

USAID/Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services



EVALUATION OF THE UGANDA PARLIAMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT (UPTAP)



December 2003

Submitted to:

Elizabeth Regan Kiingi and John Anderson, USAID/Uganda

Submitted by:

**David Hirschmann, MSI
Kintu Nyago, MSI**

The views and recommendations expressed in this report are solely those of the MSI MEMS Team and are not necessarily those of USAID or the U.S. Government.



Contract No. GS-23F-8012H, Order No. 617-M-00-03-00007-00

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
LIST OF ACRONYMS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VII
I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	3
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS	4
A. Achievement of Objectives	4
B. Summary of Qualitative and Quantitative UPTAP Project Results.....	12
C. UPTAP-Parliament Relationships and their Consequences	13
D. Project Costs	15
E. Sustainability.....	17
IV. CONCLUSION.....	21
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	23
VI. LESSONS LEARNED	27

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Evaluation Scope of Work	28
Appendix 2. Illustrative Evaluation Report Outline	33
Appendix 3. Tentative Plan for the TPM for the SUNY/UPTAP	34
Appendix 4. Work plan for SUNY/UPTAP Evaluation.....	35
Appendix 5. Evaluation Methods	36
Appendix 6. List of Documents Reviewed	38
Appendix 7. Instrument Used for Interviews.....	41
Appendix 8. Individuals Interviewed by the Evaluation Team.....	42

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is extended to all the Members of Parliament, professional staff of Parliament, officers of Civil Society Organizations and others who agreed to be interviewed, gave their time, and shared ideas and information with us. A list of the people is attached. In particular, appreciation goes to the following people at USAID/Uganda who assisted our investigation: Don Elliott, John Anderson, Elizabeth Regan Kiingi and Albert Siminyu. Finally the team appreciates the assistance provided to it by Rosern Rwampororo, the MEMS Chief of Party, Molly Hageboeck MSI Technical Associate, Polly Mugisha A. MEMS Democracy and Governance Specialist, and the rest of the MEMS project team.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CO	Clerk's Office
COP	Chief of Party
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DA	Development Associates
DANIDA	Danish Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development
GOU	Government of Uganda
IT	Information Technology
LAN	Local Area Network
LSA	Legislative Support Activity
NRM	National Resistance Movement
OOR	Office of Official Records
OPPD	Office of Professional Parliamentary Development
OPRI	Office of Public Relations and Information
PBO	Parliamentary Budget Office
PLRIS	Parliamentary Library, Research and Information Services
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
POU	Parliament of Uganda
PRIO	Public Relations and Information Office
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SOW	Scope of Work
SUNY	State University of New York
UJCC	Uganda Joint Christian Council
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPTAP	Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1998, USAID extended assistance the Parliament of Uganda (POU) through IQC AEP-5468-100-6004-00. The State University of New York (SUNY) implemented this effort, which was known as the “Uganda Parliament Technical Assistance Project” (UPTAP) project, under three separate but continuous Task Orders over the course of three and a half years at a cost of roughly \$4.4 million.

In accordance with the first Scope of Work (SOW), the primary purposes of the project were to build capacity of Parliament in two broad areas:

- 1) Legislating, Budgeting and Oversight
- 2) Representation of Constituencies
- 3) Strengthening of the CSO/POU relations

In practice the first purpose became the dominant one, though the first and third areas contributed to enabling Members of Parliament’s capacity to represent their constituencies more effectively. In 2001, a Civil Society-Parliament component was added to the program. This involved activities ranging from inviting CSOs to Exhibitions, involving the POU in linking CSOs to relevant Parliamentary Committees, organizing CSO/POU Dialogues and assisting with the publication of two (2) newsletters that primarily target parliamentarians.

Project activities in support of these purposes included workshops, study tours, strategic planning, production and dissemination of publications such as directories, technical assistance, purchase of furniture, purchase and installation of computers, and related equipment and inter- and intranet connections, as well as all related training of MPs and a technical officer.

The project focused mainly on the Parliamentary Commission, the Board of Management, the Parliamentary Budget Office (PBO), the Parliamentary Committees, the Public Relations and Information Office (PRIO), the Library, Research and Documentation Center, Office of Legislative Counsel, Office of Hansard, and on individual MPs and later on the Office of Parliament and Professional Development. The project also included an internship program.

A team of two evaluators, one American and one Ugandan, carried out this evaluation during June-July, 2003, which covers the period from August 1998 through May 2002, and is the first evaluation of the UPTAP project. Document reviews and interviews were the primary methods of data collection used in this study.

The central finding of the evaluation is that *UPTAP succeeded in its major objective of enhancing the legislative, budgeting and oversight role of Parliament*. This conclusion is supported by a range of detailed findings as summarized below in the areas of:

- a) *Activities or Inputs*: UPTAP carried out the numerous and various workshops, training exchanges, publishing and consultant undertakings foreseen in the agreements with

USAID as well as the procurement and installation of a wide range of commodities, notably IT and assistance with connectivity.

- b) *Institution building:* These activities led to new or vastly strengthened organizations and systems, sometimes to breakthroughs, for which SUNY can claim credit. UPTAP successes can be seen in the Budget Act, the Budget Office, the Library and Documentation Center, the Committee system, the Research Services, the Public Relations and Information Office, the Legislative Counsel, all of these benefiting from newly installed IT and training, and also Parliamentary-Civil Society Relations.
- c) *Services to MPs and performance of MPs:* These improvements in the functioning of specific units within the POU succeeded in enhancing the services provided by the Staff of Parliament to MPs and, in turn in the performance of Parliament. As a result of the UPTAP projects, MPs now have access to the Internet connectivity, research materials, library services and professional budgetary advice, all of which support their work as legislators. Civil Society Organizations' (CSO) input is also providing them with a helpful new source of information. Some are making use of these sources of information and advice to raise the quality of both Committee consideration and plenary debate, though we are not able from this evaluation to define the exact proportion of MPs that do so.
- d) *Attribution:* While the UPTAP project played an important role in bringing about these higher-level impacts; they cannot be attributed exclusively to SUNY work. After the Administration of Parliament Act of 1997, there was a conducive and supportive environment for change in Parliament. Also with time, other donors became increasingly involved in efforts to improve the performance of Parliament. As of July 2003, eight donors, in addition to the United States are supporting the work of the POU. Strong and capable Ugandan input has also played an important role in bringing about the improvements noted above. Nevertheless, it is clear from the evidence amassed by the evaluation that the UPTAP project played a pivotal role in initiating reform and bringing about specific changes in the way Parliament functions. It is noteworthy, in terms of understanding these changes and their importance that the Parliament of Uganda has attracted a number of visiting Parliamentary delegations from elsewhere in Africa to learn from its practices.
- e) *Sustainability:* It is only a year since the project ended but, in terms of sustainability, most of the above-mentioned initiatives continue to operate effectively. There are exceptions to this statement. The website of Parliament (POU website), for example, may be in danger of falling behind schedule, and there are calls for replacing/upgrading of IT equipment to keep up with demands. Nevertheless, the sustainability of practices introduced and the related improvement in quality of legislative work appear to be very promising.
- f) *Fulfillment of Project Objectives:* An important early emphasis in the first SOW on *Representation* (of constituencies, of people), repeated in the second and third Task Orders appears to have been de-emphasized by UPTAP throughout the three and half years. A few relevant events were organized by SUNY but these seem to have been

sporadic, not part of any planned strategy and without much impact. The explanation provided by a SUNY/UPTAP official was that their providing skills to MPs in addition to linking Civil Society Organizations to the POU contributed to the objective of strengthening parliamentarians' capacity to represent their constituencies. In addition, little progress appears to have been made on a modest component of the second and third SOWs focused on *Parliament-Local Government relations*.

Important initiative highlighted in the third SOW, namely, to build an Office of Professional Parliamentary Development (*OPPD*) got off to an uncertain start and remains open to rethinking and restructuring.

- g) *SUNY's working relations*: For the most part, SUNY's relations with Parliament appear to have been constructive and helpful. The majority of people interviewed were positive about their relations with the UPTAP project. Nevertheless there were criticisms of some aspects of SUNY's approach to working with Parliament (and USAID's practices), some of which provide lessons for USAID and future contractors. Most of those lessons focus on the extent of consultation needed with lower as well as higher level staff, when changes affect a whole unit or organization and with transparency of decision making processes, for instance, with respect to the selection of individuals for study tours.
- h) *Costs*: While project costs were significant, this is not unusual in Legislative Strengthening projects where one is the major early donor and which involve large commodity purchase components; the introduction of IT, and the provision of technical expertise from the US. While the evaluation team was not able to make direct comparisons between the costs and results of the SUNY UPTAP project and other, similar USAID-funded legislative assistance projects in East Africa, or elsewhere, it nevertheless appears that, given where the POU is today, compared to 1997, the money invested in the UPTAP project was effectively spent and has produced important and lasting returns.

I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The Parliament of Uganda derives its mandate from the 1995 Constitution, the Laws of Uganda and its own Rules of Procedures. The Constitution empowers Parliament to “make laws on any matter for the peace, order, development and good governance of Uganda.”(POU Website). Parliament in Uganda is freely elected but operates within a context of a strong Presidency and a dominant political movement, the National Resistance Movement (NRM). To date other political parties have been given limited scope to operate.

Of central importance to Parliament’s development was the passing of the Administration of Parliament Act of 1997, by the sixth Parliament (1996 - 2001). This Act established the fiscal autonomy of the Parliament of Uganda and separated it from the Civil Service. A Parliamentary Commission was created with the overall responsibility for its development as a legislative institution, and the power to establish committees.

In 1998 the leadership of Parliament requested donor assistance and USAID agreed. This was provided, in the first instance, through IQC AEP-5468-100-6004-00, Task Order 804, awarded to the State University of New York (SUNY to implement USAID’s proposed program of assistance to Parliament from August 1998 through August 1999). This program was designated the ‘Uganda Parliament Technical Assistance Project (UPTAP). The Task Order was later extended to April 2000. At the end of the first eighteen (18) months, USAID issued a follow-on Task Order 800 to SUNY to provide additional assistance from May 2000 through May 2001. A year later, USAID issued follow on Task Order 803 to provide additional services through April 2002.

The initial budget for the Program was \$1.8m. An amendment was added for an additional \$.6 million, which brought the total cost of the first Task Order to \$2.4 M. The budget for the second Task Order was \$1.2 million and the third and final was \$0.8million. This makes a total of \$4.4million for approximately 3.5 years.

The purpose of the SUNY/UPTAP program was to build the capacity of Parliament in three broad areas 1) Legislating, Budgeting and Oversight, and 2) Representation of Constituencies, and 3) The strengthening of the CSO/POU relations.

SUNY/UPTAP’s assisting the POU legislating, budgeting and oversight functions was mainly through nurturing internal reforms that led to the creation of the Board of Management and the Budget Office. This, in addition to strengthening the capacities of its already existing and newly created departments.

The second area was not pursued. While the third area involved SUNY’s organizing CSO/POU Exhibitions, linking CSOs to relevant Parliamentary Committees, organizing POU/CSO public dialogues and assisting with the publications of two CSO newsletters whose main audience is the POU. The Newsletters are The Lobbyist (produced by The NGO Forum) and The Monthly Parliamentary Bulletin produced by the Uganda Joint Christian Council.

