**THE CIVIL SOCIETY FUND**

**development interventions**

|  |
| --- |
| *Official text from CISU; The particular objective of a development intervention is to strengthen civil society organising to promote the fulfilment of rights and equal access to resources and participation and to bring about lasting improvements for poor, marginalised and vulnerable target groups.**It is also a particular objective to develop the partners’ role as a catalyst, i.e. as someone reaching out to, mobilising and cooperating with the wider society and other actors. This serves to expand partners’ access to resources and financing, while boosting the effect and sustainability of all their actions.* |

1. **Objective and relevance New objective**
* *What is the objective of the intervention?*

Increased quality of education for marginalised children in six public schools in Devdaha Municipality through mobilisation of children and parents, teachers and management in school democracy.
* *How does the intervention contribute towards strengthening civil society organising that promotes compliance with rights and equal access to resources and participation?*
old
The core of this intervention is about strengthening civil society organisation to demand equal access to education and to participate in the decision making in regard to education.
The intervention strengthens the organisation of parents and school age children in 6 wards in Devdaha municipality. Parents are currently beginning to be aware of how they can contribute to enhanced quality education for their children. We want to take this initial mobilisation further and help parents to organise so that they can work as a pressure group towards the teachers, principals and management committee, and to take up their own duty to support the education of their children and to advocate the importance of quality education at ward and municipality level.

The child clubs have started to take a more active role in the schools and in this intervention we want to focus on mobilising them further, so that they are able to reach out to the rest of the students and to community children who have dropped out of school with the message that education is important and that quality education is their right. And also to take this message to the ward and municipality level.

New from here:

During the intervention the local partner Soiya Women’s Independent Organisation will take active part in a new network/movement for quality education that they have recently joined and use the experiences and inspiration from other likeminded organisations to further strengthen the work with civil society in Devdaha. In addition, the leader of the local partner has been granted a seat in the newly founded municipality education advisory committee. She will strengthen the voice of civil society vis-a-vis the local government throught this position.

* *How does the intervention contribute towards bringing about lasting improvements for poor, marginalised and vulnerable target groups?*
From the previous application:

Currently students from poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups do not receive sufficient
education. This issue is a major part of sustaining poverty and social inequality in Devdaha municipality. Therefore the overall goal of the intervention is to strengthen rightholders (parents and children) to be able to uphold a pressure on the duti bearers (school, administration and local politicians) to deliver quality education as well as capacitate duty bearers to deliver a higher degree of quality in education. In this process rightholders themselves will also become more mobilised in support of quality education in their daily lives (eg. be more active in their support to their children’s education).
New:

Mobilisation of parents and children will be done by members of the target groups themselves from the beginning. The local partner will teach the target groups to facilitate their own meetings, make plans and evaluate their actions. This will be a gradual process and after three years they will be able to function independently. The local partner will also ensure that the target groups are informed about the new legal act for municipality level, which has just been put into action. Hence the target groups will be capacitated with information, skills and be a functioning pressure group for the long run.

* *Describe the context of the intervention, i.e. the conditions prevailing in the intervention area which are expected to shape the intervention (e.g. social, economic, political, climate*

*and environmental conditions, and whether it will take place in a stable or fragile context).*

From previous application

Devdaha municipality is characterised by three overall socio-economic groups. The rich land owners who are few and mostly living and controlling their possessions from the capital; a relatively large group of small so-called upper cast farmers, who own 1-2 hectares of land. These farmers increasingly educate their children in the mushrooming market for private education and send their children abroad for further studies and work. These two groups together have been the main actors in public and political life in the area and they are closely linked with the municipality administration and public school managements (who belong to the same 'brotherhood' of elderly males from the same casts). However, in 2017 Nepal carried out a long awaited local election which brought a first generation of elected ward committee members to power. These new ward committees consists of minimum two women and maximum three men and all wards are obliged to represent the different socio economic cast groups. Similarly men and women are to be represented at the municipality level. Hence women, dalits and tharus are for the first time in the history of Nepal represented in high numbers in policial decision making. It should also be added that most decisions and funds have been allocated to the municipality level and some even to the ward level. This makes the scope for dialog about and advocacy for quality education very promissing.

On the bright side most of the children are admitted in the local public schools but attendance is generally irregular and performance is low. Approximately 25% of students attend school regularly while the rest go to school for 10 – 60% of the schooldays. All come out with grades around the minimum and drop out before grade 6. This tendency is high for boys and extremely high for girls where around 1% of the poorest reach class 10. The youth typically marry early, girls become teenage mothers and boys start working at local building sites with their fathers if they cannot gather money to leave the country. SWOs 250 female members are from this group.

New text

Before Skoleliv i Nepal and Soiya women’s organisation began the previous 1-year intervention we had worked with school feeding and school gardens in two local schools for 9 years. We have also had several teacher and paedagog interns from Denmark working in the schools and we have supported one of the schools with home work helpers.

From this work we had the experience that the schools were deliving a very limited quality of education, in terms of repetitive copying of text books, one sided focus on talented students and ignorance of the poorest and most needy students as well as teachers being absent from the class for long periods during the school day.

Our first one year intervention focused on the two schools that we already knew and three more schools (five in total), this intervention gave us a clearer picture of the situation. The teachers get trainings from the government but is is hard for them to put this, often very theoretical training, into practical use. They need to be capacitated in class management (inclusion of all students and focus on learning of the individual) and they need to improve their planning. Our intervention gave teachers new knowledge but above all it was on a more practical level than the governments’ and it contained class management and planning training, therefore the teachers changed their practiceses to some extent following the training and it is our belief that with a continued focus on the mentioned areas this process will continue, especially if management is improved and if SMC and parents are able to add a pressure on the schools.

The leaders and SMCs made a lot of progress during our intervention. When we started most SMC meetings were about infrastructure and budget for materials and leaders mostly spoke about acquiring more materials. In the end of the intervention the SMCs spoke enthusiastically about the problems of quality in the schools and what they themselves could do to solve the problems. Two constructive suggestions were to put quality education as a compulsary part of the SMC meetings and that parents should take turns to “patrol” the school to inspect the day to day management. The latter has already been practices with success by the SMC chairperson in one of the schools, a very active man, who has helped SWO to put the agenda of lack of quality in the schools to the rest of the schools.

