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**Definition of concepts:**

**Accountability:** Within the context of the project accountability goes beyond financial aspects to include dimensions of social accountability by the supplier of services against the expected results of the end beneficiaries.

**Demand for oversight services:** Where as the supply side of oversight services is established, the demand for oversight services needs nurturing through CSOs and support to Local Councils (local parliaments) so that they can enable the masses to articulate and publicize their needs as information is essential for planning and monitoring service delivery.

**Monitoring of service delivery:** This is one of the avenues that mandated oversight entities can use in carrying out the function of oversight. The current practice is that the oversight entities are supplied with reports on service delivery that are assessed and verified to ascertain quality of service delivery.

**Oversight services:** This is a function that calls for watching over or keeping an eye on service delivery by entities mandated by the constitution and Laws of Uganda. The oversight entities are at local level and national level.

**Separation of roles of civil society and public sector:** The Civil Society Organizations support the oversight role through monitoring service delivery and advocating for accountability on the other hand within the public sector specific entities are constitutionally mandated as oversight institutions and suppliers of oversight services.

# I. SITUATION ANALYSIS

This project is part of UNDP’s operations in Uganda that are guided by the 5 year Country Programme (CP) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), which are based on the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the National Development Plan (NDP). Accountable Democratic Governance is one of the components of the CPAP. One of the expected outcomes of this component is that capacity of selected government institutions and civil society is improved for good governance and the realization of human rights that lead to reducing geographic, socio-economic and demographic disparities in attainment of Millennium Declaration and Goals by 2014. One of the outputs identified in the CPAP that contributes to this outcome, is to develop capacity for selected oversight entities and CSOs to monitor service delivery.

This project is cognisant of the challenges mentioned in the National Development Plan (NDP). The NDP is anchored on the theme ‘Growth, Employment and socio-economic Transformation for prosperity’. The main aim of NDP is to address structural bottlenecks in the economy to accelerate socio-economic transformation for prosperity. One of the key constraints identified as part of NDP analysis is weak public sector management and administration with special focus on accountability and service delivery, corruption and low absorption capacities.

The Constitution of Uganda, and various policies, laws, procedures and standards that govern and give mandate to oversight entities are in place. Oversight entities are those institutions that are constitutionally and/or statutorily mandated, in varying ways, to oversee, monitor, regulate, harmonize and generally guide various public service delivery functions performed by specified institutions/entities within their respective sectors of state. Within this context, the key oversight agencies that are referred to include: the Parliament, NPA, IGG and Auditor General.

The NPA, which as established by Act No. 15 of 2002 in compliance with article 125 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995), is mandated to put in place, operationalize, supervise, monitor, evaluate and co-ordinate the national framework, systems and strategies for cost-effective and participatory national development planning in Uganda. Consultations undertaken during the formulation of this project document, noted that monitoring tools developed so far by NPA, do not yet have systems to enable NPA and other oversight entities as well as CSOs to work through a coordinated feed back process. A National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (2010) formulated by Office of the Prime Minister provides a framework for strengthening the coverage, quality and utility of the assessment of public policies and investments. The modalities for implementation of the strategies in this policy are yet to be finalised.

The mandate[[1]](#footnote-2) of Parliament is “to make laws on any matter for the peace, order, development and good governance of Uganda", and "to protect the Constitution and promote democratic governance in Uganda" and monitor all expenditure of public funds (article 164(3)). Specifically as an oversight entity, Parliament is mandated to scrutinise government policy and administration through: pre-legislative scrutiny of bills referred to the Parliamentary committees by Parliament; scrutinising of various objects of expenditure and the sums to be spent on each; assuring transparency and accountability in the application of public funds; scrutinising reports from different entities performing oversight reporting; monitoring the implementation of Government programmes and projects. Such a mandate is still faced with inadequate finances to work on empowering the public (service users) to demand for services and accountability.

Furthermore, the mandate/role[[2]](#footnote-3) of the Auditor General is “to provide an independent oversight of government operations through financial and other management audits”. The AG audits and reports on the public accounts of all public offices, as well as those of local councils however there is no established system for monitoring the implementation of recommendations arising from OAG reports. In addition, increasing number of districts has impacted on OAG’s ability to cover all the districts.

The mandate[[3]](#footnote-4) of the IGG is “to eliminate corruption, promote and foster the rule of law and principles of natural justice in public offices and enforce the leadership code of conduct”. However implementation of the recommendations of the IGG reports remains a challenge.

The Government of Uganda recognizes the important role of Non-State actors in accelerating the country’s development process. In this regard CSOs have a legal character and are recognized by the laws of Uganda especially the NGO Registration Act Cap 113 as amended in 2006. Additionally, the Local Government Act 1997 provides CSOs with an important role in service delivery at community level. Furthermore, Government, through the National Development Plan recognizes Civil Society as an important actor and influencer in the promotion of service delivery, policy research and conflict resolution. The NDP also makes specific commitments to support a comprehensive NGO sector survey to establish the value and contribution of the sector to Uganda’s development work with other actors to identify sustainable sources of funding for NGO work and ensure better coordination of NGO work in the country. Against this background CSOs have been active in influencing governance and development process, through mobilizing and obtaining views from citizens around topical debates, influencing public policy through engagement and advocacy on policy and monitoring the performance of the public sector in services provision. In this regard they are an important constituency in supporting the oversight function at the Local Government level.

As part of the formulation of the project, several documents have been reviewed and consultations/interviews were held which led to identification of following key challenges vis a vis the scope of outcome stated in the CPAP document:

1. Weak capacity for inspection and monitoring by accountability and oversight institutions and absence and low level of adherence to service delivery standards;
2. Quality of accountability is weak due to inadequate public involvement. Yet in cases within Uganda and other countries, where the public is aware and involved[[4]](#footnote-5), they are active participants in development processes in ways that benefit both the duty bearers and rights holders;
3. The need to strengthen national and district based platforms through which actors from CSOs and the public can advocate for effective and efficient oversight services;
4. Implementation of recommendations arising out of oversight reports
5. Districts (DPACs) have limited capacities to carry out oversight functions.
6. Attitude and mindsets of service providers as well as service beneficiaries.[[5]](#footnote-6)
7. Lack of information by the public to demand for services and accountability.

