



United Nations Development Programme

Afghanistan

Support to Provincial Justice Coordination Mechanism

ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT 2008

Project ID: 00060050
Duration: 1 July 2008 – 30 June 2009
Total Budget: \$3,181,790
Implementing Partners/Responsible parties: UNAMA

PJCM Donors



Canada



Germany



Italy



United States

Executive summary

The Provincial Justice Coordination Mechanism (PJCM) began operations on 1 July 2008, with the establishment of six field offices within the UNAMA regional offices, covering a total of 27 provinces. This Annual Report covers PJCM activities from then until 31 December 2008.

Over the reporting period, PJCM made good progress towards its primary goals of coordination of the justice sector in the provinces, justice sector assessment reports and improved donor coordination. PJCM teams were able to move quickly towards the establishment of coordination mechanisms among justice institutions in the provinces, and among donors and rule of law implementers. In a very few cases, PJCM took over or assisted in strengthening existing coordination mechanisms, but in most provinces coordination was started from scratch. In some cases, those mechanisms were subsequently handed over to local partners to manage, with support from PJCM. As PJCM staffing moved towards full strength, especially in the more volatile parts of the country, its activities in respect of coordination were able to increase and become more systematised.

The PJCM also completed quantitative assessments of the criminal justice system in its 27 provinces, and a limited amount of information was obtained in respect of other provinces. At the close of the reporting period, information from those assessments and other sources was being compiled into a provincial criminal justice assessment, anticipated to be completed and published in early 2009.

PJCM was able to achieve its objectives in respect of coordination in large part due to the willingness of the direct beneficiaries to endorse the project's mandate. National justice institutions at the provincial level were eager to establish coordination mechanisms and to develop direction and ownership in respect of donor-funded assistance in their territory. Additionally, implementing partners were, for the most part, eager for PJCM to take on the much needed coordination role. It was more difficult for PJCM to complete the criminal justice assessment, largely because of the amount of data involved and the difficulty of compiling it into a useful report.

PJCM has been faced with other challenges. For example, security and distances meant that it was not possible for the project to reach all provinces or to spend an equal amount of time in each. Recruitment problems also meant that some PJCM offices were not staffed within the reporting period. In general, however, these problems were known from the beginning or were simply those to be expected in the initial phases of a project. It is hoped that the PJCM will be able to learn from these experiences and consolidate its activities in 2009, including strengthening the link between central and provincial level justice institutions and completing the various assessments and reports underway.

I. Context

The Provincial Justice Coordination Mechanism (PJCM) was set up as the result of the July 2007 Rome Conference on Justice and Rule of Law in Afghanistan, at which it was agreed that such a mechanism was necessary in order to support rule of law reform and to ensure the coordinated delivery of justice assistance in the provinces, consistent with the National Justice Sector Strategy and the National Justice Program. The PJCM was launched on 1 July 2008 and is a joint UNAMA/UNDP project.

In assisting the Government of Afghanistan (GoA) to systematically expand the rule of law beyond Kabul and to improve the delivery of justice assistance in the provinces, the PJCM aims to achieve:

- (1) effective coordination of donor assistance programmes at a central, regional and provincial level
- (2) identification of, and the mobilization of resources for, future justice assistance to the provinces
- (3) comprehensive regional assessments of formal and informal justice systems in each PJCM area
- (4) facilitation of communication and information sharing between the GoA and the international community
- (5) transfer of expertise and strengthening the capacity of government officials to manage coordination within the justice sector in the future.

The overall aims of the PJCM, and in particular the objectives numbered 2 and 5 in the preceding paragraph, fit within the UNDAF Outcome 4 under the heading Governance, Rule of Law and Human Rights, namely that “more Afghans have increased access to a reformed, comprehensive and effective Justice System”. Similar considerations apply to CPAP Outcome III, namely “Access to Justice and Human Rights improved through capacity building of justice institutions...”.

The development challenges that the project is intended to address can be considered in two parts. One is to improve the ability of justice sector institutions to identify their own needs, whether in terms of human resources, training, infrastructure or linkages with other institutions, and to develop appropriate solutions. The second is to facilitate the delivery of assistance in respect of those needs, for example by establishing coordination mechanisms at regional and provincial levels and by mobilizing resources for training, building projects, improving access to justice, etc.

The direct beneficiaries of the PJCM are, therefore, the provincial and district level justice institutions. The indirect beneficiaries are the people of Afghanistan. While the justice institutions are also the main stakeholders in the project, key partners include justice sector donors and the agencies implementing justice sector assistance projects around the country.