The principals were the hardest group to reach. Three out of five principals were very reluctant to speak about the lack of quality teaching in their schools. After the intervention they were all addressing the problem openly, but they still tend to ignore the problem and focus on the acquisition of materials and trainings for their teachers and leadership training for themselves.

Our impression, supported by the municipality education officers account, is that the principals have received lots of training in theoretical leadership, but lack practical skills and a motivation to put such skills into practise. Just like their teachers they would benefit from a forum where they are facilitated in putting theory into practice, and an outside motivation to use this in their daily work.

The lastest development in the context is that Devdaha municipality is working on a set of quality indicators that principals are going to implement. If teachers do not comply with these indicators, they can be fired.

The new indicators will become a very tangible demand on the leaders and staff in the schools, and as such they can become very useful for the SMC, parents and board. Without pressure from SMC and parents, the principals may not implement strict rules and follow up on quality indicators for their staff, but as the indicators come from the municipality they have a high degree of legitimacy so there is a potential if SWO can continue to support the right holders in the current intervention.

Another change in the context is that two of the schools from the previous intervention will be merged with bigger schools. They are very small and now that the municipality has settled the new structures of decentralisation it is starting to look at how the ressources of the schools can be redistributed. Therefore in stead of introducing only one new school to the current intervention, SWO and SIN wishes to take in three new schools. The schools of concern are bigger (all have at students upto class 8 or 10) and all have students whose mothers are in SWOs women groups. SWO already know the schools and they have on several occassions expressed interest in the work of SWO.

 Still new text:

1. **Partnership/partners**

D*escribe the experiences, capacities and resources of participant partners (including the Danish organisation) and of other actors, if any. If there has been previous cooperation, also describe how these experiences have fed constructively into the design of the proposed intervention.*

Soiya Women’s Independent Organisation was formed by a group of Musahar (dalit) women in 2013 with the support of Skoleliv i Nepal and teacher Menuka Neupane. Prior to this, the women, Menuka Neupane and Skoleliv i Nepal had worked with school feeding and school gardens for 4 years (since 2009). From 2013 – 2017 the organisation Soiya Women’s Organisation grew from 20 members to 250 members while the two organisations implemented three interventions of 200.000 – 500.000 dkk from the Civil Society Fund. The funding laid the foundation for 9 women groups that functions independently today with their own funds, regular meetings and a thrieving garden project. The groups are all represented in SWO’s board. The previous interventions taught SWO to work with group facilitation and currently all groups have two facilitators who run meeting and facilitate new knowledge for the group. Lately, in the previous education related intervention these facilitators taught the groups how to speak up in public meetings, which has increased the participation of group members in municipality and ward level meetings.

In the currrent intervention SWO and SIN want to uttilize these facilitation skills, the women facilitators and speaking skills to create sustainable change for parents and child clubs.

Another important change from before is that SWO has realised the potential of media in social mobilisation and change interventions. It was introduced by SIN in the last intervention (Anne Mette Nordfalk is a communication major) and this time SWO has drafted its own communication and PR plan.

Menuka Neupane’s new membership of the municipality education advisory committee is another new capacity that has developed from the previous intervention and has feed into the design of the current intervention, as Menuka now knows the plans of the Municipality much better.

In addition Soiya women’s organisation’s new partnership with the american NGO Girls First Fund has also fed into the process. It is clear that this new partnership has made SWO more aware of the different components of a development intervention.

Skoleliv i Nepal has also learned a lot through the previous intervention and the organisation is gradually moving from service delivery (school feeding and organic garden training) towards a rights based approach (mobilising target groups for quality education). The board of SIN has had many constructive discussions to get all members of the board on board for this change. Some members are education sector and social sector professionals and have extensive knowledge about relationship building and social mobilisation others are experienced in the development sector and community development in Nepal. All the board members have fed into the current intervention with their experiences from their professional field and through their knowledge of Nepal and Devdaha.

Particularly chairperson Mille Lübbert Hansen has contributed to the application with a vast experience in development issues and in project tools like logframe and theory of change.

As it was mentioned in the cover letter Menuka Neupane and Anne Mette Nordfalk jointly prepared this re-application in August 2019 in Devdaha on the basis of the previous intervention, the rejection of the application from March 2019 Menuka Neupane’s knowledge about the new decentralised system and the latest development in the education sector of Devdaha, and with input from all intervention stakeholders. In this process SWO has appeared to be a very equal and mature partner who has 100% ownership to the process described in this application.

Lastly it should be mentioned that SWO has become a member of a national network for education to strenghten their ability to become a catalyst for change and to improve their knowlegde and skills for advocacy.

* *Describe the roles and areas of responsibility of the partners and of any other actors.*

old

SWO and SIN have designed the intervention together on the basis of learnings from the previous intervention and the current changes in the context. SWO contributes with its theoretical knowledge about development processeses, its understanding of human ressource development, communication campaigning and as a discussion partner who knows the local context quite well. SWO contributes with their indepth knowledge about the social, cultural and economic context as well as their growing knowledge about the new decentralised eduction system and their legitimacy with the target groups.

new

It should be added that SWO also has increased their knowledge about the local education system immensely.

Most of the processes of social mobilisation will be overseen by SWO staff with the help of board members and women group facilitators. Information workshops and theatre training will be conducted by external trainers. The workshop for principals and teachers will be facilitated by SWO partly with support from an experienced management process consultant.

* ***How will the intervention develop the relationship between the partners?***

From the previous application
SWO has become more organised, more profesional and more independent of SIN in the past intervention and the current intervention is going to continue this process. SWO and SIN have always been discussing their interventions very closely and been good at developing a joint understanding of the challenges that SWO faces in their work. There is a high level of trust in the relationship and both sides know that there is an equal commitment to the common course. The current intervention will still build on this trust and understanding. But it will set aside time for SWO to develop new relations to other possible partners and to local funding options, while SIN will step back.
* **How will the intervention contribute to the partners acting as a catalyst? I.e. to the partners building relations to, mobilising and cooperating with other actors (such as authorities, other local, national and international organisations, networks, businesses and other donors) both in the developing country and in Denmark.**

New:

SWO has helped the schools to build new relations to each other by calling then for joint meetings and teacher trainings. In the current intervention this will continue. Child clubs will also be interacting with other child clubs and a leadership forum for principals awill be developed.

On the national level SWO will also use their new membership of the NCE Nepal to feed into the struggle of the education sector on the regional and national level and to feed back experiences from the network to the local level.

