



CASE-STUDY #3: NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY IN UGANDA



Official name:	Republic of Uganda
Location:	East-Central Africa, west of Kenya, east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo
Independence:	9 October 1962 (from the UK)
Form of state:	Presidential system, multiparty democratic republic
Administrative divisions:	111 districts and 1 capital city
Area total:	241,038 sq km
Population:	35.6 million (UN, 2012)
Language:	English, Swahili
Official currency:	Ugandan Shilling (UGX)
GNI per capita:	US \$510 (World Bank, 2011)
Life expectancy	54 years (men), 55 years (women) (UN)
Unemployment (% of labour force):	4,2% (2010)
National Evaluation Association:	The Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) was formed in May 2001
Introduction of NEP legislation:	2004, revised in 2013

Prepared by: Katerina Stolyarenko, Independent Consultant
For: Parliamentary Forum for Development Evaluation



Table of Content

Acronyms.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
I. Country Context	4
1.1. <i>Political, Economic and Development Context</i>	4
1.2. <i>M&E Context</i>	5
II. Institutional setting of NEP in Uganda	7
2.1. <i>NEP’s Focus and Purposes</i>	7
2.2. <i>Legal and Policy Framework</i>	7
2.3. <i>Institutional Arrangements</i>	9
2.4. <i>M&E Tools, Components, Evaluation Methodologies and Quality of Data</i>	11
2.5. <i>Professional Capacity for M&E</i>	12
2.6. <i>Utilization of M&E</i>	13
III. Achievements and Challenges	14
IV. Good Practice(s)	15
V. Conclusion	16
VI. Documents consulted	17
VII. Interviews held	18

Acronyms

APIR	Annual Poverty Eradication Plan Implementation Review
APR	Annual Performance Reports
APRM	Africa Peer Review Mechanism
BMAU	Budget Monitoring Unit
CAO	Chief Administration Officer
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development
MISR	Makerere’s Institute of Social Research
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
OPM	The Office of the Prime Minister
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics



Executive Summary

This case study presents the Government M&E system in Uganda with a view to identifying good practices and innovations.

Uganda's development of M&E is closely woven with the need to demonstrate government performance and responsiveness to citizens' demands as an indicator of good governance. A motivating factor for raised interest in M&E was the need to measure the achievements of the country's premier planning framework, the Plan for the Eradication of Poverty (PEAP), which was introduced in 1997.

Uganda has two parallel M&E systems. The one is coordinated by a unit in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). The OPM is mandated to review the performance of all ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) against stipulated targets semi-annually and annually. The other one is developed by the civil society, including national and international NGOs active in Uganda.

NEP is still evolving in Uganda. NEP Framework is set out in the draft National Policy on Public Sector M&E, which was prepared by the OPM; however, has not yet being approved by the Cabinet. The evaluation tools presently used by government include ministerial policy statements and budget framework papers, half-annual and annual cabinet retreats to review government performance, the community information system, the annual budget performance report and Barazas. The quality of administrative data is low. Professional capacity in terms of skills and experience in M&E is dispersed throughout various MDAs. Policy-level demand for M&E products to inform decision-making is still low and a culture of managers seeking M&E data to improve performance is still evolving. The incentive framework to drive M&E practices in public service systems is also still weak. Limited use is attributed to poor information dissemination and the inability of the institution to build capacity for the timely generation and distribution of information.

I. Country Context

1.1. Political, Economic and Development Context

The Republic of Uganda is a Sub-Saharan country, bordered on the east by Kenya, on the north by Sudan, on the west by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, on the southwest by Rwanda, and on the south by Tanzania. Uganda has an estimated population of 34.8 million people. Over 80% of population live in rural areas, and engage in agriculture.

Uganda gained independence in 1962. After independence, Uganda suffered decades of conflict and misrule, during which the economy regressed and living standards declined. In 1986 the present National Resistance Movement (NRM) government took power, led by Yoweri Museveni. This ushered in a more peaceful period during which there has been stability and growth. President Museveni established good relations with the donor community, and Uganda was a pioneer in a number of developmental innovations: it was the first country to qualify for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) debt relief, its own poverty strategy anticipated the now-standard Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and it was the first recipient of a World Bank Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC).

