

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A JOINT FINAL EVALUATION OF THE
DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (DDPII)
UNCDF/UNDP/MOLG**

COVER PAGE

Country: Uganda

Programme Number: UGA/01/C01

Programme Title: District Development Programme (DDPII)

Executing Agency: Ministry of Local Government/
Programme Coordination Unit

Implementing Agencies: Ministry of Local Government
Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development
Local Government Finance Commission

Programme approval date: September 2002

Programme Start Date: October 2002

Programme End Date: June 2007

Total programme cost:
Attached - Copy of Initial Programme Budget: US\$3,620,000
Copy of latest Budget Revision: US\$3,181,872

Financing breakdown:

| | |
|---------|---------------|
| UNCDF | US\$2,140,953 |
| UNDP | US\$100,000 |
| DFID | US\$300,000 |
| DANIDA | US\$220,000 |
| AUSTRIA | US\$120,919 |

Mid-term evaluation date: August - September 2004

1. PURPOSE AND TIMING OF THE EVALUATION

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The objectives of the Evaluation are:

1.1.1. To assist the Government of Uganda in particular the project executing agency (Ministry of Local Government), implementing agencies (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development and the Local Government Finance Commission), the Local Governments, and the concerned co-financing partners (i.e. UNDP, DANIDA, DFID, Japanese Women in Development Fund, GoU Austria), to understand:

- a) the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of the programme,
- b) the sustainability of programme results,
- c) the level of satisfaction of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries with the results, and
- d) whether UNCDF was effectively positioned and partnered to achieve maximum impact;

1.1.2. To contribute to UNCDF and partners' learning from programme experience.

1.1.3. To help programme stakeholders assess the value and opportunity for broader replication of the programme.

1.1.4. To help programme stakeholders determine the need for follow-up on the intervention, and general direction for the future course.

1.1.5. To ensure accountability for results to the programme's financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

1.1.6. Comply with the requirement of the programme document/funding agreement and UNCDF Evaluation Policy.

1.2 Evaluation timing:

This evaluation is part of the requirements for programme funding as agreed in the programme document. The timing of the evaluation is a rare opportunity that has coincided with a number of developments taking place in the decentralization 'sector' in the country as well as the UN namely;

1.2.1. The MOLG recently launched (Nov. 2006) the Decentralization Sector Strategic Framework (DPSF) during the Joint Annual Review of Decentralization (JARD). The DPSF provides a coherent framework for coordinating decentralized service delivery, covering the development interventions at regional and local government levels, government ministries, agencies and other development partners. It provides the basis for the Local Government Sector Investment Plan (LGSIP), which defines in concrete terms the totality of what it takes to implement Uganda's decentralization policy.

1.2.2. The Local Government Sector Investment Plan (LGSIP1 2006-2016) also launched in November 2006 during the JARD. It forms the investment framework for all programmes and activities in the decentralization sector. Its primary objectives are to: Provide a single point of reference for mobilizing resources for implementation of the decentralization policy within the context of the MTEF, ensure that resources are channeled to core programmes and activities in line with the PEAP and ensure coordinated and effective delivery of services at local level.

1.2.3. In connection with LGSIP, a Memorandum of understanding has been signed between the Government of Uganda and the Decentralization Development Partner Group for joint arrangements to support the implementation of the LGSIP.

1.2.4. Decentralization Sector Working Group (DSWG) has been formed as an advisory group to provide stakeholders within the decentralization ‘sector’ a platform for consultation, coordination and sharing of ideas in order to lead to deeper commitment to the decentralization process by all involved. The DSWG works closely with Public Sector Management Working Group for strong Policy dialogue.

1.2.5. Formulation of the successor programme to Local Government Development Programme (LGDPII). A concept paper has been developed by Ministry of Local Government with support from World Bank. Recommendations of the evaluation will provide a useful input since as a good practice LGDP has been upscaling results tested under DDPII.

1.2.6. The donor division of labour exercise initiated by the Government to increase aid effectiveness and efficiency by reducing the transaction costs.