SIN will be networking with likeminded organisation through its membership of CISU, share the knowledge gained in the intervention and feed back knowledge from CISU member forums and meetings.

From previous application:

1. **The target groups**
* Describe the target groups’ relevance in view of the objective pursued and set out their role/participation in the intervention.

**The primary target groups:**
 - Parents with school age children who use the public school or whose children have dropped out of public school, in the 6 wards of concern in the intervention. Approximately 2000 parents.
- Within the parents' group the 66 SMC members of the target schools is a separate target group.
School age children (age 6 – 18) who go to or have dropped out of school in the the 6 wards. Approximatly 4000 children.
- Within this target group, the 66 child club members are a separate target group who will be mobilised and trained to mobilise other children, run activities for other children cooperate with SMC and management and run advocacy events directed at the ward and municipality level.

**Secondary target groups are: (text from before new amounts of teachers, parents and students marked in yellow)**
133 Teachers in the 6 schools, as they are the primary service delivery agent of quality education. Their attitude and actions are paramount to the success of the intervention. In this intervention we mainly focus on teachers through the child clubs' and parents' actions, but we also try to challenge the norms and values of teachers in workshops about how to become a more socially inclusive and supportive of students from marginalised communities.

Ward committee members (five in each ward), a newly elected body, SWO will engage directly with the ward committee and invite them for meetings and trainings about importance of quality education. Ward committees are also the target of campaigning action by child clubs and parent groups.

Municipality members (mayor and vice mayor) a newly elected body, as well as education officers. SWO will engage directly with the municipality and invite them for meetings and trainings. Municipality is also the target of campaigning action by child clubs and parents groups.

* *Describe the composition of the target groups, specifying the number of persons in the primary and secondary target group disaggregated by gender, social group and, if relevant, ethnic or other affiliation.*

Total amount of children: 4500 (4000 in 60 school classes and 500 who have dropped out).
Total amount of parents: 2000 . 80% from marginalised communities (dalit and tharu mostly), and 90% from poor or vey poor household irrespective of cast.

Total amount of child club members: 66 – 50% girls and equal representation of different casts (this is a rule in Nepal).
Total amount of child clubs: 6 (one in each school)
Total amount of teachers: 133 – 70% women (primarily brahmin – socalled uppercast).
Total amount of ward committee members + municipality officials: 50. 2/5 women and 3/5 men. (most of the women are dalit members in the wards or tharu as it is a rule that casts are equally represented and that each ward committee has 2 women out of 5 members.)

* *Describe the partners’ legitimacy vis-à-vis the target groups and as champions of the target groups’ cause.*

SWO is a well embeded part of local society through its women groups and it has earned a lot of trust with parents in the past year. They have also become very familiar with the schools and has to some extent managed to get a reasonable degree of authority with schools and teachers. They know the children and they are familiar with the students as a group. They are also very familiar with some of the drop out children, whose mothers are in the member group of Soiya village. This group, who was the first group that SWO founded, is 90% Musahar and has a very high level of drop out children. All in all SWO has a high legitimacy with the target group.
1. **Strategy and expected results**

**All of part 4 is new!**

Describe the intervention’s objectives, activities, expected outputs and indicators to be applied.

* **Overall objective, output, indicators, activities:**

**Objective and relevance**

**Overall objective of the intervention:**

Increased quality of education for marginalised children in six public schools in Devdaha Municipality through mobilisation of children and parents, teachers and management in school democracy.

**Immediate objective 1: Children and parents know their rights to quality education and take action to demand the fulfilment of these rights.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1.1** Parents participate actively in support of increased quality in the schools, report problems to school management committee or principal and support their children’s school performance at home.**1.1.1 Indicator:** At least 50% of parents participate in parents’ mobilisation workshops and school events.**1.1.2: Indicator**: 50% of parents know they have the right to a certain level of quality in education from the school. **1.1.3. Indicator:** At least two parents are present at the school to check up on performance at least two times in a week, and report problems to school management committee or principal.Means of verification: Baseline, endline interviews, monitoring interviews by SWO. |
| **Activity** | output | Means of verification |
| **1.1.1 Orientation meeting for parents about the intervention**10 meetings2000 parents | 2000 parents informed about the objectives of the intervention and their own role. | Minute of meeting with signatures.Photosvideo |
| **1.1.2 New school parents**Quality education workshop/problem identification workshop. Five workshops1000 parents | Parents mobilised to give their opinion about education in the school about the project and its purpose SMC/PTA parents introduced to new role of mobilising  | Minute of meeting with signatures.Photosvideo |
| **1.1.3Indicator assessment and scoring workshop** for parents in each school | 2000 Parents know new indicators for quality education.- Parents have scored their school. | Scoringphotosinterviews. |
| **1.1.4 Quarterly progress and evaluation meetings each school** SMC parents and SWO facilitate | Parents mobilized to have active role in the education of children.Parents are informed about initiatives of quality education. | List of participantsMinutesvideo filmphotos. |
| **1.1.5 Parents Rotation plan**Approximately 500 parents  | Parents are present in the school two times in a week.Parents are informed about progress. | List with signatures.Interview with SMC members and CC members |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1.2:** Child clubs actively inform and mobilise student on their right to quality education and advocate these rights with teachers, School management committees and wards. **1.2.1 Indicators**: 50% of all students know they rights to a certain level of quality education**1.2.2 Indicators:** Students report to child clubs who report problems to school management committees when teachers **Means of verification:** baseline-and endline survey, video interviews, most significant change stories. |
| **Activity** | **output** | **Means of verification** |  |
| **1.2.1 Child club mobilisation and planning workshop.**Three identical 4-day workshops Total 66 children and 6 coordinators | - 66 children from 6 child clubs know the objective of the intervention and their own role. | Minutes, participant lists, six month action plan |  |
| **1.2.2 Meetings in the individual child clubs**66 Child club members and 6 coordinators2 times per monthThroughout the intervention | -6 Child clubs learn how to run own meetings.- Actions for all students prepared | Minutes/notes, observation (by SWO) |  |
| **1.2.4 Actions in the schools**4000 children 12 actions per school per year by the child club.108 actions.Throughout the intervention | - 4000 Students knows the child club.- Students know the role and responsibilities of the child club.- Students have been introduced to quality education indicators.- students respond to child club actions.- Students | - interviews with students.-photos.- Yearly evaluation reports |  |
| **1.2.4b**Actions in the communityPosters and interaction in the villages around the schools. | 600 children who have dropped out of school and children who are infrequent are informed about the right to quality education. | PostersVideo |  |
| **1.2.5 Evaluations and planning every six months**1 day three times times 3 yearsTotal: 9 days.Total 66 Child Club members | -66 child club members learn to plan and to adjust their plan | New adjusted action plan |  |
| **1.2.6 Child rights training** Three identical - day workshops Total 66 children and 6 coordinators | Knowledge about rights and how to communicate this to other students. | Minues, plans, participant lists |  |
| **1.2.7 Forum Theatre training workshop** for child clubs.4 days training 3 identical workshops.66 child club (CC) member6 trainersChild Club develops plays that focus on issues of Quality Education and Child rights | -66 CC members can voice issues with the use of theatre.-66 CC members increase confidence and ability to raise voice | Theatre playsFacebook updates |  |
| **1.2.8 Plays in the villages and in school.**10 plays in each school (60)5 in each school community (30)Total 90 plays | 4500 children reached for awareness raising about quality education and child rights in school community/parents and build capacity of cc children. | Theatre playsNews paper articlesTV clipsRadio news. |  |
| **1.2.9 Child club application writing workshop.**1 day three identical workshopsTotal: 66 students and 6 coordinators. | 12 Applications for funds | Applications. |  |
| **1.2.10Child club (CC)** representative participate in School management committee meetings | CC member takes the voice fo students to the SMC.SMC inform students about new issues. | Minute of meating |  |
| **1.2.11 Expossure visit** to “Child Friendly” Municipality | 20 members of the child club get Inspiration through interaction with peers | video interviews. |  |