Having pursued the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) with a focus on poverty reduction since 1997, Uganda has now embarked on a five-year development strategy. The National Development Plan (NDP) covers the period of 2010/11 to 2014/15 and envisages 'a transformed Ugandan society from a peasant to a modern and prosperous country within 30 years' by focusing on 'growth, employment and prosperity for socio-economic transformation'¹.

Uganda has made significant social and economic progress in the last two decades. Uganda's Gross Domestic Product grew at an average annual rate of 7.1% from 1992 to 2011 well above the Sub-Saharan average². The high rates of growth were attributed to the rise of a dynamic service sector. However, between 2011 and 2012 Uganda's GDP fell to 3.2%³ due to a combination of internal and external factors (including high population growth, a decrease in export performance and high inflation) have affected the country reducing economic activity.

Between 1980 and 2012, Uganda's life expectancy at birth increased by 4.4 years, mean years of schooling increased by 2.8 years and expected years of schooling increased by 7.2 years. Uganda's GNI per capita increased by about 125% between 1985 and 2012⁴ and constitutes according to the World Bank \$510 as of 2012. However, ingrained poverty and inequality as a result of geographic, historical, sociocultural, political and economic factors remain to be addressed. Uganda remains one of the poorest countries in the world with 75.6% of the population living on less than \$2 a day.

¹ National Development Plan 2030 "Our Future-Make It Work"

² African Development Bank 2013

³ African Development Bank 2013

⁴ Human Development Report 2013

Uganda's Human Development Index value for 2012 is 0.456 - in the low human development category - positioning the country at 161 out of 187 countries and territories. The Northern part of the country is particularly disadvantaged as a result of the legacy of the violent conflict between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army; these regions are still in the process of recovery and reconstruction.

Uganda is a highly aid-dependent country. The aid flows averaged 11% of GDP and 50% of public expenditure. It was the 34th largest recipient of official humanitarian assistance in 2011 and received the equivalent of 9.9% of its gross national income (GNI) as aid (ODA) in 2011, i.e. \$1.6 billions⁵. Uganda has experienced active conflict in each of the ten years between 2002 and 2011 and in 2012 it was classified as a fragile state.

Uganda's legal and policy framework supports the existence and free operation of civil society organizations. Two key instruments regulate their activities: (1) the 1995 Constitution, which provides guarantees to the right of association and recognizes the existence and role of civil society organizations; and (2) the NGO Registration (Amendment) Bill, 2006, which introduced significant legal and administrative restrictions to the operations of civil society organizations.

Civil society in Uganda is shaped by the availability of funds and interests of funders/donors, with about 95% of all funding for CSOs in Uganda coming from external sources. CSOs in Uganda have played a watchdog role and have been essential in fostering political participation in a restricted political space since the 1980s. The political environment of authoritarianism and repression of dissident voices has however restricted their freedom and the adoption of positions that explicitly challenge the authority and accountability of the government, as well as their ability to effectively influence the legal and policy agenda.

1.2. M&E Context

M&E is an emergent aspect of the public policy and management in Uganda that appeared due to the need of showing government performance in utilization of foreign aid and demonstrating good governance and accountability to its citizens and development partners.

Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP – the Uganda Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper) started 1997 with an intention of providing a framework for policies to address poverty over a 20-year period. The PEAP was revised in 2007 and later in 2010, succeeded by National Development Plan 2010-2015, with the former operating under the National Integrated Management Information Strategy (NIMES).

In addition to the PEAP, the World Bank funded Poverty Reduction Support Credits for Uganda in 2000 and 2001. These, together with the PEAP, encouraged the government and donors to develop a results-oriented framework to guide government action and support disbursement decisions.

⁵ <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/countryprofile/uganda>

The President of Uganda is the government's lead M&E champion, meanwhile the Resident District Commissioners, whom the President appoints to serve at the local level, are the M&E champions at that level. Institutionally, the Office of the Prime Minister is the lead champion for M&E in the country.

