

CARTA

CITIZEN ACTION FOR RESULTS, TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

FACT SHEET

AT A GLANCE SIPP-II SUB PROJECT

“Ensured Good Governance at the Community Level: A Challenge” is a Third-Party-Monitoring sub-project of SIPP II under the project titled “Citizen Action on Results, Transparency and Accountability (CARTA) Program”.

Total Budget: US \$95,405

MJF Contribution: US \$95,405

Organization Contribution: US\$5,405

Duration: February 2014 to March 2015

Geographical area :

80 graduated villages out of 150 from Gaibandha and Jamalpur

Gaibandha: 5 Upazillas and 21 Unions

Jamalpur: 4 Upazillas and 19 Unions.

No. of Beneficiary:

Beneficiaries	Women	Men	Total
Primary Beneficiaries			
Community People (Monitoring team)	1563	37	1600
Secondary Beneficiaries			
Gram Parishad (80)	15948	1189	17137
Total	17511	1226	18737

Implemented by:



Bangladesh Disaster Preparedness Centre (BDPC)
House No # 15 A, Road # 8, Gulshan-1, Dhaka -1212,
Bangladesh

Tel: +88 (02) 986 2169, 988 0573, 881 9718

Fax: +88 (02) 9862169,

Email: info@bdpc.org.bd;

Website: www.bdpc.org.bd

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF SIPP-II PROJECT:

SIPP-II A World Bank financed “Social Investment Program Project (SIPP II)”, also referred to as **Empowerment and Livelihood Improvement ‘Nuton Jibon’ Project** is implemented within a timeframe from 1 July, 2010 - March 31, 2016. This project is being managed by the Social Development Foundation (SDF) under Ministry of Finance, Government of Bangladesh in a total of 15 districts, covering the three regional divisions of Barisal, Rajshahi and Rangpur.

□ The objective of SIPP II:

- improve the livelihoods,
- quality of life and
- resilience to climate variability
 - focusing on empowering the community,
 - prioritizing support to poor, mainstreaming disaster risk,
 - focusing on immediate employment, building and strengthening systems and
 - linking with other programs funded.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE

- Assessment of Transparency and accountability of funds management, as well as
 - the effectiveness of internal accountability and
 - supervision mechanisms

Specially focussing on-

- Transparency in withdrawals of loan disbursement and distribution;
- Effectiveness of the social audit committee;
- Transparency of the procurement process;
- Effectiveness of the mechanisms and procedures in place to prevent and correct misappropriation of funds at the community level;
- Status of idle funds in Community Bank Accounts; etc,

- Improving capacity of existing village micro-crediting supervision structures - JPs, JS and SAC

SUB-PROJECT OUTPUTS

- Partnership Building among partners
- Team Building
- ToT for Project team
- Strategic Planning workshop & Refresher Training on SA tools
- At the district, sub-district and union level:
 - Inception meeting
 - One-to-one discussion
- At village level:
 - 80 Introductory meetings
 - 80 Formation of Sachetan Dals including SIPP beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
 - 3 Regular Coordination meetings and training with 80 Sachetan Dal
 - One orientation on Social Audit Tools to Sachetan Dal
- Conduction of Survey (Perception Survey) - 800 samples taken from both districts. Perception of the beneficiaries on the performance of SIPP-II
- Conduction of Social Audit
 - Input tracking - 78, evidence based SA
 - FGD -158, conducted on two groups in each villages (1. Beneficiaries 2. Member of Committees)
 - KII- 60 (Including the DPM, CTL of SDF, local elite, Committee leader, CF etc)
 - Public Hearing Meeting-18

TPM TOOLS

This TPM process used following Social Audit Tools:

- Input Tracking
- Focused Group Discussion (FGD)
- Key Informant (KII) Interviews
- Perception Survey

Areas were focused through Social Audit:

- Loan Processing
- Fund Management
- Procurement Process
- Effectiveness of SAC
- Committee Reformation
- Status of Savings and Idle money
- Grievance Mechanism

LESSON LEARNT

- Developing a monitoring system involving the community people
- Extracting information through Social Auditing Tools
- For the successful implementation and achievement of the project, the stakeholders (such as villagers, SDF beneficiary and SDF officials) of the project need to be more cooperative.
- Making the community people more Social Audit oriented
- Participatory Trainings or Orientations create friendly environment and scope for sharing knowledge.
- A social interface may reduce the gap between service providers and service receivers as well as create a bridge, which may play a good role in ensuring good governance.
- Enhancing the capability to work under a non-cooperative environment and social auditing activities
- Total monitoring process is a learning process

MAJOR CHANGES/OUTCOME

- Introducing the community people to the existing governing system
- Improving existing governance practices (GP, GS, VCO, SAC etc.)
- Spreading awareness about Social Auditing mechanisms
- Enhancing knowledge to right to information
- Enlightened about Roles and responsibilities of the committee members
- Developing capacity of the Community people
- Enhancing the capacity to maintain documents and record properly

MAJOR CHALLENGES

- Leadership and influence of leaders
- Lack of awareness among the committee member. Male counterparts are performing on behalf of their female counterparts
- Prior permission from SPA before attending a meeting
- Changing the members list and de-motivating the community people to participate in Sochetan Dal formation program
- Mind-set of stakeholders and key officials from GoB
- Unavailability of documents
- Delaying to provide information of Beneficiaries

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION

- Any decisions regarding micro-crediting scheme of SIPP-II should be taken through a 'bottom-up' approach.
- The committees should be reformed every 2 years as per the COM booklets and enhance the internal monitoring mechanism to ensure transparency and accountability.
- The loan should not be handed over to anyone else other than the applicant him/herself. The certified authorities of the SDF and the leader of the various village based institutions should be present while money is disbursed among the beneficiaries.
- The beneficiaries' selection process of SDF, "Participatory Identification of Poor (PIP)" should be updated each year.
- Need to reduce the COM booklet
- Improved beneficiary selection process through engagement of Independent CSO
- SAC can be strengthened by efficient and skilled member.
- All decision, audit, financial and performance related information of both SDF and committees should be disclosed proactively.
- Grievance redress mechanism
- To organize more trainings and regular meetings for the skill development of the committee members as well as the general beneficiaries.



Supported by