II. Performance review

Progress review

1. Overall progress towards the CPAP outcome and output(s)

The PJCM will contribute to the realization of CPAP Outcome III (improving the capacity of justice sector institutions to deliver justice) through improved co-ordination between institutions and

through assisting the justice sector institutions to identify their needs and to mobilise donor resources to meet those needs.

2. Capacity development

While the co-ordination objectives of the PJCM (as listed on page 4) refer mainly to coordination between the local institutions and the international and donor communities, it was obvious to PJCM teams on their deployment that there was also little or no coordination among the justice sector institutions within each province and that establishing that coordination would enable the resolution of numerous practical problems in respect of the basic functioning of the justice system. The PJCM teams therefore engaged with their provincial justice counterparts (the Ministry of Justice, the judiciary and the prosecution service) to strengthen any existing coordination mechanisms or, more usually, to establish them. Initially, PJCM teams took the lead in organizing and chairing coordination meetings, working with their counterparts to formulate agendas, inviting participants, and ensuring active participation from a broad cross-section of the justice community. As a result of efforts to build the capacity of the justice institutions to do so, mostly through on-the-job mentoring, PJCM has, in almost all areas, been able to hand the chairmanship over to the provincial justice institutions. The latter responded willingly and they now lead nearly all of the provincial coordination mechanisms, whether among the justice sector institutions themselves or between them and the donor community.

PJCM activities have also focussed on capacity building through coordination of the capacity building activities of others, in particular through training and infrastructure projects.

3. Impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries

The main impacts of PJCM on its direct beneficiaries, the national justice institutions, were to improve the institutional relationships among those institutions, and to improve the co-ordination skills of the key officials within those institutions. To some extent, the PJCM was also able to improve the delivery of assistance to the justice sector within the provinces by identifying gaps and possible duplication.

It is too early to ascertain the impact of the project's activities on its indirect beneficiaries, the Afghan population. However, as the justice system becomes more functional at the provincial level, with the assistance of PJCM, the Afghan people's access to justice should increase and with it public confidence in the justice system.

Implementation strategy review

1. Participatory/consultative processes

The PJCM is a participatory and consultative project. At its outset, the central-level justice institutions sent an official letter to their provincial officers, informing them that they should work closely with the PJCM in carrying out coordination activities, and this assisted in building strong relationships between provincial justice institutions and the PJCM teams.

In addition, at the inception of the project, the justice institutions and PJCM agreed that a baseline provincial justice assessment was needed to better inform the rule of law community of the type of assistance needed and who was carrying out such assistance. As a result, the PJCM teams undertook such an assessment in their respective provinces.

2. Quality of partnerships

Over its first six months, the PJCM built strong partnerships with national counterparts at the provincial level, in many cases meeting with them several times a week. At the central level, the partnership between the PJCM and the Ministry of Justice, the Attorney General's Office, and the Supreme Court was not as strong, due in large part to staffing shortages within the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit. It is expected that this will be rectified in early 2009, with the arrival of the Acting Head and other officers within that Unit, and that PJCM will be able to re-establish more effective relationships, including reinstating regular meetings with the central level justice institutions.

With respect to other partners, all PJCM teams, including the PJCM headquarters team at UNAMA, have cultivated good relationships with the other international agencies in their regions, including within the UN family. This has enabled, for example, PJCM to obtain significant amounts of data and information for the PJCM provincial criminal justice assessment report.

3. National ownership

The PJCM was created out of the Rome Conference and is a pillar within the National Justice Program. As such, it not only requires national partnership, but also requires a significant degree of national ownership. All project activities entail joint decision-making with national counterparts through regular meetings and strategy sessions, involvement of national counterparts in the definition of priorities, planning of project resources allocation and/or reporting, and joint monitoring and evaluation. The hand-over of provincial justice co-ordination activities to national partners by PJCM is the most powerful example of how the PJCM encourages national ownership.

4. Sustainability

As outlined above, the PJCM endeavours to strengthen national capacities, support national ownership and build more robust partnerships in an effort to ensure lasting results.

In particular, the PJCM teams have been quick to build capacity and to hand-over leadership of the various provincial coordination mechanisms to the national justice institutions. Over the reporting period, different justice actors joined these mechanisms as they realized the value of coordination and appreciated the role of PJCM within it. The larger the interest and investment in these activities, the greater the chance that these mechanisms will sustain themselves over time. Furthermore, PJCM's coordination activities always entail follow-up action. Meetings are not held in isolation but are part of the broad coordination mandate of PJCM. This strategy lays the foundation for future sustainability of the project.

