



Evaluation

Review of the Uganda Country Strategy 2010–2015
Final Report



AUSTRIAN
DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION

Imprint

Austrian Development Agency (ADA),
the operational unit of the Austrian Development Cooperation
Zelinkagasse 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria
Phone: +43 (0)1 90399-0
Fax: +43 (0)1 90399-2290
office@ada.gv.at
www.entwicklung.at

The evaluation was commissioned by the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation of the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Evaluation Unit of the Austrian Development Agency.

Conducted by



(In association with Conrad Consulting and Africa Services Group)

March 2015

This is an independent evaluation report. Views and conclusions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the contractors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Review of the Uganda Country Strategy of the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) was jointly commissioned by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Austrian Development Agency (ADA).

The review was carried out by a multi-disciplinary team comprising: Mr. Munhamo Chisvo (Team Leader, in charge of overall team coordination, Kampala-based stakeholder consultations, assessment of relevance and effectiveness as well as drawing out the lessons, conclusions and recommendations), Ms. Claudia Conrad (International ODA Expert, in charge of Vienna stakeholder consultations and assessment of efficiency) and Mr. Nelson Ofwono (Uganda National Evaluation Expert, in charge of stakeholder mapping, district and community level stakeholder consultations, and impact assessment), Mr. Joel Baliddawa (National Project Manager, in charge of district and community level stakeholder consultations, assessment of sustainability, local project administration, and stakeholder workshop organisation and rapporteuring), and Mr Ngonidzaishe Marimo (Poverty Analyst and Project Director).

The Review Team is very grateful to a) Ms Karin Kohlweg (Head of the ADA Evaluation Unit), b) Ms. Laurence Hengl (ADA Evaluation Unit), c) Mr Anton Mair (Head of Strategy and Evaluation Department, MFA), d) Dr Manfred Schnitzer (Head of Unit, Africa, MFA), and e) Ms Simone Knapp (Head of ADC Coordination Office in Uganda) for technical guidance throughout the review.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to all the people who were interviewed in Vienna, Kampala, Pader, Lira, Mbarara and Ntungamo during the review. The report would not have been possible without their contributions.

The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the review team and do not in any way necessarily reflect those of MFA, ADA, ADC CCO or any other stakeholder consulted. The review team regrets and takes full responsibility for all inadvertent errors and omissions in the report.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	1
MAP OF UGANDA SHOWING DISTRICTS VISITED.....	ii
ACRONYMS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	x
A. INTRODUCTION	x
B. OBJECTIVES.....	x
C. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	x
D. METHODOLOGY	x
E. MAIN FINDINGS.....	xi
E.1 Findings on Relevance.....	xi
E.2 Findings on Efficiency.....	xiii
E.3 Findings on Effectiveness	xiv
E.4 Findings on Impact.....	xv
E.5 Findings on Sustainability.....	xvi
F. MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS.....	xvi
F1. Formulation process and stakeholder consultation	xvi
F2. Choice of Sectors.....	xvii
F3. Choice of Thematic Areas.....	xviii
F4. Choice of Instruments (Aid Modalities)	xix
F5. Strengthen Country Strategy Execution and Effectiveness	xx
F6. Strengthen Communication and Visibility of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda.....	xxi
PART A: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	1
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	1
3 CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO THE REVIEW	3
4 REVIEW METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS	5
PART B: MAIN FINDINGS.....	6
5 FINDINGS ON RELEVANCE.....	6
5.1 Choice of sectors (Q1, Q7)	6
5.2 Choice of thematic priorities (Q1, Q7).....	8
5.3 Choice of aid instruments (Q1, Q7)	9

5.4	Geographical focus and choice of regional and local priority areas (Q3)	10
5.5	ADC's comparative strengths as viewed by Ugandan and other development partners (Q4)	11
5.6	Coverage of poverty reduction and other cross-cutting issues (Q5)	13
5.7	Treatment of the human rights based approach (Q6)	14
5.8	Extent to which ADC support enabled GoU to achieve its NDP goals (Q2)	16
5.9	Alignment of priorities and comparative strengths in Austria's 3 Year Programme and Austrian Development Policy with Uganda's NDP (Q8)	16
6	FINDINGS ON EFFICIENCY	17
6.1	Efficiency and transparency of process of developing ADC's CS 2010-2015 (Q18)	17
6.1.1	ADC in the context of policies and strategies	17
6.1.2	Process of Elaboration of CS 2010-15	18
6.1.3	Quality of CS Document	19
6.2	Efficiency of implementation of the Country Strategy (Q19)	20
6.3	Use of systematic integrated approaches in line with Nexus approach (Q20)	21
7	FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVENESS	22
7.1	Achievement of objectives and results in the chosen sectors (Q9)	22
7.2	Enabling and constraining factors in achievement of objectives (Q10)	27
7.3	Quality of indicators (Q11)	28
7.4	Extent of implementation of thematic focal areas as stated in the Strategy (Q12)	28
7.5	Mainstreaming of ADC principles and cross-cutting issues (Q13)	29
7.6	Effectiveness of the different aid modalities (budget support, sector wide approach, programme-based approach, conventional programmes and projects) (Q14)	31
7.7	Synergies between thematic focal areas and other financial instruments (Business Partnerships, NGO-Co-financing, APPEAR Programme, PIDG, CGIAR, multi-lateral projects, AEFC, OeEB) (Q15)	32
7.8	Effectiveness of donor coordination at national and local levels and ADC's role (Q16)	33
7.9	Effectiveness of the monitoring system (Q17)	33
8	FINDINGS ON IMPACT	34
8.1	Results achieved in the water sector (Q25)	35
8.1.1	Outcome level results and contribution of ADC	35
8.1.2	Impact level results and contribution of ADC	36
8.1.3	Wider benefits and contribution of ADC	37

8.2	Results achieved in rights, justice and peace (Q25).....	37
8.2.1	Outcome level results and contribution of ADC.....	38
8.2.2	Impact level results and contribution of ADC	39
8.2.3	Wider benefits and contribution of ADC.....	39
9	FINDINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY.....	40
9.1	Sustainability of results in Water and Sanitation Sector (Q21, Q22).....	40
9.1.1	Measures put in place to sustain ADC supported programmes	40
9.1.2	Results that are long lasting	40
9.1.3	Results which are not sustainable	42
9.2	Sustainability of results in RJP Sector (Q21, Q22).....	43
9.2.1	Measures put in place to sustain ADC supported programmes	43
9.2.2	Results that are long lasting	44
9.2.3	Results which are not sustainable	45
9.3	Impact of ADC support on coherent relations between Austria and Uganda (Q23, Q24) ...	45
9.4	Success of ADC efforts to contribute to critical public debate in Austria about Uganda, its development policies and bilateral cooperation (Q23, Q24)	46
PART C: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT		46
10	LESSONS LEARNT (Q6, Q8, Q13, OVERALL)	46
11	CONCLUSIONS	47
11.1	Main Conclusions on Relevance.....	47
11.1	Main Conclusions on Efficiency.....	49
11.2	Main Conclusions on Effectiveness.....	50
11.3	Main Conclusions on Impact.....	51
11.4	Main Conclusions on Sustainability	51
PART D: RECOMMENDATIONS.....		52
12	RECOMMENDATIONS (Q6, Q8, OVERALL).....	52
12.1	Formulation process and stakeholder consultation	52
12.2	Choice of Sectors.....	53
12.3	Choice of Thematic Areas	53
12.4	Choice of Instruments (Aid Modalities)	54
12.5	Strengthen Country Strategy Execution and Effectiveness	55
12.6	Strengthen Communication and Visibility of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda.....	56

PART E: ANNEXES.....	58
ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX.....	59
ANNEX 2: REFERENCES.....	66
ANNEX 3: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED	69
Annex 3-1: People Interviewed in Vienna.....	69
Annex 3-2: List of Stakeholders Consulted in Kampala	70
Annex 3-3: List of Stakeholders Consulted in Lira, Pader, Mbarara and Ntungamo Districts	72
Annex 3-4: List of Workshop Participants.....	74

ACRONYMS

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
ADC	Austrian Development Cooperation
ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
AEFC	Austrian Export Finance Credit
AfDB	African Development Bank
AG	Attorney General
AHA	Anti-Homosexuality Act
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
APPEAR	Austrian Partnership Programme in Higher Education
ASPRs	Annual Sector Performance Reports
AVP	African Vernetzungsplattform
BP	Business Partnerships
CARE	Care International
CCO	Country Coordination Office
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CS 2010-15	Country Strategy 2010-2015
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DGF	Democratic Governance Facility
DP	Development Partner
DPG	Development Partner Group
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions
DWRM	Department for Water Resource Management
EAC	East African Community
EACRE	Regional Centre for Renewable Energy and Efficiency
EC	European Commission
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FIDA	Women's Lawyers Association
GIZ	German International Cooperation
HORIZONT 3000	Horizont 3000
HIV	Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus
HQ	Head Quarters
HPM	Hand Pump Mechanic
HPMA	Hand Pump Mechanic Association
HR	Human Rights
HRD	Human Rights Defenders
HURINET	Human Rights Network
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
ICTJ	International Centre for Transitional Justice

ICM	Indirect Centralised Management
IFIs	Institutional Financial Institutions
IPs	Implementing Partners
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JLOS	Justice, Law and Order Sector
JPF	Joint Partnership Fund
LAP	Legal Aid Project
LDPG	Local Development Partner Group
LG	Local Government
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFA	Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs
MfDR	Management for Development Results
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MoWE	Ministry of Water and Environment
NDP	National Development Plan
NWSC	National Water and Sewerage Corporation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OeEB	Österreichische Entwicklungsbank/ Development Bank of Austria
OeKB	Oesterreichische Kontrollbank
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OC	Officer In-Charge
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PAS	Paralegal Advisory Services
PD	Paris Declaration
PIDG	Private Infrastructure Development Bank
PRDP	Peace, Recovery and Development Plan
RGC	Rural Growth Centre
RJP	Rights, Justice and Peace
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SBS	Sector Budget Support
SEVAL	Schweizerische Evaluationsgesellschaft
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SIP	Sector Investment Plan
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TA	Technical Assistance
TJ	Transitional Justice
ToR	Terms of Reference
UBoS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UGC	Urban Growth Centre
ULS	Uganda Law Society

UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UO	Umbrella Organisation
UPS	Uganda Prisons Service
UWASNET	Uganda Water and Sanitation Network
UWONET	Uganda Women's Network
W&S	Water and Sanitation
WG	Working Group
WIPA	Business Partnerships (of ADC)
WMZs	Water Management Zones
WRM	Water Resource Management
WSDF	Water and Sanitation Development Facility
WSSB	Water Supply and Sanitation Board
WUC	Water User Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

This report presents results of the Review of the Uganda Country Strategy of the Austrian Development Cooperation, which covers the period 2010-2015. The purpose of the review is to assess the relevance of the Country Strategy, likely impact and the effectiveness of its strategic focus, as well as its efficiency and the sustainability of its implementation. The recommendations by the reviewers are expected to feed into the design of the up-coming Country Strategy for Uganda taking into consideration that it might align to the European Union joint programming exercise. The report has 12 Chapters the first four of which are introductory. Chapters 5 to 9 assess the current Country Strategy using the OECD criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability while Chapter 10 presents lessons learnt. Chapters 11 and 12 present the main conclusions and recommendations.

B. OBJECTIVES

This review is both summative and formative in its nature. The overall objective is to analyse strengths and weaknesses of the current Country Strategy. According to the Terms of Reference the review has three specific objectives, namely:

- i. the assessment of the relevance, impact and effectiveness of the **strategic focus** of the Austrian Development Cooperation;
- ii. the analysis of the efficiency and sustainability of the Country Strategy 2010-2015 **implementation**; and
- iii. the **capitalization of experiences** which might support the elaboration of the next Country Strategy for Uganda in the context of the European Union Joint Programming exercise.

C. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The review is at the strategic level in contrast to a programme review which focuses more on operational performance issues. An analytical matrix detailing the evaluation questions, evidence and judgment criteria was developed to guide preparation of interview checklists and sampling of interviewees both in Austria and Uganda. It was the basis of the analysis of the evidence, and guided report writing. Available principles and criteria for evaluation from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (1998) and the Swiss Evaluation Society (2002) were considered to the extent possible.

D. METHODOLOGY

The review was conducted in four phases in line with the requirements of the Terms of Reference. These were: 1) visits to Austria by the Team Leader and the Official Development Assistance expert for a briefing on the review by the Austrian Development Agency and the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs; 2) a country visit to Uganda for interviews with Government of Uganda officials, development partners and Civil Society Organisations and complemented by additional consultations in Austria; 3) presentation of preliminary findings for validation by Ugandan stakeholders and the local Austria embassy staff; and 4) elaboration of the draft and final reports.

E. MAIN FINDINGS

E.1 Findings on Relevance

Sector choice: The support of the Austrian Development Cooperation to Uganda during the period 2010-2015, was mainly targeted at two focal areas:

- Water and Sanitation in the Water and Environment Sector; and
- Rights, Justice and Peace in the Justice, Law and Order Sector.

This engagement is complemented by supporting activities from Austrian and Ugandan non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, the Austrian Partnership Programme in Higher Education and Research for Development as well as the CGIAR (formerly known as Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) are part of the Austrian engagement.

The review finds the Austrian support in these sectors strongly aligned to the Millennium Development Goals, especially targets No. 10 and 11 (in relation to Water & Sanitation) and No. 2 (in relation to strengthening human rights), as well as Uganda's priorities articulated in the National Development Plan I (2010-2015). It is supported by Austria's technical strengths, and the importance of continuing¹ the existing support to the two sectors. Improving access to improved water sources remains high on the Post-MDG agenda. Furthermore, the two focal areas will continue to be critical areas of investment enabling planned health and other outcomes of the National Development Plan II (2015-2020).

Thematic areas: Within these sectors, Austria's support was carefully designed to correspond with its capacities and comparative advantages as a "small donor". In Water and Sanitation the focus was put on improving access to safe drinking water in rural areas (including small towns/rural growth centres), improved sanitation (in the same areas in rural areas), water resource management, policy reforms and institutional strengthening for decentralised water and sanitation service provision. Under Rights, Justice and Peace the focus was put on access to justice, gender and human rights standards, and promotion of alternative conflict resolution (transitional justice) mechanisms. These focal areas were well aligned to the Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015 as well as Austria's policy on development cooperation and priorities in the respective 3 Year Programmes.

In addition, the results achieved and the **strong reputation Austria has gained from its partners**, in Uganda indicates that Austria invested in areas of its technical strength and experience. Nonetheless, in the focal area of Water and Sanitation, sanitation and hygiene promotion for point water systems is urgently needed, so is the integration of water supply with small-scale livelihoods interventions that could boost nutrition outcomes in a country where stunting prevalence remains high.

Geographical focus: The geographical focus of the Austrian Development Cooperation on Northern Uganda was appropriate from poverty, human rights and conflict prevention lenses. This should be maintained, but can be broadened to include other regions of need (such as West Nile, Central and Eastern Regions). Geographical targeting of the instruments of the Austrian Official Development Assistance should be coordinated for synergy. It is important for Austria to maintain support to South Western Uganda to sustain the innovation which it tested in this region and is being replicated countrywide. The South Western small towns

¹ According to one of the DPs interviewed, "the logic of donor division of labour in Uganda is to continue in sectors where DPs already enjoy a strong partnership with the Government".

where Austria tested new concepts like the Water and Sanitation Development Facility and Umbrella Organization remain the **laboratory** where these innovations will be perfected attending to sustainability.

Choice of financial instruments: The findings confirm that Austria's aid modalities in the period under review (e.g. Sector Budget Support, Basket Funds, Technical Assistance Facility, and Project Financing) were complementary and Austria should continue with this mix. Sector Budget Support in the Justice, Law and Order Sector is appreciated by the JLOS Secretariat and other key institutions in the JLOS sector for strengthening the entire system of justice administration and delivery. In the focal area of Water and Sanitation, Sector Budget Support from Austria is topping up government allocations to the district conditional grants which are used to expand rural water and sanitation coverage. Un-earmarked basket funding to Water and Sanitation is considered to be the "**oil of the system**" enabling the Ministry of Water and Environment to address critical institutional bottlenecks and create capacity to implement interventions of other Development Partners some of whom have higher budgets than the Austrian Development Cooperation. The funding availed by the EU and managed by Austria through Indirect Centralised Management (ICM) is enabling Austria to strengthen its involvement in the water and sanitation focal area. ICM funding is strengthening Water and Sanitation Development Facilities (Eastern and South Western Regions) which are part of the decentralised system of service provision now actively promoted by the Government of Uganda in the Water and Environment Sector. However, a proper strategy to systematically harness synergy between interventions funded by the selected instruments is needed. It would be beneficial for the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office of the Austrian Development Cooperation to have strategic technical oversight and coordination responsibilities over the Austrian whole of government interventions in Uganda. At the same time the current mix of financial instruments should be maintained in both sectors and this would need Austria to maintain the Uganda Budget-line at the same or higher funding levels.

Comparative advantage: Areas of comparative advantage include: strong institutional knowledge of the two sectors; technological and institutional innovations in the Water and Sanitation sector; strong partnership with the Government of Uganda earning a reputation of "trusted donor". "Flexibility", "focus on poverty and human rights", "quality", "capacity to coordinate other donors" and willingness to "listen to others" were among the notable areas of Austria's strength cited by development partners, the Government of Uganda and civil society organizations.

Principles and cross-cutting issues of the Austrian Development Cooperation: Principles and issues like poverty reduction, human rights, conflict prevention, gender, environment, good governance, and children and people with disabilities have been systematically integrated in the portfolio of the Austrian Development Cooperation. Mainstreaming of a human rights based approach was the strongest while HIV/AIDS mainstreaming was the weakest and needs a clear strategy.

Contribution to realisation of the National Development Plan goals: Various Ugandan government institutions that were interviewed rate the contribution of Austria to realisation of Uganda's National Development Plan goals as "significant". In both sectors most sector investment programme indicators have improved due to policy reforms, institutional strengthening for decentralised service delivery, capacity building on managing for development results, technical assistance provision, and financial resources to supplement government allocations for development expenditure.

E.2 Findings on Efficiency

Elaboration of the CS: The Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015 drew from Austria's policies for development cooperation, which were developed through wide stakeholder consultations in Austria, but elaboration of the Uganda Country Strategy was more of an internal back and forth process between the Austria Development Agency, the Country Coordination Office and Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs with little benefit from a wider consultation of stakeholders in both Austria and Uganda. Although Austria narrowed down the focus to two sectors based on a donor division of labour, and withdrew from the private sector, in the remaining two sectors, the Country Strategy was more of a retrofitting of what Austria was already doing well in Uganda, than a fresh strategy arising from an intensive debate on thematic priorities and instruments with specific policy guidance on how to do this prioritisation. The nature of the process did not lead to wide stakeholder awareness and ownership (either in Austria or in Uganda) and compromised complementarity of interventions funded through Austrian whole of government approach in Uganda (but excluding those demand-driven and ordinarily not possible to plan in advance such as some of the NGO work, projects funded by the Development Bank of Austria and economic partnerships).

A coordinated and harmonized approach between Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, the Austrian Ministry of Finance and the Development Bank of Austria is needed. These actors should jointly be involved in the development of the next Country Strategy as well as coordination of the interventions they fund. A common understanding of what a Country Strategy is and what it should do is paramount in strengthening coordination of the various elements of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda.

Quality of the Country Strategy: Whilst the Country Strategy narrative is of high quality, it does not challenge the status-quo through elaborate criteria for deciding on sector, thematic and aid modality choices and strategies for ensuring coherence of the entire Austrian Official Development Assistance portfolio in Uganda. It mainly guides the interventions funded by the budget-line managed by the Austrian Development Agency and not those funded by other Austrian government agencies, some of which are clearly off-strategy. In addition, it provides sector targets, but is silent on how Austria will measure its specific contribution (added-value)². It does not outline clearly the monitoring and oversight functions, the performance accountability system, the feedback loops at a strategic level, and the division of labour between the Austrian Development Agency, the Country Coordination Office and the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs needs to steer a process of defining these together with other key stakeholders in Austria. No impact indicators were defined nor were the chosen ones gender-sensitive.

Implementation efficiency: The review concludes that implementation efficiency of the Country Strategy in both sectors is high, with the Country Coordination Office using its technical capacity and reputation as "trusted partner" to convince the Government of Uganda to allocate additional resources to the focal sectors. The Austrian Development Cooperation initiated a Joint Financial Performance Assessment, with an understanding of the importance of efficient financial management in improving the accountability and efficiency of services as well as results achieved. This Assessment analyses audit reports and follows up on findings but needs to be complemented by a resource tracking system. The Country Coordination

² Results in the CS are sector aggregates and measure the effectiveness of all support to the sector from all stakeholders. Austria's contribution to sector processes and the theory of change underpinning the CS are not articulated clearly.

tion Office's technical and financial oversight of interventions in Uganda has been good but needs to be reinforced to monitor the Austrian whole of government approach in this focus country. In the same light, the Austrian Development Agency could be strategically mandated by the Austrian Government to play an important future role as "service centre" for the whole of Austrian government approach in Uganda as well as other focus countries. This role needs to be defined and clarified by the Austrian Government taking into consideration the reality that some of the Austrian Official Development Assistance (work of non-governmental organisations, projects funded by the Development Bank of Austria and economic partnerships) is demand-driven and can hardly be planned years in advance.

Many among the development partners and civil society organizations interviewed considered the exceptional skills and dedication of the current Country Coordination Office leadership and staff as a "special gift" to Uganda.

Nexus: This is relatively a novel concept and as such not yet systematically integrated into the Austrian Development Cooperation interventions in Uganda nor ever discussed in sector or donor coordination meetings. It introduces additional costs in more comprehensive programming to take advantage of multiple opportunities presented by integrated programming. Hence the nexus approach should ideally be promoted through integration of the concept into policy so that the Government of Uganda, development partners and civil society organizations can address nexus issues more holistically.

E.3 Findings on Effectiveness

Achievement of objectives: On an OECD rating scale of "A" to "D" where **A** is Very Good and **D** is Very Poor, achievement of the stated CS objectives has been very good on 5 of the 13 sub-objectives, namely water quality (urban), sanitation coverage (rural/urban), conflict prevention, access to justice for all, and management for development results. It is satisfactory (rating B=Good) for 3 sub-objectives (namely, water availability (rural), functionality of Water and Sanitation committees, and prevention of Sexual and Gender Based Violence/ access to justice for victims. Performance has been rather weak (rating C=Poor) for two sub-objectives (namely, reduced vulnerability to climate change through protection of catchments and transitional justice framework). It has been very weak (very poor) for hygiene promotion in both rural and urban areas and water quality (especially that of rural point water supply systems).

The good results achieved in both sectors are linked to: i) the well-organised institutional structures in the sectors; ii) strong donor coordination; iii) a long period of consistent capacity building which has strengthened service delivery institutions; and iv) an enabling and growing macro-economic and governance environment³.

Although the total population with access to safe water has increased in rural areas, it has stagnated at 64% as resources are inadequate to expand coverage in a country with a high population growth rate of 3% per annum. Austria's support to Water and Sanitation has contributed to preventing a decline in water access coverage in rural areas. In Rights, Justice and Peace, progress in policy development has been slow, especially regarding the approval of the *transitional justice* policy as well as that on *legal aid*. The development of the two policies was through a very consultative process. The delayed approval is a matter that requires

³ Which has expanded the revenue base of government, and has seen the share of ODA in government expenditure decline over time

political will which in future could be triggered by strengthening the voice of victims to demand their rights.

Interventions outside the focal areas of Water and Sanitation and Rights, Justice and Peace have been too fragmented and too small and uncoordinated in nature to have measurable, consolidated outcomes at the macro-level. In addition, synergies between the focal area interventions and other financial instruments have been limited with the exception of those with NGO Co-financing while treatment of the Principles and Cross-Cutting Issues of the Austrian Development Cooperation has been strong except for HIV /AIDS which seems to lack a clear strategy. Synergies could be enhanced with greater involvement of the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office in managing the other interventions supported by the Austrian whole-of-government approach in Uganda.

E.4 Findings on Impact

Outcomes: The review of the Uganda Country Strategy concludes that outcomes achieved in both sectors are significant and there is a logical link between Austria's intervention strategy and the results achieved. Service coverage has improved in both Water and Sanitation and Rights, Justice and Peace focal areas, and the poor and vulnerable populations have also been reached and their livelihoods strengthened. The target for water access coverage in urban areas has been exceeded, so has that for the proportion of the public with access to justice services, especially in Northern Uganda. Justice administration and service delivery institutions have been capacitated and de-concentrated to deliver better services in previously underserved areas. These services now increasingly mainstream a human rights approach. Citizen satisfaction with these services has improved.

Impacts: A rigorous impact assessment was outside the scope of the review. However, reviewers found encouraging anecdotal evidence of improvements in the quality of lives of populations reached by the Country Strategy interventions across the board. The impacts range from improved quality of health status (reduction in water borne diseases) to improvements in livelihood options through time savings for people who now have closer access to safe drinking water (i.e. within 1 km for rural and 0.2 km for urban households). This time is being invested in farming and other livelihood activities which are generating more income. In Rights, Justice and Peace, large numbers of poor and vulnerable people have been facilitated to access justice and have been freed from prisons, and living conditions of prisoners and those on remand have also improved through decongestion, improvement in sanitation facilities, better quality diets and respect for the human rights of offenders.