Table 1: Requirements for Each of the 3 SUNY/UPTAP Task Orders

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of SUNY UPTAP Task Order 1 –August 1998-April 2000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o1 Provide technical support for the Parliamentary Commission o2 Building capacity for members of Parliament o3 Equipment Procurement and Installation Modifications to Task Order 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o1 Task 1 Provide technical support and equipment to create a Parliamentary Budget Office o2 Task 2 Create an internship program with local legal/political science teaching institutions that will enhance Parliament’s committee staff o3 Task 3 Improvement of the Parliamentary Office of Public Relations and Information o4 Task 4 Expand training for Members and Staff and provide equipment to fill existing gaps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of SUNY UPTAP Task Order 2-April 2000-April 2001 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o1 Enhance the technical capacity of the Parliamentary Commission. o2 Enhancing the representational capacity and outreach skills of Members of Parliament. o3 Strengthening the technical capacity of Parliament’s professional staff. o4 Providing technical and infrastructure support for Parliament’s service departments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of SUNY UPTAP Task Order 3-May 2001-April 2002 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Parliamentary Capacity to provide on-going training and staff development institutionalized o Parliamentary budgetary oversight strengthened o Civil Society Organizations-Parliament interaction strengthened

II. Evaluation Methodology

This report presents the findings of an evaluation initiated by USAID to “assess the success of the UPTAP program in achieving its objectives” and to “derive lessons learned over the project period” as outlined in the evaluation Scope of Work (SOW) which is provided in Attachment 1. This is the first evaluation USAID has undertaken of the SUNY UPTAP program. The evaluation was carried out in June-July, 2003 by David Hirschmann and Kintu Nyago, as the first Special Study under USAID’s contract with Management Systems International (MSI) for the Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project.

The methods used in the conduct of this evaluation included a review of relevant documents; interviews with approximately 30 key representatives of Parliament and other stakeholders, and through observation. Additional information on these methods is provided in Attachment 2. In the attachments to this report, the reader will also find three other documents that help to explain the study methodology, i.e., a list of documents the team reviewed (Attachment 3); the interview instrument (Attachment 4) and a list of the individuals the team interviewed (Attachment 5).

The Evaluation Team applied these techniques, as best it could within the time frame allowed for the evaluation to address the seven main questions posed in USAID’s SOW.

One evaluation question, however, turned out to be problematic from a data collection perspective. As was reported at the briefing to USAID on July 7th, it has not been possible to satisfactorily respond to the 6th question, which queried whether and how SUNY tracked and utilized program-monitoring information. There seemed to be no clear way of researching these through documents and since SUNY was no longer present in Kampala, they could not help. E-mail on this topic was sent to the two former COPs. Their response, while helpful, did not provide sufficient material to present an informed answer.

All other queries have been responded to in a slightly different pattern which was necessitated by the emerging logic of organizing and writing the findings, e.g., Questions 1 and 2 were combined because at this stage (after the project has been completed) the issues of ‘achievement of objectives’ and the ‘contribution to the functioning of Parliament’ are very closely interrelated.

Parts of Question 5 concerned with civil society and local government have been incorporated into the ‘achievement of objectives’ questions because they were integral to the program. Relationship with Parliament, also mentioned under the 5th Question gets a full section to itself (in response to the 7th SOW question).

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Achievement of Objectives

This section commences with a description and assessment of UPTAP's main Parliamentary institution and capacity building activities. It then compares the non-quantifiable results required by the various UPTAP SOWs with achievements. Thirdly it looks briefly at the achievement of quantitative results contained in USAID's Results Framework.

Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building

The SUNY UPTAP program assisted Parliament's development through its work with specific offices. Institutional strengthening and capacity building thus tends to be evident at the office level, but because of the environment within which the SUNY UPTAP project worked, its impact was often felt throughout Parliament, as exemplified by information about what changed in a number of specific situations.

Senior Management of Parliament:

UPTAP recognized that serious inadequacies in the management structures of POU would hinder communication and progress. Therefore an effort was made to clarify and strengthen the role of the senior policy-making body, the Parliamentary Commission, and initiate a supportive administrative body, namely the Board of Management. Based on considerable consultation with the Parliamentary Commission, the Clerk's Office and with various Heads of Departments, SUNY assisted the Commission to draft and operationalize its first Modernization Plan, which in turn established the key elements of a reform strategy for the POU. A senior SUNY adviser, later to become the second COP, was attached to the POU for three months to work with these two bodies to devise protocols and definitions of and advise on the roles appropriate to each organization. This resulted in clearer reporting lines and greater accountability for determining the overall direction of Parliament, and of use of SUNY and other donor assistance.

The Budget Office:

The Parliamentary Budget Office (PBO) was established in 2001. This followed a study tour in 1999 organized by UPTAP for a Parliamentary delegation to democratic institutions in the United States and Canada. The institutions visited were the House of Commons of Canada, the Federal House of Representatives of the United States of America, and the General Assembly of the State of Colorado. This exposure led to Uganda's Parliamentary Commission agreeing to support a PBO. A Private Member's Bill was also tabled and it became the Budget Act in 2001. Information from SUNY/UPTAP's COP indicates that their Research Officer provided technical input in the process of enacting this law. The Budget Act also entrusted the PBO with the role of providing Parliament and its Committees with non-partisan, objective and timely analysis required for economic and budget proposals and information and estimates required for the Parliamentary budget process. Similarly the Executive and all departments and self-accounting institutions were compelled to submit their budgetary proposals in a continuous timely manner to Parliament.

The enactment of the Budget Act radically democratized and improved the discipline of the budgetary process and gave Parliament a significant and constructive role in national spending, decision-making and oversight over the Executive.

The PBO, (which today has a professional staff of eleven economists) was furnished and equipped by UPTAP with computers, a server with internet access and sophisticated software to enhance its capacity to effectively analyze and report on the Executive's budget proposals and expenditures to Parliament. Furthermore, SUNY provided short-term training courses and made agreements with the Ministry of Finance and the Bank of Uganda to ensure the smooth flow of information to the PBO. UPTAP also strengthened the work of the Budget Committee. This occurred through provision of training on the Budget Act.

Parliamentarians, including Hon. Beatrice Kiraso the Chairperson of the Budget Committee, and professional parliamentary staff including Aeneas Tandekwire the Clerk to Parliament and staff of the PBO, have all indicated to the Evaluation team that the Budget Office has tremendously enhanced POU's capacity to analyze and respond to the Executive's budgetary proposals. They also noted that in general Parliamentarians, with the backup of the PBO, are currently better informed and analytical on budgetary issues. To date the PBO has advised Parliament on two (2) national budgets.

An interview with Samuel Wanyaka the Director of the PBO revealed that prior to its establishment, there was a tendency to submit inadequately prepared Ministerial Policy Statements to the POU. The establishment of the PBO with its expertise in data analysis acted as a deterrent to this tendency. Ministries and departments of the Executive are aware of this and are able to explain any such information to the relevant Parliamentary Committees basing on the PBO's advice. This has been demonstrated by better quality Ministerial Policy Statements being presented before Parliament.

Section 10 of the Budget Act of 2001 conditions every Bill introduced to Parliament to be accompanied by its indicative financial implications. It's the PBO that assists the POU to analyze this information. In turn this checks the reoccurrence of unpopular Bills being passed into laws, as was the previous case with the Land Act 1998.

Norbert Mao, an outspoken critic of government and MP for Gulu Municipality describes the PBO as a one-stop center for information about the status of Uganda's heavy external debt. This information that the PBO derives from the Ministry of Finance and the Bank of Uganda is disseminated to Parliament and the wider public.

Through its publications, such as the Summary of the Recommendations of the Parliamentary Sessional Committees on the 2002/2003 Budget, MPs, CSOs and interested members of the broader public are informed of Parliament's budgetary concerns. Recommendations made by Parliamentary Committees, as a result of PBO work, have contributed positively to the broader process of good governance and reduced wastage. Some of the recommendations are aimed at combating corruption, for instance the call on the Ministry of Defense to eliminate 'Ghost soldiers' from its pay role. Other recommendations called for the expeditious reforming of the pension sector in order to provide better services to pensioners.

The Clerk's Office, Clerks Assistants and the Committee System:

The Clerks Office (CO) and the Committee system greatly benefited from the UPTAP project. The main functions of the CO are to organize meetings at the Committee and Plenary levels, provide procedural advice to Parliament and act as the Secretariat to Parliamentary Committees.

At the time of SUNY/UPTAP's intervention in 1998, the CO had seven Clerks' Assistants, with two (2) computers. In 1999 the Parliamentary Commission recruited ten (10) new Clerks' Assistants and SUNY facilitated their training in recording and keeping minutes, report writing, policy analysis, organizing meetings and developing work plans. Furthermore, in 1999, six (6) of these Clerk's Assistants were sent on a Study Tour to the United States to the State Legislatures of New York and Maine. According to Chris Abwooli Kaija, POU's Under Secretary (Finance and Administration), this Study Tour's main objective was to provide a more practical follow up to the theoretical training that the new staff had earlier acquired. SUNY also provided the Clerk's Office with ten (10) computers.

Aeneas Tandekwire, Clerk to Parliament and Paul Wabwire, Senior Principle Clerk Assistant, both agree that the above-mentioned training brought about a great improvement in the manner in which the Clerks' Assistants conducted their work. The two officers say there is an improvement in the performance of Committees, which now meet regularly and are actively engaged in the legislative process.

Office of Public Relations and Information:

The Parliamentary Commission, based on the Administration of Parliament Act, provided scope for the Office of Public Relations and Information (OPRI) to fulfill its stipulated mandate for disseminating information about POU within and outside this institution.

SUNY/UPTAP assisted with nurturing the OPRI's revamped role through providing training to two (2) staff members, (including Kagole Kivumbi the Senior Public Relations Officer) in the Page Maker Computer program, which is vital in modern publishing and printing.

SUNY/UPTAP also provided OPRI with two (2) computers, a photocopier, machine and furniture.

Respondents, both MPs and staff members, and those in civil society and the media, informed the Evaluation Team that the revamped Office of Public Relations and Information (OPRI) ensures that information flow from Parliament is considerably more accessible. It was noted that UPTAP had played a central role in enhancing this Office's performance through either introducing or funding the initial publication of the following information tools:

- A Members of Parliamentary Directory which contains information on all the Members of Parliament and senior staff, including their telephone numbers and -email addresses. This directory also has the basic rules of parliamentary procedure and parliament's history. Over 1000 initial copies were distributed to targeted governmental offices, CSOs and the citizenry. For many institutions and individuals, this directory, whose subsequent publishing was taken over by the

OPRI provided the first clear link between them and Parliament.

- A Visitor's Guide to Parliament provides elaborate basic information on the national legislature.
- A Children's Guide to Parliament targeted the 10-16 year age group
- An in-house weekly Parliamentary Staff Bulletin newsletter of over 350 copies per edition, promotes communication within Parliament, for both legislators and staff members, and
- Parliament's monthly newsletter, The August House: 2000 copies are published monthly and distributed to the Judiciary and Executive branches of government, diplomatic missions, media houses and CSOs.

Interviewees were of the view that these publications, together with training and the computers provided by SUNY, offered this Office the skills and confidence to improve channels of communications within Parliament and between it and other arms of government, CSOs, the printed and electronic media and the public.

Office of Official Records:

SUNY/UPTAP provided support to the POU's Office of Official Records (OOR), whose mandate is to publish Parliament's documentation that includes the Hansard, Parliamentary Committee Reports and its newsletter 'The August House'. SUNY provided three (3) computers and a server. According to the Editor of the Hansard, this enabled OOR to network Hansard documenting operations, a process that enhanced the flow of quality information. It put an end to the original time consuming stand alone activities method of work that involved moving from one office to another to gather the required information during the documenting of the Hansard. Coupled with the high professionalism of the OOR, commented on by both the Clerk to Parliament and the POU's Under Secretary (Finance and Administration) the result was the production of a daily Hansard that contains the POU's debates of the previous day. This was a great improvement from the previous production of these deliberations on a monthly basis.

Civil Society's Access to Parliament:

UPTAP played a major role in linking Parliament with civil society organizations (CSOs). Prior to this initiative, a few of the more organized CSOs, had established contact with the POU. For instance in 2000, before SUNY's intervention, the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC) managed to establish a Parliamentary Liaison Officer linking it to the POU. That same year SUNY/UPTAP began implementing its Task Order 3 of *Building Links between Civil Society and Parliament*. It established a network of more than 35 key CSOs that represent a cross section of interests in Uganda.