Management effectiveness review

1. Quality of monitoring

Regular monitoring of the activities of the PJCM teams was carried out by UNAMA through:

- Weekly reports from each PJCM team to the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit on PJCM activities and on trends within each province
- Conference calls and meetings with all regional offices to discuss monitoring and evaluation issues and provide oversight
- Meetings of all PJCM teams with the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit.

Monitoring of the activities of PJCM as a whole has been carried out through:

- Weekly reports to donors that convey what each PJCM Team has accomplished on a daily basis.
- Quarterly project board meetings.
- Substantive and financial reporting to donors on a quarterly basis as per UNDP reporting requirements.

2. Timely delivery of outputs

PJCM commenced its activities on 1 July 2008 and so the reporting period covers the first six months of what was created as a twelve-month project. The PJCM's Annual Workplan contains three main output areas – coordination of the justice sector in the provinces, justice sector assessment reports and improved donor coordination. For the most part, the PJCM is on track to achieve the first and last of these in accordance with the schedule in the Annual Workplan.

PJCM teams were able to move quickly towards the establishment of coordination mechanisms among justice institutions in the provinces, and among donors and rule of law implementers, and some of these mechanisms have now been handed over to local partners. As PJCM staffing moved towards full strength, especially in the more volatile parts of the country, its activities in respect of coordination were able to increase and become more systematized.

The second major expected output, the PJCM provincial criminal justice assessment, was well underway in terms of data collection by the end of the reporting period. Although it was initially hoped to complete the assessment within the reporting period, the massive amount of work involved in collecting and analysing the data produced and writing a report meant that that goal was never realistic. The report is now likely to be published in the second quarter of 2009.

3. Resources allocation

Because, as described above, the mission of the PJCM is to promote coordination, resource mobilization, information gathering and sharing, and capacity building in these areas, PJCM resources are used to support the teams responsible for these tasks. The major costs are the staff-related expenses, and the support needed to permit these staff to perform their functions.

4. Cost-effective use of inputs

Cost-effective use of resources has been a priority in the allocation of PJCM resources. The fact that the PJCM is a joint UNDP/UNAMA project has permitted some creativity in ensuring cost-effective use of resources – including for example arranging for the extensive in-country travel that the PJCM staff members must undertake in order to perform their duties to be provided through UNAMA's existing travel facilities so as to avoid shifting these expenses to the donor-funded component of the PJCM. Housing the PJCM teams in UNAMA regional offices has also helped to contain costs as the PJCM staff have enjoyed access to facilities already in place as part of UNAMA. Yet another example is that fact that the support provided to the PJCM through the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit in Kabul is funded through the UNAMA budget, not through the donor-supported PJCM budget. UNAMA and UNDP have worked together effectively to identify ways to bring the assets of both organizations together to ensure that the support to the PJCM kindly provided by donor countries can be stretched as far, and used as cost-effectively, as possible.

III. Project results summary

Output: Effective Coordination of Justice Sector Assistance

The PJCM fielded teams in six UNAMA regional offices covering 27 provinces and, on the whole, the teams have been able to travel extensively throughout their regions. As discussed above, these teams have initiated and strengthened coordination mechanisms and working groups in all the provinces in which the project is operational, bringing provincial justice actors together as well as coordinating donor assistance programmes. In general, this has been done in accordance with the situation in each province rather than adopting a uniform approach. This section will therefore describe the activities and results of each regional team.

Central Region (Kabul, Kapisa, Logar, Panjshir, Parwan, and Wardak)

The PJCM team in Kabul initiated an ongoing series of justice coordination meetings for each province in its region. The first meeting, held on 13 November 2008, brought the chief judges of all those provinces to Kabul to present a plan for regular provincial coordination meetings. The group of chief judges agreed to hold a meeting in one province each week, thereby amounting to approximately one coordination meeting per province every five weeks. The PJCM team has travelled to each province and gathered the support of other provincial justice institutions and rule of law actors, and set dates for the coordination meetings. During the reporting period, the PJCM team convened two coordination meetings each in Kabul, Parwan, Kapisa, and Panjshir.

The team was unable to travel to Logar and Wardak for security reasons, but planned to bring the justice actors from these provinces to Kabul in early 2009 in order to ensure coordination among all provinces.