**Immediate objective no. 2:**

**Schools and local public authorities acknowledge their responsibility and act in favour of a qualitative improvement of the education provided in the schools.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 2.1**: Principals monitor performance of teachers according to official quality indicators and coordinate with School Management committee on a regular basis. **indicator:** Principals take up teacher performance with individual teachers and SMC in smc- and teacher meetings regularly.**indicator:** “SMC/parents/child clubs monitor compliance of standards/indicators in smc meetings, teacher meetings, parents quarterly meetings and in yearly evaluations.**Means of verification: Scorings, observation, interview, minute of meetings and observations by SWO** |
| **2.1.1** **Information meetings about the intervention for school** stakeholders.1 meeting 6 principals1 meeting for each school SMc and PTA (total 132) | 132 smc and TPA members on board for the intervention. | Minute of meeting with signatures.Facebook post.Photos. |
| **2.1.2** **New legal education act** Information workshop 2 days.120 participants.6 School management committees12 child club representatives. | - 80% Stakeholders know the new education act for Devdaha, 2 months after the meeting.- 70% of participants install a pocket version of the act for their smart phone.”- Devdaha municipality publishes the act and pocket version on website.  | - Installed pocket version of act.- Published pocket version- Interview  |
| **2.1.3. Leadership workshops 1 day**6 leaders and 6 smc chairpersons (12)4 times | - 5 indicators of good leadership produced by participants.- Yearly scoring of indicators.- Written commitment to work for indicators produced and published in the school.- Principals confront teachers if he encounters irrigularity. | - indicators- report- minute of meeting.- interview |
| **2.1.5 Regular SMC meetings**Each school each month | Quality education on the agenda every monthhigh attendance of members | - Minute of meetings- Interview- Video |
| **2.1.6 Regular teacher meetings**Each school each month | Quality education on the agenda every monthhigh attendanceActive participation | - Minute of meetings- Interview- Video |
| **2.1.7 Yearly evaluation** workshops at the individual schools.SMC (+ principals)PTAChild ClubTotal: 132 participants | 132 participants scores the teacher and management performance.132 participants plan the year according to the result | - Indicators and scoring system.- Minutes of meetings- Most significant change stories. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 2.2.: Local teachers use the knowledge they receive in trainings, diversify their methodology and become more inclusive in their class management.**I**ndicator:** Quality score of teaching increases**Means of verification:** scorings, baseline- and endline survey, video interviews, yearly evaluation interviews. |
| **2.1.4** teacher planning and class management workshop.133 teachers initially 4 days 6 times.3 days follow up workshop in the two consecutive years. | 133 teachers use different methods of teaching.SMCs know what to demand from teachers. | - a teaching plan- list of activities.- indicators |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 2.3 Local municipality education officials and ward committees are responsive to issues raised by schools, parents, and child clubs.****Indicator:** Municipality education officials and ward committee respond to issues raised and take action to support the issue. **Means of verification:** minutes of meetings, progress reports, baseline- and endline survey |
| 2.3.1 Meeting between SWO and ward/municipality to introduce the current intervention. | Municipality and ward have overview of the projectSWO and Municipality/ward coordinate actions. | Minute of meetingcoordinated actions. |
| 2.3.2 Regular follow up on the progres of the intervention by SWO/parents. | Improved relation and indepth knowledge about activities of intervention and vice versa. | Minute of meetingEvaluation interview. |
| 2.3.3 Meeting between parents and municipality/ward  | Municipality is informed about progress and challenges of the schools. | Minute of meetingsEvaluation interview. |

**Immediate objective no. 3 Soiya Women’s Organisations has the capacity to promote quality education in a sustainable way.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 3.1:** SWO board, staff and management advocate for quality education and engage in networking on the national level to share experience with quality education and local advocacy.**Indicator 3.1.2:** SWO has used knowledge from networking in their own work**Means of verification:** Yearly evaluations, progres markers, video interviews. |
| 3.1.1 Orientation workshop in local planning act.(new act ) for board members and staff. | 6 Staff and 11 board members able to use local planning act in their work.New local planning act included in SWO’s 5 year strategy | 5-year strategy. |
| 3.1.2 Networking meeting with other NCE members(National Campaign for Education) SWO staff and board member representatives. | Knowledge shared2 tangible ideas for advocacy or other education activities. | Progress markersMinutes of meeting |
| 3.1.3 Advocacy training by NCE | SWO staff and board has a plan for carrying out advocacy in the local level.SWO understands the scope for advocacy on national level. | Advocacy campaign on burning issue for SWO and SMCs/parents and child clubs. |
| 3.1.3 Advocacy action in municipality by SWO and all child clubs together.  | Municipality take action action to solve the issue posed by SWO/CC | Report. |
| 3.1.4 Fundraising visits and workshop for fundraising in Kathmandu. | 2 staff members capacitated to write applications for fundsDatabase for funding created (excel file)Meetings with australian embassyAmerican EmbassySave the Children. | 2 applications1 excel file with information about funding options. |
| 3.1.5 Social Audit conducted by SWO | - Local organisations know that SWO is a transparent organisation.- SWO can demand transparency from other organisations. | - Minute of meeting- Video- Audit flex for presentation. |
| 3.1.6PR and Mediaplanning | 30 articles/news9 local tv programmes20 radio programmes/news50 Facebook updates20 mentions by other stakeholders in social media.100 new (organic) followers of SWO facebookpage | Radio and TV programmesNews paper articles, social media updates. |
| **3.1.7 Using media in campaigning**Workshop and coaching by journalist | Clearer message in radio and TV spots.More likes on Facebook | Tv and radio clipsFacebook messages |