M&E in Uganda is aligned with the government structure, which is coordinated by OPM. Every MDA has an M&E department that is responsible for the collection of data on all the indicators and reports on a quarterly basis to OPM and the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) through an Output Budgeting Tool (OBT). The M&E department under the OPM carries out a rapid monitoring exercise of some government programmes implemented in a given financial year. The Budget Monitoring Unit of MFPED monitors the implementation or execution of the budget. The Office of the Auditor General (OAG) supplements these efforts with Value for Money Audits.

Alongside the government M&E structure, there are a parallel M&E systems developed by the civil society. At the local government level, NGOs are members of the technical planning committee and submit evaluation reports to the district planning committee. Information from NGOs is used to inform local government resource allocation. NGOs, primarily through their umbrella organizations such as the Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations, the Uganda Debt Network and the NGO Forum, also issue periodic reports on government performance as related to the National Development Plan and, previously, the PEAP. However, national and international NGOs in Uganda have developed their own M&E systems.

Donors are critical players in M&E in Uganda. Their activities are either supportive of government or civil society M&E.

Uganda developed its own vision of M&E system based on the experiences of Sri Lanka, South Africa, Mexico, Colombia, Canada and Pakistan.

In 2009, OPM initiated a policy development process and prepared a background paper on M&E practice across government. As a follow-up to the background paper, a Draft National Policy on Public Sector M&E in 2011 was developed and submitted to cabinet. This document outlines the M&E requirements for all ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) and local governments (LGs).

II. Institutional setting of NEP in Uganda

2.1. NEP's Focus and Purposes

The purpose of the NEP is to improve the performance of the public sector through the strengthening of the operational, coordinated, and cost-effective production and use of objective information on implementation and results of national strategies, policies, programmes and projects. The NEP framework is presented in the Final Draft National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation prepared by the Office of the Prime Minister in 2011. It is applied to all public policies, strategies, programmes and projects managed by Ministries, Departments, Agencies, Local Governments, CSOs and executing agencies of public programmes.

2.2. Legal and Policy Framework

A number of key acts and policies related to M&E⁶ in Uganda ensure the performance of the government and the quality of service delivery, namely:

1. *The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995)*

Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) has constitutional mandate of coordination, monitoring and evaluation under Article 108A of the Constitution.

2. *The Local Governments Act (1997)*

Under Article 14, the Resident District Commissioners (RDC) shall monitor and inspect the activities of local governments and may draw the attention of any relevant line ministry to the divergence from or non-compliance with government policy by any council within his or her area of jurisdiction.

3. *The Uganda Bureau of Statistics Act (1998)*

The Bureau is the principal data collecting and disseminating agency responsible for coordinating, monitoring and supervising the National Statistical System.

4. *The Budget Act (2001)*

The Act envisages preparation of a 3-years national macroeconomic plan and programmes for the economic and social development. Each Minister prepares a Policy Statement for each financial year which attempts to link resources to output targets.

5. *The National Planning Authority Act (2002)*

The National Planning Authority (NPA) has the mandate to produce integrated development plans for the country based on the perspective vision and the long term and medium term plans. Its functions include monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness and impact of development programmes and the performance of the economy of Uganda.

⁶ Discussion Paper "National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring And Evaluation", OPM-IDEA International, January 2010

6. *The Public Finance and Accountability Act (2003)*

The Act requires the Minister of Finance to report to Parliament on expenditure of public resources and Article 36 of the Act empowers the Auditor General to undertake value for money audits for the purpose of establishing the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the operations of any department, or any public organization, or any local government council.

7. *The National Audit Act (2003)*

Under Article 13, the Auditor General shall audit and report on public accounts of Uganda and of all public offices; conduct financial, value for money audits and other audits such as gender and environment audits in respect of any project or activity involving public funds; undertake audit of classified expenditures; audit all Government investments; carry out procurement audits; and audit Treasury Memoranda.

8. *The Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act (2003)*

Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority (PPDA) shall Monitoring and reporting on the performance of the public procurement and disposal systems and advise on desirable changes. All procurement and disposal shall be conducted in a manner which promotes transparency, accountability and fairness (Article 46) and be conducted in a manner which promotes economy, efficiency and value for money (Article 48).