UPTAP targeted primarily advocacy-oriented CSOs. Individuals in the NGO community interviewed by the Evaluation Team commented very positively on the impact of the project. Some reported that it enhanced the effectiveness of their advocacy; others said it opened the door to Parliament for the first time. Illustrative of UPTAP sponsored activities for CSOs are:

- Two CSO exhibitions for the information of Parliament were organized. Here CSOs displayed to parliamentarians their work products, as for instance printed information on advocacy and other publications. The theme of the dialogue that took place in November 2000 was ‘Civil Society and Parliament: Fostering an enabling environment for participatory democracy through dialogue’. According to a number of CSO respondents and MPs, these Exhibitions promoted free interaction and fuller understanding between legislators and civil society.
- Public dialogues on different topics, that included ‘*Effective Legislative Representation*’ in addition to debating the *Political Parties and Organizations Bill 2002* also brought CSO and MPs together and enabled them to freely exchange ideas.
- Advocacy skill seminars provided civil society organizations with legislative advocacy and lobbying skills, some for the first time.
- UPTAP efforts that helped link CSOs directly to Parliamentary Committees engaged in their specific areas of operation.
- Parliamentary publications, sponsored by UPTAP (and listed above), made a major contribution to mutual understanding, communication and cooperation, and, civil society publications, supported by UPTAP, did as well. These included a Directory of NGOs and Experts, the NGO Forum’s Parliamentary newsletter, The Lobbyist and the UJCC’s Parliamentary Bulletin. This bulletin, 500 copies of which are produced each month, are circulated to all parliamentarians, selected NGOs and member churches.

The evaluation team was given numerous examples of the positive consequences of this UPTAP initiative. The Uganda Land Alliance, for example, was invited to work with the Sessional Committee on Natural Resources on the Land Act and contributed to the Land Act Amendment Bill’s clause 39A. This ensures the right of security of occupancy on family land by any spouse, male or female. The Alliance also had an influence on the introduction of Section 40 of the same Act, which calls for spousal consent before family property is mortgaged. This interaction also improved the use of gender sensitive language in parliamentary legislation.

In 2003 the Sessional Committee on Social Services invited mainly faith based health providers to participate in the review of the Health Sector. In addition UJCC, Akina Mama Wa Africa and five other NGOs appeared several times, in 2001, and submitted written memoranda to the Committee on Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, in order to influence the contents of the Suppression of Terrorism Bill (now Act).

A similar process was undertaken by the UJCC and the Human Rights Network when the Political Parties and Organization Bill (now Act) was debated at Committee level in Amendment) Bill, 2002 (now Act) and the NGO Registration (Amendment) Bill 2002 (not yet

passed). The same type of CSO input played a role in Parliament's consideration of the Leadership Code Bill 2002 (now Act), the National Women Council.

The Parliamentary Library:

The Parliamentary Library, Research and Information Services (LRIS) was officially commissioned in 1999, with a mandate to provide information services to Parliament in a timely, accurate and non-partisan manner. Its targeted clients are MPs. It is composed of the Library, and separate Research and Information Technology sections.

UPTAP was instrumental in the establishment of the Parliamentary Library. This Library currently has a professional staff of five (5) people. The library has more than 10,000 volumes of which 1396 were supplied by UPTAP. UPTAP also provided it with fourteen computer terminals accessed to Internet services.

SUNY provided the initial consultants to train those MPs who were not able to use computers. This was an important contribution. A Commissioner of the 7th Parliament observed that up to $\frac{3}{4}$ of MPs had never used a computer before joining the legislature. Each MP and all staff were assigned their own email accounts.

UPTAP also took LRIS staff members on a study tour to the United States. In 1999, twelve research assistants, committee clerks and library staff visited the New York and Maine State legislatures. They gained exposure to the diverse ways of and conducting legislative support activities for parliamentarians. Innocent Rugambwa the Legislative Librarian says this exposure was helpful, as study tour participants had a chance to learn from well-established library and research departments.

In terms of usage of the LRIS services, *The Annual Reports for the Library*, as for instance the one for the Financial Year 2001/2002 indicated a rising interest in the use of these facilities by MPs. For instance in August 2001 there were 2681 users, a figure that grew to 5094 users during November of the same year, while rising further to 6220 users in March 2002. A point to note is that though on the rise these figures do fluctuate. Furthermore, according to the Legislative Librarian these figures point to any of the times that any individual user, that is a Member of Parliament, enters the Library facilities, whose established purpose is to provide them with reading materials and internet services.

Interviewees, notably MPs (including those that had been in the Sixth Parliament and hence had an historical perspective) and LRIS staff, were unanimous in saying that the introduction of this service had contributed to the improvement of Parliament and its Committees. These positive results were realized despite some initial problems that arose when the Parliamentary Library was in its start-up phase. These will be discussed in subsequent chapters of this report.

Parliamentary Research Service:

With the help of UPTAP, the Parliamentary Research Service, a department of LRIS was established, in 1999. This department currently employs thirteen (13) researchers. SUNY fully equipped this office with furniture, a Local Area Network (LAN) server and 15 computers, and provided training in the basic skills of legislative research.

The Research Service responds to two broad types of information requests, namely Research Reports and requests for brief specific information. The users in both cases are individual MPs and Parliamentary Committees. According to the Director of LRIS, a Parliamentary Research Report is now a detailed analytical document of investigated information provided on request by an MP or Parliamentary Committee. The demand for this service has been on the increase since the Research Section was formed. In 2000, 123 Research Reports were provided to individual MPs and Parliamentary Committees. This number rose to 145 in 2003.

An interim assessment by SUNY noted some complaints that the Research Service was unable to satisfy all requests or to do so in a timely manner and that while the Research Service was certainly being used, it was being used by a limited number of MPs. These issues were also raised by a few of the people the Evaluation Team interviewed. Overall, however, interview respondents were of the opinion that the Research Service was extremely useful in providing Parliamentarians with much needed information for legislation. A few examples of research findings being used in Parliament reported to the Evaluation Team include debates on the Amendment of the Land Act, the repeal of the Government Treasury Securities Bill, and the sale of the Uganda Commercial Bank. One MP also gave us three examples of helpful responses to his personal research requests.

Parliamentary Website:

A Parliamentary Website (www.parliament.go.ug), driven by an Oracle database, was also designed and installed for Parliament by the UPTAP project. The Website avails to the wider public information on the history and administration of Parliament, Hansards, Parliamentary Reports, Bills and Acts of Parliament, and information on Members of Parliament. SUNY also helped the POU to establish an electronic bill tracking system allowing MPs, Parliamentary staff and the public (with internet access) to monitor progress of bills and thus make informed decisions.

Internship Program:

The SUNY/UPTAP intervention introduced an Internship program for Ugandan university students. It involved approximately 16 students a year who worked on an internship basis for ten weeks. The objectives of this program were to train interns by exposing them to the operations of Parliament. It was envisaged that this program would eventually widen the pool of personnel available to Committees, and contribute to an increased public awareness about the Parliament of Uganda. Some of these interns have indeed been absorbed in on fulltime basis. This internship program has continued with particular departments basing on their budgetary provisions taking the initiative to attract the services of three interns.

Parliamentary Contributions to the Legislative Process:

In the final analysis, improvement in the functioning of Parliament was the primary purpose of all of the SUNY UPTAP initiatives. Each of them – development of the senior management system, the Budget Office, the Committee system, the library and research services, training and study visits, the introduction and application of considerable IT, and the CSO linkages to Parliament -- was intended to, and has resulted in an improved legislative process.

In addition to these initiatives, a number of other steps were taken to improve this aspect of the work of Parliament, including the creation of the Office of the Legislative Council in 1999. This Office, established with UPTAP assistance, is responsible for interpreting bills and drafting amendments. UPTAP provided the Office with computers, training and furniture. The Head of the Office acknowledged the importance of the SUNY contribution. She noted that— and this was very significant statement - *today, most bills proposed by the Executive branch are subject to substantial amendment by Parliament*. She gave numerous examples of bills and acts for which the Legislative Counsel had crafted amendments for use by Parliament. These included bills and acts relating to the Disability Council, the Youth Council, University and Tertiary Institutions, Microfinance institutions, Financial Accountability and the Land Amendment.

In addition to helping create the Office of Legislative Council, the UPTAP program ensured that MPs were provided with bill drafting skills, along with the basic overview of the entire bill drafting process. MPs were also exposed to the potential capabilities of the new Office of Legislative Counsel, and its ability to help them amend and draft legislation.

A number of interviewees spoke of Parliament ‘defacing’ or ‘mutilating’ bills they deem “inappropriate”. This according to POU’s Chief Legislative Counsel in essence refers to the concerned Bills being substantially amended, to radically change the original content.

Two caveats should be added here. A number of people said that progress was not linear as had been expected. There was a general view that the 7th Parliament was not as strong as the 6th Parliament had been especially towards the end of its term. While it is agreed that Parliament has made substantial advances, and is able to monitor and amend many of the proposals of the Ministries, this is not to say that there has been a change in the balance of power. There is a general consensus that if the Executive branch was determined to see that a bill was passed or expenditure incurred it would get its way.

Unfinished/Incomplete Business:

An important early emphasis in the first SOW on *Representation* (of constituencies, of people), repeated in the second and third task orders appears to have been de-emphasized by UPTAP throughout the three and half years. A respondent from SUNY/UPTAP pointed out that the provision of skills to MPs and POU staff, in addition to CSOs being linked to parliament went a long way in fulfilling the objective of enhancing the capacity of parliamentarians to represent their constituencies more effectively. Though the question of level of capacity provided to the MPs in this regard remains unverified.

Little progress appears to have been made on a modest component of the second and third SOWs focused on *Parliament-Local Government relations*. One meeting was held in relation to investigating relevant issues but not much more. The team could not adequately get the reasons why some SOW items were dropped.

One important initiative, contained in the third SOW, namely, to establish a new Office of Professional and Parliamentary Development (*OPPD*), and more importantly, to institutionalize within that Office Parliament’s own capacity building function got off to an uncertain start and remains open to rethinking and restructuring. SUNY provided the support and infrastructure

necessary to establish this new Office. However the Office has faced a number of problems, including lack of clarity about its reporting systems. OPPD is now the subject of a study by UNDP and DFID and recommendations will be communicated as soon as they are available.

B. Summary of Qualitative and Quantitative UPTAP Project Results

As the foregoing discussion of institution building accomplishments and a relatively few unfinished tasks indicates, The SUNY UPTAP project made substantial progress in achieving its primary objective of strengthening POU's capacity to legislate, budget and oversee the executive branch. In a number of cases, offices and services in the POU which had been non-existent or barely operational, were now playing an active and constructive role in enhancing the functions of the legislature.

From a technical standpoint, it is also reasonable to highlight the degree to which SUNY's work conformed to qualitative and quantitative expectations set forth in its Task Orders from USAID. USAID's expectations in its Task Orders were largely qualitative. In addition to these task statements, USAID established quantitative objectives for the SUNY project in the Mission's Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) against which SUNY had to report on three indicators.

With respect to the qualitative task statements in the three SUNY Task Orders as earlier mentioned in Table.1 and the modification to Task Order one, the Evaluation Team summary of findings indicates that:

- Task Order 1: All the tasks were achieved and one of the main purposes, namely the first was substantially advanced. Much less attention was given to the second purpose and USAID appears to have concurred in this.
- Modification to Task Order 1: All of the tasks were fulfilled.
- Task Order 2: All of the above were fulfilled and the purpose of more effective legislative, budgeting and oversight etc was again substantially advanced.
- Task Order 3: Task 1 was implemented but confronted problems and did not make much headway. The relevant new office, OPPD and the role of institutionalizing internal capacity building was not clearly established. There are structural issues to clear up, and other donors namely UNDP and DIFD are carrying out studies in preparation for improved management arrangements.