|  |
| --- |
| **1 In pursuit of all immediate objectives**Indicators: Stakeholders coordinate their work for quality education and share with community**Means of verification:**video from events, interviews, progress reports. |
| **4.1.1Education Fairs all schools together**parents and community members3 times | - At least 1000 visitors per year.- 60 stalls with materials- 2 news paper articles- 1 tv programme- 1 radio programme- All basic level students involved.Representation by mayor/vice mayor and ward committee. | ReportPhotosVideoNews paper articles |
| **4.1.2Knowledge sharing conference**2000 guests4 ressourcepersons | -Lessons learned shared with 31 other local schools.- Education policy issues shared by NCE to bring inspiration at the local level. | VideoPhotosNews printsFacebook updates |
| **4.1.3 Project registration at Social Welfare council Kathmandu.** | To make the intervention legal | Approval papers |

Seek inspiration in [’Guide for the formulation of NGO projects’](http://www.prngo.dk/Admin/Public/DWSDownload.aspx?File=%2FFiles%2FFiler%2FPRNGOdokumenter%2FEgne+dokumenter%2FTryksager%2FNGO-guide-eng-FINAL.pdf) (Chapter 6).

* If the intervention is an extension of a previous intervention, the following should be explained:
	+ *To what extent has the previous intervention achieved satisfactory results in view of the given circumstances?*

**The previous one-year intervention had five positive achievements:**

1. It managed to mobilise parents in all five schools, raise their awareness of their right to quality education and make them start to realise that they are able to contribute to a positive change. Between 80 – 90% of all parents came to meetings called by SWO, gave their view of the challenges to quality education (including their own role as parents) and came with concrete suggestions for how to move forward in terms frequent “patrol” in school by parents, “more accountability of SMC to parents” and quarterly meetings for all parents to follow up on the matter.

2. School management committees were mobilised. Before the intervention they were mostly concerned with infrastructural and budget matters, but during the intervention they started to take up issues of quality education and in the end they decided to put quality education as a part of every SMC meeting.

3. School leaders: Before the intervention it was a taboo to discuss the low quality of teaching and the high rate of absence of teachers in class. School leaders even told SWOs leader not to address this issue directly. During the intervention this changed, and in the end even the most reluctant leader (who is the most influential principal in the area) was able to address the issue of quality himself.

4. Teachers practices were changed. Everyone now use some new and active methods (group work, sitting arrangements, games, morning info rounds). Even though it is only a fraction of what was taught and even though there are vast differences between teachers, this is a success.

5. As the intervention ended, SWOs leader Menuka Neupane was offered a seat in a new “education board” in the municipality of Devdaha. The board consist of 10 volunteer members and a coordinator who represents different areas of the education sector. The board gives advice to the municipality education department who has to draw up their own strategy for the local schools. This is a great opportunity for SWO to know how the local education policy develops and to give input for this. She has already done so on a number of occassions. E.g. low quality teaching is also a taboo in the municipality but Menuka is bringing it up in this new forum as well.

* + *How have experiences from the work thus far been fed into the design of the new intervention?*

The most important experience was that parents are ready to be active and participate once they realised that they have a right to claim quality education for their children. Therefor it is paramount to draw on the enthusiasm of the parents and carry on the mobilisation process. As the external evaluation consultant pointed out when evaluating the previous intervention, the achievments are very positive but it will take time to make them sustainable. Hence taking the mobilisation process of parents further and to build in measures for self-sustainability is a key focus of the current intervention.

Child clubs were very underuttilised. We belive that there is high potential to mobilise the child clubs to raise awarness among students regarding their right to quality education. The new public system in Devdaha also focus on child clubs, e.g. child club members now have a seat in the SMC meetings. SWO wants to mobilise the child clubs with the goal that after three years the child clubs run their own activities and participate actively in the school management committee.

As it was mentioned earlier it is our experience that lack of management in the schools is a major challenge. So the current intervention will mobilise principals and School Management committees on two levels: The current intervention will create a forum for leaders and SMC chairpersons to unfold this theoretical knowledge, bring it in to practice and develop a system for self assessment in a sustainable way by introducing yearly evaluation workshops for the school management in the six schools.

It is also our experience that when SMC have strong members who know the rules and their own role well they are more capable of putting pressure on the principal and increase his/her performance. Hence the current intervention will make sure that all SMC members know their role according to the new legal education act for the municipality in order to understand their own role and mandate.

Another experience was that SMCs are very concerned with the challenges posed by low and inadequate teacher performance, when it was brougt up by SWO. It was very positive that SMCs themselves suggested to have this as a point in the agenda in all their meetings. The current intervention will follow up on this to make sure it happenes and becomes a routine. The child club representative who will participate in the smc meetings will also be able to assist to enforce this.

A joint education fair was a big success of working together for quality education and for bringing stakeholders together and focus on this. Hence the current intervention will make this fair a tradition that will enforce the bond betweenthe schools and be positive way to strive for better teaching.

The previous intervention had some success in changing the practices of the teachers as the training provided was very practical and had some focus on class management. It is the experience from the previous intervention that follow ups on practical use of trainings could increase teachers ability to deliver quality teaching and that clear indicators of quality would help parents and SMC to assist principals in following up on progress. Hence the current intervention will not offer training of teachers, but workshops were teachers can learn to unfold their theoretical knowledge from government trainings. During the three years this will become self help forums that the municipality can supervise. As the current intervention does not follow up on earlier training given only by the earlier intervention there is no sharp distrinction between new and old schools in for the teacher workshop. However, SWO is aware that new schools will need extra attention in order to gain the level of class room management and practical implementation skills that teachers from the previous intervention has received. SWO also plans to uttilize some of the active teachers from the previous intervention to teach new teachers.