9. *The Local Governments (Financial and Accounting) Regulations (2007)*

The Council Executive Committee has to exercise supervision and control over the Council's finances and Government conditional grants and ensure that regulations are observed as well as consider and evaluate the performance of the Council against the approved work plans and programmes at the end of each financial year.

10. *The Education Act (2008)*

Directorate responsible for standards in all education institutions have to assess the achievement of standards and to evaluate effectiveness of education programmes of institutions and agencies throughout Uganda; provide and disseminate regular reports on the quality of education at all levels and give advice to the Minister on matters related to quality control.

11. *The NGO Policy (2008)*

OPM is the lead Agency for NGO sector development and oversight. It shall present an annual report to Parliament on operational environment of NGOs in collaboration with National Council for NGOs. The Ministry of Internal Affairs, through the NGO Board, is responsible for registry and oversight of NGOs. The National Council for NGOs formulates and enforces a NGO Code of Conduct and promotes quality assurance, partnership, and information sharing. The Resident District Commissioner monitors activities of the NGO sector within the District and ensure compliance. The District Local Council ensures integration of programme plans and budgets, through District NGO Committee, into the District and lower level Development Plans and Budgets based on clear guidelines; ensures joint planning, programme monitoring and evaluation and accountability for resources allocated to joint (Government-NGOs) development activities and includes assessment of contribution and impact of NGO sector in the regular performance reports prepared by the District Administration.

2.3. Institutional Arrangements

M&E in Uganda is coordinated by a unit in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). The OPM is mandated to review the performance of all ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) against stipulated targets semi-annually and annually.

Administrative data is drawn from various sources by government institutions in the course of fulfilling their mandates and implementing policies.

Main M&E agencies in Uganda, their roles and responsibilities⁷

The Office of the President (OP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Conducts monitoring of key Government programmes to generate policy advice for Cabinet and the President; (b) Tracks the implementation of Cabinet decisions; (c) Reports on GoU policies and results through the annual State of the Nation Address of H.E. The President of the Republic of Uganda
The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Provides leadership across GoU and ensures proper coordination and oversight of M&E activities in GoU; (b) Harmonizes and standardizes M&E procedures, practices and mechanisms across GoU; (c) Provide technical support and oversight to Planning Units in MDAs and SWGs in i) the operationalization of monitoring and statistics functions, and ii) the design and implementation of 5-year rolling evaluation plans; (d) Designs, commissions, quality controls and disseminates national public policy evaluations in line with the 5-year rolling evaluation agenda of Cabinet; (e) Reports to Cabinet periodically on Government performance and results; (f) Monitors the implementation of the M&E Policy
The National Planning Authority (NPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Prepares results-orientated medium and long-term plans at national level; (b) Works with MFPED in the preparation of the annual budget, medium and long-term expenditure frameworks to support the national plans; (c) Assists ministries and local governments in preparing results-orientated plans and budgets; (d) Analyses progress in tackling constraints to national development in line with the National Development Plan; (e) Monitors and reports periodically to parliament on national development
The Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Coordinates the preparation and presentation of the national budget; (b) Reallocates financial resources to support statistics, monitoring and evaluation functions at MDA and LG levels through establishing a VF output in the chart of accounts, with budget ceilings set to this output in line with this policy; (c) Monitors budget execution and progress on MoU's commitments to promote efficiency and effectiveness of all public spending; (d) Releases timely and quality information on budget execution; (e) Reports periodically to cabinet and parliament on budget preparation, execution and performance
The Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Assists Local Governments in preparing results orientated plans and budgets (b) Strengthens local governance and upwards reporting through developing Local Governments systems and practices for monitoring and evaluation (c) Oversees Local Governments compliance with statutory requirements and adherence to national policies and standards
The Ministry of Public Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Ensures that the monitoring, evaluation and statistics functions within the public service are adequately staffed in line with this Policy (b) Ensures the operationalization of Results Orientated Management (ROM) across the public service