Women in Northern Uganda have been empowered legally, economically and politically to participate in local leadership as well as politics. Children's rights to food and nutrition security, basic education and health services, vocational training and to live in a safe and "parent-ed" home have been secured in the targeted areas. Water sources have been rehabilitated thus contributing to ecosystem protection and sustainability. Land and other conflicts have been resolved through alternative dispute resolution mechanisms thus enabling local populations to proceed freely with their farming and other livelihood activities. Slowly but surely Uganda's investment climate is improving and is contributing to sustained economic growth but much more still needs to be done.

Contribution of Austria: More strictly, however, impact attribution to Austria in quantitative terms is not statistically feasible in any of the sectors of intervention in Uganda given the nature of aid modalities used (e.g. Sector Budget Support, Basket Funding, Joint Programme Approach, Technical Assistance and small fragmented projects), and the indicators of performance which focus on macro- and outcome-level performance of the sector as a whole and (by definition) the contribution of all actors in the sector (not only Austria's specific

added-value). In both sectors, indicative attribution could be inferred based on the value added by technical assistance from Austria to policy reform dialogue, innovation and institutional capacity building, as well as the share of the Austrian Development Coordination budget in total expenditure, but the latter is not sufficient without closer budget tracking. Absence of impact indicators in the Country Strategy, and the weak link with the Office of the Prime Minister for sector impact assessment constrains the ability of Austria to ascertain its own contribution in concrete statistical terms, but does not preclude qualitative assessment of the contribution through technical assistance and policy influencing. Stronger collaboration with the Office of the Prime Minister is clearly needed in the next Country Strategy for quantitative impact assessments in the focal sectors of ADC funding. The focus would be to develop cost-effective impact assessment methodologies and good practice approaches that could be replicated by government and other development partners in Austria's non-focal sectors.

E.5 Findings on Sustainability

Sustainability of water supply systems: The review concludes that there is mixed evidence on sustainability. Sustainability of water supply is almost guaranteed within the design lifespan of the infrastructure as operation and maintenance mechanisms put in place are well-functioning. Most schemes generate sufficient revenue to cover routine operations and maintenance costs and a proportion is reserved for future repairs and extensions. However, sustainability beyond the design lifespan of schemes is not guaranteed as there is no provision for reinvestment costs in the determination of user fees, nor does government policy encourage this. At the same time resources are too limited to allow the Government of Uganda to take care of both a) new investments (new water supply schemes) to expand coverage to previously unreached populations (36% of the rural population has no access to improved water sources and it is growing at 3% per annum), and b) reinvestment through rehabilitation or reconstruction of old schemes to sustain water supply in already served areas. With this dilemma, Austria's innovation in the South Western towns may require continued investment (**to sustain the laboratory**) but this time focusing more on developing innovative community-driven initiatives for financing reinvestment costs.

In terms of sanitation, the infrastructure is of good quality. Peer influence, integration with livelihoods and early health benefits of improved sanitation are likely to encourage more investment.

Sustainability of results in Rights, Justice and Peace: Mainstreaming of a human-rights based approach and awareness promotion for Management for Development Results has led to a sustainable positive change in service culture in the administration and delivery of justice (through the various Justice, Law and Order Sector institutions), especially at the senior management level. However, whilst service culture and customer service attitudes are often still poor and need to be further improved through continued sensitisation and training, the main challenge now is donor attrition which is likely to lead to a reversal in gains made in the sector in the areas of enhancing access to justice for the poor and marginalised, case backlog reduction, prison de-congestion, de-concentration of service points, and promoting human rights observance in key institutions (such as the police, judiciary and the prison service) and the public in general.

F. MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

F1. Formulation process and stakeholder consultation

1. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should provide a concrete **Technical and Policy Guidance Paper** on the process to be followed in preparing the next Country Strategy for Uganda and the content of the document. The process should include “how” and “when” to involve relevant stakeholders, the content of the Country Strategy, the roles and responsibilities for drafting the strategy, quality assurance process, validation and official approval steps, as well as the dissemination plan for the final document (in Austria and Uganda).
2. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the Technical and Policy Guidance Paper provides criteria for sector, thematic and geographical focus as well as instrument choice. This could include inclusion and exclusion criteria which would allow systematic screening and prioritization.
3. To enhance ownership and ensure that the Uganda Country Strategy contributes to strengthening of visibility and relations between Austria and Uganda, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the formulation process involves all critical stakeholders in Austria and Uganda and the final Country Strategy document is disseminated widely, including to implementing partners.
4. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the Uganda Country Strategy is a guiding document for the whole of **Austria’s Government** and is complemented by a policy instrument to promote information-sharing and coordination to maximize synergy and impact from the whole of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should sensitise key stakeholders accordingly.
5. In keeping with the ideals of the aid effectiveness agenda, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, **the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office of the Austrian Development Cooperation**, should take full advantage of the joint European Union programming exercise in developing the next Uganda Country Strategy, while ensuring that the process does not increase transaction costs but adds-value to existing donor coordination efforts of the Local Development Partners Group.
6. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the next Country Strategy for Uganda identifies intermediate “process indicators” for measuring Austria’s specific added-value, in addition to the outcome indicators aligned to the Sector Investment Plans (e.g., golden indicators) for assessing broader sector performance. The indicators should be gender-sensitive and also cover the added-value of Austria’s technical assistance in terms of institutional strengthening, innovation and policy reform.

F2. Choice of Sectors

7. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, **the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office**, together with other members of the wider Austrian Government intending to invest in Uganda during the

period 2016-2020, should (notwithstanding **Recommendations 1 and 2** above) choose one of two options pertaining to sector choice:

Option 1: Continue with what is working: Under this option, the sector choice would be to continue in Water and Sanitation and Justice, Law and Order sectors provided the budget supports a sustained internal technical and financial capacity at current or higher level. Both sectors remain critical for achievement of outcomes in the Human Capital Development Priority Area of National Development Plan II (2015-2020), and are enablers of inclusive growth.

Option 2: Re-programme afresh: Under this option, the sector choice would include those areas crucial for National Development Plan II success, but have limited or no Development Partner support. These include: Environment; Capacity Development for successful implementation, monitoring and evaluation of National Development Plan II; Women's Economic Empowerment; Private Sector Development; Land Registration; and complementary provisions of the Land Policy. Austria could also consider supporting software aspects of agriculture and nutrition (e.g., market linkages and nutrition behaviour change) which are critical for food and nutrition security and stability (especially, in former conflict regions). The sectors would be selected transparently using the process and criteria elaborated in the Technical Policy and Guidance Paper.

8. **Keep some room for innovation:** In addition to Option 1 or 2 above, **the Austrian Government**, as a whole, would consider other additional interventions of limited financial size, that respond to new/urgent priorities/requests, meet pockets of need, or test innovative ideas, on a case-by-case basis, from a “*whole-of-government approach*”, provided technical capacity exists within the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office to support implementation on the ground.

F3. Choice of Thematic Areas

9. Under Scenario 1, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the thematic areas of focus within the Water and Sanitation Sector are broadened to encompass the following:
 - Operation and maintenance: institutional strengthening for rural point water supply systems;
 - improved sanitation and hygiene at rural point water supply sources;
 - hygiene promotion in rural and urban areas, schools and health facilities;
 - integration of nutrition and livelihoods for poor and vulnerable groups (e.g., small scale irrigated horticulture production for the urban market);
 - mechanisms for financing reinvestment to sustain water supply coverage at schemes beyond their design lifespan;
 - integration of nexus approach, lessons and good practices into sector policy; and

- strengthening cross-sectoral linkages and synergies (e.g., Rights, Justice and Peace and Water and Sanitation).

10. For Rights, Justice and Peace, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should continue/emphasise support to the following critical areas:

- institutional strengthening for administration and delivery of justice⁴;
- mainstreaming human rights based approach and gender into justice delivery system⁵;
- facilitating access to justice for the poor and vulnerable groups⁶;
- strengthening policy reform initiatives (e.g., transitional justice and legal aid policies);
- implementation of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms;
- strengthening accountability of duty bearers;
- improving service culture and service delivery;
- fighting corruption;
- implementation of land policy;
- strengthening results culture of Justice, Law and Order Sector ; and
- strengthening cross-sectoral linkages and synergies.

F4. Choice of Instruments (Aid Modalities)

11. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs , **the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office** , together with other members of the wider Austrian Government intending to invest in Uganda during the period 2016-2020, should (notwithstanding **Recommendations 1 and 2** above) choose one of the following two options pertaining to financial instruments/aid modalities:

- **Option 1: Preserve the “trusted-donor” reputation of Austria** by continuing with Sector Budget Support in both sectors, and cultivate a culture of restoring donor confidence in the use of government systems. Under this arrangement Austria would take-over a leadership role in coordinating the Development Partner Group in the sector of Justice, Law and Order (filling the gap left by Sweden, Ireland, Denmark and the Netherlands). The **advantages** of this option for Austria are sector leadership and control, improved relations with the Government of Uganda, permanent policy influencing space, and the potential to contribute to the rebuilding of donor confidence in national systems. The main **risks** associated with this option are higher transaction costs for Austria in the short-term and side-lining of Austria by other development partners. The **pre-conditions** for taking this option would be a positive risk assessment, or adequate mitigation potential, and commitment by the Federal

⁴ Focus will be on enhancing service standards, physical de-concentration of JLOS service delivery points, staff housing for police and magistrates in hard to reach rural areas, improved sanitation in prisons

⁵ Includes strengthening of Human Rights Commission

⁶ This includes provision of legal aid services and creation of a witness support fund (WSF)

Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Headquarter of the Austrian Development Agency that the Country Coordination Office will not downsize.

- **Option 2: Re-programme and jointly provide support with other Development Partners parallel to national systems.** The **advantages** of this option reside in the potential for intervening with a larger programme together with other development partners, low fiduciary risk, and critical mass of voice for policy leverage. The main **risks** are higher transaction costs, loss of momentum, damaging the good reputation of Austria with the Government of Uganda which was earned over 2 decades of cooperation, and unguaranteed policy space when the Government mistrusts donor intentions. The **pre-conditions** for taking this option are: a) Government of Uganda's willingness to continue with donor engagement and participate in joint programme steering; b) development partners' willingness to joint programme with Austria; c) Austria's ability to earmark support to its priorities; and d) ability of Austria to leverage policy influencing space as an "equal partner" with the other development partners.

12. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office, together with other members of the wider Austrian Government should chose an instrument mix that diversifies risk by providing balanced support to Government, the United Nations, Civil Society Organizations and the private sector as they play complementary roles. The support should not encourage competition for resources between these players but reinforce mutual existence, collaboration and synergy. More specifically, the support to civil society organizations should strengthen their crucial roles in:

- Community capacity development for sustainability;
- Service delivery in hard to reach areas;
- Innovations for replication;
- Monitoring and research; and
- Demanding accountability from the state and development partners.

F5. Strengthen Country Strategy Execution and Effectiveness

13. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that the institutional arrangements and processes for decision-making to improve the intervention strategy, the quality of implementation and effectiveness of the investments made under the Uganda Country Strategy are written down and clearly understood by the stakeholders in the Austrian Development Agency and the Ministry. Mechanisms to hold stakeholders to account for performance (e.g. rewards and sanctions) should be documented and evident in the way that monitoring and evaluation outputs are used.

14. For Austria to maintain its current added-value in Uganda, **the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that both the latter and the Country Coordination Office continue to

- have adequate numbers of qualified and experienced staff, who are committed and trustworthy, and working conditions continue to promote loyalty and continuity.
15. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that the joint monitoring and oversight functions of the Africa Unit in the Ministry, and Senior Management and the Uganda Desk in the Austrian Development Agency are spelt out in the Country Strategy in as clear a manner as done for the joint oversight role and activities defined for the Country Coordination Office, the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development at national level.
 16. The **Austrian Parliament** should ensure that a high level inter-ministerial coordination structure is set up to facilitate coordination of all Official Development Assistance to focus regions and countries. This can be chaired by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs or by the Ministry of Finance (or by both on a rotational basis).
 17. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that interventions in sectors of choice for Austria in Uganda are subjected to rigorous financial performance and impact assessment in line with Government of Uganda Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation. To this end, the **Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that the Austrian Development Agency forges a stronger collaboration with the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Prime Minister in Uganda and supporting it both technically and financially for this oversight function. The **Office of the Prime Minister** should ensure that sectors are held to account on the basis of the results of these assessments.

F6. Strengthen Communication and Visibility of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda

18. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should spearhead the development of a stronger **communications and visibility strategy** for Austrian Official Development Assistance (with special attention to raising the profile of results achieved by country strategies). The Communication and Visibility Strategy should spell out clear objectives, results to be achieved, targeted audiences (in Austria, Uganda, etc), communication strategies, activities, a Monitoring and Evaluation plan, and an institutional champion to drive this mandate.
19. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that staff numbers, technical qualifications, commitment and continuity along with financial resources are sufficient to operationalise the Communication and Visibility Strategy.
20. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** (with support from the **Austrian Development Agency** and the **Country Coordination Office**) should ensure that the experience being gained, development results achieved, lessons learnt and good practices emerging from Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda are more **systematically captured, documented and shared** to trigger a learning culture and add to the quality and impact of the entire Austrian portfolio.

PART A: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1 INTRODUCTION

The Austrian Development Agency (ADA) mandated Jimat Development Consultants in cooperation with Conrad Consulting and Africa Services Group to carry out a review about the Austrian Development Cooperation Country Strategy 2010-2015 (CS 2010-15) for Uganda, one out of ten priority partner countries. The Terms of References (ToR, dated 22nd of May, 2014) define as deliverables an inception report (final version approved by 19th of December, 2014), a discussion document for a consultative workshop in Uganda (held on 29th of January, 2015), a draft report of the review (presented 10th of March, 2015) and a final report which integrated comments by the Austrian Ministry of European and International Affairs (MFA), ADA and its main partners in Uganda.

The purpose of the review was to assess the relevance, the likely impact and the effectiveness of its strategic focus, as well as its efficiency and the sustainability of its implementation. The recommendations by the reviewers should feed into the up-coming Country Strategy for Uganda (starting 2016) taking into consideration that it might align to the EU Joint Programming exercise.

The report reflects the findings and conclusions obtained in the inception phase in Vienna (October 2014), the available documentation as well as the subsequent analysis in Vienna (November 2014) and the field mission to Uganda (December 2014). End of January 2015, the conclusions and possible recommendations of the field mission were presented to partners in Uganda, involving representatives from governmental and non-governmental sides of both countries as well as from the donor community. The reviewers benefited greatly from the formal and informal sharing of information and findings, and from the general team spirit that prevailed throughout the evaluation period.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

This review has been commissioned towards the end of the strategy implementation period with only few months to go. It should reflect on the design and experiences during its implementation as well as the results achieved so far. Likewise in focus were the elaboration processes of the Country Strategy among the relevant stakeholders in Austria and in Uganda, bringing different interests together and defining how to contribute to the transformation and development processes in the recipient country. A central concern of the international community is how to increase the efficiency and aid effectiveness of bilateral (or multilateral) cooperation and how to align donor policies with the national objectives of the recipient countries as expressed in the respective national policies and strategies. The review of the CS 2010-15 reflects this kind of donor orientation.

Over the period under review, Austria's support to Uganda mainly targeted two focal areas of Water and Sanitation (W&S) and Rights, Justice and Peace (RJP), using three main categories of modalities:

- a) Sector Budget Support (SBS);
- b) Basket Funding; and
- c) Complementary Projects.

With respect to RJP, ADC contributed EUR 2 million per financial year to the Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS) (6 Mio EUR over the period 2012/13-2014/15). In W&S, through the Joint Financing Agreement, ADC provided EUR 2 million per financial year (6 Mio EUR over the period 2013/14-2015/16)⁷.

In addition, ADC has been providing support to the two focal areas using two basket funding arrangements, namely: a) the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) for RJP; and b) the Joint Partnership Fund (JPF) for W&S. ADC overall support through the DGF (DGF) has been EUR 1.7 million for the period 2011-2013 and is earmarked towards interventions that increase access to justice for the poor and vulnerable people, while other development partners support other two components (deepening democracy; and strengthening voice and accountability) or give un-earmarked support. Austria support to the JPF is EUR 6 million for the period of 2013/14-2015/16.

A wide range of complementary projects (mainly with NGOs) were funded mainly focused on Northern Uganda and targeted at strengthening voice and accountability, gender, (alternative) reconciliation mechanisms (Transitional Justice, Alternative Dispute Resolution), operations & maintenance, sustainable sanitation, catchment based Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM).

Among the complementary instruments that have been available for use by Austria to finance projects in Uganda included:

- Regional projects (e.g., IWRM, ICTJ, Eastern and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project...);
- NGO Co-financing through Austrian organizations (e.g. Care, SOS Children's Villages, HORIZONT 3000 (agriculture, women empowerment, livelihoods and TA support for local NGOs);
- Multilateral funding (e.g., European Development Fund, OECD, UN-Organisations, e.g. UNIDO);
- Scientific cooperation and scholarships: appear (Partnership Program in Higher Education & Research for Dev.) since 2009;
- Humanitarian Aid: UNHCR 2012/13, South Sudan 2014;

⁷ Figures on funding levels were provided by the Country Coordination Office of the Austrian Development Cooperation in Uganda.

- Business Partnerships (Feasibility Study, full project/WiPA⁸);
- Climate change funding (e.g., through the Joint Water and Environment Sector Support Programme/JPF);
- Projects funded by other ODA providers (e.g., Ministry of Agriculture, Länder and private initiatives);
- Projects funded through the Development Bank of Austria (e.g. Energy Regulatory Authority); and
- Softloans (and preparatory funding).

At the time of the review, Austrian ODA support to Uganda was reaching approximately EUR 10 million annually, of which EUR 7 million was from the Uganda Budgetline and the remainder from other complementary financial instruments. The statistics on Austrian ODA support to Uganda during the CS period were only available up to 2013, and showed fluctuations which are an indication of fragility of ADC funding⁹:

	2010	2011	2012	2013
bilateral ODA for Uganda in Mio €	9.87	9.40	6.37	13.14
in % of bilateral total ODA	2.13	2.67	1.53	3.21
ADC for Uganda in Mio €	9.72	9.61	6.68	11.83
ADC for Uganda in % of total ODA (Austria)	10.31	11.64	10.08	13.96

Source: Statistics provided by ADA Statistic Department March 2015.

This review is both summative and formative in its nature. The overall objective is to analyse strengths and weaknesses of the CS 2010-15. According to the ToR, the following three specific objectives guided the review:

- i. The assessment of the relevance, impact and effectiveness of ADC' **strategic focus**,
- ii. the analysis of the efficiency and sustainability of the CS 2010-15 **implementation**, and
- iii. the **capitalization of experiences** which might support the elaboration of the next CS in the context of the EU Joint Programming exercise.

3 CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO THE REVIEW

The review is considered to be at the strategic level in contrast to a programme review which focuses more on operational performance issues. It is about how well ADC strategically converts Austrian policies and strategies into development results which should be aligned to Ugandan national policies. For this, the underlying processes –both in Austria as well as in

⁸ Refers to business partnerships of ADC.

⁹ Figures for 2014 were not available.

Uganda – are relevant to come up with valuable recommendations about better strategic manoeuvring and improved implementation of partnership concepts and strategic planning procedures.

- (1) The Country Strategy for Uganda should provide a framework of reference for decisions and actions taken by ADC in order to contribute towards the developments in the recipient country. It should not only guide the priority setting of the planned development in a certain sector or region or of cross-cutting issues but also the specific resource allocation as well as the donor coordination.
- (2) Therefore, the Country Strategy Paper has to meet certain criteria and requirements to ensure guidance and orientation for its implementation.
- (3) Set as a framework the Country Strategy Paper should also include:
 - Uganda's specific development challenges and Austria's focus to support the recipient country to address them;
 - the focus of Austria's development policy engagement to create an environment for development;
 - what priority sectors Austria's development cooperation will be targeted to, why those priority sectors have been chosen, which results and effects Austria wishes to achieve and how results are monitored;
 - the nature and extent of other development partner's engagement and how Austria's contribution to Uganda complements and harmonises with other donors;
 - the mutual expectations of Austria as well as Uganda; and
 - how both countries will collectively monitor and measure progress and results.

The reviewers differentiated between the various institutional systems in which the mode of aid delivery is agreed upon, decided by the relevant stakeholders and provided while using different formats and instruments. The following conceptual framework guided the team:

- (1) It is important to clearly distinguish between the processes of external assistance by ADC and the processes which form the development strategies in the recipient country (here the National Development Plan I, 2010-2015) respectively at the sub-national level the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP) which provides the single framework under which all interventions in Northern Uganda are expected to take place.
- (2) Furthermore, the reviewers distinguished between the processes within the system in which the ADC is planned, discussed, decided and administered and the linkages with other relevant systems in Austria which might influence in one way or the other the decision-making and decision-taking of ADC. As Austria seeks to adopt the whole-of-government approach to its development cooperation, the Austrian Ministry for Finance (MoF) as well as the Development Bank of Austria are key actors for coordination. Likewise Austria's willingness to participate in joint EU Joint Programming in future is an important determinant for strategic positioning of ADC.
- (3) The whole-of-government approach finds its logical continuation in the recipient country. Implementing such an approach entails clear guidance and leadership and

formal coordination mechanisms among Austria's key actors as well as among the donor community.

4 REVIEW METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

This review was conducted in phases as suggested by the Terms of Reference (ToR). The Inception phase at the beginning focused on clarifying the mandate, the methods and the evaluation focus. The team leader and the ODA expert had the opportunity to be introduced to the key stakeholders in Vienna and to lead introductory talks with all of them. On the basis of the programme documentation provided by ADA the evaluation team conducted a rough stock-taking of the activities within the review period. This first assessment helped specifying the key-questions of the ToR and led to the elaboration of the evaluation matrix. The latter is a simple chart which lists up each evaluation question and relates them to the relevant indicators, source of information and methods for data collection. The evaluation matrix was included in the Inception Report. The Inception Workshop was an important milestone during the course of the evaluation as the evaluation team and the commissioning agency worked out a common understanding of the mandate and the related tasks.

The second and third phases included the analysis in Austria and Uganda; for this the evaluation team split up into teams according their core competences. In Vienna, in-depth interviews were held with governmental and non-governmental representatives. The field mission in Uganda contained interviews in Kampala, focusing on representatives of the Government of Uganda and the International Donor community, particularly from EC side. Although not a programme evaluation, the review team took the chance to spread out into districts relevant for the focal sectors (i.e. Lira, Pader, Mbarara and Ntungamo Districts) to interview implementers and beneficiaries of Austrian ODA to Uganda. Although a direct ADC contribution could not be traced (due to the fact that part of ADC contribution is made on sector budget support and loses its identity and potential for attribution), the reviewers are of the opinion that improvements in either the living conditions of people living in remote areas or within the judiciary system may demonstrate the responsiveness of change processes which have taken place partly under the influence of Austria's support within the Ugandan systems. The field mission in Uganda was completed with an additional set of complementary interviews in Kampala after five weeks and a concluding consultative workshop in Kampala involving 53 representatives of different partner institutions.

The final phase was dedicated to drafting the report and incorporating the workshop feedback into it.

The following methods have been used for data collection and analysis:

- Analysis of programme/project documentation and relevant secondary literature;
- Interviews with key persons (semi-structured with guiding notes) in Vienna and Uganda;
- Telephone Interviews;
- Site visits;

- Direct Observation; and
- SWOT – Analysis.

The triangulation of the data was done by comparing:

- project documentation and information provided by project partner in interviews;
- information from several interviews;
- interviews held with representatives of ADC and those with other stakeholders; and
- physical observation (project site visits) and information from interviews.

Furthermore, during the field visit the team leader maintained regular consultations with the ADC representative in Kampala as well as the person in charge in the ADA Evaluation Unit. With both of them, several de-briefing sessions were held (either verbally or via mail) to provide feedback and triangulate information given by project partners and to steer the review process appropriately.

Available Principles and Criteria for Evaluation (OECD/DAC 1998, SEVAL 2002) were considered to the extent possible.

PART B: MAIN FINDINGS

5 FINDINGS ON RELEVANCE

5.1 Choice of sectors (Q1, Q7)

ADC support to Uganda during the period 2010-2015 was mainly targeted at two focal sectors: *Water and Sanitation* (W&S) and - Justice, Law and Order (JLOS). Some of the projects funded through the NGO-co-financing instrument and other financial tools such as multi-lateral financing targeted agriculture, environment and cross-cutting issues such as gender budgeting. The validity of this sector choice (W&S and JLOS) is firmly supported by two decades of strong engagement by ADC in these sectors and significant positive results already achieved therein. The review finds Austria's support to the W&S and JLOS strongly aligned with investment priorities of Uganda as outlined in the National Development Plan I (2010-2015)¹⁰, Austria's technical strengths and the importance of continuity¹¹ of the existing support to the two sectors. In both sectors, Austria's contributions to policy reforms, institutional capacity building and innovations in service delivery were significant, earning Austria

¹⁰ The NDP 2010-2015 clearly identified four investment priorities: **physical infrastructure; human capital development; facilitating availability and access to critical production inputs** especially in agriculture and industry; and **promotion of science, technology and innovation**. W&S is a key sector of investment under social sectors (Chapter 7 of NDP) and RJP is prioritised under the Justice, Law and Order sector (Chapter 8 of NDPO) as an enabling sector.