1.2.7. Annual PEAP implementation review

1.2.8. PRSC 6 Appraisal of the progress in the key reforms and agreed prior actions.

The evaluation is also in the right time bearing in mind the developments within the UN system and UNDP at country level

- i. The UN High level panel Report which recommended on how the UN should ‘deliver as one’, establish one UN at country level, with one leader, one programme, one budget and where appropriate one office.
- ii. Integration of UNCDF programmes within the UNDP MYFF/ Strategic Plan 2008-2011
- iii. Strong partnership with UNDP in terms of joint programming and resource mobilization.
- iv. UNDP CO review of the CPAP 2006-2010

The evaluation should make meaningful contributions to all these developments both within the country and the UN for improved governance and service delivery, in order to realise the goal of eradicating poverty and attaining the Millennium Development Goals

In terms of actual timing, the evaluation will last for 5 weeks beginning 23rd April and ending 25th May 2007.

1.3. Evaluation collaboration

The evaluation will be jointly collaborated by UNCDF, UNDP and Ministry of Local Government.

2 PROGRAMME PROFILE

2.1 Country context/status of decentralization in terms of strategy, policy and implementation:

Uganda has been pursuing an extensive and elaborate decentralisation policy since 1992, premised on the notion that popularly elected local governments are better placed than the central government to identify and respond to the needs of local communities, and that it is the beneficiaries of social services who are best suited to set local priorities and to hold local officials to account in the use of public resources. The policy devolved powers and functional responsibilities over decision making and service delivery to

popularly elected local governments, which was incorporated into the 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda and elaborated in the Local Governments Act, 1997. This was a reversal of the centralist tendencies that had been introduced by the Local Administration Act 1967, under which local administrations were tightly controlled by the centre.

Not until last year (2006), there hasn't been a single document in existence that brings together all the different elements and facets of Uganda's decentralization policy and its implementation framework. The Decentralization Policy Strategic Framework (DPSF) was launched in November 2006 to guide Government and other stakeholders in consolidating and deepening the decentralization policy in Uganda. The DPSF provides a coherent, comprehensive and coordinated approach to the implementation of decentralization. It reinforces inter-linkages among members of the local government "family" comprising the Ministry of Local Government, Local governments themselves, central line ministries, the Local Government Finance Commission (LGFC), Local Government associations, government agencies, development partners, NGOs and CBOs.

The goals and objectives are to:

- i. Transfer real power to Local Governments and thus reduce the workload of remote under-resources central officials
- ii. Bring political and administrative control over services to the point where they are actually delivered, and thereby improve accountability and effectiveness, and promote people's feeling of "ownership" of programmes and projects executed in their local governments;
- iii. Free local managers from central government constraints and enable them to develop effective and sustainable organizational structures that are tailored to local circumstances;
- iv. Improve financial accountability and responsibility by establishing a clear link between payment of taxes and provision of services;
- v. Improve the capacity of local authorities to plan, finance and manage the delivery of service; and
- vi. Promote local economic development in order to enhance people's incomes

Initially the policy did not place emphasis on local economic development, but experience has shown that this is essential for sustainable development.

The primary instruments through which the policy is being implemented are political, administrative and fiscal decentralization.

- (i) Political decentralization allows citizens to elect their own regional and local governments and participate in their governance by determining their own development priorities, making and approving their own development plans.
- (ii) Administrative decentralization allows regional and local governments to appoint approved statutory bodies; make ordinances and bye-laws; hire, manage and discipline personnel; manage their own payroll; and implement approved development plans.
- (iii) Fiscal decentralization allows regional and local governments to develop, approve and execute their own budgets; raise and utilize resources according to their own priorities in line with legal provisions; and utilize conditional, unconditional, equalization or any other grants from the centre in line with

central government guidelines and local priorities. Central government on the other hand will focus its energies on matters pertaining to policy, financing, planning, coordination and oversight.

As a result of the DPSF, a Local Government Sector Investment Plan (LGSIP 2006-2016) has been developed and launched last year together with the DPSF. The DPSF integrates all the multiple development interventions that relate to the decentralisation sector in order to generate a more coordinated approach to service delivery and poverty reduction. The LGSIP takes from this and provides an elaborate framework for (a) prioritising among competing programmes and activities (b) determining the actual cost of running the decentralisation programme, and (c) providing a rational basis for the volume and levels of central government transfers. The LGSIP takes account of the various factors that affect the implementation of the decentralisation policy, including the constrained resource envelope.

Six key strategic areas of investment are mentioned in the LGSIP and these include; (i) Local service delivery, (ii) Political decentralization, (iii) Administrative decentralization, (iv) Fiscal decentralization, (v) Good governance and (vi) Local economic development.