⁷ Final Draft National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation, OPM, 2011

(MoPS)	<p>(c) Oversees that performance plans and agreements with public servants are derived from strategic plans of relevant Ministries or Local Governments</p> <p>(d) Ensuring that all Ministries and Local Governments operationalize client charters outlining the minimum level of service that the public can expect</p> <p>(e) Provides for an adequate system of incentives to support M&E activities in GoU through the reward and recognition scheme</p> <p>(f) Coordinate the public service inspection function, and where appropriate, carry out specific inspections</p>
The Office of the Auditor General (OAG)	<p>(a) Audits and reports on public accounts of all public offices and any public corporation or other bodies established by an Act of Parliament</p> <p>(b) Conducts financial, value for money and other audits, such as gender and environment audits, in respect of any project or activity involving public funds</p>
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	<p>(a) Coordinates, supports, validates and designates as official any statistics produced by UBOS, MDAs and LGs.;</p> <p>(b) Coordinates and clears all censuses and nationally representative household economic surveys;</p> <p>(c) Ensures production, harmonization and dissemination of statistical information;</p> <p>(d) Strengthen statistical capacity of planning units in MDAs and LGs for data production and use</p> <p>(e) Ensure best practice and adherence to standards, classifications, and procedures for statistical collection, analysis and dissemination in MDAs and LGs</p>
Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs)	<p>(a) Produce annual results orientated Ministerial Policy Statements (MPS), linked to the corresponding SBFPs and SSIPs;</p> <p>(b) Ensure that all MDA planning units assign one or more positions responsible for statistical production, monitoring and evaluation;</p> <p>(c) Ensure that a management information system is in place and functioning;</p> <p>(d) Plan and budget for monitoring and statistics annually. A minimum of 3% of the nonwage recurrent budget and 2% of each project budget will be allocated to monitoring;</p> <p>(e) Hold quarterly MDA performance review meetings to determine progress towards output targets</p>
All Sector Working Groups (SWG)	<p>(a) Develop and implement a five-year sector strategic investment plan (SSIP), containing a results orientated monitoring matrix and 5-year evaluation plan</p> <p>(b) Produce an annual Sector Budget Framework Paper (SBFP) derived from the SSIP</p> <p>(c) Establish and maintain a monitoring and evaluation function within the SWG secretariat</p> <p>(d) Ensure proper coordination and oversight of M&E activities in their sector</p> <p>(e) Hold biannual performance reviews to assess progress against targets, and for upwards reporting</p>
Parliament	<p>(a) Scrutinizes various objects of expenditure and the sums to be spent on each</p> <p>(b) Assures transparency and accountability in the application of public funds</p> <p>(c) Monitors the implementation of Government programmes and projects</p>
Local Councils	<p>(a) Oversee monitoring activities at District and Lower Local Government (LLG) levels;</p> <p>(b) Utilize M&E findings to inform policy and resource allocation decisions;</p> <p>(c) Ensure that the District administration and LLG adheres to this policy.</p>
Other executing agencies (CSOs and private sector)	<p>(a) Participate in public sector planning processes at Local Government and sector levels</p> <p>(b) Provide timely and quality data on the financial and physical implementation of projects for which they are the executing agency to the relevant MDA or LG;</p> <p>(c) Participate in discussion and decision-making committees at programme, sector and national levels that review and comment on public sector performance</p>

2.4. *M&E Tools, Components, Evaluation Methodologies and Quality of Data*

The government uses a number of tools and approaches in its M&E efforts.

Government semi-annual and annual performance reports are used to measure government performance against agreed sector targets. Every sector working group submits quarterly strategic performance reports, based on which the Office of the Prime Minister reports to the Cabinet twice a year and to Parliament annually.

The government performance is reviewed during **biannual Cabinet retreats** organized by the Office of the Prime Minister. These retreats are chaired either by the Prime Minister or the President and attended by all Cabinet ministers, ministers of state, permanent secretaries, local council chairpersons and chief administrative officers. In these retreats, participants assess the ministries, departments, and agencies against the performance targets they set in their Ministerial Policy Statements and develop recommendations that feed into the sector budgets for the next financial year.

