



USAID | **UGANDA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program Evaluation

Final Report

October 2010

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID/Uganda). It was prepared by The Consulting House (Kenya) and Center for Innovations and Justice Studies (Uganda).



Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program Evaluation

FINAL REPORT

The Consulting House (Kenya)
Centre for Justice Studies and Innovations (Uganda)

NOVEMBER 2010

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
COP	Chief of Party
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FOWODE	Forum for Women in Democracy
HPDP	Harmonized Participatory Development Planning
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IGP	Inspector General of Police
LC	Local Council
LCIP	Liberian Community Infrastructure Program
LEMU	Land and Equity Movement in Uganda
LG	Local Government
LINKAGES	USAID/ Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda
LLC	Linkages Liaison Committee
LRM	Local Revenue Mobilization
LSA	Legislative Strengthening Activity
LST	Local Service Tax
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PPDs	Public-Private Dialogues
PRDP	Peace, Recovery and Development Plan
PSIDP	Parliamentary Strengthening and Institutional Development Plan
PSOs	Private Sector Organizations
PWD	Persons With Disabilities
RTI	RTI International
SDU I/II	Strengthening Decentralization Uganda I/II
SUNY/CID	State University of New York Center for International Development
ULGA	Uganda Local Government Association
UJCC	Uganda Joint Christian Council
UPTAP	Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Project
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UWOPA	Uganda Women Parliament Association's
UWONET	Uganda Women's Network

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank USAID-Uganda for selecting our two firms to carry out this review. Special thanks go to the CO9 team for invaluable guidance during the review. We are grateful to the LINKAGES secretariat for its logistical support as well. We are also thankful to the committees of parliament we engaged with, the Leader of Official Opposition and his Chief Whip, Parliament's technical staff, the district and sub-county assemblies, and the civil society formations we interviewed. On behalf of The Consulting House (TCH), and the Centre for Justice Studies and Innovations (CJSI), many thanks to everyone!

November 2010

Mutahi Ngunyi	TCH, Team Leader
Valentine Namakula	CJSI, Assignment Manager and Deputy Team Leader
Laura Nyirikindi	CJSI, Team Member
J.B. Kavuma	CJSI, Team Member
Wangeci Kago	TCH, Support Team
Philip Gathungu	TCH, Support Team
Clare Ahabwe	CJSI, Support Team
Esther Kabinga	CJSI, Team Assistant.
Julia Nansubuga	CJSI, Team Assistant
Juliana Apopo	TCH/London School of Economics, Team Assistant

Table of Contents

0. Executive Summary	5
1. Introduction	11
2. Design and Performance	16
3. Component Analysis and Lessons Learnt	27
4. Summary Recommendations	64
Annexes	68

O Comprehensive¹ Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The Brief. In response to RFP No.617-07-002, USAID contracted SUNY/RTI to implement the “*Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program*”. The program life span runs from July 2007 to December 2010². The total contract sum was US \$ 7 million. The intention was to strengthen linkages amongst and within three actors: the Ugandan Parliament, selected local government structures, and civil society groups. Specifically, the goals of the program³ were to build the capacity of the governmental actors to effectively identify and carry out their representational functions in the newly reinstated multi-party system; to increase democratic participation in political processes; to improve institutional transparency and accountability; and ultimately to increase and improve essential service delivery to constituents⁴.

The task for which this Report is written was to evaluate the performance and results of the program. We were meant to establish what was **done** (outputs) what **happened**⁵ (outcomes), and what **changed** (impact). Specifically, we were to answer three questions: One, what has *worked*, what has *not* and the reasons *why*? Two, What were the lessons learnt? And how can they feed into future USAID programming? Here, we were meant to identify opportunities lost and to ‘bank’ best practices for future adoption. Three, what do the results tell us? This question was meant to give us a logical connection between the findings and the recommendations.

¹ The comprehensive summary is a detailed precise for those unable to read the entire report

² LINKAGES Award contract 2007

³ As cited in the RFP

⁴ These goals are also captured, although in part, by the SUNY/RTI Technical Proposal. In particular, the intention of improving institutional transparency and accountability is not clearly articulated. We delve into this in detail in the draft report.

⁵ Response of the program site to the interventions.

Methodology and Process. We relied on both primary and secondary sources of data. The secondary sources included program and other forms of literature⁶. A total of 96 program reports and documents were reviewed⁷. The primary data⁸ was collected from a total of 380 respondents spread across 5 districts⁹. Data extraction employed three techniques; Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), in depth Interviews (IDI) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Tools for data extraction varied, but deferred to a generic Check List developed at the Inception Stage and attached to the Inception Report. At the conclusion of our fieldwork, we generated a Debrief Note and discussed its contents during a Debrief Workshop held at Cassia Lodge, Kampala on 21st September 2010. This meeting brought together the partners, some of whom we had encountered in the field. The meeting adopted the overall recommendations of the evaluation and made clarifications where necessary.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall Assessment

Achievements. The concept of Linkages is both pioneering and innovative. It seeks to influence the governance ‘nerve system’ in Uganda. Its innovativeness rotates around the creation of ‘voice’ on the demand side of governance, and ‘hearing’ on the supply side. We can confirm that the ground for doing so has been created. However, this is more notable at the Local Government level and less in parliament and the national level. Considerable ‘hearing’ on the part of local government was recorded. Similarly, the quality of popular voices has been raised. Space for the voice to articulate popular demands has also been created. Nationally, however, the returns are modest. Apart from the oversight function, investment in parliament had limited returns. In the case of civil society, the grants were rather small. This notwithstanding, civil society showed great potential by building the support on other funding. This was true in both the national and district situations. And this is how the modest voice was created. The voice was further enhanced by the program’s capacity building in advocacy.

Two other achievements are worth mention. The first is the institutional strengthening of beneficiary partners, particularly the Official Opposition and the Shadow Government at the national level; and of the District and sub county assemblies at the local level. The second and related achievement here was that of opening up of government spaces for public scrutiny. At the districts, accountability and transparency levels in government went up as a result of this scrutiny. It is also important to

⁶ The list of Literature reviewed is contained as **Annex II** of this Report.

⁷ The team deployed five people to scan through the literature. Three from CJSI, an intern from London School of Economics at TCH, who travelled to Kampala for the Scan and a TCH Research Fellow who accompanied the team leader during field visits.

⁸ Sampling details were spelt out in the Inception Report. They are also contained at Section 1.4 of the Draft Report.

⁹ The Schedule of meetings and respondents interviewed is attached as **Annex III** of the Draft Report.

note that most of these results are pitched at the levels of outputs and outcomes. Impact was only recorded in few instances. This was justified by the fact that the program cycle was far too short to guarantee impact. Potential for impact was however recorded.

Lessons Learnt. We categorize these into two; design and implementation challenges.

- a. **Design Challenges.** Two challenges were critical. One, there was a conceptual 'disconnect' between the intentions of the RFP and what was contained in the Technical Proposal. A lot of conceptual nuances were lost in this process. As a result, and in our view, the RFP was more thoroughgoing and conceptually elegant than the implementers' proposal. Two, and linked to one, a mapping of linkages before implementation was necessary. This did not happen. As a result, existing de-jure, de-facto and normative linkages that could have been strengthened were glossed over. This was a missed opportunity.
- b. **Implementation Challenges.** Three challenges are worth of mention. One, LINKAGES field office implemented the program with commendable efficiency. However, its responsiveness to challenges on the program site was inhibited by long administrative procedures between New York and Kampala; and between the implementers and USAID. Two, the monitoring and evaluation system was overly quantitative. In fact, the results framework was built around quantitative indicators. And as a result, the M&E became more interested in what was done (numbers) and less on what was achieved. Yet most of the achievements in the governance sector can only be nuanced qualitatively. Three, knowledge banking and learning were limited. This was particularly true of the civil society component. The district and national CSOs we interviewed noted that the LINKAGES field office was not open to learning 'from below'. This was a missed opportunity.

Specific Findings

Support To Local Government

HPDP Training

Achievements. This training Intervention resulted in increased participation in local government planning and budgeting processes by the people. Similarly, after the training, subsequent local government performance assessment exercises showed improved performance for most of the sub-counties that received linkages support. Approval and execution of district budget has become more open and transparent; Three (3) year Development Plans are in place at different levels of local governments; and working relationship with civil society and other players has improved.

Lessons Learnt. For these trainings to be more effective there was a need to align their timing with planning and budgeting cycles. The intensity of training was also low, and the training concentrated on procedural matters and neglected other equally important thematic contents. Also noteworthy was the fact that Local Government ministry was minimally involved in this training.

Rules of Procedure Training

Achievements. Regarding Rules of Procedure, the program led to improved record keeping of Council resolutions; these resolutions are also arrived at faster and there has been improvement in implementation of Council decisions. Shorter council sessions are also attributed to improved awareness on procedural matters and delineation of the roles between councilors and technical staff. Quality of council decisions is reported to have improved, while committees have been strengthened and CSO engagements enhanced.

Lessons Learnt. Coordination of training was entrusted to the office of the Speaker, district personnel officer were not adequately involved. Similarly, the training was not timely – coming when the council was 2 years into their term. Low academic qualifications of councilors limited their capacity to comprehend, and interpret technical documents, policy guidelines and legislations. Fragile and underdeveloped Local government structures in war-ravaged areas. Creation of new districts – this has created administrative challenges for the project as it can no longer be traced in the original 10 districts.

Enhanced revenue mobilization.

The impact of this intervention is very limited. This is partly because it was limited to a few sub-counties and national outlook towards local taxes has been down played since the abolition of GT in 2005. Among the noted challenges was a limited tax base, and an inability to administer increased taxes due to weak structures

Support to Parliament

Achievements. Among the achievements in parliament included; improved policy expertise and decision making by MPs. Reports indicate that there was almost a 300% achievement of the targeted number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance; Oversight capacity of the Opposition and Shadow Cabinet was strengthened. This was provided through technical support; Institutional Capacity building and Staff training undertaken for the Directorate of Administration of Parliament.

Lessons Learnt. The main lesson with regards to parliament support relates to what we call ‘distance decay’ in the main text. The gap between legislation and service delivery is far too big. There is no guarantee that good legislation will result in quality implementation. Focus on legislation,

therefore, had limited results. Oversight resulted in both legislative ‘activism’ on the floor of the house and in community as well. At community level, the field visits jump-started many processes that had been stalled by bad practices. The lesson, therefore is to shift from policy and legislation to emphasize on oversight and legislative activism.

Support to Civil Society

The **Achievements**. We recorded a number.

- a. **From nullification to affirmation:** Parliament and Local government affirmed that through the work of LINKAGES, there was a turnaround of their perception of the utility of CSOs.
- b. **From opening up space to Hearing:** The program facilitated national level CSO interaction with Parliament through presentation of expert input at committee levels.
- c. **Towards increased Openness:** From the field in the various districts, respondents reported an increase in transparency at two levels- one local government processes are more open to CSO scrutiny. Two, CSOs increasingly share their annual work-plans- though not budgets with Local Governments.
- d. **Shift in approach from confrontation to engagement.** A notable shift arising out of this intervention has been a behavioral change at both the local governments and the CSO levels. Testimonies of a shift in approach “from confrontation to constructive engagement” were commonly cited among respondents.

Lessons Learnt. In the rolling out of this component, some challenges were noted.

- a. **Operational Definition of CSOs.** Though broadly defined at the design stage, the concept of CSOs was narrowly construed at operational level. The focus was on non-governmental organizations- to the exclusion of the media, religious based institutions and the private sector
- b. **Linkage between Parliament and CSOs-** - CSO Respondents expressed discontent with the pace of growth of the feedback linkage between CSOs and Parliament.
- c. **Longer term engagement with CSOs.** At the National Level, LINKAGES piggy backed on ongoing processes. Though this bears inherent advantages of sustainability and effectiveness in programming- the size of the grant was negligible and parasitic contrasted with the core organizational funding. Organizations able to attract sizeable funding for instance Uganda Land Alliance and Uganda NGO Forum did not see a need to pursue the relationship upon expiry of the grant period. The lesson here is for

future programming to build upon existing programs with meaningful grants.

- d. **Token Size Grants to CSOs:** All CSOs interviewed reported that the grants were miniscule and not commensurate with the expected results.
- e. **Involvement of CSOs in Component Programming-** CSOs expressed dissatisfaction with the level of involvement in design and programming of this component. Future designs should strive to go beyond self described umbrella organizations to enlist participation of a broad spectrum of Non Governmental Actors organized around service delivery or advocacy goals in the selected service delivery sectors.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

From the aforementioned, five overall recommendations lend themselves.

Continue with Linkages. This is an innovative program with potential for replication in other countries. To increase its potential for impact, the next phase of design should be built around the Results Based Management. Specifically, emphasis should be on the results, not activities. On what was achieved, not what was done. Similarly, it should be preceded by a thoroughgoing process of ‘think-tanking’ where the mapping and targeting¹⁰ of linkages is done.

Shift focus from national to district. From our field visits, it was obvious that the lower you go in the decentralised government, the better the results in terms of impact. In our subjective assessment, one dollar at the district will give you three dollars worth of results; while three dollars at the national level can only deliver one dollar worth of returns. The resources used to engage at the national level should be used to deepen engagement to the parishes. Similarly, for the next phase of programming, USAID should go for the principle of the ‘critical few’ over the ‘trivial majority’. Instead of investing in far too many interventions, the strategy should be to invest in a few with the intention of deepening engagement.

Invest in the broader Non-Governmental Sector, not civil society. Civil society in Uganda is weak. To augment its position, and voice, collate its actions with credible market and media actors. Support to a broader Non-Governmental Sector has produced telling results in other parts of Africa¹¹.

Increase funding to civil society. Regarding support to civil society, two other things are critical. One, increase the levels of funding as a way of

¹⁰ Mapping refers to definition and location of the linkages. Targeting refers to identification of the strategic linkages and putting in place mechanisms of engaging with them (for instance, strengthening them)

¹¹ For instance SIDA support to the Land Sector Non-State Actors in Kenya. This is a coalition of civil society and professional associations of surveyors and architects involved in land management. This group drove the adoption of the Land Policy as a Chapter in the new constitution.

capacitating the 'demand side' of governance. This increase should however be on an increasing scale, starting with a lower percentage increase and raising this towards the end of project cycle¹². Two, increase the duration of the project cycle to correspond with the life cycles of parliament and the local government assemblies. Instead of 3 years, a subsequent program should consider a 5 year period for impact to be registered.

Support to parliament to go to oversight. Instead of supporting many processes in parliament, support should go to oversight function only.

Build around existing USAID interventions. The next phase of design should begin by mapping these interventions and targeting the ones LINKAGES should build around. In particular, USAID support to the health, education and accountability sectors should be targeted. This is way, LINKAGES can also motivate for extra funding from the better-funded USAID programs.

Extend the current Program for six to nine months. This is important in order to catch the new parliament and local government while fresh after the 2011 election.

¹² Important because the absorption capacity and quality of returns from the Non-Governmental actors must be strengthened as the increase in funding happens.

1 Introduction

1.1 THE CONTEXT OF LINKAGES.

The US-Government Democracy and governance strategy 2006-2009 contributes to the development goals of the United States Government Transformational Diplomacy Strategy (TDS) and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). The Transformational Diplomacy Strategy seeks “...to help build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system”. Whilst the Millennium Challenge Corporation promotes Good Governance, Investment in Citizens, and Economic Freedom¹³.

In the years 2004- 2007, the GoU outlined priorities in three areas: Governance, Corruption, and Strategic investment. These were captured in *Governance Pillar of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (2005-2008) (PEAP)*, *the National Strategy to Fight Corruption and Rebuild Ethics and Integrity in Public Office (2004-2007)*, and *Parliament’s Strategic Investment Development Plan 2007-2012 (PSIDP)*.

The priority areas identified by the Government of Uganda dovetailed with the objectives of both Transformational Diplomacy Strategy and Millennium Challenge Corporation. USAID-Uganda is the principal Agency that extends US foreign assistance to Uganda for the realization of these shared objectives¹⁴. Specifically, the objective of the USAID/Uganda S09 Team Results Framework Program is to advance the *transition from relief to development and the improvement of governance and democracy, by strengthening democratic LINKAGES*.

¹³ www.mcc.gov

¹⁴ www.usaid.gov

1.2 THE LINKAGES INTENT AND REVIEW RATIONALE

The LINKAGES program aims to strengthen democratic linkages within and amongst three actors; the Ugandan Parliament, selected local governments, and civil society groups.

The goals of the program are to build the capacity of these three actors to effectively identify and carry out their representational functions in the newly reinstated multi-party system; to increase democratic participation in political processes; to improve institutional transparency and accountability; and ultimately to increase and improve essential service delivery to constituents.

The LINKAGES program began in June 2007 and would run until December 2010¹⁵. From a review of the available literature, we discerned the overall Objectives of the LINKAGES program as improving governance and democracy in Uganda through four interventions.

- a. **One**, through a more receptive legislature that is able to discharge its responsibilities of hearing and responding to citizen demands and by establishing greater LINKAGES with Local Governments and Civil Society.
- b. **Two**, through enhancing accountability of Local Governments to their constituents by increasing their ability to perceive and react to their needs and priorities.
- c. **Three**, by enhancing transparent, responsive and accountable governance through the enhanced ability of Civil Society to influence and monitor government process.
- d. **Four**, through Mainstreaming of Cross-cutting sectoral issues which are *inter alia*: HIV-AIDS, Population and family planning, Natural Resource management and Land Tenure, and Northern Uganda. We will conduct an evaluation of these issues in the context of LINKAGES activities implemented with parliament, local governments and CSO's.

Specifically, we evaluated the performance and results of the program. We were meant to establish what was **done** (outputs) what **happened**¹⁶ (outcomes), and what **changed** (impact). More specifically, we answered three questions: One, what has *worked*, what has *not* and the reasons *why*? Two, what were the lessons learnt? And how can they feed into future USAID programming? Here, we were meant to identify opportunities lost and to 'bank' best practices for future replication. Three, what do the results tell us? This question was meant to give us a logical connection

¹⁵ LINKAGES Award contract 2007

¹⁶ Response of the program site to the interventions.

between the findings and the recommendations. Detailed evaluation ToR is attached at **Annex I** of the main report.

1.3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

1.3.1 Sources of Data

For purposes of this evaluation, two sources of data –secondary and primary – were employed

1.3.1.1 Secondary Sources

The evaluation relied on three classes of data. First was LINKAGES Program generated literature¹⁷. This included the program documents, annual reports, progress reports, project development plans (PDP's) and M&E reports within the program. The second was literature that helped us establish LINKAGES 'state-of-the-art' before implementation. Although this was not baseline data as such, it we had to use it as a way of establishing the state-of-things before and after implementation. The third class was in-country and off-country literature that facilitated a comparative study of the performance of the institutions supported under the LINKAGES program with their contemporaries elsewhere. The purpose of the comparative study is to flag out innovative practices that are suitable for replication. A total of 96 program reports and documents were reviewed¹⁸. Details of the Literature Reviewed are attached at **Annex II** of this report.

1.3.1.2 Primary Sources

The Geography. The LINKAGES operations happened in 10 districts of Mubende, Amolatar, Katakwi, Pader, Kitgum, Sironko, Hoima, Kisoro, Arua and Mukono, and in 50 sub counties¹⁹.

The primary data was collected from a geographically representative sample of 5 districts and fifteen sub-counties. In each district, 3 sub-counties were targeted for the evaluation. Of the three sub-counties, two were serviced by LINKAGES and one control sub-county without LINKAGES intervention within the district. The control sub-counties were used to compare the benefits accruing from the target counties with the 'state-of-things' in the non-beneficiary counties. *The choice of the 2 sub counties benefitting from LINKAGES interventions was influenced by applicable previous District and sub county performance under the Local Government Assessment Framework, key poverty and social criteria and demographic factors such as age, gender, urban/rural location etc.*

The Respondents. The primary data was collected from a total of 380 respondents spread across the 5 districts²⁰. We extracted data from

¹⁷ ToR 5.2 - Task 1

¹⁸ The team deployed four people to scan through the literature. Two from CJSI, an intern from London School of Economics at TCH, who travelled to Kampala for the Scan and a TCH Research Fellow who accompanied the team leader during field visits.

¹⁹ ToR 2

²⁰ The Schedule of meetings and respondents interviewed is attached as **Annex III** of the Draft Report.

informants at the national, local government and sub county levels. Two categories of informants were targeted. **The first** comprised of the implementers of the Linkages program. These include: one, the program implementers. These were the office bearers within the primary institutions charged with implementing the LINKAGES Program. Two, the implementing partners. These were the three institutions i.e. Parliament, Local Governments and CSO's targeted for capacity enhancement by the LINKAGES program. **The second** group was constituted by (i) stakeholders who were target beneficiaries of interventions from the Linkages programs and ii) a control group that provided comparative analysis. That is, persons from sub counties where LINKAGES did not work were interviewed in order to assess the extent of and effectiveness with which the LINKAGES program brought about change and impact. As a research technique, we used the idea of a 'control group' to capture any glaring variations between the implementation sub-counties and those that did not benefit. It is therefore used, not as a unit of analysis per se, but as a quality assurance measure. The position of this report is that no glaring variations were recorded. As noted in some sections of this report, the beneficiary counties recorded better governance and accountability results compared to the control sub-counties. We did not expect the contrary, but we had to be sure.

Extraction Instrument. The checklist was the primary instrument of data extraction through which program effectiveness was measured against the statement of work and intended objectives.

Extraction Methods. Three methods of data extraction were employed; Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), in depth Interviews (IDI) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Tools for data extraction varied, but referred to a generic Check List developed at the Inception Stage and attached to the Inception Report. A detailed list of Interviews is attached at **Annex III** of the main report.