The LGSIP is to be financed through the following sources:

- i. Government of Uganda Budget for MOLG and LGFC: Funding to central GOU institutions under the mainstream domestic budget.
- ii. Central Government Transfers: The funds to support the DPSF and the Local Government Sector Investment Plans shall be remitted directly from the Centre to the Local Governments for planned activities. Central Government will continue funding through conditional, unconditional and equalization grants. The utilization of these funds shall be through approved annual expenditure plans and activities. This will include notionally earmarked sector budget support from development partners.
- iii. Donor Support: Development partners will be approached to provide support under the LGSIP “basket”, bilateral and project funding as shall be agreed through dialogue with the DSWG.
- iv. Local Revenue: Local Governments are mandated to raise local revenues for financing their expenditure. The local resources can be allocated to support activities under the DPSF and LGSIP

To date, most of the members of the Decentralization Development Partners Group (DDPG) are in agreement to provide further support to the ‘sector’ within the context of the LGSIP and in accordance with partnership principles enshrined in the Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness and the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy (UJAS). The DDPG and GOU represented by MOLG have signed an MOU to show commitment for harmonized assistance and alignment of interventions with the LGSIP.

All the parties recognize that apparently over the next three to four years, there are members of the DDPG that are bound to specific operational rules and regulations, mandates as well as ongoing commitments but would work in a pro-active manner to increase harmonization with time. In this respect, some practical funding modalities to

the LGSIP have been proposed by the DDPG which at the moment include project and basket funding. The budget support modality will come later. It is expected that DDPG under the project funding arrangement will re-align their interventions with the LGSIP and gradually transform to basket modality. And those under basket funding will gradually move into budget support. Any new projects under this modality are expected to have a national focus. In the case of pilots, they should have the potential for national up-scaling.

Basket financing modality has been agreed upon by five Development Partners (i.e. Austria, Belgium, Denmark/DANIDA, Ireland/DCI and Netherlands/RNE).

2.2 Programme summary:

UNCDF has been active in Uganda since 1985 evolving over years from project-driven infrastructure delivery to institutional development and policy impact through the local development model. In the past (1985-1996) provided technical support for various government programmes especially in the area of infrastructure development, rehabilitation and maintenance. Between 1997 and 2001, UNCDF supported the decentralization process focusing on the establishment of comprehensive administrative systems and procedures. This was done through the District Development Programme (DDPI) as a pilot project operational in six districts namely: Kabale in Western Uganda, Mukono and Kayunga in the central, Arua and Yumbe in the North and Jinja in the Eastern Uganda). Some of the achievements made during this period include:

- Introduction of systems for improved planning at the local government level
- Financing and delivery of basic infrastructure and services
- Policy impact and support to current policies
- Replication and interest and support from other donors generated especially under the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP)
- Capacity built among project stakeholders and
- Support to the Ministry of Local Government for a decentralized planning and service provision process.

The DDP I was successfully piloted and later replicated national-wide under the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP) by the Ministry of Local Government jointly funded by the World Bank, DANIDA, Royal Netherlands Embassy, Development Corporation Ireland, DFID and Austria.

DDP II was developed in a context of a fully operational LGDP and in response to Decentralization challenges at the time of project formulation including:

- Limited inclusive participation at the lower local government and community levels.
- Declining local revenue as resources for sustainable service delivery
- Lack of gender mainstreaming even with policies and pronouncements which supported GM
- Lack of fully functioning local council courts which were considered as the key institution for community participation in decision making and Decentralization.

UNCDF in agreement with the Ministry of Local Government agreed to take on these challenges and support the refinement, deepening and consolidation of the implementation of decentralization policy through the formulation of DDP II. The DDP II was designed to operate within the context of the National Poverty Eradication Action Plan, which includes, among others, creation of an enabling environment for economic growth; ensuring good governance and security; and directly improving the quality of life of the poor.

DDP II has an immediate objective of ensuring “equitable and sustainable access to socio-economic infrastructure and public services improved through high quality of local governance” i.e. higher (Districts) and lower (Sub-counties). It is within the recognized understanding that strong local governance frameworks, institutions and operations are prerequisites for poverty eradication that UNCDF agreed to support Government of Uganda through the following DDP II four components (sub-projects):

- i. Component 1: Coordinated Participatory Planning and Budgeting with an objective to strengthen a coordinated participatory planning and budgeting mechanisms for Local governments and lower Local Councils.
- ii. Component 2: Local Revenue Enhancement with an objective to improve the mobilization and generation of sustainable local revenue through enhanced capacity of Local Governments and their supporting institutions.
- iii. Component 3: Gender Mainstreaming with an objective to promote equitable participation of women and men in shaping development directions and choices as by the Constitution of 1995 and the Local Government Act 1997.
- iv. Component 4: Strengthening the Administration of Local Council Courts with an objective to strengthen the local administration of justice.