Further consultations undertaken during the formulation of this project document[[6]](#footnote-7), with oversight entities and those who demand for their services, indicated the following capacity needs, but not limited to the following:

1. Strengthening monitoring of service delivery through capacity building of oversight entities at national and local levels to execute their mandates and ensure that the service delivery standards are utilized by Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies as well as CSOs to inform oversight reporting;
2. Strengthening collaboration among the national oversight entities to collaborate as a way of developing synergies and build confidence of the Local level oversight entities;
3. Harnessing the efforts of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as key stakeholders through lobbying and educating the masses about demanding for oversight services.

Given the broad spectrum of challenges, UNDP support through this project will work on strengthening the capacity of selected national and local level oversight entities to monitor service delivery on the one hand, and build the capacity of the public and ordinary citizens to demand for services and accountability. Within this context, the Government of Uganda, UNDP and other donors[[7]](#footnote-8) who can co-finance this project, are driven by the need to have strengthened oversight entities that are able to supervise and monitor service delivery in order to ensure that there are accountability and transparency checks.

The primary focus is not on actual service delivery but on strengthening oversight functionalities; focussing on CSOs ability to demand for better services through the mobilization of citizens and creating spaces for their engagement with duty bearers; and strengthening critical institutional mechanisms for accountability in service delivery. Thus, this project involves bringing the 2 government arms: executive, legislature and the ‘third sector’ together for strengthening accountability for service delivery.

# II. PROJECT STRATEGY

The project is designed to contribute to the outcome of ensuring that selected local governments and national oversight entities have capacity and deliver accountable, inclusive and demand driven social and economic services. The project contributes to the CPAP output of developing capacity for selected oversight entities and CSOs to monitor service delivery. This output focuses on accountability mechanisms within the context of service delivery by strengthening capacity of select oversight institutions and CSOs at both national and local level. Given the key challenges identified above in the situation analysis, as a strategy following two key **entry points** dealing with strengthening policy and capacity development have been identified for the project:

**Strengthening Policy development**

* Collaborative framework amongst national oversight entities;
* Service delivery standards for sectors;
* Institutional mechanisms for public and citizen empowerment through select CSOs.

**Strengthening Capacities**

* Capacity to coordinate and collaborate amongst selected oversight entities – Parliament, NPA and the National NGO Forum;
* CSOs ability to fill critical ‘information gaps’ for efficient policy design and implementation.

Both these entry points while on the one hand assist in strengthening overall oversight mechanisms in the country; also assist in building critical capacity gaps within individual agencies for delivering on mandates specific to oversight functionalities.

Project is informed by a 3 - prong strategy:

For strengthening the delivery of social and economic services there is a need to bring together the key players in the supply and demand side of accountable service delivery.

Secondly, as a strategy - it is further proposed that UNDP efforts concentrate on developing the social accountability dimensions of oversight functionalities as opposed to financial accountability dimensions of oversight functionalities given the long history of engagement with the financial accountability institutions in the previous CPAP and CCF;

Project will have to focus on select sectors

To undertake the project interventions, following the E-PAC meeting, Parliament has been identified as the most appropriate implementing partner for the project. Given the scope of project activities and the need to strengthen collaboration – National Planning Authority and the National NGO Forum have been identified as Responsible Parties[[8]](#footnote-9).

The goal of the project is to promote democratic governance by improving oversight functions that ultimately enhances delivery of accountable, inclusive and demand driven social and economic services.

The immediate objectives of the project are:

* To improve oversight reporting on service delivery by National Planning Authority, the National NGO Forum, Parliament Commission and selected Committees of Parliament;
* To strengthen collaboration among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery;
* To strengthen mechanisms for the public to demand for services and accountability from the oversight and accountability entities through CSO under the coordination of the National NGO Forum.

**Output statement in CPAP**

**Outcome statement in CPAP**

**Conducive policy environment and National capacities for strengthening oversight functions**

***Strengthening Policy Development – Entry points***

Oversight reporting on service delivery by key national oversight entities

Functional collaborative framework amongst national oversight entities

Institutional mechanisms for public to demand for accountability from oversight entities

***Strengthening National capacities – Entry points***

Capacity needs assessment for strengthening oversight functions involving NPA (executive), Parliament (legislature) and NGO Forum (for the ‘third sector)

Capacity building programme for strengthening oversight functions involving NPA (executive), Parliament (legislature) and National NGO Forum (for the ‘third sector’)

Partnership strategy for collaboration amongst oversight bodies (national and local level)

The different project outputs that will contribute to the outcome in line with the UNDP’s niche include the following:

**Output 1: Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014**

This output will deal with assessment of capacity of NPA against the stated mandates and roles in order to improve on oversight reporting. This will result into a capacity building programme that will be implemented under this project to address capacity gaps of NPA in reporting against established service delivery standards, as well as maintaining quality standards in reporting. The service delivery standards vary across the sectors. Through this output, NPA will coordinate the gathering and harmonisation of the various sector specific standards on service delivery and ensure that they are disseminated and utilised to inform oversight reports and planning. This output also emphasises the quality aspects of reports generated from the sectors.

**Output 2: A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014**

This output will work on building upon and strengthening the contribution of the national oversight entities in their various roles towards strengthening better social and economic service delivery. This collaborative effort will be managed and guided by the Clerk to Parliament’s Office as a platform to ensure that oversight services improves and results are documented and disseminated. Under this output one of the key activities is on supporting the ***National Oversight Entities Working Group*** that brings together the oversight entities.

Some of the proposed activities include:

1. Assess and build the capacity of select parliamentary committees performing oversight functions and linkages with sectors;
2. Diagnose problems in functioning of service delivery starting from the local to national level and prioritizing these challenges in order to work towards improving oversight service delivery
3. Hold Joint review meetings to assess performance and set targets for the in-coming year
4. Hold Quarterly technical review meetings to assess progress against the set targets
5. Interact regularly with select local level parliaments in regard to the joint assessment of service quality, availability and access.
6. Periodic follow-up visits to select local level parliaments on the issues raised in the monitoring reports on service delivery by national parliament and build capacity of selected local government parliaments through interactions.

**Output 3: Participation and input of the public through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014**

This output will work on building upon and strengthening the contribution of the CSOs working in the oversight service delivery and also strengthen the capacity of the population to demand for better services.

Key in taking the above commitment forward is the strengthening of a national CSO service delivery and accountability framework and platform to generate authentic and independent citizen and public feedback on the quality of service delivery and the effectiveness of delivery channels. Civil Society Organisations have already embarked on establishing an Accountability Platform and this effort will be linked to the activities of national oversight entities working group.