1.4 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

The main limitation to this evaluation was the NRM nominations. Because of this process, meetings with the parliamentary committees, most of whose members were conducting re-election campaigns, became problematic²¹. Similarly, the presence of LINKAGES team during field work was raised by UMEMS as a probable limitation²². In the view of the team, their presence enhanced our understanding of implementation more than it inhibited the analysis of results²³. It did not affect our analysis of the interventions and the processing of the results. In fact, we used the LINKAGES team to bounce the emerging findings and recommendations. At first, this was uncomfortable for both of us, but in our final de-brief meeting with LINKAGES team, the added value of the interaction enriched our analysis and recommendations²⁴.

²¹ We were able to meet with the opposition

²² Communicated as an email by UMEMS to USAID and shared with the evaluators for response.

²³ This position was communicated to USAID in an email by the Team Leader.

²⁴ We should further note that not all the comments given by LINKAGES were incorporated in the final draft of this report. As independent reviewers, we disagreed with some of their assertions.

2 Design and Performance

2.1 PROGRAM DESIGN

2.1.1 Overall Assessment

Achievements. In the view of this Report, the idea of Linkages is both pioneering and innovative. From its articulation in the RFP, It pins down the governance crisis in Uganda at the core. And this crisis is about ‘de-linked’ processes and structures. It is about a disconnect between the supply and the demand sides of governance. But it is also about a disconnect within each of the sides²⁵. The intention of the program, as per the RFP²⁶, was therefore to strengthen structural, process and transaction linkages between and within each side.

Degrees of Linkages. The position of this Report is that some linkages were created and others strengthened. But these happened in degrees. In some instances, the groundwork for establishing the linkages was built, while in others, the linkages were actually created or strengthened. The need for linkages was identified in certain instances, while in others, existing linkages were studied and replicated elsewhere²⁷. In our assessment, the successful linkages were more visible in the local government component compared to the component on parliament. This was partly a function of design, and partly as a result of performance. Thus, while a certain degree of linkages was created, certain lessons regarding design must be recorded. These lessons should plough back into future programming at USAID.

²⁵ Implied in the RFP at C.2. p.15

²⁶ This intention is NOT as expressed in the SUNY/RTI Technical Proposal. We will demonstrate the disconnect in detail in sections that follow

²⁷ We summon the evidence to support the assertions in the body of this Note and in greater details in the Draft Report.

2.1.2 Premise of Design

Other USAID Programs. Linkages was not built in a vacuum. Before the program, USAID had supported numerous interventions within parliament. Similarly, the program was designed in the context of a flora of other USAID programs these range from Investing in People program in the area of health to the Education Sector Investment Program. Design, in our view, should have advanced from this ‘flora’ with the intention of building on acquired competences and increasing the value of USAID grants through synergy-building.

Levels and Types of Funding. USAID funding to Uganda is varied. It falls into seven categories, with each motivating for different levels of resources. If SO9 gave the specific picture including the intent and resources, the ‘global’ picture is provided for by these categories. This program was designed to dove-tail into the big picture in pursuit of USAID policy intentions in Uganda.

2.1.3 Critical Design Lessons

Design Disconnect. In the view of this Report, the SUNY/RTI Technical Proposal did not unpack the RFP intentions in a way that added value. At least the conceptual unpacking of the RFP intent did not happen. In the process, some of the nuances in the RFP were lost. More specifically, the proposal did not advance the RFP’s conceptualisation of linkages. And unfortunately, there was no evidence that the SUNY/RTI proposal was audited against the RFP intentions. Had this been done after the award, the gap between the two would have been noted.

The consultant team was informed by the contracting officer at USAID²⁸ that post-contract meetings were held between the implementer and USAID. And that these meetings were meant to *inter alia*, address such gaps. However, the team was not able to examine the minutes of these meetings to determine the extent to which the gaps were to be addressed by the implementer²⁹.

We recommend that the post-award meetings between USAID and the contracted implementers be used as an Inception Briefing in which *inter alia*, the intentions of USAID are aligned with the contractor’s understanding of client intent³⁰. This is to ensure that what USAID intended to achieve is not lost through implementer interpretation.

Defining Linkages. In most of the program documents, the concept of linkages is not defined; its definition is only implied. As such, the

²⁸ Meeting with the Contracting Officer at USAID, Mr Bruce F. McFarland; the SO9 team leader and the LINKAGES manager, September 20th 2010

²⁹ These were to be sent to the team, and we expect that when this is done, we can make a determination.

³⁰ This is a good practice USAID can borrow from the consulting field. The idea is to level out expectations and to ensure USAID concerns, including nuances, are not lost at contracting level.

implementers could not ‘visualise’ what they were constructing. A trustworthy account of how many linkages were created, where they were located and what was transmitted through them, was not possible. It must be noted, however, that the LINKAGES design attempted to define the types of linkages to be built³¹. Specifically, it noted:

“...The types of linkages to be strengthened include better communications; more regularized or institutionalized interactions; joint strategic planning and policy making; coordinated activities; and joint participation in community activities, dialogues, and forums”

In the view of the consultants, this is a description of the ‘activities’ and functions to be enhanced – ‘communication’, ‘interactions’, ‘planning’ etc. These functions can hardly be described as ‘linkages’. A linkage in our view should combine both the ‘activity’ and the ‘means’ through which the activity is transacted.

From our reading of literature and field experience, however, it was clear that a linkage was a “... **transaction channel between (and within) the demand and supply sides of governance**’. The ‘channel’ is the means; while the transaction is the ‘activity’. A transaction is a *quid pro quo* engagement. The supplier provides a ‘good’; the demand side pays a price. In the case of this program, the supply side of governance was meant to improve on service delivery. And the price of this was ‘increased popular legitimacy’ and consent from the demand side (the people). The ‘linkages’ were the means through which the transactions were to happen. This two-way interaction is what made the linkages democratic. From the review, we can confirm that some of these ‘transaction channels’ were created. However, because they were not defined, most were accidental.

Mapping the Linkages. The RFP and the DG Assessment³² advance from the assumption that some linkages exist. In fact, they identify existing ‘transaction channels’ in *inter alia*, the areas of communication, planning and coordination. At the design level, however, this thinking is not unpackaged. Failure to map and target the strategic linkages- arising from an understanding of the “degrees of separation” between the supply and demand side and how best to reduce the distance was a lost opportunity in the view of this Report. From the literature and field experiences, we discerned three categories of linkages the program could have built on. The possibility is that other linkages exist.

De-jure linkages are the ‘transaction channels’ created by law or policy. For instance, the linkage between MPs and District Councils is de-jure. Similarly, the Uganda Law Society is mandated by law to advise all government agencies on matters legal. Bills that go through parliament

³¹ This point was raised numerous by LINKAGES field office and in the LINKAGES comments to the draft report. As independent reviewers, we are not persuaded that the implementers applied their minds fully in defining the concept. Had this been done, better results would have accrued.

³² The Consultants did not have access to this document, but built on what is alluded regarding its findings in the RFP.

are therefore sent to them for scrutiny. And because they are situated on the demand side of governance, this gives them some 'statutory voice'. One unintended result³³ of this program was the enhancement of this voice. If this was identified as a strategic intent of the program at design level, the potential for results would have been greater in the view of this report.

De-facto linkages are 'transaction channels' created through practice and social exchange. These are based on a common understanding of what is 'good' for society, not what is lawful. If the de-jure linkages provided for 'statutory voices', then the de-facto linkages provided for 'practice voices'. We identified most of these at the lower levers of the parish, sub-county and the district. At the district level, for instance, the CSOs acted as the 'moral voices' for community. And this is why they were accorded space in the councils to articulate community demands from a non-state perspective. These voices were strongest in the participatory planning processes and the budget conferences. Although the program strengthened them, better results would have been recorded had the linkages been mapped earlier.

Normative linkages are 'channels' created through demand. For instance, the relationship between MPs and their constituents is not regulated by law or practice. It is moderated by demand on the part of constituents and responsiveness on the part of the MPs. These kinds of linkages were noted in the lower levels between the councillors and their constituents. In fact, the lower the governance spaces, the higher the levels of civic competence amongst the constituents. But the higher the spaces, the reverse was true. Ability for the constituents to influence MPs was limited, compared to their linkages with councillors and the LC chairs. In our view, nuanced analysis of these relationships, at the level of design, would have yielded better returns.

For strategic focus, **we recommend** that any future programming in this area be preceded by an analysis of existing 'transaction channels'. These should then be prioritised with the intention of identifying which ones to strengthen or replicate. The strengthening should also sequence them with the intention of indentifying which ones to strengthen/create first and which ones to follow.

2.2 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME). Annual plans were preceded by staff reflections. The idea was to take stock of the roll-out in the previous year and plough the lessons back into the following year. We recorded this as a good implementation practice. Similarly, and according to the records, an M&E system was in place and institutional 'learnings' were banked accordingly. Also noteworthy, and from discussions with the LINKAGES field office, lessons learnt in each monitoring quarter were ploughed back into implementation. This tended to correct or enhance the direction of the program.

³³ Noted by the ULS President, the ULS Executive Director and one Program officer during a meeting with Consultants. August 26th 2010.

According to LINKAGES staff, UMEMS supported them to institutionalise and standardise the PME systems. More so in the areas of generating indicators that are measurable, and in the quantitative banking of emerging knowledge³⁴. However, the PME system was challenged at two levels.

One, most of the annual plans we reviewed did not have time lines. Activities were therefore implemented without specific time frames except for the 'one year' specified in the Annual Plans. Regardless of methodology, this was a bad practice on the part of SUNY/RTI. It made it difficult for USAID to sequence expected results and to monitor whether or not the delivered returns have 'value-for-money'

Two, the M&E system was strong on quantitative results, but weak on the qualitative nuances. Yet most of the changes in the governance sector can only be recorded using qualitative measures. This meant that a lot of lessons were missed. And the emphasis on quantitative measures can also account for the fact that the program reported more on what was *done*, and less on what was *achieved*³⁵. When we analysed this further, it was attributed to the UMEMS approach as required by USAID. While UMEMS is competent in quantitative measures in areas of health and education, the approach to the governance sector must use different measures. Although PME standardisation was done, we were not persuaded that capacity to monitor qualitative results was created at LINKAGES. And this is probably because UMEMS is limited in this area³⁶.

We recommend a nuanced PME system capable of processing the qualitative results you find in the governance sector. Sourcing for this capacity in the next phase of programming is a *sine qua non*. In the view of the consultants, the absence of this meant that critical learnings were not analysed and feedback into programming.

Implementation architecture. The division of labour was tri-furcated. SUNY was the main contractor buckstopping the results; while RTI was a sub-contractor meant to roll out the Local Government Component. The third tier of implementation was the LINKAGES field office in Kampala. It was in-charge of the day-to-day operations. But there was another implementation tier. The SO9 team played the overall role of guiding implementation to ensure that it was consistent with USAID aspirations. Similarly, a LINKAGES Liaison Committee (LCC) was created to play an advisory role. It had representation from all the program stakeholders.

In the view of this Report, the LINKAGES field office handled the implementation very competently. This was confirmed by testimonies during fieldwork, and by the teams' own assessment. The personal involvement of team leaders and the COP in the implementation was commended. Their capacity to innovate on the ground and to supervise

³⁴ De-brief meeting with the entire LINKAGES team at their offices, September 17th 2010

³⁵ What was done can be measured quantitatively. But what was achieved in the context of governance is more difficult to quantify.

³⁶ This observation was actually made by the SO9 team and we concur after reviewing reports.

implementation was also noted by the stakeholders. However, this office had limited capacity to make speedy decisions. This was due to the detailed consultations it had to make with New York on matters operational. This slowed down program responsiveness.

Three other challenges are worth mention. The first is the USAID procedures and SO9 team capacity. The long process of contracting and ensuring 'due diligence' slowed down implementation. This was particularly true with regards to engagements in parliament and procurement of consultants³⁷. Regarding the capacity of the SO9 team, it was limited. More so with respect to supervision of the implementer³⁸ and guidance to the design process in the early stages. The second challenge refers to the cost of delivering the program. Compared to the deliverables, the cost of hiring SUNY/RTI as implementers was prohibitive. The program holders also noted that SUNY/RTI did not disclose the budgets to the beneficiary institutions³⁹. This non-disclosure posed a challenge especially for parliament. The third is about the LLC. Although appreciated by the stakeholders, some of them saw it as 'tokenist'. The CSOs⁴⁰ in particular questioned the fact that some of them were beneficiaries and members of the LCC. The issue had to do with probable conflict of interest with regards to the dual roles⁴¹.

For the next phase of programming, **we recommend** the piloting of two emerging principles at USAID⁴². The first one is the use of local contractors as opposed to US-based implementers⁴³. In the case of this program, most of the work was done by the field office. The human capacity created in the process should not go to waste. This view has resonance with beneficiary institutions like parliament. **And the argument is that there are far too many new program entrants with each phase of USAID support. The problem with this is that relationships and 'linkages' built with previous program people are lost with the coming in of the new entrants. Mechanisms of utilising and retaining such relationships should be considered. This should be combined with capacity generated by other USAID programs like ACT and the Parliamentary Internship Program. If piloted successfully, the use of local contractors in Uganda⁴⁴ can be used as a model for other USAID countries.**

³⁷ But this is also two-edged. For instance, parliament would procure consultants that were not fully qualified. And this necessitated delays in contracting them. The practice here was mentioned primarily with reference to the opposition.

³⁸ As per the rules of engagement

³⁹ This is more a function of practice, and not a policy or legal requirement according to USAID. Point made in two different meetings by USAID Mission Director Mr David Eckerson and the Contracting Officer, Mr Bruce Mcfarland. It was also clarified in these meetings that there some budget items relating to implementer's fees in which disclosure is not obligatory. Mr Mcfarland further noted that most of the contract information is public and is available in relevant USAID public domains.

⁴⁰ Matter raised in a meeting with the NGO Forum August 24th 2010

⁴¹ In our assessment, this was not necessarily true in practice. But the danger could, however, emerge in a situation where a grantee's position is threatened.

⁴² These are as expressed by the New USAID administration in Washington and brought to our attention by USAID

⁴³ The draft Report offers different ways in which this can be piloted

⁴⁴ SUNY response to the suggestion that local contractors should be used was that they have no capacity to do technical work. The consultant team disagrees with this position. We are of the view that this capacity exists in Uganda and the region at large. It has not been tapped. In fact, it is more nuanced by the fact that it understands local processes better.

The second principle regards Washington's interest in relating its programming to the Paris Principles. Although the US government is not a signatory to this instrument⁴⁵, there is a desire to relate to its elements. The second phase of this program should consider piloting this as well.

2.3 The Performance Framework

2.3.1 Parameters of Performance

To measure performance, we used five parameters viz; levels of program results, program effectiveness, efficiency, responsiveness and sustainability.

2.3.2 The Program Results

Levels of Results. Three levels of results were discerned. The first level is outputs. This is what the program **did**. It is different from activities in the sense that activities are a means to the outputs. Training workshops are activities for instance. The output produced by workshops is sensitisation or skills acquisition. And this is what the program did. In the view of this report, most of the program results are located at output level. And this is partly a design⁴⁶ issue and partly a question of program lifespan. In many districts we visited, we were told to "...come later for impact assessment". That is, the period was too short to create notable change. If capacity in the three targeted sites was increased, it was highest at the level of outputs and limited at the other levels of results. Similarly, increase in political participation was noted. However, this was more pronounced at the level of 'subjective competence' (the belief that participation can lead to influencing) than at the level of 'actual competence' (actual/real ability to influence). This level of results is both at output and outcome levels.

Results were also noted at the level of **outcomes**. This is the second level and answers the question: **what happened?** That is, after the outputs, how did the program site respond to the interventions? In the view of this Note, three results were recorded at this level. One, some **linkages** were created or strengthened as a result of the interventions. Two, **institutions were strengthened**. This was particularly true in the case of Local Government. Training in the Rules of Procedure separated the functions of the technical staff from those of the politicians. This increased efficiency in the manner in which District and sub-county assemblies conducted business. Three, transparency and accountability within Local Government was enhanced. Support to participatory planning and budget process; including some of the parliamentary visits opened up local government spaces for public scrutiny⁴⁷ The challenge to these results is

⁴⁵ The US Government is not a signatory to the Paris Declaration yet but adheres to the principles

⁴⁶ Design because we did not discern a deliberate harvesting of results and grooming them to the next level. Where this happened, it was not a program intention.

⁴⁷ It was noted for instance that public discussions of the audit reports by visiting MPs in some of the districts led to increased interest in government expenditure by the public.

that of sustainability. Especially given the possibility of new councils and members of parliament after the 2011 election.

At the level of **impact**, two results were expected. Improved service delivery from the supply side of governance; and increased quality of participation from the demand side. In the language of this program, supply side represents the 'hearing' while the demand side represents the 'voice'. The two are symbiotic in their relationship. If the demand surpasses supply, the price of transacting change goes up; And if the supply is higher than the demand, the value of change as a commodity goes down. Balancing the two was therefore a *conditio sine qua non*.

In the view of this report, the idea of linkages was meant to increase the 'transaction' between the two sides. As such, it was a facilitative result; a means to impact, not an end in itself. Of equal importance was institutional strengthening. If the popular demand was raised, but the capacity to process it was challenged by institutional weaknesses, the result would have been a disaster.

In our assessment, potential for impact exists. This is more present at the level of local government. As we shall show later, there were signs of improved service delivery and an increase in popular 'voices' as articulated by civil society. However, we are of the view that US \$ 300,000, distributed amongst 38 CSOs was insufficient to 'buy' quality voice. Similarly, and at the level of design, we did not discern a strategy for harvesting and grooming results from one level to the next at the national level. This was a missed opportunity and one to be corrected in future programming.

At the district support to civil society involved initial training followed by additional technical assistance and other types of support, including financial, to enable the CSOs to put their learning into practice, thus taking their work to the next level. However the program was weak on knowledge development and documentation- a challenge that should be addressed in future programming.

2.3.3 Program Effectiveness

Attribution. Effectiveness is the extent to which results were achieved and the **cause-effect** relationship between the results and USAID funding. As already noted, program effectiveness was most pronounced at output and outcome levels. And this was partly a design glitch and partly because impact was not possible during the program cycle. Also noteworthy is this: We cannot confirm attribution (cause-effect relationship) between program results and USAID funding. But we can infer to contribution. And the higher the results level, the more we can speak of contribution as opposed to attribution.

Local Government. Within this component, training on Rules of Procedure; and on participatory planning recorded the highest effects. Although support to increase the revenue base of the districts recorded some returns, this was challenged. In some of the poor districts, there

was 'nothing' to tax. Similarly, the policy frameworks in some instances inhibited the possibilities of increasing taxation. Also noted was the absence of structures to handle this process.

Civil Society. Within civil society, Policy advocacy was probably the most effective in our view. It attained program intentions. And this is largely because the program piggy-backed on existing competencies within the national CSOs. Support to ULS, and ULA on the land policy are cases in point. The least effective aspect of CSO support, in our view, was the Small Grants intervention. This program used the 'drip principle'⁴⁸ in its engagement with civil society. It distributed US\$ 300,000 to 38 institutions⁴⁹. These CSOs were meant to create a 'credible' voice deserving a 'hearing' from state agencies. In the view of this report, this choice of grant values was not effective. Although some CSOs increased the value of their grants⁵⁰, due to the size of the grants, results were only demonstrable by CSOs with sound financial position and ongoing programs. To such organisations the support was catalytic. And this is all it did; catalyze. Because of this, some of the results were 'hit-and-run'. They were incapable of creating 'voice'

Parliament. Two aspects of support to parliament were recorded as effective. The first is support to opposition and shadow cabinet. Through linkages, opposition was able to define its space in parliament, and offer alternative propositions. Although this does not amount to effective checks and balances, it is a good starting point. There was value-for-money in 'incubating' this process. The second was the field visits and oversight functions of parliament. We recorded this as effective, but with reservations. Moreso because it was not focused. The visits ranged from issues of child mortality to auditor general reports. The broadness of this approach, in our view, was a limitation in design. One aspect was singled out as least effective in parliament. And although we record it as an effective aspect of CSO engagement, support to the Bill-making process can only produce long-term results, if any. The consultants were not persuaded that the results of this intervention improved on service delivery, or had potential to do so.

2.3.4 Program Efficiency

Defining Efficiency. In doing the 'efficiency tests', we were interested in how resources were converted into results. That is, how resources were applied and maximised to attain program results. But more fundamentally, we were interested in 'value-for-money'. Although we could not do a scientific assessment here, we were able to make inferences to situations where inputs provided higher returns and vice-versa.

⁴⁸ This is compared to the 'principle of saturation' in which interventions are properly resourced to produce necessary results.

⁴⁹ Figures availed by the Linkages Grants Manager in an Interview, 16th September 2010. The figure on paper, however is that US \$ 400,000 was distributed by way of grants to civil society.

⁵⁰ For instance, in Sironko, one CSO we interviewed had no core-support. But they rolled out the Linkages program on a voluntary basis, building it on previous support from other donors

Design Efficiency. Three things concerned us here. One, because linkages were not defined and mapped, the achievement of the same became blurred. A lot could have been achieved if this had been done *a priori*. To the contrary, a clear conceptualisation of institutional strengthening produced results. Two, the criteria used to choose the 10 implementation districts was not optimal. In the view of this Report, districts where other USAID projects are being implemented would have increased the value of funding⁵¹. More so where USAID is involved in enhancing health and education service delivery. Although the 10 districts were chosen using a scientific criteria, we hold the view that building on other USAID projects would have been more efficient. The third element of efficiency relates to a concept known as **distance decay**.