The four components have strong inter-linkages and have to compliment each other in order to fully contribute to poverty eradication. DDP II is also intended to inform dialogue on the above issues so as to encourage a sustainable impact from lessons learned through implementation to poverty oriented policies.

In the spirit of refining, deepening and consolidating achievements of the DDP I, the DDP II is also being implemented in the six DDP I target Districts, namely, Yumbe and Arua in the North, Jinja in the East, Kayunga and Mukono in Central and Kabale in the South, with the Local Revenue Enhancement component extended to four additional districts of Sironko, Kumi in Eastern Uganda, Bundibugyo and Ntungamo in Western Uganda..

As it was in the DDP I, the main target beneficiaries have remained as the respective District Councils in line with their Sub-county Local Governments. The Ministry of Local Government though a higher-level beneficiary in terms of institutional capacity development has remained as executing Ministry. However, PMU – that’s the Programme Management Unit which implemented the DDP I on behalf of the Ministry of Local Government has seen its role change in the context of mainstreaming activities to the line ministries. This change has culminated into change of name to Programme

Coordination Unit (PCU), consequently taking up the role of an execution agency for the Ministry and hence, handing over the implementation responsibilities to line ministries and departments.

Following the set up of the DDP II, the following line Ministries and Departments have been the key implementing agencies:

- a) The Policy and Planning Unit of the Ministry of LG for Component 1 – Coordinated Participatory Planning.
- b) The Local Government Finance Commission for Component 2 – Local Revenue Enhancement
- c) Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development for Component 3 - Gender Mainstreaming.
- d) The Directorate of Local Council Development in the Ministry of Local Government for Component 4 – Strengthening Administration of Local Justice.

For purposes of technical direction and guidance to the implementation departments/ministries, the Project Technical Committee (PTC) has been retained but mainstreamed into the larger Local Government Development Programme (LGDP). Because of the amalgamation of the PTC, District participation in the PTC meetings has had to be re-adjusted to fit the quarterly and regional rotational sittings.

At the policy coordination level, the DDP II Policy Steering Committee (PSC) has remained the Permanent Secretaries of Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Finance Planning & Economic Development and that of Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. In all these two paramount committees, PCU has remained as the Secretariat.

It is a legal requirement for Local Governments to prepare comprehensive and integrated development plans incorporating plans of lower local councils (Local Government Act 1997). Local Governments have the right and obligation to formulate, approve and execute their budgets and plans. Furthermore, the development plans and budgets should be gender sensitive in order to address the concerns of both females and males and to make sure that both gender participate in decision-making and in development on an equal footing. It is statutory that the planning process should be consultative and participatory. In addition, LGs business and public goods can only be sustained when LGs have capacity to generate and mobilize local revenue.

As noted above, 1995 Constitution and the Local Government Act give local governments the power to levy and appropriate taxes.

The Local Council Courts component is equally grounded in the law. It is important to note that the judicial functions of Local Council Courts were developed during the guerilla war of the National Resistance Movement of 1981 -1986. The Local Councils served as institutions of civil mobilization for the guerillas as well as local council courts to resolve disputes and or act as reconciliatory organs for the people in the then liberated “rebel controlled areas”.

Government, through the Resistance Council Judicial Statute of 1988 and of recent (2006) the Local Council Courts Act, formalized the judicial powers of the councils in

order to achieve a more accessible, cost effective and popular system of justice as an alternative to the formal court system and as a system that is much closer to the rural people. The Local Council Courts at Sub-county, parish and village levels provide an alternative to the formal, less accessible and expensive formal court system. They are used in resolving the majority of disputes affecting the people as well as reconcile them together with a sole purpose of safe guarding human rights.

Over the years, it has become very evident that the Local Council Courts are constrained by lack of up to date operational guidelines, basic training of Court Members and general awareness and understanding of both the Court Members and the litigants rights and responsibilities vis- a-vis the Local council Courts, including the basic laws and gender relations.