Southern Region (Helmand, Kandahar, Nimroz, Uruzgan, Zabul)

When this PJCM team was deployed, there was a justice coordination mechanism in place, a UNODC-led criminal justice working group in Kandahar province. The PJCM team worked closely with UNODC to expand that group to include all justice sector actors and to expand the scope of discussion beyond counter-narcotics. The group now meets twice every month, chaired jointly by UNODC and PJCM. The meetings have produced such tangible outcomes as linking the Criminal Investigation Unit of the police with the prosecutor's office to monitor the status of cases, facilitating access of defence lawyers to detention centers, and correcting the misapplication of some criminal laws.

The PJCM team also began other co-ordination groups in that province.

In Uruzgan, the PJCM team initiated a coordination meeting in Tirin Kot, the first such coordination meeting in that province. One result of that meeting was agreement that PJCM would invite the Deputy Minister of Justice to Uruzgan to view the state of the justice system there, in particular, the situation in the Uruzgan prison, which held a large number of pre-trial detainees. The PJCM team facilitated that visit, and then worked with other parts of PJCM and with the justice institutions on plans to address the problems.

The PJCM team also travelled to Zabul, Helmand and Nimroz. Even minimal contact in the provinces has been met with positive responses. For example in Nimroz, justice actors noted that

the meeting convened by PJCM in December 2008 was the first of kind to take place in the province.

Southeast Region (Ghazni, Khost, Paktika, Paktya)

This is the most inaccessible region in the country because of increasing insecurity. Nonetheless, the PJCM team managed to initiate progressive co-ordination activities in both Paktika and Khost provinces. It was not possible for the team to travel to either Ghazni or Paktya, thereby prohibiting any useful coordination work.

In Paktika, the team chaired a monthly donor coordination meeting. Participants include representatives from the judiciary, the prosecutor's office, the police, the National Directorate of Security, national NGOs, and most international partners active in the province, including the U.S. PRT, the Justice Sector Support Project, and USAID. The group was developing a training, infrastructure, and working group database to be used to plan future activities. This group also linked the national justice actors to the donors to help ensure provincial driven assistance projects.

The PJCM team was also a regular participant in the monthly prosecution coordination meetings, which are attended by representatives from the police, prison, and judiciary in Paktya province. Discussion topics include issues arising from particular cases as well as general justice sector problems.

Eastern Region (Kunar, Laghman, Nangarhar, Nooristan)

This PJCM team concentrated on strengthening coordination of justice institutions in Nangarhar, Kunar & Laghman. Travel to Nooristan was not been possible for security reasons.

The PJCM team established and then mentored a monthly Justice Sector Coordination Mechanism in each of the three accessible provinces. In Nangarhar and Kunar, the provincial chief judge now chairs these meetings. In Laghman, the Governor chairs a general meeting and the Chief Judge chairs a separate meeting that concentrates on specific cases. Participants include national justice officials, the PRT legal teams, and the UNAMA Human Rights Unit.

In Nangarhar, ISAF had been holding a monthly justice coordination meeting before PJCM was deployed. The PJCM team began attending this meeting and played a role in involving non-U.S. actors.

The PJCM team also used these meetings as a vehicle to get ISAF to participate in other coordination mechanisms, such as the legal aid coordination meeting. A quarterly legal aid coordination meeting was chaired by PJCM and attended by the five legal aid NGOs operating in this region. It was the first attempt of its kind to provide a forum for coordination of the services provided by the various legal aid NGOs.

Northeast Region (Badakhshan, Baghlan, Kunduz, Takhar)

The PJCM team initiated, organized, or participated in several provincial coordination meetings for both Afghan judicial officials and international partners supporting the justice sector in the region. In Kunduz, the PJCM team established the Provincial Law Enforcement and Judicial Organs meeting, first held in November, and continuing monthly. This was the first meeting at which all branches of the justice sector came together and this has continued. In Badakhshan, the PJCM team held two Justice Coordination Conferences, which brought together both national justice officials and international and national rule of law implementers to address provincial justice concerns.

In a new initiative, the PJCM team also organised a regional meeting of international partners of justice. This meeting, held in the UNAMA regional office, brought together justice officials from the

four provinces in the region, as well as all national and international rule of law implementers, such as NRC, the German PRT, IOM, JSSP, ILF-A, EUPOL, GTZ, and MPIL. The meeting received widespread media coverage and produced a number of recommendations. The PJCM team is now working to co-ordinate the implementation of those recommendations.

In addition to these formal coordination initiatives, the PJCM team initiated rule of law roundtables in Takhar and Kunduz.