¹¹ According to one of the DPs interviewed, "the logic of donor division of labour in Uganda is to continue in sectors where DPs already enjoy a strong partnership with the Government".

the reputation and status among government agencies, development partners and CSOs as sector lead in W&S, and an important partner in JLOS (where Sweden, Netherlands and Ireland have been the sector leads)¹². Austria's success in introducing the concept of Water and Sanitation Development Facilities (WSDFs), Umbrella Organisations (UOs) and the use of solar systems for water supply in the W&S sector is a distinct source of pride and national recognition.

Relative to resource envelopes of other development partners working in Uganda, Austria falls into the "small donor" category. With an annual ODA budget of approximately Euro 10 million, Austria has been prudent to remain out of resource-intensive sectors such as infrastructure (transport ICT, and energy) and high budget social sectors such as health and education. While Austria has been in W&S sector which is a high spender, Austria strategically chose thematic priorities and funding instruments that make the best use of its limited resources. The funding availed by the EU managed by Austria through Indirect Centralised Management (ICM) is enabling Austria to strengthen its involvement in the W&S sector. Austria is using the SBS instrument to channel a small budget to supplement government resources, with an anticipation that the funds would be allocated to District Conditional Grants for W & S services, and among others, provide a small but un-earmarked support through the Joint Partnership Fund to strengthen capacity of the sector ministry and its institutions to deliver services using larger resource envelopes of other development partners and the government. In this respect, it is regarded by the GoU and other donors as providing the "**essential oil**" needed to smoothen government operations that deliver services.

Austria's sector choice in Uganda is well aligned to MDGs targets (No. 10 and 11 in relation to W&S and No. 2 in relation to strengthening human rights). Improving access to improved water sources remains high on the post-MDG agenda, and continues to be critical under NDP II in Uganda. NDP II focuses on five priority areas, namely: agriculture; tourism advancement; mineral development; improving stock of infrastructure such as roads, rail, ICT, water for production and energy; and finally human capital development¹³. Improving access to improved water sources (for drinking water) and human rights, justice and peace, will continue to be critical enabling investments although not directly targeted by NDP II. Health outcomes expected to be achieved under NDP II investments into "human capital development" (such as reduced infant and maternal mortality rates, improved nutritional status of the population, and reduced burden of communicable diseases) can only be achieved if the population has access to safe drinking water; while an enabling human rights environment is critical for effectiveness of investments and sustainability of results achieved by the NDP II. It is

¹² The view that Austria is a sector lead in water and sanitation and an important partner in JLOS was shared by all DPs interviewed during the review, including EU, Denmark, Ireland and Sweden.

¹³ Source: <http://www.ugandaeconomy.com/invest-uganda/uganda-national-planning-authority-npa>. Elaboration of the NDP II was still on-going during the time of the Review of the ADC Uganda Country Strategy.

envisaged that the NDP II will have a 'human rights based approach' as a key element for tackling issues of empowerment, citizen participation and good governance (NPA, 2014)¹⁴.

5.2 Choice of thematic priorities (Q1, Q7)

Choice of thematic areas within sectors: W&S

Austria is focusing on enabling the poor to access safe drinking water and basic sanitation and this is a top priority of the NDP I and consistent with international commitment to MDG target 10. In the W&S sector, Austria's support is targeted at capacity development for service delivery at central, regional and local government levels. Specific priority is being given to strengthening policy reforms and the regulatory framework, WSDFs, consolidation of other de-concentrated structures such as the water management zones (WMZ), the protection and management of water sources, O&M support capacities of umbrella organisations and water supply and sanitation boards at community level, and participation of the private sector in water supply for small towns and rural growth centres. Through these thematic priorities Austria is able to address urban water supply issues of small towns by and large, holistically. The above W&S thematic areas are consistent with where Austria's areas of strength lie and the priorities of the NDP I.

However, the Review notes that hygiene promotion is less strong in Austria's portfolio yet it is critical for water quality and the achievement of health outcomes. Furthermore, support to water for drinking has not taken full advantage of the potential that exists to integrate with water-dependent small scale livelihoods interventions that could boost nutrition outcomes in a country where stunting remains a challenge. The poor people that Austria is targeting have multiple needs and water can trigger many other benefits if well-integrated with other complementary interventions.

Choice of thematic areas within sectors: JLOS

Austria has chosen to strengthen access to justice for the poor and development and implementation of the legal aid policy, mainstreaming gender and HR standards in the administration of justice, and promotion of alternative conflict resolution and reconciliation mechanisms in post-conflict areas. These interventions are poverty focused and in line with ADC principles. In addition, the review can confirm that these thematic priorities facilitate inclusive growth, promote socio-economic development, mitigate social inequities and contribute to political stability thus resulting in a more favourable country competitiveness index, consistent with the objectives of the current NDP.

Austria's interventions in the JLOS sector (RJP thematic area specifically) have been well informed by a clear donor division of labour, but this has since been put into jeopardy by the recent withdrawal of some of the DPs from the use of government systems for public financial management from the use of and working with government systems for political reasons

¹⁴ NPA, 2014, Report on the Consultative Workshop For District Officials On NDP II And How To Mainstream Cross Cutting Issues Into Local Government Development Plans.

(AHA) as well as due to a lack of trust in the public financial management system (corruption)¹⁵. As DPs that worked with Austria in the JLOS sector withdrew but continued supporting the justice sector by other means (SWAp funding and civil society support) and Austria remained providing SBS to JLOS, there has been pressure by default for Austria to take over a DP leadership role in the sector and fill the gap left by Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden.

5.3 Choice of aid instruments (Q1, Q7)

During the period under review, Austria used a mix of aid modalities that combine SBS, basket funding and project support. However, in Uganda, each of these instruments had its own strengths and weaknesses as outlined hereunder.

Table 1: Strengths and weaknesses of the Austria’s aid instruments in Uganda

Instrument	Advantages / strengths	Weaknesses / challenges
Sector Budget Support (un-earmarked)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with aid effectiveness agenda (PD, post Busan) • Lower transaction costs through harmonisation with other DPs • Consistent with GoU Aid Policy (Section 4.7 of NDP): “DPs encouraged to support Government programmes through budget support as opposed to programmes and projects” • Supplements inadequate resources of government in both sectors, grows government system • Ideal for engaging in overall reform dialogue • Strong annual dialogue with government on criteria for disbursement of tranches (e.g. public financial management (PFM), accountability, human rights, social development, and public sector reforms (PSR)) • Sectors assured of funding, even when DPs withdraw 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prone to donor attrition (e.g., JLOS), which could compromise leverage? • Susceptible to fiduciary risk • Government priorities may change, funds diverted to other priority areas • Not easy to trace the funds (e.g., donor funds going to district conditional grants) • Big donors may have more say • Not able to target a particular activity
Basket Funds (earmarked)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Partnership Fund: More control by DPs and sector, preferred by sector, easier to earmark funds (WRM and Red Plus; SW and East) • Democratic Governance Facility: has credibility due to high number of DPs • Able to secure critical mass needed for policy influencing • Austria can buy “same space” on policy table with small funds • Provides strategic funding platform for CSOs (both strong and those in need of CD) • Easier to set up efficient fund management system • Can reach small and large NGOs that complement government • DGF works with state and non-state actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compromises government’s role in steering (since funding is outside government systems) • DPs with larger resources may have greater say on resource allocation • Earmarking reduces government’s involvement and discretion in optimizing resource allocation • Earmarking fragments support

¹⁵ A case in point is the withdrawal of development partners such as Ireland, Sweden and Netherlands from SBS to the JLOS sector following two developments which discouraged DPs in Uganda: a) misappropriation of PRDP funds in the Office of the Prime Minister (meant for development programmes in the northern Uganda and the Karamoja sub-region), and b) after the enactment of an anti-homosexuality legislation by the GoU (for more details on the fraud, see “Interim Report by Evaluation and Audit Unit, Technical Team to Secretary General on Misappropriation of Funds in the Office of the Prime minister, Uganda 15 November, 2012”).

Instrument	Advantages / strengths	Weaknesses / challenges
Project Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More control, quicker to mobilise, can target pockets of need (e.g., Masindi Prison Kitchen) • CSOs complement government and holding the State to account • Project can quickly respond to specific issues of popular support by stakeholders in Vienna • Not discouraged by Govt. but DPs must share information on level of support, activities and effects of the intervention • Good potential for innovation and diversity (e.g., women empowerment oriented agricultural projects of Horizont3000) • Sustainable results achieved at micro-level (e.g., capacity building of CBOs through CSOs such as Care) often outweigh the high overheads of CSOs in the long term • Can leverage other resources, e.g., NGO co-financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-budget and often not at scale for large impacts • Weak coordination with other interventions in the sector (e.g., NGO co-financing projects) • High transaction costs (e.g., NGO overheads, PMU costs, oversight, reporting, etc) • Project information not fully/timely shared with Government • Often planned without Govt., so extra workload for Govt. Staff

Source: Own Source (Reviewers' Assessments Based on Key Informant Interviews).

SBS in both sectors tops up government resources and gives GoU some room to exercise its discretion in optimizing resource allocation. SBS in JLOS strengthens the entire system (e.g., police, judiciary and prison services) to address issues of access to justice for the poor and marginalized holistically. This approach eliminates obstacles at every stage of service provision. In W&S, SBS tops up government allocations to district conditional grants through which they invest in improving W&S but the funds are not traceable. Austria and Denmark's non-earmarked funding to the sector which is channelled through the Joint Partnership Fund, is used by the MoWE as a gap-filler or "oil to the system"¹⁶ by strengthening the institutional structure that delivers the joint sector programme. This way, Austria and Denmark enable the MoWE to deliver programmes funded by other DPs in the sector by providing discretionary funding.

Given the unique strengths and weaknesses associated with each instrument, the Review concludes that Austria's diverse mix of instruments is more advantageous than limiting the modalities to only one or two.

5.4 Geographical focus and choice of regional and local priority areas (Q3)

The activities that Austria finances through the SBS instrument are by their very nature national and therefore not geographically targeted per se. However, through the EU ICM project Austria has been channelling funding to Eastern Uganda (including, Karamoja sub-region, for strengthening the WSDF for Eastern Uganda) as per the agreement between the EU and the GoU. Until 2012, Austria was providing earmarked funding to WSDF-SW; and South-Western Uganda (strengthening of the WSDF for the SW Region). NGO projects funded by Austria through the NGO co-financing window or small-grants are mostly (but not exclusively) in Northern Uganda.

¹⁶ *Source: Focus Group Discussion with MoWE officials, Kampala, December 2014.*

The review finds geographical earmarking of funding to Northern and Eastern Uganda consistent with the NDP thrust towards addressing conflict-induced inequalities which have disproportionately affected these regions affected by civil war. There is also strong DP division of labour in both sectors which is evident through well-coordinated geographical and thematic targeting. In the W&S sector, WSDFs for Northern and Central Uganda are funded by other DPs (not Austria and EU).

Projects funded under the Uganda budget-line are in general more geographically focused and coordinated in line with the ADC Uganda CS than those financed through the other financial instruments (e.g., APPEAR, Business Partnerships, MFA Multilateral Funding, CGIAR, and Development Bank of Austria), some of which do not report to the ADC CCO (e.g., project funded under support to the CGIAR system).

5.5 ADC's comparative strengths as viewed by Ugandan and other development partners (Q4)

Both GoU and DPs appreciate the **strong institutional knowledge** Austria has of the two sectors which has laid a solid foundation for additional investment that both are undertaking in the two sectors. Austria has been instrumental to, and active in the development and implementation of the three Sector Investment Programmes of the JLOS and Joint Programmes for the Water and Environment Sector. Austria is credited for **technological and institutional innovations in the W&S sector**, especially the introduction and establishment of the concept of Water and Sanitation Development Facilities and the Umbrella Organisations which are a decentralized mechanism for GoU to develop and sustain water supply to small towns and rural growth centres. Austria is also acknowledged for innovations in legal aid, transitional justice and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms that have reduced the case backlog in the court system. Mainstreaming of human rights into the justice delivery system and introduction of results-based management training are steadily and positively transforming the attitudes, the working culture and ethics of the police-force, the judiciary and the prison services.

The EU Delegation in Uganda appreciates Austria's "**experience and quality**" in the W&S sector which in their opinion constitutes the added value to EU funding for the W&S sector. According to the EU Head of Cooperation, Austria is managing EU ICM resources well, and their technical capacity was the main reason for channelling their MDG Initiative Grant for W&S through Austria to the Joint Partnership Fund.

Over the two decades of engagement in the two sectors, Austria has established a **strong partnership with Government**, earning a reputation of "trusted donor"¹⁷ and one the GoU can rely on to manage the relationship GoU has with other DPs in the sector. Austria is given unfettered space in policy dialogue in the sector, in spite of its relatively small annual budget contribution. Austria is acknowledged for being the pioneer in assisting the GoU in coming

¹⁷ Source: Feedback from key informants in both the water and sanitation and RJP focal areas.

up with interventions at policy, and operational level (including detailed operational guidelines), for water source protection, and introduction of solar systems for urban water supply.

In JLOS, Austria's support through the Sector Budget Support instrument, even at a time when other DPs have withdrawn (or are phasing out their support) citing the misappropriation of funds in OPM and the AHA, is well appreciated by the government as a sign of genuine partnership, even though Austrian stakeholders may have questioned Austria's continued engagement when other development partners are pulling out. For this reason Austria is able to advocate for the GoU to increase resource allocation to the JLOS sector to complement the sector budget support.

Other DPs, appreciate Austria for taking an active role in donor coordination. Austria chairs well the DP Group working in Water and Sanitation sector and **provides support to other chairpersons when Austria is no longer the chair**. The additional support Austria provides to other DPs when they assume the chairpersonship role is a unique attribute that shows Austria is dedicated to not only the success of donor coordination efforts in the sector but committed to a genuine partnership with other donors.

Austria is very active and supportive within the DP group in JLOS but has not yet chaired the group (due to limited staffing). Much of this appears attributable more to the ingenuity and commitment of the sector advisors in the ADC CCO and the exemplary leadership of the ADC CCO Head of Office. It does not necessarily reflect that Austria is better resourced in terms of staff numbers than other DPs¹⁸. Overall, many among the DPs and CSOs interviewed considered the exceptional skills and dedication of the current ADC CCO leadership and her staff as a "special gift" to Uganda.

Austria's presence in the two sectors is supported by strong headquarter policy in Vienna. A key aspect of Austria's positive attitude and culture of working is that new sector advisors who replace outgoing advisors in the ADC CCO do not come and destroy what their predecessors built but they build on existing relationships in sector. This is unlike the practice of other DP advisors.

NGOs receiving funding from ADC consider Austria as "**a DP that listens**"¹⁹ and always willing to participate in and follow-up their interventions in the field, and resourceful and resolute in addressing challenges. According to the Uganda Country Office of Horizont 3000, "*Austria goes with us to the field and spends time with us, provides us with information on available funding, and links us to other NGOs in our sector*". Austria is **flexible** and thorough and has a special focus on the safeguarding and observance of the human rights of poor and marginalized groups, especially women and children. The **human rights, conflict prevention**

¹⁸ Based on a rough analysis of the ratio of technical staff to annual budgets of Austria and other DPs (e.g., Denmark, SIDA and Ireland).

¹⁹ Similar views were expressed by all NGOs interviewed including Horizont 3000, Care Uganda, SOS Children's Villages, UWONET, and East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project.

and resolution, as well **poverty reduction lenses** in the approach to development are considered stronger for Austria than for other DPs operating in Uganda. Austria's culture of flexibility is further illustrated by the statement of the Head of the ADC CCO in Uganda in Box 1.

Box 1: Added Value of Austria

"We bring the advantage of being a reliable partner, more open, approachable, more direct discussions with our partners. For example, our project on alternative dispute resolution is liked by JLOS very much, we had our ear close to the ground, understanding their needs and they decided to develop the project together with us".

Source: Interview with **the Head of Office**, ADC CCO, Uganda, December 2014.

In both W&S and JLOS, Austria has strengthened the results culture by supporting training to sector institutions on management for development results²⁰. Sector financial performance assessment is now being done (unlike before) and using a joint approach. Following audits of the sectors by the Auditor General, the sector prepared action plans for addressing the issues raised by the AG. In JLOS, the Human Rights and Governance Advisor in the ADC CCO took the lead and prepared together with other DPs, a status report on what the sector had done, the main achievements and what was still outstanding in the sector's response to issues raised by the Attorney General. The harmonised approach to assessing the financial performance of sectors was introduced for the first time in Uganda on Austria's (ADC CCO) initiative.

5.6 Coverage of poverty reduction and other cross-cutting issues (Q5)

As will be described in more details in the Chapter 7, on Effectiveness, there is evidence of systematic integration of poverty reduction, human rights, conflict prevention, gender, environment, good governance, children and persons with disabilities (Box 2). However, HIV and AIDS mainstreaming is not so strong in Austrian ODA to Uganda.

Box 2: Systematic Mainstreaming of ADC Principles and Cross-Cutting Issues

To mainstream cross-cutting issues, ADC ensures that every new project in both focal sectors (W&S and JLOS) or with NGOs follows a standard project cycle management procedure whereby it is screened for these issues by making use of a proposal format with a standard checklist to facilitate compliance. Grant applicants are requested to indicate a strategy they will use to mainstream the ADC principles and cross-cutting issues. The Gender Questionnaire and the Environment Checklist are standard requirements. The proposals are evaluated at ADA HQ level and also at the ADC CCO. Several meetings are arranged with IPs to provide technical support on how to address cross-cutting issues especially, gender and environment. "*We discuss and come to a level that is manageable at the level of the partners, e.g., if it is not the focal area of the project*".

Source: Interview with **Human Rights and Governance Sector Advisor**, ADC CCO, Uganda, December 2014.

²⁰ The first support to strengthen the results culture by supporting training was carried out in the W&S sector in 2011. Because of the success, the initiative was copied for JLOS institutions.

Some of the cross-cutting issues are addressed through tailored projects to pursue them directly. Examples are: 1) the “roll out of ADR”²¹ project with JLOS; 2) mainstreaming of gender which has been planned and budgeted for during the project design; and 3) training manuals on mediation for the judiciary and other JLOS institutions. ADC’s project with UWONET is also a gender-specific project whose objective is empowerment of women and the youths and it targets both men and women in its interventions but with women and the youth as primary beneficiaries.

In DGF, Austria and other DPs have ensured that the programme management unit has an expert on conflict prevention and management to provide grantees sufficient technical back-stopping on this subject. This is funded under DGF in general and works on all 3 components of the programme. A concept paper was also written for the DGF articulating the situation in relation to transitional justice and how best to resolve outstanding issues on the ground that could eventually trigger conflicts in future. The approach is to address issues such as bringing justice to bear on perpetrators of war crimes, and compensating people who suffered loss during the LRA conflict period. The concept note is guiding funding to NGOs to address this specific issue.

Austria has also been furthering work on conflict resolution by contributing to the formulation of the policy on transitional justice, and legal aid policy, by providing feedback on the drafts. However, approval of these policies is protracted. Once approved the two policies will greatly contribute towards resolution of civil and criminal cases that have the potential to explode and fuel conflicts in Uganda in the future.

5.7 Treatment of the human rights based approach (Q6)

The Review found Austria particularly strong in mainstreaming a human rights-based approach to its work. Mainstreaming of human rights is being addressed directly through a combination of vehicles Austria is using to channel its development assistance to Uganda. Through the SBS to JLOS, Austria is strengthening the system for the observation of human rights. It is addressing HR directly through training of officials in the justice delivery system on integrating a HR perspective to their work, including observance of the right of the offenders/suspects to be heard by the courts within 48 hours²², and the right of those in prison to live in a safe and healthy environment (access to improved sanitation and decongestion of prisons) and to have access to fair trial and have their cases concluded within the shortest possible period.

ADC is also addressing HR directly through the small grants facility (for example construction of a kitchen at Masindi Prison to improve the welfare of prisoners) and other initiatives funded through the NGO Co-financing windows. Under the latter, Horizont 3000, for example works to empower women with the specific objective of reducing domestic violence. SOS

²¹ Examples were given by the sector specialist for RJP in the ADC CCO.

²² This and other service quality standards are spelt out in the JLOS Annual Sector Performance Report for financial year 2013/14.

Children's Villages has a programme supported by Austria in two locations in Uganda, which is safeguarding the rights of orphans and vulnerable children to grow up in a safe and "parented" home, access basic education, have food and nutrition security as well as their right to basic health services and vocational skills.

With funding through the NGO Co-financing window, Care Uganda, is working on interventions to reduce the incidence of SGBV. It is supporting the 16 Days of SGBV Activism. This project is one of several through which Austria is giving life (in Uganda) to the *United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 of 2000*. This resolution on women, peace and security acknowledges disproportionate and unique impact of armed conflict on women and girls.

HORIZONT 3000 also has a HR-specific project entitled "Peace Building in Northern Uganda" through which it has been organising dialogue meetings for conflict resolution. Most of the cases are about land disputes emanating from displacement of people by the civil war²³. HORIZONT 3000 is also promoting conflict prevention and resolution by inculcating positive cultural values in children.

With ADC funding, HORIZONT 3000 also provides TA support to a network of NGOs called HURINET working on advocacy and human rights issues. NGO projects and the SBS complement each other on human rights. HORIZONT 3000 interventions are focused on community capacity building, while the SBS and basket funding focus more systems strengthening at national and sub-national levels.

ADC is providing financial support to the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project. This is directly advancing human rights by building the capacity of HR activists to defend themselves in their sub-region. While the project is relatively new, it will fill a critical gap, in advocacy to raise the profile and the image of HR defenders who are at risk as well as in strengthening networks, information systems and providing needed emergency support (legal aid, temporary or permanent relocation, study scholarships, work placements, reintegration, etc). Advocacy will be escalated to Pan Africa, UN, as well as regional level (e.g., SADC, EAC, ECOWAS, etc). HRDs play a critical role in defending the rights of the poor and marginalised by propagating their voice on human rights violations in their communities to policy makers and politicians. The sector advisor on Human Rights and Governance is actively participating in the EU HR Defenders WG. The need to support this project was identified through meetings directly with the NGO.

In the water sector, interventions supported by Austria are enabling the poor and marginalised to access potable water within a proximal distance, as a basic human right. For those

²³ When people left the camps and came back to settle in their homelands, many had forgotten boundaries of their land, Other cases relating to land are to do with land-lordship and tenancy, and others about land inheritance in paternalistic cultures, especially for women when their spouses die.

not able to afford piped water delivered to individual homes, communal taps with lower user fees are provided as an option for ensuring that all in the targeted areas access water.

5.8 Extent to which ADC support enabled GoU to achieve its NDP goals (Q2)

Although the annual Austrian ODA to Uganda is small, and the proportion of overall ODA in total budget has declined over the years, the strategic selection of a diverse range of instruments and interventions has been instrumental to achievement of progress towards NDP goals in the two sectors where most of Austria's support has been channelled. Various institutions in the GoU that were interviewed²⁴ rated Austria's contribution to the realisation of NDP goals as "significant". In the W&S sector, most NDP indicators have improved. Austrian support has been instrumental to reforms for water and sanitation services which have been going on for a long time since 1999 and continued during the period under review. These reforms have improved the way the sector is governed towards greater efficiency and coverage of services. A new Water Bill is being finalised. Institutional reforms and structures have been created in water resources management. As part of the development partner group for Water and Environment Sector, Austria made a key contribution to critical policy decisions, including those on the replication, structure, governance and funding of UOs and WSDFs. The legal frameworks for WSDFs and UOs continued to be refined during the period under review, and further refinement of the framework for UOs is on-going. The W&S sector has become increasingly de-concentrated.

In the RJP funding to the JLOS has augmented the government budget and encouraged the government to increase resource allocation to the sector which has expanded the capacity of the justice administration and delivery system partly through de-concentration of services and opening up of service delivery points in previously unreached areas.

5.9 Alignment of priorities and comparative strengths in Austria's 3 Year Programme and Austrian Development Policy with Uganda's NDP (Q8)

The 3 Year Programme (2013-2015) of Austria and Uganda's NDP converge on sector choice, especially in the areas of water supply, energy, climate protection, agriculture, forestry, human security, human rights and rule of law. Austria also prioritised "private sector and development". This is consistent with the development approach of the NDP which intertwines economic growth and poverty eradication, and recognises that the "*private sector will remain the engine of growth and development*"²⁵. Austria's attention to human rights and the rule of law is in tandem with GoU's commitment to playing a facilitating role through the provision of enabling policy, institutional and regulatory framework which will also actively promote and encourage public-private partnerships. However, during the period under review, Austria's support to the private sector to establish partnerships with those in Uganda, through the Business Partnerships financial instrument, was still being worked out.