Tasks 2, 3 and 4 were fulfilled with positive outcomes.

As indicated above the second purpose related to representation of people or

Constituencies were also very much the secondary purpose, and only a few initiatives were taken specifically to advance this purpose.

On a quantitative basis, against USAID/Uganda performance indicators, the SUNY UPTAP project was exemplary. Accomplishments in terms of Mission performance indicators show, for example, that:

For Indicator, IR 5.3 ‘Executive Branch sponsored Bills amended or rejected by Parliament,’ the target set was 9. The final number was 22.

The target for IR5.1 now IR 9.1.2 in the new Integrated Strategic Plan ‘CSOs making submissions to Parliamentary Committee hearings’ was 40. The final count was 101.

No target was set for ‘Parliamentary Committees that request data and information on budget matters from the PBO and PRS’ but the final count of requests was 53, which is a positive outcome.

While such quantitative measurements can only partially represent the complexities of the challenge and the UPTAP response, they nevertheless add to the sense of positive achievement of the Program.

C. UPTAP-Parliament Relationships and their Consequences

The Evaluation Team examined the working relationship between SUNY/USAID and the POU to establish whether there were any consequences and lessons learnt from that relationship that might affect UPTAP project results or future relations.

While one can learn from these findings about working relationships, it is important to keep in mind that much of the information given depended upon people’s memory, which can be faulty or mere hearsay. Unfortunately SUNY personnel were not readily available to respond to each statement.

A good number of key informants who were familiar with and had worked with SUNY were contacted. The majority of what they said was positive about the way SUNY worked, often supporting their opinions with examples of helpful and consultative interactions, both formal and informal.

There certainly were criticisms, and a few of them were made with some sense of annoyance. These criticisms are interrelated and categorized as follows:

Lack of Consultation:

Concern was raised about the lack of consultation with end-users. While SUNY may have discussed new initiatives with Parliamentary leaders, it did not always discuss these initiatives with the end-users. Notable here is the purchase of computers, software, furniture, carpets.

It was also observed that SUNY sometimes failed to consult with the relevant Heads of Departments in its selection of people to participate in study tours and or workshops.

The most notable reference to lack of consultation (by people who had been involved directly and by others who were not) was the decision to locate the library in the basement of one of the

Parliamentary buildings, and the air conditioning system installed to service it. SUNY is reported to having opposed the change to move the library to another more convenient location. It is important to note that while the opinions of some concerned people may have been overlooked or ignored, other key senior people in Parliament concurred with the decision to locate the library underground. Secondly, the location to which the library was later moved (in the North Wing) was not available at the time the initial decision, in which SUNY was involved, was made.

Another issue raised as a criticism of the SUNY project focused on civil society strengthening activities in what was seen as a legislative strengthening project. This USAID initiative is viewed as having been added to the UPTAP project to conform to USAID mandates, and was reportedly added without much consultation with Parliament.

Lack of Transparency:

Two respondents to the Evaluation Team observed the need for thorough consultations and transparency in project design, in assessing bids, and in the selection of a project implementer.

Others made it clear that they would like to see project and contract documents that make project objectives, as well as constraints and other stipulations, clear. They said that sometimes SUNY would say that it was not allowed to do something by USAID policy or that a task was not included in their contract. Parliament was not in a position to challenge this, as it had no access to the terms of the contract. The MPs found it difficult to judge if SUNY had achieved its objectives or not since those objectives had not been shared with them.

A few people complained that they had called for an evaluation of the SUNY project at an earlier stage but had been turned down by USAID. These individuals reported that they felt this demonstrated a lack of transparency.

There were also a number of complaints about non-transparency in the selection of people for study visits abroad. The process and the criteria used in selection were not made clear. This left people with a sense of suspicion about the project.

Lack of respect for POU systems and information needs:

The Evaluation Team was informed that UPTAP did not fully consult with Procurement Office about purchases; by-passed POU procurement processes, and failed to provide an inventory of commodities purchased for the record and for management. The team was shown an inventory that had just arrived; thus suggesting that this had been done for the benefit of the evaluation.

There was a similar complaint about a lack of information and consultation made by the Human Resources Office, which is responsible for staff development. The Office is responsible for preparing and monitoring a plan for staff capacity building. It is also responsible for monitoring and dealing with staff absences. It pointed to a failure to consult on planning for staff capacity development, criteria, the selection of individuals for training, and about a lack of timely information on training and other capacity development decisions SUNY made.

Finally there were complaints about a proposed protocol between donors and POU aimed at regularizing donor technical assistance to Parliament. It was said that USAID had taken the lead

in pressing this on Parliament. Some of the issues concern travel and living allowances when on study visits. For example, USAID pays economy class airfares and the same allowances for everybody irrespective of status. Parliament sets higher amounts for senior personnel. It was not only the content of the proposal, but also the pressure placed on Parliament to agree, that accounted for some of the irritation. The Evaluation Team was informed that Parliament forwarded the document to the Attorney General, to the displeasure of USAID.

There were also a few charges of some ill chosen phrases (and an example was provided) that had annoyed people and according to one person demonstrated the ‘arrogance’ of the UPTAP implementer. It was claimed too that on one occasion the implementer tried to intervene to change a senior person in the Parliament. This was seen as excessive interference.

To balance these reports, the Evaluation Team contacted both former leaders of the SUNY UPTAP project. By e-mail these two former SUNY Chiefs of Party (COP) explained their approach to the SUNY contract and the consultation process. Apparently SUNY’s approach was carefully planned and conforms to the descriptions given of SUNY’s working style by many of those interviewed. Feedback from the two SUNY COPs also refers to a disconnection between SUNY’s Task Orders and POU’s absorptive capacity. The issue here is that USAID’s contract required SUNY to deliver results irrespective of Parliament’s capacity. This probably explains why the SUNY team felt a need to be ‘assertive’ and the possibility of some recipients feeling that there might be less than full consultation. Incidentally, there were a few people who expressed appreciation for the ‘assertiveness’ of SUNY, saying that this was the only way to get things done. It is also clear from SUNY’s final report that it too was experiencing a number of its own problems with the 7th Parliament, and that this too may have led to a more assertive style, which, in turn, may have been negatively interpreted by some in Parliament.

Except in the case of the library, where health conditions were cited, there was no evidence of any practical harm that was caused by any of SUNY’s actions or decisions. Nevertheless, criticisms voiced should not be ignored. SUNY’s perceived, lack of consultation has left a sense of disappointment among some people, and the lack of transparency about SUNY’s objectives and the provisions of their contract provides a negative image that USAID should avoid. It is safe to say that no long-term harm has been done to the working relationship between Parliament and USAID. Even in the case of the library, the Parliament itself found a workable solution; and it had also solved some complications about computers and Internet services that arose in connection with the UPTAP project. For the most part, respondents were pleased with the way in which SUNY worked with them. It should be made clear that some of the complaints the Evaluation Team encountered refer to SUNY’s working style and others refer to USAID’s requirements and preferences, over which SUNY had no control.

There are some lessons to be learned from this experience, which, if applied, might help to avoid or reduce unnecessary misunderstandings in the future. These are dealt with at some length in the discussion of *Lessons Learned*, in Section 6 of this report.

D. Project Costs

The initial budget for the UPTAP Program was \$1.8 million; an amendment was added which cost \$0.6 million and this brought the total cost of the first project to \$2.4 million. The budget for

the second project was \$1.2 million; and the third and final was \$0.8 million. This makes for a total of approximately \$4.4 million spent over approximately 3.5 years.

To try to put this amount and the scope of UPTAP into context other USAID legislative strengthening project documents were used for comparative purposes. Such documents were drawn from Namibia, Malawi, El Salvador, Poland, Nepal and Bolivia; USAID's Handbook and Lessons Learned, SUNY's own summaries of its numerous projects, and some UNDP lessons. Only a few of these provide information on costs, but clearly the Uganda project fits into a particular model of legislative assistance. Not all USAID-funded legislative assistance projects are as commodity oriented as UPTAP was in the earlier stages; and not all included civil society and its links to Parliament, which UPTAP did in the later stages. Three comparable projects on which there is expenditure information are in El Salvador (\$1.8 million for the first stage), Bolivia (\$2.4 million for four years and another \$1.8 million for a further 2 years, for a total of \$4.4 million) and Poland (\$2.25 million and a sharing arrangement with two other countries in a regional project worth \$1.7 million). These projects were similar in scale to the UPTAP projects. The cost of the Bolivia project is the same as for UPTAP, but it lasted longer. Other projects for which funding information was found appear to have cost somewhat less. Former SUNY UPTAP project staff confirmed that this project was somewhat more expensive than similar projects in Africa.

Expenditure on legislative strengthening is certainly expected to be relatively high by comparison with many other democracy/Governance projects since there is often a heavy emphasis on equipments in the early stages. UPTAP's SOW required purchase and installation of computer technology, hardware software, connectivity, training of various users etc as well as complete outfitting of offices and committee rooms including photocopiers, tables, chairs, carpets and air conditioning for the library. The first UPTAP COP guesstimated that about one-third of all project expenses were on commodities.

In discussions of project costs with USAID staff, it was noted that all projects administered by U.S. based organizations are expensive relative to contracts with local organizations. That aside, individuals the Evaluation Team interviewed suggested that contracts aimed at strengthening legislatures tend to be expensive because of the nature of the project. From what the respondents had observed of the UPTAP project, i.e., its record of events staged, consultants employed, hardware purchased, two members of the USAID Contracts Office said that they felt the money was well spent, compared to other projects with which they were familiar. The USAID officers gave their opinion, not necessarily as experts, but as informed citizen observers who also have a sense of the expense involved.

While a project like this appears large by democracy/Governance standards, there may be cost concerns for USAID to consider in working with this type of contract arrangement, the Evaluation Team concurs with those in USAID who view the UPTAP money as having been effectively spent. For example, a more effective Budget Office (which SUNY was instrumental in establishing) that is able to challenge budget plans of the Ministries and monitor implementation, in itself is bound to save the GOU and the country considerable sums of money. UPTAP investments may also be seen as having been effective in leveraging financial support: a far larger group of donors is actively assisting the Parliament today than was the case before

UPTAP. As a result USAID is in a position to substantially reduce its expenditures in this field, if it so chooses.

E. Sustainability

Context for Sustainability: Sustainability of Parliament as an effective actor in the realm of national politics, policy formulation legislative contribution, and oversight of the Executive appears to be more assured than it was in 1997. Parliament, both its political and its staff leadership, appears seriously committed to performing as an effective Parliament, and a large number of donors are now interested in supporting this institution. Increased donor interest itself is a measure of USAID's success in Uganda.

While USAID and other donor activities are a necessary part of legislative strengthening, they can never be sufficient. Future effectiveness will also depend on the broader political context. This includes trends and patterns in the role of the Executive, the President (including the issue of the third term), the NRM and civil society, the quality of incoming MPs in the 8th Parliament, the conflict in the North and the dynamics of preparing for and living with a multiparty system. One possible scenario is that Parliament may become more effective in the overall legislative process but find itself constrained in areas considered vital by the Executive Branch. Given the opportunity, the Parliament of Uganda is capable of enhancing its role.

The Sustainability of Specific SUNY UPTAP Initiatives:

The SOW for this Evaluation distinguishes between 'achievement of objectives' and 'the functioning of Parliament' contribution' (see Section 4.1 of our Findings) on the one hand and 'sustainability' on the other. Achievements and sustainability are relatively easy to differentiate conceptually. They are sometimes less easily distinguished in practice particularly with a project that ended 14 months before the evaluation. For example, a contribution to Parliament that is already unsustainable will hardly qualify as an achievement. There may be some repetition of examples and illustrations in the two sections.