This concept is borrowed from the First Principle of Geography. It states that “...everything is related to everything else; but near things are more related than distant things” (Tobler, W 1970). Because of the distance⁵² between parliament and the people, there is some ‘relationship decay’. To the contrary, the route between local government and the people is shorter. This is why the team was not persuaded that engaging with Parliament was efficient. The time it takes for legislation to impact on the poor is far too long. The distance between legislation and its implementation is wide. To the contrary, engaging with Local Government had better ‘returns to investment’ and was more efficient. And this is why our recommendation is for the role of parliament in future programming to be confined to oversight functions only.

Although we did not do a ‘value-for-money’ assessment, we made a few subjective observations regarding design. One, the move to invest in the districts instead of the national level was value-adding. In our subjective assessment, three dollars will only buy you results worth one dollar nationally. In the reverse, one dollar at the district will buy you results worth three dollars. In our view, therefore, investing in districts was more efficient. Two, the crisis of governance is located at implementation level. The core implementing agency is the local government. Targeting it was therefore spot on. Three, value-for-money investment in civil society was limited. We followed a similar program by UNDP and we were able to make comparisons regarding design and implementation. USAID would have achieved more in this component had the design focused on the principle of ‘saturation’ as opposed to ‘drip’. This is what UNDP did. Four, the program spread far too thin in terms of geographical spread, choice of issues and partners. We questioned the cumulative effect of these multiple engagements. In our view, the choice of fewer related areas had potential for greater impact. This was also more efficient.

Efficiency of Implementation. The view of this Report is that implementation was generally efficient. As indicated by the reports and field visits, most of the intended activities were carried out. According to the parliamentary technical staff⁵³, up to 80% of the earmarked activities in their component were implemented. Our subjective estimate from the

⁵¹ For instance ‘PEPFA’ districts

⁵² The distance is both geographical and operational.

⁵³ Interview with Dison Okumu. August 24th 2010

review of documents and reports approximates this percentage on the activities in the local government component as well. Similarly, evidence summoned from the field further reveals that the consultants hired to train the different beneficiaries were of a high calibre and delivered quality training. We verified this by carrying out some 'recall tests' in some instances. There was 'value-for-money'. The only challenge as we shall show later is that these activities were not always groomed to the next level of results.

2.3.5 Program Responsiveness

Our interest here was to determine the extent to which the program anticipated and responded to emerging challenges with timely and appropriate action. This report can confirm that a notable level of responsiveness existed. The field office was quick and spontaneous. Issues and challenges arising from the program sites were captured with speed by the Team Leaders. However, speedy response was hindered by the bureaucratic ties between the field office and SUNY New York. This was also slowed down by the long procedures at USAID, especially situations that required consent from the USAID offices.

2.3.6 Program Sustainability

We define sustainability as the maintenance of benefits, as opposed to funding investments. Because they were catalytic, benefits accruing to civil society from this program were least sustainable. However, there is an exception here. At the sub-county level, the nominal investments catalysed the need for farmer associations, cashbox groups and such formations to form coalitions. The belief was that collective competence was more effective in dealing with government than scattered competence. Benefits accruing to Local government are probably the most sustainable. But these are threatened by the 2011 election which is likely to see a replacement of close to 40% of councillors⁵⁴ Support to opposition in parliament has potential for sustainability also. The team has reservations regarding the sustainability of the other components supported in parliament.

⁵⁴ This is the average attrition rate during elections at this level

3 Component Analysis

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The components were assessed using four parameters, namely design, implementation, performance, and institutional architecture. Our overall assessment is that the Local Government (LG) component performed the best. And this is largely because of the proximity between the poor and LG. But also because this component was probably better conceptualized compared to the other two. We make the detailed observations below.

3.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANALYSIS

3.1.1 Component Design

LG Intent. The purpose of strengthening democratic linkages in local governments was to ensure more accountable and transparent local governments. This was premised on the assumption that more accountable and transparent local governments lead to or significantly contribute to the attainment of the ultimate goal of improved service delivery in local governments. Within this component, four results were anticipated.

- a. Expanded 'space' for citizen participation in policy, planning and budgeting processes.

- b. Improved coordination and flow of information within and amongst local governments.
- c. Strengthened institutional capacity.
- d. Improved service delivery

Component Delivery Mechanism. The design recognizes that linkages cannot come automatically but through a combination of strategic actions. The linkages within local governments and between local governments, CSOs and Parliament were to be exploited by intervening in three critical areas;

- e. Training of Local Governments in Harmonized Participatory Development Planning (HPDP)
- f. Orientation and Mentoring of Local Government Councilors in Standard Rules of Procedure.
- g. Enhancement of Local Revenue Mobilization.

Mapping and selection of beneficiaries. The LG component was planned to benefit 10 districts and fifty (50) lower local governments. That is, five (5) sub counties from each of the 10 sampled districts⁵⁵. The criteria for selection of beneficiary districts entailed performance status of the district as revealed by the most recent LG Performance Assessment, poverty and other socio-economic indicators; regional representation and focus on the Northern districts (PRDP). Specifically, the ultimate selection of beneficiary districts is as in the Table below.

Region	Districts	Criteria (LG assessment, regional representation & unique features)
1. North	1. Amolatar	LG best performer/North/ PRDP
	2. Arua	LG average performer/North/ PRDP
	3. Kitgum	LG average performer/North/ PRDP
	4. Pader	LG poor performer/North/ PRDP
2. Eastern	1. Sironko	LG average performer/East/poverty
	2. Katakwi	LG poor performer/East/cattle rustling
3. Central	1. Mukono	LG poor performer/Central/pioneer decentralization
	2. Mubende	LG best performer/Central/ pioneer decentralization
4. Western	1. Kisoro	LG poor performer/West/isolation and minimal CSO presence
	2. Hoima	LG average performer/West/oil & gas phenomenon

3.1.1.1 Design Strong Points

The design of local government component of linkages identified a number of strong points that needs to be espoused to inform future programming of Linkages. They include:

⁵⁵ SUNY/RTI Proposal

- a. **Project interventions and workplans were drawn and aligned to priorities of participating institutions.** Although design did not involve beneficiaries in earlier stages, the project interventions were chosen from amongst the planned outputs and activities of the participating agencies. These were activities and outputs, which were already captured in institutional strategic work plans and annual plans and budgets but pending execution for some reasons. Similarly, beneficiaries had an opportunity to input into project workplans and activities⁵⁶ during the early activities for introducing the project to beneficiaries.
- b. **Participation in selection of beneficiaries.** Within the district local governments, selection of beneficiary sub counties was done with the input of district leadership.
- c. **Politically viable and socially acceptable criteria for selection of beneficiary local governments.** First, regional representation gave the criteria a political appeal and image, which was expounded by heavy representation and focus on post- conflict northern Uganda (40% of project coverage). By targeting areas with poor poverty and socio-economic indicators, social acceptability of the project was enhanced. However, the criteria did not purposively select districts where there is USAID/USG presence. It was therefore, 'programmatically' weak in as far as establishing linkages with existing USAID/USG programs.

3.1.1.2 Design Shortcomings

Mapping. Linkages were not strategically mapped from a LG perspective. The approach seems to have asked this question: "...what needs to be **done** in local governments, CSOs and Parliament in order to improve their working relationships" Yet the flipside question would have been more relevant. That is: "...what is it that LGs required from CSOs and/or Parliament in order to attain the ultimate goal of improved service delivery?"

Over-reliance on Experts. Approach to training and mentoring relied heavily on experts who were picked from a pool of consultants by MoLG, as such, this did not necessarily result in immediate institutional capacity strengthening. While the experts' competences were not at all questionable, they coming from outside the implementing districts left a physical gap between trainees and experts. The opportunity for further consultations, interactions and guidance was watered down. The general feeling and recommendation was that the consultants could have been drawn from within the LG formations themselves in order to build immediate local capacities.

Absence of a Baseline survey. The design identified a number of quantitative indicators and targets to be measured at the end of the

⁵⁶ However, beneficiaries could not discuss nor influence the budget.

project⁵⁷. However, the design did not benchmark the targets against baseline survey data. Without quantitative data on performance of these indicators, ‘quantitative assessment’ is not possible.

3.1.2 COMPONENT IMPLEMENTATION

3.1.2.1 Overview

Under implementation, evaluators were interested in examining and establishing how the designed strategies and interventions were translated into actionable activities. In this section we demonstrate ‘what was done’ on each of the intervention areas but not what resulted from these interventions. This is based on analysis of periodic performance reports for the project. The outputs and outcome these activities are discussed in the subsequent sections (performance and results framework).

3.1.2.2 Training in HPDP

This intervention aimed at building capacity of local governments in participatory planning and budgeting. Most of its intended activities were carried out with varying levels of results.

The Achievements. Under training, the key **outputs** realized included:

- a. **Awareness on local government planning and budgeting processes enhanced.** Training of sub-county chiefs, parish development committees, community development officers and CSOs in HPDP tool enhanced their awareness about planning budgeting processes. They became more conversant with the budgeting cycle and observance of the budgeting timelines also improved. By comparing with sub counties with no linkages intervention the difference in awareness about of planning and budgeting processes was not that distinct. However, observance and compliance with the budgeting procedures and timelines was skewed in experimental group. This implies that there exists some minimum awareness about government planning and budgeting systems among key personnel that participate in these processes irrespective of LINKAGES. But applying the knowledge to develop plans required additional capacity enhancements. This was lacking in control areas and LINKAGES endeavored to provide it where it intervened⁵⁸.
- b. **Capacity of technical officers in planning and budgeting strengthened.** Interviews with technical officers at sub-county and parish levels confirm that the training apprised participants with skills in participatory planning and budgeting. The common skills

⁵⁷ USAID RFP and Submission by SUNY and RTI

⁵⁸ A control group in Kisoro says “ we are aware of the benefits of participatory planning and budgeting but where can we get money to facilitate workshops leave alone transport to engage in village consultations – we have no donor in our subcounty , government budget is always earmarked to projects and local revenue is not forthcoming”.

mentioned by respondents ranged from resource mapping, village profiling to priority setting and preparation of development plans.

- c. **Operationalisation of budget conference.** Whereas a budget conference is a consultative arrangement provided for in the local government planning guidelines to enable stakeholders input into the budgeting process, at sub-county and parish levels budget conferencing only became a reality with linkages intervention⁵⁹. Most of lower local government lacked logistics to facilitate budget consultations and this is the main reason as to why budget workshops are not held in most of the sub-counties with no LINKAGES' presence. At district level, the quality of budget conference was improved. First, there was increase in both number and variety of participants. Second, there was improvement in the way conferences were arranged and managed. Unlike before where only district technical staff were allowed to say something in the conference and the rest of the participants were there to 'rubber stamp' what they had already decided, this time around, all participants were free to debate strategies and priorities in district plan and contribute ideas outside the plan⁶⁰. Third, the quality of debate in conferences improved. Fourth, the feedback and follow up on issues that were being agreed upon in the conference also reported to have improved.

Some Lessons Learnt. A few lessons that should be ploughed back into future programming were recorded to include the following:

- a. **Aligning with the government planning and budgeting cycles** – for these trainings to be more effective, there was a need to align their timing with planning and budgeting cycles. By the training taking place a few months into the budgeting cycle as it happened in most sampled sub counties, the trained cohort loses the opportunity to use the acquired knowledge to input into and/or influence the process. Yet by the time, the next planning cycle emerges the 'steam' may have evaporated or even some of the trained staff may have been transferred or changed place of aboard. Beating the stringent budget time-lines, required a more bigger training force that would deploy in all districts at ago, which was practically difficult leading to crush program in execution of trainings.

Roll out of training needs to be accelerated especially in lower local governments. While the training was phased in different modules with a defined minimum acceptable package, many local governments were yet to receive full- training. At the district level, a few had received the full training program but in lower local government many were halfway to completion of the training

⁵⁹ Linkages facilitated budget conference in provision of workshop logistics such as stationary , printing of documents, venue and transport refund as well as advise on events management.

⁶⁰ This is the feeling of the majority of the people interviewed in all sampled districts.

program. Roll out in sub counties should be expedited especially in non PRDP/HPDP districts for tangible results.

- b. **Imbalance between methodological/procedural aspects and 'thematic' content.** The training concentrated on procedural matters and neglected other equally important thematic contents that are relevant to local government such as procurement, contracting and tendering.
- c. **The training was not institutionalized in local government and at the centre.** It would have been expected that the responsible MDAs⁶¹ in planning and budgeting would take a lead in coordination of these trainings at national level or at the centre. Instead, these institutions were minimally involved in the entire arrangement – Ministry of Local Government (MoLG) with only coordination roles over all governments was on the spotlight. At the district level, the personnel department should have been seen to be driving the program alongside the planning unit. However, in all districts the personnel officers were sidelined by planning units and offices of the Speaker.

3.1.2.3 Orienting Councils in Standard Rules of Procedure

With the return to multiparty democracy, the Ministry of Local Government developed Standard Rules of Procedure to guide council business in a multiparty set up. Linkages took up this planned activity, which was underfunded in the ministry's strategic plan. The activities under this intervention included i) duplication and dissemination of the procedure, (ii) orientation of councilors on the procedures, and (iii) mentoring and sculpting of the procedures in selected councils.

Achievements. At the level of Outputs, a number of achievements were recorded.

- a. **Standard rules of procedures became operational** – this was engendered awareness creation on importance of applying rules of procedure, capacity building of the speaker and executive and improved access to rules of procedure.
- b. **Capacity of the speaker in moderation of council business enhanced** – this was as a result of training as well as mentoring and advisory services from trainers.
- c. **Separation of roles of the council and the technical arm** - this was largely achieved through training both parallel and joint training of hon. Councilors and technical officers. Within the council, division of tasks was also realized between the council and executive. But we further recorded the percolation of this achievement in community. In Sironko, the communities we visited noted that now

⁶¹ For planning the responsible national institution is National Planning Authority (NPA) and for budgeting, it is the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED)

they know the responsibilities of the CAO and his staff *vis avis* the councilors. This separation of 'powers' was important to communities because of the manner in which the technical staff had abused their powers in community.

Lessons Learnt. We recorded a number of lessons from this intervention.

- a. **Coordination of training** was entrusted to the office of the Speaker, district personnel officer were not adequately involved. Similarly, the training was not **timely** – coming when the council was 2 years into their term. Future interventions of this nature should be timed to begin immediately after a new council is put in place.
- b. **Low academic qualifications of councilors** – limiting their capacity to comprehend, and interpret technical documents, policy guidelines and legislations.
- c. **Fragile and underdeveloped Local government structures in war-ravaged areas**– in areas where there were IDP camps, the role of LC had been replaced by commandants and physical offices were improvised for with 'satellite' offices in safer areas.
- d. **Creation of new districts** – this has created administrative challenges for the project as it can no longer be traced in the original 10 districts. For example, Njeru Town council in Mukono is now under Njeru and Padibe East and Agoro formerly Kitgum are now in newly created Lamwo District.
- e. **Seasonal factors** – the project area being predominantly rural, rainy seasons interfered with attendance and time keeping as most participants especially councilors had to tend to their gardens.

3.1.2.4 Enhanced Revenue Mobilization

This intervention aimed at enhancing capacity of local governments to mobilize and utilize additional local revenues. This arose from the need to fill the glaring funding gaps in local governments resulting from the abolition of graduated tax (GT) in 2005. The activities under this intervention, entailed training of technical officers in lower local governments in local revenue mobilization and utilization. The training covered the following aspects including enumeration, assessment and valuation. It also covered experimentation with alternative revenue sources in selected local governments.

The Achievements. Two significant achievements can be recorded in this intervention.

- a. **Sources of alternative revenue mobilization identified and implemented in selected local governments.** For example, Padibe East in Kitgum identified loading fees, slaughter (abattoir) fees and advertisement fees charged on mobile advertisers. While Lagoro Sub County in Kitgum identified grilling mill taxes, Amolator Town Council settled for ground rates.
- b. **New local revenue enhancements taxes popularised** – awareness creation about new local government taxes replacing the graduated was critical. Linkages helped to popularize these taxes by publication and printing of the tax manuals, distribution of the manuals and coaching of selected local governments to apply the taxes.

Lessons Learnt. We recorded the following lessons.

- a. **The tax base** for most local governments has not been substantially widened. A few additional taxes are not economically viable when one compares the amount to be generated vis-à-vis the cost of administering these taxes.
- b. **Inconsistent national policy on taxes especially on local taxes** – the national glance on taxes keeps migrating with politics of the time. The messages passed on by different policy makers are conflicting. Secondly, the need for citizens contributing to national development through taxes is normally distorted the closer the country gets to subsequent Presidential and general elections.
- c. **Poverty incidence** – it so happens that the majority of program districts are also high poverty concentration districts in Uganda particularly the northern districts⁶². As such, the alternative revenue sources in these districts, especially lower local governments, were not easy to come by. Similarly, outturn of revenues is expected to be poor due to low ability to pay.

3.1.3 Component Performance

3.1.3.1 Overall Performance

The view of this report is that performance was pitched at the levels of output and partly at outcome level. What exists at the higher level of results is **potential for impact**. And this is also because the evaluation happened before the results could completely 'cook'⁶³

⁶² Northern Region has the highest poverty incidence in Uganda with 66% of the population living below the poverty line in 2006, compared to Eastern with 46.8%, Western with 34.4% and central region with 27.1%.

⁶³ This was the common position taken by almost all the technical staff at the district level.

At the level of outcomes (what happened), we recorded more returns in the training and 'rules of procedure' interventions than in the third component on taxation. We elaborate below.

3.1.3.2 Specific Performance

Training Intervention. A number of outcomes were recorded in this intervention.

- a. **Participation in local government planning and budgeting processes enhanced** – it is a general belief by local governments that linkages improved stakeholder participation in planning and budgeting processes. This was engendered by a number of factors: one, awareness created under the HPDP trainings; two, devolution of planning and budgeting activities in villages and parishes; three, facilitation of inclusive budget conferences in lower local governments; and four opening of council meetings to the public (public hearings) and encouraging interested parties and individuals to attend.
- b. **Improved performance of local government** – subsequent local government performance assessment exercises showed improved performance for most of the sub-counties that received linkages support. For example in Kitgum, Padibe East graduated to reward in 2010 from Penalty in 2006/07 while Lagoro also improved from 'static' to 'reward'. Improved performance was also reported in most of the experimental sub counties in Kisoro, Amolator and Sironko.
- c. **Approval and execution of district budget has become more open and transparent** – the approval of budget by council has become more consultative, open and transparent. The councils devote adequate time to discuss the budget before it is approved and where there are issues not agreeable to the majority, approval of the budget is subject to adjustments. For the programs and projects where the council lacks information and, technical officers are normally requested to provide additional clarity to enable the council make informed decisions. Budget execution is also reported to have become more transparent on the following accounts: one, display of budgets and work-plans for different departments; two, display of disbursements from the centre and releases to lower local governments; three, as result of linkages sensitization, the council and executive have stepped up monitoring activities in sub-counties and there is proper delineation of monitoring roles between the executive and council⁶⁴.

⁶⁴ A respondent in Amolator says that before the entire council wanted to go for monitoring exercise but after the training by linkages, it came out clearly that it is role of executive to monitor subcounty interventions, the rest of council have obligation to monitor only the constituents that they represent.

- d. **Three (3) year Development Plans are in place at different levels of local governments** – while it is mandatory that districts prepare three year rolling plans that incorporate aspirations and needs of lower local government's this has not been attained. Linkages are reported to have stimulated and catalyzed the process of developing development plans at lower local governments. As a result of training, improvement was also reported in observance of timelines for local government budgeting. All sampled experiment sub-counties in the North confirmed to have gone through a participatory planning process that cascade from village to parish and through sub-county to district. Most of these sub counties also had in place approved 3- year development plans. There were also some parishes that showed evidence of possession of 3 -year parish plans. In addition, there were villages within sampled sub counties with well prepared village profiles.
- e. **Ownership of local development initiatives and government programs** – it is reported that before sensitization by linkages, lower local governments were passive about development initiatives in their localities - had little appreciation of government programs as they never considered themselves to have been party to design and programming of these programs. With linkages and most importantly through bottom -up planning activities, communities in experimental districts started appreciating development initiatives in their localities and buy-in into government programs like NAADS, NUSAF and PRPD enhanced. The communities also become more vigilant in monitoring implementation of these programs and demanding accountability from concerned officers.
- f. **Working relationship with civil society and other players improved** – training in HPDP helped the local government planning entities to appreciate civil society as partners in the development process on one hand and appreciation of the need for civil society organizations to disclose their activities and integrate their workplans into district development plans⁶⁵ on the other. Both district and civil society respondents confirm that the training helped to ease mistrust and suspicion between districts and CSOs and to improve working relations. CSOs are normally invited to attend district planning and budgeting conferences and district officers are often times invited to officiate on many occasion by CSOs. However, it was noted that the relationship is just building and still fragile. Districts have not fully opened up to CSOs and at the same time CSOs are yet to fully disclose their activities to districts.

Rules of Procedure. Orientation of councilors on standard rules of procedure is reported to have results in the following outcomes;

⁶⁵ In Kitgum several CSOs submit their workplans for integration into district plans and these include World Vision, and AVSI.