²⁴ For example, JLOS Secretariat, MoWE, Chief Registrar, and Acting Solicitor General.

²⁵ NDP 2010-2015.

6 FINDINGS ON EFFICIENCY

6.1 Efficiency and transparency of process of developing ADC's CS 2010-2015 (Q18)

In relation to efficiency, the review assesses:

- a) the process of development of the CS 2010-2015;
- b) the quality of the output (the strategy document); and
- c) the utility of the CS 2010-2015.

Additionally, the stakeholder participation (in Austria as well as in Uganda) as well as whether the process was sufficiently reflective including a sound analysis of strategy options are assessed.

6.1.1 ADC in the context of policies and strategies

The recently published DAC Peer Review²⁶ states very clearly that Austria “uses both bilateral relations and EU instruments to contribute strategically to addressing global public risks and processes that are important for Austria and Europe” (DAC, p.9). The overall framework for ADC is set out in the Federal Ministries Act (1986), the Federal Act on Development Cooperation (amended in 2003) and the Government's work programme 2013-2018. These policy documents are complemented by the three-years-programme, elaborated under the direct responsibility of the MFA (Section 7) in a comprehensive consultative process bringing together a wide range of governmental and non-governmental actors. Therefore the document seems to have nowadays a wide ownership and cannot be labelled anymore as a rolling, continuously written document as it was the case in previous years. Nevertheless, it cannot be understood as a binding document which represents and reflects the whole ODA of Austria. For this reason, the DAC Peer Review suggested a more structured and binding dialogue with all relevant actors – particularly other aid-spending Ministries – which would contribute to an improved coherence and a better support within the governmental system.

The actual CS 2010-2015 for Uganda took these policy documents into account and translated them into practise. Furthermore, it takes the Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme 2008-2013 between the Government of Uganda and the European Community into consideration and aligns to that. According to the MFA, Austria will continue to follow more consequently this chosen path while participating in the EU Joint Programming exercise for Uganda. The reality in Uganda confirms that ADC is already perfectly placed to play a decisive role within the efforts to strengthen donor harmonization among EU member states that are present in Uganda. ADC enjoys not only the respect and acknowledgement of all but has already a proven record within in the sector coordination of W&S.

²⁶ OECD/DAC Peer Review “Review of the Development Co-Operation Policies and Programmes of Austria” Secretariat Report, 3rd of December 2014

6.1.2 Process of Elaboration of CS 2010-15

The CS refers to the overall objectives outlined in the EU development policy²⁷, Austria's development policy²⁸ and the Uganda's development strategy²⁹.

Within the EC framework the member states agreed upon an EU Joint Programming procedure to harmonize its activities in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of European development cooperation through greater coordination, division of labour, and policy coherence. According to MFA, this endeavour is very much driven by the goodwill of 28 member states. Consequently, ADC is on its best way to put this into practice as Austria is part of the core group in Uganda which coordinates the respective sector engagement in the recipient country. Actually, the biggest challenge for harmonizing the aid delivery in Uganda is the on-going discussion around the Local Development Partners Group.

The CS is elaborated in a bilateral forward and backward procedure between ADA, the ADC coordination office and the MFA. It is rather handled as an administrative compulsory exercise than a debate of possible support to a change process in the recipient country. Assessing the process of elaboration in Austria itself, representatives of MFA face rather some challenges due to the often criticized fragmentation within the Austrian governmental system³⁰. The MFA tries to meet this critic (which is expressed also by Austrian non-governmental actors) with a more targeted implementation of the whole-of-government approach in Austria. There are nowadays approaches to foster the dialogue between the three key actors within the Austrian governmental system: the Federal Ministry of Finance, the Development Bank of Austria and the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs. This apparently arises from a pragmatic approach as policy coherence is not established by instruments or institutional arrangements but first of all by the political will of the involved parties.

Looking at the expiring CS one must state that although the leading policy and strategy papers have served as a basis for the formulation of the CS, it is de facto a merger of existing and foreseen interventions of that time. This reduces the CS paper to just an information paper while describing the interventions along existing budget lines. This might be the lowest common denominator among the different institutional actors involved as the interests vary significantly from actor to actor.

However, a strategy paper should be more than that: First of all, it is a management instrument for steering the engagement of ADC in Uganda. Secondly, it is a debate on how to achieve certain goals and objectives. And thirdly, it is a deliberate choice for one option among several possible. For this, a discussion and negotiation process among the various

²⁷ Cp "Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme for the period 2008-2013 – Uganda" of the European Commission

²⁸ here the "Three-Year-Programme 09-11", "Three-Year-Programme 10-12" and "Three-Year-Programme 13-15"

²⁹ Cp the "National Development Plan 2010/11 to 2014/15", individual Sector Investment Plans as well as the "Peace, recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda"

³⁰ "The 2010 evaluation of humanitarian aid called for clear criteria for funding allocations in order to increase the transparency of decision-making and counter fragmentation across government (MFA, 2010); this recommendation remains pertinent. Current procedures have resulted in a fragmented programme, with many crises receiving less than EUR 500 000 in funding". DAC Peer Review, page 54

stakeholders is inevitable. The output should be the country strategy paper to which all agree.

6.1.3 Quality of CS Document

The quality of the CS 2010-15 has been assessed according the following criteria:

- *elaboration in a structured and transparent formal way*

There is no formal structure or procedure set up by the MFA, the agency in lead of the CS. De facto a request is made towards ADA headquarter and the Coordination Office to make a first serve. The further development and formulation takes place in the triangle MFA – Coordination Office –ADA Headquarter with the support of the technical expertise from experts if required.

- *participatory elaboration involving relevant stakeholders in Austria as well as from partner country*

The elaboration of the CS 2010-15 remained in the above mentioned triangle. Coordination meetings with other governmental actors or non-governmental actors did not formally take place during the elaboration of the strategy. There were only consultative meetings within the sectors in Uganda.

- *provision of a clear strategic guidance and orientation*

The paper reflects rather what ADC is actually “doing” in Uganda; hence it serves primarily as an information tool for ADC actors. Furthermore, it serves as a reference paper for ADC to what can be done respectively to what has to be excluded from funding and/or support. Therefore the paper is rather a kind of argumentative support for ADC positions than it gives clear strategic guidance to ADC staff and outsiders.

- *aligned to relevant policies and strategies in Austria, in the EU, and in partner country*

The CS acknowledges current policies and strategies and takes them into account. The EU development policy serves as the overall objective to alleviate poverty, to strengthen peace and security, to foster good governance and to enable the recipient country to take its share in Africa’s efforts to achieve the MDGs. The alignment to Austria’s Development policies and strategies (legal framework, three-years-programme) and to the development strategies of the partner country (NDP, PRDP) is clearly set.

There is a clear imbalance in the reference to the cooperation systems in each system: Whereas relevant stakeholders in Uganda are clearly identified and mentioned as leverage to initiate and support ongoing change processes, the cooperation systems in Austria and on EU level remain unmentioned. From the strategic point of view these are likewise relevant; modes of cooperation should be stated.

- *considering cross-cutting issues like poverty reduction, gender, environment, do no harm and others*

Cross cutting issues are clearly mentioned and linked to the interventions in both focal areas.

- *reflection about the planned development in a specific sector or in a certain area*

Reflection about the intended impacts and outcomes are clearly made in both focal areas but impact indicators and targets are not outlined in the CS.

- *referring to the ways and criteria of resource allocation and the chosen funding instruments*

The CS 2010-15 states clearly the amount of funds available and the percentage which will be channelled in both focal areas. Instruments for funding (e.g. sector budget support; pooled funding) as well as other financing tools (e.g. NGO cooperation framework, AP-PEAR, CGIAR, Business partnerships, PIDG, multilateral project funding, OeKB) are listed up. However, one cannot distinguish whether this is a selection of possible funding sources or a clear strategic choice which ensures the targeted contribution to Uganda.

- *describing how both countries will monitor and measure the progress and the results*

The CS 2010-15 clearly describes the joint review and planning processes under the lead of the GoU and in harmonization with other donors. However, the monitoring of the CS and therefore the steering remains unclear.

- *incorporating lessons learned from previous experiences either in the partner country or in other countries*

Lessons learned are considered in the two focal areas and are an important base for the advisory role in technical issues.

As mentioned above the CS 2010-15 is used as information about what ADC is doing in Uganda and to protect the Uganda Budget-line from impromptu cuts. However, in its contents the CS remains vague and leaves room for wider interpretation. As it is not used more as a management tool there was no need so far to establish corresponding procedures and formats which go along the strategy cycle (e.g. regular feedback loops on strategic level). This might change with the elaboration of the future CS as the discussions in Austria move towards the application of the whole-of-government approach.

Following this idea the CS might be embedded in higher-level processes. A good linkage could improve the buy-in of other partners. There are certain important points of contact mentioned in the CS which could lead to an improved coordination and possible bundling of activities. Based on the three major processes for channelling funds to the recipient country –the ADC programme interventions, the engagement of the MoF with the International Financial Institutions and the support of private sector projects through the Development Bank of Austria – coordination on political-strategic level could be envisaged. But also the actual participation in the EU Joint Programming requires an improved coordination among Austria's relevant stakeholders. This has to be linked and fine-tuned to the actual processes in Kampala (be it among the donors or with the Ugandan counterparts).

6.2 Efficiency of implementation of the Country Strategy (Q19)

The implementation of the CS in Uganda relies on how well the ADC Coordination office understands and fulfils its role vis-a-vis the Ugandan stakeholders. The self-understanding of the coordination office is strongly linked to that of a donor. In that it supports the efforts of the Ugandan Government in implementing its national strategies in the respective sectors while playing an advisory role in technical and organizational issues. However, ADA states clearly that the dialogue among the relevant stakeholders is being led on programme implementation level rather than on strategic issues. This finds its roots in the long-standing engagement of ADC in both sectors and the related excellent technical know-how. ADC is appropriately involved in steering ADC funded activities but as advisor and supervisor, and not as a micro-manager. This bears the risk that ADC serves rather as a problem-solver at pro-

gramme level. The good reputation of ADC as a reliable partner predestines them to play a bigger part in donor dialogue at one hand and in supporting the Ugandan government to actively steer and manage the sector strategies as demands or context conditions may change over time. This could serve as a good practice example in the donor community as well as in Austria (accountability).

6.3 Use of systematic integrated approaches in line with Nexus approach (Q20)

Although not part of the current CS 2010-15, discussions have started in 2013 around the use of systematic integrated approaches in ADC programmes. In focus is *Nexus* –an initiative for creating more comprehensive policy strategies for an improved support of sustainable development. Interim results are two field studies in Ethiopia and Burkina Faso and a comprehensive study³¹. However, the discussions seem to shift on technical level; the actual innovative approach, which is equivalent to a paradigm shift in ADC works, gets into the background. If Nexus would be incorporated to the future CS, sustainable aspects like structures, processes, policies and strategies would get more into the focus.

Furthermore, the process of elaborating a strategy would change considerably as a systematic integrative approach needs to be more participatory and comprehensive than current practice. The changes would be seen rather in Austria than in Uganda as the inter-ministerial consultation processes between the key actors of the Austrian ODA (MOF, MFA and OeEB) would have to coordinate more closely. This could be a chance to gain broader support but stands (and falls) with the existing political willingness, commitment and the available capacities. However, the intention behind participating in the EU Joint Programming means that ADC is actively looking for strategic alliances within the governmental system and the Nexus approach could be a tool for leverage. Furthermore, also other stakeholders (private business, non-governmental organizations) would have the chance to complement the endeavour.

As technical and organizational aspects come together, it is very important to distinguish the levels of engagement and the actors to be involved. Until today, there are important questions still open: What the approach should look like, how does it have to be operated? Who is responsible, who has to be involved and in which role? How can this be organized? Seeing the limited resources on ADC, one has to raise the question whether the capacities are ensured to initiate and continue this process.

Leverage may be more focused on inter-governmental level while setting up a clear steering structure on political-strategic level (the three key actors relevant for main ODA processes, the MoF, MFA and OeEB) and a clear operational strategic level with each process according to the standards and procedures of the key institutions. It would be a huge step forward to have this coordination between the three main processes.

³¹ cp. Guidance document „Nexus Approach for ADA Programming, Project/Programme implementation and policy dialogue” by Sustainable Europe Research Institute, undated

7 FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVENESS

7.1 Achievement of objectives and results in the chosen sectors (Q9)

The achievement of targets set in the CS is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 on Outcomes and Impacts. Achievement of most of the objectives stated in the CS for the chosen sectors has by and large been satisfactory (Table 2), but the performance targets were specified at outcome level, and the results at outcome level require that all other critical actors also play their part well. **Access to improved water sources in rural areas (including small towns)** has improved significantly but water quality remains an issue for rural areas, mainly as a result of lack of sanitation around water points (mainly springs) and poor hygiene practices. Both the number and proportion of the population with improved access to water sources have grown over time but the latter has stagnated in recent years as growth in demand for water has exceeded the additional coverage achieved by new and rehabilitated water schemes. The investment in rehabilitation and construction of water supply schemes for human consumption has been less than is required to offset the increase in demand arising from population growth of about 3% in Uganda³². The stagnation in access to safe water (at 64%) in rural areas is “*mainly attributable to the inadequate funding to the district local governments that have the responsibility for water and sanitation service provision*”³³. The target is unlikely to be achieved by the end of the CS period under review.

Table 2: Extent of Achievement of Stated Objectives

Objective	OECD Ratings for Sub-Objectives (A=Very Good; B=Good; C=Poor; D=Very Poor) ³⁴
1. Improved access to safe water supply in rural areas (including small towns and growth points)	Water availability (rural): B Water quality (rural): D Water quality (urban): A
2. Improved access to improved sanitation in rural areas (including small towns and growth points)	Sanitation (rural/urban): A Hygiene (rural/urban): D
3. Protection and sustainable use of water resources contribute to conflict prevention and reduced vulnerability to climate change	Functionality of W&S committees: B Conflict prevention: A Reduced vulnerability to climate change through Protection of catchments: C
4. Rule of law, respect for human rights and	Access to justice for all: A

³² Uganda Bureau of Statistics, National Population and Housing Census 2014, Provisional Results, Revised Edition, November 2014

³³ Uganda Water and Environment Sector Performance Report 2014 (Foreword)

³⁴ Achievement is rated A=very good if targets are being met or over-achieved or progress within the control of ADC is more than satisfactory. It is rated B=Good if slightly missed target but is on course to meeting the target, or it is satisfactory within the control of ADC. It is C=Poor if significantly below target but overall trend is still an improvement. It is D=Very Poor if targets won't be achieved altogether and if the trend is showing a negative trend instead of an improving one. Caution should be taken not to over interpret the ratings, as they are done using qualitative but objective judgment of the reviewers based on several pieces of evidence and interviewing many people. They are meant to give a rough indication of where things are going well and where some attention should be drawn to address observed issues.

Objective	OECD Ratings for Sub-Objectives (A=Very Good; B=Good; C=Poor; D=Very Poor) ³⁴
an effective justice system mitigate social inequities	SGBV prevention/access to justice: B Transitional justice framework: C Management for Development Results: A

Significant progress was made during the period of the strategy in **improving the population with access to improved sanitation** in both rural and urban areas, partly due to the policy adopted for new water supply schemes, of making 100% coverage of sanitation a condition for developing new water supply schemes in small towns and rural growth centres. Hygiene promotion however, remains the weakest link between investments in water and sanitation and improvement of health outcomes eventually expected among the targeted population.

Substantial progress has been made in relation to the “**protection and sustainable use of water resources contribute to conflict prevention and reduced vulnerability to climate change**“, with an increase of 1% point per year in functionality of rural water supplies due to improvements in O&M such as strengthening of hand-pump mechanic associations, emphasis by districts on conducting advocacy meetings for water programmes both at district and sub-county levels. For instance, 90% of districts were reported to have held advocacy meetings in 2013/14 financial year³⁵. Austria has contributed to this, among others, through a financing facility for Technical Assistance to the Ministry of Water and Environment which the latter is using to recruit advisors, one of whom is dedicated to strengthening capacity for O&M and another on providing support to institutional strengthening of WSDFs. In addition, the improvement in functionality of water supplies is attributed to increased investment for rehabilitation using the conditional grant. Austria’s SBS to Water and Environment Sector is earmarked to water, and is believed to be finding its way to district conditional grants, part of which is then used for these important activities which are expanding and sustaining rural water supplies.

Availability of water for all, within 1 kilometre or less, in previously disadvantaged areas, and the fact that O&M of rural water facilities (including small towns and growth centres) is largely based on the Community Based Maintenance System has together with integrated, catchment based water resource management contributed to conflict prevention as people learn to share a resource and work together to sustain it. Determination of user fees for water supplies has also been sensitive to the objective of preventing exclusion of the poor and vulnerable, which can be a source of conflict. These measures have been complemented by training of the police force and community leadership structures and general members of the communities on alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and the rights of women and children to protection against abuse in the community and when fetching water.

³⁵ Source: MoWE, Water and Environment Annual Sector Performance Report (2013/14)

Regarding the objective of **reducing vulnerability to climate change through protection of catchments**, significant progress has been achieved although much more work is needed. The Framework and Guidelines for Water Source Protection were finalized and launched by the Minister of Water and Environment at the time of the Joint Annual Sector Review in October 2014. Austria is credited for triggering the initiative and supporting it together with Denmark. The framework and guidelines include those for protecting water sources for piped water supply system and point water supply systems. The National Water Resources Strategy was improved based on the findings of a National Water Resources Assessment that was conducted also during the same period. Water Management Zones (WMZs) began to provide services of water resources monitoring, water quality testing, water resource management technical guidance to local governments, and assessment of water permit applications and compliance monitoring. Austria's resources were also committed to capacity building stakeholder capacity building to produce and implement catchment management plans. This development has facilitated for the first time dialogue between government, private sector, CSOs and communities on management of their catchments. Private sector participation is promoted first through risk assessment and awareness promotion on investments into mitigation measures related to water catchment protection. Breweries, the NWSC, and Coca-Cola Company have been attracted to participate in catchment area planning and setting aside resources for implementation of the catchment management plans. Austria was instrumental in convincing DPs to adopt a policy of encouraging every entity that creates water infrastructure (mainly MWE departments and NWSC) to set aside a budget for water source protection (up to 3% of the investment). This is defined in the new water source protection guideline of GoU. Austria was instrumental in developing the guideline, though.

According to the Acting Director for Water Resources Management there were other achievements (Box 3).

Box 3: Achievements in water resources management

*"We have also integrated W&S and WRM leveraging resources from developers to finance protection and management of water sources. WRM and Water Development are now working more closely together; they now know how to manage the resource together. The approach has led the sector to think holistically. Environment sector is now also on board. Their mind-set has shifted from thinking of water as a commodity to a resource that needs to be looked after to get the quality and quantity you need for ecosystem preservation. People now speak of things they were not talking of. We are now saying how can the water and environment officers use the resources they individually have to get the best results? Donor support has helped to re-orient things to the best practice. **Government has jumped onto the bandwagon of DP innovation**".*

Source: Interview with **Acting Director, Water Resources Management**, December 2014

As regards the **rule of law, respect for human rights and an effective justice system mitigate social inequities** the review noted commendable progress made with respect to access to justice for all, especially the mainstreaming of human rights into the justice system, and training of staff in JLOS institutions on managing for development results which has triggered a change the mind-set of officials in the police, judiciary and prison services. In addition it has the potential to modernise the management in the sector, but has also demonstrated the need for more training.

The integration of legal aid service provision to the poor and vulnerable into the official system delivering justice services is a major area of success. The work the ADC CCO is carrying out with the Paralegal Advisory Services and Justice Centres Uganda to facilitate justice for the poor is in particular outstanding in its effectiveness, and acceptance by government institutions. It is instrumental in the disposal of many court cases overdue and in reducing the case backlog. These activities were supported by Austria through an earmarked contribution to the DGF for activities under the component addressing issues of rights, justice and peace. The number of districts with completed chain of frontline JLOS services increased from a baseline of 30% to 34.8% by May 2014.

Human rights issues were mainstreamed into the justice system by establishing five human rights desks in Uganda Police regions, and almost all prison units (95%) now have human rights committees. The desks have been effective to some extent in increasing the number of human rights abuses reported, and in reducing the number torture cases by the police and the army.

Partly due to Austria's sector budget support to JLOs, though relatively small (2 million Euros per year), the holding capacity of prisons was increased by 3.3% to reduce congestion and sanitation facilities in prisons were improved, with significant investments in such infrastructure, although more than half of the prison units continue to need improvements in sanitary facilities. Staff accommodation was also improved for those working in the courts, the police and the DPP. ADC support has taken into account the welfare of vulnerable groups in conflict and in contact with the law. Remand homes have been improved and now ensure that some of the police stations have areas for juveniles. The justice system is much more conscious of and adhering to the national standards, such as the 48 hour rule, including that children are not kept in prisons. In 2014, inspection guidelines and manuals were finalized and launched aimed at improving the institutional systems and quality of services, especially compliance with the standards. These are now guiding inspectors in the entire JLOS sector.

The capacity to handle human rights complaints and dispose of them was increased through the strengthening of the Human Rights Commission on mediation. The ADC funded project on the Roll-out of ADR started in 2013. The effectiveness of the HRC is evident in that in 2013, two out of every five human rights complaints were disposed of through mediation of this Commission. Although it may have been too early for the ADC funded project to have contributed to this achievement it shows that the ADC support is targeting an institution that has potential to deliver good results.

ADC contributed along other DPs, to the improvement of the policy and legal regime for doing business through participation in the sector and selected thematic working groups³⁶ and provision of technical assistance to the JLOS sector. Forty out of 44 laws were reformed

³⁶ The thematic working groups where ADC attends regularly include, among others: M&E, human rights/accountability, access to justice, and budget).

thus reducing the burden of doing business in Uganda. Efficiency of the legal framework for settling disputes was improved and strengthened Uganda's ranking to 49th in the world. Enforcement of existing laws was improved to 29% public confidence³⁷. Austria was also credited for introducing the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanism to fast-track pre-trial disposal of cases, while Denmark introduced a "small claims procedure mechanism" for disputes below 10 million Ugandan Shillings. According to the Chief Registrar, "*the programme (ADR) has taken off mainly in civil justice – all civil cases now go for compulsory mediation. As a result we will provide training for judges, magistrates and advocates and other actors*"³⁸.

Austria contributed to the development of the transitional justice policy through its direct engagement in the sector (in sector and thematic working groups) and supporting training and capacity development through a grant to the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ). ICTJ provided TA support to government in transitional justice issues, including on how to handle and resolve human rights violations (through criminal justice, truth telling, state reparations to victims of human rights violations, amnesty and reconciliation) using international best practice. TA support was provided on how to reform institutions that were responsible for propagating the violations (police and the military). ICTJ's work also targeted capacity building and training of CSOs and this improved their understanding of transitional justice issues. It broadened the debate on transitional justice by bringing together CSOs and government to discuss policy issues. Special training to judges and study tours to other jurisdictions (e.g., the Hague) were arranged for a government delegation that was headed by the Deputy Attorney General who is also Deputy Minister of Justice) to open for them an opportunity to learn by seeing transitional justice being delivered in practice. CSO leaders also benefitted from special courses on gender justice and youth and child justice. However, despite all these measures the TJ Policy is yet to be approved by Cabinet and then developed into law, and the process is protracted for various reasons described in detail under section 7.2.

ADC provided training to W&S and JLOS leadership and management on managing for development results which was well appreciated (see Box 4). Austria has strengthened the monitoring function by supporting the use of M&E Plans for both sectors, and technical advice during regular joint M&E visits.

³⁷ Source: Statistics in this section are from ADC (2014) Impact of ADC Support to JLOS May 2014[1]

³⁸ Interview with Chief Registrar, December 2014.

Box 4: Feedback on Training on Management for Development Results

“ADC support has gone towards stronger information management systems, the prisons can account for everybody and now they can say these are children. Direct support has been provided in terms of building management capabilities of top management in the area of management for development results, PS, Directors, and technical committee and JLOS leaders and they (training sessions) are oversubscribed, meaning we have build-ings but we need to arrest the mind and get it in the area of MfDR. Because of ADC support the sector has a strong M&E system which is missing in most government departments. The strong area of ADC is M&E, they are also very good in financial management, and they give you their grant but it is not easy money. They have advo-cated the opening up of public financial management systems. We had to open up. Now we have a lot of infor-mation in the public domain”.

Source: Interview with **Chief Registrar**, December 2014.

7.2 Enabling and constraining factors in achievement of objectives (Q10)

The good results achieved in both sectors are linked to the well-organised institutional struc-tures in the sectors, strong donor coordination, a long period of consistent capacity building which has strengthened service delivery institutions, and an enabling and growing macro-economic environment, which has expanded the revenue base of government, and has seen the share of ODA in government expenditure decline over time. Government revenues are growing and GoU has been able to increase investments in the two sectors, though in water the increase in the level of government expenditure has been overshadowed by the rising demand for services emanating from a high annual rate of population growth. This issue and the other major constraints hindering achievement of objectives in the two sectors are sum-marised in Table 3 below.