When parents come to school, it is hard for them to judge the quality of the education delivered. As it has been mentioned earlier, Devdaha municipality is currently in the process of developing a set of indicators of quality education. The current intervention will utillize some of these indicators when parents are going to monitor the performance of teachers and when SMCs are going to follow up on progress with the principal. We will implement a scoring system, where the stakeholder score the progress of the quality in each of their quarterly meetings and where all stakeholders score the progress in the yearly evaluations.

Last but not least we are experiencing how SWO is gaining a position in the education sector of Devdaha municipality. We want to increase this and make it stronger by strenghtening SWOs participation in national networking for quality education (NCE).

* + *To what extent does the proposed intervention pursue new objectives, take a new strategic approach or involve a new target group?*

The current re-application has changed its its overall objective from “marginalise parents and children defend their right to quality education” to “Increased quality of education for marginalised children in six public schools in Devdaha Municipality through mobilisation of children and parents, teachers and management in school democracy.” From the previous intervention and from the current situation in Devdaha municipality we belive that it is highly possible to mobilise the stakeholders and that it is also possible to create sustainable change this way.

Following this revised overall objective the current immediate objectives have also been revised to match this. Currently one regards the right holders, one regards duty bearers and the last immediate object focus on the role of the local partner Soiya Womens Independent Organisation.

From the previous application:

Target groups: This intervention focus more directly on children and child clubs as well as on the right holders own ability to mobilise duty bearers, and for right holders and SWO to be able to advocate the challenges to the local political level at the wards. The previous intervention also included parents and children, but the training given was about quality teaching and class management hence focussed on new knowledge necessary for teachers to improve their teaching. Now it is time to focus on how this new learning can be put into action and how teachers and other duty bearers can be made accountable.

New:

As mentioned earlier the current re-application will bring in three new schools. In the beginning this means that extra efford will be put into familiarizing with the new stakeholders. New schools will also receive support from “old schools”.

* *Describe the interlinkage and balance between capacity development, advocacy and possible strategic deliveries (the Development Triangle).*

In the current intervention the focus is to build the capacity and mobilise the right holders (parents and children) to put pressure on duty bearers (schools and local authorities) to deliver quality education and for SMC and local authorities to be held accountable. It is also the focus of this intervention to build the capacity of the duty bearers to uttilize their existing ressources, and to support sustainable forums for exchange and self assessment. Lastly, this intervention will teach the local partner to advocate the right to education of the right holders and for the local partner to build the capacity of the right holders to advocate their right at the school, ward and municipality level.The municipality already has a focus on quality education. Hence the current intervention will feed into this focus through the experiences gained and through future networking with likeminded organisations as a part of their new membership of NCE Nepal (national campaign for education).

Service delivery is primarily information about the new local education act and overall planning act for the local level. For children trainings in “Child Rights” and “Forum Theatre” are strategic service deliveries that we belive will strengthen the ability of Child clubs to informe and mobilise their peers.

* *How are priorities, plans and resources existing within the context taken into account?*

The education system of Nepal has now been decentralised and new local rules have been made. This means that Devdaha municipality has the responsibility for all matters concerning their 47 schools (31 public and 16 private) schools. Some funds and authority has also been deligated to the ward level. Devdaha municipality wants to focus on education - in its own terms it wants to become a child friendly municipality. There are two employees who has to oversee all the local schools and take care of their administration and an 11 member education advisory committee has been formed to assist them where SWOs leader has a seat. The local government officials are new and enthusiastic and have a clear view on the local challenges to quality education, and their coorporation with SWO is good. In the coming year their priority is to train local teachers in use of IT to be able to use internet for improving their teaching, to merge schools which have become too small and to reallocate teachers between schools to match the real number of students.

The municipality is also in the process of creating indicators of quality education and to give authority to principals to terminate the contract for staff who do not comply with these indicators. The latter is a very interesting development and very much in line with the intentions of the current intervention. Hence SWO will focus on mobilising SMC/parents and students to hold principals and municipalities accountable in this regard.

* *What possible factors (risks) may hinder or delay fulfilment of the intervention’s objective?*

1. Municipalities do not have the capacity to enforce their vision of a child friendly municipality, fx the new indicators of quality in the schools.

**Mitigating measures**: SWO will support the municipality by mobilising the parents, Child club and school management committees in support of using the indicators. And support staff and principals to deliver progress on the indicators. But also pressure the municipality to follow up on the implementation of the indicators.

2. Principals do not want to cooperate, so they do not follow up on implementation of indicators and are reluctant to meet and create indicators for their own performance.

**Mitigating measure:** SWO should be working closely with municipality officials to gain their support, and make sure parents and SMCs are also ready to support.

3. Teachers claim that they cannot deliver quality education because they do not have adequate ressources (time and materials).

**Mitigating measures:** A set of realistic indicators of quality which mostly demand that the current working time is spend effectively (in class, using proper class management and a variety of methods), and making sure parents know these indicators and are ready to pressure teachers and principal to adhere to them.

4. Child clubs are afraid to complain about teachers and advocate their right to quality education.

**Mitigating measures:** Using theatre as a tool will mitigate this as it portrait current problems as “plays” this means that audience may learn without feeling accused. SWO has used this succesfully in the women groups.

* Describe how and with which methods the intervention is to be carried out so as to make it likely to lead to the objectives defined, including how the role as a catalyst has been considered.

	+ *If the proposed intervention is an extension of a previous intervention, it must be described to what extent the strategy is being refined, including strengthening of the role as a catalyst, potential for advocacy and long-term sustainability.*

The overall strategy of the intervention is to aware and mobilise parent and children (right holders) and school management committees to pressure schools and municipality (duty bearers) to deliver quality education. Bringing in the child club is new as the first intervention did not focus on child clubs.

**The child clubs** will be trained in a workshop where they also meet other child clubs. They will be informed about their own role and the right to education will be discussed. Then the situation in the schools with regard to quality of education will be analysed in a participatory manner. The indicators for quality education will be introduced and the students will make an initial scoring of their school according to the indicators. The workshop will make use of facilitation methods so that child clubs learn to plan actions and facilitate their own meetings from the beginning. The workshop will also introduce the first method for campaigning: Posters, and all child clubs will make their first 6 months plan during the workshop.