- a. **Improvement in confidence of councilors on the floor** - this was a cited outcome despite concerns of poor academic qualifications of the councilors. The confidence was engendered by awareness creation on a councilor's roles and procedural matters such as moving a motion.
- b. **Improved record keeping** - Keeping records of council were reported to have improved. One testimony during an FGD at Lagoro sub county for councilors noted: "... before linkages, our sub county chief lost the minutes of council twice. One time he actually claimed that the rebels had stolen them. But now the minutes are well kept. We can now refer to past decisions and follow – up on their implementation”.
- c. **Council resolutions are arrived at faster and there has been improvement in implementation of Council decisions.** The evaluation established that before linkages intervention, council meetings would last for a whole day and at times stretch into another but now they last for average of 3 hours (one morning or afternoon). This has made council sessions more enjoyable and improved attendance because councilors can now attend the council and space adequate time to do other business. Shorter council sessions are attributed to improved awareness on procedural matters and delineation of the roles between councilors and technical staff. For example, it was reported that before linkages in Kisoro technical officers used to debate (and at times hijack the council) but as a result of training and other awareness measures, now technical officers only intervene if asked by the speaker to give advice. And even then, the advice is provided through relevant committees.
- d. **Quality of council decisions is reported to have improved** – this was however, difficult to verify as it was subjective and there were no standard measure for quality that could be applied to all districts.
- e. **Strengthened Committees and CSO engagements.** We also noted that this aspect of training strengthened the committee structures. In Kisoro and Mukono for instance, we were told that instead of witch-hunting on the activities of technical staff, the committee Secretaries were now busy familiarizing themselves with the running of council. They do this to furnish their committees with accurate information ahead of council meetings. They also noted that they receive hearings from CSOs. The CSO concerns are then packaged into part of council agenda. Although this training did not as such focus on CSO involvement in council affairs, the division of labor has helped the committees appreciate contributions from other stakeholders⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Noted in an FGD with Councilors in Kisoro.

Enhanced revenue mobilization. The impact of this intervention is very limited. This is partly because it was limited to a few sub-counties and national outlook towards local taxes has been down played since the abolition of GT in 2005. None the less, some outcomes were recorded.

- a. New alternative taxes were introduced eg. Grinding mill in Lagoro Kitgum, loading fees, slaughter fees and hire of council hall in Padibe East Kitgum and ground rate in Amolator.
- b. Reported improvement in community appreciation of the need to pay taxes and willingness to pay taxes

3.1.3.3 Component Recommendations

- a. In order to build the requisite capacities, training should be delivered by local government staff with only technical backstopping from experts. Training of Trainers (ToTs) sessions are also recommended to enhance training skills of selected local government staff including district planners, community development officers and parish chiefs.
- b. Trainings and other capacity building initiatives need to be institutionalized by entrusting their overall coordination to the HR/personnel office of districts including those targeting politicians. In addition, districts through relevant departments should be encouraged to develop comprehensive capacity building plan/program as part and parcel of their District Development Plans (DDPs) so that all capacity building initiatives by donors are guided by and directed towards achieving the plan.
- c. There is need to complement trainings and capacity building with basic 'hardware' such as computers, filling cabinets etc.
- d. Direct targeting of communities is necessary to ensure community empowerment
- e. Orientation of councils should be done immediately the new council is sworn in.
- f. Orientation and training of councilors should cover specialized technical areas such as procurement and tendering.
- g. There is a need to document good practices and enhance peer learning .
- h. In order to circumvent unnecessary politicking involved with taxation at local level, there is a need to commission a national study on challenges of and potentials for enhancing domestic revenue mobilization. The study should provide a strong basis for policy direction and imperatives for broadening the tax base at the national level and thereby paving way to restating alternative taxes

and levies at local level. Otherwise, attempts to build it from bottom –up will continue to meet a lot of resistance as the local leaders are ready to lose their popularity and votes, which are likely tradeoffs.

3.2 PARLIAMENT

3.2.1 Component Design

Some Preliminaries. The advent of the 8th Parliament under a multiparty dispensation introduced novel systems, structures, procedures and processes. These included the creation of caucuses, a formal office of the Leader of the Opposition and a shadow cabinet, Opposition Chairmanship of oversight committees. The creation of new districts meant increased numbers of Parliamentarians. In addition, Parliamentarians being ex officio members of District Councils had duties at the national and sub-national level, which increased their roles, responsibilities and scope of interactions. Approximately 50% of the Members of the 8th Parliament were new entrants, and almost all the Parliamentarians, as well as staff were challenged by the novelties of the multi-party system, which required significant resource and skills inputs and sustained capacity building for the effective functioning of Parliament.

Design Intent. The RFP required the Contractor to 1) promote meaningful and regular linkages between the Parliament and its constituents including CSOs and elected local representatives, 2) forge and strengthen these linkages in order to increase transparency and create a better understanding of the roles, responsibilities and expectations of leadership. In addition to this, the Linkages Award Contract stated that LINKAGES was designed to enhance Parliament's key institutions and the execution of Members' roles and responsibilities with a view to facilitating more informed decision-making through greater policy expertise, increased outreach and public input, and ensuring more effective use of constituency participation in the business of the legislature.⁶⁷ In achieving this goal, the contractor undertook to focus on 'enhancing decision making processes by increasing access to in-depth policy expertise, access to best practices law-making, engaging in public outreach, soliciting greater public input and participation, and approaches for conducting legislative oversight and investigations.

Critical areas were identified by the contractor based on the Review of USAID Support to the Ugandan Parliament, January 2006. This review recommended that USAID assistance focus on activities such as committee proceedings and caucus activities, oversight and budget review, supporting the development of the formal opposition institutions of Parliament, including Shadow Ministers, and the Office of the Leader of the Opposition. The thinking was that strong Parliamentary committee processes would translate into effective and efficient lawmaking and

⁶⁷ Linkages Award Contract Document, p 11

oversight functions, which presupposed the dependence on policy expertise and increased public input in the legislative process.

In addition, and with a view to achieving its objectives, the Contractor undertook to support the achievement of the outcomes of the Parliamentary Strategic Investment Development Plan in the following areas, which will also constitute part of the basis for evaluation:

- a. Enhanced knowledge and expertise of MPs and Staff to Operate Effectively in a multiparty Parliament
- b. Improved Parliamentary Legislative, Administrative and Infrastructural Support Services to enable Members to legislate and perform oversight functions more effectively resulting in better utilization of public sector resources
- c. Strengthened Parliament's representative capacity through external linkages and partnership with various stakeholders to foster sustainable development
- d. Increased Parliamentary engagement in peace making, conflict management and resolution and in promoting democracy

The decision to provide support in these areas of the PSIDP was sound, as the PSDP focused on institutionalized capacity building and the creation of linkages with other actors in key democratic interventions, tying in neatly with the USAID objectives for LINKAGE.

In Parliament, LINKAGES worked with caucuses and Parliamentary Committees. These included the AMANI Forum; Uganda Parliamentary Forum for Children; the African Parliamentarians Network Against Corruption (APNAC); Parliamentary Internship Program; Parliamentary Committee against Corruption; the office of the Leader of Opposition; HIV AIDS Committee; Parliament Public relations Officer, Greater North Parliamentary Forum; Chairperson UWOPA, Local Government Structures Committee; Presidential affairs committee; The Budget and Social Services Committee; the Gender Committee on population growth issues, the Committee on Physical Infrastructure and the Tourism Committee among others.

One of the key LINKAGES objectives in working with Parliament was institutional strengthening. The intent of LINKAGES was to achieve this through support to units such as the shadow cabinet and the Parliamentary Committees. LINKAGES found that in Parliament, the entry point for their programs is Committee and caucuses. Although the program operates in ten districts, over time the Parliamentary Committees have been able to move outside the boundaries of the 10 districts, and UWOPA is not restricted to working in the districts identified.

Recommendation on Design⁶⁸

While the design of LINKAGES programs focuses on the Parliamentary Committees as the entry point, in the wake of the multiparty system, the

⁶⁸ Leader of Opposition, Professor Latigo

biggest perceived threat for the foreseeable future seems to be the erosion of Parliament's voice by elements in Parliament. There is need to ensure that Parliament's integrity is upheld. In this case a program designed to strengthen Parliament should come in very early on in the program design so that the fundamentals are ingrained in the members of Parliament from the outset to insulate it from being derailed by the Executive too early. After the 3rd year, MPs are in transition and in the 4th year MPs pay very little attention to executive schemes as they are busy with their constituency. The first year can be about creating a character for parliament, second year for empowering technically, and the third year is to link them to their constituencies. MPs find value in anything that draws them towards their constituencies and elements of the technical in the third year. Linking MPs to constituencies and district councils in the first year is also important in strengthening the link.

3.2.2 Component Implementation

Outreach Field visits by MPs. Outreach field visits were undertaken in the 10 districts and even outside the 10 district after LINKAGES in consultation with USAID, exercised discretion to re-design this aspect. Outreach trips were made by MPs in an attempt to filter the issues regarding service delivery and their policy implications for Parliamentarians. In some instances, advance parties from the Research Department collected data and prepared reports for the Parliamentary Committees in order to facilitate informed investigative and consultative mechanisms. In the LINKAGES design, field trips were followed up by an Issues Forum so that issues generated around a visit are discussed by all stakeholders, including CSOs.

Certain committees and caucuses took full advantage of this activity to synthesize their findings in the Issues Forum, although attempts to feed their findings into ongoing Parliamentary processes yielded varying degrees of success. For example, the issues forum covering the three UWOPA visits to the districts of in Kisoro, Mbarara, Masaka, Sironko, Katakwi and Amolatar in 2007- 2008 formulated resource mobilisation and advocacy strategies for the Reproductive Health Road Map. A press briefing to communicate their observations and recommendations was also held thereafter. This is a good example of increased policy expertise as a result of consultative and investigative mechanisms being used to increase public participation in ongoing processes.

In another example of informed decision making through increased interactions with constituencies and local governments, the Parliamentary Local Government Accounts Committee was supported by LINKAGES to hold hearings in Soroti and Luwero districts rather than Kampala. This resulted in identification of gaps in the law requiring reforms although it is not clear what follow through processes were undertaken. Below is a table showing other outcomes of outreach activities

Table 1: Outreach activities and outputs⁶⁹

Purpose of outreach	outputs
Physical Infrastructure Committee and Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee Public Hearings on the Land (Amendment) Bill 2007)	The views of the people collected during the consultative visits formed part of the main report as well as the minority report that informed passage of the Land Amendment Bill
Parliamentary Committee of Public Service and Local Government to the districts of Katakwi, Sironko, Amolatar, Kisoro, Ibanda and Lyantonde	As a follow-up to the field visit LINKAGES organized an Issues forum where civil society, the Executive arm of Government, Parliament and Local Government leaders met together to discuss issues regarding local government revenue generation.
Oversight field visit by the Committee on Gender, Labor and Social Development to Oyam, Gulu, Pader, Kitgum districts (Northern Uganda) from January 29 – 23, 2009	The report of the field visit and its recommendations were presented and adopted by Parliament on October 28, 2009
Hoima District Oil and Gas Forum (attended by Natural Resources Committee). The purpose of the forum was to promote dialogue, local stakeholder engagement and awareness on their collective and individual roles and responsibilities in mitigation of negative environmental impacts and social economic wellbeing of the people.	Following the Hoima meeting, the Ministry of Energy stated that it was in the process of developing a communication strategy. An advert for the strategy was run in the public media shortly afterwards.
Local Government Accounts Committee Regional Hearings on the Auditor General Reports, 19-22 nd November, 2009	These reports were tabled and recommendations adopted by Parliament in March 2010.
Monitoring visits and Public Hearings on the draft HIV/AIDS Bill by the Parliamentary Committee on HIV/AIDS to the districts of Kalangala, Masaka, Mayuge and Busia 21 st -24 th February 2010	This work is on-going with public consultations on the Bill itself. The field trip provided inputs and enriched the original draft.
Social Mobilization field visit to eastern Uganda by members of Uganda Women's Parliamentary Association (UWOPA) and the Forum on Population Food Security and Development	(This was oversight and advocacy on reproductive health and family planning at the local government level. The Committee recommended that LGs specifically budget for family planning. On radio and public this advocacy was undertaken and is a continuous effort
Monitoring of the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) implementation in northern and eastern Uganda by the Greater North Parliamentary Forum (GNPF)	As part of the field visits, two Issues Fora (one in Lira and another in Soroti attended by leaders from 16 districts deliberated on the findings of the field visits and the challenges facing PRDP implementation. As a further follow up of PRDP monitoring visits, LINKAGES facilitated a meeting between the GNPF and Northern Uganda development partners to specifically clarify on the issue of donor contribution to PRDP. The meeting opened up new opportunities for engagement between GNPF and development partners. The findings of the field visits formed the basis of discussion and recommendations at the 3 rd PRDP Policy Monitoring Committee meeting held on June 28 2010.

⁶⁹ Information provided by Linkages

The allowances for MPs on these trips were funded by LINKAGES at a donor set scale, which was deemed to be quite low. This has caused reluctance on the part of MPs in undertaking field activities. Field visits of Parliament were meant to be demand driven investigative machinery, with necessary and logical links to the policy and decision making processes of Parliament. The oversight visits of the oversight committees were conducted, but there seems to be the sense that they were merely activities that had been earmarked in annual work plans, with little sense that they were demand driven, even when linked to district issues. For example, in Kisoro, the Deputy RDC when asked what the four visiting committees of Parliament (on Tourism, Public Service, Local Government Infrastructure and Local Governments Account Committee) had this to say-

The Parliamentary Committees access our offices; we offer manpower, guidance and security etc to them when they come. The Tourism Committee sat with us and discussed the outstanding issue gorilla permits. These committees don't often give us feedback in writing or otherwise, we do not evaluate their work.

Communication channels for feedback after the Parliamentary outreach visits were not always effective. While the general impression received from respondents indicates that LINKAGES staff were easily reachable to talk to, in regard to follow up and follow through on field trips and recommendations in several instances was lacking. The District Council officials and CSOs who interacted with the Local Government Accounts Committees and Tourism committees of Parliament in Kisoro complained that while they voiced their concerns and queries e.g. on the budget for recurrent expenditures or the monopoly of the Gorilla permits by central government respectively, no answers were forthcoming.

Delay in reporting back to Parliament on Committee field visits minimized the opportunities for effective follow through, e.g. the Committee on Gender went to see children in IDP camps in March 2009 but reporting happened in November.

Improve policy expertise and decision making for MPs. Reports indicate that there was almost a 300% achievement of the targeted number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance. These manifested in activities such as legislative committee investigations, public hearings, formal question and answer sessions and, written interrogatories regarding an executive branch program, decision or action.⁷⁰

A total of 200 training and educational events were held in the year 2009, which included workshops, seminars, conferences, study missions of any duration, discussion groups, round table discussions, etc. It is unclear from the Results Performance Framework and PMP whether

⁷⁰ Ibid p4

these tied in to current legislative processes and functions. However in at least one example, an orientation workshop organized by LINKAGES in 2009, the HIV AIDS Committee resulted in the development of a five point work plan to guide its work for 2009 -11. In a survey by LINKAGES, it was indicated that the knowledge levels of MPs and staff improved by 91%, although this knowledge related to lessons learnt from educational events or training,⁷¹ although this related to lessons learnt after the training.

In a bid to increase Parliament interactions with local government and civil society organisations,²⁶ Public forums were held out of the targeted 20, and these included public hearings, consultative meetings and radio-call-in shows related to legislative processes and national policy.⁷² Targeted consensus -building processes such as national/sub-national/local dialogues, referenda, and peace processes were met 100%.

LINKAGES made critical contributions in facilitating the knowledge base of MPs particularly in light of the new system of multiparty politics. In this regard it carried out several capacity building initiatives for new membership to targeted committees and the Shadow Cabinet, contributing to increased knowledge on roles and mandates. In regard to the Shadow cabinet, the building of capacity to review existing policies and provide alternative Policy instruments was particularly useful, even though this support was belatedly supplied by LINKAGES in 2010.

There were clearly efforts by LINKAGES to link Parliament to executive bodies in order to increase understanding of government processes and improve oversight functions. For example in 2010, a joint workshop on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities comprising of MPs, local government and civil society stakeholders and Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development resulted in the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development being instructed to draft regulations aimed at addressing the gaps in implementation of the PWD Act.⁷³

In another workshop, the Minister of State in charge of Northern Uganda highlighted the PRDP and CSOs also made presentations on the situation in Northern Uganda. MPs obtained knowledge on the PRDP and clarification on Government of Uganda disbursements to Northern Uganda, as well as donor. Consequentially, when implementation of the PRDP commenced in July 2009 and in September 2009, the Ministry of Finance printed a newspaper supplement in the New Vision Newspaper which clearly delineated the split in remittances by the Ministry to PRDP districts between regular GOU funding and additional PRDP funding.

The orientation of MPs on the issue of PRDP was vital, given that it was one of the core areas that the PSDIP was being supported in by LINKAGES, and that Parliament had not had a role in the design of PRDP

⁷¹ ibid

⁷² Ibid p 5

⁷³ Linkages Quarterly Report 2010

prior to this, affecting their ability to conduct oversight in this crucial area. This was buttressed by support to the Greater North Parliamentary Forum to make field trips to Northern Uganda.

However, in several instances, whereas the work of Parliamentary Committees was supported in areas such as field trips or workshops, there are no clear outputs recorded as they feed into the business of Parliament or the functions of the Parliamentary Committees regarding oversight and law making⁷⁴. Members of Parliament of the Natural Resources Committee to attend the Hoima District Oil and Gas Forum were supported in 2009 and it was the first time that a Government Minister, Permanent Secretary, Members of Parliament of the Natural Resources Committee, Local Governments and traditional leaders came together to discuss Uganda's oil and gas sector. However, there is no evidence of what this activity generated after the forum.

In another example, LINKAGES organized the Local Government issues forum on Financing and Service Delivery. The forum addressed several issues particularly the need for urgent solutions for the mismatch between decentralized functions and devolved finances and support to local governments for implementation of LST among others. Field visits by the Consultants elicited overwhelming concern on the part of the local government officials in this regard, reiterating the urgency of this matter. By 2009, these issues were under review by the Parliamentary Committee on Public Service and Local government and the situation is yet to be satisfactorily addressed.

Strengthening the oversight capacity of the Opposition and Shadow Cabinet. The opposition's capacity to oversee the implementation of Government programs has a direct correlation in promoting checks and balances. The first area of technical support from Linkages to the opposition was in the shadow cabinet. Policy statements from Ministries are received every financial year, and many Shadow Ministers lacked technical expertise and capacity to understand these briefs and scrutinize them thoroughly.

LINKAGES has been able to give support to the Shadow Cabinet through hiring services of agreed upon experts to engage them depending on their technical competence in respective Ministerial Policy Statements. LINKAGES also make policy provision for the opposition in the area of alternative policy making eg budget and function as a shadow cabinet. In 2009 it was anticipated that the Shadow Cabinet would review 10 committees' budget whose budgets , but only 4 were reviewed and this without LINKAGES funding, due to the limited capacity on the part of the Shadow Cabinet to utilize the support offered in year one.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ This observation was contested by LINKAGES during the De-brief meeting at Cassia Lodge Kampala on 21st September 2010. The consultants were not persuaded since evidence to the contrary could not be adduced in literature.

⁷⁵ LINKAGES Results Framework and Performance Monitoring Plan 2008, p3

The alternative policies that the Opposition posits have been given serious consideration by government and offer a measure of credibility to the opposition. LINKAGES has also helped foster leadership mandates in a multiparty setting by providing a resource handbook on roles and responsibilities and conduct, relations, and it is 90% underway. Overall, while the policy review capacity of the Shadow Cabinet has been supported by LINKAGES, the skills have not been transferred to the research department as the work was done by consultants, which is not sustainable in the long term. However, the need for longer term technical capacity building was recommended rather than ad hoc technical support, particularly regarding policy analysis.⁷⁶

Staff Institutional Capacity building. Staff training was undertaken for the Directorate of Administration of Parliament which addressed challenges relating to communication and information flow. In November 2009, LINKAGES provided workshop support in team building and information sharing for about 60 officers from different departments, about 60 of them (middle and senior level officers i.e. PC 4 upwards).⁷⁷ Parliament identified the areas of capacity gaps and had wanted to start with the Legal and Directorate and move to the Administrative Directorate but delays by LINKAGES to undertake the workshops in the scheduled time resulted in only one training for the Legal and Legislative directorate. As a result, there is improved knowledge on roles and contributions of staff, and there are fewer staff who are not knowledgeable on mandates. The team building efforts of LINKAGES however did not attain the desired results of bridging the gaps between the two directorates, as the heads of divisions from both directorates who were to carry forward the interventions that had been identified in the team building workshops did not undertake this.

LINKAGES and the Parliamentary Research Department agreed that the department would gather district-specific statistics and information profiles in the 10 target districts, in conjunction with the Ministry of Local Government and using available library resources. Such data was to act as an information base to equip the Parliamentary Committees with necessary information for field visits. However the staff were not reached and building of relevant database is still outstanding. The department was supported to undertake pre-visit studies, about 4 or 5 were undertaken. The information obtained was presented to the committees to prepare them for field work. The research team would also accompany the committees in the field. There are 20 researchers serving all of Parliament. In a multiparty setting, it is difficult because in most parliaments there is a team of researchers who do policy analysis objectively and the shadow cabinet could also have one. The research office does not undertake politically aligned research.⁷⁸

The Research and Budget office of Parliament has about 42 staff- who handle the analysis of policy briefs from Ministries, but still faces

⁷⁶ Interview with Chief Whip of the Opposition, Hon Kassiano Wadri

⁷⁷ Mutagubya Frank Senior Human Resource Officer, Parliament

⁷⁸ Mugabi John Bagonza Principal Research Officer (Bills and Policies)

capacity constraints. For example, the accountability section within the department is a new section that needs technical support e.g. linking up with Auditor General, and skills building in the area of monitoring and evaluation of government programs. Some bills cover very technical areas requiring specific competencies, e.g. in the area of Petroleum and Oil, the engineers, lawyers and economics in the Research Department lack expertise in this area.