Ministerial Policy Statements and **Budget Framework Papers** specify output and outcome indicators, as well as targets for measuring performance of respective institutions and sectors. All sector Budget Framework Papers are supposed to be results oriented monitoring compliant.

The **output budgeting tool** is used by ministries, departments, and agencies to report data to the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development. This tool is the government's largest single database of annual performance plans and budgets. The Biannual Government Performance Report provides a summary of findings from all government process evaluations facilitated through the output budgeting tool.

The government uses the **Medium Term Expenditure Framework** to undertake budget planning and expenditure controls. Sectorial and district-level budget framework papers inform the national budget and describe how sectors and districts plan to achieve PEAP goals.

All ministries, departments, and agencies and local governments report quarterly on their budget expenditure and outputs to the Budget Monitoring and Accountability Unit. This unit then undertakes field visits and audits to verify the reports in priority sectors such as agriculture, education, energy, health, industrial parks, roads, and water and sanitation. Twice a year the unit produces a Budget Performance Report, informed by the ministries, departments, and agencies and local government reports and field visits.

The National Planning Authority is in charge of producing the **Annual National Development Report**, summarizing the country's progress toward achieving the National Development Plan goals. The Authority presents the report to the Parliament. The National Integrated Management Information Strategy uses data from a wide range of sources to compile the six monthly National Policy and Program Performance Status Report.

Sub-county Accountability Meetings (Barazas) are conducted by citizens to hold local government officials accountable for resources spent on public programs.

Evaluation is still emerging within the government of Uganda. Only about 10% of project investments in the country have undergone evaluations.

The quality of administrative data is low, although it is collected by all MDAs. Many institutions do not have operational Management Information System for proper collection, storage and retrieval of data as well as lack the technical capacities necessary to compile, maintain, and update the databases. However, social, economic and demographic statistics which is prepared by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) are of good quality.

2.5. Professional Capacity for M&E

Monitoring and evaluation in Uganda is conducted by a wide range of skilled personnel, including economists, statisticians, accountants, auditors and other social scientists from various MDAs and NGOs all over the country. However, most of these individuals mainly monitor, having limited advanced evaluation skills and competencies. Uganda has still limited on-job training and mentoring in M&E.

Academic institutions in Uganda taught M&E only as a subsidiary subject through short-term M&E courses:

1. **Uganda Christian University** offers Post Graduate Diploma in Development Evaluation Studies (PGDDES).
2. **Makerere University** proposes a Post Graduate Certificate in Monitoring and Evaluation. It also has other courses that tackle M&E, i.e. Post Graduate Certificate in Project Planning and Management. At the moment, the Makerere University together with the OPM is working on launching Masters programme in M&E (day/distance learning). The introduction of the new programme is planned for middle 2014.
3. **Uganda Management Institute**⁸ offers a Post Graduate Diploma in Monitoring and Evaluation. In addition, it has short courses on monitoring and evaluation:
 - “Public Policy Analysis and Programme Evaluation” course for policy unit heads and planners at central and meso/local levels of government and all those involved in non-state sector advocacy work under the School of Civil Service, Public Administration and Governance;
 - “Project Monitoring and Evaluation” for project officers, managers and professional evaluators/consultants charged with the responsibility of monitoring and evaluation of projects under the School of Business, Productivity and Competitiveness.

The need to develop a critical mass of professional evaluators in the country who can undertake evaluations became a major driving force for establishment of the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) in May 2001. The UEA was registered in 2002 as a professional association and national chapter of the African Evaluation Association with an ultimate goal to improve evaluation capacity in the country. The institutional development and capacity building activities were supported by the World Bank (\$10 000 funding) and started in September 2002. The Association started with a membership of over 50 individuals in 2002 with increase to 220 members in 2013 drawn from M&E units in Government, Parastatals, local and international NGOs, private organizations and members from the

⁸ <http://www.umi.ac.ug/>

public that are engaged in evaluation practice. The UEA cooperates with different MDAs and has representatives at the Evaluation Committees of OPM. In 2012, UEA started collaboration with OPM to promote professionalism in evaluation through the development of evaluation standards, which were officially launched in use in November 2013⁹. In spite of positive developments, the UEA still needs support to enhance the capacity of the UEA in terms of strengthening organizational capacity and developing sustainable funding mechanisms for being able to achieve the set goals.