The project will work on supporting this collaborative initiative through:

1. Strengthening institutional linkages (sector specific) between CSOs and select national oversight entities for strengthening service delivery mechanisms;
2. Disseminating findings and feedback generated from the mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability;
3. Evaluating the mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability together with the National Oversight Entities Working Group.
4. Tracking the issues raised from national and local PACs and advocating for the same.

**Partnership strategy**

As identified above, the project will be implemented by three players: Parliament, National Planning Authority and National NGO Forum. All the proposed players have a critical role to play in the machinery of oversight functionalities in the country. It is further expected that the proposed partnership (which is a capacity building intervention) will also create space for sustainable institutional linkages for enhanced oversight (going beyond the scope and timeframe of project) – at both national and local levels.

The Parliament has been selected as implementing partner because of mandate as being the key national oversight entity in the country. The select committees of parliament i.e. committees that support the functions of oversight service delivery and parliament’s commission will be the areas of focus/ points of entry for this project.

NPA as one of the responsible parties has received support from UNDP to develop a monitoring framework and tools for the NDP, however, through this project, focus is on NPA further ensuring service delivery standards across the sectors are consolidated, disseminated and included in the M&E system and tools for by monitoring the overall progress of NDP.

The National NGO Forum as a responsible party because of their role in coordinating civil society as agents involved in stimulating public engagement in demand of oversight services. The National NGO Forum will convene and coordinate other NGOs and civil society organisations working on monitoring service delivery and through them work to strengthen the demand aspect for oversight services. For improvement in monitoring service delivery and sustainability it is imperative the supply and demand sides are addressed in any intervention.

National Oversight Entities working group and CSO Platform are 2 key institutional systems focussed on in this project for ensuring effective involvement of all key players and implementation of project in a participatory manner.

Along with the above identified players, project interventions will focus on developing inclusive partnerships, through working groups and joint technical committees, with other key players like: Inspectorate of Government, Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda Local Government Finance Commission (UGLFC), Auditor General, President’s office and other constitutionally mandated oversight entities. Effort will be made to ensure that all these agencies work with interlinked institutions like Uganda Local Governments Association (ULGA), Urban Authorities Association of Uganda (UAAU); among others.

On the side of non state actors, the project will work with the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) through the National NGO Forum to improve effectiveness of demand for services and accountability. The National NGO Forum will act as a Convening Platform for other civil society organisations and networks active in service delivery monitoring and accountability, including, but not limited to the Uganda Debt Network, Anti-Corruption Coalition, DENIVA, Uganda Joint Christian Council and other institutions active in the area of monitoring service delivery (including Uganda journalists association (UJA).

UNDP, as part of project management structure, will also ensure that the project interventions are not duplicated and are complementary (as opposed to competition) to existing donor programmes. 2 key programmes: Democratic Governance Facility (successor programme of the current Deepening Democracy Programme) and European Union engagement with CSOs - both programmes with significant components focussing on strengthening accountability – have been identified to work closely. In addition, GIZ is also working on governance in specific districts in the Teso-region. DANIDA, USAID, Netherland’s Development Fund are supporting oversight entities, especially those who work in governance related areas. This UNDP project can gain from such work which is already planned and/or being implemented, by discussing and planning together with the other donors to strengthen co-ordination of activities.

**Project Beneficiaries**

The direct project beneficiaries are on one hand the line ministries, departments and agencies whose capacities will be built to improve their reporting on the implementation of the NDP. The National Oversight Entities Working Group as a platform that watches over the national oversight entities is a beneficiary because its functionality will be strengthened through this project. The selected committees of parliament, parliament’s commission, the National NGO Forum and NPA are also beneficiaries because their capacities too will be built to improve oversight reporting.

In addition, the citizens of Uganda and the local level parliaments will also benefit from project interventions given the institutional linkages component. Through the efforts of the National NGO Forum and the select committees of parliament, opportunities for demanding effective oversight services will increase.