Several activities were undertaken to enhance the capacity of the Office of Public Relations and Outreach of the specific activity referred to publishing 200 copies of an outreach booklet entitled *Parliament and the Public: The Public's Role in the Legislative Process*, to facilitate Parliamentary field visits. This booklet was meant to inform the public on the workings of Parliament with a view to improving the public's interactions with Parliament. The web based Parliament publication has effectively enabled the dissemination of information to concerned actors, although its outreach is limited to only those who can access the internet, and it is not yet interactive. 398 email addresses of CSOs were provided by LINKAGES to the PRO and added to the e-briefer mailing list at Parliament. However the Communication strategy which was meant to be established by June 2010 is still being developed, due to delays caused by procurement processes of USAID.

3.2.3 Component Performance

Convergence. Perceptions abound in the Parliamentary Planning department that where the core objectives of Parliament did not converge with the core interests or planned activities of LINKAGES, Parliament suffered. It was also constantly expressed by respondents that the LINKAGES core areas featured rather than Parliament. MPs had very little personal interface with Linkages and were at the receiving end. This made it difficult for the planners to buy into the program, and caused a sense of alienation and distance. The response of LINKAGES to sudden demands of Parliament has not always been expeditious and is always subjected to decision making processes in New York, perpetuating perceptions that LINKAGES is externally driven by the powers that be rather than a home grown one.

The agenda of LINKAGES was derived from the RFP and annual work plans, and this too added to the sense that the agenda was not demand driven. For example, the view was expressed that outreach trips should have been linked to the agenda of the House in order to have coherence of outcomes and purpose. An example was given in regard to incidences when the Government gazetted forest reserves without consultations in Mayuge, Kooki, Kisoro and Bundibugyo. In response, relevant Parliamentary committees went to consult. The feeling in certain segments of Parliament was that the number of field visits were set out in LINKAGES annual work plans, as well as the Parliamentary Committees that would participate, regardless of the pertaining issues of the day. However, evidence provided indicates that the issues for the field visits

were usually agreed upon with Parliament, and related to planned legislation.⁷⁹

Schedule of Parliament and effectiveness. Parliament operates on an unusual dimension that poses a challenge, in that the chairmanship of these committees changes yearly. To a significant extent too, the personal interests of the Chairperson determine the business of the Parliamentary Committees. In addition, the emphasis in terms of work keeps changing; the Parliament calendar is fairly fluid, at one point legislation is emphasized, at others it is oversight or representational functions and it is very hard to tell the agenda in advance. Even the speaker may not know the agenda because the order paper always changes and the legislative agenda is very fluid. As in most projects, specific activities happen over time, hence MPs may not be available because the Speaker has directed otherwise. This has affected the ability of LINKAGES to implement and plan effectively, and has featured regularly in their reports. This calls for some flexibility in programming.

The last two years have been very unique and a lot of disruptions in the life of the 8th parliament to the extent that a plenary session may hold at the same time as some Sessional committees. Standing committees in some instances also conflict with Sessional committees in terms of sitting. Parliament as a matter of policy should draw its work plan at the beginning of a session so that dates of opening and recession are known and restrictions happen to the planned schedules of work. This will help partners to be aware of work schedules.⁸⁰

For future planning, flexibility must be built into the program without losing sight of the overall issues. This problem pertains to most programs except UNDP which has had a lot of experience in Parliament and have adopted flexible programs.

Linking area MPs to CSOs and Local Governments. The role of MPs on councils is essential in linking Parliament with the District Councils as they have similar roles, but the execution of the roles is the problem. Local Government officials interviewed pointed out that many MPs articulate their own views in Parliament rather than District needs, although a few MPs may get access to the District Development Plan and attempt to articulate some of the issues therein. Local Governments in many instances are not aware of how the area MP utilizes the Constituency Development funds, and there is no promotion of mutual accountability. Sometimes the MPs clash with Council members over politics; in Kisoro for example, respondents noted incidences of rifts between some MPs and the council, which the office of the RDC had to undertake measures to heal the rift.

One of the challenges that LINKAGES had was that in one of the districts, there was a perception that District MPs were going to be brought to the district, and not committees, raising the spectre of partisanship

⁷⁹ Information provided by Eva Matsiko, Chief of Party, LINKAGES

⁸⁰ Recommendation of the Chief Whip of Parliament

particularly given the divisions over multiparty loyalties. In response and for institutional purposes, LINKAGES deliberately placed emphasis on committees not individuals to avoid perceptions of partisanship. However, this has inadvertently resulted in LINKAGES not taking advantage of a statutory linkage that is vital in increasing citizen participation through area MPs. In at least one district visited (Kisoro), the sentiment was voiced that the area MP was a vital link in articulating the needs, concerns and aspirations of the CSOs and local governments at the national level, and in the absence of this, they are having to innovate through other actors.

One district level NGO for example had this to say⁸¹

The Equal Opportunities Committee came here and invited our organization to attend their meetings. We presented a petition regarding the Batwa through the EOC to Parliament, but we haven't received a response yet. We have tried to contact our area MP to help push the petition but we haven't gone far. An area MP would be able to speak on behalf of the Batwa and raise awareness on their plight. This is an opportunity to draw attention to such issues to the whole nation. Two months ago in Kampala we launched a book on the plight of the Batwa and the Presidential Advisor took the book to the President. Later on the New Vision highlighted the issue of the Batwa.

However, it should be noted that despite the imperative for MPs, who are *ex officio* members of the District councils, to sit in Council meetings and deliberate on substantial national and district matters, relations between the two have not been good generally. Initially, some District Councils tried to ban calling for the intervention of the Prime Minister,⁸² while accusations abound regarding absentee MPs even where districts are not ambivalent to their presence. The mandate of LINKAGES in promoting the capacity of Parliament to work more effectively in a multiparty environment must extend to addressing the challenges this may spawn in the actors at various levels and designing appropriate interventions to eliminate or reduce these challenges.

The logic of the area MP being actively involved in consulting the district as envisaged in the local government law is still sound, and even respondents at the Sub-county, county and village level attested to this. In Kisoro for example, respondents pointed out that the area MP has a role to play in informing councils about existing national/ line Ministry programs and development issues and guide the councils. Hon. Bucyanayandi in Kisoro was singled out as having highlighted opportunities that the Council can take advantage of at national level in at least one meeting. In Mukono, Civil society actors reported that while they were unable to meet with the visiting Parliamentary Caucuses, their

⁸¹ United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda

⁸² District Councils Chairmen pinned for blocking MPs from attending meetings

<<http://www.weinformers.net/2010/08/04/district-councils-chairmen-pinned-for-blocking-mps-from-attending-meetings>>

area MPs were accessible to them and provide much needed information about how Parliament works regarding the concerns of the area. In Najjembe the reports of the Council seatings are given to the Area MP to help them deliberate on development issues. Respondents also recommended that LINKAGES can devise a way for MPs to interact with LGs when training new councilors so that there is clarity on roles vis a vis roles Parliament, the Executive and local government institutions.

Area MPs have statutory dues that they must and can pay to their constituencies through their liaisons with district service delivery processes, and this is backstopped by a statutory mandate. In addition, they are well positioned to articulate this through their knowledge of related national programs and processes that can offer viable channels of action, including Parliament. The answer is not in eliminating support to area MPs from participating in the districts where LINKAGES programs exist, but rather, in strengthening their capacity to engage at this level in backward and forward linkages.

Progress made on LINKAGES programs in Parliament. The Parliamentary Planning and coordination office indicates that of the planned activities, 80% was achieved. Delays in implementation caused by a fluid agenda, as well as changing expectations have been a major problem to systematic implementation of planned activities, and even core Parliament programs like the implementation of the PDSIP have faced the same problem.⁸³ Given the irregularities of Parliament, there is need to design and set programs in a flexible manner e.g. if MPs are away on recession, LINKAGES can focus on training staff. However, it should be noted that the District Councils have an oversight function that can be strengthened to function effectively and this could be reinforced as a linkage to be built upon.

3.3 CIVIL SOCIETY

3.3.1 Component Design

The overall goal of the civil society component was twofold- one was to increase its ability to mobilize communities to articulate their needs. Two was to act as a conduit from and to local and national governments. The Linkages intervention therefore anticipated an increase in citizen awareness of the roles, functions and operations of their lower level governments and an increased ability for CSOs to engage around issues of importance to local communities. The Program document broadly defines CSOs to include media, non government organizations, religious based organizations and private sector.

Within civil society two levels of engagement existed. One at the national level – through CSO organization and coalescing around “hot issues “of the day⁸⁴. Two was at the sub national district levels through capacity development and grant making.

⁸³ Interview with the Principal Program Coordinator of Parliament

⁸⁴ These included land, oil and gas, population and natural resource management among others.

At the national level, LINKAGES Program intended to identify and equip national level CSO coalitions to advance priority development issues. The overriding objective was to strengthen CSO voices for transparent, responsive and accountable governance. In order to support CSO advocacy efforts on policy reform, LINKAGES planned to build the capacity of CSOs in advocacy, equip them with tools and information to enable this, facilitate their inclusion in planning processes, and capture and document best practices in CSO advocacy. In addition LINKAGES also intended to strengthen CSO collaboration at national level with government to enhance debate and improve the engagement of CSOs with Parliament on selected “hot” development issues of the time.

At District level, LINKAGES sought to empower CSOs with the capacity to better engage with their Local Governments and to organize the voices at the grassroots to channel their issues to local government leadership.

Design Challenges The component design was premised upon a number of assumptions. Two are of particular significance to this Review. One related to the capacity of CSOs and their willingness to engage the supply side for democratic governance. The second assumption related to the proximity of CSOs to the citizenry. The first assumption obtained at national level but less so at the sub-national levels. The majority of CSOs at district level were engaged primarily in service delivery, exhibited limited previous engagement with the local governments and had limited institutional capacity to match the demands of the program. To match the Program ambition to the existing CSO capacity, the LINKAGES Program had to start from investing in the process of making CSOs ready to engage local governments.

The Program design also assumed the existence of a seamless linkage between the communities and CSOs at both district and national levels. In practice this is an area that required pre-profiling and strategy development. There is a distance between the communities and civil society organizations- that varies across districts and sub counties. The longest distance was visible in Kitgum and Mukono where the majority of CSOs are based at the District. The distance was shortest in Sironko- where community organizations targeted were based at the Sub county and the lower levels.

Inadequate targeting of Communities: Deriving from the two assumptions above, it was equally important that the design targets the ability of the communities to identify, articulate and package their needs to the Local governments and also hold Civil Society actors accountable for their performance as their conduits. It is the view of the evaluation team that the design should not only have carried three but four components of Parliament, Civil Society, Local Governments and the Community.

3.3.2 Component Implementation

What was Done?: Under sub component 1- the creation of linkages to Policy Reform Processes, this was done at both National and District levels, LINKAGES identified and targeted four policy reform efforts at national level. These were the National Land Policy development, ongoing NGO Policy, National Oil and Gas Policy, and Population/Family Planning Policy. LINKAGES selected national level NGOs with proven record of policy advocacy work. Among these were Uganda Land Alliance which was supported to solicit CSO input on Draft II of the National Land Policy in four regions of the country, hold learning for a or colloquia in which experts, parliamentarians and CSO representatives extensively discussed the complex issues related to the policy. Uganda Law Society received a grant to solicit, package and present the input into the land policy formulation process by members of the legal profession. Land and Equity Movement (LEMU) received a grant and enriched the land policy debate through introduction of alternate thinking in the area of land customary rights.

Strengthening CSO- Parliament Collaboration, LINKAGES supported dialogue between the two. Under small grants-LINKAGES provided funding to catalyze policy advocacy in the areas of the land law amendment; land policy formulation, oil and gas policy development, whistle blower law enactment and the amendments to the HIV/AIDS legal framework. Uganda Land Alliance (ULA) is a consortium of organizations working in the area of land, the complexities and interrelations therein. Consultative meetings to generate issues for the land policy were held and supported by LINKAGES. Linkages supported regional consultations of CSO to inform the draft land policy. The consultations involved at least 30 organizations per region. The composition of these CSO was general and not limited to those specifically dealing with land. Focus was on districts where LINKAGES/USAID programs were. A Core team of CSO representatives per region was selected to put together a report which was presented at the land conference in 2008. All the reports were combined into one document and submitted to the National Land Policy working group to input into draft 4.

Through the support of the Uganda Land Alliance, Uganda Law Society and the Land and Equity Movement in Uganda, the formulation process of the National Land Policy benefitted from civil society input across the country, the views of the legal profession and alternative voices regarding customary land rights. It was the view of the Uganda Land alliance that the small funding from USAID “tapped into the potential of ULS and its members thereby enriching the Policy formulation process”. Due to this intervention, the role of ULS in providing legal advice to government was activated. ULS became a resource to the process through participation in the National Land Policy Working Group; chaired a number of meetings and received numerous demands for its services in other sectors.

Capturing and documenting best practices in CSO Advocacy: LINKAGES had planned to enhance the utilization of the advocacy toolbox through a

national CSO documentation, dissemination, advocacy and award competition for best practices. This activity was postponed due to delays in conducting training workshops on the advocacy toolbox and in awarding the remaining grants.

District level. At the district level, a number of things were done. The Linkages Program utilized the Community Development Officers (CDOs) as entry points to identify CSOs operating in the district. All identified CSOs were invited to an “About- LINKAGES” sensitization workshop. The second workshop targeted a reduced number of participants. They were introduced to the functions, powers, processes and procedures and advocacy entry points in local governments. The third level of engagement consisted of a request for proposals from CSOs to engage in advocacy at the level of local governments.

Training. The training brought together local governments technical and political actors and representatives of civil society organizations. The overall objective of the training was to orient the district local government officials and CSOs on the real essence of decentralization and their roles and responsibilities in the harmonized participatory development planning. The process aimed at achieving a clear and applied understanding of decentralization, the local government planning and budgeting processes and creating a harmonious and mutually beneficial working relationship between political leaders and technical officers within the local governments and between local governments and CSOs especially in the Local Development planning process.

HDPD Districts: In Northern Uganda, CSOs received training in Harmonized Participatory Development and Planning processes, the structure and functions of Local government and in advocacy. A manual on CSO advocacy was developed, disseminated and CSOs were trained to use it. Mentoring of CSOs was also done by LINKAGES. In this regard CSOs were mentored in coalition building, identifying priority local development issues and doing advocacy of the identified issues through the appropriate channels. LINKAGES provided additional support for them to advocate for these issues.

Small grants: In total LINKAGES awarded 38 grants to CSOs across the board to implement what they had learnt from the training. The grants were given following what is viewed as a “grantor driven criteria that bears little appreciation of CSO realities on the ground”⁸⁵. LINKAGES closely monitored the grant implementation. It was reported that LINKAGES staff were in constant touch with the grantees to provide support and assistance whenever it was required. The Sironko Civil Society Network (SICINET) in Sironko obtained a grant of 18m UGX to build the capacity of its members in two subcounties to engage local governments. The Uganda Women Concern Ministry based in Mbale obtained a grant to support women with disabilities in two sub counties of Sironko district. Kitgum NGO Forum in Kitgum obtained an equal grant to conduct an assessment of governance and accountability mechanisms in

⁸⁵ FGD with CSO representative in Mukono District. Position affirmed in Kitgum

three sub counties. 4 CSOs received grants in Kisoro District- the size of the grants ranged from 8-17 million UGX. URP does a lot of village profiling, Virunga on maternal access to health, Pet works with welfare of marginalized groups and Community Empowerment worked at empowering women and youth to influence development processes.

Using these grants, several CSOs were able to successfully advocate for issues identified in their localities for instance; in Arua, CSO advocacy efforts saw the Food security and nutrition ordinance pronounced, in Katakwi, CSOs advocated for increased funding for family planning services and the local authorities responded positively by increasing the budget for family planning services. At national level too, some CSOs received small grants for example LEMU received a grant to support policy brief production around the National Land Policy, the Land Amendment bill and issues of compulsory land acquisition.

3.3.3 Component Performance

From nullification to affirmation: Parliament and Local government affirmed that through the work of LINKAGES, there was a turnaround of their perception of the utility of CSOS. In the words of the Head of the Coordination Unit in Parliament” we now recognize CSOs as resources to our Committees-CSOs hold valuable information hence consultative meetings have become necessary especially when a bill is being discussed in Parliament.⁸⁶”. This was affirmed by Local Governments Technical Planning committees across the board. Contrasted against the position in control Sub counties- it was evident that this positive state of affairs was a contribution of the LINKAGES Program. Members –both political and technical in the control sub-counties were not convinced that CSOs added value to the planning process – a position that was heavily contested with examples of CSO contributions in sub counties with LINKAGES intervention⁸⁷.

From opening up space to Hearing: The program facilitated national level CSO interaction with Parliament through presentation of expert input at committee levels. Civil Society Organizations pointed to a land policy largely influenced by their input. The result was that CSO input shaped Draft IV of the policy. In the words of the Chief Executive Uganda Land Alliance” over 80% of our input was taken on board. When you read draft V and compare with our submission, you will see a close match. We were not disappointed⁸⁸” group. Requests for legal guidance and support continue to flow to the Uganda Law Society.

Realizing the Strength in Numbers: Similarly, the civil society organizations that participated at this level recognized and acknowledged the benefits of working together to achieve a common cause. The Government recognized and continue to draw upon CSOs at this level to resource ongoing processes. LEMU, ULA and ULS are now members of

⁸⁶ Meeting with Mr. Dison Okumu Parliament Building 15th August 2010

⁸⁷ Focus Group with two sub counties with LINKAGES intervention and one without in Sironko Districts.

⁸⁸ Interview with Executive Director, Uganda Land Alliance

the National Land Policy CSO working group. Requests for legal guidance and support continue to flow to the Uganda Law Society. On a good note though, findings of the evaluation reveal that CSO collaboration has improved as they are now able to work more closely together, identify some priority issues and advocate for them. This is evident in a number of CSO coalitions that have been formed especially at district level to front identified local development issues. CSOs now appreciate more the importance of working together for greater impact or voice. Evidently linkages have been created among CSOs at the national and local government levels. CSO coalitions of about 7 in number are working in the area of child sexual abuse and protection- access to protection and redress against sexual abuse for the girl child in Kisoro. In HIV AIDs there is also a coalition of CSOs to address this issue, and CSOs have formed an association called Kisoro Network of Aid Services Organisations courtesy of LINKAGES. CSOs have understood their force as having capacity to confront issues after the toolbox that was relayed regarding advocacy

Towards increased Openness: From the field in the various districts, respondents reported an increase in transparency of CSOs particularly to Local Governments. CSOs now freely share information regarding work-plans. Budgets are shared to a lesser extent. This was reported to be a good emerging practice especially for the Planning units at local governments. These reported an increased ability to capture all intended interventions within their localities. This was less visible at the national level.

Shift in approach from confrontation to engagement. A notable shift arising out of this intervention has been a behavioral change at both the local governments and the CSO levels. Testimonies of a shift in approach “from confrontation to constructive engagement” were commonly cited among respondents. Local government planning and community development offices pointed to an increase in demand for information from the CSOs. On the part of CSOs, CISINET in Sironko noted that “now that the doors have been opened for CSOs to engage, we find ourselves challenged to add value to the processes to which we are invited. We no longer have to run to the streets-we now engage- the challenge is we do not have adequate resources to fully utilize the spaces that have been opened to us”.

Participation and Skills Acquisition: CSOs, for the first time in some districts, were involved in the planning process and are now regularly invited to budget conferences and planning meetings. The program gave them the knowledge and the skills required to channel issues to the local authorities. Evidently relations between CSOs and Local Government significantly improved creating a more conducive environment for them to work together as partners in development, fostering accountability, transparency and efficient and responsive service delivery. This is apparent in the fact that both parties reported increased mutual openness in sharing budgets and work plans.

The benefits to CSOs can best be summed up in the following verbatim quotation drawn from a Focus group discussion in Kisoro District

“We have found a home in Local Government (LGs); before the onset of LINKAGES we were seen as aliens and saboteurs. We used to call them for our activities but they couldn’t respond because they thought we were irrelevant, but through several interactions vide LINKAGES we have closer relations. We have increased collaboration with LGs. We are not competition now, we have increased information flow. We work more as partner. We used to hide our budgets and work plans but now work together- mutually supportive, we are transparent and we also go for council sessions where we present our frameworks. The relationship with LGs increased our appreciation of each other, and when LGs are calling for Council meetings, budget conferences, planning, or CDOs are planning for quarterly meetings, we are called. We are also called for problem solving meetings. There was also openness in participation. LINKAGES equipped us with advocacy skills and information. We as CSOs also work as a team and with a collective voice. We have been advocating for the Batwa and since LINKAGES, URP and Good Samaritan have been working together⁸⁹.”

Some Challenges. In the rolling out of this component, some challenges were noted. Although we have mentioned some already, we summarize the critical ones here.

- a. **Operational Definition of CSOs.** The first challenge lies with the definition of civil society. Though broadly defined at the design stage, the concept of CSOs was narrowly construed at operational level. The focus was on non governmental organizations- to the exclusion of the media, religious based institutions, professional organizations and the private sector. Even within NGOs, the scoping was limited to those registered under the relevant laws. Whereas this provided administrative efficacy, the community based groups for instance farmers groups, cash boxes and women’s self help groups- groups that mobilize around livelihood concerns at the grass root were outside the targeted group. Taking into account the history and dynamics of NGOs in Uganda, solely focusing on them minimizes their impact. There exists considerable distrust and suspicion between the government and NGOs. In many ways Government exploits NGO weaknesses to discount their message. In this state of affairs highly regarded actors like the Private Sector; and the difficult to dismiss ones like the media provide leverage to an otherwise weak NGO sector. This is recorded as a missed opportunity.
- b. **Profiling of degrees of separation and strategic linkages to strengthen.** As earlier discerned under the section on design- the challenge of mapping, profiling and targeting was also visible

⁸⁹ Focus Group Discussion in Kisoro District.

within the CSO component. Within the broad definition of CSOs are constituent members with varying comparative advantages. There are varying degrees of separation between national, District based, community based and communities. These vary across districts making a one size fits all strategy for CSO support questionable. Whereas umbrella organizations like KINGFO were opined to be good entry points for CSO support at the district level, there was a strong lack of confidence in similar networks referred to as “self described” in Hoima and Mukono districts. In Kitgum, the participation of private sector formations was said to have increased willingness to raise revenue through increased compliance with the tax regime, and also stimulated demand for fiscal accountability to the tax payers. Sub county based CSOs in Sironko District were also found to be more strategically positioned to handle sub county matters, as community formations engage at that level as well. In sum CSO and NGA broadly in Uganda is at varying levels of growth across the districts. In some districts the distance between the communities and the CSOs is further apart questioning the ability of the CSO to articulate community voices. Profiling of the situation on the ground to better understand these dynamics prior to launch of the new program is strongly recommended.