Poverty is lack of access to services, including justice, particularly, fair, effective and equitable one. It is on this basis that UNCDF agreed to pilot support activities to strengthening Local Council Courts as one of the organs of LG institutions in the dispensation of justice.

2.3 Programme expected results:

Component I: Coordinated Participatory Planning and Budgeting (CPPB)

The specific expected outputs/results are as follows:

- i. Harmonized Participatory Guidelines tested, refined and implemented at LLG levels in pilot districts.
- ii. Capacity of Local Councils in strategic planning at district level enhanced.
- iii. Participation in Fiscal Decentralization Strategy guideline preparation and testing supported.
- iv. Mechanism for vertical and horizontal communication, transparency, accountability and reporting in place

Component II: Local Revenue Enhancement

Specific expected outputs/results are as follows;

- i. Mechanisms established for enhanced policy exchange on local revenue generation and mobilization.
- ii. Operational guidelines for efficient revenue collection systems produced, tested and introduced for use by HLGs and LLGs
- iii. Local Capacity enhancement for professional property assessment and tax collection
- iv. Gender sensitive communication strategy for councils, taxpayers and collectors designed and implemented.
- v. Public and Private sector Partnerships (PPP) for revenue mobilization and generation enhanced.

Component III: Gender Mainstreaming

Specific outputs/results are as follows:

- i. MoGLSD capacity enhanced to achieve a more coherent policy environment for Gender Mainstreaming;
- ii. Gender mainstreamed in areas of planning, budgeting, implementation and M&E;
- iii. Local Capacity of gender key actors in gender analysis and gender mainstreaming increased.
- iv. Institutional mechanisms to support gender mainstreaming improved.

Component IV: Strengthening the Administration of the Local Courts

Specific outputs/result are as follows:

- i. Local Council Court strengthening Strategy developed and disseminated;
- ii. Operational guidelines for Local Council Court proceedings introduced and tested;
- iii. Capacity of Local governments for local Justice improved;
- iv. Community members sensitized on roles and responsibilities of Local Council Court System of local justice.

There were no major strategic changes adopted except under component1: the Mid-Review (August to September 2004) and the Tripartite review meeting (UNCDF, UNDP, MOLG, MOGLSD, LGFC, PCU) in May 2005 recommended the need to decentralize some of the implementation responsibilities to LGs.

There were no significant project revisions in terms of scope and direction. However, there were some budget revisions with a reduction in UNCDF earmarked funding.

2.4 Programme status:

Component I: Coordinated Participatory Planning and Budgeting (CPPB)

- Harmonized Participatory Planning Guidelines (HPPG) for lower local councils were developed, tested, refined and disseminated.
- The training of trainers (TOT) for training of Local Councils in the use of HPPG and a training module was completed.
- Environmental check lists were developed and disseminated to all programme districts to mainstream cross-cutting issues into planning and budgeting processes.
- Guidelines for appraisal of investment in the production sector were developed and disseminated.
- Fiscal Decentralization Strategy (FDS) manuals and guidelines were reproduced and disseminated.
- The communication guide has been rolled out to all the project areas.
- LG Planning Activities have continuously been followed and supported resulting into good achievement of the six target Districts in the National LG Assessment for the LGDP resources.

Component II: Local Revenue Enhancement

- The Local Revenue Enhancement Coordination Committee was established to promote dialogue and sharing of experiences.
- Inventory of best practices in local revenue mobilization, generation and management was completed and disseminated.

- The guidelines for implementation of the Best Practices in LRE were developed and disseminated.
- Radio talks were conducted to increase gender sensitive public awareness on the value of paying taxes. In addition exchange visits and round table discussions were conducted on revenue mobilization and generation.
- Reviewed the tendering and Contracts management in local revenue administration.

