



COPEGOL-RWANDA SCORING SHEET 2008

TABLE 1: QUALITY OF THE PRACTICE (35%)

Transparency	Accountability		Participation	Legality/Innovation	
	Voice	Responsiveness			
<p>The established proof that the practice is visible to citizens. <i>(postings, flyers distribution, dissemination meetings, radio announcement, door to door information campaign, others)</i></p>	<p>Mechanisms available to citizens/beneficiaries to ask questions and express needs or complaints in the execution of the practice <i>(councilor representation, NGO representation public consultation, radio, others)</i></p>	<p>Availability of ways which the practice provides answers to the concerns of citizens/beneficiaries <i>(complaints registration, informal or formal response, private or public explication/justification, consultative action, others)</i></p>	<p>Degree of inclusion of various groups of citizens in practice implementation <i>(considerations for languages, age, gender, handicap, poverty level, others)</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the practice implementation fits into the current legal legislations.</p>	
<p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no proof 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 proofs 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 proofs 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 proof</p>	<p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanisms 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 mechanisms</p>	<p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no ways 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 ways 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 ways 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 ways</p>	<p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no considerations 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 considerations s 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 considerations 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 considerations</p>	<p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> non legal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> respects legal texts 2 <input type="checkbox"/> respects law and community added new elements 3 <input type="checkbox"/> practice is totally initiated by community, and could inspire enactment of new law</p>	
Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	
SCORE TABLE 1				/12	<b>/35</b>



COPEGOL-RWANDA SCORING SHEET 2008

TABLE 2 : GENERAL PERFORMANCE OF PROCESS						
Decision Steps	Planning	Budgeting	Service Delivery	Procurement	Auditing	Monitoring and Evaluation
Transparency	<p>Mechanisms of disseminating periodic planning reports to the public domain.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanisms            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 mechanisms</p>	<p>Mechanisms used to disseminate periodic budget execution reports to the public domain.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanisms            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 mechanisms</p>	<p>Mechanisms used to inform citizens on the availability of the key public services</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanisms            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 mechanisms</p>	<p>Procurement process, in accordance to the Public Procurement Act, is publicized via different modes of communication.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no            1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes            2 <input type="checkbox"/> regularly            3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p>	<p>Audit reports are distributed/made available.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never            1 <input type="checkbox"/> to councilors            2 <input type="checkbox"/> to councilors and some selected groups of citizens            3 <input type="checkbox"/> to all</p>	<p>Evidence that objectives and results of a project are communicated to the public.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no communication            1 <input type="checkbox"/> communication for a few projects            2 <input type="checkbox"/> communication for most of projects            3 <input type="checkbox"/> communication for all projects</p>
	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:
Transparency	<p>Mechanisms of disseminating Action Plan to the public domain</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanism            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms            3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms</p>	<p>Mechanisms used to inform citizens about objectives and process of resources mobilization (tax)</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no mechanism            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 mechanisms            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 mechanisms            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 mechanisms</p>	<p>The percentage of beneficiaries aware of procedures to access the services provided.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> &lt;10%            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 11% - 35%            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-60%            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥61 %</p>	<p>Various tender notices and tender awards are publicly announced</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no            1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes            2 <input type="checkbox"/> regularly            3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p>		<p>Means of disseminating Progress Reports on various programs to the public</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no means            1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 means            2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 means            3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 means</p>
	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:



COPEGOL-RWANDA SCORING SHEET 2008

<b>Participation</b>	<p>Involvement of citizens in the various stages of planning process (<i>need assessment, prioritization, validation, others</i>)</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no citizens' involvement          1 <input type="checkbox"/> involvement at one stage of planning process          2 <input type="checkbox"/> involvement at most stages of planning process          3 <input type="checkbox"/> involvement at all stages of planning process</p>	<p>Degree of involvement of councilors and citizens in budget preparation.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> budget prepared by executive secretary only          1 <input type="checkbox"/> budget prepared by executive bureau          2 <input type="checkbox"/> budget discussed in council, without citizen participation          3 <input type="checkbox"/> budget discussed in council, with citizen participation</p>	<p>Degree of involvement of citizens in taking care of public infrastructures (<i>markets, roads, water, health centers, schools hospitals, others</i>)</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no infrastructure is managed by community          1 <input type="checkbox"/> a few infrastructure is managed by community          2 <input type="checkbox"/> many infrastructure are managed by community          3 <input type="checkbox"/> all infrastructure are managed by community</p>	<p>Degree of involvement of citizens in tender committees</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no tender committee          1 <input type="checkbox"/> tender committee exists but does not include citizens          2 <input type="checkbox"/> tender committee sometimes includes citizens (as observant or participants)          3 <input type="checkbox"/> tender committee most of time includes citizens (as observant or participants)</p>	<p>Ways of involvement of citizens in discussing final accounts before audit</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> non existent          1 <input type="checkbox"/> citizen may initiate audit          2 <input type="checkbox"/> citizens' input is included in audit process          3 <input type="checkbox"/> citizen groups may carry out external audit</p>	<p>Degree of involvement of citizens in monitoring and evaluation of projects being implemented</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> non existent          1 <input type="checkbox"/> informal, punctual and individual          2 <input type="checkbox"/> informal, regular collective          3 <input type="checkbox"/> formal, regular and collective</p>
	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:



# COPEGOL-RWANDA SCORING SHEET 2008

<b>Accountability</b>	<b>Voice</b>	<p>Coverage of consultations carried out to find out citizens needs and priorities in order elaborate the plan</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> &lt;25% population 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 25% - 44% population 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 45-79% population 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥80 % population</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Opportunities available to citizens/beneficiaries to raise their concerns related to allocation of available resources to priority projects/program (<i>individual hearings, public sessions of council, radio program, NGO representation, others</i>)</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no opportunities 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 opportunities 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 opportunities 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 opportunities</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Opportunities available to citizens/beneficiaries to complaint on quality of service delivery</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no opportunities 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 opportunities 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 opportunities 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 opportunities</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Opportunities available to citizens denounce irregularities in tender award process</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no opportunities 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 opportunities 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 opportunities 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 opportunities</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Opportunities available to citizens denounce irregularities in administrative and financial procedures</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no opportunities 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 opportunities 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 opportunities 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 opportunities</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Opportunities for citizens/beneficiaries inquire about non-performing projects</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> no opportunities 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,2 opportunities 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,4 opportunities 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥5 opportunities</p> <p>Comments:</p>
	<b>Responsiveness</b>	<p>Number of times councilors provided explanations to citizens complaining about the plan not taking their needs into account</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Number of times councilors provided explanations to citizens complaining about budgetary allocations</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Number of times councilors provided explanations to beneficiaries' reported dissatisfaction on the quality of service provided.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Number of times councilors provided explanations to regarding procurement process</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Number of times councilors responded to citizens' questions or to the queries raised in auditors reports.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>Number of times explanations was given to citizens/beneficiaries about performance of various projects/programs.</p> <p>0 <input type="checkbox"/> never 1 <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> most of times 3 <input type="checkbox"/> always</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<b>SCORE TABLE 2</b>		/15 (Audit: /12)					<b>/25</b>



**TABLE 3: SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT (20%)**

Coverage	Equity	Social inclusion	Environmental Considerations	Social Peace
Percentage of the population covered/benefiting	Evidence that the practice treats participants according to capability and affordability criteria	Evidence that the practice considers People living with HIV/AIDS	Evidence that practice implementation integrates environmental protection concerns such as soil erosion (terracing)	Established mechanism to mitigate social conflicts
0 <input type="checkbox"/> <10% 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 11% - 35% 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-60% 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥61 %	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes
Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:
	Evidence of Participation in the program without discrimination	Evidence that the marginalized population (women, genocide survivors, people with disabilities and children) are covered by the practice.		Evidence that the practice incorporates mechanism for addressing the effects of genocide ideology.
	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes		0 <input type="checkbox"/> no 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes
	Comments:	Comments:		Comments:
SCORE TABLE 3	/10			<b>/20</b>



**TABLE 4: SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION**

GGP Durable	Citizens Perceptions (public trust, local governance credibility, legitimacy)	Financial feasibility	Technical feasibility
Evidence that existing institutions involved in the implementation of the practice are supportive of the practice	The percentage of the citizens/beneficiaries considering the practice to be legitimate/non-corrupted	Documented evidence available showing financial operational costs of the practice can be borne from locally mobilized resources	Level of technical competences for implementing the practice
0 <input type="checkbox"/> none 1 <input type="checkbox"/> practice has become customary 2 <input type="checkbox"/> practice is formally inserted in modus operand of district 3 <input type="checkbox"/> practice is formally inserted in modus operand of district and budgeted	0 <input type="checkbox"/> <10% 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 11% - 35% 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-65% 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥66 %	0 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires 75-100% of external financing 1 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires 35-75% of external financing 2 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires 15-35% of external financing 3 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires no external financing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> - 1 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires constant external technical assistance 2 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires medium level competences, with temporary or no external technical assistance 3 <input type="checkbox"/> practice requires simple competences locally available
Comments:	Comments:	Comments:	Comments:
	Percentage of citizens/beneficiaries consider the practice necessary		
	0 <input type="checkbox"/> <10% 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 11% - 35% 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-65% 3 <input type="checkbox"/> ≥66 %		
	Comments:		
<b>SCORE TABLE 4</b>	/15		<b>/20</b>
<b>SCORE TOTAL</b>			<b>/100</b>