Also Northern Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Network was founded in April 2009 by M&E professionals who were working in the post conflict Northern Uganda as a regional forum for experience and skill sharing aimed at empowering its members and stimulating individual/institutional interest in M&E.

2.6. Utilization of M&E

Over the past decade, Government of Uganda has made improvements in public sector performance measurement and financial management, strengthening the basis for scrutiny and oversight of the use of public funds in improving service delivery and governance. However, utilization of data and evidence to strengthen performance and accountability has been inadequate suggesting the need to enhance systems for evidence based policy making.

The Government produces Government Performance reports bi-annually, which are discussed at Cabinet retreats. These reports utilize monitoring data extensively, and top officials discuss their agencies' successes and areas for improvement. This is a very positive aspect of Uganda's approach to using evidence, based on monitoring information. However, there are areas for improvement (not unique to Uganda). The data are more robust in some sectors (education, health, and water and sanitation), but less strong in others.

⁹ <http://www.ugandaevaluationassociation.org/documents.html>

III. Achievements and Challenges

o Main Achievements

- ✓ Establishment of the Government Evaluation Facility under OPM with changing the main emphasis of the government M&E system from monitoring to evaluation.
- ✓ Elaboration of the draft public sector M&E policy to harmonize different M&E systems in government.
- ✓ Introduction of Barazas (Citizens demand for accountability) to strengthen citizen's engagement with the state and oversee Government spending at Local Government level.
- ✓ Development of an online database (and website) for tracking actions from Cabinet Retreats and implementation of recommendations of the Government Performance Assessments.

o Key Challenges

- ✓ In spite of M&E's well-placed champions, a culture of seeking M&E information to inform decision- making and improve performance is still evolving.
- ✓ The incentive framework for encouraging M&E practice within the public service also remains weak.
- ✓ Parliament's demand for M&E findings to help inform decision-making remains low. Across the government, there is a lack of demand for M&E, and M&E data are rarely used in policy making. This limited utilization is attributed in part to a lack of capacity to generate and disseminate information in a timely fashion.
- ✓ A need to create greater convergence and wider integration of M&E functions between the public service and civil society.



IV. Good Practice(s)

a) *Government Evaluation Facility (GEF)*

GEF was established under the Office of the Prime. The new facility is part of ongoing efforts by Uganda, with the support of international partners, to strengthen national capacities and promote an evaluation culture in the public sector. Its main function is to conduct evaluations of key government policies and institutionalize evaluation in government. The operation of the GEF is overseen by a National M&E Technical Working Group made up of experts from public sector institutions (Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, National Planning Authority, Uganda Bureau of Statistics), academia, Non-Government Organization and Donor Community. The facility is composed of a two-year rolling evaluation agenda, a Virtual Evaluation Fund, a National Evaluation Subcommittee, and a small Secretariat in the Office of the Prime Minister. A National M&E Technical Working Group comprised of all ministries, departments, and agencies and led by the Office of the Prime Minister has been established to oversee the operations of the facility. The National Evaluation Subcommittee is responsible for overseeing all government-led evaluations. In its first year of operation, 2011, the facility initiated six major evaluations.

b) *Barazas (Citizens Demand for Accountability)*

Barazas are public fora that were set up at sub-county level for the civil and political leaders to explain to community what local government does, what the amount of funds received from the central government and how they are spent. The Barazas Program was initiated by the President and started in Uganda in January 2009. First, it was piloted in 10 districts and then rolled on to more than 90 districts of Uganda to-date. The Office of the Prime Minister has mandate to provide oversight, program liaison and monitoring through its M&E department.