Senior Management:

The two components, the Parliamentary Commission, which UPTAP helped strengthen, and the Board of Management, under the Commission, which UPTAP helped establish, continue to operate regularly and effectively. Nevertheless there are two studies being undertaken by other donors, namely UNDP and DFID, into the POU management structures, specifically the OPPD. This implies, and not surprisingly so, that there is thought to be room for improvement.

Budget Office:

This appears to be working effectively. The Office is reported to operate well insofar as it assists the Budget Committee and Parliament to question the internal consistency of budgetary proposals, the budgetary impact of all bills and monitor the record of expenditure of the executive branch. Representatives of the Office gave a clear exposition of their work and contribution and examples of issues on which they have successfully helped the Budget Committee and Parliament challenge the Executive. They also readily availed the Summary of the Recommendations of the Parliamentary Sessional Committees on the 2002/2003 Budget

(November 2002), which reflects detailed questioning of the executive by both the Budget Office and the Budget Committee. This contribution was confirmed by the Chair of the Budget Committee and by every MP and other respondents continued technological change in the Budget Office generated an ever growing demand for more advanced and powerful equipment; and it is uncertain that Parliament itself has the resources to keep up with the demands.

Committee System:

On average it can be said that the committee system is working effectively. There are about five or six meetings scheduled per day and displayed on the committee notice board, which is updated regularly. During the evaluation some committees were in action. Interviews with some committee chairpersons confirmed that the committees were working. A few CSO interviewees indicated that the committees with which they work were operating and they gave us examples of recent useful contact with committees. With respect to committee functioning, the Evaluation Team noted that there was a comment mentioned by USAID (in one of the SUNY UPTAP SOWs) that an attendance rate in some Committees is poor. The Evaluation Team was not able to verify this one way or another, nor could it determine whether committee attendance has changed since the SUNY project ended.

Parliamentary publications:

What is possibly the most important publication, The Hansard Reports on the Legislative assembly, is consistently up to date. The August House, which is relied upon by a strengthened Public Relations and Information Office is a publication for public consumption. The Hansard and The August House were started under UPTAP and continue to be published regularly. Volume 3 Issue 2 March 2003 of The August House contains useful information on upcoming bills, laws passed, MPs etc. The production of the latest edition of the Directory of Parliament was funded by UPTAP. This raises questions about the sustainability of the publication. However it is reportedly extremely useful to parties (including the evaluation team) interested in tracking down and gaining access to information on Parliament. The team was told that it is very likely to be updated soon.

Parliamentary contributions to legislative enactments:

As regards the introduction of Private Members' bills, there are few of these. This is better than nothing but probably less than hoped for. A serious limitation is Article 93 in the Ugandan Constitution that stipulates that Private Members' bills cannot incur additional government expenditures. Until that is changed the niche for this type of bill remains very constrained. As regards substantial amendments to Executive sponsored bills, Parliament continues to make frequent and substantive amendments. Examples included amendments to the budget proposals of the Executive branch. It was also suggested that only a limited number of MPs are able (i.e., have the will or/and familiarity with procedures and issues) to effectively challenge the agenda of the Executive. It was not possible to independently test this proposition.

Civil Society access to Parliament:

There were at least two MPs who said that the link between CSO and the Parliament had weakened in the months since the SUNY contract ended. It is possible that they were referring to

some aspects of the SUNY program such as the CSO Exhibitions for the benefit of MPs. In its final report SUNY was optimistic that the CSOs would manage to set up an exhibition on their own, but this has not yet occurred. Nevertheless, in terms of mutually useful connections between CSOs and Parliament, the relationships are cordial and there is evidence to support this. The evidence relates to land, gender, security, electoral laws and political parties. There is still a full time CSO liaison officer located in Parliament whose task it is to keep CSOs informed of Parliamentary activities. This is an important contribution to CSO-POU relations. The April - May 2003 issue of the Parliamentary Bulletin produced by UJCC included up to date, useful and user-friendly information including a summary of the issues involved in legislation under consideration, and examples of CSO initiatives. One person observed that the future of Civil Society- Parliament relations would depend partly on how the NRM and the Executive Branch work with Parliament.

It continues to buy books and periodicals and the place is clearly well organized and utilised. Computer/email/internet use is considerably higher than book use. When Parliament is in session all of the approximately 14 terminals are in use and there are people waiting. A visit to the Library on a Monday, when MPs were not present, showed two of the terminals in use. Another visit on a Wednesday showed seven terminals in use. During these visits it was noted that some computers could not be used. Photocopying services are in heavy demand. As mentioned earlier, the Library tracks the services it provides. These data were presented early in our Findings section. .

Research Services:

With 12 researchers the Parliamentary Research Services continues to serve MPs and Committees. It tracks the record of reports it provides in response to demands. While the number of Research Service reports continues to grow – from about 120 to about 150 over three years, this is less of an increase than one might expect. Also with 305 MPs and numerous Committees, this number represents continuity rather than substantive progress since the end of the SUNY contract. However the Research Service also responds to a large number of on-the-spot requests from MPs or their assistants. There are many of these and are time consuming but not recorded. Despite the fact that this Office is working with old and underpowered computers, respondents spoke highly of the continuing quality of the Research Service's work.

The Internship Program:

This program continues to operate. We were introduced to two professional officers who first came to Parliament as interns. Unfortunately it was not easy to set an exact number of interns working in Parliament, as there does not seem to be a centralized process any longer. The Team noted in this regard that there no longer appears to be a special program for the interns who work in Parliament.

Information Technology:

Not surprisingly we got various opinions about the sustainability of the IT introduced by UPTAP. Sustainability in relation to IT is complex. Success inevitably leads to demands for better and more powerful equipment; and consequently to some dissatisfaction. The technology

itself advances rapidly generating further demand for training. Maintenance too is expensive. Also the more advanced technologically the individual, the more critical and frustrated he/she tends to be of the state of IT. As reported earlier, there was agreement that the equipment and systems that SUNY installed were helpful and appropriate at the time and made a major contribution to changing the way Parliament operates. We were informed that nearly all (one opinion) or most (another view) of the original computers are still in service although some had been ‘passed down’ to employees whose main need was for word processing. Other donors have reportedly provided a number of new computers to Parliament and other had been purchased by the POU itself. The Evaluation Team is not in a position to verify this statement. To ensure that its IT resources function, Parliament has established a maintenance team and additional maintenance work is outsourced. Despite this, frustration was expressed by a few of the key IT users (e.g., in the Library, the Budget Office, Research Services, MPs) at irregular maintenance, which in turn affects their performance.

The Parliamentary Website:

The electronic legislative tracking system is not working. While one can find some of the legislation under consideration and access the contents of those bills, there is far less information available than say in either the CSO or Parliament’s own printed publications, and website tracking of progress of a bill does not appear to be operating. Also Hansard on the Web has fallen behind.

Local Government:

We noted that little progress had been made in strengthening Local Government-Parliamentary relations. It therefore seems premature to expect any sustainability in this regard.

Office of Parliamentary and Professional Development:

Finally the OPPD and the role of institutionalizing internal capacity building and donor coordination, as anticipated in the Final SUNY report, has not gotten off to a good start, let alone made progress towards sustainability. Tasks foreseen for this Office are potentially important ones, over which Parliament needs to exercise increased and better-informed control. OPPD has experienced a number of structural problems: some relating to lines of responsibility, others to the exact role intended for the Office. These issues remain unclarified. As noted above, two other donors are carrying out a study of the management structure of Parliament including the future of functions for which OPPD was intended to take responsibility.

Overall the record of sustainability of the various components of UPTAP in cooperation with POU is a strong one.

IV. CONCLUSION

UPTAP succeeded in its major objective of enhancing the legislative, budgeting and oversight role of Parliament. This conclusion evolves from the assessment of every aspect of the project examined. Discrete elements of the project, and conclusions reached concerning them, are summarized below.

Activities or Inputs: It is clear that UPTAP carried out the numerous and various workshop, training, exchange, publishing and consultant undertakings foreseen in the agreements with USAID as well as the procurement and installation of a wide range of commodities, notably IT and assistance with connectivity.

Institution building: These activities led to new or vastly strengthened organizations and systems, sometimes to breakthroughs, for which SUNY can claim strong attribution UPTAP successes. The Budget Act, the Budget Office, the Library and Documentation Center, the Committee system, the Research Services, the Public Relations and Information Office, the Legislative Counsel, improved Parliamentary-Civil Society Relations are some of the outcomes benefiting from newly installed IT.

Services to and performance of MPs: These improvements in turn succeeded in enhancing the services provided by Staff to MPs and in the performance of Parliament. In support of their work MPs now have access to the Internet connectivity, research materials, library services and professional budgetary advice. CSO input is also providing them with a helpful new source of information. Some MPs are making use of these sources of information and advice to raise the quality of both Committee consideration and plenary debate. It may be that change is taking place within a limited sphere of policy making but, compared to the situation before the 1997 Act and UPTAP, the legislature is challenging the Executive more effectively and constructively than it did before the project commenced.

Attribution: Not all of these higher-level impacts can be attributed solely to SUNY and the UPTAP project, however. After the Administration of Parliament Act of 1997, Parliament provided a conducive and supportive environment for change. With time, other donors have become increasingly involved in assisting Parliament; and of course there has been a strong and capable Ugandan input as well. Nevertheless, SUNY played a pivotal role in initiating reform, in fostering change, and in what have proven to be lasting achievements. These successes and a high level of attribution to SUNY were confirmed in the interviews with Ugandans, the vast majority of whom were very positive about the impact of the project.

USAID's comments and measures: USAID acknowledged 'excellent progress' at the end of the first project, in its 2nd Task Order for the UPTAP project. At the end of the second Task Order, USAID observed that the Parliament of Uganda was much stronger than its regional counterparts. Results that USAID clarified and quantified in its Results Framework and associated targets, including a count of substantial amendments initiated by Parliament, were achieved and even exceeded under the UPTAP contract. Further, USAID/CDIE, the Agency's central Evaluation Office, included three results of the UPTAP project, namely the Budget Office of the Ugandan Parliament, the committee system, and the library among its success It is

also noteworthy that POU has attracted a number of visiting Parliamentary delegations from elsewhere in Africa to learn from its practices. USAID's investment has also attracted eight other donors who now share in the effort to strengthen Uganda's Parliament.

Sustainability: It is only a year since the project ended but, in terms of sustainability, most of the above-mentioned initiatives continue to operate effectively. The website might be in danger of falling behind, and there are calls for replacing/upgrading of IT equipment to keep up with demands. Sustainability of practices introduced and the related improvement in quality of legislative work appear to be very promising.

Unfinished/Incomplete Tasks: An important early emphasis in the first SOW on *Representation* (of constituencies, of people), repeated in the second and third task orders has not been emphasized by UPTAP throughout the three and half years. A few relevant events were organized by SUNY but these were sporadic, not part of any planned strategy and without much impact. Work with CSO-UP relations can certainly assist in better representation, but there is more to representation than this.

Little progress was made on a modest component of the second and third SOWs focused on *Parliament-Local Government relations*.

One important initiative, contained in the third SOW, namely, to build the *OPPD*, got off to an uncertain start and remains open to rethinking and restructuring.

SUNYs working relations: For the most part, SUNY's relations with Parliament appear to have been constructive and helpful. The majority of people interviewed were positive about this. Nevertheless there were criticisms of some aspects of SUNY's approach to working with Parliament (and USAID's practices), some of which provide lessons for USAID and future contractors.