Component III: Gender Mainstreaming

- A Gender Task Force to support the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development to implement gender activities was set up and is effectively working.
- The National Gender Policy has been revised and an Action Plan for its implementation developed.
- The National Action Plan on Women was audited and guidelines for its implementation developed and disseminated.
- The Gender Planning and Budgeting guidelines were developed
- Gender Mainstreaming District Action Plans were developed.
- Gender Planning and Budgeting indicators have been developed and incorporated into the Harmonized Participatory Planning Guide.
- Sensitization workshops were conducted in the project areas, these involved training of technical staff and political authorities on gender analysis and planning and training of women leaders lobbying and advocacy and their roles in local government operations and practices.
- The Women leaders Forum were established and are operational at national level and also in the target districts.
- Mentoring of Local governments in gender mainstreaming was carried out in project districts.
- Basic institutional support and training was offered to the District Community Services Department, especially to Gender, Youth, Disability Community Development and Culture officers.
- Pre-Budget women caucus' were established and functional in the target districts

Component IV: Strengthening the Administration of the Local Courts

- Local Council Court Guide has been developed and distributed.
- A Training Manual for the Local Court Guide has been developed
- A training Manual has been translated into 9 key local languages.
- A District based ToT (comprising of District staff) has been created and;
- Training of Local Council Court members has been undertaken for the first time ever.
- Massive awareness messages have been broadcast on local radios for the benefit of the communities.

The monitoring visits have so far revealed that:

- The HPPG is a very popular instrument that is being used at the Lower Local Councils to sensitize the masses on planning for poverty eradication.
- The Local Council Courts in the DDPII districts were more active than in those Local Governments where the DDPII was not.

- The problems of local revenue mobilization were still prevailing with cases of politicization of tax management.
- The Local Governments were now practicing gender budgeting using the manuals developed under DDPII.

The evaluation team shall be able to access the reports on the four main components from the component managers, which outline the progress made during each reporting period/on a quarterly basis.

Mid-term evaluation – summary of issues raised during mid- term evaluation and how these were addressed/followed-up on

Co-ordinated Participatory Planning and Budgeting:

Within the context of this component, one of the key recommendations was the need to decentralize some of the implementation responsibilities to Local Governments. In line with this recommendation, a financial input of up to Ushs 500,000 was advanced to each of the Lower Local Governments in all the six project districts to support lower level training events, complete with backstopping support from the District Planning Unit.

Gender Mainstreaming Component

The MTR revealed that MGLSD did not have the capacity (in terms inadequate numbers of personnel to carry out all the “engendering” activities.

Actions taken include;

- * Component 1, 2 and 4 undertook the gender mainstreaming activities and strategies in their respective components. The Local council courts training and guides to consciously took into consideration gender issues and concerns.
The HPPG as well as the orientation training consciously integrated/mainstreamed gender in both the training and the guides.
The Local revenue enhancement had targeted gender sensitive radio programmes
- * Funds for conducting the quarterly district Gender/Women Leaders Forum, the Pre-Budget women caucus meetings and study tours were sent to the districts in order to operationalise the decentralisation of gender mainstreaming activities.
- * The component utilised the services and skills of the UNV that was attached to the UNDP/GOU Country Programme who was based within the MGLSD.
- * Outsourcing was effected and several outputs achieved such as the revision of the National Gender Policy, Development of planning and budgeting training manuals and guidelines were due to outsourcing in terms of consultants.

On deepening understanding of gender and mainstreaming capacity the following were undertaken.

- * Established gender/women leaders’ forum targeting key gender actors who are able to identify gender issues and propose relevant strategies and activities to address them.

- * Established a Pre-Budget women caucus charged with identifying critical gender to be addressed in the District Budgets and plans.
- * Introduced mentoring and support supervision in gender mainstreaming for Higher Local governments the results have been improved performance in gender mainstreaming in the LGDP annual assessments for instance in 2005/2006 five out of the six districts scored 10/10.
- * Intensified monitoring activities to Higher and Lower local governments for close follow up on the integration of the Gender mainstreaming action plans into the District Development Plans.

3. CONTENT AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

3.1 Key Evaluation Questions

Taking into account the implementation status of the programme and the resource disbursements made to date, the evaluation will explore the following questions:

3.1.1 Results Achievement

3.1.1.1 Has the programme made satisfactory progress in terms of achievement of programme outputs (as per logframe indicators and annual workplan targets) and related delivery of inputs and activities? How effectively and efficiently have results been achieved, and to what quality? (analyzed by output)

3.1.1.2 Given output achievement and related delivery of inputs and activities, what is the evidence that the programme has or is likely to attain its Immediate and Development Objectives? Specifically in this regard what is the evidence/likelihood that the programme will achieve its intended contribution, including to:

- Alleviating programme-relevant dimensions of poverty
- Improving access to infrastructure and services
- Achieving more equitable participation and distribution of benefits across gender, ethnic and socio-economic groups
- Influencing policy reforms and implementation that support effective decentralization
- Replication of the approach by Government and/or other donors.

