point Univ. of Nigeria Nsukka Tel: 234-042-770420 Misunn@aol.com ICOnonogbu@unima.wn.apc.org



Slgp

- The State Programme Managers, and SEEDS and NEEDS Advisors be requested to confirm case studies. One month prior to each LLR, programme offices should be invited to confirm or consider which SLGP reports and other materials should be made available to the review teams for each case study, provide details of key interviews to the LLDO, and determine, in consultation with partners, which people should participate in the focus group discussions
- The LLDO or Programme Coordinator should speak with DFID to determine any guidelines SLGP should adhere to when discussing the outcomes of the LLRs with media outlets

Annex 1

Template for the presentation of the case studies

Initiative	<i>e.g. Creation of a Debt Management Desk</i>
Partner	<i>e.g. Ministry of Budget and Planning, Kano State Government</i>
Starting point	<i>A brief description (no more than 4 sentences) of the environment at the outset of the initiative, e.g. No Chart of Accounts produced in 2002; No audit of budget between 1998 and 2003 etc.</i>
<p>Expected outcomes and outputs, and original theory of change</p> <p>Expected outcome: <i>statement of 1 sentence, i.e. the expected result that may be attributable to a particular stream or programme of support</i></p> <p>Expected outputs: <i>bulleted. (i.e. the direct results of the activities implemented).</i></p> <p>Theory of Change: <i>statement of no more than 1 paragraph.</i></p> <p>This section should also indicate when the initiative commenced.</p>	
<p>Process, activities and related events</p> <p>Process: <i>3-4 sentences on how the parties approached the initiative. This is different to the succinct activities detailed below and instead refers to a general approach, i.e. SLGP and government attempted to create a coalition for change with trade unions, CSOs, and Ministry; SLGP had regular meetings with the Permanent Secretary etc.</i></p> <p>Activities and related events</p> <p>Month/year: x Month/year: x 6.1.1.1.1 Month/year: x Month/year: x</p> <p><i>Related events (e.g. KSG organised and held a two-day training for staff of Department x; Permanent Secretary posted to a different Ministry etc.) should be placed in italics</i></p>	
<p>Successes and achievements</p> <p><i>Bulleted list, supported, where possible, by measurable indicators and references to evidence sources (e.g. Published Annual Accounts). Be mindful to compare <u>expected</u> outputs and outcomes with <u>actual</u>. No more than 6 paragraphs</i></p>	

Shortcomings and challenges

Bulleted list. For guidance, consider the following: did the activities achieve the expected outputs and, in turn, the expected outcomes? If not, why not? Should they have been differently? Were/are different activities required? Did the operational context change and if so, in what ways did this affect the proposed implementation? Was the original theory of change flawed? Did the initiative capture all of the risks? What remedial action was taken to address problems as and when they emerged? How successful were these? No more than 6 paragraphs

Costs

Consultancy:
Capital (*sub-divided if it includes several expensive items*):
Sundry expenses:

TOTAL

Show in NGN (remembering to include a GBP exchange rate in the opening pages of the review document).

Relevance

Relevance to Nigerian stakeholders (including State Governments)

Relevance to DFID, other donors and their programmes

In no more than 4 paragraphs, state the relevance to Nigerian stakeholders, DFID, other donors, and their programmes using the two sub-section titles above. Consider the following:

- *To what extent were the original objectives in line with the expressed needs, priorities and partner government policies (see, for example, SEEDS documents, FG initiatives/policies, MDG goals etc.)?*
- *To what extent did the initiative fit with agenda of key parties, such as the Governor?*
- *To what extent are the objectives of the initiative still valid?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the initiative consistent with the objectives?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?*
- *Does the initiative have a potential for replication? If so, with whom/what?*

Effectiveness

In no more than 2 paragraphs consider the extent to which the initiative has achieved its objectives. Examine, for example:

- *The extent to which the objectives were achieved / are*

	<p><i>likely to be achieved</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives</i>
<p>Efficiency</p>	<p><i>In no more than 2 paragraphs consider the extent to which the initiative was efficient in terms of the resources and time allocated? Where possible, examine rates of return (for example, on HRM initiatives one might compare costs with savings derived from the elimination of host workers from the payroll). Where this is unavailable, present contextual information to demonstrate if value for money has been delivered, e.g. a State Government receives a monthly statutory allocation of xxxxx NGN, and SLGP's support to improved financial management cost xxxx NGN. To assist, consider whether</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Activities were cost-efficient?</i> • <i>Objectives were achieved on time?</i> • <i>The programme or project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</i>
<p>Impact</p>	<p><i>In no more than 2 paragraphs consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What has happened as a result of the programme or project?</i> • <i>What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?</i> • <i>How many people have been affected?</i> <p><i>Also consider the (potential) link to MDG attainment in Nigeria and make explicit reference to particular MDGs where possible.</i></p>
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p><i>Brief comment of no more than 2 paragraphs on the likely sustainability. Consideration should be paid to the following questions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?</i> • <i>What is the probability of long-term benefit?</i> • <i>Will the initiative continue after SLGP closes?</i> • <i>Has a momentum for institutional change been generated? Who is likely to drive this forward? Is there or does there need to be a 'coalition for change'?</i>
<p>What lessons have been learned to inform future programme design of [insert initiative type, e.g. debt management offices, IFMS, HR databases etc]?</p> <p>For government partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) xxx b) xxx c) xx d) xx 	