Costs: In terms of costs, the project appears to have been slightly more expensive than some other legislative strengthening projects USAID has supported, but high costs are not unusual in legislative strengthening projects where one is the major early donor and which involve large commodity drops, introduction of IT, purchasing technical expertise from the US, starting from a low level of 'modernization,' and in which many of the rates are set in Washington DC. Given where Parliament is today compared to 1997 our assessment is that the money has been effectively spent.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

USAID's current legislative strengthening project, managed by Development Associates, is considerably smaller in scale than the SUNY program. In contrast to the situation when the SUNY UPTAP project was initiated. There are now seven other donors involved in efforts to strengthen Parliament. There is more donor coordination and plans for a 'basket' mechanism to deal with donor funds and it is expected Parliament will be directly involved in this coordination. This is the context in which the Evaluation Team's recommendations are being made. In one sense the current context is limiting, in that it no longer encourages USAID to make large investments. On the other hand the current situation represents possibilities, because the donors working together with each other and Parliament have the resources to achieve a great deal.

Process

Consultation at multiple levels, transparency, and information sharing is key to an effective legislative strengthening program.

- A careful *Stakeholder Analysis* should be carried for each initiative in this type of project, laying out winners and losers, measuring the impact on specific groups of stakeholders. This type of thinking through various project actions and steps can reduce a sense of disappointment and suspicion among those who are "left out" when other individuals or other offices are selected for attention.
- Need to take explicit steps to consult and inform those who are indirectly affected by any decisions made as well as those who must participate in the decision-making processes.
- Any possible steps that can be taken to enhance consultation and transparency that are compatible with USAID regulations should be applied. For example, increasing transparency in processes for selecting people for short visits and in the selection of local trainers for workshops would be a step in the right direction.
- Criteria of selection of local trainees should be made clear and key supervisory persons should be consulted and informed.

Representation

This was a major objective of UPTAP, but received much less attention than the other objectives. The reasons remain unclear. Improved representation of people and constituencies (or MP-constituent relations) is significant to a meaningful democracy. It is however a challenging, possibly formidable and long-term task. There is also one specific and major problem that MPs face as soon as they are elected which hinders Parliament and democratic processes. Immediately after they are elected, MPs are seen as service deliverers to individuals and families, and an entire range of expectations of personal patron-client relationships are established between them and their constituents. The client in this arrangement has significant influence in the sense that the threat from the constituency is: if you do not deliver (assistance say with coffins, weddings, school fees etc) you will not be re-elected. The outcome in Uganda has been that very effective MPs who play a constructive role in Parliament (including on behalf of their constituency as a

whole) have been defeated, and replaced other representatives, who are not necessarily more effective as legislators. A number of very able MPs have been discouraged by this and said they would run not again because of this situation. Expectations of this sort can also lead to corruption, since most MPs do not have the resources to meet all the demands placed on them by constituents. These patterns suggest the need for a separate study showing the setbacks that MPs face and a plan for improving the situation to be undertaken, and then public education on civic rights and obligations should be promoted. At the local government level, USAID should be working to improve Parliament– Local Government Relations possibly through its decentralization project.

Performance Measurement

It was found that the performance measurement function somewhat uneven. USAID in its Task Orders gave SUNY a rather vague set of result statements. At some stage there was agreement that USAID would select indicators for its Results Framework and R4 reporting and these would apply to the UPTAP project. In this vein there is evidence in some of the quarterly reports of counting of amendments and private members bills and committee meetings. But this does not appear to have occurred on a regular basis and USAID does not seem to have made much of it. In the future it might be appropriate for USAID to be more specific about its expectations for performance measurement by implementers. Given the contingencies of politics that lie outside donor hands, it might be appropriate to establish performance targets under two scenarios, one more optimistic and one more pessimistic. It is also becoming more difficult to attribute results to USAID projects that support Parliament, since USAID is now a smaller player in a more complex field of donors, some of whom are contributing to a “basket fund”. This will require USAID to look more thoughtfully ‘plausible association’ of its implementer’s actions with outcomes, and be willing to step back from an expectation of ‘direct attribution.’ One approach might be to include qualitative components indices that assess Parliamentary improvement, since, for example, Parliament might be making an impact on large numbers of bills, but be ignored or consistently defeated by the Executive on the few important ones.

Big-Ticket Items

In the course of the evaluation, a number of people asked the Evaluation Team for further professional training. It was said that the training to-date had really been exposure training, focusing on application of expertise to the dynamics of Parliament but that there was no professional enhancement. A number of people we spoke to requested and made strong justifications for further professional training such as Masters and even Ph.D. degrees for people in their departments. Fields such as international relations macro and microeconomics and social science research are dynamic and changing. Parliament could easily find itself falling behind. The other big item is more advanced IT as has been discussed in this report. Again there is validity to this case. Given the rapidity of change, Parliament could soon fall behind in its capacity to work with large quantities of information and data sets. We appreciate the expense involved and that this category of assistance probably does not fit into present USAID proposals but the points made have validity and donors as a group might wish to give them the attention due.

The Website

Progress on the website is falling behind. USAID, in consultation with other donors, should give attention to working with Parliament's IT section to find out what the problems are and help to solve them sooner rather than later, as the situation could decline even further if not addressed. As it stands, the system is losing its currency and legitimacy because outdated information, say in the bill tracking system, is worse than no information.

Dealing with 'turnover'

Over 50% of those trained in the 6th Parliament failed to return in the 7th Parliament and this has benefits but it also has costs and it provides challenges to sustained capacity building in Parliament over time. There are no easy answers but donors might look into finding systemic responses. One answer is to give attention to the professional staff of Parliament, but in the end it is the MPs who are elected by the people and who need the capacity to challenge the executive. This points to returning to and calls for the need to emphasizing 'institutionalized' capacity building of Parliament, an idea initiated under the third UPTAP Task Order.

Additional Recommendations from Interviewees

(These are not included in the above, as they are not recommendations made by the Evaluation Team. They are simply listed here without comment.)

- Refine exchange visits. It was suggested that if there are future exchange visits, they should be more specifically focused on individual needs and less general.
- Committee clerks need more support and training (in recording, report writing, etc) to enable them to record deliberations and report them accurately and timely fashion. The inadequate training of assistant clerks adds an unnecessary burden onto Committee Chairpersons.
- Parliament should experiment with an interactive website which will provide another channel for citizen input into public debates and decision making
- To accompany the program to strengthen local government, there is a need to build civil society capacity at the local level. Local Governments have power to make by-laws and these decisions affect people directly. People need to have a sense that they are participating.
- Civil Society exhibitions for the information of Parliament should be repeated.
- MPs, especially new ones, need training in legislative drafting, public speaking and also in how to negotiate.
- Parliament needs an electronic voting system

- Civil Society includes large business and industrial federations. These should be included in the USAID's CSO work as these kinds of organizations play an important role in economic policy formulation.

A meeting should be held with the successor implementer to see how the main lessons and recommendations of this report might be helpful to its work.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED

Lessons learned from this evaluation are intended to carry forward to future projects in Uganda.

A parliament is not a homogeneous unit. It needs ‘unpacking.’ It has many departments, committees, levels of seniority, systems and, of course, relatively large number of elected MPs who have varied agenda, demands and levels of ambition. Therefore a quite genuine consultation with one component or one level of Parliament might well look like lack of consultation to another. For example, leading MPs and professionals (end users) will see things differently and both will require consultation.

Another related lesson is that in a legislative strengthening project there are going to be winners and losers. Given the size of the ‘community’ in a parliament the losers will be fully aware of the decisions and will be disappointed and displeased, sometimes even suspicious. This refers to both individuals (say in the selection for overseas exchange visits) and departments (say in the installation of advance IT). This is inevitable. But steps can be taken to reduce the sense of exclusion and disaffection.

Donors may be able to improve the capacity (information systems, research services, committee system, and public speaking and policy analysis skills of MPs etc) but they may not be able to change the balance of power between the executive and the legislature. What they are doing is essential but it is not necessarily sufficient. The outcome of legislative strengthening projects depends on a context that is outside the project’s control and is heavily influenced by the agenda of Presidents, the Executive Branch, political parties etc. It can also be affected by the quality of MPs, which can change from one election to another.

Technology is advancing rapidly. Success leads first to improvements and then appreciation and then soon to frustration and demands for more and better equipment. Demands grow too as people come to understand the potential and as technology continues to advance. This provides a challenge to sustainability. Ensuing recurrent costs on an initial investment will not only need to cover maintenance but the additional expense of constant upgrading, renewal and re-training.

To some extent competition between the Executive and the legislature may be seen as a win-lose game. Given the strength of most Executives, donors are often in the position of siding with, and empowering, the legislative branch, at the expense of the Executive Branch, including the country’s leadership. Efforts need to be made to work closely with the Executive to reduce some of the suspicion and to help it see some of the advantages.

MPs have to look in two directions; toward the executive branch, and towards the people who elect them. In looking towards the ‘people’ they are confronted by another duality: people as a constituency (who want to receive ‘public services’ such as roads) and individuals (who want to receive ‘private’ goods such as school fees). This raises some serious challenges for representation, exacerbates potential for corruption, and can affect the quality of those who choose to stand for elective office.

Appendix 1

Evaluation Scope of Work

STATEMENT OF WORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF SUNY/UPTAP ACTIVITY (1998-2002)

Background

The Sixth Parliament of Uganda was elected for a five-year term commencing in 1996. Two years later, the leadership of the Sixth Parliament contacted USAID with a wide-ranging request for assistance. In 1998, USAID agreed to provide assistance through IQC AEP-5468-1-00-6004-00. Following standard procurement practices for the IQC, the State University of New York (SUNY) was awarded Task Order 804 to implement USAID's proposed program of assistance to Parliament from August 1998 through August 1999. This program of assistance was designated the "Uganda Parliament Technical Assistance Project" (UPTAP), and the Task Order completion date was later extended to April 2000.

At the end of the first 18 months of the SUNY/UPTAP Activity, USAID/Uganda issued follow-on Task Order 800 to SUNY/UPTAP to provide additional assistance from May 2000 through May 2001. One year later, USAID/Uganda issued follow-on Task Order 803 to provide additional services through April 2002. The Scopes of Work for SUNY/UPTAP Task Orders 804, 800, and 803 are attached as Exhibits A to this Statement of Work. A summary of accomplishments under those three Task Orders is attached as Exhibit B1. Some of the capacities and institutional structures of Parliament set up by SUNY/UPTAP activity include:

- Increasing the ability of members and committees to access information through the provision of research and reference services (library)
- Parliament's direct link to the Internet, Internet web page and installation of computers to provide better technical information from which to develop policy positions and legislate.
- Parliamentary budget office to provide professional budget analysis to inform the review of the executive-driven budget process.

In 2001-2002, USAID/Uganda designed a successor activity to UPTAP that would include additional elements of support related to legislative drafting, anti-corruption, and election law reform. This successor activity was designated the "Legislative Support Activity" (LSA). In January 2002, USAID/Uganda issued RFP No. 617-02-004 under IQC AEP-I-00-00-00003-00. Following standard procurement practices for the IQC, Development Associates (DA) was awarded the Task Order to implement the LSA Activity.

¹ Documents will be obtained from MEMS office in Kampala.

Objective of the Assignment

Although the successor LSA Activity is now well underway, USAID/Uganda's main objective for this assignment is to conduct an evaluation of the SUNY/UPTAP program covering the period August 1998- April 2002, to derive lessons learned over the project period: The major issues to evaluate include:

Activity Results:

- The success of the program in achieving the objectives stated in the Task Orders; (804, 800, and 803), that is the progress towards achievement of expected results of Task Order activities.
- The contribution of the overall program to the functioning of the Parliament of Uganda, the strengthening and sustainability of the institution, and whether SUNY activities contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of Parliament as a legislative body.
- The cost-effectiveness of the overall program, i.e., was the cost reasonable relative to the effects it produced, i.e., greater or less than initially anticipated, considering not only the original planned cost, but changes in the cost of the program incorporated into follow-on task orders.
- Evidence of the sustainability of activity-led changes, based on the period from the end of the SUNY/UPTAP project to the present.