# III. Results and Resources Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resource Framework:**  Capacity of selected local governments and oversight entities built and delivering accountable, inclusive and demand-driven social and economic services | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:**  Legal frameworks, structures and oversight functions harmonized for strengthened service delivery. | | | | |
| **Applicable Key Result Area (Strategic Plan):** Accountable Democratic Governance | | | | |
| **Partnership Strategy:** The project will be implemented by three players: Parliament, National Planning Authority and National NGO Forum. | | | | |
| **Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID):** Strengthening oversight functions for accountable service delivery | | | | |
| **INTENDED OUTPUTS** | **OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)** | **INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTIES** | **INPUTS** |
| **Output 1**  Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014  **Baseline:**  Weak capacity for inspection, monitoring and reporting on service delivery  Absence of service delivery standards  **Indicators:**  Number of oversight reports improved and utilized  Number of service delivery standards adhered to in the oversight reports | **Targets 2011**  Capacity assessment report of NPA for performing oversight functions undertaken | 1. Carry out a capacity needs assessment of NPA 2. Institutional linkages among NPA, Parliament and National NGO Forum established | *NPA* | *200,000* |
| **Targets 2012**  Report on consolidated sector specific service delivery standards in selected key sectors | 1. Carry out a study to establish sector specific service delivery standards 2. Develop reporting formats for implementation of sector specific service delivery standards 3. Disseminate service delivery standards | *NPA* | *350,000* |
| 1. Develop capacity building programme for NPA in complement of the ACBF supported initiative. | *NPA* | *50,000* |
| **Target 2013**  Report on consolidated sector specific service delivery standards in selected key sectors | 1. Carry out a study to establish sector specific service delivery standards 2. Develop reporting formats for implementation of sector specific service delivery standards 3. Disseminate service delivery standards | *NPA* | *350,000* |
| 1. Implement capacity building programme for NPA that is in complement and does not duplicate the ACBF supported initiative. | *NPA* | *200,000* |
| **Target 2014**  No. of consolidated sector specific oversight reports on service delivery produced | 1. Disseminate service delivery standards | *NPA* | *200,000* |
| 1. Sector specific oversight reports produced 2. Monitoring and Evaluation | *NPA* | *150,000* |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | | **1,500,000** | |
| **Output 2**  A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014  **Baseline:**  Weak capacity for inspection and monitoring by accountability and oversight institutions  Adhoc inter-phase among oversight entities.  **Indicator:**  Institutional platform functional | **Targets 2011**  Capacity assessment report of Parliament and Parliamentary committees for performing oversight functions undertaken  An Institutional platform for monitoring oversight entities established | 1. Carry out a capacity needs assessment of Parliament and parliamentary committees 2. Develop capacity building programme for Parliament and Parliamentary Committees 3. Diagnose and prioritize challenges in the functionality of oversight entities for service delivery 4. Support institutional platform - *National Oversight Entities Working Group* - to draw consultative workplan on addressing challenges 5. Strengthen linkages with Local Councils (local parliaments) & DPAC 6. Strengthen linkages with Civil Society Organisations in a systematic and coordinated manner | *Parliamentary Commission* | *300,000* |
| **Target 2012**  Capacity building programme for Parliament and Committees for oversight functionalities developed  An institutional platform for monitoring oversight entities functional | 1. Implement capacity building programme for Parliament and Parliamentary Committees (focusing on service delivery standards and linkages with CSOs) | *Parliamentary Commission* | *500,000* |
| 1. Implement workplan of institutional platform - *National Oversight Entities Working Group* 2. Hold joint review meetings with national oversight entities to assess performance of sectors & prioritize interventions for next fiscal cycle 3. Develop, build consensus and disseminate modalities of joint assessment of service quality, availability and access 4. Strengthen linkages with Local Councils (local parliaments) & DPAC | *Parliamentary Commission* | *500,000* |
| **Target 2013**  No. of joint sector review meetings with national oversight entities held and No. of reports reviewed | 1. Implement capacity building programme for Parliament and Parliamentary Committees (focusing on service delivery standards and linkages with CSOs) | *Parliamentary Commission* | *400,000* |
| 1. Implement workplan of institutional platform - *National Oversight Entities Working Group* 2. Hold joint review meetings with national oversight entities to assess performance of sectors & prioritize interventions for next fiscal cycle 3. Develop, build consensus and disseminate modalities of joint assessment of service quality, availability and access 4. Strengthen linkages with Local Councils (local parliaments) & DPAC | *Parliamentary Commission* | *400,000* |
| **Target 2014**  No. of joint sector review meetings with national oversight entities held and No. of reports reviewed | 1. Hold joint review meetings with national oversight entities to assess performance of sectors & prioritize interventions for next fiscal cycle | *Parliamentary Commission* | *250,000* |
| 1. Strengthen linkages with local level parliaments and DPAC 2. Monitoring and Evaluation 3. Audit | *250,000* |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | | **2,600,000** | |
| **Output 3:**  Participation and input of the public through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014  **Baseline:**  Inadequate public participation in demand for accountability  **Indicators**  Mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for oversight services disseminated | **Target 2011**  Capacity assessment report of CSOs for performing oversight/ monitoring functions | 1. Identification of CSOs supporting the oversight functions at the national and district levels, and in the selected sectors. 2. Carry out a capacity needs assessment of CSOs (that are members of the accountability platform)for performing oversight/monitoring functions 3. Institutional linkages among NPA, Parliament and the National NGO Forum established 4. Support Civil Society Accountability Platform and its linkages with national oversight entities working group 5. Complete CSO service delivery monitoring tools and pretest them in the field 6. Operationalisation of the CSO - Parliament Interface MoU Strengthening collaboration among CSOs to foster demand side service delivery and accountability. | *National NGO-Forum (as the coordinator of CSOs)* | *50,000* |
| **Target 2012**  Number of mechanisms for empowering public to demand identified  A CSO forum on monitoring service delivery functional with linkages to *National Oversight Entities Working Group* | 1. Conduct citizen led monitoring of service delivery in the selected sectors and districts and organise sector specific public interface meetings 2. Document existing practices and state of capacity of the public in selected sectors to demand for services and accountability from the oversight entities and responsible service delivery entities. 3. Working with CSOs on the Accountability Platform, evaluate the mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability. | *National NGO-Forum (as the coordinator of CSOs)* | *250,000* |
| **Targets 2013**  Number of mechanisms for empowering public to demand identified  A CSO forum on monitoring service delivery functional with linkages to *National Oversight Entities Working Group* | 1. Conduct citizen led monitoring of selected service delivery sectors and organise sector specific public interface meetings. 2. Document existing practices and state of capacity of the public in selected sectors to demand for services and accountability from the oversight entities and responsible service delivery entities. 3. Extensively disseminate monitoring findings and stimulate citizen debate and action to improve service delivery. 4. Evaluate the mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability | *National NGO-Forum (as the coordinator of CSOs)* | *250,000* |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | | **550,000** | |
| Total | | | **4,650,000** | |

# IV. Annual Work Plans

**Year: June to December 2011**

| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1:** Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014 | Activity Result: Number of reports to NPA with Service delivery standards incorporated | | | | | | | | |
| Carry out a capacity assessment of the NPA and develop a capacity building programme |  |  |  |  | NPA | UNDP | Contractual services | 120,000 |
| Carry out a study to establish sector specific service delivery standards |  |  |  |  | UNDP/ GoU | Contractual services | 80,000 |
| **Output 2:** A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Activity Result: An Institutional platform for monitoring oversight entities established | | | | | | | | |
| Carry out a capacity assessment of select parliamentary committees and develop a capacity building programme |  |  |  |  | Parliament | UNDP | Contractual services | 160,000 |
| Diagnose and prioritize challenges experienced in the functionality of monitoring service delivery |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Contractual services | 20,000 |
| Support the National oversight entities working group to draw up a consultative work plan on addressing prioritized challenges |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 460,000 |

**Year: 2012**

| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1:** Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014 | Activity Result: Number of reports to NPA with service delivery standards utilized | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2012 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  | NPA | UNDP | Training | 200,000 |
| Disseminate the identified service delivery standards through media houses |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Contractual services | 360,000 |
| **Output 2:** A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Activity Result: Institutional platform for monitoring oversight entities functional | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2012 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 400,000 |
| Review performance of the national oversight entities in FY 2011/12 and prioritize interventions for FY 2012/13 |  |  |  |  | Parliament | UNDP | Contractual services | 160,000 |
| Develop, build consensus and disseminate modalities of joint assessment of service quality, availability and access |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 20,000 |
| Carry out periodic follow-up visits to select local parliaments on issues raised in the oversight monitoring reports |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 240,000 |
| **Output 3:** Participation and input of the public through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Number of mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability recommended | | | | | | | | |
| Support the forum for CSOs working in the oversight sector to collate interventions, successes and challenges experienced |  |  |  |  | National NGO Forum |  |  | 20,000 |
| Assess the existing practices and state of capacity of the public in selected localities to demand for services and accountability |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40,000 |
| Evaluate the mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,460,000 |