The ultimate purpose for Baraza Program is to bring together stakeholders from all three sectors: Government the policy maker; Public Service Providers public sector policy implementers; and the Public the users of services; to share public information; generate debate and dialogue on how to develop collective strategies improve for service delivery at the community level. It is a monitoring tool for Government to identify challenges facing service deliver and inform the discussion during the bi-annual and annual review of Government performance. The Barazas are focusing on five (5) key priority sectors: Health, Education, Water, Agriculture and Roads. The objective is to stimulate community dialogue where people are able to hold their leaders to account for resources to implement projects in these sectors. On the other hand, Barazas provide an opportunity for district leaders to get in touch with the grassroots.

In the districts, the Resident District Commissioners and their deputies are mandated to conduct this exercise on behalf of Government. At each meeting, the entire public is mobilized and invited to attend on specified dates. Issues arising from Barazas are noted and acted upon by the sub-county authorities; district councils and sectors (including the police) depending on the nature of the issue and the responsibility center concerned. Barazas are leading to: improved transparency in the management of public funds; strengthened accountability; and enhanced the public's involvement in holding the Government to account for service delivery.

V. Conclusion

Uganda's development of M&E is closely woven with the need to demonstrate government performance and responsiveness to citizens' demands as an indicator of good governance. A motivating factor for raised interest in M&E was the need to measure the achievements of the country's premier planning framework, the Plan for the Eradication of Poverty (PEAP), which was introduced in 1997. M&E in Uganda is coordinated by a unit in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). The OPM is mandated to review the performance of all ministries, and agencies (MDAs) against stipulated targets semi-annually and annually. Alongside the government M&E structure is a small but growing arm of evaluative practice by civil society, including national and international NGOs operating in Uganda. The primary challenge at sector level is to harmonize data from all the M&E systems before onward transmission to the OPM. Secondly, OPM has to harmonize all the data from the different sectors and make it available for use. The evaluation tools presently used by government include ministerial policy statements and budget framework papers, half-annual and annual cabinet retreats to review government performance, the community information system, the annual budget performance report and Barazas. Establishment of Government Evaluation Facility to evaluate public policies and major public investments is critical and a major milestone towards improvement of service delivery in Uganda. The evaluation capacity is still insufficient in Uganda and has to be strengthened both within the government and civil society.

VI. Documents consulted

Human Development Report 2013, UNDP

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2013-media-toolkit>

<http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=67399&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ug.html>

African Development Bank 2013

<http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org/en/data-statistics/table-2-real-gdp-growth-rates-2003-2013/>

Data on Global Humanitarian Assistance,

<http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/countryprofile/uganda>

Kabuchu, Hope (2013), "To be or Not to Be: The Government, Donor and CSO Triangle in the Ugandan Environment", Civicus State of Civil Society Report 2013

National Development Plan 2030 "Our Future-Make It Work"

Discussion Paper "National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation", OPM-IDEA International, January 2010

Final Draft National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation, OPM, 2011

The Baraza Implementation Manual, Office of the Prime Minister, April 2013

Towards a Peaceful and Prosperous Uganda with Happy People, The Citizens' Manifesto 2011 – 2016, NGO Forum

Government Annual Performance Report, OPM, 2011

National Development Plan 2010/11-2014/15, National Planning Authority, Kampala, Uganda, 2010

Hauge, A. (2001). Strengthening Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in Uganda: A Results-Based Management Perspective. ECD Working Paper Series No.8. OED. (Washington: World Bank)

Hauge, A. and Mackay, K. (2004). *Monitoring and Evaluation for Results, Lessons from Uganda*. Capacity Enhancement Briefs. Number 3. (Washington: World Bank)

Office of the Prime Minister of Uganda

<http://www.opm.go.ug/departments/PolicyCoordinationMonitoringandEvaluation/monitoring-and-evaluation.html>

Uganda Christian University

<http://www.ucu.ac.ug/ucunew>

Uganda Management Institute
<http://www.umi.ac.ug/>

Makere University
<http://mak.ac.ug>

Uganda Evaluation Association
<http://www.ugandaevaluationassociation.org>

VII. Interviews held

Timothy Lubanga, Assistant Commissioner-Monitoring and Evaluation, Office of the Prime Minister