<p>etc</p> <p>For donors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) xxx f) xxx g) xx h) xx <p>etc</p>	
<p>Further information</p>	<p>SLGP documentation:</p> <p>See reports <i>[insert numbers]</i>. <i>(Include partner documentation if available)</i></p> <p>Key contact points:</p> <p><i>Include the name(s) of key individuals in the partner bodies (e.g. Alh. Adamu Garin Gabas, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Budget and Planning, Jigawa State. (This enables interested parties to ‘track’ institutional memory, particularly if post-holders are likely to move within government).</i></p> <p>Other relevant bodies of information:</p> <p><i>Include web links to key documents/resources on, for example, GRC Exchange, UNRISD etc.</i></p>

Annex 2
Proposed time schedule and budget for the LLRs and dissemination workstream

Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
1	Review of policy & strategy work	0																
	ToR ready & consultants recruited																	
	Study 200 b&w copies of the full report & 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to' document printed.	19630																
		610																



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
	flyers printed and distributed				2600													
	Lesson - sharing workshops in Abuja, Kano, Dutse, Lagos and Enugu	2600				2600												
	Pre-release launch & media engagement	100				100												
	Listserve discussion	0				0												



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
2 Review of PFM part 1 - expenditure management, accounting and reporting	ToR ready & consultants recruited	0															
	Study 200 b&w copies of the full report & 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to' document printed. 300 flyers printed and distributed	25800															
		610															



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
3	Lesson - sharing workshops in Abuja, Kano, Dutse, Lagos and Enugu	2600															
	Pre-release launch & media engagement	100															
	Listserve discussion	0															
	ToR ready & consultants recruited	0															



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
	Study 200	18520															
	b&w copies of the full report & 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to' document printed. 300 flyers printed and distributed	610															
	Lesson - sharing worksh ops in Abuja, Kano,	2600															



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
	Dutse, Lagos and Enugu Pre-release launch & media engagement	100																
	Listserve discussion	0																
4	Review of PFM part 2 - Auditing, public accountability, fiscal management & revenue	0																
	ToR ready & consultants recruited	6700																
	Study																	



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
	200 b&w copies of the full report & 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to' document printed.																	
	300 flyers printed and distributed	610																
	Lesson - sharing worksh ops in Abuja, Kano, Dutse,	2600																



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
5 Communication and Transparency	Lagos and Enugu																
	Pre-release launch & media engagement	100															
	Listserve discussion	0															
	ToR ready & consultants recruited	0															
	Study 200 b&w copies of the full report	610															



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
	& 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to' document printed.																	
	300 flyers printed and distributed																	
	Lesson - sharing worksh ops in Abuja, Kano, Dutse, Lagos and Enugu	2600																
	Pre-release launch	100																



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007													
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC		
6 Issues Based Projects	& media engagement Listserve discussion	0																
	ToR ready & consultants recruited	0																
	Study 200 b&w copies of the full report & 300 colour copies of the glossy 'How to'	19560																
		610																



Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
	document printed.																
	300 flyers printed and distributed																
	Lesson sharing workshops in Abuja, Kano, Dutse, Lagos and Enugu	2600															
	Pre-release launch & media engagement	100															
	Listserve discussion	0															



Slgp

Sub Heading	Deliverable	Budget (GBP)	2006		2007												
			NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
7	Lesson learning & dissemination officer appointed	8800															
	SLGP conference	7000															
8	Other related tasks			(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	(WU)	
	10% contingency	14103.5				(SMR)							(SMR)				
	Projected cost	155138.5		(JI)	(JI)						(JI)						
			Website update		(WU)												
	Six-month Report		(SMR)		Juliet's Inputs	(JI)											

Annex 3

List of SLGP and related documents consulted during the assignment

Juliet Pierce	Monitoring and Evaluation for SLGP (Sept 2003)
Steve Bertram and Oluyemi Adeleye	Lesson Learning From SLGP Ekiti: Review of the Service Delivery Improvement Pilot, the SEEDS Process and the Debt Management Unit (Dec 2004)
Juliet Pierce	Report on SLGP Monitoring and Evaluation 2005-6 (Feb 2005)
Juliet Pierce	Monitoring and Evaluating SLGP 2005-6 (May 2005)
Philippa Haden and Daniel Ugwu	Issue-Based Projects: Lesson Learning Review of Enugu Solid Waste Management Pilot (June 2005)
Simon Foot & Juliet Pierce	Design of an Institutional Change Monitoring System (Feb 2006)
SLGP	SEEDS Manual
SLGP	Keysheets prepared in advance of the OPR (2006)
DFID	Programme document & logframe
SLGP	Executive summaries of consultants' reports

Annex 4

List of persons met during the assignment

Date	Institution	Person
18 Oct 06	SLGP	Neil Orchardson, Programme Coordinator
18 Oct 06	DFID	Audu Grema, DFID-Nigeria (informal discussions)
19 Oct 06	-	Philippa Haden (to discuss earlier SLGP reviews)
19 Oct 06	SLGP	Alan Griffiths, FAM
19 Oct 06	SLGP	Joe Abah, NEEDS Advisor
19 Oct 06	SLGP	Obi Ugochuku, SEEDS Advisor
19 Oct 06	SLGP	Neil Orchardson, Programme Coordinator