Table 3: factors constraining achievement of objectives in the W&S and RJP

Water and Sanitation	Rights, Justice and Peace
<p><u>Sector funding gap:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIP budget exceeds available resources • Few (2) DPs with un-earmarked funding for the sector <p><u>Sustainability of the investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 65% coverage investment to keep current infrastructure is now more costly than the new infrastructure (dilemma, what to priori-tize?) <p><u>Sanitation and hygiene model not adequate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and other institutions do not have proper sanitation facilities both in the towns and in rural areas • Limited focus on hygiene • Improved sanitation coverage counts those sharing a latrine and not in line with MDG target (quality of access to improved sanita-tion) • Hand-washing below 40% - cholera out- 	<p><u>Sector funding gap:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constrained government funding • Constrained human capacity, slows court processes • Infrastructure not adequate, leading to con-gestion of prisons <p><u>Endemic corruption:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corruption endemic in justice system <p><u>Slow traction on policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lengthy process of approval of policy and legislative documents (e.g., legal aid policy, transitional justice policy, etc) <p><u>Weak technical capacity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak capacity to mainstream gender in the justice delivery system

Water and Sanitation	Rights, Justice and Peace
breaks in N and E • Sanitation costs are high, many households cannot afford	

Source: Own source.

7.3 Quality of indicators (Q11)

The review notes that the CS indicators were set at macro outcomes level and well-aligned to national indicators for measurement of performance of sector programmes (JLOS and W&S). They were derived from the Sector Investment Plans. The advantage of this is that the system for collection and reporting on the indicators is well established and ADC does not need to reinvent the wheel. However, the review notes some inherent disadvantages with the approach. The first limitation of CS indicators is that they assess the results from all interventions including those funded by ODA from Austria, and as such difficult to attribute, especially when the contribution is small compared to other development partners. The indicators do not measure what Austria is doing in the sector and how effective it is. They measure effectiveness of the collective effort of all stakeholders in the sector not individual contribution of Austria. To this end it might be useful in future to include indicators that track more closely the processes that Austria influences and the quality of engagement of Austria in these processes.

The second shortcoming is that the CS indicators are only gender-sensitive to the extent that the corresponding sector programme indicators are gender-sensitive/specific (most of the indicators are not sex-disaggregated).

A third gap in the Country Strategy Document, in relation to indicators, is that no impact indicators were identified (only output and outcome indicators were identified).

7.4 Extent of implementation of thematic focal areas as stated in the Strategy (Q12)

A key finding of this review is that the Uganda CS retrofitted *existing* interventions of Austria in Uganda and to this extent it was more of a *description of the status quo*. As such, most of the thematic interventions funded through ADA and MFA were to a large extent implemented as planned (including geographical targeting), but with asymmetrical success across the thematic areas (as summarised in section 7.1). Significant implementation progress was observed in the areas of construction/rehabilitation of water schemes, strengthening of institutions to expand water supply, institutional strengthening for community based management (O&M) of water schemes, and promotion of improved sanitation. However, progress was slower in water resources management (where water management zones lacked an operational budget and resources for implementation of catchment management plans have been inadequate) and hygiene promotion (which has not been an area of focus of the CS nor one where ADC or WSDF staff had strength, yet it is critical in terms of water quality). The integration of W&S for rural areas, including small towns and growth points, and similar

interventions in sectors such as basic education and health (maternal and child health) has been particularly weak.

In the RJP sector, significant progress was achieved in promoting access to justice for the poor and marginalised, mainstreaming of gender and a human rights based approach into the administration and delivery of justice, but less so for policy development. However, access to justice remains a challenge for the ordinary Ugandan women and men.

Progress in the review of laws for improving the investment environment has been strong. That in policy development (transitional justice, and legal aid policies) has been good but only up to the stage of approval at sector level (by the technical, steering and leadership committees), and not yet by cabinet. Approval of the policies at higher levels of governance has been slow, and hampered mostly by factors considered to be outside the influence of the JLOS, ADC and cooperating partners³⁹.

7.5 Mainstreaming of ADC principles and cross-cutting issues (Q13)

The treatment of poverty, human rights and conflict prevention has been discussed already in Chapter 5. In this section we provide a summary of the ratings for these and other principles and cross-cutting issues, as well as the main observations of the Review on each. As shown in Table 4, mainstreaming of ADC principles and cross-cutting issues varies by principle/issue and needs to be strengthened specifically for HIV and AIDS (rated C=Poor). There is also more room for strengthening good governance, environment and conflict resolution which are rated B=Good. Further work on getting the policies on transitional justice and legal aid approved is needed for conflict prevention and management and this may require ADC to refresh its approach on policy influencing, paying more attention to strengthening advocacy capacity of relevant institutions able to influence the next steps and strengthening the voice of the various target groups in the population who should benefit from this policy.

Table 4: Extent of mainstreaming of ADC principles and Cross-cutting issues in Austrian ODA to Uganda

Principle / Issue	OECD Rating: A=V. Good; B=Good; C=Poor; D=V. Poor	Observations / Examples
Poverty	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geographical targeting of poorest regions Legal aid support to the poor and vulnerable Pro-poor user fees for water
Conflict prevention	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TJ included in SIP 3 Document Transitional justice policy drafted awaiting Cabinet approval

³⁹ TJ Policy is led by the Minister of Internal Affairs.

Principle / Issue	OECD Rating: A=V. Good; B=Good; C=Poor; D=V. Poor	Observations / Examples
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms successfully introduced Integrated catchment-based water resource management Specific NGO projects (e.g., Horizont 3000)
Gender	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work-in-progress - mediation project-gender sensitive training manual for judiciary staff is to be developed Women empowerment project (UWONET) – mainly targeting women and the youth but also targeting men JLOS NGOs - Gender Questionnaire to screen project Gender-sensitive results reporting needs to be strengthened Specific gender projects (e.g., budgeting (Makerere University funded through APPEAR), and UWONET) Promoting the participation of women in water supply and sanitation boards
HIV / AIDS	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W&S sector strategy on HIV/AIDs exists JLOS sector strategy on HIV/AIDs exists No strong evidence of implementation of strategy on mainstreaming HIV/AIDs
Environment	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work-in-progress EIA standard requirement for large infrastructure projects Environmental screening of project proposals Establishment of water management zones Wetland area demarcation and protection activities Specific projects through UNIDO (Regional Centre for Renewable Energy and Efficiency), IUCN, etc Promotion of renewable energies (solar pumping) and sustainable sanitation technologies (e.g., ICM project)
Good governance	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of SBS modality (JLOS and W&S) supports good governance in both sectors Institutional strengthening of MoWE, WSDFs and UOs for improved governance of water supply Good Governance Working Group and the Good Governance Action Plan exist and are operational in the W&S sector Implementation of the action plan is an important element of the JWSSPS/JWESSP supported by Austria through the JPF ADC CCO actively participates in the GG Working Group
Human Rights	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstreaming HR through trainings and through increasing the understanding and awareness of human rights (HRCU project) Legal aid service provision to poor and vulnerable Support to human rights defenders - EHAHRDP Promoting access to water for all Joint support of Austria/Denmark to strengthen the implementation of the Human Rights Based Approach to Water and Sanitation
Children and people with disabilities	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific NGO Projects – SOS Children’s Villages Not clear in other interventions in JLOS and W&S

7.6 Effectiveness of the different aid modalities (budget support, sector wide approach, programme-based approach, conventional programmes and projects) (Q14)

Budget Support: Though it is a known fact that traceability of the use of the funds is a challenge, the SBS has been highly appreciated by GoU for supplementing government resources for service delivery (district conditional grants in W&S, and institutional strengthening for administration and delivery of justice, in the case of the JOS).

Basket Funding (SWAp): In W&S the non-earmarking of support by Austria and Denmark has provided the sector with the oil necessary for delivering services with funding from government and other development partners in the sector.

Programme Based Approach. In the RJP sector the DGF is outside government systems but has been instrumental in strengthening CSO role in holding government to account, in deepening democracy and protecting the rights of men, women, and children in the whole country working with over 86 partners (comprising a mix of local and international NGOs, Government and state institutions). It has successfully provided targeted support to fill the gap left by government services – e.g., in provision of legal aid to the poor and vulnerable groups, especially women, the youth and children in a total of 59 districts (out of a total of 112), and elevating the challenges, needs and voices of the victims of gross human rights violations perpetrated during the armed civil conflict in Northern Uganda to bear in national policy. Paralegal aid service provision alone is enabling over 5,600 prisoners to secure their right to be released from prison in a year⁴⁰. Civic education on their rights, roles and responsibilities has also been carried out reaching large numbers of people (500,000 per year).

The DGF has delivered other benefits in strengthening W&S sector coordination by providing resources for UWASNET to coordinate NGOs involved in W&S service provision⁴¹, research and policy advocacy. These NGOs contribute an estimated 20% of resources invested in the W&S Sector. The DGF is appreciated for strengthening and empowering both small and large NGOs in both governance and service delivery.

Project support: The absence of a system to aggregate results achieved through the NGO interventions funded by Austria in Uganda makes it difficult to judge the effectiveness of these interventions at scale. The Review notes that at best they are having very good micro-level impacts but which need to be captured and documented, to facilitate sharing and replication if they are to have wider impacts. Some good examples of NGO co-financed projects bearing results exist for SOS Children's Villages, Horizont 3000, and Care Austria in partnership with Care Uganda. Other projects funded under the Uganda Budget-line are also responding to critical needs (e.g., training on managing for development results for JLOS institutions, and construction of small infrastructure in the justice sector).

⁴⁰ Source: Statistics in this paragraph are from DGF Annual Report July 2013-June 2014.

⁴¹ UWASNET is mainly funded under JWSSPS/JWESSP through non-earmarked funding to the JPF including by Austria.

7.7 Synergies between thematic focal areas and other financial instruments (Business Partnerships, NGO-Co-financing, APPEAR Programme, PIDG, CGIAR, multi-lateral projects, AEFC, OeEB) (Q15)

The Review notes that linkages between thematic focal areas and other financial instruments are only strong for the NGO Co-financing instrument, but internal cohesion still needs to be strengthened (Table 5).

Table 5: Synergies between focal area interventions and other financial instruments

Financial instrument	Rating for synergies ^a	Observations / Examples
Business partnerships:	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Partnerships projects are at preparatory stage • Grant component should have a social and development impact • BPs used to support partnerships between Austrian and Ugandan companies where there is potential for poverty reduction effect • In Uganda, so far only done 2 feasibility studies (one concluded and at project proposal development stage, and one just started), 2 more projects in pipeline • In the BPs, ADC CCO Head closely involved – commenting/advice • In Uganda nothing structured to spread the word on BPs, except in 2014 when the BP manager sensitized stakeholders and interlocutors.
NGO Co-financing	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADC CCO more strongly involved in project screening and technical support, but very short time for assessment of proposals • Care Austria/Care Uganda, complement UWONET, FIDA, DGF – women’s empowerment, counselling of women, economic empowerment, helping them to access justice, but a lot of their work is on social work • Projects in the same districts and using same implementing partners on the ground not communicating with each other (e.g., CARE and UWONET’s work in Northern Uganda) • ADC CCO in regular contact with the NGOs receiving grants • ADC CCO joins missions from Vienna visiting the NGO projects, frequent visit to all projects
APPEAR	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 2 of the 4 projects have potential synergies with CS (Mitigation of CC, and Gender-Responsible Budgeting) but not harnessed (e.g., no direct link between Makerere Gender Project and CARE/UWONET women empowerment projects) • 2 of 4 APPEAR projects not necessarily complementing CS (i.e., Social Work and Masters Programme in Medical Anthropology) • ADC CCO involved in assessing APPEAR funding applications • APPEAR project selection criteria not necessarily aligned to Country Strategy priorities • ADC CCO keeps contact with the grant recipients, attends their workshops • The CCO initiated a meeting between the APPEAR Gender Responsive Budgeting project and the OECD Sigi Project • Also UWONET, Police, etc are part of the Gender subcommittee organized by UBOS
PIDG	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADC CCO not informed and not involved in project screening
CGIAR	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little exchange between ADA HQ and ADC CCO • CGIAR grant recipients do not report to ADC CCO
Multi-lateral projects	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria funding to UBOS goes through OECD in Paris, focuses on gender statistics and social norms, advocating for gender sensitive policies • No direct link with RJP, but JLOS institutions (e.g., NGOs such as UWONET, FIDA) supply and receive information from UBOS for planning (e.g., number of people, cases, etc.) • Specific projects through UNIDO (Regional Centre for Renewable Energy and Efficiency), IUCN, etc
AEFC/OeK B	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No intervention in Uganda at the moment • Previous project was on renewable energy following Agreement signed between Austria (MFA) and the Ministry of Energy (MEMD)

Financial instrument	Rating for synergies ^a	Observations / Examples
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much follow-up from MFA

Notes: a) OECD Rating scale: A=Very Good; B=Good; C=Poor; D=Very Poor.

b) ADA HQ launching an evaluation of the Business Partnership.

c) BPs have 2 phases (feasibility study and project implementation phase) to facilitate partnering of Austrian and Ugandan company.

7.8 Effectiveness of donor coordination at national and local levels and ADC's role (Q16)

Donor coordination has been very strong in both W&S and JLOS sectors. There is evidence of clear donor division of labour in relation to both thematic and geographic coverage in both sectors. Sector advisors and the Head of Office within ADC CCO have been very active in participating in both the DP Sector WGs and thematic WGs. The inputs they contribute to policy reforms, programming, technical studies and review are well appreciated by the GoU and other donors. However this coordination is mostly at national level due to the nature of the main funding instruments they are using for supporting the two sectors. More work is needed to ensure that interventions funded directly by other agencies in Austria and in other sectors (Agriculture and Environment) implemented in Uganda, are well-coordinated with the mainstream activities funded through the Uganda Budget-line. This is partly explained by the fact that the ADC CCO sector advisors are already fully occupied with participation in the several WGs in the two focal sectors prioritised by the CS (W&S and RJP).

7.9 Effectiveness of the monitoring system (Q17)

Given the dependency of the M&E system on national/sector level indicators, it is heavily reliant on reports from the Joint Annual Sector Performance reviews, whose quality is improving⁴² and information can be used for decision-making, but continue to carry the obvious biases of a self-reporting system which development partners address through an official response to the progress reported in the Annual Sector Performance Reports (ASPRs). In both the JLOS and W&S sectors Austria has been supporting the GoU to strengthen the quality of information reported in the ASPRs.

Until 2014, the quarterly reporting system between the ADC CCO and ADA Headquarters and MFA was considered burdensome and with no clear results focus. Quarterly reports were too heavy for the ADC CCO given the currently constrained staffing situation. The introduction of a half-yearly reporting system in 2014 and a more results-based reporting report outline have improved the quality of reporting on results, but there is no explicit system defined for either rewarding good performance or penalising poor performance in relation to whole of Government ODA to Uganda. Oversight roles and responsibilities need more clarity between ADA management and MFA on strategy execution. MFA is limited on staff numbers to strictly monitor on the ground the activities and results achieved. A formal system needs

⁴² Development partners in the JLOS sector have (in 2014) recommended the full application of the M&E system development for the sector.

to be developed to review performance of the CS not only from the perspective of ADC but an Austria whole of government approach.

The ADC CCO and ADA HQ (country desk and thematic advisors) appear to have strong oversight on NGO projects, contracted through ADA but the control diminishes outside these funding instruments. Implementers funded through the grant to CGIAR institutions, do not report to the ADC CCO.

The division of labour in supervision of Country Strategy execution between ADA Headquarters and MFA is hazy, and exacerbated by the absence of a well-documented feedback process, and inadequate personnel within MFA. In general, performance management appears stronger for projects financed under the NGO co-financing window and the DGF where follow-up is systematised and stronger.

The absence of gender disaggregation of the results to which the Country Strategy contributes alongside other development partners, CSOs and government hinders assessment of impact on different population groups – and closer monitoring of the effectiveness of ADC principles and cross-cutting issues such as poverty and gender.

The ADA CCO is playing an active role in M&E, but is not really empowered to monitor those not funded through ADA or MFA directly.

Lastly, absence of an annual review of all Austrian ODA funded interventions in Uganda deprives the M&E system of an opportunity for peer review across the broader Austrian ODA family of implementing partners. An information exchange once per year for all Austrian ODA partners in Uganda would facilitate this peer review and sharing of good practices and innovations for replication, at the same time promoting synergy across the various instruments.

8 FINDINGS ON IMPACT

Over the period of the CS, the two sectors received significant investment including Austrian ODA. Outcome and impact indicators provide an indication of how well changes hoped for as a result of, amongst others, the utilisation of outputs produced by implementation of the strategy have been achieved. Therefore, they are a measure of the extent to which the objectives and the longer term goal have been achieved. For purposes of this review, outcomes refer to the CS objectives (short-term) while impact refers to the CS contribution to NDP goals (longer-term). Indicators of outcomes are therefore about immediate changes sought while those of impact refer to larger and longer term changes. Attribution of impact to Austria is not feasible given the nature of the main aid modalities used (e.g., SBS and basket funding) which make Austria's contribution lose identity. In addition it was not envisaged that the study do a rigorous impact assessment through sample surveys, but assess in qualitative terms the contribution of Austria to development outcomes.

8.1 Results achieved in the water sector (Q25)

The investment made in the water and sanitation sector enhanced Uganda's capacity to develop and manage the country's water resources and to deliver safe and accessible water supply and sanitation services. However, this capacity still needs further enhancement for full national coverage to be achieved.

8.1.1 Outcome level results and contribution of ADC

A review of the outcome performance of the water and sanitation programme shows mixed results as shown in Table 6. As data for January 2015 are not available the June 2014 data have been used in this report.

Table 6: Outcomes achieved in W&S focal area

Outcome Narrative	Indicators	Baseline	Target 2015	June 2014 ⁴³
Outcome 1: More Ugandans can use safe water and sanitation through improved access to sustainable quality water and sanitation services	1A. Access to water supply:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of people within 1km (rural) of an improved water source • % of people within 0.2km (urban) of an improved water source (golden) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65% rural water supply (2009) • 51% urban service level (2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 71% coverage in rural areas • 65% coverage (at urban level) in small towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 64% coverage in rural areas • 72.8% coverage (at urban level) in small towns
	1B. Access to improved sanitation:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of people (households) with access to improved sanitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68% rural (2009) • 73% urban (2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 77% rural • 100% urban 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74.6% rural • 84% urban*
Outcome 2: Protection and sustainable use of water resources contribute to conflict prevention and reduced vulnerability to climate change	2A. Water abstraction: % of water abstraction and discharge permit holders complying and permit conditions (golden indicators 11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water abstraction 65% • Ground water abstraction 55% • Discharge permit 40% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water abstraction**-% • Ground water abstraction**-% • Discharge permit**-% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water abstraction 68% • Ground water abstraction 68% • Discharge permit 50%

Sources: (1) ADC, *Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015*; (2) MWE, 2014, Water and Environment Sector - Annual Performance Report, 2013/14

Notes:

* Without Kampala data

** Targets not set

The percentage of people within 1 km of an improved water source has stagnated at 64% compared to the baseline of 65% and the planned strategy target of 71%. The urban areas however witnessed an increase to 72.8% from 51% which is actually higher than the targeted figure of 65% for 2015 even at June 2014. The contribution of Austria to expansion of coverage in rural areas by providing the SBS to supplement government allocations to the district conditional grants and the establishment and strengthening of WSDFs and UOs (via the JPF and TA Facility) is evident in the increase in the number of people connected to improved water sources every year in both rural and urban areas, but population growth coupled with lower than optimal investment by Government and donors and CSOs in new water

⁴³ Water and environment sector annual performance report, 2013/2014, October

supply systems in rural areas has led to stagnation of coverage. Without Austria's support, water supply coverage in rural areas could even have declined.

Access to improved sanitation increased in both the rural and urban areas to 74.6% (from 68%) and 84% (from 73), respectively. However, in both cases, it is less than the targeted values for 2015, due to a combination of the high cost of technology and low household incomes. Though achievement is less than the target, Austria's innovation by making sanitation coverage a precondition for water supply investments in urban areas, and the technical support in developing more affordable sanitation technologies, is credited for a large part of the growth in sanitation coverage in small towns and growth points reached by WSDFs.

Additional results have been achieved in the area of protection of water sources, and other measures to sustain water supply including catchment management plans and national guidelines for water source protection. The DWRM has also been de-concentrated with the establishment of Water Management Zones and is providing laboratory services, water resources technical guidance and support to local governments, water users and other stakeholders. As a result compliance parameters have improved, albeit slowly to 68%, 68% and 50% for surface water, ground water and water discharge respectively.

Many stakeholders also credit Austria for strong follow-up on technical approach and capacity building of decentralised institutions for W&S services. However, concerns have also been raised on the dilution of the original concept of WSDFs and UOs, with the scale-up through the JWESSP, as recruitment of personnel is now more government driven, and no longer open to secure the most appropriate skills.

8.1.2 Impact level results and contribution of ADC

Investments in water and sanitation can only be worthwhile if they deliver tangible impacts on ultimate beneficiaries and if this impact is long-lasting. While outcomes have been mixed, beneficiaries in the locations visited during the review appreciated that the investments in water and sanitation had a positive impact on their lives. The availability and accessibility of safe water means members of beneficiary communities spend much less time to collect water and therefore have more time to engage in other economic activities.

Box 5: Impact testimonial from beneficiaries of improved access to water supply

"In the past I used to devote five hours a day to fetching water and this left little time for me to engage in other economic activities. Since the water point was built, life has somehow become easier and I am now able to supervise my farm activities and to carry out household activities. I can engage in other economic activities like basket weaving and making utensils."

Source: Interview of **Maria Anyani, Chairperson Alirak Water Point**, Otodi Village, Lira District.

"The availability and accessibility of safe water near our homes has improved the quality of our lives, our health is better, menstrual hygiene has improved and this has made us feel secure even in front of others."

Source: **Lato Rose MWAKA, Local Councillor and Secretary** for Production, Pader District.

Lack of safe water and adequate sanitation is directly linked to fatal diseases and conditions such as cholera and diarrhoea. Some beneficiaries confirmed that they have experienced a significant reduction in incidences of diarrhoea and other water and sanitation related diseases in their homes. Diseases such as bilharzia, scabies and yaws have also been eradicated from the villages. Women's personal hygiene, especially during their menstrual period, has improved dramatically as they are able to bathe regularly.

In the past only a small percentage of all school age children in Pader district were sent to school because they were needed to help in fetching water and taking animals to water sources. This has changed and there is evidence that more children are now sent to school and that girl children now stay longer at school.

Equally important are the changes brought about in the socio-cultural life of villagers. Participants in a Focus Group Discussion in Lira indicated that since the building of water points the quality of their family life has improved as more attention can now be given to other domestic duties. It was reported that women no longer needed to wake up as early as 5am to look for water and that children are able to spend more time at home with other family members.

As impact is a direct function of outcomes, it is therefore reasonable to deduce that ADC contributed to the achievement of the impacts discussed above.

8.1.3 Wider benefits and contribution of ADC

There is evidence that the management of the water and sanitation sector in Uganda has also improved and currently represents a good practice of water sector management. Such evidence includes sector policy reforms, decentralisation of the provision of water and sanitation services, the regular consultative process in the sector in annual planning and budgeting, annual sector performance review, and the establishment of UWASNET to coordinate the engagement of NGOs in the sector.

The water and sanitation services provided to the Rural Growth Centres such as Pajule, Rachrock and Acholi Bur have catalysed economic activities that rely on or are associated with these services. This has also enhanced the rate of growth of the Urban Growth Centres as populations gravitated to the water sources. The establishment of water supply sources has encouraged communities to demand and cause action to deliver to their needs by their leaders.

ADC is credited for its focused support of the programme beyond its valued financial support. The technical assistance provided to programme implementation, the follow up on programme processes, among others were seen as directly responsible for the visible impact.

8.2 Results achieved in rights, justice and peace (Q25)

The Justice Law and Order (JLOS) is a sector wide approach adopted by government in 2000 to bring together institutions with closely linked mandates of administering justice and maintaining law and order and human rights. It focuses on a holistic approach to improving access to and administration of justice through a sector wide approach to planning, budgeting, programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Austria has been instrumental in supporting this sector throughout its evolution from SIP 1 through SIP 2 and now in SIP 3.

8.2.1 Outcome level results and contribution of ADC

Austria has and continues to play an active role in the JLOS DPG. Together with other DPs, Austria established a well-functioning dialogue with government (JLOS institutions, through for example, Joint M&E Visits by Government and Development Partners; and regular thematic meetings on M&E, Human Rights/Accountability, Access to Justice, Budget) as a result of which significant achievements have been made in policy development, programming, institutional strengthening of service delivery institutions, and de-concentration of services to previously underserved areas. Many stakeholders agree that the JLOS sector is the enabler which underpins the success of national development efforts. Outcomes in the RJP focal area are summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: Outcomes achieved in the RJP focal area

Outcome Narrative	Indicators	Baseline	Target 2015	March 2012
Outcome 3: Rule of Law, respect for human rights and effective justice system mitigate social inequities	3A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of public confidence in the justice system, especially of women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55% Gender specific baseline data to be added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65% Gender specific target to be added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59.7% 60.8%
	3B. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of public with access to justice services, especially in Northern Uganda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% baseline data for Northern Uganda to be added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65% target for Northern Uganda to be added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75%*(2014) 68%*

Sources: (1) ADC, Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015; (2) A Baseline Survey Report on Selected JLOS Indicators, 2012. (3) JLOS Annual Sector Performance Report 2013/14.