The Processes, which may help, explain results and from which lessons may be derived:

- The various working relationships established with and within Parliament; e.g. SUNY's relationships/meetings with other strategic partners; its handling of development initiatives linking parliament with local government and civil society.
- Whether and how the SUNY team not only tracked but also utilized information about progress towards planned results based on activity led benchmarks and indicators.
- Assess what was effective or counter effective with the way USAID assisted Parliament, including the cost effectiveness of the program

Existing Performance Information Sources

The following are some of the information sources:

- The Scopes of Work for SUNY/UPTAP Task Orders 804, 800, and 803 and a summary of accomplishments under those three Task Orders.
- Annual/quarterly reports running from August 1998-October 2001

- Parliamentary Proceedings
- Parliamentary Library Materials

Evaluation Methods

The Consultant's evaluation should be based upon:

- Information from secondary sources and the contractor's knowledge of the levels of development and effectiveness of other Parliaments in Africa – and particularly in East Africa – and recent improvements in the performance of such Parliaments;
- Reviews of all SUNY/UPTAP program documents, assessments, and reports;
- Reviews of data from Afrobarometer opinion polls conducted in 2000 and 2002
- Interviews with USAID/Uganda staff and contractors;
- Interviews with Parliament of Uganda staff; and members of select Parliamentary committees;
- Interviews with other donors supporting institutional development of Parliament, who include DFID, EU among others.
- Other methods deemed appropriate and proposed by the consultants.

Deliverables

The Consultants shall produce a short written evaluation (no more than 20 pages of text in the body of the report, plus an Executive Summary and annexes) of the SUNY/ UPTAP activity addressing the topics listed above. The report shall avoid extensive repetition of the history of the SUNY/UPTAP program, and shall instead focus on evidence required to answer the questions posed by this SOW, including specific examples of activities that illustrate the degree of effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability of the activities implemented. In addition, the report shall identify changes in legislative performance over the period of time since SUNY's program began in those areas of legislative function or performance that the SUNY program focused on, and shall evaluate the degree to which those changes in performance attributable to SUNY programmatic activities or interventions. Changes that have been sustained beyond the term of the SUNY program, without additional external assistance, should also be noted. Finally, the report shall include a list of specific recommendations as to how future programs of support to the Parliament of Uganda could be structured so as to be more effective, or more cost effective, or to produce more sustainable results. Through the Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project, the Consultants shall provide to USAID/Uganda one hard copy and one electronic copy (in Microsoft Word 97, Times New Roman 12 point font) of the Final Report.

A suggested format for the formal evaluation report is provided in the form of MEMS illustrative Table of Contents for an Evaluation Report (Attachment A).

Team Composition and Participation

USAID/Uganda anticipates that this evaluation will require the combined skills of:

- One senior evaluator from outside Uganda with broad experience in Evaluation and Parliamentary strengthening; and
- One local evaluator from Uganda with strong background and knowledge of the Ugandan political system, the challenges facing the Parliament of Uganda and African in general.

Both of the above should collectively have good evaluation methods and data collection skills. The team members should maintain the objectivity and independence of an evaluation; special care should be taken by the team members to have no evident conflicts of interest. That is no potential biases or vested interests in the evaluation's outcomes. In addition, the team should ensure that as a whole, the evaluation is balanced and represents various points of view.

Reporting and Dissemination

MEMS project on behalf of its client USAID/Uganda will be responsible for overseeing the operations and effectiveness of this assignment. The team shall execute the assignment in close consultation with MEMS' Chief of Party (COP) or the Technical Director and the key liaison person for Democracy/governance. The consultants shall ensure that reports are handed over in good time to allow enough time for comments and feedback. The Consultants will also be required to make an oral presentation of their key findings to MEMS, USAID and other relevant stakeholders.

Procedures: Schedule and Logistics

This evaluation shall commence on/about 24th June and will be completed by 16th July 2003. It is anticipated that the international evaluator will need to be present within Uganda for a maximum of 12 working days. The consultants shall be availed office space at MEMS office, 3^d floor, Cotton House, 15 Clement Hill Road and a cell phone will be placed at their disposal for the duration of the field work period of this evaluation. MEMS will facilitate a one-day, on site Team Planning Meeting (TPM) for this evaluation in its Kampala offices (Attachment B.) The Evaluation Team will be expected organize its own program of work and interviews following the TPM, working within the parameters of the illustrative work plan provided for this evaluation. (Attachment C) MEMS receptionist will assist the Evaluation Team in making appointments, as needed. The contractor shall be required to deliver a draft report to the MEMS Technical Supervisor for this evaluation, Mr. Polly Mugisha, who will, in turn, submit it to USAID/Uganda on or before July 17, 2003. USAID/Uganda will review and provide MEMS with comments on the draft evaluation report within one week of its receipt, and the consultants shall be required to submit to MEMS a final version of the report that is responsive to USAID/MEMS comments on or before July 28, 2003. The final report will be submitted in both hard copy and electronic form. Three bound copies of this report will be provided to USAID/Uganda by MEMS. Electronic submission to USAID is intended to facilitate

compliance with USAID's requirement for the delivery by USAID operating units of an electronic copy of every completed evaluation to USAID/PPC/CDIE at cdie_acq@usaid.gov.

Terms of Payment

International and local consultants assigned to this evaluation will be paid in accordance with their individual contracts with MSI and the MEMS field office, respectively, but in no case will final payment be issued prior to MEMS acceptance of the final report on this evaluation.

Budget (in Man days)

No.	Activity	International consultant	Local Consultants
	Preparation in the US	1	-
0	Days of travel (Air)	3.5	-
1.	Document review	12	13 4
2.	TPM, Initial Meeting with USAID		
3.	Data Collection and Analysis		
4.	Oral briefing for USAID		
5.	Prepare draft report		
6	Review final report	1	
	Total	17.5	17

Appendix 2

Illustrative Evaluation Report Outline

Cover Page [Standard MSI format: identify the title of the project/activity evaluated, the date of the evaluation and both recipient's name and those of the members of the evaluation team.]

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

Lists of Charts, Tables or Figures [Only required in long reports that use these extensively.]

Project/Activity Summary [Stand-Alone, 1 page, providing background information on program being evaluated.]

Executive Summary [Stand-Alone, 1-3 pages, summary of report. This section may not contain any material not also found in the main part of the evaluation report.]

Main Body of the Evaluation Report

1. Introduction/Background and Purpose [Overview of the project/activity and where this evaluation falls in the project cycle. Summarizes the development problem addressed and the kind of assistance provided. Covers the purpose and intended audiences for the evaluation and their main concerns as identified in the SOW.]
2. Evaluation Approach and Methods [Brief summary. Additional information, including instruments should be presented in an Annex]
3. Findings [This section, organized in whatever way the team wishes, must present the basic answers to the evaluation questions, i.e., the empirical facts and other types of evidence the evaluation team collected.]
4. Conclusions [This section should present the evaluation team's interpretations or judgments about its findings].
5. Recommendations [This section should make it clear what actions should be taken as a result of the evaluation.²]
6. Lessons Learned. [In this section the evaluation team should present any information that would be useful to people who are considering replicating or scaling-up this activity or any part of it in Uganda or elsewhere. Other lessons the team derives from the study should also be presented here.]

Annexes [These may include supplementary information on the project itself; further description of the data collection/analysis methods used; data collection instruments; lists of persons interviewed; statistical tables, an other relevant materials.]

² Recommendations may include suggestions for the distribution of the evaluation report, pursuant to USAID's policy to openly share and discuss evaluation findings with relevant customers and partners as well as other donors and stakeholders, unless there are compelling reasons not to do so.

Appendix 3

Tentative Plan for the TPM for the SUNY/UPTAP

Wednesday, June 25, 2003

- 8:30 a.m. Preliminary discussion with MEMS Technical Supervisor for the evaluation, the clarity of the SOW; technical questions and issues; logistics for the evaluation; MEMS expectations for the evaluation report; the importance of sorting out team roles and responsibilities at the start of the process.
- 10:00 a.m. Meeting with USAID. Briefing from USAID on SUNY/UPTAP; the evaluation purpose and audiences; priority SOW questions from USAID's perspectives. Discussion of any issues.
- 12:00 a.m. Evaluation planning session: SUNY/UPTAP evaluation team opportunity to develop a detailed a plan for responding to the evaluation scope, including proposed approach, methods and instruments for data collection; data analysis plan, including analysis methods to be used.
- 4:00 p.m. Evaluation team presentation and discussion with MEMS staff of its proposed approach to the evaluation, including data collection methods, timing, etc., and its plans for data analysis. The team should make clear in this session how much additional time it will spend refining its plans and instruments before beginning to collect data through direct interviews, observation, etc. This presentation should also cover team roles and responsibilities as the team has worked them out.

Appendix 4

Work plan for SUNY/UPTAP Evaluation

No.	ACTIVITY	VENUE	DATES
1.	Pre-evaluation set-up, e.g., document reproduction, preparation of potential list of names and phone numbers of potential evaluation interviewees, e.g., offices/committees of Parliament and their staff, MPs, other donors, etc., for discussion with USAID. [Concurrent with travel of international member of the evaluation team.]		June 23, 2003
2.	Team review of SOW and SUNY/UPTAP reports and other relevant materials, e.g., Afro barometer opinion polls conducted in 2000 and 2002; USAID CSP in force during SUNY/UPTAP work period, etc. [Team may elect to start making data collection appointments with individuals they are certain they need to see.]	MEMS' office	June 23-24, 2003
3.	TPM for the SUNY/UTAP Evaluation, including discussion of the SOW with USAID. Evaluation Team develops field data collection plan, including relevant instruments; data analysis plan and relevant forms/tables; divides roles and responsibilities, prepares detailed Evaluation schedule; and report preparation/writing schedule and assignments. Interview scheduling for data collection continues.	8:30 MEMS' office 10:00 USAID 12:00 – 5:00 MEMS' office	June 25th
4.	Data collection in Kampala, i.e., at Parliament, with other donors, etc.		June 26 th – July 3 rd
5.	Analysis of findings evaluation findings; formulation of conclusions and recommendations/lessons learned; preparation of a PowerPoint or Flip Chart presentation, or a typed summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations for USAID.	MEMS' office	July 3 rd – 5 th
6.	Oral briefing on the evaluation results for USAID	2:00 p.m. USAID office	July 7 th 2003
7.	Report writing (Draft) [Starts concurrent with the departure of the international consultant.]	MEMS' office	July 8 th -11 th
8.	International consultants review of draft evaluation report	Consultant's "home base"	July 10 th - 13 th
9.	MEMS' staff technical review and submission of report draft	MEMS' office	14 th -15 th July
10.	USAID comments incorporated into final version of the evaluation report; final report submitted to USAID by MEMS	MEMs office	July 16 th - 17 th

Appendix 5

Evaluation Methods

Documents Reviewed

Given that the evaluation team was encouraged by USAID to concentrate more on broad issues and achievements than on detailed events, the key documents studied were the three scopes of work that USAID prepared for the UPTAP project implementer, the project budget documents, the three final reports prepared by the implementer and a written record of achievements provided by the Undersecretary of Parliament.

Although we focused on broad issues we nevertheless took the detail seriously. For this purpose the quarterly reports of the implementer were studied. They provided considerable information of the numerous events and activities undertaken, of commodities installed, publications issued, and processes managed by SUNY. We also read selectively some of the numerous attachments to the reports to get a sense of the content and quality of, and reactions to, the workshops and study tours, and the content of some of the consultants' reports.

By way of background we read periodicals and newspapers, referred to the POU website (which contains information on the history and administration of the Parliament), the USAID website, the second Afrobarometer study and various related studies. To get a sense of comparable projects we also read some USAID CDIE legislative evaluations, as well as a few other USAID funded evaluation documents. (See attachment 1 for a list of documents to which we referred.)