Western Region (Baghdis, Farrah, Ghor, Herat),

This PJCM team established a coordination model for its four provinces that won the approval and support of the national justice sector actors in Herat. The model involves six thematic working groups, focusing on physical infrastructure, training and legal education, prisons and detention centres, legal aid and public awareness, gender issues, and juvenile justice. PJCM, national and international technical experts were to meet regularly to review and evaluate programs in each field in an effort to ensure that the delivery of assistance meets the needs of the province. Each thematic committee was to then report its findings to a central provincial justice coordination group.

During the reporting period, the PJCM team worked to strengthen two of these groups in Herat province - the legal aid working group and the gender justice working group – and started exploring ways to establish a third working group, on prisons and detention centers. The team was planning to replicate these activities in Ghor, Baghdis, and Farrah provinces.

In Herat, the PJCM team also initiated a police-prosecution coordination meeting, with the backing of the chief of police and chief prosecutor.

National level – UNAMA Headquarters

At the national level, the work of the PJCM teams and relations with the national level institutions was carried out by the UNAMA Rule of Law Office.

At this level, the PJCM was able to establish ties with the national justice institutions and with all rule of law implementing projects, national and international. However, shortage of staffing with in the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit meant that the link between the provincial justice coordination mechanisms and the national level were not as well developed as had been initially hoped. Some ongoing activities, such as regular meetings or reports, lapsed during the period, resulting in limited information passing from PJCM to the national level justice institutions. Steps were being taken to rectify these problems during the reporting period, in particular by an intensive recruitment programme within the UNAMA Rule of Law Unit.

Output: Provincial Justice Assessments

Following a request from the GoA for information on the justice sector in the provinces, PJCM developed a methodology to enable a comprehensive assessment to be made. The PJCM teams gathered data from each province to which they had access, following a template designed for the purpose. Information was largely gathered by interviews, telephone calls and site visits. Some information that could not be gathered at the provincial level was obtained by the PJCM team at Kabul HQ.

The data collection exercise produced 27 separate provincial justice assessments. However, the amount of data produced precluded the production of one summary document and instead it was decided to separate some of it into a provincial criminal justice assessment, which was begun during the reporting period. It was intended that, following completion of the criminal justice assessment, the 27 provincial assessments would be prepared for publication and distribution.

V. Implementation challenges

Project risks and actions

Security Concerns

The deteriorating security situation in large parts of the country has made access to certain provinces and districts difficult and will continue to do so.

Action taken: In locations where staff cannot travel due to security restrictions, PJCM conveyed this issue to donors and others in order to readjust expectations.

Politically complex environment

The inherent sensitivity of playing a coordination role in a setting that is both politically complex and involves a complex set of government and donor dynamics can limit the ability of the PJCM teams to achieve planned outputs on time or at all.

Action Taken: This risk can (and has to some extent) been minimized by prioritizing the development of strong relationships with local authorities and other local actors in an effort to sensitise them to the nature of the project and build cooperative relationships within the area where staff can operate.

Centralized Nature of Justice Institutions

One continuing challenge confronting the implementation of the project is the ability of the provincial justice institutions to make decisions without direct approval from their counterparts in Kabul. Getting that approval also presents challenges, given distances and poor telecommunications infrastructure.

Action Taken: PJCM staff in Kabul continues to engage with the justice officials at the central level in order to provide a more direct and easily accessible link to their counterparts in the provinces.

Project issues and actions

Human Resources

The project continued to face challenges in staffing complete field units in each of its provincial offices. Most notably, PJCM has yet to place staff in Mazar-e-Sharif and Bamiyan, as selected international candidates declined offers.

Action Taken: PJCM actively sought new candidates from the DPKO roster and an international staff member was eventually recruited for Mazar-e-Sharif. PJCM also sped up the recruitment of national staff to fill the teams in all regions.

Administrative issues

The PJCM is a joint UNAMA/UNDP project, with each agency having different rules and procedures. A number of different operational, logistical and financial matters arose during the reporting period, not all of which were easy to resolve.

Action Taken: UNAMA and UNDP entered into informal agreements on how to address these issues and many were resolved by the end of the reporting period.