Notes: *districts with a functional chain of frontline JLOS services

There has been no recent data with which to compare achievements to the targets in the CS as far as public perception of the sector is concerned. However, findings of “A Baseline Survey Report on Selected JLOS Indicators” carried out in 2012 (for the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs) indicate that 59.7% of respondents were satisfied with decisions of JLOS institutions when they sought services from them. Respondents in Northern Uganda indicated the highest level of satisfaction with decisions of judicial institutions they engaged with at 68.5%. Between male and female respondents, female respondents showed a higher level of satisfaction at 60.8% as compared to male respondents for whom only 58.6% indicated satisfaction with decisions of JLOS institutions. As far as access to services is concerned, on average of 75% and 68% of the districts in the country and in Northern Uganda respectively have a functional chain of front-line services.

Mainstreaming of human rights into the work of the judicial institutions, provision of legal aid, promotion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, measures to promote a results culture and advancement of the JLOS standards, strengthening of human rights and accountability institutions are contributing to the improvement of service quality and perceptions of the users. Paralegal Advisory Services and Justice Centres Uganda have received support from ADC (indirectly through DGF and JCU also through JLOS) which has made it possible for them to provide legal aid to those who need it most, where they need it. Services have in-

cluded: Legal advice, legal representation, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), counseling, legal awareness, referrals and a toll free phone line.

Box 6: Impact testimonial on impact of legal aid services

“Legal aid is the cornerstone of building a just society where both the rich and the poor, including the most vulnerable citizens, have equal access to legal and judicial services and are confident that they enjoy equal protection under the law. Adopting a legal aid policy and law will further deepen access to justice and create a justice system which is trusted and respected for being balanced, fair, just, honest and responsive to the needs of its users.” Benjamin Odoki, former Chief Justice of Uganda.

Source: On the Road to Justice - Legal Aid Helps where Justice is Still Missing.
www.entwicklung.at/en/countries-and-regions/uganda (5 March 2015).

These initiatives are credited with making a significant contribution to the reduction of case backlogs. As Austrian financing targeted them, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that this support made a significant contribution to this result.

However, a majority of the population needing justice services do not as yet access them partly due to their negative perceptions, cost of legal services, and non-availability of services.

8.2.2 Impact level results and contribution of ADC

The immediate impact of JLOS has been to bring improved coordination and cooperation among key institutions in the administration of justice. There is a clear framework for engagement with national and international stakeholders in the sector. Secondly, as the performance of the Justice Law and Order Sector is a major factor in the socio-economic transformation of Uganda, the programme has supported the establishment of an environment that enabled economic and relevant support activities to ensue.

Box 7: Importance of JLOS results in economic growth and social transformation

“JLOS is the oil that keeps the Uganda’s efforts at national development moving. If there is no peace, rights and order, it is not possible engage in economic development and to talk about socio-economic transformation”.

Source: interview of **David Edward OKOT, Magistrate Grade I, Pader**. December 2014.

It is evident that systems and procedures for the delivery of justice have continuously been strengthened. For example, a recent study by Reev Consult⁴⁴ showed that public satisfaction with JLOS institutions is highest with Local Council Courts because of their composition and mode of operations which gives them a human face. Generally, the confidence of the Ugandan public in the justice system has improved.

8.2.3 Wider benefits and contribution of ADC

While the economic status of the Ugandan public needs further and continued development, the well-recognised recent achievements in economic and human well-being including the improved security of person and property in Northern Uganda is attributable, in no small measure, to the JLOS programme which Austria has supported using the SBS, basket funding and special projects.

⁴⁴ A baseline survey report on selected JLOS indicators for the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs

The confidence and esteem of the Uganda public has generally improved as evidenced by their ability to demand including through demonstrations for services and accountability for which they are entitled. However the heavy handed manner in which the law enforcement institutions respond to these demonstrations especially close to time of elections still shows that the country is still a long way from realising a free and just society.

9 FINDINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

9.1 Sustainability of results in Water and Sanitation Sector (Q21, Q22)

Evidence on the sustainability of the increase in access to safe water and in household sanitation is mixed.

9.1.1 Measures put in place to sustain ADC supported programmes

In terms of building capacity (for both individuals and institutions) hand-pump mechanics (HPMs) have been trained and organised into Hand Pump Mechanic Associations (HPMAs), which are self-sustaining business entities. However, this initiative stopped short of creating cooperatives of mechanics, a short-coming in empowering them to deliver what they should have delivered as organised service providers.

Water User Committees (WUCs) and Water Supply and Sanitation Boards (WSSBs) have been set up and trained to manage each of the established rural point and small town water schemes. The water schemes are in turn members of their respective regional Umbrella Organisations (UOs). UOs operate as quasi-cooperatives that receive contributions from their member schemes, apportioned from the user fees that the schemes collect, which are then vested in a fund. This fund is used to support individual schemes to meet their larger maintenance requirements. So far, the determination of user fees has not taken into account reinvestment costs when the schemes reach their design lifespan. Some of the oldest schemes built by a project funded by Austria are reaching this lifespan.

9.1.2 Results that are long lasting

Increased Sanitation Coverage - In terms of population reached, the increased coverage is sustainable and will continue to grow with additional investments. However, this result is qualified when considered in terms of the proportion of the population with access to improved sanitation and the challenges with the affordability of technology.

Collection of User Fees – The review found that collection of user fees is likely to be sustainable. Several factors contribute to this but are centred on the social and economic benefits derived by users of water. Improved access to clean water has resulted in better health and economic welfare of the beneficiaries. Because less time is spent fetching water, more time has been freed up for beneficiaries to engage in income-generating activities. Water users also value the infrastructure provided to them and have a commitment to protect it.

Box 8: Security of water supply infrastructure

“The community values the infrastructure. Some responsible citizens keep watch on the solar panel and protect them. Citizens are quick to alert the committee on problems such as pipe bursts and stray animals in the water zones”.

Source: Interview of **Rweshemeire Water Scheme Management Committee**. December 2014

However, more still needs to be done to secure and invest the collected fees. In the north, it was reported that some WUCs are not trained even to bank the revenue they raise from user fees.

Funding of Operation and Maintenance of the Water Schemes – Some UOs are investing user fees collected. For example, in Kabale, the Umbrella Organisation has invested in a building for income generation through leasing. Investment in a building shows that the schemes have significant revenue potential. However, it is unlikely that funds generated by these investments will be sufficient to cater for the replacement costs of the schemes when they reach the end of their useful lives. Whilst, in line with the pro-poor approach to tariff-setting, replacement has never been expected to be funded by user fees, there is need to start thinking about how the schemes will be replaced as they reach the end of their lives.

Box 9: Adequacy of O&M and reinvestment resources

“An effective operations and maintenance framework is in place and is in the budget. Small maintenance can be handled, but pump replacement and other larger issues are handled by the Umbrella”

Source: Interview with **Rweshemeire Water Scheme Management Committee**. December 2014

Choice of Energy Technology – The average lifespan of a solar unit is estimated at 35 years whilst that of a diesel generating plant is estimated at 8 years⁴⁵. In the earlier South Western Small Towns Project, diesel was discouraged and continues to be discouraged as a major energy source. The WSDF Manual lists grid power as the first option followed by solar energy. However, with the replication in other parts of the country, diesel has been installed and used more frequently as a back-up power source. In situation of volatile oil prices, the use of diesel presents a considerable risk in that the cost of O&M of a diesel-powered scheme may fluctuate considerably in tandem with global price fluctuations.

Improved Sanitation – Improved sanitation is likely to be sustainable largely achieved through the education and sensitisation programmes carried out in the intervention areas. These are reinforced by peer pressure in the community. However, some of these results are dependent on the continued functioning of the installed water supply system. Sustaining investments in household sanitation require intensive community mobilisation, triggering, social marketing, economic and physical access to appropriate technology and high degree of peer influence and support. The capacity to promote this on a country-wide scale is not there.

⁴⁵ Source: Interview with Engineer Ali Aus Tushabe, December 2014

Protection and Conservation of Water Catchment Areas – The establishment of water management zones and implementation of water catchment management plans is expanding. The increased awareness by the communities of the benefits of these initiatives for water quality and prevention of conflict augurs well for the sustainability of this result. In catchment areas, beneficiaries are being encouraged to establish woodlots as part of catchment area rehabilitation and as an investment that will earn revenue in the long run through the sale of woodlot products.

Box 10: Appreciation of critical importance of investing in IWRM for water source protection

“There is a need for conservation of water resources ... the degradation of water resources is alarming. If we are not careful, there will be no water resources in the next 20 years due to poor catchment management.”

Source: Interview with **Hillary MUTABAZI, Manager – WSDF-SW**, Mbarara District. December 2014.

Institutional Capacity Building – The institutional capacity for the design and development of water schemes built through the replication of the WSDF model is well recognised and acknowledged. However, this is qualified by the inadequate staffing level, as observed in Lira which is understaffed, and are therefore only able to do limited studies (e.g. to inform them on how to focus on groups of service areas rather than single interventions). WSDFs are now incorporated into national policy and are receiving allocations of resources from the fiscus, but this is not enough to sustain them and they rely on donor support for continuity. The umbrella organisations concept for O&M is sustainable, but a major area of concern is the takeover of management of water supply and sanitation services of the growing small towns by the NWSC, which weakens the membership and financial base of the UOs to which the departing schemes are affiliated.

Box 11: Sustainable capacity development

“Capacity has been built in terms of technicians, pump attendants and plumbers. The capacity of the Water Board has also been built in areas of monitoring, decision-making, planning and budgeting, financial management and book keeping”.

Source: Interview with **Rweshemeire Water Scheme Management Committee. Ntungamo District, December 2014.**

“People have been trained by the Umbrella organisation to cater for the scheme and how implementation would be done. That is the Water Board and the system operators including the manager, pump operator, caretaker and night watchman. Water Board members have capacity to run the system.”

Source: Interview with **Kagarama Water Scheme Management Committee.** December 2014.

9.1.3 Results which are not sustainable

Cost of Maintenance and Supply Chain Management – In the absence of a credible system for supply of inputs for operation and maintenance of the schemes, particularly the newer schemes, pipe bursts and other system failures will continue to keep the cost of O&M high and jeopardise sustainability of the schemes. The importation of spares of substandard quality and the absence of a strong regulatory framework is undermining efforts to sustain the

water supply schemes. There is a need to enforce the standards and specifications developed for the importation and use of replacement parts in the schemes⁴⁶.

Box 12: Poor quality of parts and supplies

“Simple repairs are catered for using user fees. For bigger maintenance we look to the Umbrella Organisation. We save money on the account to cater for future needs and the account generally grows. However, due to pipe bursts which are consuming all money the account gets drained.”

Source: Interview with **Kagarama Water Scheme Management Committee**. December 2014.

Sustaining the services beyond the design lifespan of the installed infrastructure –

Whilst the established water schemes are able to meet their operation and maintenance requirements, there is no provision for reinvestment. One of the schemes visited during the review (Rwashemeire), is an example of such a scheme (designed for a life of 10 years) and is nearing the end of its life-span but has no plans for reinvestment. Apart from a pump breakdown, it has had no other major faults, but only a *“few minor repairs like fuses, small parts that, gate valves and taps that needed replacement”*⁴⁷.

Water quality improvement – The rate of contamination of rural point water sources and household water is increasing due to inadequate coverage of improved sanitation and compromised hygiene practices. This will need attention if water quality gains are to be sustained. Lack of attention to this issue will ultimately lead to a decline in the use of these rural water sources.

9.2 Sustainability of results in RJP Sector (Q21, Q22)

The results in the RJP sector are attributable to the holistic approach adopted to improve access to and the administration of justice through a sector wide approach to planning, budgeting, programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The justice system has been strengthened resulting initially in:

- a) reduced suspect and prisoner populations;
- b) reduced time on remand; and
- c) improved reintegration of former suspects and prisoners as a result of the education and rehabilitation programmes introduced in some of the country’s prisons.

With the exception of suspect and prisoner populations which have lately been on the rise, probably due to increased registration of cases, the results are largely sustainable.

9.2.1 Measures put in place to sustain ADC supported programmes

Policy reforms (e.g., transitional justice and legal aid), the amendment of laws hindering business are measures likely to bring sustainable results. So is the inculcation of a culture of results and promotion of JLOS service standards. There has been a sector wide change in

⁴⁶ In Northern Uganda, GIZ supported the establishment of a standards framework.

⁴⁷ Source: Interview with Kagarama Water Scheme Management Committee. December 2014.

mind-set to RJP issues especially at the most senior levels of the JLOS institutions with the adoption of the human rights-based approach to justice. This is evidenced by the non-tolerance of individuals that do not uphold the rights of suspects that enter the justice system. There is optimism about sustainability of results in the JLOS sector (Box 13).

Box 13: Sustainability of results in the JLOS sector

“Whatever is being done is sustainable. JLOS stakeholder activities affect each other in the chain of justice. That is in the transition of cases from police to the courts and on to the prisons. This interconnectivity makes it inevitable that activities must continue rain or sunshine. The money culture is being overcome. We have meetings without money.”

Source: Interview with **Phillip ODOKI, Chief Magistrate, Mbarara.**

9.2.2 Results that are long lasting

Sector-wide change in mind-set and attitudes towards RJP issues – The change of institutional mind-set, especially at the most senior levels of the JLOS institutions, is a sustainable result. Whilst human rights violations may not be completely eliminated, with the sensitisation of the institutions (especially police and prison services) on the importance of safeguarding human rights, the cases of human rights violations by members of these forces will continually reduce. There are examples of the non-tolerance of individuals that do not uphold the rights of suspects that enter the justice system⁴⁸.

Use of alternative approaches to justice and conflict resolution – The benefits of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms have already begun to bear on both a) the duty bearers (police, courts, prison services) in terms of reducing the case backlog and congestion of remand centres and prisons, and b) the right holders (suspects, offenders and victims) in terms of getting their cases resolved faster and more satisfactorily. These benefits are likely to sustain the use of the approach.

Box 14: Examples of positive change in attitudes towards human rights of offenders in the justice system

“There was an Officer in Charge posted here who had stopped the activities of PAS by refusing us to access to the suspects. We complained to their superiors and the officer was changed. We were then able to continue assisting suspects to contact their relatives to alert them of arrests and get them to come and stand as surety so that suspects can be released on police bond. This has reduced the number of suspects held unnecessarily.”

Source: Interview with **Stee Nyindo BIYONZA, Paralegal Officer, PAS, Mbarara District.** December 2014.

“JLOS has improved infrastructure in the prisons services. There are more wards for prisoners and staff welfare and operational capacity have improved in terms of uniforms, transport, regional fleet of vehicles and courses for staff and JLOS partners. Court operations have also improved. There are now 4-5 high court sessions up from 1 per year. This has led to sanity in prisons with reduced congestion and increased hope for the prisoners for their day in court and also reduced insecurity for warders. There is reduced length of stay on remand. Previously this was as much as four years which was leading to desperation amongst prisoners. Prison farms have also become more productive. This higher production has led to improved quality of diets for prisoners.”

Source: Interview with **Peter ARIKO, OC, Mbarara Central Prison.**

⁴⁸ A good example is the case of the quick replacement of transferred police officers who sought to curtail the activities of paralegal officers in Mbarara police station.

9.2.3 Results which are not sustainable

Improved performance of the judiciary – The judiciary is often cited as the bottleneck in the justice system but is at the same time under-funded. This notwithstanding, there is a reported increase in levels of satisfaction with and confidence in the justice system. In the absence of continued and increased support to the judiciary (principally by increased funding by GoU through prioritisation of the sector in budgeting), these gains are not sustainable.

Institutional capacity - JLOS is in a worse situation compared to other sectors (e.g., W&S) given that it is normally viewed as a consumptive sector and has historically been marginalised in resource allocation by government. There is risk that as donors pull out, government funding for the sector may dwindle with time. The sector has a high case load but its development needs have so far largely been unmet. Infrastructural development is lagging behind needs and attitude change will require sustained messaging. The judiciary, being the lead institution, is likely to continue bearing the brunt of criticism and client dissatisfaction. With the withdrawal of development partners from SBS to JLOS, funding for the sector may dwindle and so will be the conditions of service sector-wide resulting in proliferation of the culture of bribes.

9.3 Impact of ADC support on coherent relations between Austria and Uganda (Q23, Q24)

Coherent relations between Austria and Uganda require a unified approach in Austria towards its ODA and non-ODA flows into the partner country. At the moment, this is not ensured. Although there is a governmental decision to coordinate the ODA processes between MFA and the Austrian MoF, one cannot state that there is a joint strategy which bundles potentials and synergies together. However, due to the year-long engagement of Austria in Uganda both the ADC and the Austrian contribution to IFIs seem to benefit while having more clarity in the own strategic foci.

Currently, MFA is looking for ways to implement the whole-of-government approach in Austria. For a number of years, Austria has been criticized as being too fragmented within its political system, reducing development assistance to a minor political issue. Austria lacks an overall strategy to guide ODA and non-ODA flows. There has been the attempt to have a more systematic approach by setting up an inter-ministerial working group (since April 2005); however, this group has hardly met within the last two years.

The three year program might serve as alternative instrument for fostering a more coherent approach as other ministries and non-governmental actors are now more involved by consultation. However, this consultation process is already criticized of standing under too much time-pressure which does not allow a thorough elaboration of joint positions or the launching of specific strategic alliances.

To explore and use the existing scope for action, the semi-formal exchange between MFA and MoF on the one hand and MFA and the Development Bank of Austria on the other is promising. Although there are no programme contributions foreseen, the MoF uses the country strategy for fine-tuning its own engagement in the context of IFIs. The Development

Bank of Austria invested in 2 projects related to Uganda⁴⁹ and benefitted from the exchange of information from the ADC CCO.

9.4 Success of ADC efforts to contribute to critical public debate in Austria about Uganda, its development policies and bilateral cooperation (Q23, Q24)

ADC contributes with various activities in Austria to the public perception of the Austria's development engagement. This applies to the funding of the North-South dialogue of Parliaments⁵⁰, or the African Vernetzungsplattform (AVP), an alliance of African groups and initiatives based in Austria. Furthermore, the co-funding of Austrian NGOs can be assessed also as relevant for the Africa-related debate in Austria. However, none of the interview partners described the public debate as appropriate to bring the discourse further. If any, then the current discussions and/or initiatives can be seen as discussions towards a group or audience which is interested in issues about and around Africa and its development. There is no indication of a broad public debate in Austria about Uganda.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

10 LESSONS LEARNT (Q6, Q8, Q13, OVERALL)

In deciding on sectors of intervention, there is a significant tension between a) remaining in sectors of long historical engagement where a reputation has been built and innovations need to be preserved for up-scaling (sustain the current laboratory), and b) thinking “**outside the box**” to consider new priorities and support sectors previously under-funded (create new laboratories for innovation).

A human-rights based approach succeeds only when both the duty bearers and right holders are sensitised and capacitated to avoid a service delivery gap that would emerge when the latter begin to demand their rights and duty bearers are incapacitated.

Mainstreaming of a human rights based approach into the justice sector for the benefit of the poor and vulnerable people requires a **twin track approach** focusing on both the software aspects (e.g., civic education on human rights) and the tangible (hardware) support (e.g., legal aid and witness support fund) to enable them to access and secure these rights.

The notion of comparative advantage is broader than superior knowledge, experience, geographical positioning, technology, and financial resources but exhibits itself also in **salient features of national/organisational/social culture** – how Austria approaches development

⁴⁹ Support of the Electricity Regulatory Authority (ERA) of Uganda and to the regional programme to support Micro Finance Institutions Capacity Building Initiative.

⁵⁰ cp. www.nordsueddialog.org

and the quality of stakeholder engagement. A unique feature of the Austria's comparative advantage in Uganda is its approach: "they **listen**", "they are **flexible**", and "they are **consistent**". It is also in the development philosophy: "they **focus on the rights of the poor and marginalised**".

The "nexus approach" is novel in Uganda. Its success calls for strong partnerships between Austria and other players in development as this introduces multiple needs for which one player may not have the necessary comparative advantages to address them all. For this reason a nexus approach is best addressed through integration into national or relevant sectoral policy as this would permit resource leverage from multiple sources.

Addressing ADC principles and cross-cutting issues is best done using multiple strategies as no single strategy will suffice. These strategies can include: a) direct programming (e.g., gender specific activity, project or intervention), b) mainstreaming (e.g., treatment of gender in all stages of the project cycle, gender targeting, gender budgeting, gender-sensitive indicators, gender training of partners and beneficiaries, gender screening of project proposals), and c) promoting the principle or issue through development of relevant policy (e.g., gender policy or guidelines).

Opportunities for addressing ADC principles and cross-cutting issues increase with the diversity of the country portfolio (sectors, projects, thematic areas, implementing partners) but can only be harnessed effectively if the partners have an opportunity to regularly share information, exchange experiences, peer review each other's work and collaborate for synergy and impact.

Addressing HIV and AIDS is likely to remain weak and will not happen automatically without a concrete strategy at corporate level for the whole of Austrian ODA.

11 CONCLUSIONS

11.1 Main Conclusions on Relevance

Alignment: The ADC Country Strategy is strongly aligned with GoU NDP priorities in relation to sector and thematic choices and the preferred funding instruments for the period 2010-2015. Results achieved on the ground reconfirm that support is being channelled to the sectors and thematic priorities where Austria's strength clearly lies, and, most importantly, where Austria has a comparative advantage relative to other development partners.

A number of non-ADC funded Austrian interventions are not aligned to the Uganda CS and this raises the issue of the purpose of the document and the need for a strategic high level discussion in Austria on the aim of the CS and which actors in the Austrian government and what interventions it should govern and the roles of ADA and MFA in the process.

Sector choice: Although the NDP II is still being finalised, the importance of W&S and RJP in enabling future development outcomes planned under NDP II is very clear. In addition, the needs in these two focal areas remain significant, so is the importance of consolidating the results achieved to-date and continuing to take advantage of the strong reputation Austria in these sectors in Uganda. With this consideration, the review concludes that there is no strong justification for a fundamental shift in choice of sectors in Uganda for the next five year strategy.

The main implication of this is that should Austria decide to remain targeting at least two sectors, it can do so successfully only if the current funding level and staff establishment is maintained. Further cuts in budget or staffing have implications for the choice of financial instruments, thematic coverage and quality of support ADC will be able to provide to the GoU, other DPs and CSOs. A cut in either funding or financial instruments (under ADC) or staffing may damage Austria's competitive advantage and reputation.

Thematic priorities: The findings indicate a strong need to fine-tune the thematic choices in both sectors. **In W&S**, more attention is required on interventions to safeguard the quality of water in rural point water supply systems and those sustain the water supply schemes beyond the design lifespan. Furthermore, the scope to integrate W&S interventions with school sanitation and hygiene promotion, maternal and child health improvements, and livelihoods and nutrition of poor and vulnerable people, has until now not been fully exploited, yet the potential for synergy is significant.

In RJP, the current focus on improving access to justice for the poor and vulnerable, strengthening of observance of human rights and gender equality in the administration and delivery of justice, transitional justice, and strengthening of voice and accountability remain critical. However, new strategies are needed to strengthen policy reform initiatives around transitional justice and legal aid so that these instruments are approved by Cabinet and immediately developed into law. A critical examination of the appropriateness and quality of inter-sectoral policy dialogue is needed (between JLOS and the Ministry of Interior), strengthening of this dialogue and institutions responsible for pushing for approval of the policies, and strengthening the voice of intended target groups (beneficiaries) of the policy.

In addition, given that a majority of civil cases are emanating from land disputes, ADC can be more proactive and support the land registration initiative and other provisions of the land policy.

Geographical coverage: ADC's geographical focus on Northern Uganda from poverty, human rights and conflict prevention lenses is advantageous. This should be maintained, but broadening the criteria and including other regions of need. Geographical targeting of all Austrian ODA instruments should be coordinated for synergy. Hence targeting criteria that are transparent should be developed using a whole of Austrian ODA approach. Concrete suggestions on geographical targeting are provided in the recommendations chapter.

Choice of financial instruments: The experience of Austria's financing instruments in the period under review confirms that each of these instruments (e.g., SBS, Basket Funds, TA Facility, and Project Financing) has its own strengths and weaknesses and it would not be prudent to narrow down below this range of instruments (e.g., only relying on 1-2 instruments). However, what is essential is for Austria to ensure that the instrument mix is complementary and a proper strategy to systematically harness synergy between interventions funded by the selected instruments is developed and implemented. It would be beneficial for MFA, ADA and ADC CCO to have strategic technical oversight and coordination responsibility over the Austrian whole of government interventions in Uganda. At the same time maintaining or growing the ADC budget allocation so that the current mix of financial instruments can be maintained.