Interviews Conducted

We carried out 36 interviews with key informants. We gave most attention to Parliament. We sought to get a reasonable balance of politicians and officials, a majority of them senior, and familiar with or/and beneficiaries (either personally or as members of an office or committee) of the UPTAP project. We sought to get at least one person closely familiar with each of the SUNY initiatives. We also interviewed a few donor representatives, including USAID, to get their sense of the issues involved in working with UP. In this case a few key donor representatives were out of country. Finally we met with one person from the NRM and a few CSO representatives who had worked with SUNY. In a few cases people represented more than one category.

Given USAID advice to us that one of the most important aspects of the study was to find out what the Ugandans thought and to let them determine what success meant and whether it was achieved, interviews were a very important part of the evaluation. In seeking opinions and perspectives we also pressed respondents to give us concrete examples and materials to back up their case. The study is essentially qualitative in nature. This involved careful listening but it also involved interpretation. For example, people from different offices may have had different experiences. People who had been selected for training may have different opinions from those who were not. People with greater technological insight might make different assessments from those less technologically advanced. People supportive of the NRM might have perspectives that vary from people sympathetic to other parties. We also gave attention to the quality of evidence

or illustration provided by the interviewees. We certainly did not talk to everyone we should have but in five days allotted for the task we believe we spoke to a reasonably balanced group of informed people. (See Attachment for a list of people interviewed)

Since SUNY was no longer present in Kampala we emailed a set of questions to the two people who had served as Chief of Party during the duration of the project.

Observation and Reality Testing

In addition to asking interviewees to give specific examples in support of points made, we also asked for performance data where it was available, examples of publications and reports and we tried to observe processes in action. This was particularly relevant in seeking to respond to the question of sustainability. Items we checked on included: publications of Parliament, including Hansard, and of CSOs, the UP Web site, electronic legislative tracking system, Hansard on the Website, the Committee Notice Board, Committee rooms, state of furniture and equipment, use of the library and the computers in the library.

Appendix 6

List of Documents Reviewed

Freedom House, Uganda. Washington DC, post 2000 taken from the internet (no specific reference).

Jean Paul Emmert et al, Parliament Strengthening in Nepal, Washington DC: CDIE USAID Impact Evaluation, 1996.

Hal Lipmann and Joel Jutkowitz, Parliamentary Assistance in Poland (Title to be checked, Washington DC CDIE: USAID Impact Evaluation, 1996.

Hal Lipmann and Joel Jutkowitz, Legislative Strengthening in El Salvador, Washington DC CDIE: USAID Impact Evaluation, 1996.

Carolyn J Logan, Nansozi Muwanga, Robert Setamu and Michael Bratton, AFRObarometer. Uganda Round 2 Afrobarometer Survey Report, Kampala, 2003.

National Democratic Institute, Namibia: Consolidating Parliamentary Democracy in Namibia, USAID Co-Operative Agreement No 690-A-00-98-00228-00, September 1, 1998 to December 31, 2000.

Norad, Country assessment, Corruption in Uganda, June 2003, [http://www.nord.no/ default.asp](http://www.nord.no/default.asp)

Ochieng Henry, 'MPs give Museveni 14 days to explain UCB scandal,' Africa Online 12 Aug 2001. <http://www>africaonline.com/site/Articles/1,3,19092.jsp>

Parliament of Uganda, A Directory of Uganda's Seventh Parliament, 2001-2006, SUNY/Parliament of Uganda, Kampala, 2001.

Parliament of Uganda, Summary of the Recommendations of the Parliamentary Sessional Committees on the 2002/2003 Budget, Parliamentary Budget Office, Kampala, 2002.

Parliament of Uganda Information and Public Relations Office, The August House, 1, 1, 2000.

Parliament of Uganda Information and Public Relations Office, The August House, 4, 5 May 2003.

Parliament, Republic of Uganda History of Parliament [http://www.parliament/go.ug/ history.htm](http://www.parliament/go.ug/history.htm)

Parliament. Republic of Uganda Parliamentary Committees, <http://www.parliament.go.ug/sessional%20committees.htm>

Parliament. Republic of Uganda, Administration of Parliament, <http://www.parliament.go.ug/admin.htm>.

Parliament. Republic of Uganda, Business Transacted by the 7th Parliament, http://www.parliament.go.ug/Business_session2mtg2.htmadmin.htm.

Republic of Uganda, Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995, Government of Uganda, Kampala, 1995

SUNY/IDG Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Project (UPTAP) Final Report to USAID Uganda on Contract No OUT AEP-1-804-96-00004-00. Task Order 804. Submitted by Marc Cassidy, COP, June 2000.

SUNY/IDG Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Project (UPTAP) Final Report to USAID Uganda. Contract No AEP-1-800-00-00003-00. Task Order 800. May 2001.

SUNY/IDG Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Project (UPTAP) Combined Fourth Quarterly and Final Report to USAID/ Uganda. Contract: OUT AEP-1-803-00-00004. Task Order 803. Submitted by Donna Bugby, COP, April 2002.

[Plus a selection of SUNY/IDG Quarterly Reports and Attachments]

United Nations Development Program, Parliamentary Reform in Africa and the World. Latest Trends, <http://www.udp.org/surf-wa/links/NEPAD/parliamentarians/docsen/reformen.htm>.

Uganda Joint Christian Council, Monthly Parliamentary Bulletin, February- March 2003.

Uganda Joint Christian Council, Monthly Parliamentary Bulletin, April-May 2003.

USAID/CDIE Impact Evaluation, Modernizing Bolivia's Legislature PN-ABS-537 no 1 , 1996.

USAID/CDIE, USAID's Experience in Strengthening Legislatures. (downloaded/details not provided)

USAID Activity Data Sheet. Program Uganda 21 June 2003
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/cbj0afr/ug/617-005.html>

USAID, Malawi: Strengthening Parliament and Civil Society, USAID Grant No 612-G-00-94-00005-00, April 1, 2000 to September 30, 2000, Semi Annual Report

USAID Program Data Sheet, Program Uganda, 21 June 2003
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/cbj0afr/ug/617-009.html>

USAID Uganda, First Scope of Work for the Implementation of USAID/Uganda's Capacity Building Program for the Parliament of Uganda, August 21, 1996 – April 10, 2000.

USAID Uganda, Second Scope of Work for the Implementation of USAID/Uganda's Capacity Building Program for the Parliament of Uganda, April 11, 2000 – April 30, 2001.

USAID Uganda, Third Scope of Work for the Implementation of USAID/Uganda's Capacity Building Program for the Parliament of Uganda, May 1, 2001 – April 30, 2002.

USAID Uganda The Uganda Parliamentary Technical Assistance Project (UPTAP), Prepared by
USAID-Uganda Strategic Objective 09, January 2002.

Appendix 7

Instrument Used for Interviews

Interviews carried out with staff and Members of Parliament during this evaluation all followed the general line of explanation and set of questions provided below:

We are carrying out an evaluation for USAID of the work of SUNY which worked with Parliament from 1998 till 2001. The purpose is to find out what worked and what did not work and why and to learn useful lessons from that experience – lessons that may be helpful to USAID and Parliament as they provide guidance to the new implementer and look to the future - so that future programs can be more effective.

SUNY's mandate was to provide training, technical assistance, study visits and install equipment (particularly furniture and information technology for purposes of electronic communication and internet access) all aimed at strengthening the capacity of Parliament to play its role more effectively. In particular SUNY focused on the Parliamentary Congressional Committee, the Committee System (including helping civil society have access to the Committees), the Budget Office, The Library and Documentation Center, the Legislative Counsel and the Research Service.

We are trying to find out if the SUNY program worked and would like to ask

1) did you participate directly in any way (seminar, study tour, training, equipment)

If so Do how did you assess the work of SUNY at the time (in training, providing equipment)? Did you benefit (a lot, some, not much, not at all) from the program? – in what way? – What did you do differently/better as a result – please give examples

2) Did 'your' office or committee benefit in any way. (a lot, some, not much, not at all) in what ways – what did you do differently or better as a result – please give examples and provided any evidence

3) Did Parliament benefit in any way (a lot, some, not much, not at all)? in what way ? What did you do better or differently as a result – please give examples or provide evidence.

4) Of the changes that took place are they 1) or 2) are they working but not very effectively or 3) have they stopped? Can you suggest reasons why? If they are still operating reasonably well are other donors supporting them?

5) What was your general impression of SUNY?

6) How should they have done things differently?

7) What recommendations would you make about what should be done to improve /enhance any future legislative assistance program funded by USAID?

Appendix 8

Individuals Interviewed by the Evaluation Team

Respondents Interviewed During the SUNY/UPTAP Evaluation

No	Name	Designation
	Parliamentarians	
1	Hon. John Kazoora	Seventh Parliamentary Commissioner
2	Hon. Beatrice Kiraso	Chairperson Budget Committee
3	Hon. Nobert Mao	Member: 1) Public Accounts Committee 2) Legal and Parliamentary Affairs
4	Hon. Christopher Mbalibulha	Committee Member: Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
5	Hon. Augustine Ruzindana	Former: 1) Inspector General of Government, 2) Chairperson Public Accounts Committee 6 th Parliament. Member: Budget Committee
6	Hon. Johnson Nkuuhe	Member: 1) Budget Committee 2) Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries
Subtotal	6	
	Parliamentary Staff	
1	Mr. Aeneas Tandekwire	Clerk to Parliament
2.	Mr. Chris Abwoli Kaija	Under Secretary, Finance and Administration
3	Mr. Manuel Pinto	Director Office of Parliamentary Professional Development
4	Mr. Samuel Wanyaka	Director Parliamentary Budget Office
5	Mr. Assuman Golooba	Senior Economist Budget Office
6	Mr. Hunington Asaba	Economist Budget Office
5	Mr. Aloysius Makata	Director Library, Research and Information
6	Ms. Margeret Ndawula	Chief Legislative Counsel
7	Mr. Innocent Rugambwa	Legislative Librarian
8	Mr. Ahmed Kagoye	Sergeant At Arms
9	Mr. Paul Wabwire	Senior Principle Assistant, Clerk's Department
10	Ms. Victoria Kaddu	Senior Personnel Officer
11	Mr. Enoth Tumkwasiabwe	Principle Research Officer
12	Mr. Kagole Kivumbi	Parliamentary Public Relations Officer
13	Ms. Ranny Ismail	Parliamentary Information Officer
14.	Ms. Ester Mwambu	Parliamentary Publications Officer
Subtotal	14	
	Civil Society	
1	Rev. Canon Grace Kaiso	Executive Director: Uganda Joint Christian Council

No	Name	Designation
2	Ms. Jackie Assimwe Mwesige	Co-ordinator: Uganda Women's Network
3	Ms. Margeret Rugadya	Programme Officer; Uganda Land Alliance
Subtotal	3	
	Non-Parliamentary Politicians	
1	Mr. Abu Mayanja	Former: Parliamentarian: 2 nd and 5 th Parliaments, and Former Deputy Prime Minister and Attorney General
2	Ms. Margeret Oumo Oguli	Director of Information Movement Secretariat, and Member FIDA
3	Mr. Onyango Kakoba	Former Member of Parliament 6 th Parliament
Subtotal	3	
	Donors	
1	Mr. John Anderson	USAID
2	Mr. Don Elliot	USAID
3	Ms. Liz Kiingi	USAID
4	Mr. Albert Simunyu	USAID
5	Mr. Patrick Mugabo	USAID
6	Mr. Samuel Ibanda	UNDP
7	Mr. Tom Wingfield	DFID
Subtotal	7	
	SUNY/UPTAP	
8	Mr. Dick Cassidy (Communicated by email)	Formerly with SUNY/UPTAP
9	Ms. Donna Bugby (Communicated by email)	Formerly with SUNY/UPTAP
10	Ms. Betty Byanyima (Communicated Telephonically)	Formerly with SUNY/UPTAP
Subtotal	3	
Grand Total	36	