**Year: 2013**

| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1:** Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014 | Activity Result: Number of reports to NPA with service delivery standards utilized | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2013 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  | NPA | UNDP | Training | 150,000 |
| Educate the selected Local Parliaments on the utilization of the service delivery standards |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Workshops | 100,000 |
| NPA to develop reporting formats for that utilize the service delivery standards |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Workshops | 100,000 |
| **Output 2:** A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Activity Result: Institutional platform for monitoring by oversight entities functional | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2013 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Training | 260,000 |
| Review the performance of the national oversight entities in FY 2012/13 and prioritize interventions for FY 2013/14 |  |  |  |  | Parliament | UNDP | Contractual services | 240,000 |
| Hold quarterly review meetings to assess progress against set targets |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 80,000 |
| Develop and disseminate Accountability sector performance reports |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120,000 |
| Carry out periodic follow-up visits to select local parliaments on issues raised in the oversight monitoring reports |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 120,000 |
| **Output 3:** Participation and input of the public through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Number of mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability implemented | | | | | | | | |
| Disseminate findings and feedback generated from mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability |  |  |  |  | National NGO Forum |  |  | 220,000 |
| Track issues raised from national and local PACs and provide feedback to the masses |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |
| Hold meetings between the National oversight entities working group and the CSO fora on oversight service provision |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40,000 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,480,000 |

**Year: 2014**

| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1:** Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014 | Activity Result: Number of reports to NPA with service delivery standards utilized | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2014 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  | NPA | UNDP | Training | 100,000 |
| Educate the selected LPAC on the utilization of the service delivery standards - |  |  |  |  |  | Workshops | 70,000 |
| NPA to revise and improve reporting formats for that utilize the service delivery standards |  |  |  |  | UNDP | Workshops | 30,000 |
| **Output 2:** A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Activity Result: Institutional platform for monitoring by oversight entities functional | | | | | | | | |
| Implement the 2014 capacity building programme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100,000 |
| Review the performance of the national oversight entities in FY 2012/13 and prioritize interventions for FY 2013/14 |  |  |  |  | Parliament | UNDP | Contractual services | 160,000 |
| Hold quarterly review meetings to assess progress against set targets |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 40,000 |
| Develop and disseminate national oversight performance reports |  |  |  |  |  |  | 250,000 |
| Carry out periodic follow-up visits to select local parliaments on issues raised in the oversight monitoring reports |  |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 70,000 |
| **Output 3:** Participation and input of the public through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014 | Institutional platform for monitoring by oversight entities functional | | | | | | | | |
| Facilitate the institutional platform to conduct regular meetings with the CSO for a |  |  |  |  | National NGO Forum |  |  | 35,000 |
| Develop and disseminate progress reports from the Institutional Platform activities |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70,000 |
| Develop and disseminate progress reports from the activities of empowering the public to effectively and sustainably demand for services and accountability |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |
| Support media houses to keep track of the issues and update the masses |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,060,000 |

# V. Management Arrangements

As identified in the CPAP, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED), through ALD, will be the Executing Agency.

Project organisation structure is informed by UNDP POPP guidelines.

**Project Manager**

Directorate of PDCO

**Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiary**

Representatives of Parliamentary Commission, Board of NPA and Board of NGO forum

**Executive**

Office of Clerk to Parliament

**Senior Supplier**

UNDP

**Project Assurance**

*UNDP – Governance Unit*

**Project Support**

Staff

**Project Organisation Structure**

**Responsible Parties**

National Planning Authority & NGO Forum

**The Project Board**

A multi-stakeholder Project Board comprising of the executive and chaired by the Parliament, the senior supplier as UNDP and the senior beneficiaries as Chairperson of the selected Parliamentary Committees and representatives from the CSO forum. The Project Board will be the highest policy organ of the project management structure responsible for overseeing the implementation of project.

Project Board’s main functions will include provision of policy, strategic and functional direction and guidance to the project (including making all the necessary policy-level decisions and approvals); as well as being responsible for overall coordination among all national stakeholders, with respect to project matters.

**The Project Manager**

Parliamentary Commission shall be the Implementing Partner/Agency of the project and will support and coordinate delivery of all project outputs. The Parliamentary Commission shall, accordingly, host and oversee the day to day implementation of the project and will sub-contract project work and other requirements to Responsible Parties as necessary, in accordance with the legal framework of UNDP and Government of Uganda. On an annual basis, project manager in close consultation with the RPs will prepare and submit one annual work plan to UNDP which will be the basis for annual financial allocations.

Specific responsibilities will include:

1. Manage and ensure the realization of project activities and achieve project outputs.
2. Coordinate closely with key relevant stakeholders.
3. Provide guidance and direction to the project support team and consultants.
4. Responsible for the overall project administration and managing risks.
5. Monitor financial resources and accounting to ensure accuracy and reliability of finance reports and also prepare quarterly progress reports as well as end of project reports.
6. Participate in relevant UNDP planning and progress reporting events/activities for purposes of establishing synergy with other projects.
7. Prepare quarterly and annual planning and review reports and submit to the project steering committee.
8. At the closing stage, prepare final project review report and undertake the mandatory closure processes as stipulated by UNDP.

**Responsible Parties**

As identified above, NPA and National NGO Forum will act as responsible parties for implementation of outputs 1 and 3 respectively.

UNDP POPP guidelines will be followed in deriving working relationships between the IP and RPs.

**UNDP Project Assurance functions**

The UNDP will provide technical assistance when needed and requested for. In addition, the UNDP will provide periodic monitoring and evaluation of the project implementation, to ensure that the project is on track and secondly to ensure that the project is contributing to the CPAP outputs and UNDAF outcomes.