11.1 Main Conclusions on Efficiency

Elaboration of the CS: The Uganda CS drew from Austria's policies for development cooperation, which were developed through wide consultations in Austria, but elaboration of the Uganda CS was more of an internal back and forth process between ADA, the ADC CCO and MFA with little benefit from a wider consultation of stakeholders in both Austria and Uganda. The document was more of a retrofitting of what Austria was already doing well in Uganda, than a fresh strategy arising from an intensive debate on sector choice, thematic priorities and instruments with specific policy guidance on how to do this prioritisation. The nature of the process has not landed itself to wider awareness and ownership (either in Austria or in Uganda) and compromised complementarity of interventions funded through Austrian whole of government approach in Uganda.

It is crucial that MFA develops a stronger cooperation with MoF and OeEB in Vienna and solicits their involvement in the development of the CS as well as coordination of the interventions they fund with those of ADC. A common understanding of what a CS is and what it should do is paramount in strengthening coordination of the various elements of Austrian ODA to Uganda.

Quality of CS: The CS as a document is of adequate narrative quality, and serves as a useful reference for explaining Austria's engagement in Uganda. However, it does not challenge the status-quo. It is also weak on articulation of how Austria will measure its contribution (added-value)⁵¹. It does not outline clearly the monitoring and oversight functions, the performance accountability system, the feedback loops on strategic level, and the division of labour between ADA, ADC CCO and MFA. Role clarity among these stakeholders and the definition of procedures and formats to be followed are needed for the next CS, and MFA needs to steer a process of defining these together with key stakeholders in Austria.

⁵¹ Results in the CS are sector aggregates and measure the effectiveness of all support to the sector from all stakeholders. Austria's contribution to sector processes and the theory of change underpinning the CS are not articulated clearly.

Implementation efficiency: The review concludes that implementation efficiency of the CS in both sectors is high, with ADC CCO using its reputation as “trusted partner” with the GoU helping it to leverage additional budget allocations to sectors where ADC support is channelled, and effectively coordinating with other development partners. ADC initiated a Joint Financial Performance Assessment, which is important in improving the accountability and efficiency of services and achieving better results. This Assessment analyses audit reports and follows up on findings but needs to be complemented by a resource tracking system. ADC CCO’s technical and financial oversight of in-country interventions has to be reinforced to monitor the Austrian whole of government approach in Uganda. ADA’s role as a service centre for the whole of Austrian government in focus countries needs to be defined and clarified by the Austrian government. This vision should also take into consideration the reality that some of the Austrian Official Development Assistance (including, work of non-governmental organisations, projects funded by the Development Bank of Austria and economic partnerships) is demand-driven and can hardly be planned years in advance. For these what would be necessary is that information on funded interventions be shared with ADA/ADC CCO, as soon as it becomes available for consolidation and dissemination to relevant stakeholders who may wish forge synergies with the funded NGO, OeEB and economic partnership projects.

Nexus: Addressing nexus issues remains pivotal, but is relatively a novel concept and as such not yet systematically integrated into the ADC interventions in Uganda nor ever discussed in sector or donor coordination meetings.

11.2 Main Conclusions on Effectiveness

On effectiveness, it can be concluded that the Country Strategy has by-and-large been effective in contributing to critical outcomes in the two sectors, but interventions outside these sectors are too fragmented and too small and uncoordinated in nature to have measurable impact at the macro-level. Progress on policy reforms is mixed and in RJP the process needs to be rejuvenated with new approaches and perhaps new institutional strengthening to support advocacy for approval of the transitional justice and legal aid policies by Cabinet.

The findings clearly lead to the conclusion that synergies between the focal area interventions and other financial instruments have been limited with the exception of those with NGO Co-financing while treatment of ADC Principles and Cross-Cutting Issues has been strong except for HIV and AIDS which seems to lack a clear strategy. Synergies could be enhanced with greater involvement of ADA and the ADC CCO in managing the other interventions supported by the Austria whole of government approach in Uganda. A steering structure is needed in Austria to facilitate inter-sectoral coordination and ensure coherence of interventions in focus countries.

11.3 Main Conclusions on Impact

Outcomes: The Review concludes that outcomes achieved in both sectors are significant and there is a logical link between Austria's intervention strategy and the results achieved. Service coverage has improved in both sectors, and the poor and vulnerable populations have been reached. Institutions have been strengthened and de-concentrated to deliver better services in previously underserved areas, and mainstreaming a human rights approach. Citizen satisfaction with these services has improved.

Contribution of Austria: However, impact **attribution** to Austria is not feasible in any of the sectors of intervention in Uganda given the nature of intervention approaches used (e.g., SBS, Basket Funding, Joint Programme Approach, Technical Assistance and small fragmented projects), and the indicators of performance which focus on macro- and outcome-level performance of the sector as a whole and (by definition) the contribution of all actors in the sector as opposed to Austria's added value. Absence of impact indicators in the CS, and the weak link with OPM for sector impact assessment constrains the ability of Austria to ascertain its contribution in concrete statistical terms, and leaves it with only one option of using the sector outcome indicators as proxies to infer its impact in Uganda.

11.4 Main Conclusions on Sustainability

Sustainability of water supply systems: The review concludes that there is mixed evidence on sustainability of results achieved in both sectors and this issue needs greater attention in the next ADC Uganda Country Strategy (2016-2020). In W&S most schemes generate sufficient revenue to cover routine O&M costs and a proportion for future repairs and extensions, but not enough for reinvestment when the schemes reach their design lifespans. While it is not GoU policy or in keeping with the ADC pro-poor approach to include reinvestment costs in the user fees, at the time of the review there was no alternative and the sector had stagnated in terms of progress towards achieving the MDG Target for access to improved water source in rural areas.

The poor quality of spares and supplies and the absence of a policy to ensure quality standards in the distribution of WASH supplies reduce prospects for sustainability. The reinvestment requirements are not factored into the determination of user-fees. The takeover of management of water supply systems of the more successful and growing small towns by the NWSC undermines UOs.

Sustainability of results in RJP: With respect to RJP, the mainstreaming of a human rights approach and positive service culture change in the administration and delivery of justice (through the various JLOS institutions), especially at the senior management level, is likely to continue. Continuation of current government allocations to the JLOS is doubtful with donor attrition which is likely to lead to a reversal in gains made in the sector in the areas of enhancing access to justice for the poor and marginalised, decongesting prisons and improving sanitation therein, reducing the case backlog, human rights promotion and protection within the public and key institutions such as the police, the judiciary, and the prison service.

PART D: RECOMMENDATIONS

12 RECOMMENDATIONS (Q6, Q8, OVERALL)

12.1 Formulation process and stakeholder consultation

1. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should provide a concrete **Technical and Policy Guidance Paper** on the process to be followed in preparing the next Country Strategy for Uganda and the content of the document. The process should include “how” and “when” to involve relevant stakeholders, the content of the Country Strategy, the roles and responsibilities for drafting the strategy, quality assurance process, validation and official approval steps, as well as the dissemination plan for the final document (in Austria and Uganda).
2. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the Technical and Policy Guidance Paper provides criteria for sector, thematic and geographical focus as well as instrument choice. This could include inclusion and exclusion criteria which would allow systematic screening and prioritization.
3. To enhance ownership and ensure that the Uganda Country Strategy contributes to strengthening of visibility and relations between Austria and Uganda, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the formulation process involves all critical stakeholders in Austria and Uganda and the final Country Strategy document is disseminated widely, including to implementing partners.
4. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the Uganda Country Strategy is a guiding document for the whole of **Austria’s Government** and is complemented by a policy instrument to promote information-sharing and coordination to maximize synergy and impact from the whole of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should sensitise key stakeholders accordingly.
5. In keeping with the ideals of the aid effectiveness agenda, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, **the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office of the Austrian Development Cooperation**, should take full advantage of the joint European Union programming exercise in developing the next Uganda Country Strategy, while ensuring that the process does not increase transaction costs but adds-value to existing donor coordination efforts of the Local Development Partners Group.
6. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the next Country Strategy for Uganda identifies intermediate “process indicators” for measuring Austria’s specific added-value, in addition to the outcome indicators aligned to the Sector Investment Plans (e.g., golden indicators) for assessing broader sector performance. The indicators should be gender-sensitive and also cover the

added-value of Austria's technical assistance in terms of institutional strengthening, innovation and policy reform.

12.2 Choice of Sectors

7. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, **the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office**, together with other members of the wider Austrian Government intending to invest in Uganda during the period 2016-2020, should (notwithstanding **Recommendations 1 and 2** above) choose one of two options pertaining to sector choice:

Option 1: Continue with what is working: Under this option, the sector choice would be to continue in Water and Sanitation and Justice, Law and Order sectors provided the budget supports a sustained internal technical and financial capacity at current or higher level. Both sectors remain critical for achievement of outcomes in the Human Capital Development Priority Area of National Development Plan II (2015-2020), and are enablers of inclusive growth.

Option 2: Re-programme afresh: Under this option, the sector choice would include those areas crucial for National Development Plan II success, but have limited or no Development Partner support. These include: Environment; Capacity Development for successful implementation, monitoring and evaluation of National Development Plan II; Women's Economic Empowerment; Private Sector Development; Land Registration; and complementary provisions of the Land Policy. Austria could also consider supporting software aspects of agriculture and nutrition (e.g., market linkages and nutrition behaviour change) which are critical for food and nutrition security and stability (especially, in former conflict regions). The sectors would be selected transparently using the process and criteria elaborated in the Technical Policy and Guidance Paper.

8. **Keep some room for innovation:** In addition to Option 1 or 2 above, **the Austrian Government**, as a whole, would consider other additional interventions of limited financial size, that respond to new/urgent priorities/requests, meet pockets of need, or test innovative ideas, on a case-by-case basis, from a "*whole-of-government approach*", provided technical capacity exists within the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office to support implementation on the ground.

12.3 Choice of Thematic Areas

9. Under Scenario 1, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should ensure that the thematic areas of focus within the Water and Sanitation Sector are broadened to encompass the following:
 - Operation and maintenance: institutional strengthening for rural point water supply systems;
 - improved sanitation and hygiene at rural point water supply sources;
 - hygiene promotion in rural and urban areas, schools and health facilities;

- integration of nutrition and livelihoods for poor and vulnerable groups (e.g., small scale irrigated horticulture production for the urban market);
- mechanisms for financing reinvestment to sustain water supply coverage at schemes beyond their design lifespan;
- integration of nexus approach, lessons and good practices into sector policy; and
- strengthening cross-sectoral linkages and synergies (e.g., Rights, Justice and Peace and Water and Sanitation).

10. For Rights, Justice and Peace, the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs should continue/emphasise support to the following critical areas:

- institutional strengthening for administration and delivery of justice⁵²;
- mainstreaming human rights based approach and gender into justice delivery system⁵³;
- facilitating access to justice for the poor and vulnerable groups⁵⁴;
- strengthening policy reform initiatives (e.g., transitional justice and legal aid policies);
- implementation of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms;
- strengthening accountability of duty bearers;
- improving service culture and service delivery;
- fighting corruption;
- implementation of land policy;
- strengthening results culture of Justice, Law and Order Sector ; and
- strengthening cross-sectoral linkages and synergies.

12.4 Choice of Instruments (Aid Modalities)

11. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs , **the Austrian Development Agency** and the **Country Coordination Office** , together with other members of the wider Austrian Government intending to invest in Uganda during the period 2016-2020, should (notwithstanding **Recommendations 1 and 2** above) choose one of the following two options pertaining to financial instruments/aid modalities:

- **Option 1: Preserve the “trusted-donor” reputation of Austria** by continuing with Sector Budget Support in both sectors, and cultivate a culture of restoring donor confidence in the use of government systems. Under this arrangement Austria would take-over a leadership role in coordinating the Development Partner Group in the sector of Justice, Law and Order (filling the gap left by Sweden, Ireland, Denmark and the Netherlands). The **advantages** of this option for Austria are sector leadership and control, improved relations with the Government of Uganda, permanent policy influencing space, and the

⁵² Focus will be on enhancing service standards, physical de-concentration of JLOS service delivery points, staff housing for police and magistrates in hard to reach rural areas, improved sanitation in prisons

⁵³ Includes strengthening of Human Rights Commission

⁵⁴ This includes provision of legal aid services and creation of a witness support fund (WSF)

potential to contribute to the rebuilding of donor confidence in national systems. The main **risks** associated with this option are higher transaction costs for Austria in the short-term and side-lining of Austria by other development partners. The **pre-conditions** for taking this option would be a positive risk assessment, or adequate mitigation potential, and commitment by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Headquarter of the Austrian Development Agency that the Country Coordination Office will not downsize.

- **Option 2: Re-programme and jointly provide support with other Development Partners parallel to national systems.** The **advantages** of this option reside in the potential for intervening with a larger programme together with other development partners, low fiduciary risk, and critical mass of voice for policy leverage. The main **risks** are higher transaction costs, loss of momentum, damaging the good reputation of Austria with the Government of Uganda which was earned over 2 decades of cooperation, and unguaranteed policy space when the Government mistrusts donor intentions. The **pre-conditions** for taking this option are: a) Government of Uganda's willingness to continue with donor engagement and participate in joint programme steering; b) development partners' willingness to joint programme with Austria; c) Austria's ability to earmark support to its priorities; and d) ability of Austria to leverage policy influencing space as an "equal partner" with the other development partners.

12. The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs, the Austrian Development Agency and the Country Coordination Office, together with other members of the wider Austrian Government should chose an instrument mix that diversifies risk by providing balanced support to Government, the United Nations, Civil Society Organizations and the private sector as they play complementary roles. The support should not encourage competition for resources between these players but reinforce mutual existence, collaboration and synergy. More specifically, the support to civil society organizations should strengthen their crucial roles in:

- Community capacity development for sustainability;
- Service delivery in hard to reach areas;
- Innovations for replication;
- Monitoring and research; and
- Demanding accountability from the state and development partners.

12.5 Strengthen Country Strategy Execution and Effectiveness

13. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that the institutional arrangements and processes for decision-making to improve the intervention strategy, the quality of implementation and effectiveness of the investments made under the Uganda Country Strategy are written down and clearly understood by the stakeholders in the Austrian Development Agency and the Ministry. Mechanisms to hold stakeholders to account

- for performance (e.g. rewards and sanctions) should be documented and evident in the way that monitoring and evaluation outputs are used.
14. For Austria to maintain its current added-value in Uganda, **the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that both the latter and the Country Coordination Office continue to have adequate numbers of qualified and experienced staff, who are committed and trustworthy, and working conditions continue to promote loyalty and continuity.
 15. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Development Agency** should ensure that the joint monitoring and oversight functions of the Africa Unit in the Ministry, and Senior Management and the Uganda Desk in the Austrian Development Agency are spelt out in the Country Strategy in as clear a manner as done for the joint oversight role and activities defined for the Country Coordination Office, the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development at national level.
 16. The **Austrian Parliament** should ensure that a high level inter-ministerial coordination structure is set up to facilitate coordination of all Official Development Assistance to focus regions and countries. This can be chaired by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs or by the Ministry of Finance (or by both on a rotational basis).
 17. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that interventions in sectors of choice for Austria in Uganda are subjected to rigorous financial performance and impact assessment in line with Government of Uganda Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation. To this end, the **Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that the Austrian Development Agency forges a stronger collaboration with the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Prime Minister in Uganda and supporting it both technically and financially for this oversight function. The **Office of the Prime Minister** should ensure that sectors are held to account on the basis of the results of these assessments.

12.6 Strengthen Communication and Visibility of Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda

18. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should spearhead the development of a stronger **communications and visibility strategy** for Austrian Official Development Assistance (with special attention to raising the profile of results achieved by country strategies). The Communication and Visibility Strategy should spell out clear objectives, results to be achieved, targeted audiences (in Austria, Uganda, etc), communication strategies, activities, a Monitoring and Evaluation plan, and an institutional champion to drive this mandate.
19. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** should ensure that staff numbers, technical qualifications, commitment and continuity along with financial resources are sufficient to operationalise the Communication and Visibility Strategy.
20. **The Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs** (with support from the **Austrian Development Agency** and the **Country Coordination Office**) should ensure that the experience being gained, development results achieved, les-

sons learnt and good practices emerging from Austrian Official Development Assistance to Uganda are more **systematically captured, documented and shared** to trigger a learning culture and add to the quality and impact of the entire Austrian portfolio.

PART E: ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
Relevance	1. When taking into account the Division of Labour amongst development partners and the aid effectiveness agenda in Uganda: to which extent are the choice of sectors, the use of instruments and the thematic priorities of the Austrian Development Cooperation in line with the current National Development Plan I (2010-2015)?	WASH and Rights, Justice and Peace are priorities in NDP. NDP specifies the funding instruments used by ADC as priority. ADC thematic priorities for the focal sectors are prioritised in NDP.	Literature review (NDP). + SIPs KII with OPM and MOFPED KII with focal ministries.
	2. To which extent has the Austrian support under its Country Strategy enabled GoU to achieve its goals as outlined in the National Development Programme?	Progress in achievement of Government Targets in NDP. ADC contribution to resolving constraints GoU was facing in achieving its goals outlined in the NDP.	Literature review (national statistics, Joint Annual Reviews, ADC annual progress reports). + SIPs KII with focal ministries. + MOFPED
	3. How relevant has the geographical focus and the choice of regional and local priority areas been?	ADC fills major gaps in support in the geographical areas of focus.	Literature review (NDP). + SIPs KII with focal ministries. KII with NGOs.
	4. How do the Ugandan partners and other development partners assess ADC's comparative strengths? Do they reflect what was outlined in the current Country Strategy? What is the added value of ADC's presence for Uganda and for Austria?	DPs confirm that ADC has unique strengths and roles in the focal sectors as outlined in ADC CS. ADC fills a noticeable gap in development assistance to Uganda.	KII with DPs. KII with OPM, and focal sectors. + MOFPED
	5. Has the Country Strategy focused on issues of poverty reduction and been designed to also cover cross cutting issues? Have these issues been systematically followed up in implementation and bilateral dialogue?	Interventions in focal sectors address strategic needs of the poor to move out of poverty. Strategic needs of the poor to move out of poverty are on the agenda of bilateral dialogue with government and DPs.	FGDs with beneficiaries in project sites. Literature review (minutes of bilateral discussions with GoU and DPs).

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
	6. Has the Country Strategy considered the human rights based approach and in which areas are there successes, specific lessons learnt and recommendations to be followed up in the next Country Strategy?	ADC interventions influence policy, legal and institutional reforms to compel GoU as duty bearer to deliver water, sanitation, justice and peace, and citizens as rights holders to demand the services.	KII with ADC supported NGOs, focal sector ministries, ADC CCO, ADA Thematic Advisor for GGHR. Literature review (ADC CCO progress reports, JARs, previous evaluations in focal sectors).
	7. In view of the next National Development Plan (NDP II, 2015-2020) and the priorities of other development partners, and in the context of aid effectiveness principles and joint programming: will the focal areas Water and Sanitation and Rights, Justice and Peace , together with priority themes within these sectors and the various instruments and priorities of other actors, remain relevant for ADC's future Country Strategy?	WASH, rights, justice and peace are identified as priority areas of focus for NDP 2015-2020. Thematic priorities, such as capacity development of duty bearers and rights holders for affordable and sustainable public services remain priority in NDP. ADC continued roles in these sectors are jointly agreed upon by DPs. General Budget Support, Basket Funding, Project-Type Funding, Donor Staff and Other TA, scholarships remain priorities in NDP 2015-2020).	Literature review (NDP 2015-2015). + SIPSs KII with DPs, OPM. + MOFPED
	8. Are ADC's priorities and comparative advantages as laid down in Austria's Three Years Programme on Austrian Development Policy 2013-2015 (e.g. Nexus Approach; Human Rights based approach) in line with those of Uganda? Are there any specific lessons to be learned and/or recommendations to be made concerning a systematic and integrated follow-up?	Similarities or differences between GoU's integrated approach to WASH, energy and environment and the ADC Nexus approach. Existence or non-existence of mechanisms for systematic follow-up of Nexus Approach and HRBA Approach by GoU.	Literature Review (3 Years Programme on Austrian Development Policy; Joint Water and Environment Sector Support Programme; JLOS Third Strategic Investment Plan).
Effectiveness	9. How effective has the implementation of the country strategy been in terms of achieving its objectives and	Progress made towards achievement of performance targets in the results matrix	Literature review (ADC CCO Annual Progress Report 2013; Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
	results as stated in the results matrix?	of the Uganda CS.	Country Strategy (2010-2015); Sector M&E Reports). KII with ADC CCO, focal sectors.
	10. What are the external and internal causes and factors behind the fulfilment of objectives?	Enabling internal and external conditions. Challenges encountered in fulfilment of objectives.	Literature review (ADC CCO Annual Progress Report 2013; Sector M&E Reports). KII with ADC CCO, GoU focal sectors of WASH and JLOS.
	11. To which extent are the indicators specific, comprehensible, realistic and gender-sensitive?	Indicators meet SMART Criteria. Indicators monitor gender equality and empowerment of women.	Literature Review (Uganda Country Strategy (2010-2015), Results Matrix; ADC Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Policy Document).
	12. To which extent has it been possible to implement the thematic focal areas as stated in the Strategy?	Outputs achieved in implementing activities in thematic focal areas.	Literature review (ADC CCO Annual Progress Report 2013; Uganda CS (2010-2015). Interviews with GoU focal sectors; ADC CCO.
	13. How well has the mainstreaming of ADC's principles and cross-cutting issues (Poverty Alleviation, Conflict Prevention, Gender, Environment, HIV/AIDS, Good Governance and Human Rights, including children and persons with disabilities) been achieved? Are there any lessons to be learned in this regard for the next Country Strategy?	Examples of strategies used by implementers to systematically mainstream ADC principles and cross-cutting issues in programme interventions on the ground. Specific groups of beneficiaries reached and specific types of benefits delivered to beneficiaries as a result of mainstreaming ADC principles and cross-cutting issues.	Literature review (Focal Sector M&E reports and databases on beneficiaries and types of benefits delivered; Guidelines on mainstreaming ADC principles and cross-cutting issues given to / developed and used by implementers; Project proposals of implementers). KII with GoU focal sectors and ADC funded NGOs.