- c. **Reciprocity in Strengthening the Linkage between Parliament and CSOs-** CSO Respondents expressed discontent with the pace of growth of the linkage from Parliament to CSOs. Whereas they seemed bent over in participating within the Parliamentary space- not much progress was registered in Parliament engagement and interaction within CSO dominated space. The interactions have increased but predominantly within the Parliament space- making it a heavily lopsided relationship. The turn up especially of Parliamentarians to workshops or other forum organized by CSOs was reportedly very low⁹⁰.
- d. **Longer term engagement with CSOs.** At the National Level, LINKAGES piggy backed on ongoing processes thereby extending the value of its dollar. Whereas this is positive and commendable the flip side is that LINKAGES support came off to CSOs as a one off. Building of durable linkages is a process- this was one point that was emphasized by all CSOs- calling for longer term engagement and /or devising strategies to retain the capacity within the communities.
- e. **Token Size Grants to CSOs:** All CSOs interviewed reported that the grants were miniscule and not commensurate with the expected results. This appears like a recurring theme in USAID programming⁹¹ that requires an in-depth examination of existing

⁹⁰ Though it was noted that this may be to the low rates of attendance allowances paid by CSOs in comparison to Government or Donor led events.

⁹¹ Similar findings recorded in End Term Evaluation on ACT Program May 2010.

assumptions underlying CSO programming within USAID.⁹² CSOs require institutional strengthening more than the Government if they are to match the seemingly ‘convoluted’ institutional strengthening efforts in the public sector.

- f. **Involvement of CSOs in Component Programming-** CSOs expressed dissatisfaction with the level of involvement in design and programming of this component. Specific reference was made to the grant making process. In retrospect many CSOs opined that greater levels of involvement would have made the grant selection criteria more responsive to the realities of NGOs and CBOs on the ground. The exclusion of loosely formed community CBOS in favor of more established NGOs meeting all the requirements may have guaranteed and reduced the fiduciary risk but it also negatively impacted program results. The case of Sironko District was cited in example. A local sub-county based formation with firm roots in the community working with disabled groups failed to meet the criteria of access. A bigger Mbale based NGO- Uganda Women Concern Ministry received the grant and worked in the sub county with the small organization. Without roots in the community, the activities of the bigger NGO were delivered at a higher traNGAction cost and came off as one offs. Citing another example where involvement in programming would have helped, NGOs were of the view that possibilities of inclusion of smaller credible formations existed. These include use of coalitions and consortiums led by stronger organizations.

Lesson Learned. Under this component the lessons learned can be summarized as follows:

- a. Non Governmental Actors broadly defined to include market formations, the media, faith based organizations, NGOs and issue based coalitions at community level play a pivotal role in building democratic linkages and
- b. Linkages that have the potential to yield maximum service delivery returns are those that are closest to and seek to empower the community. Coalitions and consortiums offer opportunities to close the gap between stringent accountability requirements and small loosely formed and issue based community organizations like farmer groups, cash box units etc. In future CSO support, CSOs should be resourced sufficiently to augment this link to the community.
- c. Empowering of the communities is a sine qua non for enhanced accountability. Direct targeting and empowerment of communities should be advanced in future programs

⁹² Probably underpinned by studies towards deeper understanding of this sector in Uganda.

Component Recommendations: Four key recommendations arise out of the above analysis;

- a. **One is to shift the focus from CSOs to all Non Governmental Actors.** This will include private sector, faith based organizations, non governmental organizations and the media. The advantage is to coalesce along issues across a broader spectrum of actors than what was possible under the Program. Amidst the documented challenges of civil society organizations, private sector, professional organizations and the media stand out with demonstrated capacity and willingness to seek and motivate for change for issues closest to their interests. The challenge for future programs is to explore and design a program at the intersection of service delivery, Government and broad NGA interests.
- b. The second recommendation goes to **strategic targeting** of intervention to build upon the comparative advantage of each NGA in the process. For instance at the national level there is added advantage in working with CSOs with stature- those that already have the linkage- either by law, or practice, the clout, capacity and willingness to engage national level actors. Where this was done with CSOs of such caliber for instance the ULA and ULS- the returns were much higher. Where smaller unknown organizations with less clout were expected to engage the results were not as encouraging.
- c. The third recommendation relates to **reducing the distance between the national level CSOs, their counterparts at the district and the communities-** the intended beneficiaries of CSO services. The focus should be to deepen understanding of the degrees of separation between the links supplying the services and the communities paying for, and receiving the services. The selected intermediary(ies) will be one to offer effective, efficient and sustainable closure and/or reduction of this distance. Future programs should seek to strengthen the vertical linkage between national, district and CBOs on one hand, and the horizontal across CSOs, with both the Executive and the Legislature.
- d. The fourth recommendation speaks to **community empowerment strategies** through civic education. The ultimate beneficiary of the intervention is the community member through improved service delivery and increased responsiveness on the part of local and national leadership. Without an empowered community, the danger of elite capture becomes real and a risk to the development process.

3.4 Police Review

Under this component, the Evaluation was centered on the assessment of the contribution of the LINKAGES project to the review of the Uganda Police Force. The key questions here were whether the interventions made at the policy and institutional levels are trickling down or have the potential to effectively propel the police force towards becoming a more professional and accountable institution⁹³.

3.4.1 The Intent

LINKAGES administered the consultative process of the Uganda Police Review. The role of the LINKAGES SECRETARIAT was that of facilitator and grant manager. The process was funded by the US Government and the Netherlands government. A review of design bears no demonstrable value addition to the primary intention of the LINKAGES PROJECT. In the evaluation therefore the project is reviewed as a stand-alone project administered by LINKAGES.

3.4.2 Component implementation

What was done?: At the operational level, LINKAGES supervised the contracting, operations and delivery of results by the consultant firms facilitating the Review. At the time of the Review all upcountry consultations were completed despite the slippages from originally stipulated timelines. In early 2009 LINKAGES participated in planning meetings for the preparations of the activities comprising the second phase of this review. The meetings culminated in the development of the following key documents; the police review proposal, a road map for the consultations, and final terms of reference for the consultants.

LINKAGES contracted AKIJUL Enabling Change Ltd a consultancy firm to facilitate the consultations. The Terms of Reference (TORs) for the consultants were; to provide resource persons to guide the development of the program and methodology for the consultative process; participate in planning and coordination of meetings of the police review steering committee and to develop methodology for the consultative process.

The consultations' launch though delayed was launched on January 11 2010. The process then kicked off with National Consultations and regional level consultation workshops conducted. Views were also collected from the general public at district and one selected Sub County from each of those districts and the rank and file from police regions. The respondents were very cooperative in informing the review. These were mainly probation officers, Social welfare officers, Resident District commissioners, Regional police commanders, District police

⁹³ Page 3 of the Statement of Work.

commanders, Chief Administrative officers, Religious leaders, civil society organizations, Government and political leaders.

The methodology utilized in collection of data comprised of consultative workshops, radio programs, a UPF walk -in office established in Kampala, Newspaper supplements run advertising the review to the public, phone line with the normal call rates at the walk -in office, a website was established and on it, a questionnaire uploaded; and a pilot community police project set up in Muyenga, a city suburb.

The information collected is classified in three thematic areas; Policy, legal and regulatory framework; policing functions and Police structures; and Human and non-human Resource.

Status: As noted earlier, by the time of this Evaluation, the upcountry consultations with members of the public were completed with focus now shifting to the Kampala metropolitan region. The data collection is categorized in three thematic areas: policy, legal and regulatory framework; policing functions; and police structure, human and non-human resources. The final report is expected to be put out by the consultants conversing emerging issues, levels of commitments to implementation and recommendations and resulting actions.

3.4.3 Evaluation Assessment

Placed in the context of the Justice, Law and Order Sector, there was no doubt the exercise of reviewing the Force to increase institutional operational efficiency and reclaim public confidence in the institution was long overdue. For an institution founded in the early nineteen hundreds and battered by years of under investment, political manipulation and neglect—it was a priority that the police force as an instrument for maintenance of law and order would be prioritized under the ongoing justice, law and order reforms. The National Service Delivery Survey 2008, the National Integrity Survey 2008 and the JLOS Baseline and Follow up Survey 2007 all affirm this position.

Achievement. All in all the conduct of the Review is in principle appreciated by both GoU and Development Partners driving justice, law and order reforms.

Challenges: The challenge identified lies in designing future initiatives within existing frameworks, utilizing existing platforms and minimization of the creation of parallel reporting lines. Where activities are designed as one offs the challenge is the follow- through of a process based reform like an institutional review.

3.4.4 LESSONS LEARNED

Design of programs should be squarely within the national strategic frameworks. This ensures sustainability and a long term approach to USAID Support.

Added on programs (outside the original program design) within USAID programming should have explicitly-stated intentions-to ensure that these are pursued with clarity on the part of implementers. Added on programs may be intended to deepen the intensity of existing interventions, may be in response to a change in the external environment and/or a pilot with an intention to incubate and demonstrate what works for purposes of future programming.

Respect and compliance with set procedural guidelines as an empowering mechanism of recipients for instance regarding quantification of allowances payable. Where clarity of amounts payable exists for example as set out in Government of Uganda guidelines, USAID is well served through compliance at the operational level and engagement at a higher level to if necessary to seek convergence of GOU/USAID positions. Victimizing lower level operational managers through reduction in their entitlements negatively impacts on morale, commitment and results⁹⁴.

⁹⁴ The Uganda Police Force members of the Police Review Steering Committee are entitled to 150,000UGX per diem at the rank of Assistant Inspector General of Police. LINKAGES following USAID guidelines paid 90,000UGX per diem- an amount payable to a corporal within the UPF.

4 Summary Recommendations

4.1 OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS.

The aim of this chapter is to condense all the recommendations scattered in the report into one menu of possible actions for programming in the next phase⁹⁵.

Continue with Linkages. This is an innovative program with potential for replication in other countries. To increase its potential for impact, the next phase of design should be carefully calibrated. Emphasis should be on the results, not activities. Similarly, it should be preceded by a thoroughgoing process of ‘think-tanking’ where the mapping and targeting of linkages is done. The current program design was conceptually poor.

Shift focus from national to district. From our field visits, it was obvious that the lower you go in the decentralised government, the better the results in terms of impact. In our subjective assessment, one dollar at the district will give you three dollars worth of results; while three dollars at the national level can only deliver one dollar worth of returns. The resources used to engage at the national level should be used to deepen engagement to the parishes.

Invest in the broader Non-Governmental Sector, not only civil society. Civil society in Uganda is weak. To augment its position, and voice, collate its actions with credible market and media actors. Support to a broader Non-governmental Sector has produced telling results in other parts of Africa⁹⁶.

⁹⁵ This is repetitive, but the intention is to put together a practical route map under one chapter.

⁹⁶ For instance SIDA support to the Land Sector Non-State Actors in Kenya. This is a coalition of civil society and professional associations of surveyors and architects involved in land management. This group drove the adoption of the Land Policy as a Chapter in the new constitution.

Increase support to civil society and extend the project cycle. In order to achieve quality impact, support to civil society or the new Non-Governmental sector should be increased significantly. The increase, should however be phased starting with a lower percentage and increasing it as the project cycle advances. The idea is to ensure that the increase is in tandem with the absorption capacity of the Non-Governmental Actors/CSOs. Of equal importance is the need to extend the project cycle of support to these formations to correspond with the life cycles of both parliament and local government.

Build around existing USAID interventions. The next phase of design should begin by mapping these interventions and targeting the ones LINKAGES should build around. In particular, USAID support to the health, education and accountability sectors should be targeted. This is way, LINKAGES can also motivate for extra funding from the better-funded USAID programs.

Strategic Focus. For the next phase of programming, USAID should go for the principle of the 'critical few' over the 'trivial majority'. Instead of investing in far too many interventions, the strategy should be to invest in a few with the intention of deepening engagement.

Program Design

Inception Briefing. Post-award meetings between USAID and the contracted implementers be used as an Inception Briefing in which *inter alia*, the intentions of USAID are aligned with the contractor's understanding of client intent⁹⁷. This is to ensure that what USAID intended to achieve is not lost through implementer interpretation.

Analysis Before Design. that any future programming in this area be preceded by an analysis of existing 'transaction channels'. These should then be prioritised with the intention of identifying which ones to strengthen or replicate. The strengthening should also sequence them with the intention of indentifying which ones to strengthen/create first and which ones to follow.

Knowledge Banking and PME System. A nuanced PME system capable of processing the qualitative results you find in the governance sector. Sourcing for this capacity in the next phase of programming is a *sine qua non*. In the view of the consultants, the absence of this meant that critical learnings were not analysed and feedback into programming.

Implementation Architecture

For the next phase of programming, **we recommend** the piloting of two emerging principles at USAID⁹⁸.

⁹⁷ This is a good practice USAID can borrow from the consulting field. The idea is to level out expectations and to ensure USAID concerns, including nuances, are not lost at contracting level.

⁹⁸ These are as expressed by the New USAID administration in Washington and brought to our attention by USAID

- a. **Use Local Implementers.** The first one is the use of local contractors as opposed to US-based implementers⁹⁹. In the case of this program, most of the work was done by the field office. The human capacity created in the process should not go to waste. This view has resonance with beneficiary institutions like parliament. And the argument is that there are far too many new program entrants with each phase of USAID support. The problem with this is that relationships and ‘linkages’ built with previous program people are lost with the coming in of the new entrants. Mechanisms of utilising and retaining such relationships should be considered. This should be combined with capacity generated by other USAID programs like ACT and the Parliamentary Internship Program. If piloted successfully, the use of local contractors in Uganda can be used as a model for other USAID countries.
- b. The second principle regards Washington’s interest in relating its programming to the **Paris Principles**. Although the US government is not a signatory to this instrument¹⁰⁰, there is a desire to relate to its elements. The second phase of this program should consider piloting this as well.

4.2 COMPONENT RECOMMENDATIONS.

4.2.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- a. In order to build the requisite capacities, training should be delivered by local government staff with only technical backstopping from experts. ToTs are also recommended
- b. Trainings and other capacity building initiatives need to be institutionalized by entrusting their overall coordination to the HR/personnel office of districts including those targeting politicians
- c. There is need to complement trainings and capacity building with basic ‘hardware’ such as computers, filling cabinets etc.
- d. Direct targeting of communities is necessary to ensure community empowerment
- e. Orientation of councils should be done immediately the new council is sworn in.
- f. Orientation and training of councilors should cover specialized technical areas such as procurement and tendering.
- g. There is a need to document good practices and enhance peer learning.

⁹⁹ The draft Report offers different ways in which this can be piloted

¹⁰⁰ USAID was not clear whether or not they were signatory to this instrument.

4.2.2 PARLIAMENT

Extend support to parliament. In order to sustain the investment in parliament, USAID should consider extending support for six to nine months after December 2010. The extension should aim at targeting MPs in May while they are still fresh.

Law of Critical Few. Consistent with the principle of the critical few, support to parliament should target the oversight function and opposition only.

4.2.3 CIVIL SOCIETY

First recommendation is to shift the focus from CSOs to all Non Governmental Actors. This will include private sector, faith based organizations, non- governmental organizations and the media. The advantage is to coalesce along issues across a broader spectrum of actors than what was possible under the Program.

The second recommendation goes to **strategic targeting** of intervention to build upon the comparative advantage of each NGA in the process. For instance at the national level there is added advantage in working with CSOs with stature- those that already have the linkage- either by law, or practice, the clout, capacity and willingness to engage national level actors. Where this was done with CSOs of such caliber for instance the ULA and ULS- the returns were much higher. Where smaller unknown organizations with less clout were expected to engage the results were not as encouraging.

The third recommendation relates to **reducing the distance between the national level CSOs, their counterparts at the district and the communities-** the intended beneficiaries of CSO services. The focus should be on strengthening the vertical linkage between national, district and CBOs on one hand, and the horizontal across CSOs, with both the Executive and the Legislature.

The fourth recommendation speaks to **community empowerment strategies** through civic education. The ultimate beneficiary of the intervention is the community member through improved service delivery and increased responsiveness on the part of local and national leadership. Without an empowered community, the danger of elite capture becomes real and a risk to the development process.

Annexes

Annex I: TOR

Annex II: List of Literature Reviewed

Annex III: List of Interviews Conducted

Annex I:
Statement of Work
Evaluation of Strengthening Democratic Linkages - 2007-2010

1. Purpose of Evaluation

The USAID/Uganda Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program will end in December 2010 after a performance period of forty two months. USAID/Uganda is seeking an Evaluation Contractor (the “Contractor”) to design and implement an evaluation of the Activity. The purpose of the evaluation is to: (1) provide lessons learned for USAID and its partners, (2) provide practical lessons and recommendations for current and future programming; (3) determine which key successes should be replicated, and (4) meet the institutional commitment of measuring program impact and results. USAID/Uganda will share evaluation results, with USG partners, the LINKAGES Liaison Committee¹⁰¹, development partners, government partners, and civil society.

The Contractor will be responsible for developing work plans and instruments for the program evaluation. The Contractor will provide direction on technical and methodological approaches, evaluation design and be responsible for executing the evaluation. USAID/Uganda will provide the Contractor flexibility in arranging the work plan and division of labor, but will provide final approval on any arrangements.

2. Background

The LINKAGES Activity is a component of the U.S. Government’s (USG) Democracy and Governance Strategy (2006-2009) ‘*Governing Justly and Democratically*’, which supports the Government of Uganda (GOU) priorities outlined in the *Governance Pillar of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (2005-2008) (PEAP)*, the *National Strategy to Fight Corruption and Rebuild Ethics and Integrity in Public Office (2004-2007)*, and *Parliament’s Strategic Investment Development Plan 2007-2012 (PSIDP)*¹⁰². The Program also directly addresses the development goals of the USG’s Transformational Diplomacy Strategy (TDS), which seeks **to help build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system**, and those of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), which promotes governing justly, investing in people, and economic freedom. The goal of the Mission’s democracy and governance strategic objective *Governing Justly and Democratically* is to **increase democratic participation, transparency and accountability in Uganda**.

The LINKAGES Activity was designed to support the USAID/Uganda SO9 Team Results Framework Program Objective to advance *transition from relief to development and improve governance and democracy, by strengthening democratic LINKAGES*. The LINKAGES Activity is aimed at strengthening LINKAGES between key Ugandan government actors and civil society by improving

¹⁰¹ The LINKAGES Liaison Committee plays a consultative and quality assurance role to the project and its composed of representatives from Ministry of Local Government, Parliament, civil Society and USAID.

advocacy for more effective local and national government response to grassroots needs. LINKAGES activities focus on select parliamentary committees and issue-based caucuses, in ten districts (Mubende, Amolatar, Katakwi, Pader, Kitgum, Sironko, Hoima, Kisoro, Arua and Mukono), 50 sub-county governments, and national and local civil society organizations. LINKAGES' goals include building the capacity of these institutions to more effectively identify key local development and national policy issues so they may carry out their representational functions within the reinstated multi-party system. The LINKAGES Activity began on June 11, 2007, and will run for 42 months until December 11, 2010.

The program's objectives are:

1. A more responsive Parliament with an increased ability to hear and respond to citizen demands, exercise its roles and responsibilities, and ensure greater LINKAGES with local government and civil society.
2. A more accountable local government with an increased ability to hear and respond to constituent needs and priorities.
3. Enhanced ability of civil society to influence and monitor government to ensure transparent, responsive and accountable governance.

The Implementer was mandated to develop activities that focus on building the capacity of the three institutions; these include Parliament, local government and civil society with an emphasis on strengthening the LINKAGES among them in order to produce tangible results. Specific tasks were assigned as follows:

Task 1: Parliament

Objective: A more effective, independent and responsive legislature

This task includes support to the Parliamentary Strategic Investment Development Plan (PSIDP), working with targeted parliamentary committees, caucuses, and offices of the Opposition in Parliament. These institutions within Parliament have been supported to engage in more informed decision-making, increase outreach and make more effective use of constituency participation in the business of the Legislature. Activities under Task 1 have focused on enhancing decision-making processes by increasing access to in-depth policy expertise, access to best practices law-making, engaging in public outreach, soliciting greater public input and participation; and approaches for conducting legislative oversight and investigations.

Task 2: Local Government

Objective: More transparent and accountable government institutions

This task supports local governments to increase service delivery to local constituents by increasing participation and strengthening democratic representation. The focus of this task has been to forge and create LINKAGES with Parliament, national /local government and civil society. By increasing local level participation in local governance issues and creating an enabling environment for more effective and responsive representation at the local level where local representatives are able to identify and respond to the needs of their constituents and advocate for resources through vertical and horizontal LINKAGES.

Task 3: Civil Society

Objective: Increased citizen participation in the policy process and oversight of public institutions

The task supports Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and groups that give voice to citizens and expands their influence on the political process. This task focuses on support to civil society's capacity to identify areas of public interest, foster helpful debate and consensus building on key issues, and promote public policy that serves the local and national interest. Stakeholders have been supported to foster LINKAGES among existing credible civil society groups, local government partners and Parliament; develop policies and structures that improve governance and service delivery and contribute to local and national development in addition to forging LINKAGES with local leaders to ensure local priorities are developed and achieved.