Specific responsibilities will include:

1. Maintenance of thorough liaison throughout the project amongst the different members of the project and ensure information flow to the PSC on quality of implementation.
2. Risks are controlled and monitored and activities implemented in a timely manner.
3. Project fits into the overall National Development Plan and Country Programme.
4. Quality management procedures as stipulated in the project documents are followed.
5. Project Steering Committee decisions are followed.
6. Project Output decisions and activity definitions including description and quality criteria are recorded in ATLAS project management module to facilitate monitoring and porting.
7. Ensure project quarterly and annual reports are prepared in accordance with the standards of UNDP.
8. Performing Monitoring and on-spot visits.
9. On closure of the project, ensure project is operationally closed in ATLAS, ensure all financial transactions are in ATLAS and accounts closed financially in ATLAS.

**Audit arrangements**

To ensure effective use of project resources, at least one project audit will be conducted by legally recognized Auditor of Government, or by a private Auditor engaged by Government and UNDP in the project life cycle or as required, based on the risk level of UNDP Uganda.  In accordance with the provisions of the signed CPAP, special project audits by external auditors may be called upon by UNDP. The IP has audit obligations to: prepare in a timely manner all books of accounts and other financial records to facilitate scheduled and special audits; receive and review the audit report issued by the auditors; provide timely statement of the acceptance or rejection of any audit recommendations to UNDP; undertake timely actions to address the audit recommendations; and report on the actions taken to implement accepted recommendations to UNDP as required.

**Project Funding**

Project funds shall be allocated annually based on an approved AWP and the IP shall be advanced funds on a quarterly basis based on an approved quarterly work plan. In this case, the IP shall submit to UNDP a draft work plan within 15 days to the end of the quarter.

**Financial accountability**

The IP will be responsible for ensuring that all the resources allocated for project implementation against the AWPs are effectively and efficiently utilized for undertaking planned project activities. In executing its role the, IP will also be responsible for maintaining up-to-date records and necessary controls for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of all financial information with regard to the implementation of the AWP. This will require, inter alia, that the IP’s accounting system shall ensure that all disbursements are within approved budgets and shall track all advances received and disbursed, as well as all other related project financial transactions.

**Reporting**

Subsequent upon requesting for and receiving project funds from UNDP, the IP shall regularly submit to UNDP quarterly and annual progress reports with regards to activities, achievements, results and challenges, in accordance with UNDP guidelines and formats. In addition, UNDP shall organize periodic review meetings and project visits with the IP to assess the reported progress. At the closure of the project an end of project report shall be prepared and submitted to UNDP.

Similarly, with respect to financial reporting and in accordance with UNDP financial regulations and the Harmonized Approached to Cash Transfer (HACT) guidelines, the IP shall, on a quarterly basis request for funds and submit accountability to UNDP using the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditure (FACE) report that will be provided by UNDP. In submitting accountability, the IP shall provide the FACE form together with other documents including detailed breakdown of expenditure, Bank Statement, Bank Reconciliation Statement and quarterly progress report. This shall be submitted within fifteen days after end of the quarter.

 Upon completion/termination of the project, the IP shall prepare a financial and end of project report that shall be submitted to the UNDP within a maximum of one month after completion/termination of the project, including a complete inventory of project equipment and other supplies.

# VI. Monitoring Framework And Evaluation

## 6.1. Overview

Project Monitoring and Evaluation will be managed and carried out in accordance with the established National Execution and UNDP procedures.

In order to ensure effective M&E, efforts shall be made to ensure that all indicators of performance that will be assigned to each project output shall meet the basic standards of the ideal Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), which are instrumental in facilitating precise ‘measurement’ of actual project performance at any point in the project cycle, namely; Quality, Quantity & Time (QQT); and Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound (SMART). Project Monitoring and Evaluation will have both the on-going monitoring and reporting component and the Independent M&E components. In accordance with the programming policies and procedures outlined in the UNDP User Guide, the project will be monitored through the following:

Within the annual cycle

* On a quarterly basis, a quality assessment shall record progress towards the completion of key results, based on quality criteria and methods captured in the Quality Management table below.
* Based on the initial risk analysis submitted (see annex 2), a risk log shall be activated in Atlas and regularly updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation.
* Based on the above information recorded in Atlas, a Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) shall be submitted by the Project Manager to the Project Board through Project Assurance, using the standard report format available in the Executive Snapshot.
* A project Lesson-learned log shall be activated and regularly updated to ensure on-going learning and adaptation within the organization, and to facilitate the preparation of the Lessons-learned Report at the end of the project
* A Monitoring Schedule Plan shall be activated in Atlas and updated to track key management actions/events

Annually

* **Annual Review Report**. An Annual Review Report shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Board and the Outcome Board. As minimum requirement, the Annual Review Report shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the QPR covering the whole year with updated information for each above element of the QPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level.
* **Annual Project Review**. Based on the above report, an annual project review shall be conducted during the fourth quarter of the year or soon after, to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year. In the last year, this review will be a final assessment. This review is driven by the Project Board and may involve other stakeholders as required. It shall focus on the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and that these remain aligned to appropriate outcomes.
* **Audit Report.** The project will be subjected to annual audit in accordance with UNDP and GoU procedures

## 6.2 Sustainability and Exit Strategy

Sustainability will be addressed at the systems, entity and selected oversight entities. The Project will utilize existing capacities and structures in the selected parliamentary committees, parliamentary commission and National Planning Authority as suppliers of oversight services. It will also harness and build upon the CSOs efforts in educating the masses to demand for oversight services. The proposed institutional platform for national oversight entities and that of CSOs will build a collaborative effort that will promote synergies and hence in the process improve service delivery. The assurance of availability of funds for the components/activities is crucial to the success of this project. It is also important that the government counterparts devote full time in the implementation of the project.

The Project will be implemented and rolled out through both national and civil society institutions (Parliament, NPA and National NGO Forum) that are legitimate and their time horizons are more permanent and will continue to exist after the end of the project. The selected Project activities are feasible from a financial, technological and human resource point of view. The activities are capable of being effectively implemented by sited national and civil society institutions to improve monitoring and reporting of oversight entities. There is commitment from the national oversight entities to improve and enable the local level oversight entities to improve and ensure that the masses receive quality services.

With the oversight monitoring reports improved and being utilized as a result of the tools disseminated to national level line ministries, departments and agencies. The national level oversight entities e.g. IGG, Auditor General, Accountant General and Parliament will be fed with informative reports that guide oversight monitoring.