V. Lessons learnt and next steps

Lessons learnt

Establishing a project of this nature has provided a number of lessons, the first two of which noted below relate to the need to manage expectations of the project:

- Each PJCM team must cover at least four provinces, many of which have been difficult to access, given security requirements and weather conditions. This meant that teams were not able to provide even coverage within their areas and, in some of the more remote or insecure provinces, the PJCM teams were fortunate to make one or two trips during the reporting period. Some provinces remain inaccessible. Overall, this meant that it took longer to achieve outcomes countrywide than expected.
- A second problem relates to the criminal justice assessment. The data collected became unwieldy and preparation of a useful report not only took much longer than expected, but also overwhelmed the work of the Rule of Law Unit in Kabul at a time when it was short-staffed. In retrospect, it might have been more useful to have narrowed the project's ambitions, with a more focussed data-gathering exercise and a consequently narrower report, able to be completed in a shorter period.
- Finally, as indicated above, the multiple administrative rules and procedures governing the project has been challenging and much energy was spent dealing with them. Future collaborations of this type should build on lessons learned and, to the greatest extent possible, resolve anticipated issues prior to the start-up of activities.

Recommendations

The priority actions for the PJCM for the remainder of this current phase (until 30 June 2009, subject to any project extension) are:

- To strengthen the linkages between the PJCM and the central level justice institutions, in order to ensure that they are informed of the situation in the provinces and are aware of problems identified through the PJCM and that need to be resolved at central level. It is anticipated that this will at least partly be facilitated through increased staffing of the Rule of Law Unit in UNAMA in early 2009. Among other things, this activity should enhance implementation of the National Justice Program.
- Now that co-ordination mechanisms are established in the provinces to which PJCM has access, to improve their operations, including through sharing information among the PJCM teams on what works and does not work and through consideration of regional initiatives.
- To publish the provincial criminal justice assessment and to implement its recommendations.
- To update and complete the individual provincial assessments.
- To complete staffing of the Mazar-e-Shariff and Bamiyan offices and to extend the reach of the existing PJCM officers to as many provinces as possible.
- To address all outstanding administrative issues, including how to deal with them in future.

VI. Financial status and utilization

Table 1: Contribution overview [Jan 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009]

DONOR NAME	CONTRIBUTIONS		CONTRIBUTION BALANCE
	Committed	Received	
Government of Germany	554208	554208	-
Government of Italy	521181	521181	-
Government of United States	1561308	1561308	-
Government of Canada	545093	545093	-
TOTAL	3181791	3181791	-

Table 2: Funding status (as of Dec 31, 2008)

Financial Status

DONOR NAME	RECEIVED*	EXPENDITURES			PROJECT BALANCE	EARMARKED**	AVAILABLE FUNDING (as of 1 Jan of the next year 2009)
		Period Prior to the Reporting Year	Reporting Year Only	TOTAL			
Government of Germany	554208.00	0	283600	283600	270608	0	270608
Government of Italy	521181.42	0	176073	176073	345108	0	345108
Government of United States	1561308.00	0	754074	754074	807234	0	807234
Government of Canada	545093.30	0	170488	170488	374605	0	374605
TOTAL	3181791	0	1384235	1384235	1797555	0	1797555

Financial utilization

Table 3: Annual expenditure by activity [1 January – 31 December, 2008]

Activity	BUDGET [year-2008]	EXPENDITURES	BALANCE	DELIVERY (%)
Activity 1 & 4 [Coordination & Support Cost]	1397574	1287660	109914	92 %
Activity 2 [Audi Cost]	0	0	0	0
Activity 3 [Evaluation Cost]	0	0	0	0
UNDP GMS (based on donor agreements)	105194	96575	8619	92 %
Total	1502768	1384235	118533	92 %

Table 4: Annual expenditure by donor [1 January, 2008 – 31 December, 2008]

DONORS	ACTIVITY (as in ATLAS)	BUDGET [year,2008]	EXPENDITURE S*	BALANCE	DELIVERY RATE (%)
Government of Germany	Activity 1&4: [Coordination & Support]	263748	263748	0	100%
GMS [7 %, as per donor agreement]		19852	19852	0	
Subtotal [Germany]		283600	283600	0	
Government of Italy	Activity 1&4: [Coordination & Support]	216180	163748	52432	76%
GMS [7 %, as per donor agreement]		16272	12325	3947	
Subtotal [Italy]		232452	176073	56379	
Government of United States	Activity 1&4: [Coordination & Support]	701466	701610	-144	100%
GMS [7 %, as per donor agreement]		52798	52464	334	
Subtotal [USA]		754264	754074	190	
Government of Canada	Activity 1&4: [Coordination & Support]	216180	158554	57626	73%
GMS [7 %, as per donor agreement]		16272	11934	4338	
Subtotal [Canada]		232452	170488	61964	
TOTAL		1502768	1384235	118533	92%