3.1.1.3 Assess the performance of the programme with regard to the High-Level Outcome Indicators in the UNCDF Strategic Results Framework.

3.1.1.4 Are the results reported through the programme's monitoring/Management Information System validated by evaluative evidence? Analyze any discrepancies.

3.1.1.5 Assess the significant changes (positive and otherwise) in the country relating to decentralization and local development during the programme lifetime and assess the programme's contribution to these changes (i.e. the criticality of programme results). What level of value added and consequence can be attached to the programme in the area of decentralization in the country?

3.1.1.6 Assess the relative effectiveness and efficiency (cost-benefit, value for money) of the programme strategy compared to other strategies pursued by the Government, other donors or actors to achieve the same outcomes?

3.1.1.7 Is there evidence of any unintended negative effects of the programme?

- 3.1.1.8 What is the level of satisfaction of various programme stakeholders with the programme and the results achieved?
- 3.1.1.9 Have the agreed recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the programme been implemented? How has this affected programme performance, relevance, management etc?
- 3.1.1.10 Evaluate any other critical issues relating to results achievement (for example, time and cost effectiveness, quality of participation in different phases of planning, linkages between investment planning and budgeting and from local to regional/national planning frameworks, contribution of the programme to co-ordinated multi-sectoral planning, local resource mobilization, local governance culture and accountability, etc.)

3.2 Sustainability of Results

- 3.2.1 What is the likelihood that the programme results will be sustainable in the longer term, independent of external assistance, in terms of systems, impact on policy and replicability, institutions, capacity, local governance culture, financing, and in terms of benefits at the individual, household and community level?
- 3.2.2. Is there sufficient funding available (from the Government and/or donors) to support programme innovations in the pilot area, and the wider adoption or replication of the model piloted by the programme?
- 3.2.3 Are UNCDF and partner strategies for exit/further engagement appropriate with regards to promoting sustainability?

3.3. Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement

Was programme implementation and results achievement according to plan, or were there any obstacles/bottlenecks/issues on the UNCDF/Government/programme partner side that limited the successful implementation and results achievement of the programme?

3.3.1 External Factors:

- Has the policy environment had consequences for programme performance?
- To what extent does the broader *policy environment* remain conducive to the replication of the lessons learnt from the pilot programme?
- Are there *any other factors external to the programme* that have affected successful implementation and results achievement, and prospects for policy impact and replication?

3.3.2 Programme-related Factors:

3.3.2.1 Programme design (relevance and quality):

- Was the programme logic, design and strategy optimal to achieve the desired programme objectives/outputs, given the national/local context and the needs to be addressed?
- In assessing design consider, among other issues, whether relevant gender issues were adequately addressed in programme design.
- Is the programme rooted in and effectively integrated with national strategies (e.g. poverty reduction strategy) and UN planning and results frameworks (CCA, UNDAF) at country level?
- Have the programme's objectives remained valid and relevant? Has any

progress in achieving these objectives added significant value?

3.3.2.2 Institutional and implementation arrangements: Were the programme's institutional and implementation arrangements appropriate, effective and efficient for the successful achievement of the programme's objectives? Where there any institutional obstacles hindering the implementation/operations of the programme?

3.3.2.3 Programme management:

- Were the management arrangements for the programme adequate and appropriate?
- How effectively has the programme been managed at all levels? Is programme management results-based and innovative? Has financial management been sound?
- Have the programme's management systems, including M&E, reporting and financial systems functioned as effective management tools, and facilitated effective implementation of the programme.
- Have the programme's logical framework, performance indicators, baseline data and monitoring systems provided a sufficient and efficient basis for monitoring and evaluating programme performance? Has the M&E system supported effective programme management, corporate decision-making and learning?

3.3.2.4 Technical backstopping: Is technical assistance and backstopping from programme partners appropriate, adequate and timely to support the programme in achieving its objectives?

3.4 Strategic Positioning and Partnerships

3.4.1 Has UNCDF, through this programme and any other engagement in the country, optimally positioned itself strategically, with respect to:

- UNDP and other UN/donor/government efforts in the same sector in the country?
- Implementing national priorities, as reflected in national development strategies?
- UNCDF corporate priorities

3.4.2 Has UNCDF leveraged its comparative advantages to maximum effect?

3.4.3 Has UNCDF leveraged its current/potential partnerships to maximum effect?

3.5 Future UNCDF role

3.5.1 What are the remaining challenges and gaps in the area of decentralization in the country? How are various actors positioned to address these? Is there a conducive environment for further progress on decentralization? In light of the above, is there a future opportunity for UNCDF to add value following the end of the current programme? In what capacity?