After the mobilisation workshop the child clubs will start to run meetings where they plan monthly actions in the school. In the beginning the actions will simply be to make sure all students in the school knows who they are (present themselves in the morning meeting and explain their role. Secondly the child club will produce posters about quality education where other students are invited to make comments (smileys). This is the initial training of response to the child club.

After the holidays the child club will take part in the planning of the education fair and they have their own responsibilities to carry out on the day. During the education fair the Child Clubs will also make a presentation of themselves to all the guests.

In the first year Child Clubs will also start to take part in SMC meetings, this is a part of the local education act for Devdaha but it is usually not practised.

Every six months the child clubs meet in larger groups (2-3 child clubs together) and evaluate the last six months and inspire each other for planning the coming months. This will teach child clubs to reflect on their achievements and to learn to adjust plans to a fast changing reality.

In the second year the child club is expected to take be able to faciliate their meetings more independently. In the second year they will learn about Childrens Rights as a basis for understanding their right to education. The child clubs will also be trained in forum theatre to enable them to take up dilemmas from their school and to empower the child club members to be able to speak in public. After the training the child clubs will create their own plays about child right and the challenges to quality education in their school and performe in for the different school sections and in the village. There is still a lot of taboo connected to the low performance of teachers and ignorance of management. Theatre is a very good way to break the taboo as it is often portraying the situations in a humoristic way. In Forum theatre audience is urged to reflect and take part in solving the problem proposed in the play. This is an effective way to mobilise the larger group of students in the schools.

In the second year the child club is also introduced to advocacy, and to the budget cycle of the ward and municipality. The former holds a budget for the child clubs, so knowing how and when to apply is a way to make the child clubs sustainable.

In the third year the child club should plan its own activities and be largely independent. It will be urged to take up advocacy at the ward and municipality level. SWO wil urge the school coordinators to coordinate the half yearly evaluation and planning meetings where child clubs meet each other.

The Child club will go on an expossure trip to a near by district that has had tangible success as a child friendly municipality (the local term for quality education). Expossure to other ways of working with quality education will inspire the child clubs and will introduce them to networking.

**Mobilisation of parents:** Parents in the new schools will be introduced to the intervention and then SWO will use the school management committee and its local women group to call for a parents problem identification workshop. This workshop took place at a much later stage in the previous intervention, but now that SWO has more experience in how to reach parents it is resonable to expect to be able to do this much earlier (otherwise the workshop will be repeted).

The old parents groups (3 old schools) are ready to go to the next level: Developing forums for follow up on the issue of quality education where parents may also receive information about the latest activities in the education sector of their ward and of Devdaha municipality and to develop the rotation of parents in the school suggested by parents in the previous intervention.

The first meeting will include a discussion about the municipality’s new quality education indicators and the parents will score their own school and discuss the results.

This quarterly meeting forum will be faciliated by parents from the SMC or the parent teacher association, SWO staff and women group members will be teaching the skills of facilitation.

**Parents rotation:** Parents should come to the school as per rotation. Not everyone is expected to participate but the SMC and PTA parents will try to activitate a larger number of parents covering all the villages connected to the school. Parents who come to the school will not be expected to comment on teachers directly but to report irregularity to the principal or to the SMC. The quarterly parents meeting will evaluate if the reports has led to action by the principal. If this is not the case and if there is no further action, SWO will urge parents to go to the municipality and file a complaint.

**Leadership workshops:** Principals will be activated in yearly workshops. They will formulate what practical leadership is and create the own set of approximately five indicators for good leadership. The yearly workshop is designed to a forum for sharing ideas and activitating theoretical knowledge as it is felt that principals do not unfold their theoretical knowlegde and thus perform weak and inefficient. The SMC chairpersons and vicechairpersons will also be involved in this forum as a balanced relationship between these two roles is found to very important to progress in quality.

**Teacher workshops:** In the first year all teachers will be invited for a four-day workshop. The main purpose is to get a clear view of the collective knowledge base of the teachers, to activate this knowledge in practical teaching plans an to make this a regular event for teachers where they feel supported and inspired in their work. The first year there will be a trainer for 2 days who will help the teachers to tap into the common knowledge base and to make a system for mutual sharing. In the following years the workshop will be faciliated by the teachers themselves with support of SWO.

**Sustainability:**

The current intervention wants to create a sustainble pressure system, that is facilitated by rightholders themselves. Hence it is the objective of SWO from day one, beside deliving information, to enable parents to facilitate meetings and actions, and for child clubs and their coordinating teacher to plan and run their meetings and actions themselves.

In the first year SWO and key members of its women groups will teach parents how to facilitate meetings. In this process the SMC and PTA (parent teacher association) members will be expected to take responsibility of the meetings, as this group needs to strengthen their accountability to the parents and also could benefit from receiving the increased legitimacy vis-a-vis principal and teachers, from the overall parent group. In the second year the faciliation process will be mostly on the parents themselves (SMC/PTA parents and other parents) and in the third year SWO is merely the observing.

**A catalyst of change: I**n order to be a strong catalyst of change SWO needs to be upto date with the basis for local development work. The local planning act has recently been changed to match the decentralisation process and SWO would like to be trained in the content and use of the new planning act. Anoter issue for the role as a catalyst is social audit. In Rupandehi social audits has become a norm among organisastions who want to be transparent to the local society, hence to strengthen its reputation SWO would like to do small scale social audits during the intervention period.

**Public authorities:**

The municipality and the ward officials will be part of all major events and informed about progress and challenges. The strategy is to draw on support and legitimacy from the municipality and at the same time pressure the municipality to deliver on its promises/duties, by awaring right holders of the existing of these duties. Like SWO has mobilised its women group members to participate in meetings with local government bodies it will now mobilise parents and to some extent, children to to this, so that they can take their demand for quality education further if schools do not progress.

**Indicators:**

To support the overall objective, the strategy entails using indicators of progress owned by the stakeholders. Either created by the right holders and duty bearers together or by discussing and prioritising among indicators given by the municipality.

The other part of the strategy is to mobilise duty bearers by enhancing their capacity in a sustainble way, creating forums for turning theoretical knowledge into practical use.

**New and old target groups:**

The intervention works with three old schools and three new schools. Hence new schools need to be capacitated in terms of a problem analysis and initial mobilisation. However to a large extent the strategy for both new and old will be the same. The previous intervention investigated the need for training of teachers. It was found that this need is to some extent served by the government and that there is a high need for supporting the uttilization of acquired knowledge. Hence the current intervention does not focus on whether or not schools/teachers have receieved teacher training from the previous intervention.