However, there is need for further interventions in possible subsequent projects that look to develop and disseminate tools for the local level oversight entities. It is important that the local level oversight entities’ capacities are built to monitor and report on service delivery since the delivery of services is decentralized. There is need to strengthen the processes of following through with concerns raised in oversight reports and by oversight entities. Through this process, the confidence of the masses will be further built to demand for accountability and oversight services.

# Quality Management for Project Activity Results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OUTPUT 1: Oversight reporting on service delivery and quality of oversight reports by National Planning Authority improved by 2014** | | | | |
| **Activity Result**  **(Atlas Activity ID)** | *Tools for monitoring service delivery disseminated* | | Start Date: June 2011  End Date: Dec. 2014 | |
| **Purpose** | *To improve the monitoring and reporting of service delivery by NPA as an oversight entity* | | | |
| **Description** | *The activity will involve capacity building of NPA to improve in oversight monitoring and reporting roles.*  *Consolidate the sector specific service delivery standards for dissemination and education of lower level users* | | | |
| **Quality Criteria** | | **Quality Method** | | **Date of Assessment** |
| Capacity development agenda developed  Service delivery standards utilized in oversight reports | | Capacity needs assessment report  Oversight reports from ministries and sectors including service delivery standards | | Dec. 2011  Dec. 2012, Dec. 2013 & Dec. 2014 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OUTPUT 2: A functional collaborative framework among national oversight entities to improve monitoring of service delivery strengthened by 2014** | | | |
| **Activity Result**  **(Atlas Activity ID)** | *Institutional platform for monitoring oversight entities established and functional* | | Start Date: June 2011  End Date: Dec. 2014 |
| **Purpose** | *To have collaborative efforts and synergies among national oversight entities as an avenue for improving monitoring service delivery* | | |
| **Description** | *The activity will involve capacity building of parliament-PACs & NPA to enable them improve their monitoring and reporting roles.*  *Through supporting the National oversight entities working group, ensure that issues of monitoring service delivery by national oversight entities are prioritized and discussed* | | |
| **Quality Criteria** | | **Quality Method** | **Date of Assessment** |
| Capacity development agenda developed  National Oversight entities are represented and working as one with the National oversight entities working group | | Capacity needs assessment report  Joint review proceedings | Dec. 2011  Dec. 2012, Dec. 2013 Dec. 2014 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OUTPUT 3: Increased input from participation of the public working through CSOs to demand for oversight service delivery strengthened by 2014** | | | | |
| **Activity Result**  **(Atlas Activity ID)** | *Mechanisms for empowering the public to demand for services and accountability utilized* | | Start Date: Jan 2012  End Date: Dec. 2014 | |
| **Purpose** | *Through existing mechanisms build the capacity of the public to demand for services and accountability.* | | | |
| **Description** | *NPA through working with CSOs (represented on the accountability platform) will use mechanisms that encourage the public to inform the budgeting process and also provide feedback to the public. The CSOs’ interventions will be focused on building the capacity of the public to demand for services and accountability* | | | |
| **Quality Criteria** | | **Quality Method** | | **Date of Assessment** |
| Mechanisms to be used in the empowering of the public to demand identified and implemented | | CSO and NPA reports | | Dec. 2012, Dec. 2013 & 2014 |
| CSOs are effectively represented on the National Oversight Entities Working Group | | Proceedings of the sector working group’s meetings | | Dec. 2013 & 2014 |

# VII. Legal Context

**If the country has signed the** [***Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA)***](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/SBAA.pdf)**, the following standard text must be quoted:**

This document together with the CPAP signed by the Government and UNDP which is incorporated by reference constitute together a Project Document as referred to in the SBAA [or other appropriate governing agreement] and all CPAP provisions apply to this document.

Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the implementing partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the implementing partner’s custody, rests with the implementing partner.

The implementing partner shall:

1. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
2. assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document”.

# VII. ANNEXES

# ANNEX 2: OFFLINE RISK LOG

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title: Strengthening oversight and monitoring functions for service delivery** | | | | | | **Award ID:** | | | **Date:** | | |
| **#** | **Description** | **Date Identified** | **Type** | **Impact &**  **Probability** | **Countermeasures / Mngt response** | | **Owner** | **Submitted, updated by** | | **Last Update** | **Status** |
| 1 | Discrepancy in mandates between oversight entities (OPM and NPA) | Feb-2011-After the formulation of the policy on monitoring public finance and accountability by OPM | Operational | Middle since the concerned institutions are aware and they are in process of holding dialogue. If not sorted out, it will hinder harmonisation of systems and tools for monitoring  P =3  I = 4 | The concerned entities are willing to sort out any discrepancy in mandates and operations | | Project board (especially executive with support from UNDP) | Consultants during consultations with oversight entities | | March 2011 | In process of negotiation |
| 2 | Local level oversight entities are many due to increase in number of districts. There is therefore a risk in selection of those to include in the project | March 2011 | Operational  Organizational  Political | Middle, due to the existence of on-going processes using regional groupings of districts working with NPA, Auditor General, Parliament  P = 3  I = 4 | The agencies working on regional groupings are willing to use the forms of work that have been effective | | Project manager | Consultants; UNDP | | April 2011 | To be worked on during project implementation |
| 3 | The complexity and non linear relationships of oversight entities | April 2011 | Organizational  Strategic  Financial | Middle, due to a limited resource envelop, only a few oversight entities (national & local) can benefit from UNDP funding  P=2  I=3 | Since the focus is on ensuring that the system that supports the oversight and monitoring functions, the Parliament, Local Level parliaments and NPA are the key players. With success, the lessons learned can easily be replicated | | Project Board and project Manager | Consultants; UNDP | | April 2011 | To be worked on during project implementation |