3.5.2 Analyze and comment on any emerging vision, strategy and measures proposed for disengaging or continuing UNCDF's programming in the country.

3.5.3 What are findings and lessons from the final evaluation of the current programme that should influence any decision on a future role for UNCDF and its partners?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTS

To be incorporated by outsourced firm (based on design contained in Manual for Use by Team leaders being finalized by ECI)

5. COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION TEAM

5.1 Profile specification for Evaluation Team Leader

- International consultant with strong international comparative experience in the field of decentralization and local development including:
 - fiscal decentralization;
 - decentralized infrastructure and service delivery;
 - local government capacity building for decentralized public expenditure management and operationalization of decentralized systems of planning and budgeting;
 - policy, legal and regulatory reform related to decentralization;
 - rural development.
- Experience leading evaluations of decentralization and local development programme, including experience using a range of qualitative evaluation methodologies to assess programme results at individual/household, institutional, sector and policy level.
- Sound knowledge and awareness of issues related to gender and social inclusion.
- Through understanding of key elements of results-based programme management.
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking, and excellent analytical and writing skills.
- Strong task management and team leading competencies.
- Country/regional experience relative to the programme to be evaluated an advantage.
- Language skills relevant to the evaluation.

5.2 Profile specifications for Evaluation Team Members

- **Local Decentralization Specialist**, with experience in fiscal decentralization and good understanding of decentralization history, process, and issues in Uganda.
- **Specialist on Gender, Social inclusion and Participation**, to assess programme performance with respect to participation and service delivery process, level of satisfaction with the process and results, and outcome and impact of the programme, disaggregated by gender, socio-economic, ethnic status, etc.

6 WORKPLAN FOR THE EVALUATION MISSION

(Please see attached)

7 MISSION COSTS AND FINANCING

US\$90,000

Annex 1: Indicative documentation list

(1) UNCDF DOCUMENTS

All relevant programme-related documentation will be provided to the Evaluation Team. Documentation will include, at minimum:

- Programme document
- Previous evaluations
- Baseline study
- Technical studies
- Mission reports
- Annual work plans, progress reports (Management Information System reports) and financial reports
- Programme Audits
- Documentation, guidelines, studies produced by programme
- UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework for the programme country, CPAP
- UNCDF Strategic Results Framework
- UNCDF (2005) [Delivering the goods: Building Local Government Capacity to Achieve the MDGs - A Practitioner's Guide from UNCDF Experience in Least Developed Countries](#)
- UNCDF (2003) [Empowering the Poor: Local Governance for Poverty Reduction](#)
- UNCDF (2002) [UNCDF Strategy for Policy Impact and Replication](#)

(2) **Other relevant Non-UNCDF Documents**

The Decentralization Policy Strategic Framework

Local Government Sector Investment Plan 2006-2016

The Local Government Act, 1997

The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995

Annex 2

| Activity | Responsibility | # Work days | Schedule |
|---|----------------|-------------|---|
| A. CAPITAL | Team/UNCDF etc | Number | Date |
| ▪ Team Leader arrive | | Arrive am | 22 nd April 2007 |
| ▪ Preparation for evaluation: Internal meeting of evaluation team to | | | 23 rd April 2007 |
| ▪ Review documentation | | | |
| ▪ Refine and agree evaluation methodology, | | | |
| ▪ Discuss division of labour, etc | | | |
| ▪ Final planning meeting of evaluation team | | | 24 th April 2007 |
| ▪ Briefing meeting with Programme Officer / programme staff | | | |
| ▪ Security Briefing | | | |
| Meetings with National stakeholders | | | 25 th to 30 th April 2007 |
| Meetings with stakeholders at district and LL levels in 10 districts | | | 1 st to 16 th May 2007 |
| Data Analysis, report writing | | | 17 th to 22 nd May 2007 |
| National validation workshop | | | 23 rd May 2007 |
| Final meeting with UNCDF, implementing agencies and co-funding partners | | | 24 th May 2007 |
| Departure of evaluation team | | | 25 th May 2007 |