**Advocacy:** In the current intervention SWO and the target groups will become more familiar with advocacy. SWO will take a course and also practise advocating the rights of target group with right holders at different levels. SWO will also take its first steps towards participating in national level advocacy and gathering experience from other likeminded organisations in the NCE Network.

In the previous intervention SWO started to use a media strategi. This time SWO will get a local professional journalist’s advice become more effective then choosing media messages and to become more effective on social media.

**Knowledge sharing conference:** The results of the interventions and the overall discussion about quality education will be shared with the rest of the municipality schools in quality education conference in the end of the three years. The purpose of the conference is to make sure lessons learned are communicated to the rest of the local school SMCs and to take the opportuny to invite a number of ressource persons to talk about the issue of quality education.

T**heory of change**

The current intervention will explore a theory of change approach. The yearly and half yearly evaluations will serve as forums for adjusting the intervention according to the changes in context and the changes made by the intervention. This entails that SWO will be trained in making outcome joournals and create progress markers and most significant change stories. ToC will be unfolded by SWO and SIN using the ToC guide from Fagligt Fokus and CISU.

* *Describe the plans with regard to monitoring as well as systematisation and use of experiences both along the way and at the end of the intervention. If an external evaluation has been planned (obligatory for interventions above DKK 2 million), this should be described.*
From first applicion:
Monitoring visits by SIN will be taking place yearly. Progress reports will be produced monthly and used in staff meetings to keep the project on track. The monitoring system will include the use of progress markers and staff will keep an outcome journal, changes stories will be collected in a video dairy format and each year most significant stories will be selected by the relevant stakeholders in a joint meeting to learn from each other.

An external evaluation will be carried out even though this is not mandatory, as it is the experience of SWO and SIN that external evaluation are a great opportunity to learn more and create more reflections than internal evaluations.
1. **Phase-out and sustainability**
* *How will it be ensured that neither local partners nor target groups are left in an inappropriate relationship of dependency when the intervention period expires?*

New
* The sustainability will be ensured on two levels

the target groups:

1. All activities except information delivery sessions are done by the facilitation of stakeholders themselves. E.g. stakeholders are from day one urged to facilitate their own meetings, and after three years stakeholders are expected to be fully capable of doing so. In addition, child clubs will learn how to apply for funds from the ward for theiractivities.

Yearly evaluations and reflections is also a major tool for sustainability of the achieved successes.

**Local partner:**

2. The local partner SWO has started up a partnership with an american NGO regarding girls at risk of dropping out of school and girls who have dropped out. Initially this is a one year project, but it will be followed by a three year project period if the first is successful. The project is coordinated by an experienced staff member and key members of SWOs board.

Hence SWO is gaining experience with more partnerships and is becoming less dependent of SIN. In addition: From the beginning of the current intervention at least two key staff members will be trained in fundraising to assure further independence.

* *How is the intervention envisaged to lead to lasting improvements for the target groups?*

As described in the previous section, the SMC and PTA parents will be the owners of the process of mobilising parents. They will learn to facilitate parents meetings from the beginning so in the end of three years they will feel confident on their own.
The same process is envisaged with the child club. Who will also be faciliating their own meetings from the beginning. Each year they will be encouraged to do their own planning. So after three years they are confident in creating a plan for their work, applying for funds from the ward etc.

Another key factor in sustainability are the quality indicators. By making quality indicators known to all parents and by creating a self relient system of control/observation regarding these indicators and by mobililising parents and children to advocate for change according to these indicators, there is a better chance that parents and children are able to sustain the improvements made to quality education.

For the duty bearers the process will also be focussed on self reliance and the municipality will be involved as owners of the process from the beginning (so that they may carry on with the forum and do the same in the rest of the municipality schools.

Last but not least, as Menuka Neupane is now a member of the municipality education committee and she will make sure the results are fed into the work of the municipality.

* *How can the strengthening of partners’ and other actors’ capacity be continued when the implementation period expires?*

The local partner SWO is now a member of an advocacy network for organisastions that work for education. NCE (National campaign for education has around 280 member organisations all over Nepal), this membership will be a source of inspiration and information in the long term.

Through its partnership with the american NGO Girls First Fund, SWO occassionally meet with the other 27 organisations who are partners with GFF and who work with girls at risk of leaving school before time.

As a member of the local education committee in Devdaha Menuka Neupane, leader of SWO will feed the committee with information and inspiration from the network and from the GFF partner forum.

Regarding the schools, SWO will continue to supervise the stakeholders in years to come as the organisation plans to work with the education sector in the long run. And the municipality education office will be urged to follow up on the progress also.

1. **Planned intervention-related information work in Denmark**

NOTE: reply only if the intervention includes information work in Denmark.

Information work in Denmark is not a requirement, but an option which applicants are encouraged to take advantage of. The maximum allowable amount is equivalent to 2% of intervention costs (budget items 1-7).

If information funds are applied for, the following points should be reflected upon:

Goal:

* Communicating the 4th UN development Goal (quality education) through the experiences of the current intervention. E.g. sharing the experiences of mobilising local stakeholders for a qualitative change in education.
* 1: Teachers, 2: Youth - in Århus and Copenhagen. Total: 100 people.
* Film, dinner and partner presentation of the project by partner representative.

Last year Skoleliv i Nepal made a film about the challenges to education in Nepal. We would like to use the opportunity to view the film and invite a representative from our partner organisation to tell about the project in view of the messages in the film.

 If possible we will combine the visit and activities with a conference about advocacy for education and our partner will be invited to discuss the findings of the intervention with a number of danish education and school/parent relationship specialists.

Maj Carboni Editor at the magazine Skolebørn will write an article about the activities.

(Maj is vising one of the intervention schools in autumn 2019).

1. **Supplementary financing**

NOTE: reply only if the intervention includes supplementary financing.

If the intervention has supplementary financing, the following must be taken into account.

* If the supplementary financing underpins concrete activities in the intervention, these must be specified in the application and budget.
* Has the supplementary financing been secured at the time of submitting the application?
	+ If not, explain why it is considered realistic to raise the funds.
* Is the supplementary financing a prerequisite for implementing the activities?
	+ If so, CISU can only give definitive approval of the application when the applicant documents that the supplementary financing has been secured.
	+ If not, describe how the intervention can be implemented without the supplementary financing.