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
			FGDs with beneficiaries.
	14. How effective has the use of different aid modalities (budget support, sector wide approach, programme-based approach, conventional programmes and projects, pooled funding, ICM) been in implementing the Country Strategy?	Progress made towards achievement of performance targets in the results matrix of the Uganda CS. Outputs achieved in implementing activities in thematic focal areas.	Literature review (ADC CCO Annual Progress Report 2013; Uganda Country Strategy (2010-2015); Sector M&E Reports). KII with ADC CCO, GoU focal sectors.
	15. Have the other financial tools mentioned in the Country Strategy (Business Partnerships, NGO co-financing, APPEAR Programme, PIDG, CGIAR, multi-lateral projects, Austrian Export Finance Credit, Development Bank of Austria) been used in a way that created synergies with the thematic focus areas? What was the role of policy as well as political dialogue?	Examples of ways in which other financial tools have complemented activities funded by the aid modalities in the thematic focus areas of the Uganda CS.	Literature review (project proposals and contracts for the other financial tools). KII with Programme Managers (NGO co-financing, APPEAR, PIDG, CGIAR, Business Partnerships; Austrian Export Finance Credit; Development Bank of Austria).
	16. How effective has donor coordination at national and, where applicable local level been implemented and what was ADC's role in it?	Clear division of labour between DPs in the focal sectors. Part played by ADC in donor coordination at national and district level.	Literature review (UJAS Framework). KII with ADC CCO, DPs, GoU Focal Sectors, District Authorities.
	17. How effective has the monitoring system been used during the implementation of the country strategy, including monitoring the integration of cross cutting issues? Have monitoring results been documented? To what extent have they affected joint learning of all actors/institutions involved, including ADC in general and its strategic planning cycle in particular?	Relevance and quality of data collected. Examples of how the M&E data has been used for steering and strategic management (e.g., key decisions made to adapt interventions).	KII with ADC CCO, OPM, GoU focal sectors, ADC-funded NGOs. Literature review (ADC CCO Quarterly, Half-Yearly and Annual Progress Reports, M&E Reports of the Focal Sectors; M& Reports of

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
			NGOs receiving ADC funding)
Efficiency	18. How efficient and transparent was the process of developing ADC's Country Strategy 2010-2015 with Uganda? Did it include (the most important) stakeholders in Uganda and in Austria? To which extent were their experience and comments taken into account?	<p>Time taken to consult stakeholders and develop Country Strategy.</p> <p>Names and organisations of stakeholders consulted.</p> <p>Levels of involvement and roles of consulted stakeholders.</p> <p>Examples of inclusion of comments and suggestions from stakeholders.</p>	<p>KII with ADA HQ, ADC CCO, MFA.</p> <p>Literature review (minutes of consultation meetings on formulation of Uganda Country Strategy (2010 – 2015).</p>
	19. How efficient and transparent has the implementation of ADC's Country Strategy been?	<p>Synchrony between time lapse and activity completion rate.</p> <p>Progress in achievement of outputs versus what was planned.</p> <p>Value for money performance (economy, efficiency, cost-effectiveness)</p> <p>Evidence of joint planning, monitoring and reporting.</p>	<p>KII with ADA HQ, ADC CCO, MFA.</p> <p>Literature review (Reports of Annual Planning and Review Sessions),</p>
	20. To which extent have systemic/integrated approaches been used in the Country Strategy? How can the next country strategy create synergies given Austria's commitment to a Nexus approach?	<p>Examples of ways in which other financial tools have complemented activities funded by the aid modalities in the thematic focus areas of the Uganda CS.</p>	<p>Literature review (project proposals and contracts for the other financial tools).</p> <p>KII with Programme Managers</p>

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
		<p>Examples of how aid modalities have complemented each other synergistically.</p> <p>Examples of integration between interventions in water and sanitation and those in rights, justice and peace.</p>	<p>(NGO co-financing, APPEAR, PIDG, CGIAR, Business Partnerships; Austrian Export Finance Credit; Development Bank of Austria), ADA CCO and GoU Focal sectors.</p>
Sustainability	<p>21. How sustainable, in terms of lasting benefit, have ADC's interventions based on its Country Strategy been in Uganda?</p>	<p>Benefits likely to continue after phase out of ADC support.</p> <p>Benefits that will stop after ADC support is phased out.</p>	<p>KII with GoU focal sectors, NGO implementers and beneficiaries.</p>
	<p>22. What measures have been set in place in the focal sectors in order to sustain ADC supported programs in case of stop of funding?</p>	<p>Examples of exit strategies to ensure sustainable financing of activities.</p> <p>Examples of capacities created in service delivery institutions supported by ADC.</p> <p>Examples of community empowerment to demand services from duty bearers.</p> <p>Policy provisions to sustain service delivery.</p> <p>Examples of replication/scale-up by government and other development partners.</p>	<p>KII with GoU focal sectors, NGO implementers and beneficiaries.</p>

Austrian Development Cooperation

Uganda Country Strategy Review

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/Sources
	23. Has the Country Strategy, its implementation and its results contributed to coherent relations between Austria/ADC and Uganda?	<p>Perceptions of GoU on relations with Austria based on the ADC Uganda Country Programme.</p> <p>Perceptions of Austrian Government on relations with Uganda based on ADC Uganda Country Programme.</p>	KII with OPM, GoU Focal Sectors, sub-national stakeholders. + MOFPED
	24. How successful have the efforts of ADC been to contribute to an informed and critical public debate in Austria about Uganda, its development policies and the respective bilateral cooperation? (See - among others - DAC Peer Review 2008/2009).	<p>Examples of debates in Austria about Uganda, policies and bilateral cooperation.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions about success of the debates – topics discussed and resolutions.</p>	Literature review (Austrian parliament resolutions, public opinion polls, media reports on Austria-Uganda relations, DAC Peer Review 2008/2009).
Impact	25. What are the tangible results that can be derived because of the Austrian Country Strategy support in the sectors? To which extent has the ADC support contributed to the Sectors achievements?	<p>Outputs and outcomes achieved in the two focal sectors as a result of ADC specific contributions.</p> <p>Beneficiary views on benefits from ADC-supported interventions.</p>	<p>KII with GoU Focal Sectors, ADC CCO, DPs, NGOs, research and academic institutions.</p> <p>Literature review (evaluations such as: Impact of ADC Support to JLOS 2014, South-Western Towns: A Review of the Results and Sustainability of Water and Sanitation Interventions since 1996).</p>

ANNEX 2: REFERENCES

- ADA (2002) Country Programme Uganda, 2003–2005
- ADA (2010) Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015
- ADA (2012) Aenderungen durch Agnes Neid nachvollziehbar aber nicht in Unterschriftsversion aufgenommen - Annex I Description of the Action
- ADA (2012) Annex 1-Project Document to the Bilateral Agreement between the Austrian Development Agency and the Government of Uganda for **Water Supply and Sanitation Development in Small Towns and Rural Growth Centres** project
- ADA (2012) Annex I Description of the Action- *“Water Supply and Sanitation Development in Small Towns and Rural Growth Centres under the EU MDG Initiative”*
- ADA (2012) Appendix A to Annex I_Logframe
- ADA (2012) Appendix B to Annex I_Monitoring Plan
- ADA (2012) Appendix C to Annex I_tentative workplan
- ADA (2012) Appendix D Budget_vers 04 12 2012
- ADA (2012) Water Supply and Sanitation Development in Small Towns and Rural Growth Centres under the EU MDG-Initiative”
- ADA (2014) Co-financing of individual projects in developing countries in the South Funding Guidelines - An instrument of Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC)
- ADA (ibid) NRO-Rahmenprogramme: Kofinanzierung von Rahmenprogrammen österreichischer Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft
- ADC (2013) NGO Framework Programme: Rahmenprogramm 2013-2015 HORIZONT3000 Programme intervention (Environmental Sanitation Management for Human Life Improvement in Busia Municipality, Phase II)
- ADC (2013) NGO Framework Programme: Rahmenprogramm 2013-2015 HORIZONT3000: Programme intervention Ecological Rehabilitation of St. Mary's Hospital Lacor in Gulu
- ADC (2013) NGO Framework Programme: Rahmenprogramm 2013-2015 HORIZONT3000 Programme intervention (Peace Building and Socio-economic Development using Information & Communication Technology (ICT) in the Acholi sub-region, Northern Uganda)
- ADC (2013) NGO Framework Programme: Rahmenprogramm 2013-2015 HORIZONT3000 Programme intervention (Protection and Development of Children in Kitgum and Iganga Districts)
- ADC (2013) NGO Framework Programme: Rahmenprogramm 2013-2015 HORIZONT3000 Programme intervention (Enabling Rural Innovation Project East Africa (ERI-EA))
- ADC (2014) 141030 ODA_ADA Uganda nach Type of Aid 2005-2013 (2)
- ADC (2014) Impact_of_ADC_support_to_JLOS_May 2014[1]
- ADC (2014) NGO Cooperation International Funding instruments (NGO Cooperation International, 07/2014)
- Antwi, R. (2012) **Final Report:** Review Of ADA Second Framework Programme 1 (2010 - 2012) and External Evaluation Of Ada Co-Funded Family Strengthening Programmes In Ethiopia, Uganda And Zimbabwe Submitted To Fsp Continental Office For Africa And The Middle East
- Bernhard Wenger (2012) Evaluation: Austrian Development Cooperation, Bhutan Country Strategy 2010- 13, Mid-Term Review Report
- Bruner, M., Hauszer, M. (2012) Final Report: External Review of the Care Österreich Ada Framework Programme (Cöafp), 2010-2012 “Claiming Rights - Promoting Peace: Empow-

erment of Women in Conflict Affected Areas (Burundi, Uganda and Nepal)” Project No. 1980-02/2010

Buczko, C., Lutter, S., Hinterberger, F. (ibid) Guidance Document - Nexus Approach for ADA Programming, Project/ Programme Implementation and Policy Dialogue

CARE (2009) Women’s Empowerment and male engagement for gender transformation in post-conflict and chronically food-insecure settings (Ethiopia, Nepal, Uganda)” 2013-2015

EU (2012) Annex II c9 To The European Union Delegation Agreement - General Conditions to The European Union Delegation, Agreement for Indirect Centralised Method of Implementation

EU (2012) Annex III Budget of the Action

EU (2012) ANNEX IV to the European Union Delegation Agreement for Indirect Centralised Method of Implementation Detailed Provisions on the Central Exclusion Database (Article 10 Annexe II)

EU (2012) Annex V c12_delegation_ANNEX II - Communication of information by implementing authorities or bodies

EU (2012) Annex VI c13_delegation_Financial Identification

EU (2012) Annex VII c14_delegation_ Annex VII to the European Union Delegation Agreement for Indirect Centralised Method of Implementation

GoA (2007) NGO Cooperation - Austrian Development Cooperation Policy document

GoU & Development Partners (2011) Memorandum of Understanding between The Government of the Republic of Uganda - The Development Partners Under the Joint Budget Support Framework

GoU & GoA (2002) Bilateral Agreement Austria & Uganda 2003-2005 on A Framework for Development Cooperation for the Period 2003 until 2005

GoU & GoA (2012) Bilateral Agreement between Government of Uganda & Austrian Development Agency: Support to the Water Supply and Sanitation Development in Small Towns and Rural Growth Centres under the EU MDG-Initiative - Financial Years 2012/13-2016/17

GoU (2005) Joint Assistance Strategy for the Republic of Uganda (2005 - 2009)

GoU (2008) Joint Financing Agreement between the Govt of Uganda and the Development Partners: Joint Water and Sanitation Sector Programme Support (JWSSPS) 2008-2012

GoU (2009) Ministry of Water and Environment, Directorate of Water Development Operations Manual for the Water and Sanitation Development Facility

GoU (2009) National Development Plan, Uganda 2010 - 2015

GoU (2009) THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA Ministry of Water and Environment: Joint Partnership Fund Phase 2 Operations Manual

GoU (2012) Uganda PRDP Audit Interim Report [1]

GoU, Water and environment sector performance report, October 2014

Reev Consult, Baseline survey report on selected JLOS indicators for the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs

Schnitzer, M. (2014), Annex C - What we should learn from the DAC Peer Review 2009

Schnitzer, M. (2014), Annex D - What we should learn from the Bhutan Review of Bernhard Wenger 2012

SOS-Kinderdorf (ibid) NGO Framework Programme — Programme Document (1980-07/2013) (Strengthening effectiveness and sustainability of partner-programmes for the most vulnerable children, OVC, in Uganda, Ethiopia and Tanzania)

Uganda Bureau of Statistics, National Population and Housing Census 2014, Provisional Results, Revised Edition, November 2014

Water and Sanitation Development Facility-North (2013) Job Description of Manager -
Northern Umbrella of Water and Sanitation Office
WB & ADA (2010) JBSF Trust Fund - Admin Agreement signed by WB
WB (2013) World Bank - Amendment to the Trust Fund Administration Agreement 2640-
00_2010

ANNEX 3: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

Annex 3-1: People Interviewed in Vienna

Full Name	Position	Organisation
Ambassador Peter Launsky	Director General Department for Development Cooperation	MFA
Anton Mair	Deputy Director General for Development Cooperation	MFA
Stefan Scholz	Head of Department, Programming and Planning of Development Cooperation	MFA
Manfred Schnitzer	Head of Unit	Africa Unit, MFA
Reinhold Gruber	Task Manager, Private Sector Development	MFA
Martin Ledolter	Managing Director	ADA
Robert Zeiner	Director of Department Programmes and Projects International	ADA
Günter Engelits	Programme Manager East Africa	ADA
Monika Tortschanoff	Programme Manager West Africa, Burkina Faso, Uganda	ADA
Gertraud Findl	Advisor Education	ADA
Daniela Krejdl	Desk Manager Humanitarian Aid	ADA
Helmut Hartmeyer	Director of Department Funding Civil Society	ADA
Gunter Schall	Head of Unit Private Sector Development	ADA
Andrea Schmid	Head of Unit NGO-Cooperation International	ADA
Sonja Grabner	Advisor Good Governance and Human Rights	ADA
Gottfried Traxler	Advisor Private Sector Development	ADA
Robert Burtscher	Advisor Water and Sanitation	ADA
Ursula Steller	Head of Unit Countries/Regions	ADA
Konstantin Huber	Deputy Head of Department for International Finance Institution	MoF
Gerhard Gunz	Senior Manager, Strategies and Development Policies	OeEB/Development Bank of Austria
Thomas Vogel	Head of Department Projects and Programmes	Horizont 3000
Petra Bayr	Member of Parliament	SPÖ

Annex 3-2: List of Stakeholders Consulted in Kampala

Name	Position	Department	Institution
Callist TINDIMUGAYA	Commissioner	Directorate of Water Resources Management	Ministry of Water and Environment
Susan SPETS	Counsellor, Head of Cooperation		Embassy of Sweden
Christian GUGGENBERGER	Regional Director East Africa	HorizonT3000 East Africa	HorizonT3000
Christine BIRABWA-NSUBUGA	National Coordinator		Justice Centres for Uganda
Disan SSOZI	Ag. Commissioner	Water and Environment Sector Liaison Department	Ministry of Water and Environment
Erwin KUENZI	Programme Officer Water and Sanitation		ADC - Uganda
Rita ACIRO-LACOR	Executive Director		Uganda Womens' Network (UWONET)
James BOT	Country Director		Care Uganda
Mr. Hassan Shire	Executive Director		East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
Maris WANYERA	Commissioner	Aid Liaison Department,	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Martin Bo BRANDER	Head of Development Cooperation		Embassy of Denmark
Joseph SSEMMANDA	Senior Programme Coordinator	Urban Water and Small Towns	WaterAid
Michael OTIM	Head of Office	Uganda Office	International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ)
Olive LUMONYA	National Director		SOS Childrens' Villages
Franz Eichinger	Austrian development expert and entrepreneur resident in Uganda		Park Construction
Frank KIRWAN	Head of Cooperation		Embassy of Ireland
Francis ATOKE	Solicitor General		Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Faith Mutumba WASUBIRE	Legal Officer	Paralegal Advisory Services	Foundation for Human Rights Initiative

Name	Position	Department	Institution
Dr. Patrick B. Birungi	Director	Development Planning	National Planning Authority
Doreen Kabasindi Wandera	Executive Director		UWASNET
Paul Wolimbwa GAD-ENYA	Chief Registrar, High Court	Judiciary	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Allen Sophia Assimwe	Director and Co-founder		The International Human Rights Network East Africa
Aaron M Kabirizi	Director	Directorate of Water Development,	Ministry of Water and Environment
Sam Rogers WAIRAGALA	Technical Advisor	JLOS Secretariat	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Sarah Jesca AG-WANG	Programme Officer	Programmes	Uganda Womens' Network (UWONET)
Simone KNAPP	Head of Office		ADC - Uganda
Simone UNGERS-BOECK	Programme Officer - Governance		ADC - Uganda
Theo HOORNTJE	First Counsellor, Head of Cooperation		Delegation of the European Union
Dr Albert Abyamugisha	Commissioner	Monitoring and Evaluation	Office of the Prime Minister
Ali Aus Tushabe,	Engineer	Retired	

Annex 3-3: List of Stakeholders Consulted in Lira, Pader, Mbarara and Ntungamo Districts

Name	Title	Organisation
1. Mr. Johnson Opige	Senior Engineer	WSDF North
2. Ms. Mary Akao	Procurement Officer	WSDF North
3. Mr. Uwe Kraisse	Technical Assistant	WSDF North
4. Mr. Felix Okwir	Engineering Assistant	WSDF North
5. Mr. Mark Tendo	Engineer	WSDF North
6. Mr. Bernard Pariyo	Senior Engineer	WSDF North
7. Mr. Yusuf Lule	Engineering Trainee	WSDF North
8. Mr. Geoffrey Obong	Engineering Assistant	WSDF North
9. Mr. Geoffrey Ebyeru	Paralegal Officer	Paralegal Advisory Services
10. Mr. John Oguti	Paralegal Officer	Paralegal Advisory Services
11. Mr. Emmanuel Opio	Social Worker	Paralegal Advisory Services
12. Mr. Ronald C. Adukule	Social Worker	Paralegal Advisory Services
13. Mr. Samuel Odyeng	Social Worker	Paralegal Advisory Services
14. Mr. Nicholas Mancus	Country Director	International Lifeline Fund
15. Mr. Kevin Deans Eluk		International Lifeline Fund
16. Mr. Edwin Okabo	Program Manager	Divine Waters Uganda
17. Mr. Francis Ojok	Program Officer	Caritas Lira
18. Mr. David Okello		All Nationals Christian Care
19. Mr. James Odur	Program Officer	All Nationals Christian Care
20. Mr. Moses Abuc	Field Officer	JOY Drilling Deliverance Church
21. Mr. Isaac Okaka	Program Manager	JOY Drilling Deliverance Church
22. Mr. Iga Gonzaga	IOC Crime	Lira Police Station
23. Mr. Seiko Chemonses	Police Commander	Lira District Police
24. Mr. Suwed Mansur	R/PRO Police	Lira Regional Police
25. Ms. Maureen Ninsima	OC Lira Prisons	Lira Prison
26. Ms. Stella Adakun	OC Women Prison	Lira Prison
27. Ms. Faith Malinga	OC Erute Prison	Erute Prison
28. Mr. Patrick Bwire	Psycho-social Specialist	Justice Centres Uganda, Lira
29. Mr. Hudson Apunyo	Member	Community Member, Lira
30. Ms Maria Francis Any	Chairperson	Alirak Well, Atodi Village Lira
31. Mr. Wellborne Ber Otto	Vice Chairman	Pader District
32. Mr. Joseph Aluba	WASH Manager	Concern Pader
33. Mr Richard Okoli	CAO	Pader District
34. Mr. Balaam Oyugi	A/DWO	Pader District
35. Mr. Charles Obali	DWO	Pader District
36. Mr. Robert Okwir	A/CAO	Pader District
37. Ms Lato Rose Mwaka	SP/Councilor	Pader District
38. Mr. Julius Onika-nono	Hand Pump Mechanic	Ogom, Pader District
39. Mr. Mike Odong	Hand Pump Mechanic	Ogom, Pader District
40. Ms. Florence Adyero	Hand Pump Mechanic	Ogom, Pader District
41. Mr. Bishop Loklum	Hand Pump Mechanic	Ogom, Pader District
42. Mr. Bosco Okwera	Hand Pump Mechanic	PTC, Pader District
43. Mr. Patrick Ochola	Project Manager	ALARM Uganda
44. Mr. Lawrence K. Otika	Project Manager	AMREF Pader
45. Mr. Lawrence Odong	Project Manager	ZOA, Pader
46. Mr. John Okello	Technician	BHM, Pader

Name	Title	Organisation
47. Mr. Francis Olwoch	PSWO	Pader District
48. Mr. Edward David Okot	Magistrate I	Pader Magistrates Court
49. Mr. Wilson Ocheng	Court Clerk	Pader Magistrates Court
50. Mr. Antero Enyang	Deputy in Charge	Criminal Investigations Department, Pader
51. Ms. Rosaline Ochaya	OC	CFPU
52. Mr. Ludera Watum	OC Prisons	Pader Prisons
53. Mr. Festo Okidi	DCDO	Pader District
54. SP. Ambrose Sabiti	Commander	District Police
55. ASP. Romeo Onek	OC Police	Pader Police
56. Mr. Thomson Epia	Resident State Attorney	DPP
57. Ms. Betty Balisalouru	Legal Officer	
58. Gabriel Rogers BWAYO	Deputy Chief Administrative Officer	Mbarara District Local Government
59. Moses KAHANGIRE	District Engineer	Mbarara District Local Government
60. Stee Nyindo BIYONZA	Paralegal	Paralegal Advisory Services
61.	District Police Commander	Uganda Police Force – Mbarara
62. Jaffar MAGYEZI	Officer in Charge	Mbarara Central Police Station
63. Gilbert MUKESHA	Deputy Manager	WSDF-SW
64. Nicholas BASHASHA	Paralegal	PAS – Mbarara
65. Brian IRIHO	In Charge	National Community Service Programme – Western Region
66. Lydia NINSIMA	In Charge	National Community Service Programme – Mbarara
67. Didas MUHUMUZA	Assistant Court Registrar	Mbarara Magistrates Court
68. Phillip ODOKI	Chief Magistrate	Mbarara Magistrates Court
69. Sam KIRIBIRE	Paralegal	PAS – Mbarara
70. Genesisius MUGISHA	Police Cell Guard	Mbarara Central Police Station
71. Fortunate BWAMBALE	M&E Officer	WSDF-SW
72. Dunstan Paul DDAMULIRA	Acting Programme Manager	ACORD-SW Programme
73. Peter ARIKO, SP	Officer in Charge	Mbarara Central Prison
74. Everlyn LANYERO, PO	Officer in Charge	Mbarara Womens' Prison
75. Joy ORISHABA		MIFUMI – Mbarara
76. Franco BAREKENSI	Legal Officer	Uganda Law Society – Legal Aid Project – Mbarara
77. Hillary MUTABAZI	Manager	WSDF-SW
78. Ian KAKURU	Officer in Charge	Uganda Police Force – Mbarara
79. Sulaiman NABAASA	Scene of Crime Officer	Uganda Police Force – Mbarara
80. Perez Birungi NDYAKURA		Livelihoods Improvement Programme of Uganda
81. Owen AGAABA		Living Water International Uganda
82. Arthur MBABAZI		Literacy Action and Development Agency

Name	Title	Organisation
83. Samuel BARYEMARA	Assistant Technical Officer	South Western Umbrella of Water and Sanitation
84. Godwin RUTAREMWA	Chairperson	Water Board – Kagarama Water Supply Scheme
85. Stella TUMUSIIME	Secretary	Water Board – Kagarama Water Supply Scheme
86. Godwin NUWAGIRA	Scheme Operator	Water Board – Kagarama Water Supply Scheme
87. Lovinsa ATUHWEIRE	Water Point Attendant	Kagarama Water Supply Scheme
88. Grace KALENDA	Acting Town Clerk / Member	Water Board – Rwashemeire Water Supply Scheme
89. Juliet BARIMUNSI	Treasurer	Water Board – Rwashemeire Water Supply Scheme
90. Eric KUBIRIBA	Chairperson	Water Board – Rwashemeire Water Supply Scheme
91. Obadiah MUHWEZI	Member	Water Board – Rwashemeire Water Supply Scheme
92. Edward TUMUHIMBISE	Scheme Operator	Water Board – Rwashemeire Water Supply Scheme
93. William KAYUMBU	District Community Development Officer	Mbarara District Local Government
94. Joseph MUCUNGUZI	Senior Assistant Engineering Officer	Mbarara District Local Government

Annex 3-4: List of Workshop Participants

Name	Position	Institution
Alfred BOYO	Nutrition & Child Health Specialist	USAID Uganda
Benjamin KACHERO	Economist - JLOS Desk	Office of the Prime Minister
Callist TINDIMUGAYA	Commissioner	Ministry of Water and Environment
Caren BLUME		German Embassy
Charles MAGARA	Senior Programme Advisor	Embassy of Denmark
Chris AZUBA	Assistant Commissioner	Ministry of Water & Environment
Christian GUGGENBERGER	Regional Director East Africa	HorizonT3000
Christine BIRABWA-NSUBUGA	National Coordinator	Justice Centres for Uganda
Clarissa MULDER	Support Consultant	Water & Sanitation DP Group
Disan SSOZI	Ag. Commissioner	Ministry of Water and Environment
Erwin KUENZI	Programme Officer	ADC - Uganda
Gabi ZILLER	Founder / Donors' Representative in Uganda	Kindern eine Chance
Hans Peter van der WOUDE	Head of Cooperation	Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
Irene OVONJI-ODIDA	Chief Executive Officer	Women's Lawyers Association (FIDA)

Name	Position	Institution
James BOT		Care Uganda
James KABANDA	Team Assistant	Africa Services Group Ltd
Jane NABUNNYA-MULUMBA	Country Director	IRC International Water & Sanitation Centre
Joan KABAKAMA		Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development
Joel BALIDDAWA	Consultant	Africa Services Group Ltd
Josephine MUGALA	R&D / Water Engineer	UWASNET
Katja KERSCHBAUMER	Senior Advisor	DANIDA
Laurence HENGL	Monitoring and Evaluation	ADA
Manfred SCHNITZER	Head of Unit	Africa Unit, MFA
Martin Bo BRANDER	Head of Development Cooperation	Embassy of Denmark
Mary O'NEILL	Country Director	Concern Worldwide
Maureen NAHWERA	Chair JLOS, DPG, Senior Governance Advisor	Embassy of Sweden
Michael OTIM	Head of Office	International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ)
Molly APIO		Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development
Munhamo CHISVO	Team Leader / Consultant	JIMAT Development Consultants
Nelson OFWONO	Consultant	Africa Services Group Ltd
Olive LUMONYA	National Director	SOS Childrens' Villages
Pamela MBABAZI	Professor	Mbarara University
Paul Otim OKELLO	Programme Officer - Democracy & Human Rights	Delegation of the European Union
Paul Wolimbwa GADENYA	Chief Registrar, High Court	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Peter KABAGAMBE	Ag. Programme Manager	NETWAS-U
Rachel ODOI-MUSOKE	Senior Technical Advisor	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Rashid NGUMA	Economist	Office of the Prime Minister
Richard MATUA	PE - Urban	Ministry of Water & Environment
Sam MUTONO		World Bank
Sam Rogers WAIRAGALA	Technical Advisor	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
Samalie LUTAAYA	Programme Officer	HorizonT3000
Sarah Jesca AGWANG	Programme Officer	Uganda Womens' Network (UWONET)
Sarah NAKINTU	Country Coordinator	HumaneAfrica
Sharon NABADDA	Secretary / Project Assistant	ADC - Uganda
Simone KNAPP	Head of Office	ADC - Uganda
Simone UNGERSBOECK	Programme Officer - Governance	ADC - Uganda
Sonja HOFBAUER	WSDF Advisor	Ministry of Water and Environment
Søren Høgsbro LARSEN	Program Officer	DANIDA
Stefan PLEGER	Chairman	Kindern eine Chance
Theo HOORNTJE	First Counsellor, Head of	Delegation of the European

Name	Position	Institution
	Cooperation	Union
Timothy LUBANGA	Ass Commissioner	Office of the Prime Minister
Veronica NANSASI	National Family Strengthening Programme (FSP) Coordinator	SOS Childrens' Villages
Wilbrod TURIMASO	WASH Advisor	SNV