# ANNEX 2: CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title | | | ***Strengthening Oversight functions for Monitoring Service Delivery*** | | |
| Name of the Institution | | | ***Parliament of Uganda*** | | |
| Date of assessment | | | ***17th June 2011*** | | |
| **INDICATOR** | **AREAS FOR ASSESSMENT** | | | **APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS/TOOLS** | **COMMENTS** |
| **PART I – REFERENCES AND PRELIMINARY CHECKS** | | | | | |
| **1.1 History and Compliance with International Resolutions/Standards** | | | | | |
| 1.1.1 History | Date of creation and length in existence  Has the institution gone through a recent re-organization/re-structuring? | | | Annual Reports  Media Kit  Website | ***Created in 1920/91years***  ***Between 1986-2005 Monolithic Parliament/ Individual Merit and 2006- Present Multiparty Parliament*** |
| 1.1.2 United Nations Security Council 1267 | Is the institution listed in any reference list? | | | United Nations Security Council 1267 Committee’s list of terrorists and terrorist financiers | ***No*** |
| 1.1.3 Certification | Is the institution already certified through international standards? | | | ISO, Project Management standard, other standards | ***Parliament is a member of the Inter Parliamentary Union, Commonwealth Parliamentary Association etc*** |
| **PART II. ASSESSING NATIONAL INSTITUTION CAPACITY FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| **2.1 Managerial Capacity**  Ability to plan, monitor and coordinate activities | | | | | |
| Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation | Does the institution produce clear, internally consistent proposals and intervention frameworks, including detailed work plans?  Does the institution hold regular programme or project review meetings?  Are there measurable outputs/deliverables in the defined project plans?  Was the institution previously exposed to UNDP RBM approach/methodology or equivalent in other donor agencies? | | | Well-designed project and programme documents  Action Plans/Work plans  Log frame or equivalent  Project reports  Evaluation reports  Indicators available in project plans  Lessons-Learned reports | ***Parliament produces project proposals, detailed annual quarterly work plans and project implementation reports.***  ***Parliament holds regular project Midterm Review meetings every two and half years depending on the project lifespan.***  ***Parliamentary staff was exposed to UNDP RBM and ATLAS approach during the previous CCF I&II and CPAP projects*** |
| 2.1.2 Reporting and performance track record | Does the institution monitor progress against well defined indicator and targets, and evaluate its programme/project achievements?  Does the institution report to its stakeholders on a regular basis? | | | Reports to donors and other stakeholders  Reporting system | ***Parliament has a well established M&E Section which monitors implementation of projects.***  ***Reporting is on a quarterly, biannual and annual basis depending on the project reporting system.*** |
| **2.2 Technical Capacity** | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 Specialization | | Does the institution have the technical skills required?  Does the institution have the knowledge needed?  Does the institution keep informed about the latest techniques/ competencies/policies/trends in its area of expertise?  Does the institution have the skills and competencies that complement those of UNDP? | | Publications on activities, specific issues, analytical articles, policies  Reports from participation in international, regional, national or local meetings and conferences  Tools and methodologies  Evaluations and assessments | ***The Parliamentary Commission employs a team of experts and competent staff, who are regularly trained in identified core areas, including latest techniques that can compliment UNDP’s efforts.*** |
| 2.2.2 Ability to monitor the technical aspects of the project. | | Does the institution have access to relevant information/resources and experience?  Does the institution have useful contacts and networks?  Does the institution know how to get baseline data, develop indicators?  Does it apply effective approaches to reach its targets (i.e. participatory methods)? | | Evaluations and Assessments  Methodologies/training materials  Use of toolkits, indicators and benchmarks/capacity-development tools  Databases | ***Parliament has a developed information system which it uses to network with stakeholders in tracking key aspects of projects to improve project performance***.  ***Parliamentary Staffs have the capacity of conducting baseline surveys; develop indicators and databases in partnership with other agencies including funding agencies.*** |
| 2.2.3 Human Resources | | Does the institution staff possess adequate expertise and experience?  Does the institution use local capacities (financial/human/other resources)?  What is the institution capacity to coordinate between its main office and decentralized entities/branches (if relevant)?  Have staff been trained on project management methodology? | | Profile of staff, including expertise and professional experience  Staff turnover  Chart of assignments of roles and functions  Reports on technical experience from national or international agencies for operations and capacity-building  Individual certification on project management such as PRINCE2 | ***Parliament employs local qualified staff with experience in diverse areas including but not limited to Project Management.***  ***Parliament has in the past and presently coordinates programmes mainly on oversight and accountability with other partners including CSOs and District Local Governments.*** |
| **PART III. ASSESSING NATIONAL INSTITUTION CAPACITY FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| **3.1 Administrative capacity** *Ability to provide adequate logistical support and infrastructure* | | | | | |
| 3.1.1 Ability to manage and maintain infrastructure and equipment | | Does the institution possess logistical infrastructure and equipment?  Can the institution manage and maintain equipment? | | Adequate logistical infrastructure: office facilities and space, basic equipment, utilities  Computer capability and library materials  Proper equipment for area of specialization  inventory to track property and cost | ***Parliament has a well developed infrastructure in terms of office space, basic equipment and utilities.***  ***Besides that, Parliament maintains an updated inventory of all project and government equipment under its control and has a well established system of managing and maintaining of equipment, including periodical outsourcing of maintenance firms*** |
| 3.1.2 Ability to procure goods services and works on a transparent and competitive basis. | | Does the institution have the ability to procure goods, services and works on a transparent and competitive basis?  Does the institution have standard contracts or access to legal counsel to ensure that contracts meet performance standards, protect UNDP and the institution’s interests and are enforceable?  Does the institution have the authority to enter into contracts? | | Standard contracts  Examples of how procurement is done  Written procedures for identifying the appropriate vendor, obtaining the best price, and issuing commitments | ***Parliament has put in place a Contracts Committee which strictly follows PPDA procurement rules. The Committee liaises with procurement entities of project financiers including UNDP and EU etc.*** |
| 3.1.3 Ability to recruit and manage the best-qualified personnel on a transparent and competitive basis. | | Is the institution able to staff the project and enter into contract with personnel?  Does the institution use written job descriptions for consultants or experts? | | Standard contracts  Job descriptions | ***Parliament has a well established Directorate of Human Resource and Management which recruits staff on a competitive basis.*** |

1. Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Article 163 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) and the National Audit Act, 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Chapter 13 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) and Inspector General of Government (IGG) Act, 1988. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Examples are provided within the Accountability Sector Strategic Investment Plan of 2010-2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. One of the key binding constraints identified in the NDP. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Refer to item on definitions for the contextualisation of how the concepts apply in the project [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Such as those donors funding Justice, Law and Order Sector as well as Decentralization [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. In line with UNDP POPPS, LoA will be signed between the Implementing Partner and UNDP and all quarterly advances will be made to Implementing Partner. Implementing partner will work with Responsible Parties to undertake specific project activities/outputs but will be accountable to the implementing partner. Implementing Partner will accountable for submitting quarterly progress and accountability reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)