Cross cutting Issues

The Implementer was mandated to consider cross cutting sectoral priorities during implementation. These priorities include;

- a) **HIV/AIDS** support to the HIV/AIDS and Social Services Committees of Parliament: The main purpose is to raise the capacity of MPs to advocate for HIV/AIDS awareness, prevention and treatment. The Program was also aimed at encouraging outspoken leadership, law reform and to stimulate community participation. The program was designed to forge and strengthen relationships to provide more effective oversight of the resources and activities being carried out in the constituencies.
- b) **Population and Family Planning**: USAID/Uganda identified this issue as a priority due to Uganda's high population growth and fertility rates. The Program was designed to forge strong and effective LINKAGES between Parliament, local government and civil society to effectively address the alarming rate of population growth and issues relating to reproductive health.
- c) **Natural resource management and land tenure**: In Northern Uganda especially, the environment is vulnerable due to the lack of control over natural resources and a lack of reconciliation between short and long term sustainable practices. At the inception of LINKAGES, there were critical concerns that land tenure disputes could explode as IDPs return to their homesteads in the post conflict environment. The Program was designed to bring key stakeholders together to dialogue and find solutions which will preserve natural resources, find solutions to land disputes and promote compliance with international treaties.
- d) **Northern Uganda**

To complement increased local government involvement and responsibility for service delivery in the conflict-affected areas, LINKAGES supports civil society to organize and understand the entry points for participation in local government planning and budgeting. This is because civil society views, ideas

and opinions on recovery, development priorities and budget allocations should be taken into account in the decision making processes. Post-war peace building and recovery in northern Uganda is a key cross-cutting issue in the LINKAGES Activity. Of the LINKAGES target districts, six are part of the GOU's Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP). LINKAGES has sought to strengthen local government and civil society capacity for effective and participatory planning and budgeting in post-conflict in four of the PRDP districts namely Arua, Kitgum, Pader and Amolatar. LINKAGES has also sought to support Parliamentary committees to carry out field visits to the north, to ensure national representatives contribute to the recovery efforts through oversight of PRDP.

Police Review Activities

The Implementer was further mandated to support a police review funded jointly by USAID/Uganda and the Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation. The Police Review is aimed at making the Uganda Police Force (UPF) a more professional and accountable establishment, as outlined in Article 211 of the 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda. The Police Review represents an effort to make the UPF a pro-people force that can meet the political, economical and socio-economic and technological challenges of the 21st century. LINKAGES has supported the review of the existing policies of the UPF the current legal and regulatory framework that impact the police, existing police structures and existing policing systems with a view to making them capable of supporting the UPF in fulfilling its core and support functions. The review is also aimed at examining the current human resource management and development functions of the UPF and evaluating the non-human resource support functions of the UPF.

3.0 Scope and Objectives

USAID/Uganda is seeking a Contractor to carry out an evaluation of the LINKAGES Program. The evaluation should provide answers to the following evaluation questions related to program impact and lessons learned:

3.1 Implementation and program results

The Contractor will evaluate the program by collecting data and analyzing it to assess program effectiveness in achieving the intended objectives vis-à-vis the program Statement of Work. In particular, the contractor should determine the extent to which the program has:

- a. Enhanced the capacity of parliament to exercise its roles and responsibilities
- b. Strengthened greater linkage between parliament, local government and civil society groups
- c. Increased local government capacity to respond to constituent needs and priorities
- d. Strengthened CSOs for transparent , accountable governance
- e. Strengthened LINKAGES for community oversight functions

In determining the above the contractor should address the questions below;

A) **Implementation**

1. To what extent can the success in the above areas of intervention be attributed to the LINKAGES project?
2. Were the planned activities fully implemented?
3. What were the relevant and positive outcomes of these activities?
4. To what extent can these outcomes be sustained after the program?
Provide evidence for this.

B) **Problem identification:**

1. Was the basic program rationale appropriate?
2. Were the causal links between the project inputs, outcomes goal logical?
3. If not logical, what changes should be adopted if the same/similar program is to implemented in the future?
4. To what extent did the program meet its targets as laid out in the performance monitoring plan?
5. What factors can be cited for the program achieving its goals, achieving some of them, or not achieving them?

C) Lessons Learned:

1. What lessons can USAID and its partners obtain from this program?
2. What went well and what did not?
3. How can these lessons be applied in future programming vis-à-vis program design and implementation?
4. The Contractor should collect anecdotal information from Parliament, local government and civil society partners, and other USG partners and stakeholders' views, on the extent to which the three and half-year timeframe hindered or accelerated policy improvements and implementation of activities.

D) Local Government Performance

The Contractor will determine whether there is improved local government performance by using the local government performance measurement tool to determine the impact of the LINKAGES activities in the 10 Districts and 50 sub counties of intervention. (Area for sampling will be 20% of the 50 sub counties where LINKAGES intervened).

The overall objective of applying the tool in the evaluation is to determine the impact of the LINKAGES' activities in the 10 higher local governments and the 50 lower local governments in the areas of development planning, local revenue enhancement and council procedures, using customized national assessment guidelines. The tool covers a broad range of areas for which LINKAGES does not provide support, whose administration and the amalgamation of the scores would not be a correct reflection of LINKAGES work in those districts and sub-counties.

The sections of the assessment tool that have relevance to LINKAGES support are listed below and described in detail in the 'Ministry of Local Government Assessment Manual for Higher and Lower Local Governments' attached. These are:

Assessing Minimum Conditions for Districts/Municipalities

- i. Functional Capacity for Development Planning
- ii. Quality of the Development Plan and LINKAGES with the Budget Framework Paper and the Budget
- iii. Local Revenue Performance
- iv. Council and Executive Committee Performance
- v. Performance of Council Standing Committees

Measures and Assessment Procedures for Lower Local Governments

- i. Quality of the Investment Plan and linkages with the Budget
- ii. Local Revenue Performance
- iii. Council and Executive Committee Performance
- iv. Performance of Council Standing Committees

4. Programming Recommendations:

Based on analysis of data and lessons learned, provide recommendations for areas for further support for most effective/sustainable activities in relation to the design of the program and its intentions. Should USAID/Uganda continue supporting all three institutions, or should it think of new approaches?

5. Specific assignments

Assignment One: The Contractor will be responsible for proposing a work plan and division of responsibilities. The Contractor will provide direction on technical and methodological approaches and be responsible for the quality and timeliness of deliverables. The Contractor shall conduct a desk review of available documents and work with USAID/Uganda, and the program implementers to develop an evaluation methodology and detailed work plan, including a timeline and budget for implementing the evaluation of the LINKAGES Program. The proposed methodology should be based on consultation with USAID/Uganda and meetings with the LINKAGES Liaison Committee. All evaluation activities will be conducted in close collaboration with USAID/Uganda and the LINKAGES Liaison Committee.

Assignment two: Upon USAID approval of the evaluation methodology and implementation plan, the Contractor shall implement the evaluation, analyze and present evaluation results according to the agreed work plan. USAID will provide the Contractor flexibility in arranging the work plan and division of labor, but will provide final approval on any arrangements. To conduct the evaluation, USAID anticipates the Contractor will rely on existing documentation on the program, other data from the partners, USAID as well as interviews with the LINKAGES Steering Committee members, Parliament, local government counterparts, civil society, implementers and beneficiaries. In some cases, qualitative and quantitative data collection methods may be necessary, such as surveys or focus groups. The Contractor may be asked to reconstruct baseline information and/or consider credible counterfactual scenarios, where feasible.

5.2 Evaluation Design: The following specific tasks shall be addressed during the evaluation.

Task 1: Project Background Review

- Develop and present a detailed work plan to USAID. This work plan should be completed within the first ten days of the contract and must be approved by USAID. The work plan should include specific activities, timing of each activity and planned outreach to program implementers, Parliament, Local Government and civil society counterparts and USG partners involved in program implementation.
- The format for the final evaluation report must be agreed upon between USAID and the Contractor.
- Meet with USAID/Uganda program managers, LINKAGES Liaison Committee and implementers to understand the LINKAGES program design, program theory and collect program details, including program reports and other documents.
- Review LINKAGES documents and data provided by USAID/Uganda and the Implementers.
- Identify the program logic and the intended links between inputs, outputs, outcomes, and intended results.
- Based on the desk review, submit an evaluation design document that incorporates the program logic analysis, a list of meetings, proposed evaluation questions and associated methodological approaches. This task should be completed before any field visits are conducted.

Task 2: Refine the Evaluation Design

- Solicit feedback from USAID/Uganda and the LINKAGES Liaison Committee on important hypotheses to consider. Meetings should be held with USAID, the LINKAGES Steering Committee and other stakeholders identified by the Implementer.
- Assess data availability and quality of data created and/or used by project implementers. Identify other sources of data – from development partners, citizen groups or others – that are relevant to the evaluation questions. Given available data, assess the feasibility of proposed evaluation methodologies and where necessary, identify alternative methodologies. Discuss potential opportunities to recreate or otherwise complete for lack of baseline data and establish a credible source of data.

Task 3: Analysis and Presentation of Findings

- Consolidate and analyze any relevant data.
- Prepare a final Evaluation Report on LINKAGES and make a presentation of the findings to USAID/Uganda, the LINKAGES Liaison Committee and other key stakeholders. Timeline and will be determined by USAID.

6.0 Deliverables

The following deliverables shall be provided during this activity; the outline, format (including length) and content will be agreed upon with USAID

6.1 Work Plan

- Preliminary proposal for evaluation design and data collection needs. This should be accompanied by a preliminary assessment of proposed methodologies with details regarding time and cost implications. This must be completed within the first two weeks of the start of the evaluation.
- Outline plans for data collection and identify methodologies for the evaluation. Include details regarding travel, time and cost implications.
- Plan for completing the evaluation design, including strategies to obtain additional data and dates and scope for in-country travel. This should be completed by the end of the third week of the assignment

6.2 Evaluation Design Report

- Detailed description and outline of proposed methods and main questions to be addressed.
- Detailed description of the data to be used in the evaluation including a data collection plan for new data collection (sources, methods, timing for data collection, and a quality review process) and strategy for collecting data where necessary.

6.3 Interim Report

Provide an interim report on findings, outcomes and mid-course corrections.

6.4 Final Report Outline

1. Cover page with title of program evaluated, date of the evaluation and the recipient's name and those of the members of the evaluation team
2. Table of contents
3. List of Acronyms
4. Evaluation Summary (brief description/synopsis of purpose of the evaluation, findings and recommendations)

Main part of the Evaluation Report:

5. Introduction
6. Methodology (should include analytical tools and assessment method)
7. Background (program background information)
8. Assessment of the implementation and program results
9. Lessons learned
10. Findings and Recommendations
11. Annexes

6.5 Period of Performance

The performance period will be on or about July 28, 2010 to August 7, 2010 and will not exceed a total number of 40 days provided for in the attached budget.

Performance Location

Uganda

Qualifications of Consultants

- Experience in decentralization, local government administration; parliament/legislative processes and civil society or other related fields that have a high component of qualitative analysis.
- 5-7 years minimum experience designing, implementing, and evaluating development assistance projects in developing countries.
- Experience/expertise in parliamentary affairs, institutional development and local government, and civil society in Uganda are an added advantage.
- Excellent English language written and oral communication skills, including document editing and layout design.

Annex II: List of Literature Reviewed

1. A Study Tour Report, September, (2009). Budget Monitoring and Accountability Unity: Lessons from South Africa “Let the Managers Manage But Hold Them Accountable”.
2. Agisesaasi Apophia SPH, (October 2008). Research Report on Reasons for Higher Prevalence of HIV/AIDS in Fishing Communities (Masaka and Mayuge Districts). Submitted To Parliament Committee On HIV/AIDS.
3. Amiri Mudde, (31st May, 2009). Voluntary Action Plan For Rural Community Development (VAPCODE): A Report On The Baseline Survey Carried Out In Myanzi Sub County-Mubende District. Strengthening Democratic Linkages In Uganda USAID, Uganda.
4. Barbara Batesaki, (21st-26th February 2010). Report On Training Of Health Service Providers, Government Officials And Councilors (Phase 1)
5. Barbara Batesaki, (24th March, 2010). Community Based Rehabilitation Alliance: Second Quarter Report (COMBRA). USAID UGANDA.
6. Barbara Batesaki, 28th February – (5th March 2010). Report On Training Of Health Service Providers, Government Officials And Councilors (Phase 2). USAID UGANDA.
7. Fred Grace Kasirye Sekamwa and Timothy Mutesasira (DR), (4th -22nd August, 2008). Training Report: Training Of CSOS in Amolatar, Arua, Kitgum, Pader, Mubende and Mukono Districts: The Structure, Functions and Operations of Local Governments in Uganda.
8. John Arumadri, (August 2008). Opposition Statement in Response to the Ministerial Policy Statement for the Ministry Of Local Government for the Financial Year 2008/9. Office of the Opposition Leader.
9. Josene K. Ntamirweki Mpiirwa, (11th July, 2008). Reporter’s Report on Appraising the Parliamentary Committees on Gender and Social Services on UPFC’s Report and Work. Organized by Uganda Parliamentary Forum for Children (UPFC) with Sessional Committees Of Gender And Social Services.
10. Justine Tayembwa, (April 24, 2009). Report On an Orientation Meeting On Uganda’s Population Growth Issues for Parliamentary Communities.

11. Kalundi Serumaga (5th September, 2008). Report on Technical Assistance to Media (Media Assessment Project).
12. Oduman Okello A.C [Shadow Minister For Finance, Planning And Economic Development], (2010).Opposition Response To The Government Budget Statement FY 2010/11: Improving Household Incomes Of The Poor Through Increased Expenditure On Agriculture.
13. Okebe Onya and Kangwagi AMB. G W., (18th -22nd August 2008). Training Report: Training of CSOS in Kisoro and Hoima Districts. “The Structure Functions and Operations of Local Governments In Uganda”
14. Okebe Onya, (February 2009). Report On Technical Support Given To The CSO Network In Mukono District. USAID-UGANDA
15. Olga Mugerwa Nakato, (June, July 2008). Report on the CSO Consultation on the Draft Uganda Land Policy Conducted in the Districts of Arua, Kasese, Jinja, Soroti and Gulu. Organized By The Uganda Land Alliance.
16. Performance indicator Reference Sheet (2009). CSOs with Improved Capacity for Advocacy Work.
17. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). CSO Advocacy Campaigns supported.
18. Performance Indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). CSOs that Engage in Advocacy and Watchdog Functions.
19. Performance Indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). CSOs that Engage in Legislative Proceedings with National Legislature and its Committees.
20. Performance indicator Reference sheet, (2009). CSOs Trained in Advocacy.
21. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). Expanded Knowledge of National Legislator and Legislative Learning from.
22. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). Improved Local Government Performance.
23. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). Local Government Supported to Increase Own-Source Revenue.
24. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). National Legislators and legislators Staff Trained.
25. Performance indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). People Trained to Strengthen Local Government.

26. Performance Indicator Reference Sheet, (2009). Public Forums Engaging National Legislators and Public.
27. Police Consultations Update (February- June 2010). Update on Police Review, Phase 2 (A) Key findings from National Consultations.
28. Rebecca Auge Otengo [Shadow Cabinet Minister for Public Service], (August 2008). Opposition Statement in Response to the Ministerial Policy Statement for the Ministry Of Public for the Financial Year 2008/9.
29. Ronald Muteyi, (22nd March 2010). Second Quarter Progress Report On By Kwize Development Organization. USAID-UGANDA.
30. RTI International, (2007). Annual Assessment of District and Sub-County Local Governments Draft. USAID Strengthening Democratic linkages program
31. Social Development Consultants (SODECO) U LTD, (March 2010). Report On The Training Of Civil Society Organisations In 10 Districts Of Uganda To Promote Transparency, Accountability And Good Governance In Local Governments For Improved Service Delivery. USAID UGANDA.
32. Stephen Ssemakula, (29th January, 2010). Report On Environment And Natural Resources Management Thematic Group Meeting Of Mukono District. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, USAID-Uganda.
33. Strengthening Democratic linkages in Uganda (LINKAGES) Activity, (January 2008). The Report of the National CSO Policy Forum Workshop
34. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, (2008). Quarterly Progress and Annual Report, July to September 2008. The State University of New York Center for International Development. New York.
35. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, (2009). Quarterly Progress Report, April-June 2009. The State University of New York Center for International Development. New York.
36. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, (2009). Quarterly Progress Report, January to March 2009. The State University of New York For International Development. New York.
37. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, (2010). Quarterly Progress Report, April –June 2010. The State University of New York Center for International Development. New York.

38. Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, (2010). Quarterly Progress Report, October To December 2009(Revised). The State University of New York Center for International Development. New York.
39. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program (19-21 May 2010). The Greater North Parliamentary Forum (GNPF) PRDP Monitoring Visit In Northern Region.
40. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (12-14th March 2009). A Report on the Orientation Workshop for the HIV/AIDS Parliamentary Committee on HIV/AIDS and Related Matters.
41. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (14-18, 2008). Report of the Committee on Presidential Affairs on the Assessment of the Reconstruction of Northern Uganda.
42. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2007). UWOPA Field Trips to the Reproductive Health Units of Mukono, Pader and Kitgum Districts, December 4-8th, 2007.
43. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). An Analysis of the Policy Statement for the Ministry Of Defence and Internal Affairs for FY 2008/9.
44. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). An Analysis of the Policy Statement for the Ministry Of Defence and Internal Affairs for Financial Year 2008/9.
45. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). Opposition Response to the Policy Statement for Ministry Of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries for Financial Year 2008/9.
46. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). The Opposition Response to the 2008/9 Policy Statement for the Ministry Finance, Planning and Economic Development.
47. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). The Opposition Response to the 2008/9 Policy Statement for the Ministry Of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.
48. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2008). The Opposition Response to the 2008/9 Policy Statement for the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

49. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2009). A Report on the 2009 HIV/AIDS Implementators' Meeting [-June 10-14, 2009]. Optimizing the Response for Sustainability. Windhoek, Namibia.
50. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2009). Report On Regional Public Hearing By Parliamentary Committee on Local Government Accounts on the Auditor General's Report for Financial Year 2005/6, 2006/7 & 2007/8. Central Region- Luwero. December 17-20, 2009.
51. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2009). Report On Regional Public Hearing By Parliamentary Committee On Local Government Accounts On The Auditor General's Reports For Financial Years 2005/6, 2006/7, 2007/8. Teso Region.
52. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2009). Report On Training and Technical Assistance to Selected Sub Counties in Kitgum District and Pader District On Harmonized Participatory Development Planning Process (HPDP) Situational Analysis And Prioritization April 2009.
53. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2009). Women Lead in Repositioning Family Planning and Reproductive Health September 7-25, 2009. Washington DC.
54. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (2010). Report On Parliamentary Committee On HIV/AIDS Visits To Mayuge And Busia Districts.
55. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (21-23 February, 2010). Report On Parliamentary Standing Committee On HIV/AIDS Visits to Masaka And Kalangala Districts.
56. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (25th-29th May 2010). Report On The Greater North Parliamentary Forum (GNPF). Members' Visit to Teso Region.
57. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (26th November 2008). Report on Workshop on Draft HIV and AIDS Prevention and Control Bill 2008.
58. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (28th September -5th October, 2009). Report On The Attachment By Information Officers Of Uganda Parliament To The National Assembly Of Namibia.

59. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (29-30th April 2009). The Forum on Oil Gas Extractive Activities in Hoima. "Social and Environmental Impact Preparedness Ahead Of Extractive Activities in the Region". Organized By Advocates Coalition For Development And Environment (ACODE) In Partnership With Hoima District Local Government And Kitara Heritage Development Association.
60. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (4-8th December, 2008). UWOPA Field Trips to the Reproductive Health Units of Sironko, Katakwi, and Amolatar Districts.
61. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (4th July, 2008). Report on Workshop to Scrutiny the Draft Anti-Corruption Bill 2008. Organized by Parliament of Uganda In Conjunction With African Parliamentary Network Against Corruption (APNAC).
62. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (8th July, 2009). Breakfast Meeting With Members of Parliament. Organized By Population Secretariat World Population Day 2009.
63. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (April 14-18th 2008). The Committee on Presidential Affairs on the Assessment of the Reconstruction of Northern Region. Gulu, Kitgum, Lira and Katakwi.
64. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (December 17-20, 2009). Report On Regional Public Hearing By Parliamentary Committee On Local Government Accounts On The Auditor General Reports For Financial Years 2005/6, 2006/7, 2007/8. Central Region- Luwero.
65. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (December 4th -8th 2007). UWOPA Field Trips to the Reproductive Health Units of Sironko, Katakwi, and Amolatar Districts.
66. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (January 19-23rd 2010). Report Of the Parliamentary Committee on Gender, Labor and Social Development on the Situation of Children in Selected Districts of Northern Uganda.
67. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (January 20-23, 2010). Report of the National Consultative Workshop on the Persons with Disabilities Act 2006 and Amendment of the Mental Health Act 1938.

68. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (July 11, 2008). Activity Report on MPs' Visit to Katakwi as Part of the National Celebration for World Population Day.
69. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (July 4th 2008). Report On Workshop To Scrutinize The Draft Anti-Corruption Bill 2008.
70. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (July 7, 2008). Peace Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) Stakeholders Workshop.
71. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (June 27- July 1st, 2008). Report On The Land Consultative Exercise Held In Eastern Districts Of Uganda.
72. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (June 27- July 1st, 2008). Report On The Consultative Exercise Held In Eastern Districts Of Uganda.
73. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (May 18-21, 2009). Report On Field Visit By Parliamentary Committee On Presidential Foreign Affairs To Lango And Teso Regions.
74. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (Nov 3th-15th, 2008). Report On The Orientation Workshop For Members Of Parliament On The Peace Recovery Development Plan (PRDP) For Northern Uganda.
75. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (November 19-22, 2009). Regional Public Hearing By Parliament Committee On Local Government Accounts On The Auditor General's Reports For Financial Years 2005/6, 2006/7, And 2007/8. Teso Region.
76. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (November 26th, 2008). Consultative Workshop on Draft HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Bill 2008.
77. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (October 2008). Report On Research Services: Reasons For Higher Prevalence Of HIV/AIDS In Fishing Communities (Mayuge And Masaka) Districts.
78. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, (September 28th – October 5th, 2009). Report On the Attachment by Information Officers of Uganda Parliament to National Assembly of Namibia.
79. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, Report from the National Consultative Workshops On The Persons With Disabilities Act 2006 And Amendment Of The Mental Health Act 1938.

80. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, Report On Civil Society and Parliamentary Consultative Workshop for Harmonizing Inputs for The Whistle Blowers Protection Bill. Organized By The Africa Parliamentarians Network Against Corruption (APNAC).
81. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program, Report on Social Mobilization Field Visit to Eastern Uganda by Uganda Women's Parliament Association (UWOPA) and Population Forum.
82. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program. Local Government Financing and Service Delivery. A Working Paper for Discussion with Decentralization Stakeholders by the Sessional Committee on Public Service and Local Government.
83. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program. Northern Region Consultative Workshop on Implementing Of Persons with Disabilities Act 2006 and Amendment of Mental Treatment Act 1938.
84. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (11-15th August 2008). Final Report on Training of Civil Society Organisations on Local Governance. Sironko and Katakwi Districts.
85. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (13th March 2008). Report Of The Rapporteur On: Strengthening Democratic Linkages In Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop. Pader District. USAID UGANDA.
86. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (25th January, 2010). Report Of The Rapporteur On: Strengthening Democratic Linkages In Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop. Mukono District. USAID UGANDA.
87. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (28th July- 3 Aug, 2008). Report On Consultations On The Land Amendment Bill 2007 In Iganga, Mukono, Kayunga And Kiboga Districts.
88. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (29 January, 2008). The Report on the National CSO Policy Forum Workshop. Kampala. USAID -UGANDA
89. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (29th February 2008). Report On The Rapporteur On: Strengthening Democratic Linkages

- In Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop.
Mubende District, USAID-UGANDA.
90. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (29th March 2008).
Report of the Rapporteur on Strengthening Democratic Linkages in Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop, Hoima District.
 91. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (4th March 2008).
Report Of The Rapporteur On: Strengthening Democratic Linkages In Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop, Sironko District. USAID UGANDA.
 92. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda, (December 2009).
Advocacy Tool Box Dissemination Workshop Report for CSOS.
 93. Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program-Uganda. (6th March 2008).
Report Of The Rapporteur On: Strengthening Democratic Linkages In Uganda, Civil Society Organisations Consultative Follow-Up Workshop, Katakwi District. USAID UGANDA.
 94. Strengthening Democratic Linkages, (2009). Program Activity Report: MPs Visit to Katakwi as Part of the National Celebrating For World Population Day, July 11, 2009.
 95. Strengthening the Democratic Linkages between Government and Civil Society in Uganda. Statement of work.
 96. Sunday Richard Ale, (30th December, 2009). Action Paper on DAT and DAC Training: Kassade Cornerstone Foundation. USAID-UGANDA.
 97. SUNY/CID, (2008).Annual Work Plan September 2008- September 2009. USAID Uganda.
 98. SUNY/CID, (2009). Annual Work Plan; October 2009- September 2010. USAID.
 99. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (December 2008). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Arua District.
 100. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (December 2008). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Pader District.

101. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (February 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Mukono District.
102. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (February 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Kisoro District.
103. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (January 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organization Katakwi District.
104. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (January 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Sironko District.
105. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (March 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Mukono District.
106. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (March 2009). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Hoima District.
107. Tim Mutesasira and Okebe Onya, (November 2008). Training Report on Harmonized Participation Development Planning For Local Government Officials and Civil Society Organizations Kitgum District.
108. Timothy Mutesasira and James Kintu, (2009). Advocacy Toolbox for Civil Society Organisations. US Agency for International Development. New York
109. Uganda National NGO Forum, (2008). Organizational Strategy (2008/09-2011/12): Providing A Sharing and Reflection Platform for NGOS to Influence Governance and Development Processes In Uganda, and Enhance their Operating Environment.
110. United States Agency for International Development, (2007). Strengthening Democratic Linkages Program in Uganda: Proposed Annual Work Plan September 2007- August 2008. Center for international Development.
111. USAID Linkages Program, Draft SOW for Linkages module II.
112. USAID Linkages program, Linkages Proposed Change Budget for add-on Modification.

113. USAID Linkages Program. Assessment Report on the Private-Public Dialogues held in 10 Linkages program Districts. Wilsken Agencies Ltd.
114. USAID Uganda Evaluation Team, (2007). Review of USAID Support to the Ugandan Parliament, Political, Processes and Election from 2002-2006 and Recommendations for Future Assistance.
115. USAID Uganda. Success Story; Enhanced Citizen Participation in Local Governance. US Agency for International Development.
116. USAID Uganda. Summary Issues for Linkages from DG Assessment
117. Vincent Kinene, (January-March 2010). Activity Report for Kassanda Cornerstone Foundation (KCF). USAID-UGANDA.
118. Workshop Report, (September 11, 2009). Public Expenditure and Physical and Accountability Tracking In Mubende District Report Dissemination Workshop and District Stakeholders. Organized By Mubende Women Agro-Processors' Association (MWAPA).

Annex III: List of Interviews Conducted

No.	Name	Title	Institution/Designation
1	Charles Binwe M.	Principal Program Coordinator: Planning And Development Coordination Office	Parliament
2.	Kassaino E. Wadro (MP)	Deputy Secretary General (Administration)	Parliament
3.	Dison B. Okumu	Director Planning and Development Coordination Office	Parliament
4.	Eva Mulema Matsiko	Chief Of Party-Linkages	Linkages
5.	Peter Okello Jabwell	Parliamentary Team Leader	Linkages
6.	Tom Kyakwise	Local Government Team Leader	Linkages
7	Mephy J.M Wegulo	Civil Society Organization Team Leader	Linkages
8.	Harriet Muwanga	Governance Advisor-Usaid- In Charge Of The Linkages Project	Linkages
10.	Liyvia Kakonge	Governance Recovery And Reconciliation Advisor	USAID-DG
11.	Judy Aturi Adoko	Executive Director- LEMU	Land and Equity Movement in Uganda
12.	Mr. Shalita Julius	Chairman Police Review Steering Committee	Police Review
13.	Hon. Kasiano Wadri	Shadow Cabinet Team Chief Whip	Parliament
14.	Yasin Ssendawula	Linkages Liason Contact	Local Government
15.	Abdal Kasigwa		Local Government
16.	Bernard Ogwang	Director Grants And Local Revenue	Local Government
17.	Esther Obaikol	Executive Director Uganda Land Alliance	Civil Society Organization
18.	Arthur Larok	Director Program- NGO Forum	Civil Society Organization
19.	Joseph Kayuza	Manager Decentralization-NPA	Local Government

MUKONO DISTRICT

20.	Annette Nakawanggi	Representative Of The Disabled	Mukono District
21.	Charles Kayizi Musoke	Town Clerk	Buikwe District
22.	Edward Mutebi	Finance Standing	Mukono District

		Committee	
23.	George Eustace Gakwandi	Chief Administrative Officer	Mukono District
24.	James Kulobwa	Speaker	Mukono District
25.	Musa Kiggundu	Vice Chairman/Speaker	Mukono District
26.	Robinah Muwonge	Secretary Gender And Community Service	Mukono District

COUNCILORS

27.	Abdu Mayanja	Speaker	Najjembe T.C
28.	Cissy Nakalyowa	Councilor	Najjembe T.C
29.	Florence Nanyonjo	Community Development Officer	Najjembe T.C
30.	Ibrahim Nzirahaha	Councilor	Njeru T.C
31.	John Rusaka Smz	Secretary Production and Security	Njeru T.C
32.	Joy Gashaija	Deputy Speaker	Njeru T.C
33.	Julius Ssekimuli	Town Agent	Njeru T.C
34.	Juma Isabirye	Councilor	Najjembe T.C
35.	Luwardagga A.C	Senior Internal Auditor	Njeru T.C
36.	Mebra Mwanjaka	Veterinary Officer	Njeru T.C
37.	Michael Nalyamagwa	Councilor	Njeru T.C
38.	Michael Odeba	Councilor	Njeru T.C
39.	Ronald Katende	Chairperson Finance	Njeru T.C
40.	Ruth Nanziri	Clinical Officer	Njeru T.C
41.	Sarah Namirimu	Clerk Assistant	Njeru T.C
42.	Stephen Kayengi	Senior Health Inspector	Njeru T.C
43.	Stephen Wakaza E.M	Town Agent South	Njeru T.C
44.	Peter Ssozi	Councilor	Njeru T.C
45.	Peter Ssekandi	Councilor	Njeru T.C
46.	Nabbosa Annet	Councilor	Njeru T.C

CSOS MUKONO DISTRICT

47.	James Ntege	SPSWO	DCDO for MDC
48.	Martin Osinde	Assistant Community District Officer (ACDO)	MDC
49.	Milly Bulega	SCDO and Linkages Coordinator	Mukono District
50.	Richardson Kyambadde	Director Action For Development In Underserved Areas(ADUA)	ADUA Mukono District
51.	Stephen Ssemakula	Program Officer	Uganda Environmental Education Foundation (UEEF)
52.	Susan Nampijja	Head Social Worker	Child And Youth Foundation
53.	Travis Bogere	Program Officer	Macro Uganda
54.	Peter Ssozi	Councilor	Njeru Town Council

KITGUM DISTRICT

55.	Kevin Aciro	Linkages Coordinator	Kitgum and Pader
56.	Alfred Omony Ogaba	Resident District Officer	
57.	Komakech John Ogwok	Chairperson LCV	
58.	James Okello	Planner	
59.	Oola Eugene	Ag Chief Administrative Officer	

CSOS KITGUM DISTRICT

60.	Acellam David Fred	Program Coordinator	ARYA
61.	Arop Denis	Executive Director	ACVIYOF
62.	Babu Robert	Project Officer	Kitgum District
63.	Godfrey Binanisa	Program Officer Protection and Education	KICWA
64.	Hames Olayo Oballar	Program Coordinator	Concerned Parents Association
65.	Kibwota Churchill Okeny	Administration of Hope Development Agency	RAYOS
66.	Nyero Allan Humphrey	Project Officer	AEI
67.	Nyero Fred	Program Officer	KICWA
68.	Ocen John Bosco	Project Officer	Kitgum District
69.	Okeny Richard Dick	Project Officer	ACVIYOF

70.	Okot Moses	Director	Children the World Foundation
71.	Richard Okumu Oloya	Project Officer	KIWODA
72.	John Bosco Onek	General Secretary	DPAPDA
73.	Otto Godfrey	Program Coordinator	ACET
74.	Otto Moses	HIV Counselor	Cow Foundation
75.	Jacqueline Oyella	Project Officer	Health Alert Uganda
76.	Fred Wokorach	Program Manager	Watwero Rights Focus International

LAGORO SUB COUNTY COMMUNITY MEMBERS

77.	Aol Peregi Bulugi	Women Councilor	Vietnam
78.	Arienmo Bisentina	Secretary Parish Finance	Vietnam
79.	Adwong Marina	Village Disability	Lagoro
80.	Acayo Grace	Youth Secretary For Information Parish Level	Lagoro
81.	Acayo Florence	Secretary Information Village	Vietnam
82.	Night Orama	Community Member	Vietnam
83.	Adiyo Pascal	Community Member	Lagoro
84.	Alfred Onen Elkana	Town Clerk	Katum
85.	Ocira Ronlad Joe	Parish Chief	Katum
86.	Otim Samuel	NAADS Coordinator	Kitgum District
87.	Okot Franklin	Accounts Assistant	Lamwo District
88.	Cero Mathew Patrick	Community Development Officer	Padibe East
89.	Akera Wilson	Out Going Parish Chief-	Padibe East
90.	Oroma Godfrey Benaiza	Parish Chief	Padibe East
91.	James Oola	Chairperson LCIII	Padibe East
92.	Arnago Josephine	Deputy Speaker	
93.	Zupira Thomas	Secretary For Finance, Planning and Administration	Lamwo

SIRONKO DISTRICT

94.	Mariam Pamela Tukahuriwa	Chief Administrative Officer	Sironko District
95.	Murana Justine	District Planner- Planning Unit	Sironko District
96.	Kato Matanda	Resident District Commissioner	Sironko District

COUNCILORS

97.	Masaba Peter	Sub County Chief	Buginyaya
-----	--------------	------------------	-----------

98.	Gidoi James Michael	Parish Chief	Buginyaya
99.	Nakimalo Alex	Delegated In Charge Of Bufumbe Parish	Sironko District
100.	Sibeke David Wamburu	Community Development Officer	Bukalu
101.	Musamali Herbert	Councilor	Bukalu
102.	Gimei Moses	Technical Planning Committee	Masira
103.	Woniala Rogers	Technical Planning Committee	Masira
104.	Zevo Joseph	Parish Chief,	Masira
105.	Watula Bernard Namulindi	SAS	Masira
106.	Gidor Moses	Councilor	Masira
107.	Kalita Koneka	Councilor	Masira
108.	Mugide Lydia	Councilor	Masira
109.	Namboze Agnes	Councilor	Buginyanya
110.	Maleka Godfrey	Community Development Officer	Buginyanya
111.	Nandala Tebenesi	Councilor	Buginyanya
112.	Wolenda Moses	H/A	Buginyanya
113.	Kisiro Patrick	Councilor	Buginyanya
114.	Kituyi Dan	Councilor	Masira Sub-County
115.	Muloni Vincent	Councilor	Buginyanya
116.	Gimei Fred	Councilor	Buginyanya
117.	Mudoko Rose	Council	Buginyanya
118.	Kituyi Jane	Councilor PWDS	Bukalu
119.	Shisa Paul	Councilor	Bukalu
120.	Shebulo Moses	Speaker	Masira
121.	Wobyanga Beatrice	S/P/C	Bukalu
122.	Klondo Catherine	Assistant Accountant	Bukalu
123.	Gimei Joseph	Accounts Accountant	Masira
124.	Womume Charlisil	Councilor	Bugiyanya
125.	Agnes Muloni	Councilor	Bugiyanya
126.	Mabende Edward	Sub Accountant	Bugiyanya
127.	Wotsuna James	Councilor	Bukalu
128.	Manana Titus Makwa	Councilor	Bukalu
129.	Nagua Sylvia	Health Assistant	Bukalu
CSOS SIRONKO DISTRICT			
130.	Boniface Walubya	Chairperson	MAFODE
131.	Florence Beenga	Chairperson	Buyaka Uganda
132.	Gibutayi Florence		Community Partnership for Development
133.	Salata Milton	Chairman	Masira

134.	Nakimolo Moses		Bugiyanya
135.	Nangabo Michael		Masira Sub County
136.	Mafabi Joseph	Buginyanya Farmers	Bugiyanya
137.	Hajji Mauso Muhamad	CCF C/P	Bukalu
138.	Masolo Patrick	Butsesoli Farmers Group	Bukalu
139.	Mudaga Joseph	Chairperson Farmers	Lima CSO
140.	Wandabwa Innocent	Chairperson Youth Group CSO	Bukalu
141.	Mwalye Issa	Muno Mukabi Farmers Group	Bukalu
142.	Mutanyi Simon Male	Kasana Sacco Bungwanga Elobana Grown	
143.	Nadunga Grace	Vice Chairperson	Bukalu
144.	Eric Wakoko	Chairperson	CYDI- Sironko district
145.	Gerald Bwonya	Chairperson	Human Rights Foundation
146.	Wubo Abu Bakar	Chairperson	Salikwa Development Project
147.	Dison Wekombia	Chairman	Haluwali Elderly Group
148.	Magamu Mubaraka	Coordinator	Civil society network Sironko
149.	Nyote Jimmy	Secretary	Muyembe Cooperative Society
150.	Gidale France		Community Partnership for Development
151.	Waniaye John		Mahempe Farmers and HIV/AIDS Initiative.

KISORO DISTRICT

152.	Aheebwa Gideon	Deputy Resident District Commissioner	Kisoro District
153.	Fr. Sebatware Joseph	Vice Chairperson LC 5	Kisoro District
154.	Francis Bainenaama	District Planner	Kisoro District
155.	Nkusi Anatoli	Chief Financial Officer	Kisoro District Local Government
156.	Rita Byiringiro	Assistant CAO	Kisoro District

CSOs

157.	Ainemaani Jovia	Representative	Koinenia
158.	Bizimana Abel	Patron	Virunga Allied Actors
158.	Dushime Elisa	Field Trainer	Water School
160.	Kabihogo Beatrice	Team Leader	Uplift The Rural Poor
161.	Dushime Elisa	Field Trainer	Water School
162.	Kampiire Annet	Field Trainer	Water School
163.	Kigongo Sarah Kaggwa	Senior Community Development Officer	

164.	Kwizera Florence	Chairperson	Nyakinaka PHA Network
165.	Mbabazi Ephraim	Director	Pet- Uganda
166.	Ssanyu Regina	Field Officer	Gorilla Organization
167.	Nyiramugisha Jacqueline	Chairperson	Kisoro Association Of Women With Disabilities
168.	Nzeyimana Charles	Coordinator	Good Samaritan
169.	Sebuhinja Julius	Coordinator	Kisoro African Traditional Cultural Group
170.	Neeza Henry	Capacity Building Officer	United Organization For Batwa Development In Uganda
171.	Bosenibo James	Parish Chief	Nyakabande
172.	Dan Munyambabazi	Sub County Chief	Chahi
173.	Grace Mpagi	Sub County Chief	Busanza
174.	Harega Gervase	LC III councilor	Nyakabande
175.	Kwibuka Bob	Sub County Speaker	Nyakabande
176.	Monica Kibatenga	Sub County Chief	Kanaba
177.	Mushime Elizabeth	Sub County Cashier	Nyakabande
178.	Musyambere Tadeo	Councilor	Nyakabande
179.	Ntawe Ndizeye Domis	Sub County Chief	Nyakabande
180.	Nteze George	O/C Police Post	Nyakabande
181.	Nyirabakuzimana Maria	Councilor	Kanaba
182.	Serutoke Silver	LC 3 Chairperson	Chahi
183.	Tumusabe Emmanuel	Parish Chief	Rutare sub county
184.	Mbabazi Anne	Councilor	Nyakabande

AMOLATAR DISTRICT

185.	Cong Nelson	District Speaker LCIII	Aputi sub county
186.	James Auna	Secretary	A.D.L.G town council
187.	Oling jasper	Youth councilor	Amolatar
188.	Ebong Epia Charles	Councillor	Muntu Sub county
189.	Anne Ebek	Councillor	Awello Sub county
190.	Ogony Ventice Beatrice	Female Councilor	Muntu

CSOs

191.	Obete Geoffrey	Chairman	Arwotyek Youth Group
192.	Oceng Bonny	Secretary	Akol Youth Group

193.	Otee Nelson	CSO member	Akol Youth Group
194.	Okuja O Partick	Project assistant	Rich Consult Uganda
195.	Okwir Patrick	Secretary	Farm T/C Women's Group
196.	Ocen Joshua	Legal assistant	Facilitation For Peace And Development
197.	Alele Emunrael	Program officer	(COBITHA) Community Based Organsiation
198.	Ocen Okello Robert	Senior citizen/community member	Youth Build Foundation
199.	Ebine Tonny	CEO	Youth Build Foundation
200.	Okot Denis	Staff Youth Build	Youth Build Foundation
201.	Okello John	Chairman	Agikadak Tree Planting Association
202.	Arap Francisco	HRAO	Youth Build Foundation Uganda
203.	Okello Charles	Executive Director	Abailer Youth Development Association

Councilors and Technical Team

204.	Okello Engim Simon	Chairperson	Amolatar
205.	Odongo Robert Tiam	Secretary for finance	Amolatar
206.	Eliilu James Ray	Opinion leader	Amolatar
207.	Adong Hellen	Chairperson	Opumai-inomo
208.	Ogwal Peter	Chairperson	Aburkot
209.	Alele Dorcus	Town Agent	Amolatar
210.	Ogwal Alweka Charles	Town Agent	Amolatar
211.	Ukao Ambrose	Councilor	Amolatar
212.	Josephine Alwoko	Councilor	Amolatar
213.	Jennifer Eyaa	Councilor	Amolatar
214.	Odongo Solomon	Chairperson	Youth P.T.C
215.	Esther Stella Achieng	Secretary Education and Health	
216.	Obong Ben Bosco	Town agent	Amolatar
217.	Obougi martins	Town agent	Amolatar
218.	Ketty Atine	Vice chairperson	Amolatar
219.	Akella Scovia	PTER	Amolatar
220.	Arum Thomes	Town engineer	Amolatar
221.	Okopa Peter	Chairperson LCIII	Nalubwloyo
222.	Amony Mary	Sub accountant	Muntu subounty
223.	Okello Samuel	Sub accountant	Muntu
224.	Ewalu Stephen	Secretary finance	Nakatiti
225.	Apio Jawet	Councilor	Abarler
226.	Jolf Agwea	Secretary education	Muntu/ Nakatiti
227.	Ketty Obang	Secretary works	Nalubwoyo

228.	Okwanga Jimmy	Ag. Parish chief	Abarler Parish
229.	Akongo Grace	Chairperson CBO	Abarler parish.